

[Copyright material. Please do not use without permission.]

Poverty, Mobility, and Revolution

25 May 2015

Nian-Sheng Huang

California State University Channel Islands

The nature and extent of poverty on the eve of the American Revolution have long intrigued two groups of modern scholars who hold opposite views. Believing that the number of the poor is insignificant in a predominantly middle-class society, one group has stressed America's great promise, abundance, opportunity, and mobility. Meanwhile, the other group—convinced of having found so severe a conflict between the haves and have-nots as close to the brink of a class war—has underscored America's glaring inadequacies, limits, inequalities, and inconsistencies. These conflicting views are further compounded with another tendency of casting eighteenth-century poverty into the unmitigated mold of rich against poor—a dichotomous approach often silent about the manifest distinctions between the middle and the upper classes on the one hand, while downplaying many crucial differences between the laboring classes and the poor on the other.

In recent years Ruth Wallis Herndon's *Unwelcome Americans* (2001), Jacqueline Barbara Carr's *After the Siege* (2005), Barry Levy's *Town Born* (2009), Seth Rockman's *Scraping By* (2009), and Cornelia H. Dayton and Sharon V. Salinger's *Robert Love's Warnings* (2014) have filled some of the gaps and addressed some of the weaknesses in earlier investigations. This new output of scholarship in the post-revisionist era advanced two salient changes. First, more sophisticated understanding and more sensitive delineations of class stratification and class relationships than before came to light as a result of these new publications, which significantly broadened

the narrowly defined class antagonism and class consciousness revisionist history had tried to demonstrate since the 1960s. Second, their micro-history approach brought much richer and much more vivid details about real people and their lives than what revisionist historians ever did, whose preoccupation with class and class struggle tended to treat people in the past as distinctive congregates of economic interests, predetermined categories of social forces, and even symbolic mouthpieces of political agency. Most authors of the post-revisionist era, however, discovered significant interactions and cross-connections between and among different social-economic classes, as well as between and among different racial, ethnic, and gender groups, which widened the scope of the kind of symmetrical social history that has artificially separated and disconnected them.

Recognizing both the limits of past interpretations in American historiography and the growing interest in a post-revisionist approach to studying the poor, this article proposes an elastic framework as a new lens through which to observe the intertwined cross-influences and intense flowing dynamics between poverty and mobility in the era of the American Revolution—something polarized conventions and binary views have not yet taken into consideration. That is, new details in this article suggest a mixed dual process moving back and forth between poverty and mobility, neither one of which has excluded the other to the previously assumed degree.

Eighteenth-century Massachusetts left no fewer than 40,000 names in selectmen's minutes, charity books, warning-out notices, and almshouse records, which furnished tangible clues not only for studying the poor, but also for reconsidering the revisionist paradigm of class struggle in a fresh context. Based on an analysis of several thousand deprived individuals, this article shows that the extensive mobilization campaigns for military action in the revolution had a transforming impact on the issues of poverty and mobility concerning the poor whose lives, contrary to some modern

assumption, did not remain monolithic, static, or one dimensional. Poverty was never predestined to mean failure nor mobility success. What most poor people experienced during this period was neither a doomed failure nor a promised success, but a strenuous and prolonged fight between poverty and mobility. Driven by despair, striving for hope, and frequently shifting between the two ends, their constant exertions mixed poverty with mobility. Such a mixing of life and death struggles resonated in the larger society where other groups faced similar situations. In the aftermath of the Stamp Act crisis, periodic swings between ever-present poverty and ever-tempting mobility opened the possible reciprocity through which the poor and the middle classes were willing to join forces. The massive mobilization in the revolutionary war created this unprecedented reciprocity which galvanized both the poor and the middle classes whose collective efforts propelled the struggle for independence to success, even though their class distinctions did exist and hardly ever disappeared before or since.

Layers of Deprivation

At least three groups of people could be considered poor, whose distinctions have all but vanished to modern investigators due to the lack of empirical tools that could gauge poverty in their times. Extant evidence suggests that the minimum cost of living was about six shillings per week (about £15 12s. per year) for a single adult person in Massachusetts for much of the eighteenth century. This benchmark, initially hypothesized and subsequently confirmed by contemporary data, indicates a highly consistent demand on what a single adult had to earn to buy enough daily provisions for survival. In other words, no matter how the prices of grain, produce, dairy, clothing, and other goods might varied throughout the colonial era, six shillings

would always purchase no less than nineteen pounds of white bread, twenty-nine pounds of wheaten bread, or thirty-nine pounds of household bread, even in the most commercialized urban areas.¹ Thus, half the sum (three shillings) could buy enough wheaten or household bread for one adult to survive for a week, enabling the person to use the other half to purchase additional necessities, such as drinks, meat, milk, shoes, and clothing.²

If anyone's total income hovered around six shillings per week (£15 a year),³ the person was highly unlikely to accumulate any assessable property to pay taxes, much less to meet the franchise requirement of £20 for a man above the age of twenty-one.⁴ Thus, it seems that the amount between an annual income of £15 (the level of bare survival) and an assessable estate of £20 (the level of some basic security and comfort) may serve as a reasonable threshold of separating the poor from the rest of the population. Namely, the colonial convention was on the whole correct in the sense that a man who did not hold enough wealth or income to be rated to pay property taxes would likely face a far more serious problem of survival than those who did.

Yet in addition to clarifying some conventional ambiguities, the same benchmark can further separate three groups of poor people at the very bottom of society, whose distinctions have all but become blurred to those who failed to pay adequate attention to the varied meanings of being poor in the past.⁵ First, the dejected poor, who could not earn 6s. per week, would indeed face starvation and despair. They were perhaps the poorest of the poor, who were commonly called sturdy beggars in the Old World. Some of them were idlers, but most belonged to the incompetent, the aged, and the lame who badly needed relief. Second, healthy adults who could earn 6s. a week would manage to survive, although their lives were little

better than bare subsistence. Often categorized as the competent poor, they caused concerns in a community where the better sorts lamented their presence and intermittent need for public aid.⁶ Finally, those people who could earn significantly more than 6s. per week had the opportunity to save and climb up to the higher economic ranks. According to colonial wage scales, most healthy men, women, and children could earn 6s. a week so long as they found employment,⁷ even though they did have to deal with many additional costs during unemployment, under-employment, and seasonal employment—not to mention accidents, injuries, sickness, disabilities, deaths, and marriages as well as raising a large family. Thus, the majority of the colonial poor were not the first group, who were facing imminent starvation,⁸ but rather the second and third groups, who—still hovering near the poverty lines—had to struggle long and hard to escape poverty permanently and move into a more secured economic and financial condition.

In fact, the poor in Massachusetts were hardly a single class locked in an irrevocable situation, but rather a mixture of countless groups of diverse people who had fallen into poverty due to widespread reasons and circumstances ranging from economic exigencies, financial crises, trade fluctuation, market shifting, and natural disasters to human tragedies and personal foibles. Take the latest scholarly interest in those warned out transients for example. Even though many of them were indeed poor, the population of domestic migrants in Massachusetts was not a monolithic whole, but rather a mixture of the poor with many aspiring members of the lower and middles classes. Motivated by a variety of goals and circumstances, this migratory population comprised of at least five distinct segments (and their approximate proportions): homeless vagrants (10%), strolling poor (30%), lower class families of limited

means (50%), middle class and professional people (5%), and diverse travelers, visitors, and sojourners on temporary trips (5%).⁹

Although visible to contemporaries, the thin lines between the poor and the lower class in those mixtures were particularly difficult to distinguish for modern investigators who, without a benchmark, tended not to differentiate the two classes at all but to treat them interchangeably as one and the same. With the benchmark, however, a seemingly small distinction separating the poor from the lower middle class could mean a real difference in the ways the two groups responded to poverty. Consider their different reactions after receiving a warning notice, for example. Records show that whereas many of the poor were forced to return to where they had first come from, nearly all migrants of any modest means were able to choose to resettle within a few years inside or across county lines. In the newer Worcester County, where land was still available, seven townships warned out 340 families in the 1760s. About one in every three of them showed on the provincial tax rolls of 1771, indicating an impressive rate of resettlement among the lower class. The distributions of those numbers are as follows:

	Families received warnings	Families stayed where warned	Families became taxpayers in any community
Lancaster	112	21	40 ¹⁰
Mendon	41	9	13 ¹¹
New Braintree	18	0	0
Oakham	12	3	5 ¹²
Oxford	19	5	7 ¹³
Rutland	94	6	40 ¹⁴
Worcester	44	10	19 ¹⁵

Total:	340	54 (15%)	124 (36%)

Clearly, except for the situation at New Braintree, about one half of the migrants of modest means were able to resettle and reestablish their homestead in a new community within a few years. Thus, a key difference between this group and the strolling poor was that the lower-class migrants were not easily discouraged after the initial rejection; some 15% of these Worcester County families were able to stay where they had been warned—a small but clear improvement compared with what the poor families experienced. Moreover, most did not return to the old places from which they initially came as the poor did, but instead continued to push on in their journey of migration until they could finally find a new place to settle. Sustained by their small possessions but attracted to a big future, the lower class demonstrated considerable aggressive, indefatigable, and resilient energies that characteristically distinguished them from the poorer folk on the same road of migration.

Wealth and Social Divide

From another angle, what frequently mystified the conundrum of poverty have been those elusive descriptions in many works stressing the evil versus good paradigm of rich against poor. In his chronicle *Boston Riots: Three Centuries of Violence* (2001), for example, Jack Tager's narrative phrases (all appearing on the first fifty pages) included the "lower and upper classes," "thousands of common people in Boston," "all classes," "the upper classes," "the ruling classes," "the increasing and pronounced inequality, poverty, and general economic depression from the 1730s," "[that] violence became the plebeians' means of political expression," "the working poor," "the powerless lower classes," "the poor," "the laboring poor," "the unworthy poor," "the plebeians," "the common people," "the poorer sort," "hungry Bostonians," "middling and

poor Bostonians,” “the poorer classes,” and “the dispossessed”—few of which were adequately explained, while nearly all of them were more asserted than proven.

Furthermore, although not a few historians were seriously committed to finding social stratification and class antagonism between the haves and have-nots, seldom did they look into the material status beyond the middle or upper-middle class. Gary B. Nash’s massive data of the century, in his *Urban Crucible* (1979), stopped in 1775 and did not mention nearly a thousand loyalists who went on board with General William Howe and sailed for Halifax at the end of the Siege of Boston in March 1776.¹⁶ Doubling their number within the next few years, these loyalist refugees included, among others, the royal governor, thirteen members of his council, twelve representatives, eighteen clergymen, two hundred customs officials, and many eminent families, whose wealth and possessions surpassed even the richest Americans.¹⁷ A deep social and economic gap separated the rich from the middle and lower classes, let alone the poor, during this period—that is, a clear class division existed between the rich loyalists and meager patriots.¹⁸

Records show that many of those who had steadfastly defended the king were substantial property owners, big merchants, royal appointees, and imperial officers.¹⁹ At least 600 of them left information concerning their family wealth in their pension files and in the Massachusetts tax rolls for 1771.²⁰ Meanwhile, a comparative review of the two belligerent camps indicates that most leading patriots were men of modest fortunes who had either less than £40 of rental value in town or less than 100 bushels of annual grain output in the country.²¹ A handful of them were wealthier, such as John Hancock, James Bowdoin, James Otis, James Warren, William Phillips, Joseph Hawley, and William Molineux. According to the

Massachusetts Tax Valuation List of 1771, Hancock had real estate at a yearly rental value of £60, 3 warehouses, 22,672 feet of wharf surface, 2 slaves, 594 tons of vessels, £7,000 of merchandise, £11,000 in lending money, and 5 horses. Bowdoin had 1 house, real estate valued at £100 per annum, 2 slaves, £5,120 in lending money, and 2 horses. Otis had 1 house, real estate valued at £40 per annum, 1 slave, and 1 horse. Warren, of Plymouth, had 3 houses, 1 warehouse, real estate valued at £80 per annum, 75 tons of vessels, £700 of merchandise, 3 horses, 10 oxen, 13 cattle, 5 swine, 240 acres of pasture good for 40 cows, and 23 acres of tillage with a yearly production of 350 bushels. Phillips had 1 house, real estate valued at £93 per annum, £2,076 of merchandise, £3,630 in lending money, and 2 horses. Hawley, of Northampton, had 1 house, 1 barn, real estate valued at £22 per annum, £200 in lending money, 1 horse, 3 cattle, 2 swine, 5.5 acres of pasture for 4 cows, and 18.5 acres of tillage with a grain production of 148 bushels a year. Molineux had 1 house, 1 warehouse, real estate valued at £46 per annum, £3,630 in lending money, and 2 horses.²²

Yet few of these middle-class rebel leaders could match the enormous wealth and financial power their political foes possessed. Approximately 160 loyalists appeared on the same tax list of 1771. Of them, 49 had a shop (or barn, still house, tan house, warehouse, and/or mill) in addition to 1 dwelling house for each of the taxpayers, 40 had 1 or more slaves, 26 had real estate worth £40 to £49 in yearly rental, 16 had real estate valued at more than £50, 14 had merchandise valued at £1,000 or more, 4 had wharf surface of more than 1,000 feet, 7 had lending money of £1,000 and upwards, 3 had yearly commissions of £300 and above, 3 had vessels of more than 100 tons, and 18 had enough improved land capable of producing more than 100 bushels of grain annually.²³

Meanwhile, merchants and importers of British merchandise had staggering stocks, devoted loyalists held lucrative offices, and the Episcopal ministry was exempt from taxation. Indeed, the loyalists possessed overwhelming wealth and privilege in as many material categories as any contemporary could imagine.²⁴ Henry Barnes of Marlborough, an importer of British goods, had a pearl ash works and distillery in Boston. He exported large quantities of pearl ash and held as many as 8,000 acres of land in the countryside. Describing himself as a gentleman of fortune in Boston, John Lindall Borland held land valued between £6,000 and £7,000. His father, John Borland, Esq., had an estate valued at £2,000 sterling per annum from his vast holdings in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. In Salem, William Browne's property was worth £33,000. John Chandler of Worcester had an income of £1,300 a year. He claimed a loss of property valued at £11,067 during the war and was granted £7,221 by the England government.²⁵ Known as "King Hooper," the merchant and manufacturer of cordage, Joseph Hooper of Marblehead possessed huge wealth. His son Robert Hooper was a Mandamus Councillor. The family claimed a loss of property in the amount of £9,160. Eliakim Hutchinson, Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, the grandson of a Councillor, and a Councillor himself,²⁶ was certainly a man of eminence and luxury, who owned "Shirley Place," valued at £12,000. It was the finest estate in Roxbury that he purchased from his father-in-law Governor Shirley, who built "Shirley Hall," the palatial mansion on the eighty-acre estate, with all material, wood frames, and bricks imported from England. The son-in-law's confiscated property in Suffolk County alone totaled £21,400.²⁷ Thomas Hutchinson, the eldest son of and personal attorney to Governor Hutchinson, claimed a property loss of £14,148, for which he was allowed £6,025 in addition to a pension of £40 per annum for his loss of income as a royal official.²⁸ A

representative to the General Court for thirty years, a justice of the peace for Worcester County, a judge of the Court of the Common Pleas, and a Mandamus Councillor, John Murray (of Rutland) was one of richest men in Massachusetts. The rental income for his great estate amounted to £26,000, and his fortune was four times bigger than that of either of his two fellow councillors—Nathaniel Hatch of Dorchester and Richard Lechmere of Taunton. He claimed to have lost £21,832, for which he was granted £9,774.²⁹

Individually speaking, the possessions of a John Hancock, a James Bowdoin, or an Elbridge Gerry might rival those of a wealthy loyalist.³⁰ Collectively, however, the loyalists were clearly the elite class whose power and wealth, buttressed by their political privileges and close commercial ties to the mother country, overshadowed the patriots from the middling to lower ranks as completely as most of their contemporaries could see. Thus, any modern attempt to address the issues of poverty, disparity, and class struggle can be laudable. Yet if that attempt mistook the middle class (including the upper-middle class) as the sole villain while giving no careful attention to who the rich and poor truly were, it may still distort and misinterpret realities. By the same token, it seems only necessary that any reasonable discussions concerning poverty, class consciousness, and class antagonism in that era should include explicit standards by which to judge not only the poor, but also various other social-economic groups from the lower, laboring, and middling classes to the wealthy and rich. For the sake of clarity, therefore, three additional classes (other than the poor) have been mentioned throughout this article, and their classification is suggested here according to these material conditions:

	For rural inhabitants annual grain production per household	For urban dwellers yearly rated estate & other income per household
The lower class	below 40 bushels	below £20
The middle class	from 40 to 300 bushels	from £20 to £1,000
The rich/upper class	above 300 bushels	above £1,000 ³¹

Poverty and Mobilization

That poor members of society often supplied most soldiers in the past is hardly new in history.³² Yet, while some may not deny the role the poor played in the struggle for independence, to what extent society relied on the poor to conduct the war is not as clear. In fact, few townships in Massachusetts could meet their draft quotas without counting on the able-bodied poor as an important source to fill the ranks. Although not qualified to vote and sometimes not even a legal inhabitant of the community in which they resided, some poor volunteered in the local militia and many more went on to join the Massachusetts regiments and the Continental Army. Newcomers or those who had received warning-out notices made up about 4 to 5 percent of the regular troops (90 to 100 men per company) and 7 to 8 percent of the local militia (40 to 50 men per company). The impoverished—both native and incoming—counted for as much as one half of all enlisted militia men and soldiers. If these assumptions hold, at least 10,000 to 15,000 poor men in Massachusetts fought during the war.³³

The existence of poverty was no secret to that generation, and both the Whigs and Tories alike understood it. A small town young lawyer and soon an aspiring member of the “North Caucus” in Boston, John Adams had worked on five legal cases involving the removal of

transients and he knew the plight of the poor first hand. As a local selectman, Adams once visited his neighbor Robert Peacock and his wife Elizabeth (Crane) in Braintree. While writing down what he had seen in his diary on a Saturday in March 1767, Adams could hardly contain his emotions. Peacock had been bedridden for seven weeks and unable to move. His distressful family gathered in one room that—although “excessive[ly] cold and dirty”—served as their “kitchen, cellar, dining room, Parlour, and Bedchamber.” Poor Peacock held a baby in his arms while three small children—all aged under ten—huddled in another bed across from his. The mother was the only one standing by a fire and making a few chips no larger than Adams’s palm. Apparently disturbed to realize what a selectman now had to cope with, Adams recorded that “[T]hese are the Conveniences and ornaments of a Life of Poverty. These the Comforts of the Poor. This is Want. This is Poverty! These the Comforts of the needy. The Bliss of the Necessitous.”³⁴

Beyond Adams’s private reckoning, however, what would soon follow was a visible shift of rhetoric in public discourse and a palpable change of perspectives through which Whig leaders and middle-class commentators would openly reposition poverty and reassess its causes. No longer consider poverty either a purely personal matter stemming from individual misfortunes or a limited neighborhood matter to be dealt with on a community basis as convention had always dictated, an increasing number of middle class observers in the late 1760s began to look for a broader connection between local poverty and a sinister source from overseas. They unequivocally concluded that external oppression caused domestic deprivation.

More than a few attributed the local sagging economy to the greed of big import-export houses, wholesale merchants, London bankers, and Scottish factors whose tightened loans and

credit led to widespread colonial poverty and suffering. Modern scholars confirmed this transatlantic connection. Several big swings, detailed by the historians Marc Egnal and Joseph A. Ernst, propelled the British trade expansion that benefited the colonies starting in the 1740s. Yet at each of the low ebbs, particularly the one after the Seven Years' War, the colonies acutely felt those drowning effects, which they characterized as "our emergency from the present alarming Scarcity of Money, and consequent Stagnation of Trade; and from the almost universal increasing Complaints of Debt and Poverty."³⁵

In this time of "stringency," "economic grievances," "bitterness of depression," "debt contraction," and "financial panic," Egnal and Ernst found a broadening involvement of the lower and middle classes, who joined with leading colonial merchants in protest and remonstrance.³⁶ Applying graphic descriptions as disturbing as any ideological ones, some charged the British government that its "people were sinking under poverty and oppression."³⁷ Others blamed external abuses that "evidently tend to oppress and enslave us."³⁸ Feeling "the galling yoke of oppression and slavery," still others used incendiary terms ranging from "baleful designs," "odious views," and "impending Evil" to "servile Subjection."³⁹ Convinced that "whenever the Americans dissolve their union with Britain, in consequence of her oppression, she will thereby receive a fatal wound to her commerce," some went so far as to insist that America's "total slavery is the object of the British ministry."⁴⁰ Even William Pitt the Elder, Earl of Chatham, described the situation in Boston after the Port Bill as being "reduced to beggary and famine [of] 30,000 inhabitants."⁴¹ Their involvement in the ensuing revolution, so it seems, would be only a matter of time.

Boston, the hotbed of patriotic fervor, recruited more than 3,000 men on its behalf to fight the war. Only about 7 percent of them were the property owners whose names appeared in the tax valuation of 1771, a crucial document for reviewing the economic status of typical Massachusetts residents shortly before the war. Whereas nearly all of the officers from ensigns and lieutenants to captains and majors were property owners and taxpayers, the overwhelming numbers of privates were not. Of those soldiers who were ratable residents, more than half had a rental value of less than £10 a year.⁴² A close look also shows that, the longer term of service, the more likely small property owners and the poor were to be enlisted. Dividing all enlistment terms into five groups according to the number of months served results in the following distribution of average property values of army recruits representing Boston:⁴³

£15 for service from 1 to 9 months⁴⁴

£12 for service from 10 to 19 months⁴⁵

£14 for service from 20 to 29 months⁴⁶

£12 for service from 30 to 39 months⁴⁷

£11 for service from 40 months or more⁴⁸

All told, only a fraction of the taxpayers and property owners engaged in military service, which stood at four percent—200 commissioned officers and enlisted men from assessed households out of 5,500 Bostonians on the 1771 tax rolls. The vast majority of Boston soldiers came from the marginal and transient segments in society including large numbers of newly arrived migrants and poor strangers, whose ratio of participation was at least three to four times as high as that of the long-time local proprietors and householders. In the short period of three years between 1771 and 1773 Robert Love, the town searcher for nearly a decade, warned out 1,126 outsiders coming to Boston, including 450 adult men, 360 women, and 300 children.

About 15 percent or 71 of those adult men, married or single, later became soldiers, and 22 (30%) of them were enlisted for three and more years in the war.⁴⁹ In fact, Boston enlisted a total of more than seven hundred common soldiers for the term of three years or during war, but few of them were registered local property owners or taxpayers.

Similarly, from 1769 to 1789, 14 townships in Plymouth County warned 357 adult men and their families to depart; more than 100 of them served in the Revolutionary War.⁵⁰ Of the same data, 119 adult males were warned in the first 5 years (1769-1774); 46 of them enlisted in the war while 28 of the enlisted men served for those communities that had originally warned them to leave.⁵¹ Records from Wrentham, Weston, and Lancaster also suggested a broad participation of the poor. Led by Captain Oliver Pond, Captain Benjamin Hawes, and Captain Lemuel Kollock, three Wrentham companies marched on the alarm of April 19, 1775. Their muster rolls listed a total of 116 men, including all officers and soldiers. Only 54 of them were rated in 1771—37 for property tax and 17 for a poll tax only.⁵² The other 62 men might not have been rated for several reasons, including (1) they were too poor to be rated, (2) they were under age in 1771, and/or (3) they were newcomers after 1771.⁵³ Whatever the reason for their omissions, it is not to exaggerate to say that more than half of those volunteer militiamen were from small estates or of no ratable property at all. Judging by the traditional standard that those paying no property tax were considered poor, the Wrentham militia can be characterized as the poor men's army as the composition of this local militia—from its captains to its privates—was evidently closer to the middle- and lower-ranks in society. A heavy dependence on those lesser and poorer members of the community to raise the local militia began long before the battle at Lexington and Concord started.⁵⁴

Although a smaller town, Weston rated the productivity of its inhabitants higher than that in Wrentham. Yet its militiamen showed the same characteristics. The Weston valuation of 1771 indicated that 44 of the 177 rated households were able to produce 100 or more bushels of grain annually. Only 12 of those 44 household heads joined the local militia.⁵⁵ The muster roll of Captain Samuel Lamson's company listed 103 men who had marched on the Lexington alarm. In addition to the 12 men who were valued at 100 bushels a year or higher, 11 others were rated with a household output from 20 to 80 bushels a year.⁵⁶ Another 17 men were rated for poll tax only.⁵⁷ The rest of the volunteer militiamen, or 60 percent of Captain Lamson's soldiers, were not rated at all,⁵⁸ although all his officers and staff were. This suggests that, like Wrentham, 80 of the 103 militiamen in Weston were either from poor families or from families of very limited grain-producing capacities.⁵⁹

Lancaster had 474 taxpayers in 1771. Although 144 of them had had a yearly output of 100 or more bushels of grain, only 54 men from this group served as soldiers in the war.⁶⁰ According to the 1771 valuation list, Lancaster's 188 soldiers showed the following distribution in regard to their farm income:

- 47 had no house, land, or grain output⁶¹
- 18 had a house but no grain output⁶²
- 18 had a house and a grain production of 40 bushels or less⁶³
- 19 had a house and a grain production of 45 to 50 bushels⁶⁴
- 15 had a house and a grain production of 60 to 75 bushels⁶⁵
- 17 had a house and a grain production of 80 to 90 bushels⁶⁶
- 24 had a house and a grain production of 100 to 110 bushels⁶⁷
- 14 had a house and a grain production of 120 to 130 bushels⁶⁸
- 9 had a house and a grain production of 140 to 160 bushels⁶⁹

5 had a house and a grain production of 200 to 220 bushels

2 had a house and a grain production of 300 bushels or more.⁷⁰

Thus, of the 188 soldiers, 65 had no farm income and 37 had less than 50 bushels a year. This indicates that more than half of Lancaster soldiers came from day laborers, poor families, or households of subsistence. Moreover, about 500 additional names of soldiers did not appear on the 1771 tax rolls at all, suggesting that Lancaster must have recruited more poor persons, newcomers, emerging young householders, and traveling strangers into the ranks.

From “Unwelcome Americans” to “Hot Commodities”

While studying the marginal members of society in the second half of the eighteenth century, historian Ruth Wallis Herndon aptly named the transient population “unwelcome Americans” in her book under the same title, describing the predicaments and sufferings of those poor individuals and families that received warning notices in the context of peace rather than war.⁷¹ That situation would quickly change as the siege of Boston ended in March 1776 while the fighting continued to drag on. In fact, finding and engaging lowly and transient persons in long-term enlistment (for six months or more) became increasingly critical as many better-off families’ interest and willingness to serve dwindled. Such a divergent trend became so apparent at Concord where the earliest armed resistance began that “the very character and social meaning of the war were transformed,” as Robert A. Gross has pointed out, “from a voluntary struggle to a battle by conscript and eventually from a community-wide effort to a poor man’s fight.” Slipping away from the widespread voluntary participation at the beginning of the war, the portion of voluntary soldiers at Concord dropped to as low as a quarter of the

total enlisted men in 1778; two years later “only eight of the sixteen men who signed up for three-years terms had any known connection to the town.”⁷²

Consistent with what Gross found out about Concord, the rate of enlistment and participation from poor people and their families at many communities in Massachusetts never declined.⁷³ Instead, it not only sustained but also increased throughout the war. Records show that Wrentham warned out four poor men and their families—Jonathan Felt in 1769, William Puffer in 1768, Eleazer Fisher in 1767, and William Wetherbee in 1770⁷⁴—who subsequently enlisted and fought in the war on behalf of Wrentham. Although not poor, Jesse Ballou was born in the area of Wrentham, which later became Cumberland, Rhode Island. He was warned in 1762, but enlisted for both Massachusetts and Rhode Island during the war. Felt, Puffer, and Ballou marched with the Wrentham militia responding to the alarm of Lexington on April 19, 1775. Felt continued to serve thereafter and was promoted to captain in 1780. Puffer’s son George also enlisted and served in 1778 and 1780. Fisher continued his service during the siege of Boston and again in 1777 and 1780.

At least three poor strangers to Weston became patriotic soldiers, and all of them responded to the first shot at Lexington. Born in Medford, Samuel Nutting and his parents received warnings from several townships when he was young. Weston warned him, his wife, and family in 1772. He marched with the Weston militia responding to the alarm of April 19, 1775. Two years later he served in the company under Captain Jonathan Fisk, the same person who had warned him to depart from Weston a few years earlier. Weston authorities also warned Nathan Boynton (whose father Jacob was the great-grandson of John Boynton of Rowley), his mother Mary, and several siblings numerous times. At 14, Boynton became an

apprentice to Isaac Cory of Weston in 1771. He marched on the alarm of April 19, 1775, and served again later the same year. Born in 1757, Peter Cary's parentage was not clear. Weston warned him in 1773, when Isaiah Bullard took him as an apprentice. Serving in Captain Samuel Lamson's company of militia, both he and his master responded to the Lexington alarm.

Whereas Bullard resumed his civilian life soon afterward, Cary continued to serve during the siege of Boston and enlisted again and again throughout the war in 1778, 1779, 1782, and 1783.

Lancaster authorities warned out four men who later represented the town in service during the war. Born in 1747, Thomas Cleland came from Colchester, Connecticut, and was warned in 1765. He served as a private shortly after the battle at Lexington. He enlisted for more than two years from 1777 to 1779, and continued to serve until March 1781, when he was reported to have deserted. Lemuel Gates was from Rowley, Canada. Lancaster warned him, his parents, and siblings in 1763. He was a fifer in 1775, served as gunner in the Continental Army for three years, and became a sergeant in 1780. His brother Samuel also enlisted for Lancaster. He too was a gunner in the same company as Lemuel and served in the Continental Army for three years, beginning in 1777. Born in Holden, Elijah Ball came to Lancaster from Shrewsbury, some 12 miles to the south. He enlisted as a private and marched in response to the alarm of April 19, 1775. He was a sergeant and served for three months in 1777. His older brother Daniel fought in the war for Shrewsbury. As a private, he marched to Cambridge on the alarm of April 19, 1775. He later served for three months, from August to October 1775.

If any town's effort to entice the poor into service was due to a shortage of manpower, townsfolk's willingness to serve side by side with the poor in the revolutionary forces could be more than a matter of expediency. The traditional sense of social hierarchy separated people

according to their distinct status. Yet the same stratification also necessitated a mutual dependency, which only deepened during war. Whereas the middling sort and the able-bodied poor had a history of interaction in civilian life, the prolonged military action soon made it clear that they now more than ever would rely on each other's participation to survive.

That the middle to the lower-middle classes and the able-bodied poor took most of the direct responsibilities in fighting the war was largely due two realities. First and from the top segment of society, few members of the rich families tended to serve, whose wealth could easily free them from enlistment. In Wrentham, 15 taxpayers had the ability to produce 100 or more bushels of grain in 1771. Only four joined the local militia.⁷⁵ Meanwhile, no fewer than 140 merchants, professionals, and substantial Bostonians paid a fine of 10 pounds each to avoid enlistment in the Continental Army in 1776, when authorities drafted 258 men from the 12 wards in town.⁷⁶ Second and from the other end of the spectrum, hampered by their decayed mental and physical condition, the impotent and wretched poor at the bottom of society were less likely to qualify to serve. Nevertheless, if they were able and willing to join the army, the fact that they had received public aid in the past would not disqualify them from enlistment. John McClary, a recipient of town relief, engaged in war activity on behalf of Boston. A legal resident and rated householder, he was not an abject poor, but one who had received outdoor relief as many times as he was entitled to.⁷⁷

Low Circumstances but High Sacrifices

Poverty did mean dire need, and the poor would rarely show up in modern discussions but for their wretched miseries. Alternately stereotyped as inactive, unintelligent, vile, or violent,

they were often portrayed as either helpless victims of low circumstances or passive recipients of charity and relief. If ever they held any place connecting to the revolution, they played the roles of nameless street crowds in furious protests and destructive activities. A closer look of service records suggests that the poor were not only important participants in the war, but also the ones who made greater sacrifices for and highly positive contributions to the patriotic cause than many other social groups in several comparable categories.

Longing for self-rule and identity, former bound-out orphans were an active group of participants in the war. Their willingness to join the fight for independence became even stronger if they were also looking for freedom from bondage. The strong urge to achieve liberation was perhaps deeply personal to those bound-out orphans whose terms would end on the eve of the revolution. Between 1734 and 1776, Boston overseers of the poor bound out some 700 orphans who had been born at or brought to the almshouse. A large percentage of the boys whose indentures ended in the early 1770s joined the military service for various townships to which they had been sent. Records show that about fifty-three bound-out apprentices reached the age of twenty-one from 1770 to 1775. More than a quarter of them enlisted during the revolution, including Thomas Lillie (bound out to Marblehead), Thomas Craige (Worcester), Bartholemew Lynch (Marblehead), John Davis (Hadley), John Banks (Grafton and later Alstead, New Hampshire) and his younger brother Thomas Banks (Hatfield), Thomas Caryl [Cariel] (Southborough), Encoh Jarvis (Marblehead), Francis Akley (Holden), Benjamin Champney (Boston), William Bright (Salem), Matthew Hopkins (Boston), Joseph Maxfield (Springfield), Mark Noble (Hadley), and William Shirley (Marblehead).⁷⁸ Thus, despite their sad childhood, these bound-out orphans actively responded to the calls for military

service; the rate of their participation was as impressive as anyone else's, if not more. In addition to their relative health and young age, which made them suitable candidates for recruitment, one hidden aspect of their active participation lay in the fact that not one of their masters—who might have persuaded their bound boys to substitute for their obligations to enlist—had served. Joseph Maxfield's terms, for instance, would not end until 1778. Yet he enlisted in 1776 and served again from 1779 to 1782 for three years. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the master must have agreed Maxfield's early release which would allow him to join the service.

If everything else being equal while poor households happened to have a large number of children, they seemed to have sent more family members to the war than others, which was one of the most significant sacrifices they made to the revolution. Caleb Church, whose family received warnings five or six times from several townships in Worcester County, participated in the battle in April 1775. After responding to the Lexington alarm, his younger brother Silas later served during the siege of Boston and again in 1777. Both Elijah Ball and his brother Daniel marched on the Lexington alarm, one for Lancaster and the other Shrewsbury. Warned several times by Weston authorities, three members of the Elisha Cox family fought for independence while one of them, Ensign Elisha Cox, died for the cause. His superior Colonel William Bond called him "a good officer."⁷⁹ Coming from Boxford, Essex County, Daniel and Sarah Symonds Black and their five children were warned at Holden, Worcester County. All three of their sons—Jacob, Daniel, and John—served during the revolution. After being warned by Bridgewater, Ebenezer Hill, wife Abigail Hill, and their five children (from Abington) refused to leave. All three of their sons— Daniel, Solomon, and John—enlisted in the war for Bridgewater.

Although not utterly destitute, of those who had received warning notices at one township or another, many joined the revolution with their siblings and relations nonetheless—Jonathan Barrett and his brother Samuel, Thomas Burnham and his brother John, William Bogle and his brother Thomas, Lemuel Gates and his brother Samuel, Luther Graves and his brother Calvin, Thomas Harris and his brother Daniel, Samuel Fellows, Jr., and his brother John, Jonathan Johnson and his brother Job, Edward Payson and his brother David, William Puffer and his son George, Zenas Gibbs and his two brothers Frederick and Jonas, and Asa Haven and his two brothers Ebenezer and Daniel.

Compared with people of better circumstances, families of the lower classes not only sent more members, they generally enlisted more times and served for longer durations. As late as three years into the war until early 1778, both officers and militiamen generally served for a short term, ranging from several days to several months. Those who enlisted for one, two, or more years were often from families of little estate. Similarly, it rarely happened that a poor person would serve only one term of enlistment. Most joined and rejoined the service, and many enlisted up to three years or for the duration of the war—the longest term of service in the revolution. If possible, few people from substantial backgrounds chose this option of long service. Based on a study of a random collection of some seventy poor men, this article can positively confirm that eighteen of them enlisted for three or more years, which showed a high rate (one out of four) of prolonged service among those of low circumstances.⁸⁰

Yet their experiences were not out of the ordinary. The case of Lancaster provides further illustration. By several orders of the General Court (on December 5, 1776, January 27, 1777, and February 3, 1778) and subsequently by Congressional Resolve of December 2, 1780,

Massachusetts towns were required to send one seventh of all males sixteen years old or older to form twenty regiments of the Continental Army in Massachusetts. Under these orders, Lancaster had to procure a quota of 138 men. Of those whose names have survived, 29 also appeared on the 1771 valuation list. Thus, those who signed up for a term of three years appeared to have come from the following groups:

- 2 from those whose yearly output of grain was 100 bushels⁸¹
- 3 from those whose yearly output of grain was from 80 to 90 bushels⁸²
- 4 from those whose yearly output of grain was from 60 to 75 bushels⁸³
- 2 from those whose yearly output of grain was from 45 to 50 bushels⁸⁴
- 3 from those whose yearly output of grain was 40 bushels or less⁸⁵
- 3 from those who had a house but no yearly output of grains⁸⁶
- 10 from those who had no house, no land, or grain output⁸⁷

Clearly, unlike early in the war—from the Lexington alarm to the end of the Boston siege—when the call of service meant a few days to a few months, no resident whose yearly grain production exceeded 100 bushels was now willing to serve for a three-year term while those households of 50 bushels or less a year continued to contribute the bulk of the new quota Lancaster badly needed to fill. As a single group, these landless laborers contributed the highest percentage of the long-term soldiers. While other groups' participation had declined as the duration of enlistment extended, people of small fortunes or no property at all played more significant roles in the army than what they did in the short-term services right after the war first started.

The heavy demand for soldiers was a difficult task for any township that suffered a chronic shortage of labor. The congressional resolves and the General Court's orders of 1778 added

more pressure, forcing many communities into a frantic search for new solutions. One such solution was to divide a local community into the same number of “classes” (or “squadrons”) as the assigned quota a township had received. Each “class” was in turn responsible for securing the allocated soldier. All households in each class were rated for any supplies, bounty money, or taxes for the support of the soldier and his family. Constables were authorized to take the body of anyone who failed to pay the assessed rate. If no person in the class volunteered to serve for the sum the class had agreed to offer, a lottery ensued to determine which household in the class would provide the soldier. Whomever the lot hit had to enter the army for as long as the term would require or find a substitute.⁸⁸

Because many people were reluctant to enlist for three years, finding a substitute for hire became a common practice soon after the passing of 1777-78 resolves. Indeed, townships gladly accepted anyone willing to enlist, and it was not infrequent that two communities would compete with each other for the same soldier to fulfill their quota. Thus, Lancaster submitted to the army, in addition to its residents who had volunteered to serve, quite a few servants, “bounty-jumpers,” “hired slaves,” “hired strollers,” or “hired foreigners.” They included, according to the town’s own descriptions, “Perley Rogers, a negro,” “Charles Stuart, a mulatto,” “Jonas Carter, a hired Lunenburg man,” “Peter Franklin, a negro,” “Ephraim Fuller, aged sixteen,” “Job Lewis, a negro,” “Abel Moor, claimed by Bolton,” “Robert Skinner, a hired stroller, claimed by Bolton,” “Cornelius Tigh, a substitute, claimed by Bolton,” “Asa Wyman, aged seventeen,” “John Wyman, aged seventeen,” “Edom London, a negro slave, claimed by Winchendon,” “Reuben Kendall, a negro,” “Matthew Wyman, credited to Lunenburg,” “Elisha Houghton, claimed by Harvard,” and “Cain Lewis, a negro.”⁸⁹ Meanwhile, enlistee William Deputin openly

acknowledged to have accepted fifty-four pounds (Lawful Money) to substitute for a certain class in town. The army deemed Lancaster's three other recruits "unfit for service": "Clark Gibbs, 60 years old. Rheumatic and decrepid with age," "Lemuel Shed, infirm," and "Jotham Wood, 41, bodily deformed."⁹⁰

In these gloomy years Lancaster was by no means the only town scrambling for soldiers. Hired or not, voluntary or substituting, native or transient alike, the warm bodies of the poor now became a hot commodity whose impoverishment was far less of a concern under the grave pressure of war. Every community was willing to pay a price to recruit them for enlistment. A widespread campaign was underway across the commonwealth to include the poor in the ranks of a fighting force. Local residents of Billerica in Middlesex County, for example, were highly active in supporting the American cause from the start. A total of 104 townsmen from all social ranks joined the militia, which participated in various actions in 1775, including the march on the Lexington alarm. Colonel William Tompson, one of the three highest taxpayers in town, paying £6 a year, was a participant as were 67 other men who had paid a tax ranging from 10s. and £1 to £5 a year. Another 36 men were non-taxpayers or non-residents, accounting for approximately 30 percent of the militia force. As the war continued, however, poor individuals and outsiders became the main source for recruitment. Of the thirty-six men who enlisted in 1777 for three years, only fifteen of them were taxpayers. Eight men paid ten shillings a year. John Needham paid the highest at £2 6s. 7d. a year. Clearly, far fewer substantial taxpayers volunteered for the long-term enlistment in 1777 than they had done for the short-term service two years earlier. As a result, the town had little choice but to recruit more than half of the enlisted men from non-taxpayers, non-residents, or strangers.⁹¹

In late 1779, people from the small town of Wilbraham in Hampshire County keenly felt the mounting pressure of recruitment. “The difficulties which hindered the raising of men continued to accumulate,” as they recalled. “The demand was imperative, the work well-nigh impossible. A desperate rally was made in October, and £400 were raised for the soldiers’ bounty and mileage money, and subscriptions were opened that the money might be promptly obtained.” A month later the town voted to raise £2,860 for those soldiers who would serve for nine months.⁹² No sooner had a town meeting at Westborough, Worcester County, voted in July 1776 that “every man should pay his just proportion in supporting the war from April ye 19, 1775, and so forward” than their resolve was tested. In addition to horses, shoes, stockings, and shirts for the troops, Westborough, like every other town, was ordered to provide supplies such as beef, cattle, sheep, butter, cheese, rye, and Indian meal for the relief of the besieged Boston. The town had to borrow a loan of £400,000 for its share. In 1775, the town paid £4 for each man who responded to the Lexington alarm. In 1780, the town had to pay £17,780 for 14 men who had agreed to enlist for the reinforcement of the Continental Army, averaging £1,270 per soldier.⁹³

These staggering sums and prices reflected the horrendous currency depreciation during the war years. Dropping as much as 400 percent, the precipitate decline of the credit bills made recruitment efforts extra difficult. In Middlesex County, Sudbury voted a bounty of £20 in bills of credit to a soldier in 1777, but granted a bounty of £15 in specie or £600 in bills in 1781. The town paid £4,929 to a full muster roll of 113 soldiers and officers in 1778. Two years later, it had to raise £10,000 to pay off as few as 14 men in exchange for their promise to enlist.⁹⁴ For all the face value of credit bills, the enlisted men gained little. Soldiers generally received their

bounties in state bills and town notes, and their pay in Continental money, which at the end of their term of service could neither meet the expenses of their outfit nor pay the taxes they had owed to the government.⁹⁵ Facing these obstacles, some communities improvised. New Bedford, Bristol County, gave out £1,356 9s. 1d. in cash bounties to those who would engage in the continental service.⁹⁶ Sunderland, Hampshire County, decided to lower the ongoing rate from one silver dollar for forty Continental dollars to one for seventy-five. Knowing how desirable merchandise could be, the town also voted to add a pair of shoes as a bounty to each of its enlisted men.⁹⁷ Costing 7s. a pair in the late 1770s, good shoes for men could be worth as much as £14 in the early 1780s, when commodities were often preferred over money.⁹⁸ Townsfolk in Royalston, Worcester County, decided to raise as much as £1,000 Spanish milled dollars to hire soldiers. They also promised that any resident who was willing to serve for the term of three years could receive “ten cows, heifers three years old with calf or with calves by their sides.” The strategy seemed to have worked. In the end, twenty-four soldiers came from other places to serve for Royalston, becoming lawful residents after the war. They accounted for one fifth of all the revolutionary veterans living in Royalston at the time.⁹⁹

It is clear that despite their low circumstances, the able-bodied poor, people of meager means, laborers, non-residents, outsiders, strangers, wanderers, transients, and non-whites became an indispensable force in the revolution. Especially as the war dragged on, no township could afford to exclude them. On the contrary, recruiting the willing poor to serve was a top priority for every community, which understood in unmistakable terms that a regular supply of them for the patriotic army was a critical condition for achieving independence.

Lingering Poverty after the War

The revolution that succeeded in winning independence for the thirteen colonies did not end poverty, which continued to haunt hundreds of those common soldiers who fought in the war. Through individual valor or various opportunities, some enlisted men did achieve distinction and moved up from the ranks. Foot soldiers in particular generally served longer terms than seamen and sailors, which provided them almost twice the number of opportunities to receive small or big promotions in a diversified military organization. Based on an analysis of the service careers of 3,000 soldiers and 1,000 seamen recruited in Boston,¹⁰⁰ about five in every hundred men serving in the navy had a chance to receive promotions, while the number in the army was ten. Performance on board of a ship depended on diligence and courage as well as a long accumulation of experience, which perhaps explains the low rate (3%) of promotion from the inexperienced low-rank boys/landsmen to seamen among the 1,000 crew members studied in the data. Although experience did matter, military service on land was wide open for recognition accorded with a broad range of competence, skills, hard work, endurance, and bravery.

Of those 1,020 enlisted men who entered the army at the lowest rank of private in the above data, 15% got promoted. Many were small promotions, such as from a private to a matross, a bombardier, or a gunner. Some also appeared more like lateral changes of positions or reassignments than anything else, such as from a drummer to a fifer or the other way around. However, some did mean real promotions and pay increases, such as from a drummer to a

drum major or from a fifer to a fifer major.¹⁰¹ Moreover, several dozen privates rose to corporals and no fewer than fifty privates or corporals were promoted to sergeants, which indicated a clear advancement in ranks. Yet could these soldiers further their careers by entering the ranks of officers? The answer is “yes.” Records show that 15 sergeants broke through the top ranking of soldiers and became officers. Among them, Asa Copeland and John Eayers became conductors; William Dawes, William Rickard, Christopher Wal(l)cut, Benjamin Brown, Ebenezer Floyd, and Andrew Garritt were promoted to ensign; Luke Howell and James Leary were promoted to second lieutenant; Joseph Ford and Richard Skilling were promoted to first lieutenant; George Reab, Etham Moore, and Daniel McLane were promoted to lieutenant.¹⁰²

Indeed, a number of individual advancements in the army did show the potential of an upward mobility, which sometimes did relate the story of a soldier becoming an officer. For example, William Price was a gunner and later rose to become second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and lieutenant. Similarly, Richard McClure, a gunner/bombardier, was first promoted to sergeant, then to conductor, and finally to second lieutenant and first lieutenant. John Meacham, Andrew McIntire, and Ebenezer Wilds rose from corporal to sergeant and finally to lieutenant. Ralph Hart Bowles, Benjamin Callender, and Thomas Hollis Condy entered the service as privates, but all three soldiers later rose to become lieutenants.¹⁰³

Nevertheless, breaking into the rank of a commissioned captain (either in the Continental Army or in the Massachusetts regiments) proved to be a serious barrier for Boston soldiers. In fact, of the forty-five captains of the troops recruited from Boston, none of them rose from a soldier, even though most had prior experience serving at a lower rank before receiving their

appointment, and even though no fewer than two dozen were promoted from lieutenants and adjutants. The reasons for this glass ceiling could be many, such as being too young or too old, and the lack of socioeconomic status, literal skills, and leadership experience, which could be typical among low ranking soldiers and new recruits.¹⁰⁴ Moreover, unless they had had long-time connections with the city prior to the war, most common soldiers and new recruits could not expect to earn the kind of trust needed to establish themselves among total strangers in a short period of time, no matter how brave and how capable they might be on the battlefield. The case in point can be found in several small communities and townships, where many a soldier did have the chance to become a captain. For example, Luther Bailey of Hanover was a corporal early in the war and later rose to captain; similar transformations were—Samuel Baldwin of Northbridge from private to captain, and Abner Bourn of Middleborough, William Burley of Salem, and Matthew Chambers of Marblehead, all three from sergeant to captain.¹⁰⁵ One of the most remarkable stories was that of Moses Porter of Danvers, who participated in the first battle of the war as a private in 1775 and finally rose to brigadier general toward to end of his long military career.¹⁰⁶ In addition to these individual soldiers' own bravery and talents, the fact that they and families were all long-time local residents and militia men prior to 1775 proved to be very difficult to match for those temporary residents, newcomers, and transients whom Boston authorities expediently began to recruit after the war started.

Big or small promotion and advancement notwithstanding, many hundreds of fellow soldiers were wounded, disabled, captured, imprisoned, missing, or lost at sea while others were killed or died of cold, sickness, diseases, and countless other miseries. Still more remained where they had been before the war, returning to the same needy circumstances of

impoverishment, penury, and distress. Soldiers from wealthier backgrounds had a better chance of readjusting to civilian life. A sizable homestead, an established business, and a dependable financial chest blessed a veteran wishing to return to his home of peace and stability. As previously mentioned, Isaiah Bullard of Weston took in Peter Cary as his apprentice in 1773. Although both had served as privates in Captain Samuel Lamson's company and had marched on the Lexington alarm, Bullard quickly returned as a civilian. The value of his property rose steadily and he served several town offices during the next ten years. In 1778 he paid a town tax of £122. Meanwhile, Cary continued to serve until the end of the war in 1783. Weston paid various wages for his service, but Cary never held enough property to be rated afterward.

Of those veterans who were not long-time residents of a local community but served in the war, perhaps no more than 15 percent managed to stay where they had first enlisted. Not having a legal settlement or a good prospect of gaining one, many veterans opted for some hopeful future elsewhere. Perhaps as many as 40 to 50 percent of the poor veterans removed again after the war away from the communities in which they had enlisted during the revolution. Their action strongly resembled the pre-war migration patterns of moving through three gradually expanded circles—first within a county, then crossing county lines, and finally across state lines. Only this time, a large number of veteran families did not seem content to stay within the commonwealth; they were willing and prepared to move to other states altogether. This group accounted for about 20 to 30 percent of the poor veterans—a significant new trend indicating the mounting pressures of population increases in the face of the dwindling sizes of available land in the pro-war years.

The population of Massachusetts increased some 20 percent (by 70,000) from 1775 to 1790.¹⁰⁷ During the same period, the General Court issued no land grants to any individuals.¹⁰⁸ From 1760 to 1775, the General Court granted an average of four townships each year; this figure dropped to two a year during the last quarter of the century.¹⁰⁹ By comparison, available land elsewhere in the newly independent United States certainly attracted those veterans, whose wartime experience had perhaps made them more accustomed to moving across long distances than average civilians. Born in and serving for Brimfield, Hampshire County, Ebenezer Cooley moved to and died in Lebanon, New York. Artemas Cox, the son of Elisha Cox in Weston, enlisted during the war but moved to Sagadahoc County in Maine after the war. A laborer from Connecticut, Ephraim Baker enlisted for Sudbury, Middlesex County. He participated in Shays's Rebellion and took an oath of allegiance in 1787. He moved to Buffalo, Niagara County, in New York, but died in Concord, Erie County, New York in 1826. Born in Boxford, Essex County, Jacob Black enlisted for Holden, Worcester County, during the war. Afterward he moved to Marshfield, Washington County, Vermont. An orphan at the Boston almshouse, John Banks was bound out to Andrew Adams, a local housewright in Grafton. Banks served the local militia for three months in 1775 and moved to Alstead, Cheshire County, New Hampshire, where he raised a family of eleven children. Thomas Craige was also an orphan at the Boston almshouse. He had been bound out to Worcester, but after his master's death during the French and Indian War, he moved to Northampton, where he enlisted. In 1802, he again moved to Windsor County, Vermont, where he stayed until at least 1833 when he was 79 years old. Twin brothers Willis and William Fellows enlisted for Shelburne, Hampshire County. After the war, Willis moved to Bloomfield, Greene County, but died in Crawford County, Indiana. William moved to

Watertown, Jefferson County, New York. Enlisted in Hampshire County during the war, Andrew Howard subsequently moved several times from Westfield and Palmer to Belchertown, where he still lived in 1818. He died, however, in Oakfield in Fond du Lac County, Wisconsin, in 1849 at the age of 85.

Moving alone did not free people from poverty. As many as 33,300 veterans and their families in Massachusetts applied for federal pensions, suggesting that a sizeable portion of them still faced difficulties in life long after the war ended. Veterans in good circumstances tended not to apply for assistance. They perhaps accounted for 10 to 15 percent of the veteran population. Another 10 to 15 percent applied for pensions more as a benefit than as an absolute necessity. William Bogle, a transient from Oxford, Worcester County, to Weston, Middlesex County, was among the lucky few who settled relatively well in his adopted community. After he returned at the end of war, he married Lucy Tilton of Weston in 1786. When he appeared on the town tax rolls several years later, he owned one dwelling house, four acres of improved land, twenty acres of pasture, fifty acres of unimproved land, one horse, six oxen, seven cows, and two swine.¹¹⁰ He did receive a federal pension of \$80 a year in 1832. At the time of his death in 1839, his properties were valued at \$4,653, including his homestead with several building structures and 196 acres of land valued at \$4,000. However, his personal debts and funeral expenses amounted to \$635.16. His widow received a pension of \$65.21 per annum in 1844. When she died two years later, she left an estate of \$1015.75 and a total debt (including her funeral costs) of \$1186.45.¹¹¹

William's brother Thomas Bogle, however, was not as prosperous. Serving in the Massachusetts Line for six years, he received a federal pension of \$80 a year in 1818, when he

was living in Wardsboro in Windham County, Vermont. In 1820, he had 100 acres of land worth \$500 and a personal estate valued at \$78.50. Three years later, except for clothing and bedding, his real and personal properties amounted to \$47.59. They included one cow, one calf, one heifer, three sheep, one old kettle, one iron pot, one old desk, six old kitchen chairs, one old armchair, one old pine table, four knives and forks, one old cutter, some old farm tools, and crockery ware. He sold the 100 acres for cash to pay for his mortgage and debt totaling more than \$900. Many of his farm tools and much of his furniture were worn out, and he had no regular income but a few dollars here and there. "And I do also swear," he declared in his pension application of 1823, "that my occupation is that a common labourer, my health is poor and unable to perform hard labor.—My wife Elizabeth is 64 years of age, of a slender Constitution, and unable to perform much labor.—I have 8 children living, but they are all of age and left me except one son—who is 33 years old—and whom I have lived with." After serving his country and supporting his numerous children and several grandchildren, the veteran Bogle and his wife Elizabeth seemed indeed poor and exhausted.

Others had no better stories to share in their applications than Bogle. Perhaps as many as 30 to 40 percent of the veterans were in serious distress because of old age, wounds, declining health, personal debt, and the large size of their families. For all the gratuity and relief he received, the veteran Ichabod Bozworth was not doing well. He obtained a bounty land of 100 acres in 1793. Credited for a total of 7 years in service, he was granted a pension of \$8 per month (that is, at 3 shillings a dollar, 6s. a week) in 1818, when he was a resident of Bellingham, Norfolk County. He wrote in his petition that "I am in reduced circumstances in life & have need of assistance from the Country I served." He held no real property in 1820, and his personal

estate totaled \$16.10, including one chest and one chest of drawers, two tables, seven chairs, a brass kettle, some glassware, earthenware, and cooking ware. He died in Franklin, Norfolk County, on November 16, 1820. His widow moved to Upton, Worcester County, and received a pension in the same amount of \$96 per annum from 1848 to 1850, when she died at Grafton, Worcester County. Veteran Peter Cary had been a captive in the war. He settled in Shrewsbury, Worcester County, where he applied for and received a federal pension in 1818. An inventory showed that assessed at \$108.22, his properties included no more than an old house, a barn, a cow, two tables, seven chairs, and numerous household items. He had a family to support, and his wife was "in very low state of health." He died in 1832.

The returning soldier Caleb Church bought 30 acres of land in Oakham in 1777. He also bought land in Ashfield in 1785 and appeared in the census there in 1790. Although his son Seth built a house in Ashfield and served as a selectman and representative for the town, he was not on the tax roll for 1793. Claiming poor health and the inability to support himself, he applied for and was granted a federal pension of \$8 a month in 1818. His personal properties, valued at \$16.60 in 1823, included such items as 1 pig, 1 old cart, 1 plow, 1 ax, 1 hoe, 1 pot, 1 old kettle, 3 old chests, 1 cupboard, 1 table, 6 chairs, 2 pails, 1 poor saddle and bridle, and 2 spinning wheels. He could not sign his name. After serving in the war for six years, Ephraim Barker moved several times. At the age of 59, he applied for a federal government pension on April 21, 1818 from Buffalo, Niagara County, New York. He was granted one at the rate of \$8 per month. Two years later, he petitioned again. He listed his belongings valued at \$112, including a mare and a colt, two hogs and two pigs, one old wagon, one old sleigh, one plow, one kettle, one pot, and some knives and forks. However, he stated that he was "indebted to individuals in about the sum of

three hundred and twenty dollars,” and that a weak shoulder and pain in the heart prevented him from working in the fields. He was thus unable to support himself.

After his service, Thaddeus Gibson moved to New Hampshire, ultimately settling on a 300-acre farm in Henniker in the early 1780s. He received a pension of \$8 per month in 1818. In 1820, his properties included a horse, a wagon and harness, a cow, a hog, ten sheep, ten lambs, one plough, one sleigh, one chest with drawers, one old desk, ten chairs, one kettle, three axes, and numerous other household articles, totaling \$120.50. His personal debt, however, amounted to \$147. Veteran Andrew Howard’s finances were only slightly better. At 54, he applied for a federal pension on May 12, 1818, at Belchertown in Hampshire County. He was granted \$8 per month. In 1820 the value of his properties was \$123.75 while that of his debt \$91. After the war, the orphan John Doyle Legg moved to Oswegatchie in St. Lawrence County, New York, where he applied for a federal pension in 1818. No longer under dire circumstances, he owned 80 acres worth \$200 and some personal possessions, including 1 old horse, 2 cows, 1 calf, 2 hogs, 2 pigs, 26 sheep, 1 plough, 1 pot, 1 tea kettle, 5 spoons, 6 knives, 6 forks, 6 bowls, 2 pictures, 1 tea pot, 1 tea cup and 2 saucers, 6 chairs, 1 table, 2 platters, 3 plates, 1 cupboard, 1 lantern, 1 coffee pot, 1 wooden bottle, and 1 jug. Yet on his application he stated that “he is by occupation a farmer but is old and his constitution so much enfeebled as to be unable to labour hard, that his wife is also very infirm being in her sixty eighth year and is entirely unable to labour.” The couple had no children living with them. The children were all of age, had separate households, and were in no condition to offer any assistance. He also had an orphaned grandchild to support. John Legg was granted a pension of \$8 a month.

No linear attempt can adequately explain the significance of the American Revolution and its impact on poverty and mobility. At the personal level, the end of the war hardly brought any immediate prosperity for those veterans who had come from the lower ranks of society. The small percentage of them who managed to stay where they had been enlisted suggested insecurity, while the large numbers of those who moved or who applied for federal government pensions further indicated that life had not become any easier for them long after the war. To most of those poor soldiers and needy veterans, the revolution was a great experience, but little else. No splendid honor or adulation would glorify their extended military services and uncommon contributions any time soon, nor would they receive much deferential treatment in places where they had not established legal residency by the time of enlistment. Life conditions and family circumstances were as disappointing as ever, and many were willing to take to the road again and again, looking for change and improvement. Their achievements lied not in how many were better off right after the revolution, but in the monumental sacrifices they had made during the war. The fact that they survived the ordeals of those tumultuous years at all was testimonial to the enduring faith, determination, and fighting spirit they possessed. What the poor soldiers in the American Revolution achieved was not a drastic turnaround of their own livelihood, but a fresh beginning for subsequent generations. Their children and children's children were now able to start life anew from a more stable family background and a freer environment than they had ever experienced in the past.

However disparity persisted, the revolution's impact on the issues of poverty and mobility was no less significant nonetheless. As early as in the 1760s middle-class commentators missed no chance to spread the notions of "poverty," "deprivation," and "misery" to protest oppression under home rule. The ensuing mobilization at the beginning of the revolution and the exhaustive recruitment campaigns soon afterward throughout the war set off a series of big steps toward mobility. The dire need for soldiers compelled local communities to recruit the poor in large numbers, whose latest values as highly sought-after inductees superseded past stereotypes of idlers, charity recipients, ignorant bystanders, or irascible mobs in the street. The revolution unleashed as well as channeled their energy, and their active participation, extensive service, and extraordinary sacrifice earned themselves all the promotions, improvements, and advancements they deserved. Although legal residence was never granted right away but still had to be earned, their massive participation in the war and active migration afterward became the last straws which finally ended the 135-year practice of warning out in 1794.

In summary, evidence shows that most able-bodied poor in eighteenth-century Massachusetts lacked those visible characteristics of uniformity, homogeneity, and permanency that could be associated with the industrial classes of subsequent periods. Instead they belonged to diverse transitory groups, such as bound-out children, indentured servants, apprentices, day laborers, refugees, non-residents, seamen, migrants, and newly arrived immigrants of low circumstances. Difficult and unstable, their lives went through a floating status for days, months, and even years, such as displaced laborers looking for the next opportunity of employment, newcomers gaining legal settlement, or bound servants finishing their terms. Yet few of them ever stuck to a synchronized situation as most poor people and

families had to deal with varied circumstances at different times and locations—a condition least conducive to a shared experience or a common ideology.¹¹² Many warning-out records registered a pattern of local and regional migratory volatilities. The commotions and roller-coaster movements during this transitional stage suggested both the social predicaments hundreds of migrants were facing on the one hand and the personal fights they were engaging on the other. Neither entirely free from individual frustration and discontent nor completely deprived of any aspiration, they as a group also had an acute need and strong desire for change. What kept them on the move was not how to survive at those same old places that had tied them in the past, but how to seek out new opportunities to improve their livelihood elsewhere in the future.

Poverty was never predestined to mean failure nor mobility success. Despite the fact that the minimum cost of living was attainable for most single working adults, the despondent subsistence and insecurity forced the lower social strata to improve their lot, even though industry and frugality did not always lead to wealth and prosperity. What most poor people experienced during this period was neither a doomed failure nor a promised success, but a strenuous and prolonged fight between poverty and mobility. The American Revolution not only embraced that volatility, but also accelerated and broadened it into a nationwide crusade. Poverty and hardship no doubt existed as much as they coexisted with hope and change. Massachusetts did not experience a class war—perhaps not because the disparity was negligible, but because those frequent undulating moves between poverty and mobility outran potential extremities. In other words, the middle class, rising against those who had mistreated them, was frequently in need of help from those below them while members of the lower class

and the poor, striving for a better future, were as willing and determined as anyone to transform their destinies into one of those above them.¹¹³

NOTES

¹ From 1716 to 1798 Boston selectmen used this formula to regulate the assize of bread— $A = B \times (C+D)$, or, the total weight of bread produced from a bushel of wheat (A) equals a unit weight of bread (B) times the total of the price of wheat per bushel (C) plus the baker's charge (D).

Anyone who wants to test this benchmark can find data in the Boston assize on these (or any other) days: 15 May 1716 (the first recorded case but information incomplete); 3 December 1720; 13 June 1726; 27 September 1726; 6 August 1729; 26 June 1731; 26 July 1736; 31 January 1742; 30 March 1743; 25 April 1748; 30 May 1748; 25 July 1748; 5 October 1748; 3 May 1749; 16 April 1750; 15 August 1750; 27 May 1751; 31 October 1763; 29 October 1764; 2 September 1767; 30 August 1769; 16 December 1772; 14 August 1782; 29 May 1786; 29 October 1787; 2 September 1796; 27 June 1798 (the last recorded assize in the selectmen's minutes). Details can be found in corresponding volumes of the Boston selectmen minutes as in *Reports of the Record Commissioners* (Boston, 1885-1896), 13 (1716-1736), 17 (1742/3-1753), 19 (1754-1763), 20 (1764-1768), 23 (1769-1775), 25 (1776-1786), and 27 (1787-1798). For severe bread shortage and precipitous price inflation during the French Revolution see Alan Forrest, "The Condition of the Poor in Revolutionary Bordeaux," *Past and Present* 59 (1973), 163-74.

² Rent is not included here on the assumption that average Bostonians lived in a one-room house, which served as the kitchen and bedroom for everyone in the household, including the husband and wife, their children and servants. Even if paying the rent was financially feasible, any poor individual would be less likely to feel the need for renting a room all for him- or herself. Lodging, therefore, cost far less than boarding, and the two were often counted together. Little evidence indicates that there was a homeless population in colonial Massachusetts,

where hundreds of transient poor people came and went. Most warning-out notices show that even those who were warned seemed to be able to find a place to stay. Consider the fact that 900 local residents, business owners, landlords, and landladies in Boston housed 1,482 warned parties, and that only one out of 480-odd strangers was described as needy, see Cornelia H. Dayton and Sharon V. Salinger, *Robert Love's Warnings* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), p. 96, 216n. These clues suggest that lodging was not too hard even for those uprooted and distressful newcomers, many of whom had no connections with the local population. For housing conditions in colonial Boston, see Nian-Sheng Huang, *Franklin's Father Josiah: Life of a Colonial Boston Tallow Chandler* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2000), 12-14, 64-70. During the crisis of receiving the "French Neutrals" a government committee suggested, in 1759, that "the Rent of a house for each Family not exceeding Three pounds per annum." *Acts and Resolves, Public and Private, of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay* (Boston: Wright & Potter, 1881), 4: 101. Boston's problem of overcrowding per household Gary Nash has found was more a reflection of the general living arrangement in that city for a very long time than one of a sudden degradation, *Urban Crucible*, 195-96. In Philadelphia where houses were generally larger than those in Boston, renting could cost considerably more. Sharon V. Salinger and Charles Wetherell, "Wealth and Renting in Prerevolutionary Philadelphia," *Journal of American History* 71 (1985): 826-40. Billy G. Smith, *The "Lower Sort": Philadelphia's Laboring People, 1750-1800* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990), 103-104.

³ Like any statistical indicator, this benchmark was not absolute and carried with it at least three important variables. First, colonial currency changed a great deal; thus, the six shillings must be

considered in the value of Lawful Money or an equivalent. Second, early in the century until the late 1720s, the benchmark dropped by as much as 2 shillings, making the minimum cost of living close to 4 shillings a week (or £10 8s. a year for 52 weeks). Third, from the mid 1770s until the end of the century, the benchmark rose higher by as much as 2 shillings, making the minimum cost of living 8 shillings a week (or £20 16s. a year). The fluctuation of currency impacted the cost to support civilians and the military personnel. William Douglass stated that, in 1725, a guard at “Castle William in Boston harbour was victualled at 7s. per man, per week; anno 1748, victualling was 38s. per week, because of depreciations.” The sharp increase of cost was consistent with currency change in Old Tenor and the rising price of grain during that period. Also in the land service, the standard allowance of provisions to each soldier included— (1) for garrison allowances, 1*l.* bread per day, half pint of peas per day, 2 *l.* pork for three days, 1 gallon molasses for 42 days; and (2) for marching allowances, 1*l.* bread, 1*l.* pork, and 1 gill rum per day. *A Summary, Historical and Political, of the First Planting, Progressive Improvements, and Present State of the British Settlements in North-America* (London: Reprinted for R. Baldwin, 1755), 1: 535-36. In a 1792 proposal of a nationwide plan for the support of the poor in England, Thomas Paine suggested to pay £6 per annum for a person at fifty, and £10 for one at sixty. *Rights of Man* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1973), 480.

⁴ Robert E. Brown, *Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691-1780* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1955), 38-60, 78-99. At Concord town elections, a resident property owner whose estate could rent for £3 6s. 8d. a year shall be eligible to vote. Robert A. Gross, *The Minutemen and Their World* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1976), 11. See also

Richard C. Simmons, *Studies in the Massachusetts Franchise, 1631-1691* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1989).

⁵ Stephen Edward Wiberley, Jr. discussed how the lack of such a benchmark may lead to inaccurate assessment of the poor and other classes. *Four Cities: Public Poor Relief in Urban America, 1700-1775*, Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1975, 56-57, 141.

⁶ Elain Forman Crane has discussed women's earning power, their various roles as producers, vendors, and distributors, and a continuous threat of poverty to their well-being and survival, *Ebb Tide in New England: Women, Seaports, and Social Change, 1630-1800* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998), 98-138. Also see Olwen Hufton, "Women and the Family Economy in Eighteenth-Century France," *French Historical Studies* 9 (1975), 1-22.

⁷ A common laborer could earn 2 to 3s. a day if not more since settlement, and so could a hired-out boy as early as the late 1600s. Spinning allowed a woman to earn 1s. a day in mid-1700s and more specialized piece work could pay more (see chapter 2). James E. McWilliams, *Building the Bay Colony: Local Economy and Culture in Early Massachusetts* (Charlottesville, Va.: University of Virginia Press, 2007), 110, 117-18. G. B. Warren, "The Distribution of Property in Boston, 1692-1775," *Perspectives in American History* 10 (1976), 86-7. Richard B. Morris, ed., *Government and Labor in Early America* (1946; Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1981), 55-84. William B. Weedon, *Economic and Social History of New England, 1620-1789* (1800; Williamstown, Mass.: Corner House Publishers, 1978), 1: 83; 2: 879-81, 883-85, 887, 896, 898-904. Between 1718 and 1723 the young Benjamin Franklin was an apprentice to his older brother James in Boston. Reflecting on his life and income, he boasted that he had not only survived on half of his regular weekly pay by a vegetarian diet of "Boiling Potatoes, or Rice,

making Hasty Pudding, & a few others,” but also managed to save half of that money to buy books. The “light Repast,” said he, had nonetheless produced “greater Clearness of Head & quicker Apprehension which usually attend Temperance in Eating & Drinking.” J. A. Leo Lemay, ed., *Benjamin Franklin: Writings* (New York: The Library of America, 1987), 1320-321.

⁸ See G. B. Warden, “Inequality and Instability in Eighteenth-Century Boston: A Reappraisal,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 6 (1976): 585-620; William Pencak, “The Social Structure of Revolutionary Boston: Evidence from the Great Fire of 1760,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 10 (1979): 267-78. Stephen Edward Wiberley, Jr., *Four Cities: Public Poor Relief in Urban America, 1700-1775*, Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1975, p. 64-65, 196-97, 203-04.

⁹ Based on an examination of these documents: Blake, Francis E., comp. *Worcester County (Mass.) Warnings, 1737-1788* (Worcester, Mass.: F. P. Rice, 1899). *Easton Town Records*. 2 vols. 2 (1789-1816): 32-33, 34-35, 35-37, 45, 46, 70-71, 92-93, 105-106, in Barbara Tourtillott’s transcripts at <http://www.tourtillot.org/easton/index>. Hanson, Robert Brand, ed., “Transients, Strangers, Servants, Sojourners, and Warnings Out,” in *Vital Records of Dedham, Massachusetts, 1635-1845*, 489-567 (Camden, Me.: Picton Press, 1997). Love, Robert. Record book, January 29, 1765 to August 27, 1766 (Massachusetts Historical Society). List of warnings out, May 1 to August 28, 1772 (Boston Public Library). *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* 57 (1903): 141-143 (Walpole); 65 (1911), 39-43 (Foxborough); 70 (1916): 283 (Northbridge); 83 (1929): 164-168 (Chelmsford); 92 (1938): 46-60 (Malden); 105 (1951): 75-76 (Sharon); 111 (1957): 320-321 (Sudbury); 141 (1987): 179-202, 330-357; 142 (1988): 56-84 (Wrentham); and 144 (1990): 215-224 (Weston). Sherman, Ruth Wilder, Robert M. Sherman, and Robert S. Wakefield, comps., *An Index to Plymouth County, Massachusetts, Warnings Out from the*

Plymouth Court Records, 1686-1859 (Plymouth, Mass.: General Society of Mayflower Descendants, 2003). Warning-out books, 1745-1770, 1771-1773, 1791-1792, in Boston Overseers of the Poor Records, 1733-1925. Microfilms, reel 1, vols. 1, 2 (Massachusetts Historical Society).

¹⁰ Headed by Jonathan Brooks (Charlestown), John Brooks, William Brown (Stow), Thomas Cleland (Colchester in Connecticut), Caleb Church (Harvard), Thomas Grant (New Hampshire), David Goodnow (Marlborough), Stephen Gates (Rowley in Canada), William Judawine (Lunenburg), Joshua Johnson (Stow), Russell Knight (Sudbury), John Loring (Lexington), Thomas Mears (Bolton), Ebenezer Pike, Jr. (Shrewsbury), Jonas Powers (Lunenburg), Moses Russell (Littleton), Benjamin Shed (Lunenburg), Job Spafford (Leominster), Peter Thurston (Pepperell), Jacob Winn (Tewksbury), and Josiah Winn (Bolton), twenty-one families managed to stay at Lancaster. Nineteen others moved again: John Davis (Rutland) to Oxford, Jonathan Fletcher (a minor from Groton) to Rutland District/Barre, Benjamin Goodnow (Shrewsbury) to Petersham, Nathan Goodall (Westborough) to Rutland, Josiah Hosmer (Concord) to Concord, Joseph Houghton (Leominster) to Harvard, Mathew Knight (Leominster) to Winchendon, Gardiner Maynard (Templeton) to Sherburn, Samuel Mason (Lexington) to Winchendon, Hugh Moor (Shirley) to Palmer, Abel Mosman (Princeton) to Princeton, Joseph North (Boston) to Princeton, Reuben Parminter (Rutland) to Princeton, Sylvanus Sawyer (Bolton) to Templeton, John Stearns (Middleton) to Worcester, Nathaniel Sever (Westminster) to Petersham, David Stone (Groton) to Petersham, William Tuffs (Medford?) to New Braintree, and William Withington (Stow) to Stow.

¹¹ Headed by Benjamin Blake, James Battle(s) (Holliston), Abraham Joslin (Smithfield in Rhode Island), Micah Maddin (Holliston), Joseph Marsh (Douglas), Benjamin Read (Uxbridge), John Wilson, Elias Whitney, Sr. (Framingham), and Elias Whitney, Jr., nine families managed to stay at Mendon. Four others moved again: Read Benjamin (Smithfield) to Rutland, Micah Thayer (Bellingham) to Ware, Peter Thompson (Bellingham) to Charlmont, and Ezra Whitney (Wrentham) to Montague.

¹² Headed by Sheers Berry, Daniel Henderson, and John Stevenson (all from Rutland), three families stayed at Oakham. Two others moved again: Daniel Felton (Marblehead and Rutland) to Petersham and Silas Rice to Rutland.

¹³ Headed by Jedediah Blanney, James Brown, John Fessenden, John Morris Jewell (Dudley), and Adams Streeter (Douglas), five families managed to stay at Oxford. Two others moved again: Moses Gage (Andover) to Mendon and Jonathan Rugg to Lancaster.

¹⁴ Headed by George Clark (Worcester), Caleb Harrington, Luke Moore (Sudbury), John Parker, Joseph Wight, and James Williams (Marlborough), six families managed to stay at Rutland. Thirty-four others moved again: Isaac Amsden (Southborough?) to Conway, Olive Graves (Sudbury) to Whatley, Kimball Amsden (Rutland District) to Petersham, Jeremiah Beath (Worcester) to Boothway, Robert Converse (Leicester) to Woburn, Robert Clark to Rutland District, Samuel Duncan (Worcester) to Worcester, Nathan Eager (Leicester) to Lancaster, Aaron Ellis (Dedham) to Winchendon, William English (Spencer) to Greenwich, Daniel Felton (Marblehead and Oakham) to Petersham, Gideon Fisher (Princeton) to Winchendon, James Fuller (Newton) to Lancaster, Samuel Gould (Shrewsbury) to Shirley, John Goodale (Marlborough and) to Conway, Peter Harvey (Holden) to New Salem, Ephraim Heyden (Sudbury)

to Sudbury, William Hartwell to Charlmont, Samuel Jones (Brookfield) to Mendon, Joseph Nurse (a minor from Hopkinton) to Hopkinton, Ezekiel Newton, Sr. to Southborough, Ezekiel Newton, Jr. to Southborough, Timothy Newton (Shrewsbury) to Marlborough, David Newton (Paxton) to Southborough, Robert Patrick to Rutland District, Benjamin Pierce (Charlestown) to Weston, Benjamin Parker (Newton) to Southborough, Ephraim Rice (Sudbury) to Petersham, Josiah Rice (Sudbury) to Sudbury, Nathaniel Rice (Sudbury) to Sudbury, William Smith (Western) to Rutland District, David Sprague (a servant from Smithfield in Rhode Island) to Sunderland, James White (Southborough) to Rutland District, and John Winch (Holden) to Framingham.

¹⁵ Headed by Joseph Belknap (Holden), Jonathan Fiske, Samuel Fitts (Sutton), Samuel Griggs (Dedham), Daniel Haven (Dedham), Azael Knight (Stow), Thomas Nichols (Sutton), Joseph Perry (Boston), Moses Redman (Lancaster), and John Wait (Framingham), ten families managed to stay at Worcester. Nine others moved again: James Butler (Charlton) to Lancaster, John Barret (Rutland) to Rutland District, Aaron Farnsworth (Groton) to Groton, Isaac Gleason to Petersham, John Hayden (Boston) to Boston, Isaac Miller (Shrewsbury) to Westborough, John Newton (Marlborough) to Southborough, John Stockwell (Sutton) to Athol, and Peter White (Shrewsbury) to Rutland.

¹⁶ Gary B. Nash, *The Urban Crucible: Social Change, Political Consciousness, and the Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979), 257, 395 (Table 3), 396 (Table 4), 397-98 (Table 5), 400 (Table 7). The few wealthy people he mentioned—Samuel Waldo, Charles Apthorp, Thomas Hancock, and James Bowdoin I in Boston—all deceased before 1775.

¹⁷ David Hackett Fischer, *Washington's Crossing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 9. Richard Frothingham, *History of the Siege of Boston* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1903), 311-12. James H. Stark, *The Loyalists of Massachusetts and the Other Side of the American Revolution* (Boston: Printed by the Author, 1910), 133-36. Samuel Eliot Morison, "The Commerce of Boston on the Eve of the Revolution," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* (1923), 32: 51. Arthur M. Schlesinger, *The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution, 1763-1776* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1918), 602. Lorenzo Sabine estimated that the total number of loyalist refugees from various parts of Massachusetts may have reached two thousand, *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1864), 1: 25-26.

¹⁸ If Boston instead of Massachusetts is the sole focus of analysis, the picture can look different. John W. Tyler, *Smugglers and Patriots: Boston Merchants and the Advent of the American Revolution* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1986); "Persistence and Change within the Boston Business Community," in Conrad E. Wright and Katheryn P. Viens, eds. *Entrepreneurs: The Boston Business Community, 1700-1850* (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1997), 95-119. However wealth and possessions are highlighted here in this segment, religious affiliations, personal animosities, kinship ties, varied perceptions of and commitment to law and order, differences of temperament, regional history, neighborhood networks and affinities also influenced people's attitudes toward the opposing camps. Joseph S. Tiedemann, Eugene R. Fingerhut, and Robert W. Venables, eds., *The Other Loyalists: Ordinary People, Royalism, and the Revolution in the Middle Colonies, 1763-1787* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 2009).

¹⁹ Bernard Bailyn examined the rise and fall of those “colonial member[s] of the British ruling class” in *The New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955) and *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974).

²⁰ James H. Stark, *The Loyalists of Massachusetts and the Other Side of the American Revolution* (Boston: Privately Printed for the Author, 1910). E. Alfred Jones, *The Loyalists of Massachusetts: Their Memorials, Petitions, and Claims* (London: The Saint Catherine Press, 1930). Peter Wilson Coldham, *American Loyalists Claims* (Washington, D.C.: National Genealogical Society, 1980), v. 1. David E. Maas, ed., *Divided Hearts, Massachusetts Loyalists, 1765-1790: A Biographical Directory* (Boston: The New England Historic Genealogical Society, 1980). Bettye Hobbs Pruitt, ed., *The Massachusetts Tax Valuation List of 1771* (Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1978).

²¹ This group includes Samuel Adams, John Adams, Joseph Warren, John Gill, Josiah Quincy, Paul Revere, Isaiah Thomas, Moses Gill, Samuel Barrett, Edward Davis, William Greenleaf, Moses Grant, and Fortesque Vernon. Other than a house and some rental value, few of them had warehouses, wharf surface, money for lending, horses, or tillage. See Bettye Hobbs Pruitt, ed., *The Massachusetts Tax Valuation List of 1771* (1978; Camden, Me.: Picton Press, 1998).

²² See also Robert E. Brown, *Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691-1780* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1955), 18.

²³ William Vassall, Esq., of Boston, for example, had 1 house, and a real estate worth £80 per annum, 3 slaves, 4 horses, and 1 cattle. Nathaniel Ray Thomas, Esq., of Marshfield, had 1 house, a real estate worth £99, 2 horse, 11 oxen, 11 cattle, 35 goats, 8 swine, 220 acres of pasture good for 55 cows, 25 acres of tillage with a yearly grain production of 375 bushels. Isaac Royall,

Esq., of Medford, had a real estate worth £120, 5 slaves, £119 of lending money, 7 horses, 4 oxen, 8 cattle, 4 swine, 55 ½ acres of pasture good for 26 cows, 7 acres of tillage with a yearly grain production of 155 bushels. Benjamin Pickman, Esq., of Salem, had 1 house, ¼ of a still house, 4 warehouses, 1,300 feet of wharf surface, a real estate worth £147, 2 slaves, 563 tons of vessels, £4,100 worth of merchandise, 1 horse, 4 acres of tillage with a yearly grain production of 80 bushels. Josiah Edson and his son of Bridgewater had 1 house, a real estate valued at £27, 2 horses, 3 oxen, 8 cattle, 60 acres of pasture good for 12 cows, and 15 acres of tillage with a grain production of 130 bushels a year. The owner of a large estate worth £7,500 sterling, Abijah Willard of Lancaster had 1 house, a real estate valued at £24 per annum, 6 horses, 4 oxen, 6 cattle, 26 goats, 1 swine, 40 acres of pasture good for 18 cows, 12 acres of tillage with a grain production of 180 bushels a year. Nathaniel Dickinson of Deerfield had 2 houses, a real estate valued at £54, 5 horse, 2 oxen, 15 cattle, 13 goats, 6 swine, 46 acres of pasture good for 20 cows, 50 acres of tillage with a grain production of 350 bushels a year. See Bettye Hobbs Pruitt, ed., *The Massachusetts Tax Valuation List of 1771* (1978; Camden, Me.: Picton Press, 1998), and E. Alfred Jones, *The Loyalists of Massachusetts: Their Memorials, Petitions, and Claims* (London: The Saint Catherine Press, 1930), 48-50, 69-74, 114-18.

²⁴ Dr. John Calef of Ipswich had a ship of 300 tons, with cargo, valued at £4,200 sterling.

Nicholas Ward Boylston held wealth in bonds and personal securities worth £3,000 to £4,000 or more. His uncle Nicholas Boylston also left him £3,000 worth of property. The merchant Gilbert Deblois of Boston was an importer of goods valued at £200,000. He had an annual profit of £1,200 sterling. His relation Lewis Deblois, also a merchant in Boston, had a business valued at £31,027 by 1774. Benjamin Lynde, Esq., of Salem, had £2,900 to lend, and John Worthington,

Esq., of Springfield, had £3,500. The Rev. John Troutbeck was assistant chaplain, with the Rev. Henry Caner (who also claimed a loss of property at £3,900), of King's Chapel. The estimate of his estate in 1772 included three dwelling houses in Boston and one in the country, a library worth £266, a chariot valued at £133 in London, two chaises of £30 each, and lands in New York, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, as well as debts of £2,000 due to his wife Sarah as the sole executrix of her father, making the estate totaling £30,293 currency, equal to at least £22,719 sterling. After Troutbeck's death, the widow Sarah Troutbeck claimed a loss of £3,043 to the British government, and was allowed £769. She received a pension of £80 until her death in 1816. E. Alfred Jones, *The Loyalists of Massachusetts: Their Memorials, Petitions, and Claims* (London: The Saint Catherine Press, 1930), 48-50, 69-74, 114-18.

²⁵ A statistical study is Wallace Brown, *The King's Friend's: The Composition and Motives of the American Loyalist Claimants* (Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 1965), 19-42, 294-98. For the process of claiming and recovering those losses see Mary Beth Norton, *The British-Americans: The Loyalist Exiles in England, 1774-1789* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1972), 42-61, 185-222. Carol Berkin, *Jonathan Sewall: Odyssey of an American Loyalist* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974), 144-153. Sheila L. Skemp, *William Franklin: Son of a Patriot, Servant of a King* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 267-76.

²⁶ Nian-Sheng Huang, "The Impeachment of Justice Hall." *Massachusetts Historical Review* (2010), 12: 109-10.

²⁷ E. Alfred Jones, *The Loyalists of Massachusetts: Their Memorials, Petitions, and Claims* (London: The Saint Catherine Press, 1930), 41-42, 58-61, 76, 81-83, 165-66, 169, 279-80. James

H. Stark, *The Loyalists of Massachusetts and the Other Side of the American Revolution* (Boston: Printed for the Author, 1910), 178-80.

²⁸ In the heat of the Stamp Act crisis, an angry Boston crowd attacked the mansion of Thomas Hutchinson, chief justice and lieutenant governor of Massachusetts, on the night of August 26, 1765. In addition to the wanton destruction and physical damage, the mob carried away £900 sterling in cash. The total loss of property was estimated at £2,218 sterling, based upon an exhaustive list of household possessions Hutchinson provided to the home government, which was as long as ten printed pages. In spite of these substantial setbacks, he continued heavy investment in the lucrative tea trade, averaging £1,000 a year for the remainder of the 1760s. Through the early years of the next decade until the ensuing tea party crisis, “his liquid capital—nearly £4000—was invested in East India Company stock, and in addition his crown salary of £1500 sterling per annum was drawn from the income of the tea duty in America.” Bernard Bailyn, *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), 35-36, 154, 259, 273. James Kendall Hosmer, *The Life of Thomas Hutchinson: Royal Governor of the Province of Massachusetts Bay* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1896), 351-61. Hutchinson sailed for England on June 1, 1774 after the arrival of the new governor Thomas Gage in May.

²⁹ E. Alfred Jones, *The Loyalists of Massachusetts: Their Memorials, Petitions, and Claims* (London: The Saint Catherine Press, 1930), 173-74, 216-17. Still, those loyalists whose claims for lost properties exceeded £3,000 included at least the following –John Joy of Hingham, Richard Lechmere, Daniel Leonard, Henry Lloyd of Boston, Widow Mary Loring of Roxbury, the Chief Justice Peter Oliver and his second son Peter Oliver, Lt. Governor Thomas Oliver, Adino Paddock,

Sir William Pepperall, William Lee Perkins of Boston, Capt. David Phipps, James Putnam of Worcester, Brigadier General Timothy Ruggles of Hardwick, the merchant and ironmaster Esq. Joseph Scott of Boston, the Attorney-General Jonathan Sewall, the Brookline lawyer Samuel Sewall (1745-1811), Jonathan Simpson, the Younger (b. 1752), John Vassall of Boston, Francis Waldo of Falmouth, and Samuel Waterhouse, the officer at the Custom House in Boston. E. Alfred Jones, *The Loyalists of Massachusetts: Their Memorials, Petitions, and Claims* (London: The Saint Catherine Press, 1930), 185-86, 189-91, 191-94, 196, 198-99, 224-25, 225-26, 226-27, 232-33, 233-34, 235, 240-41, 251-53, 256, 258-59, 259-60, 262, 283-85, 285-86, 290-91. Adding to these wealthy people were a legion of surveyors, searchers, tidesmen, boatmen, comptrollers, deputies, commissioners of custom houses, pilots, mariners, officers, justices, judges, councilors, barristers, attorneys, and doctors who could draw an annual pension of the British government from £10 and £20 to as high as £300 or more. E. Alfred Jones, *The Loyalists of Massachusetts: Their Memorials, Petitions, and Claims* (London: The Saint Catherine Press, 1930), 119, 120, 121, 125, 130-33, 139, 140-42, 144-45, 159-60, 163, 166, 167, 179-81, 189-91, 212-13, 218, 236-37, 239, 266-69, 278-79, 290-91, 292-93, 293-94, 295, 298-300, 301, 303.

³⁰ Although not recorded on *The Massachusetts Tax Valuation List of 1771*, the Gerry family estate at Marblehead was valued at £7,919 in 1775. Hancock's estate was assessed at £60 on the same list, but he claimed a "loss of £100 sterling for a year's rent on his house as a result of the Boston siege." Robert E. Brown, *Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691-1780* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1955), 18, 34, 95.

³¹ Compare this classification here with the assertion of "the fabulously rich and the desperate poor" in Gary Nash, *The Urban Crucible*, 257. He used such terms as "the working poor," "the

lower orders,” “the laboring classes,” and “the bottom of the urban hierarchy” to describe the deprived peoples of the colonial era. However, except for a few cursory words (say, on page 196 about Henry Neal), not a single poor person’s career in Massachusetts was sufficiently presented, explained, or analyzed. Furthermore, based on the vast amount of information collected largely from tax rolls, mortgage books, and inventories of estates, Nash’s aggregated data spoke for those taxpayers of low brackets, householders of limited means, and property owners of small fortunes, most of whom would be considered lower to middle classes, but not exactly “poor” in those days. *Ibid.*, 387-91, 396-401. Perhaps Nash’s findings actually revealed less about the destitute people *per se* than about the specter and capricious nature of eighteenth-century poverty. That is to say, his extensive studies have depicted the middle and lower-middle classes’ worst nightmares of falling down into poverty, but stopped short of the real-life experiences of those hundreds of impoverished families and individuals who were already in destitution and misery. The chief concerns for the poor (as distinct from those for small to modest property owners) were perhaps more about day-to-day subsistence than about declining estates or rising taxation according to Nash’s delineation because, as non-taxpayers and individuals of few possessions, their deplorable circumstances had long deprived them of the opportunity to show up on most tax rolls, land deeds, mortgage books, business transactions, registered wills, or estate inventories. Meanwhile, Nash’s broad categorization of “91-100%” of the “richest” seriously obscured the distinctions between the middle class and the rich—notice the wealth spread in his data, *ibid.*, 395 (Table 3), 396 (Table 4), 397-98 (Table 5), 400 (Table 7). In an article investigating the Boston 1687 and 1771 tax rolls, James A. Henretta showed greater nuances than those found in Nash’s. Henretta noted not only those

who held no taxable property, but also those whose taxable wealth exceeded £1,000 in three categories—from £1,001 to £1,500, £1,501 to £5,000, and from £5,001 and up. He even related some apparent inconsistencies that tax rolls alone could not fully explain, such as several adult males of none taxable wealth were nevertheless elected to minor town offices. Realizing the importance of residence or community membership and a “highly transient maritime element” in colonial Boston, he went on to point out that the adult males without property “did not form a single unified class, a monolithic body of landless proletarians.” “Economic Development and Social Structure in Colonial Boston,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., 22 (1965), 75-92. Based on William Pencak’s “The Social Structure of Revolutionary Boston” (1979), Cornelia H. Dayton and Sharon V. Salinger equated “the lower sort with those owning less than £40, the middling £40-499, and the better sort more than £499,” *Robert Love’s Warnings*, p. 212n. See also Allan Kulikoff, “The Progress of Inequality in Revolutionary Boston,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., 28 (1971): 375-412; Kulikoff, “Whither the Progress of Inequality?” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., 57 (2000), 825-32; and Stephen Innes’s review of *Inequality in Early America*, eds. Carla Gardina Pestana and Sharon V. Salinger (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1999), *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 31 (2001): 468-69.

³² The Bay Colony had a history of impressing marginal men (such as those of low socio-economic status, no deep roots in and few connections with local communities, criminal records, or debt) into the militia. Kyle F. Zelner, *A Rabble in Arms: Massachusetts Towns and Militiamen during King Philip’s War* (New York: New York University Press, 2009).

³³ Some discussions about the social/economic status of Massachusetts militiamen and soldiers are Charles Neimeyer, “‘Town Born, Turn Out’: Town Militias, Tories, and the Struggles for

Control of the Massachusetts Backcountry,” and Walter Sargent, “The Massachusetts Rank and File of 1777,” in John Resch and Walter Sargent, eds., *War and Society in the American Revolution: Mobilization and Home Fronts* (DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 2007), 23-41, 42-69.

³⁴ L. H. Butterfield et al. eds., *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961), 1: 332-33.

³⁵ *Boston Gazette*, September 2, 1767. *Boston Post-Boy*, October 26, 1767.

³⁶ Marc Egnal and Joseph A. Ernst, “An Economic Interpretation of the American Revolution,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser. 29 (1972), 3-32.

³⁷ *Boston Post-Boy*, March 12, 1770.

³⁸ *Boston Evening-Post*, August 30, 1773.

³⁹ *Boston Evening-Post*, August 30, 1773. *Essex Journal*, July 20, 1774.

⁴⁰ *Essex Journal*, July 20, 1774.

⁴¹ *New-England Chronicle*, October 26, 1775.

⁴² Philip Swain, “Who Fought? Boston Soldiers in the Revolutionary War” (Honor Thesis in American History, Tufts University, 1981), 60, 62.

⁴³ All computations below were based on the information of Boston soldiers and officers in Philip Swain, “Who Fought? Boston Soldiers in the Revolutionary War” (Honor Thesis in American History, Tufts University, 1981), 115-242. Yet some discrepancies were found between his numbers and the data in Bettye Hobbs Pruitt, ed., *The Massachusetts Tax Valuation of 1771* (1978; Camden, Me.: Picton Press, 1998). The categorizations here were, therefore, more illustrative than definitive.

⁴⁴ The first group included 42 servicemen (and their taxable rental value in parentheses)—David Adams (£5), William Adams (£7), James Addams (£5), Adam Airs (£2), James Allen (£10), Benjamin Andrews (£10), John Bacon (£3), John Barber (£18), John Barnes (£16), John Barrett (£7), William Bennet (£9), William Bowes (£40), Edward Burbeck (£5), John Cades (£5), Lewis Channy (£4), Joseph Clough (£14), Gilbert Colesworth (£10), Edmund Dolbeare (£8), Nathaniel Dunn (£7), Thomas Emmons (£22), John Gardner (£10), Moses Grant (£23), John Hancock (£60), William Hart (£70), Eleazer Jackson (£33), Henry Johnson (£12), John Joy (£26), Joseph Loring (£17), Thomas Loring (£8), Thomas Lloyd (£16), John Mill (£5), Anderson Philips (£8), Samuel Pierce (£7), Henry Prentiss (£13), Edward Prevear (£10), John Richardson (£6), Edward Rumney (£8), William Smith (£33), John Sumner (£20), James Thompson (£9), William Torrey (£8), and Joseph Watts (£4).

⁴⁵ The second group included 19 servicemen—Nathaniel Barker (£36), William Barker (£4), John Barry (£6), William Cooper (£26), William Dawes (£21), William Farmer (£4), John Gill (£46), Samuel Greenleaf (£5), Robert McClary (£12), John New (£5), Thomas Perkins (£4), Charles Perrill (£10), William Perry (£13), Thomas Reed (£9), Levi Stutson (£13), Richard Walker (£10), Thomas Webb (£4), John Williams (£5), and Stephen Winter (£5).

⁴⁶ The third group included 18 servicemen—Francis Booth (£7), Gawen Brown (£33), William Cromic (£20), Patrick Daily (£3), Michael Edwards (£17), Benjamin Hall (£17), John Hardey (£3), William Hickling (£13), John Holland, Sr. (£10), Thomas Holland (£8), John Langdon (£46), James Marston (£5), James Otis (£42), Aaron Perbeck (£6), John Sheppard (£9), Zebulon Sylvester (£5), William Taylor (£13), and William Thompson (£11).

⁴⁷ The fourth group included 23 servicemen—William Adcock (£7), John P. Barnard (£20), William Candell (£11), James Crawford (£8), Temple DeCosta (£16), Benjamin Eustus (£20), Ebenezer Freeman (£17), Andrew Gardner (£8), John Hill (£16), Joseph Ingraham (£10), Ebenezer Jackson (£4), Henry Little (£26), Thomas Mitchel (£11), William Moore (£7), William Page (£10), John Pierce (£2), Samuel Pierce (£5), William Pitts (£9), John Popkin (£10), John Townsend Preston (£26), Joseph Ransford (£3), Thomas Rice (£6), and Richard Salter (£26).

⁴⁸ The last group included 41 servicemen—Ebenezer Ballard (£3), Samuel Bass (£26), William Bell (£13), Jonathan Brown (£18), Thomas Brown (£26), John Callender (£4), Robert Campbell (£4), Thomas Cartwright (£11), Nathaniel Cushing (£9), Thomas Daken (£8), Joseph Dyer (£10), Thomas Fitch (£8), Francis Green (£46), Jabez Hatch (£20), Abraham Hunt (£3), Edward Hunt (£13), Henry Jackson (lodger), John Madden (£13), John McClary (£2), Christopher Minot (£10), John Mitchel (£8), Benjamin Mourfort (£3), John Nowell (£20), George Oglesvie (£6), Simeon Osborn (£7), Elias Parkman (£10), William Perkins (£10), Paul Revere (£20), James Shepherd (£10), Holmes Simpson (£7), John Simpson (£5), John Snelling (£6), William Spooner (£20), Abraham Tuckerman (£3), Benjamin Waldo (£10), John Welch (£4), Jacob Wendall (£13), John White (£36), Robert William (£5), William Williams (£20), and John Wright (£10).

⁴⁹ The 71 men representing Boston and other towns (in brackets) in service (3 years or more with *) were—John Berry, Rufus Bent, Matthew Bird (Dorchester), Benjamin Bussey, Anthony Castikin, Samuel Champney, *Michael Crosby (Newburyport), Thomas Cummings, Moses Draper (Dedham), Isaac Greenleaf (Medford), Prince George, James Gorden (Scituate), Enoch Hayden (Braintree), Oliver Hunt (Milton), *Peter Jackson, James Ives, Ignatius Jordan (Stoughton), Peter Larken (Westford), Jonathan Nash (Braintree), *Joseph Niles (Braintree),

Jonathan Nurse (Barre), Hugh O'Brine (Roxbury), *Daniel Parker (Malden), Thomas Pratt (Abington), Charles Perrin (died at Valley Forge), *Silas Phillips (Easton), Samuel Richards (Dedham), *Charles Richey, John Swain, Laban Sprague (Scituate), Nathaniel Seaver (Brookline), Ezra Tilden (Stoughton), Elijah Tuttle (Cambridge), Spencer Vose, Ezra Wait (Lynn), John Wentworth (Stoughton), *Enoch Wentworth (Stoughton), Elijah Withington (Dorchester), Josiah Brown (Waltham), William Champney, *Benjamin Clark (Framingham), Joshua Davis, Jr., Jason Fairbanks, Daniel Fowler (Swansey), *Thomas Harris, *John Handley, *John Hamilton, *John Hayward, *Daniel Haley, Thomas Hadley (Stoneham). James Hughes, *Benjamin Hunt, Joseph Ingolls, *Gershom Joy (Stoughton), *John Lewis, James Lovell, Patrick Lyon (Sturbridge), *John Mitchell, Richard Nash, *Jacob Reed, John Ruthford, *Richard Rowen, *James Shepard, *John Spear, *Benjamin Smith, Thomas Studley (Scituate), William Studley (Scituate), Benjamin Studley (Scituate), William Waters (Abington), John Walker (Rehoboth), and Thomas Williams (Dorchester). Warning out book from 1771 to 1773, Boston Overseers of the Poor Records, 1733-1925, roll 1, folder 4, Massachusetts Historical Society. Unfortunately, Boston seems not to have warning records from 1774 to 1790. A similar trend took place during the French Revolution as Alan Forrest, after examining 2,832 volunteer soldiers, pointed out that "it was not the sons of the professional classes who were dashing to fight for France." Most of the soldiers were tradesmen, manual workers, and immigrants; some of them were "frequently living in conditions of the utmost misery and degradation." "The Condition of the Poor in Revolutionary Bordeaux," *Past and Present* 59 (1973), 161-163.

⁵⁰ Data collected from David Thomas Konig, ed., *Plymouth Court Records, 1686-1859* (Boston: New England Historic Genealogical Society, CD-ROM, 2002), Ruth Wilder Sherman, Robert M.

Sherman, and Robert S. Wakefield, comp., *An Index to Plymouth County, Massachusetts, Warnings Out from the Plymouth Court Records, 1686-1859* (Plymouth, Mass.: General Society of Mayflower Descendants, 2003), and *Massachusetts Soldiers and Sailors of the Revolutionary War*, 17 vols. (Boston: New England Historic Genealogical Society, CD-ROM, 2006).

⁵¹ The 28 men were Ebenezer Andrews Jr. from Taunton for Hanover, Lemuel Bates from Pembroke for Hanover, Elnathan Benson from Wareham for Plympton, Jephtha Benson from Middleborough for Plymton, Job Caswell from Pembroke for Hanover, Job Caswell Jr. from Pembroke for Hanover, Robert Corthell from Hingham for Hanover, Calvin Curtis from Scituate for Hanover, Joseph Darling from Plympton for Duxbury, Samuel Darling from Hingham for Duxbury, Samuel Darling Jr. from Plympton for Duxbury, Henry Darling (no settlement, b. Hanover, warned by Scituate and Hanover) for Hanover, Daniel Darling from Scituate, warned by Abington and Pembroke, for Pembroke, Daniel Darling Jr. b. Abington, warned by Pembroke, for Pembroke and Roxbury, William Green from Taunton for Plymouth, Samuel Hollis (no settlement, b. Weymouth, m. Plymouth), warned by Kingston, served for Kingston, also Plymouth and Hanover, Nathaniel King from Plymouth for Kingston, Reuben Muxam (b. Rochester, m. Middleborough), warned by Wareham, served for Wareham, Daniel Pratt from Plymouth for Plympton, John Rickard from Plymouth for Plympton, Isaac Robinson from place unknown for Kingston, John Robinson Jr. from place unknown for Kingston, Richard Smith from Raynham, warned by Pembroke from Hanover, served for Pembroke, William Thorn from place unknown for Wareham, Benjamin Tubbs from Pembroke, warned by Plympton, served for Middleborough and Plympton, Joshua Waterman from Plymouth for Kingston, Josiah Waterman from Plymouth for Kingston, and Josiah Waterman Jr. from Plymouth for Kingston.

⁵² The 37 men rated for property tax were Capts. Oliver Pond, Benjamin Hawes, Lemuel Kollock, Lts. Timothy Guild, Joseph Everett, Sergeants Elias Bacon, David Ray, Abijah Blake, William Puffer, Jesse Everett, Corporal Elijah Farrington, and Privates John Blake, Benjamin Day, Benjamin Rockwood, Stephen Blake, James Blake, David Man, Samuel Brastow, Daniel Holbrook, David Holbrook, Turil Gilmore, Samuel Pettee, Joseph Ware, Jeremiah Day, Ichabod Turner, Daniel Messinger, Isaac Fisher, Obediah Man, Ebenezer Blake, Benjamin Shepard, John Bates, John Dale (money lent), Ephraim Hunt, James Blake, Jonathan Shepard, Ebenezer Fisher, Jr., and Joseph Hancock. The 17 men rated for poll tax were Lts. Wiggleworth Messinger, Hezekiah Ware, Noah Pratt, Sergeant John Whiting, Drummer Hezekiah Hall, and Privates John Druce, Jonathan Felt, Joseph Field, George Man, John Porter, Oliver Rouse, Jr., Jacob Blake, Oliver Ware, Samuel Baker, Stephen Pettee, Elisha Turner, and David Ware.

⁵³ The 62 militiamen were Sergeants Nathan Blake, Daniel Guild, Corporals Nathan Hancock, Beriah Braston, Aguilla Robbins, Timothy Pond, Drummer Jason Blake, Fifers Christopher Burlingame, Daniel Cobb, and Privates William Wetherbee, Isaac Clewly, Asa Day, Jonathan Everett, Samuel Frost, John Fisher, Timothy Hancock, David Everett, Jeremiah Hartshorn, Theodore Kingsbury, Ebenezer Kollock, Benjamin McLane, James Newhall, Abijah Pond, Jacob Mann, Peter Raysey, Benjamin Ray, Deodat Fisdale, Daniel Ware, — Ware, John Needham, Moses Craig, William Green, Jason Richardson, Ephraim Knowlton, Jacob Daggett, Oliver Harris, Samuel Wood, Ebenezer Field, John Kingsbury, Jeremiah Cobb, Henry Holbrook, Jacob Holbrook, Samuel Richardson, Jr., Nathan Kingsbury, John Hawes, Ebenezer Gilbert, Daniel Mumm, Stephen Harding, Aaron Hall, Lm. Messinger, Isaac Richardson, Daniel Gould, Joseph Hawes, Jr.,

Joseph Cook, Jr., Nicholas Barton, Ralph Freeman, Samuel Bolkom, Jeremiah Pond, Benjamin Guild, 2d., Ebenezer Allen, Nathan Moses, and Jesse Ballou.

⁵⁴ A comparable case is John Shy, "Hearts and Minds in the American Revolution: The Case of 'Long Bill' Scott and Peterborough, New Hampshire," in his *A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggles for American Independence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), 163-79.

⁵⁵ The 12 men were Capt. Samuel Lamson, Lt. Jonathan Fisk, and Privates Jonathan Stratton, Benjamin Peirce, Increase Leadbetter, Isaac Hobbs, Joseph Whitney, Joseph Steadman, Jonas Pierce, John Lamson, Thaddeus Fuller, and Joseph Peirce.

⁵⁶ The 11 men were Lt. Mather Hobbs, Corporals Abijah Steadman and Simeon Smith, and Privates John Walker, Jr., Thomas Rand, Samuel Child, Jonas Harrington 3d, John Bemis, William Whitney, Samuel Train, Jr., and Joel Smith.

⁵⁷ The 17 men were Sergeants Josiah Steadman, Josiah Seaverns, John Wright, Abraham Hews, Drummer Samuel Nutting, and Privates Isaiah Bullard, John Warren, Jr., Micah Warren, Isaac Flagg, Isaac Cory, William Bigelow, Nathaniel Parkhurst, Samuel Fisk, Ebenezer Steaman, William Bond, Moses Peirce, and Daniel Stratton.

⁵⁸ The 63 unrated privates were Nathan Hager, John Allen, Jr., Jonathan Warren, William Hobart, John Frost, Abijah Warren, Isaac Walker, James Jones, Amos Jones, David Sanderson, Abraham Harrington, Samuel Underwood, Eben Brackett, Oliver Curtis, Josiah Corey, Reuben Hobbs, Thomas Rand, Jr., Benjamin Rand, David Fuller, David Livermore, Jacob Parmenter, Thomas Corey, Roger Bigelow, Elijah Kingsberry, Jonas Underwood, Convers Bigelow, John Stimpson, Thomas Williams, Elisha Stratton, Benjamin Bancroft, Samuel Twitchell, William Bond, Jr., John

Flint, John Norcross, William Cary, Daniel Lawrence, Jedediah Bemis, Lemuel Stimpson, Benjamin Dudley, William Lawrence, Elias Bigelow, Abraham Anderson, Josiah Allen, Jr., Daniel Benjamin, Nathaniel Boynton, Eben Phillips, Jedediah Wheeler, Benjamin Peirce, John Peirce, William Jones, John Gould, Solomon Jones, Phineas Hager, Paul Coolidge, Samuel Taylor, Jos. Lovewell, Peter Cary, Samuel Woodward, Elijah Allen, Hezekiah Wyman, Joseph Jennison, Daniel Bemis, and Amos Parkhurst. N. B. Several of these men's fathers were rated, such as John Allen, Sr., Thomas Rand, Sr., and Benjamin Bancroft, Sr.

⁵⁹ For the militia personnel of Weston see Daniel S. Lamson, *History of the Town of Weston, Massachusetts, 1630-1890* (Boston: Press of Geo. H. Ellis Co., 1913), 79-80. For the valuation data of Weston see Bettye Hobbs Pruitt, ed., *The Massachusetts Tax Valuation List of 1771* (1978; Camden, Me.: Picton Press, 1998), 288-93.

⁶⁰ Henry S. Nourse, *The Military Annals of Lancaster, Massachusetts, 1740-1865* (Clinton, Mass.: W. J. Coulter, 1889), 385-89.

⁶¹ The 47 men were Jonas Powers, Joseph Wheelock, Israel Cook, Samuel Sawyer, Jr., Asa Smith, Joshua Sawyer, John Sergeant, Abel Wyman, Josiah Wilder, James Pratt, Joshua Johnson, Moses Osgood, John White, Jr., Andrew Haskel, Jacob Zwear, Joseph Beaman, Adam Fleeman, Joseph Nichols, Jotham Woods, Titus Wilder, Salmon Goodfry, James Fuller, Asaph Wilder, John Priest, Abel Wright, Ethan Kendal, Mathew Wyman, Benjamin Houghton, Jr., Samuel Churchel, Ephraim Powers, Joseph Fairbanks, John May, John Dunsmoor, Thomas Kendall, John Kindrick, John Wheeler, Obediah Gross, William Ball, Samuel Wilder, Ebenezer Brooks, Jacob Kilburn, Joseph House, Aaron Geary, Joseph Bayley, Oliver Atherton, Samuel Flood, and Abiel Abbott.

⁶² The 18 men (of no grain production) were Stanton Carter, Jeremiah Haskel, John Stuart, David Hosly, Robert Phelps, Jonas Wyman, Thomas Cleland, James Clark, Thomas Mears, John Willard, Jonathan Knight, Peter Thurston, Aaron Dressor, Hezekiah Whitcomb, John Moors, Enoch Dole, Thomas Grant, and Isaac Evelith.

⁶³ The 18 men (with a yearly grain output of 40 bushels or less) were Elijah Wood, Jonathan Whitcomb, John Wheelock, Jr., Ephraim Whitcomb, Samuel Herring, Aaron Willard, Jr., Jonathan Sawyer, Daniel Goss, Thomas Brooks, Jonathan Moors, Micah Harthan, Nathan Gary, Benjamin Priest, Moses Burpee, Benjamin Houghton, George Hibroth, Jabez Brook, and Nathaniel Sawyer.

⁶⁴ The 19 men were Abner Haskel, Aaron Willard, Jonathan Wheelock, Nathaniel Beaman, Cyrus Fairbanks, Nathaniel Wright, John Hewitt, John Hawks, James Houghton, John Loring, John Nichols, John Bennett, Timothy Haywood, John Snow, Nathaniel Jones, Samuel Snow, John Warner, William Jewett, and Stephen Wilder.

⁶⁵ The 15 men were Abijah Philips, John Brooks, James Goodwin, Ephraim Wilder, Thomas May, Joseph Sever, John Parson, Abijah Houghton, Caleb Whitney, Shubael Bailey, Samuel Prentice, John Wheelock, Jabez Fairbanks, Josiah Fairbanks, and Samuel Carter.

⁶⁶ The 17 men were Joseph Sawyer, Asa Wilder, John Carter, Peter Willard, Roger Bartlet, Moses Sawyer, Daniel Robbins, Thomas Ross, Phinias Wilder, William Greenleaf, Fortunates Eager, Joel Osgood, Samuel Thurston, William Phelps, Nathaniel White, Gersham Flagg, and Josiah Winn.

⁶⁷ The 24 men were John Wilder, Elisha White, Samuel Joslyn, Joshua House, Joshua Phelps, Samuel Sawyer, Jonathan Prescott, Jonathan Whitney, Nathaniel Houghton, Joseph Bennitt,

James Richardson, Samuel Bailey, Seth Haywood, Solomon Holman, Nathan Burpee, Solomon Stuart, Henry Haskel, Oliver Moors, Ephraim Richardson, Ephraim Willard, Jonathan Wilder, Jr., Amos Rugg, Paul Sawyer, and Jacob Bennitt.

⁶⁸ The 14 men were David Willard, Asael Phelps, Ephraim Sawyer, David Osgood, Thomas Sawyer, Manasah Sawyer, William Richardson, Elisha Sawyer, Amo Knight, James Wilder, William Dunsmoor, Teley Richardson, Joshua Fletcher, and Joseph White.

⁶⁹ The 9 men were Ebenezer Buss, Thomas Bennitt, Joel Houghton, Daniel Rugg, Daniel Willard, Joshua Fairbanks, Jonathan Fairbanks, Peter Ayres, and Ephraim Boynton.

⁷⁰ The 5 men were Jonathan Wilder, David Wilder, John White, Aaron Sawyer, and John Prescott. The last two were Asa Whitcomb and Ebenezer Allen.

⁷¹ See also Douglas Lamar Jones's pioneer work, "The Strolling Poor: Transiency in Eighteenth-Century Massachusetts," *Journal of Social History* 8 (1975): 28-54, and "Poverty and Vagabondage: The Progress of Survival in Eighteenth-Century Massachusetts," *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* 133 (1979): 243-54. His *Village and Seaport: Migration and Society in Eighteenth-Century Massachusetts* (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1981) used computer programs to analyze the moves of inhabitants, newcomers, in-migrants, and out-migrants at Beverly and Wenham, Essex County.

⁷² Robert A. Gross, *The Minutemen and Their World* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1976), 146-52.

⁷³ All information concerning individual soldiers, sailors, veterans, and their careers in this article comes from local history, vital statistics, military records, and pension files. Multiple sources of evidence have been used to ensure the accuracy of each case.

⁷⁴ Esther L. Friend, "Notifications and Warnings Out: Strangers Taken into Wrentham, Massachusetts, Between 1732 and 1812," *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* 141 (1987): 191, 199, 330, 351; 142 (1988): 82, 84.

⁷⁵ The 15 family heads were Simon Slocomb, Daniel Thurston, Asa Whiting, Nathan Aldis, John Clark, Asa Fairbank (a captain), Nathaniel Hawes, Benjamin Shepard, Elisha Ware (a sergeant), Stephen Turner, Jr., William Hewes, Abijah Blake (a private), James Boyden, David Fales, and John Smith (a colonel).

⁷⁶ They included such notable individuals as Nathaniel Appleton, Samuel Austin, George Bethune, Caleb Blanchard, James Bowdoin, Thomas Boylston, Dr. Thomas Bulfinch, Ezekiel Goldthwait, Henderson Inches, William Mackay, John Pitts, Ebenezer Storer, Benjamin Waldo, and Samuel Wentworth. *Report of the Record Commissioners* (Boston, 1894), 25: 19-23. Annie Haven Thwing, *Inhabitants and Estates of the Town of Boston, 1630-1800* (Boston: New England Historic Genealogical Society, CD-ROM, 2001).

⁷⁷ John McClary in Ward No. 2 received wood from town on April 17, 1769, February 19, 1770, and June 5, 1770, as well as 3s. of cash on June 1, 1770. He paid a single poll tax as a householder in 1771, owned a tan house, and was rated to have a real property of £3 in an estimated annual rental income. The records of his first enlistment dated at Cambridge on May 13, 1775. A matross or a bombardier, he served a short term of less than two months in that year. He later enlisted again at Boston for the town. The Continental Army paid him from January 1, 1777 to December 24, 1779, when Lt. Osgood Carleton certified that the said McClary, a sergeant in his company and formerly in Capt. Benjamin Wallcut's company, Col. Thomas Marshall's regiment, "being unfit for military duty on account of lameness contracted

while in service, was accordingly discharged.” Eric Nellis and Anne Decker Cecere, eds., *The Eighteenth-Century Records of the Boston Overseers of the Poor* (Boston: Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 2007), 889, 899, 902. Bettye Hobbs Pruitt, ed., *The Massachusetts Tax Valuation List of 1771* (1978; Camden, Me.: Picton Press, 1998), 12. *Massachusetts Soldiers and Sailors of the Revolutionary War* (Boston: Wright & Potter, 1896-1908), 10: 430, 432. Records in these titles further suggest that public aid recipients John Hobbs, Samuel Chandler, Thomas Rice, James Flood, John Morrison, and Thomas Welch in Boston might have also enlisted in the American Revolution. But evidence is still needed to establish the definitive connections between these needy individuals and their roles in military service.

⁷⁸ W. Graham Millar, “The Poor Apprentices of Boston Indentures of Poor Children Bound Out Apprentices by the Overseers of the Poor of Boston, 1734-1776” (M. A. Thesis, College of William and Mary, 1958). Millar’s work laid the foundation for Lawrence W. Towner’s article, “The Indentures of Boston’s Poor Apprentices, 1734-1805,” *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts* 43 (Boston, 1966): 417-68. Ruth Wallis Herndon, “Children and Masters: Tracking Eighteenth-Century New Englanders through Indentures,” *New England Ancestors* 4 (2003): 22-24.

⁷⁹ For the Cox family’s experiences before the war see Douglas Lamar Jones, “The Transformation of the Law of Poverty in Eighteenth-Century Massachusetts,” in Daniel R. Coquillette, ed., *Law in Colonial Massachusetts, 1630-1800* (Boston: The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 1984), 181-83.

⁸⁰ They include these soldiers—Abraham Aldrich enlisted for three years but deserted after several months. John Atkinson three years. Ephraim Barker served for six years. Jonathan

Barrett three years. Ichabod Bozworth served for three years. Luke Chapin three years. Thomas Cleland served for the duration of the war. John Fellows served for three years. Jonathan Felt served several years. Both Lemuel Gates and his brother Samuel for three years. Zenas Gibbs three years. Joseph Langley served for more than three years. John Doyle Legg enlisted at least five times. Thomas Lillie enlisted for three years but was disabled soon after enlistment. Joseph Ransford served for almost six years. Jabez Steven served for three years. Levi Vinten for the duration of the war.

⁸¹ They were Joseph Bennitt and Henry Haskel.

⁸² They were Roger Bartlet, Gersham Flagg, and Peter Willard.

⁸³ They were Shubael Bailey, Abijah Philips, John Wheelock, and Caleb Whitney.

⁸⁴ They were John Hewitt and Aaron Willard.

⁸⁵ They were Jabez Brook, Samuel Herring, and Jonathan Sawyer.

⁸⁶ They were Thomas Cleland, Isaac Evelith, and Thomas Grant.

⁸⁷ They were Joseph Bailey, Andrew Haskel, Joseph House, Joshua Johnson, Jacob Kilburn, James Pratt, John Priest, John Wheeler, Joseph Wheelock, and Jotham Woods.

⁸⁸ Bedford had a typical situation of this sort in 1780. Abram English Brown, *History of the Town of Bedford, Middlesex County, Massachusetts, from Its Earliest Settlement to the Year of Our Lord 1891* (Bedford: Published by the Author, 1891), 26-27.

⁸⁹ "Among the black soldiers in the Continental Army were former slaves who served longer than most white soldiers for less pay." Charles Royster, *A Revolutionary People at War: The Continental Army and American Character, 1775-1783* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 241-42.

⁹⁰ Henry S. Hourse, *The Military Annals of Lancaster, Massachusetts, 1740-1865* (Clinton, Mass.: W. J. Coulter, 1889), 178-94.

⁹¹ Henry A. Hazen, *History of Billerica, Massachusetts* (Boston: A. Williams and Co., 1883), 234-51.

⁹² Chauncey E. Peck, *The History of Wilbrahm, Massachusetts* (Wilbraham, 1913), 128, 129.

⁹³ Heman Packard DeForest, *The History of Westborough, Massachusetts* (Westborough, 1891), 165, 166, 169, 171.

⁹⁴ Alfred Sereno Hudson, *The History of Sudbury, Massachusetts, 1638-1889* (Sudbury, 1889), 401, 403-05, 413.

⁹⁵ James M. Crafts, *History of the Town of Whately, Mass.* (Whately, 1899), 227.

⁹⁶ Leonard Bolles Ellis, *History of New Bedford and Its Vicinity, 1602-1892* (Syracuse, N.Y.: D. Mason & Co., 1892).

⁹⁷ John Montague Smith, *History of the Town of Sunderland, Massachusetts* (Greenfield, Mass.: E. A. Hall & Co., 1899), 140, 141.

⁹⁸ See the price list of Westborough, Heman Packard DeForest, *The History of Westborough, Massachusetts* (Westborough, 1891), 167. A legend of this era said that a constable was about to pay the town treasurer for buying a pair of oxen, which would cost £40. After inquiring how much a mug of cider would sell, he settled the account by paying three and one-third mugs of the drink. Rufus P. Stebbins, *An Historical Address* (Boston: George C. Rand, 1864), 245.

⁹⁹ They were Maj. John Bacheller, William Brown, John Eillis, Joseph Emerson, Ammi Falkner, Caleb Felch, Nathan Felch, Samuel Felch, Samuel Felch, Jr., Benjamin Leathe, from Reading, Nathan Bliss, David Cook, Lt. John Davis from Rehoboth, Samuel W. Bowker from Rutland

District, Benjamin Clark from Abington, Silas Foster, Jonathan Wellington, and Capt. Enoch Whitmore from Acton, Lt. Micah French, — Perham, Josiah Waite from Athol, Lt. Edward Holman from Sutton, Col. Ebenezer Newell from Brookfield, and Nathan B. Newton from Southborough. Lilley B. Caswell, *The History of the Town of Royalston, Massachusetts* (Published by the Town of Royalston, 1917), 403, 411-12.

¹⁰⁰ Unless otherwise indicated, all soldiers mentioned here in this segment were from Boston, although not everyone was a longtime resident of the city. Either attracted to the events of the time or because of some personal expediency, many people from other communities, seamen, newly arrived emigrants, and transients enlisted by claiming their residence of Boston.

¹⁰¹ Such as from drummer to drum major—Jonathan Kinney, Daniel Reed, Richard Ryan, Robert Steel, and from fifer to fifer major—William Owen.

¹⁰² The son of Jacob Copeland (1731-1802)—one of the great great grandsons of Lawrence Copeland, Asa Copeland's birth date, place, and the mother's identity were not known. His father married, in 1766, Rachel Adams of Stoughton, who died in the same year three months after giving birth to a girl also named Rachel. Family tradition assumed that Asa was born about 1756, because of his recalling of the participation in the Boston Tea Party at the age of 17. He served in the revolution from 1777 throughout the war. He married Amelia Price in Philadelphia in 1783. The couple had seven children. He died on September 3, 1797 and she on April 16, 1828, in Philadelphia. John Eayers's identity remains difficult to ascertain for as many as 49 people in Massachusetts under the same name (John Air, Ayre, Ayres, Ayrs, Eaye, Eayers, Eayres, Eayrs, or Eyers) served, including 14 from Boston and 17 with no place of residence. William Dawes (1745-1799) was the famed rider, with Paul Revere and Samuel Prescott, who warned

the patriots at Lexington and Concord of the approaching British troops on the night of April 18, 1775. Born in 1756, both William Rickard's parents and his birthplace were unknown. He married Elizabeth Stinson (b. 1760, parents unknown), and their only child Susannah was born in c. 1775. Promoted to lieutenant in 1782, he later became captain after the war, went to Fort Blount in the Tennessee territories, and took charge of the garrison. He was a Nashville resident in 1803, and received a 200-acre land grant. He died there in 1811. Christopher Walcut was the son of Benjamin Walcut II and Elizabeth (Marshall) Walcut. Born in 1756 in Boston, he was killed at the Battle of Fort Ann on 8 Jul 1777. Benjamin Brown was the son of Benjamin Brown, Jr. and Ann (Lappish) Brown. He was born in Boston in 1757/8. After the war he owned a store in Lancaster, Pennsylvania until 1824 when he decided to return to Boston. He fell from the horse on the way and was sent to the House of Industry in Boston the next year. He then applied for and received a federal pension until his death on March 5, 1833. Born on 13 December 1756 in Boston, Ebenezer Floyd was the son of Mary and Ebenezer Floyd, Sr. He served during war and afterward moved to Blue Hill, Hancock County, Maine. He died there on 10 October 1809. Born on 25 February 1755, Andrew Garrett was the son of Andrew Garrett and his first wife Temperance (Parker) Garrett of Barnstable. He moved to Essex County, married Lucy Morgain at Gloucester on 7 November 1775, and enlisted for Gloucester in 1777. He was taken prisoner at Cherry Valley, New York on 11 November 1778, less than three weeks after he was promoted to lieutenant. He remained in captivity for three years, one of which with the Indians. After the discharge on 3 June 1783, he returned to Salem but found his wife remarried. He moved back to Barnstable where he married Olive Blish (b. 1761) on 5 November 1785. He worked as a carpenter and owned no real estate but a few pieces of chairs, tables, iron pots, kittles, and a

cow and pig. Both Olive and himself feeble and infirm in 1818, he applied for and received a federal pension at \$20 per month. Enlisted as sergeant from Boston in February 1779, Luke Howell was promoted to 2d lieutenant after serving three months. Two months later he was further promoted to captain in Col. Nathan Tyler's regiment. He soon deserted. Little was known about James Leary who came from Scarborough, Maine.

Born in 1740, Joseph Ford was the son of Joseph and Priscilla Ford of Braintree, and a housewright in Boston. After his stay and quick rise in the service between 1778 and 1780, he returned to Boston and began to style himself as gentleman in 1782 until his death in 1797.

Richard Skilling was a blockmaker in Boston, where he died in c. 1793. Born in c. 1753, George Reab was from Roxbury but moved to Salem, Washington County, New York after his service in the war from 1777 to 1783. He was infirm and in reduced circumstances in 1818, when he applied for a federal pension, which was raised to \$320 per annum in 1828 and to \$480 per annum in 1831. He died in Salem on 20 June 1838, and his widow Abigail Reab died on 16

March 1843. Etham Moore served and rose in Col. Thomas Crafts's artillery regiment from 1777 to 1780 when he stationed in Falmouth, Maine. After his resignation on 10 November 1780, he married Eunice Hayden, on 15 August 1781, in Boston where he sold land with buildings in 1783.

Enlisted as sergeant on January 1, 1776, Daniel McLane was promoted to ensign the same year and to lieutenant the next. He served until 1782 but his identity was undetermined.

¹⁰³ Many enlisted men served out their terms for three or more years but were not promoted, such as John Coasts (invalided in 1780), Abijah Chadwick, Joseph Cowell (honorably discharged), John B. Benrick (French), John William Bentroff (foreigner), John Boudeno (or Boudino, French),

Michael Combler (or Cumber, French?), Philip (or Peter) Frederick Wild (or Weld, foreigner), and George Wood (foreigner).

¹⁰⁴ Compare the experience of Captain Edward Blake of Taunton with that of Lieutenant Edward Blake, Jr. of Boston—(1) The son of Edward and Anne (Hannover) Blake, Capt. Edward Blake was born on 4 July 1736. His ancestors came to Taunton in the late 1600s and established a homestead named Blakeville on the bank of Taunton River. Marching to Roxbury, Edward Blake joined the military action as 2d lieutenant in response to the alarm of April 19, 1775. A month later he was raised to captain in Col. Jonathan Brewer's regiment. He continued to serve in 1776, 1777, and 1780, but all his terms lasted from several days to a month each time, of which a tour of 3 months 8 days in 1775 was the longest. He died on 19 November 1818, and his widow Mercy (Thayer or Mrs. Mary Blake, b. 1761) was granted a federal pension in 1838 until she passed away in 1842. (2) Born in Boston and baptized in 1753, Edward Blake, Jr. was the son of Edward (1728-1792) and Rebecca (Hallowell, 1731-1821) Blake of Boston. He married Dorcas Smallpiece, the daughter of John (d. 1759) and Sarah Smallpiece, on 4 Feb. 1779, and had seven children. Edward Blake, Jr. marched to Roxbury on the alarm of Lexington and Concord on April 19, 1775, and served 11 days. From then on his participation rarely stopped until the end of the war, or as he described it that his "service on first day hostilities commenced between Great Britain and the United States and at battles of Bunker Hill, Germantown, Brandywine and Monmouth." Although he was a resident of Boston, he enlisted during war for Boxford in 1777. He started a private in the company that was under the command of one his relatives—Captain Edward Blake of Taunton. Yet he rose from a sergeant in Col. Crane's artillery regiment in 1777 to a lieutenant between 1778 and 1783. While he was

the regimental quartermaster in 1783, he was never commissioned as captain to lead a company. Like some of his relatives including the wealthy Edward Blake (1742-1824) of Dorchester who had a mansion on Pleasant Street in Boston, Edward Blake, Jr. was a carpenter and housewright. Unfortunately, his home in Pearl Street, Boston was caught on fire and burned down in 1789. He died in 1797 or 1800. His widow Dorcas Blake applied for and received a federal pension of \$521.78 per annum from 1831 until her death on 16 November 1837.

¹⁰⁵ Born on 22 September 1752, Luther Bailey was the second son of the famed Colonel John (1730-1810) and Ruth (Randall) Bailey of Hanover, Plymouth County. He was a corporal in his father's regiment which marched on the alarm of 19 April 1775, rose to adjutant later that year, and was commissioned as a captain at the age of 25 in 1777. He married Sylvester Little on 21 October 1784, and died in Hanover on 12 May 1820. The youngest of the eight children of Henry (1664-1739) and Abigail (Fiske) Baldwin of Woburn in Middlesex County, Samuel Baldwin was born on 31 August 1717. He married Elizabeth Jones—the daughter of Captain James and Sarah (Moore) Jones—of Weston in the same county in 1742, settled there later, and had eight children. He was a veteran soldier in the Seven Years' War, served as town clerk from 1770 to 1774, and was elected selectman in 1775, when he also served on the local Committee of Correspondence. A 58-year old private who marched on the alarm of April 19, 1775, he rose to lieutenant later that year and became captain in Colonel Nicholas Dike's regiment in 1776 when he, enlisted for Northbridge and leading a company of Worcester County soldiers, stationed at Dorchester Heights. He had three more children from two additional marriages and died in Weston on 22 July 1778. Abner Bourn(e) (1748-1806) was sergeant at the Lexington Alarm of 19

April 1775. Rising from 2d lieutenant to 1st lieutenant, he was commissioned in 1778 and rose to the rank of captain two years later, serving in the 4th Plymouth County regiment of Massachusetts militia. A native of Hanover, he and Mary Torrey, also of Hanover, published their intentions of marriage at Middleborough in 1765, and had seven children. He died at Middleborough where he owned a mansion called the “most pretentious” “Old Bourne House.” The son of Andrew (1719-1788) and Hannah (Coggswell) Burley of Ipswich in Essex County, William Burley was baptized on 6 January 1750. A sergeant in 1775, he became a lieutenant two years later and was promoted to captain in 1780. He was captured in a severe skirmish with the British troops near West Point, New York and remained a prisoner for a year and nine months. He moved back to Essex County after the war, lived at Beverly, and died there on 22 December 1822. Mathew Chambers, of Marblehead in Essex County, first enlisted as sergeant on 16 May 1775. Enlisted again on 1 January 1777 for three years, he served as lieutenant and was promoted to captain on 26 November 1779. He continued to serve until 1782 and was given a pension for life in 1794. He died on 30 January 1809.

¹⁰⁶ Born in Danvers, Essex County on 20 March 1756, Moses Porter could sometimes sign “junior” to distinguish himself from another Moses Porter (1719-1811) of neighboring Boxford. A tanner from Wenham in the same county, his father Benjamin Porter (1726-1810) moved to marry Sarah Rea of Danvers—the widow of Bartholomew Brown—on 27 March 1755. Still an apprentice, the young Porter joined as private in Capt. William Perley’s company of Boxford Minutemen, marching on the alarm of April 19, 1775 to Cambridge. He fought there and at the Battle of Bunker Hill, seldom leaving the army again for the rest of his life. He served Captain John Peabody’s company in Colonel Edward Wigglesworth’s regiment which stationed at

Ticonderoga in August 1776. He then tarried in Boston but, as did 15 other men in the same city, took the bounty of £20, offered by the Township of Boxford in March 1777, to enlist in the Continental Army for Boxford for the duration of war. An artillery man, Moses Porter rose to sergeant in Captain Henry Burbeck's company, Colonel John Crane's artillery regiment, and participated in the fight at Brandywine in September 1777. Wounded on the banks of Delaware River a month later, he was promoted to lieutenant early 1778. He and his troops stationed near Morristown in January 1781 and at West Point the next year. As one of the few commissioned officers who remained to serve after the war, he went with General Anthony Wayne to fight Native American Indians in the west and supervised regional garrisons. In the War of 1812-14 he marched from Niagara to New Orleans in five months and was appointed brigadier general on 10 September 1813. En route for inspecting the north garrisons in Massachusetts and Maine, he died on 14 April 1822 in Cambridge where he started as a soldier 47 years ago. Moses Porter was unmarried. His body was interred in his birthplace—Danvers.

¹⁰⁷ Evarts B. Greene and Virginia D. Harrington, *American Population before the Federal Census of 1790* (1993; New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), 12-19. Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce and Labor, *A Century of Population Growth: From the First Census of the United States to the Twelfth, 1790-1900* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1909), 10.

¹⁰⁸ *Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, 52-55 (1776-1779), passim*. The only exception was the sale (in an attempt to raise £163,200 through a lottery for the state treasury) allowed on November 9, 1786, of 50 townships in Lincoln County, Maine. *Acts and Resolves 1786-87, 97-102. American Herald and the Worcester Recorder 18 June 1788. Essex*

Journal 2 July 1788. *Independent Chronicle* 29 January 1789. *Cumberland Gazette* 24 July 1788.

Mabel Cook Coolidge, *The History of Petersham* (The Petersham Historical Society, 1948), 158.

¹⁰⁹ Moreover, half of those newly incorporated areas were either too small and close to urban centers or too remote and rugged to encourage any expansion of agriculture. The number of farms, therefore, remained well below 100 in those two dozen communities until the second half of the nineteenth century. They included Hamilton, Lynnfield (all in Essex County), Quincy, Randolph, Canton, Dover, Foxborough (all in Norfolk County), Boxborough, Tyngsborough (all in Middlesex county), Ward (now Auburn), Gerry (now Phillipston), Gardner (all in Worcester County), Goshen, Montgomery, Leyden, Holland, Russell, Plainfield (all in Hampshire County), Hancock, Washington, Dalton, Clarksburgh, Mount Washington, and New Ashford (all in Berkshire County). Elias Nason, *A Gazetteer of the State of Massachusetts* (Boston: B. B. Russell, 1890), *passim*. Land was becoming harder and harder to find inside the commonwealth, where most of the desirable tracts had already been taken after more than 150 years of settlement, reducing many family farms to a pitiful acre or two. Barry Levy, *Town Born: The Political Economy of New England from Its Founding to the Revolution* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 2.

¹¹⁰ *Town of Weston: The Tax Lists, 1757-1827* (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1897), 181.

¹¹¹ Middlesex Probate Records: 2125.

¹¹² For a similar situation in a vastly changed modern environment see Stanley Aronowitz's extensive studies based on his personal experience and insight, *False Promises: The Shaping of American Working Class Consciousness* (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1992).

¹¹³ The conventional (Marxist or revisionist) pattern of class struggle stresses the uncompromising divide between two extremities which often take the form of two classes between the haves and the have-nots, or between the rich and the poor. Peter Novick recounted Marxist influences on American historiography in *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 415-68. For recent discussions about class in early America see Greg Nobles, "Class," in Daniel Vickers, ed., *A Companion to Colonial America* (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 2003), 259-87; The special issue on "Class and Early America," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., 63 (2006), *passim*; Michael A. McDonnell, *The Politics of War: Race, Class, and Conflict in Revolutionary Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Simon Middleton and Billy G. Smith, eds., *Class Matters: Early North America and the Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008); Alfred F. Young and Gregory H. Nobles, eds., *Whose American Revolution Was It? Historians Interpret the Founding* (New York: New York University Press, 2011), 192-224.