

Lee Soltow
OHIO UNIVERSITY
and Kenneth W. Keller
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

RURAL PENNSYLVANIA IN 1800: A PORTRAIT FROM THE SEPTENNIAL CENSUS

MODERN historians have begun to make fresh discoveries about patterns of eighteenth century Pennsylvania society that were only dimly perceived by persons of the time. Studies by Jackson Turner Main, Gary Nash, James Lemon, Stephanie Grauman Wolf, Robert Harper, and Jerome Wood have raised new questions about social stratification, occupational structure, family life, and settlement patterns, especially as they contributed to the development of the American Revolution in Pennsylvania.¹ Most of these works have relied upon tax lists or other records from the years 1765 to 1793, since it is for these years that the surviving tax lists seem most accessible and abundant. These pioneering works have stopped short of the eighteenth century's end because of the sheer volume of work necessary for completing the tasks these authors have undertaken. None of these studies has used one especially rich and comprehensive source that gives us the best portrait of eighteenth century Pennsylvania society available—the septennial census of 1800. This article attempts to describe what it records about Pennsylvania society and to point to directions of research that scholars should begin to take using its riches.

The Pennsylvania septennial census of 1800 is one of a series of census counts taken in the commonwealth from the beginning of the American Revolution. Although earlier provincial population estimates have disappeared, the census manuscripts for the years after independence for many counties still exist at the Division of Archives and Manuscripts (State Archives) of the Pennsylvania Historical and

Museum Commission at Harrisburg.² The records are a valuable unexploited resource for studying the commonwealth's early history. Septennial census records exist for four of the eleven counties of 1779, thirteen of the seventeen counties of 1786, eight of the twenty-one counties of 1793, and all the counties of 1800. Highly fragmentary septennial records also exist for 1807, 1814, 1821, 1828, 1835, 1842, 1849, and 1863. Still, the septennial record of 1800 is the most complete of any Pennsylvania state census.

The information recorded in this remarkable census includes data that cannot be found anywhere else. It contains the occupations of about 48,000 taxables. These precious occupational records are complete for eleven of the twenty-seven Pennsylvania counties in 1800, and for five additional counties the census records partial occupational information. Such tallies of occupations are not available elsewhere in the United States prior to 1850. In addition to these lists, the census contains extremely rare age and marital data for four Lycoming County townships. The septennial lists also yield a comprehensive accounting of slaveholding in Pennsylvania. Nine of the counties in the census list the names of slaveholders, while three occasionally do so. For fourteen of the twenty-seven counties, the names of the slaves the masters owned appear; three county lists occasionally do so. Twenty-one counties recorded the ages of slaves, and two more do so less completely. These data are far superior in their detail than federal census data for either 1790 or 1800. By linking the septennial census's unusual data with information from the federal census of 1800, county tax lists and city directories, a portrait of the commonwealth's society takes shape.

A statute of March 7, 1800, reminded Pennsylvania's county commissioners of provisions of the Constitution of 1776 and 1790, for a census of taxable inhabitants to occur every seven years so that the legislature might be apportioned. The act instructed the commissioners to issue orders to township and ward assessors to begin to prepare the census between June 1 and August 1 of 1800 and to submit the results to the governor by December 1. The governor was to transmit the results to the legislature so that reapportionment could take place in the legislative session that began in December. The 1800 septennial law stipulated that assessors prepare two alphabetical lists "containing a just and true account of the names and surnames of every taxable person of the age of twenty-one years and upwards, whether male or female, resident within their respective township, town, wards, or districts." In a section that followed, the act ordered assessors to list the occupations of taxables actually residing in each county. Moreover, the commissioners and

assessors were told to count all slaves and list their ages and sexes. Judges of the county courts of quarter sessions were to check the lists for accuracy.³ Using these instructions, assessors went about Pennsylvania's countryside in the summer of 1800 listing the names of 113,355 taxable inhabitants.

The assessors of 1800 accumulated the names of about 18.8% of the commonwealth's total population, or 113,355 taxables out of 602,365 persons reported in the federal census of 1800.⁴ The taxable population of Pennsylvania was not identical to the commonwealth's adult white male population, and some persons who were not white or male were included in the taxable figures. It is necessary, then, to estimate what Pennsylvanians the taxable figures include as well as what Pennsylvanians they excluded. A sampling of taxable counts for 1800 indicates that about 2% of the taxables' names were those of tax-paying widows and spinsters. About 2.4% of the population of Pennsylvania in 1800 consisted of free black people and some of these were occasionally listed on the septennial lists. The names of free blacks appear less frequently than those of widows and spinsters, but at times the lists indicate free blacks and their occupations, as in the case of Delaware Township in Wayne County, where five farmers called "men of color" appear. Less than 1% of the taxables must have been free blacks. Some adult white males were also left out of the septennial schedules. The federal census of 1800 provides a key to determining how many adult white males the assessors of 1800 did not count.⁵ Federal census takers did not list the number of inhabitants age 21 and up for any state. They reported inhabitants in categories of those under 10 years, between 10 and under 16, between 16 and under 26, between 26 and under 45, and 45 and over. If we assume 21 lies midway between 16 and 26, we can estimate the number of federal census white males age 21 and older. By adding the number of adult white males age 26 and over to half the cohort between ages 16 and under 26, we get 125,049.⁶ By estimating the number of spinsters, widows, and free blacks in the taxable totals, and removing them from the calculations, we estimate that the septennial enumerations omitted from 6 to 11% of the adult free white male population. These persons may have been indigents, recent arrivals who had not paid a tax, or transients who were not "actually residing" anywhere. This estimate also indicates the number of adult free males who could not vote, since the taxable inhabitants minus women constituted the Pennsylvania electorate.

Although Pennsylvania's 1800 taxable inhabitants represented only 18.8% of its total population, the 1800 septennial record comprises a

broader sample of Pennsylvania society than do many other lists of taxables for other states in the early republic. In an effort to compare the coverage of the 1800 septennial figures with the coverage of similar censuses of other states, the authors have located nineteen other state censuses or lists of taxables for period 1783 to 1821 in the states of New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maryland, Virginia, and Kentucky. Of these censuses, only two contain surveys of their states' inhabitants that come close in scope to Pennsylvania's in 1800. The Massachusetts census of 1792 surveyed 71,365 taxables of 387,417 persons, or 18.4% of the population. The Maryland enumeration of 1783 recorded data for 31,067 taxables out of 170,689 inhabitants, or 18.2%. All the other state censuses discovered ranged in coverage from 13.7% to 17.6% of the population in each state.⁷

It was the intention of the drafters of the 1800 septennial act to clarify the meaning of terms used for decades in the collection of data involving the commonwealth's taxable inhabitants, but even the act of 1800 did not clear up all ambiguity in terms used to describe taxables. Frequently in the past assessors had used terms applied in the commonwealth's county tax assessment laws to describe the occupations or statuses of Pennsylvanians. Recent complaints about the complexity and unintelligibility of Pennsylvania's tax laws encouraged legislators to specify that taxables could be either male or female and that they should be age 21 or over.⁸ A taxable was an adult tax-paying person who resided in the township surveyed. The lists compiled were to count only actual residents. These changes would exclude absentees and apprentices from the septennial count. In another recent law, "An Act to Raise and Collect County Rates and Levies" of April 11, 1799, the legislature overhauled the definition of what was to be taxed. Assessors were to value land, houses, livestock, slaves, mills, furnaces, and ferries when they estimated the county taxes inhabitants were to pay. Single free men 21 and over without occupations and without property were also taxed. County commissioners could exonerate indigents from taxes, so the count of taxables the septennial census contains presumably did not include poor people whom the commissioners had excused from paying local rates.⁹ Since 1790 there had been no taxes paid into the state coffers (except for carriages and marriage and tavern licenses); the determination of what was taxable was based entirely upon those taxes assessed, collected, and expended at the county level.¹⁰ But the legislature provided no further guidance to local assessors for defining what was a taxable.

The legislature dropped the old term "inmate" from the 1800

septennial statute. Earlier county tax and septennial statutes had required assessors to list inmates: the term appears as early as "An Act for Raising County Rates and Levies" of 1724/1725, the fundamental Pennsylvania county tax statute for the eighteenth century.¹¹ Inmates were persons who lived in the house of someone else, sometimes in exchange for payment. They were not family members of the houseowner, nor were they guests or servants.¹² In England they were often poor persons, farmed out by the parish, to be cared for by householders.¹³ In Pennsylvania the term "inmate" may have meant a married tenant; presumably inmates were not indigents, for the county tax law of 1799 had instructed county commissioners to exempt persons they considered indigent.¹⁴ The Pennsylvania legislature abandoned the term "inmate" in county tax law in the 1795 statute, "An Act to Regulate the Mode of Assessing and Collecting County Rates and Levies."¹⁵ Nevertheless, a few county assessors continued to list inmates in a separate column in their septennial lists. Where inmates appear on the septennial schedules, they may indicate tenancy. "Inmates" appear in the septennial lists for such townships as Brandywine, Coventry, Charlestown, Kennett, and Pikeland in Chester County, for East Hanover and Lebanon in Dauphin County, and for most Lancaster County townships, except for the borough of Lancaster. Sometimes the local assessors used the term "laborer" where they did not indicate "inmate," as in the case of Albany Township of Berks County. There were, of course, other persons in the commonwealth who were not inmates but were tenants; the "inmate" designation represents only a portion of the commonwealth's total tenant population.¹⁶

Another old term that continues to appear in the septennial lists was the designation "single freeman," "freeman," or "singleman." The septennial acts of 1786, 1793, and 1800 had not required assessors to list single men, but the April 11, 1799, county tax statute did require assessors to compile lists of the names of all single freeman above age 21 "who shall not follow any occupation or calling."¹⁷ Accordingly, most county assessors listed single men separately in the septennial lists. They were adult males, out of their apprenticeship, often without property, but occasionally with occupations listed. Frequently they must have lived with their parents. If they did own property, assessors were to list its valuation. Jackson Turner Main suggests that in 1765 singlemen were free artisans and laborers. In the Chester County tax lists he studied, they owned no animals and amounted to 40% of the men of the county. The proportion in the 1800 septennial lists seems to be smaller for most counties for which information is available.¹⁸ Perhaps after

independence there was a greater tendency for single men to head for newly opening lands in the west.

There is also considerable diversity in the septennial lists in the use of terms to describe taxables' occupations. No specific explanation of how any occupational label was to be used appears in any septennial or county tax statute. Since terms describing occupations changed in eighteenth century America, it is necessary to consider what they meant and how they were used in the septennial census of 1800. Three of the most common and troublesome terms to appear were "farmer," "laborer," and "yeoman." In English law, the term farmer usually meant "one who cultivates hired land." English farmers were tenants, but were not considered laborers.¹⁹ According to some authorities, in Pennsylvania in 1800 the term "farmer" applied only to persons who were proprietors of their own land. Thomas Cooper, later of Northumberland County, made this assertion in his 1794 *Some Information Respecting America*. To Englishmen he wrote:

Nor is the term "farmer" synonymous with the same word in England. With you it means a tenant, holding of some lord, paying much in rent and much in tythes, and much in taxes; an inferior rank in life occupied by persons of inferior manners and education. In America a farmer is a landowner, paying no rent, no tythes and few taxes, equal in rank to any other rank in the state, having a voice in the appointment of his legislators and a fair chance, if he deserves it, of becoming one himself. In fact, nine tenths of the legislators are farmers.²⁰

In some surviving county tax lists, assessors did not indicate that inhabitants were farmers even though they may have possessed landholdings of farm size. This practice of omitting the designation of farmer, while listing designations for craftsmen or professions, seems to have occurred in such agricultural counties as Lancaster, York, Northumberland, Westmoreland, and Armstrong in the septennial census of 1800.²¹

Another clue to the meaning of the word "farmer" in the septennial lists appears in conjunction with the use of the word "yeoman." Most assessors did not use the word "yeoman" in the 1800 lists, but when it does appear, the word "farmer" seldom does. In England a yeoman was a man possessed of a small landed estate usually amounting to forty shillings in value. He was an independent freeholder who could vote and serve on juries. He was not a tenant.²² The Berks County assessors seem to have used the term "yeoman" more frequently than assessors

elsewhere, yet in no township were both commonly used. In nineteen of Berk's thirty-one townships, the assessors used the term "farmer" instead of "yeoman." In twelve they preferred the term "yeoman" and seldom used "farmer." Apparently in Berks "yeoman" and "farmer" were synonymous. Farmers were yeomen and landed proprietors.

The occupational term "labourer" also presents difficulties. There seem to have been different meanings for it in England and America. Eighteenth century English law specified that a man in possession of land could not be a "labourer."²³ But in America laborers did own land, even though most of them may have been landless. Jackson Turner Main found that as early as 1765, one out of five Chester County laborers owned real estate.²⁴ Casper Shaffner, Jr.'s, assessment roll of the borough of Lancaster for about 1785 shows that one of the four laborers listed for the town owned 10 acres of land. The rest of the laborers listed were landless.²⁵ An 1806 county tax list for the borough of Easton records an estate for a laborer that includes six acres of real estate, although the six other laborers in the borough were landless.²⁶ In England a laborer could not be a farmer; rather, he was a wage earner directly dependent upon others for employment. He had no specific skill or trade. The term laborer appears quite frequently in the septennial census, as in Montgomery and York Counties. But within the same county there was considerable variation in its use. Franklin County, for example, reported about 11% of its inhabitants as laborers in 1800, but half of its townships listed no laborers at all. The assessors of Stumpstown in Bethel Township of Dauphin County listed laborers separately at the end of their township report. Perhaps they meant these persons were inmates; the Stumpstown assessors also listed singlemen, so apparently singlemen and laborers were not identical. Other anomalies appear when the 1800 septennial lists are compared with earlier lists: townships like Caernarvon in Lancaster County used it in one census only to drop it in a succeeding one. Delaware County reported no occupational titles in 1800, but did so in its 1793 septennial records. In its 21 townships in 1793, some assessors used the term "laborer" frequently, while others chose not to use it at all.²⁷ Possibly these Delaware assessors preferred the term "farmer."

Since the septennial lists collected the reports of assessors from every region of the commonwealth, and since most of these assessors followed the instructions of the septennial statute to collect occupational data, the manuscript schedules of the 1800 septennial census present the most complete collection of occupational data we have for early Pennsylvania. Indeed, such comprehensive occupational information is generally not

available for the United States in the early national period except for published city directories for the towns of Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore, Richmond, Norfolk, and Charleston.²⁸ The terminological inconsistencies that appear within the septennial occupational lists make it difficult to use the occupational listings to obtain a portrait of social stratification in 1800. But the changing applications of familiar occupational descriptions do indicate that understandings of the roles farmers, yeomen, laborers, singlemen, freemen, and inmates were changing from what they had been in England and in provincial Pennsylvania. Pennsylvanians in 1800 were observing a social revolution at work, and the septennial census record shows that people had not yet made up their minds about what to call the new statuses that were evolving.

The lists of taxable inhabitants of 1800 yield information on changing population patterns in the commonwealth. Records of the federal censuses of 1800 and 1810 cannot always be used to chart the growth or decline of local communities because numerous county and township boundary changes during the decade altered the geographic areas and populations various civil divisions covered. The county boundaries of Northumberland, Somerset, Bedford, Westmoreland, Lycoming, Luzerne, and Huntingdon Counties changed between 1800 and 1810, so federal census estimates for the earlier years do not describe populations covered in the latter. The county courts of quarter sessions, which created and altered township boundaries in Pennsylvania, changed them in counties like Berks, Northampton, and Allegheny during the decade, so earlier estimates do not measure the same regions as later ones. Fortunately, the rates of growth of local communities can be computed from records of taxables in the 1800 septennial census and a special accounting made in 1803.

On April 4, 1803, the state legislature passed a statute entitled "An act for laying out competent districts for the appointment of justices of the peace."²⁹ The act ordered county commissioners to transmit lists of taxables to the Secretary of the Commonwealth by the second Tuesday of December in 1803 so that the commonwealth might be "laid out into suitable districts, for the appointment of a competent number of justices of the peace." Before 1803 no districts existed for these local magistrates. When the Secretary of the Commonwealth recorded the names of persons holding commissions as justices, he also listed the number of taxables each justice's district included. The Secretary kept these records in the commonwealth's appointment books which contained the names of every person holding any civil appointment in Pennsylvania. These appointment books have survived, and it is from them we can obtain the special 1803 counts of taxables used to draw the justices' districts.³⁰

When compared with the taxable count of 1800, these figures tell us something about short-term population change in Pennsylvania between 1800 and 1803. Since only a few of the returns for the 1807 septennial census can be found, the 1803 figures supply the only complete existing taxable figures for the first decade of the nineteenth century.³¹ A few counties like Philadelphia, Bucks, and Chester merely transmitted to the Secretary the 1800 taxable figures, but most of those reporting sent in an entirely new count. An examination of the two sets of figures shows those areas where growth continued and where it had slowed down.

In 1800 striking population shifts were taking place in the commonwealth. One of the most dramatic areas of growth in 1800-1803 was in Allegheny County around the borough of Pittsburgh, where persons traveling down the Ohio outfitted themselves for the journey west. Pittsburgh and various adjacent townships grew at annual rates of from 9 to 13%. Recently established counties like Wayne, begun in 1798, were beginning to attract settlers: the population of Palmyra Township along the Lackawaxen River grew by 19.9% in the period, thus exceeding growth rates for every other locality in the state. Settlers were moving up the East Branch of the Susquehanna to the vicinity of Bloomsburg, into eastern Dauphin and the Lebanon Valley, west from Easton up the Lehigh, and across the Blue Mountain into Brunswick Township of Berks County. A decade later these population shifts created political pressure for the establishment of the counties of Columbia, Lebanon, Lehigh, Schuylkill, and Pike. Parts of Huntingdon and Somerset Counties registered growth in this period although at somewhat slower rates. The population of the Northern Liberties of Philadelphia County annually grew by 9% in these years. Reading grew dramatically in the early nineteenth century as its milling, hat-making, and brewing industries profited from river trade. Wilkes-Barre and Lewistown also recorded growth. Townships adjacent to Philadelphia County like Abingdon and Cheltenham in Montgomery profited from the spread of population north and the establishment of new industries like the rolling and slitting mill recently founded at Cheltenham.³² Increases in the taxables in parts of Cumberland may reflect the migration of Pennsylvania Germans into Newton and West Pennsboro Townships; about this time the Pennsylvania Germans began to take farms on the pine lands adjacent to the South Mountain in that county.³³

The figures also suggest that population in some townships of Cumberland, Mifflin, York, Adams, and Franklin Counties had stabilized or was declining as their inhabitants moved south down the Great

Valley or to the west.³⁴ Scots-Irish inhabitants of these regions were moving away during the early nineteenth century. Population seems to have stabilized in north central Montgomery and northern Delaware Counties and in the borough of Harrisburg. The future state capital lacked the manufacturing establishments of Reading and recent yellow fever episodes associated with the collection of stagnant water behind a mill dam gave Harrisburg the reputation of being a health hazard. The population of a few Northumberland County townships along the Susquehanna remained stable; perhaps they registered little growth because of migration to new settlements up the river. These figures show that not all the commonwealth experienced dynamic growth and that substantial internal migration took place in Pennsylvania as the nineteenth century began.³⁵

Thomas Jefferson once asserted that it was a common belief in the eighteenth century that the best distribution of labor in a society was one "which places the manufacturing hands alongside of the agricultural; so that one part shall feed both, and the other part furnish both with clothes and other comforts."³⁶ The septennial census of 1800 reveals that rural Pennsylvania came surprisingly close to Jefferson's ideal, for the census demonstrates that rural Pennsylvania, where 89% of the commonwealth's adult males lived, was not overwhelmingly agricultural.³⁷ By sampling the septennial lists' references to occupations, we may estimate what portion of the commonwealth's labor force was employed in agricultural or other pursuits.

The septennial lists give complete occupational descriptions for the city of Philadelphia and eleven counties and partial listings for five other counties.³⁸ These lists provide occupational identifications for about 48,463 taxables in 1800. (About 12% of the names in the septennial lists have no occupational titles.) By sampling every fiftieth census page that lists occupations, the authors found 1,085 names, 970 of which were identified by occupation. The 115 persons whose occupations were not stated in the census may have been farmers or laborers, since census-takers sometimes omitted these designations. In any case, the estimates made here will not be perfectly representative of Pennsylvania's occupational composition. Nevertheless, since the 1800 lists give the most complete occupational census we have for early Pennsylvania, a general sketch of Pennsylvania's occupational profile should be attempted. To draw this sketch, the authors have estimated the number of persons in each occupation in the 48,463 taxables and then grouped the occupations according to the economic functions they served to find what portion of the labor force occupied each sector of the economy.

Table 1 summarizes the results of this sampling. To estimate the absolute number of persons engaged in each occupation in the listings, the authors have multiplied the percentages derived from the sample of 970 occupations times the total number of occupations listed. Next, the number of persons in each specific occupation has been grouped into broader occupational categories representing agricultural, manufacturing and mechanical, domestic and personal services, trade and transportation, and professional services sectors of the economy. For example, this method classifies farmers and yeoman as belonging to the agricultural sector, while it includes carpenters and blacksmiths in the manufacturing and mechanical sector.

Using these techniques, the authors conclude that farming seems to have been a less common occupation in rural Pennsylvania than might be supposed. The most frequently listed occupations in the census appear in Table 1. Those occupations most often mentioned were farmers (about 18,097 listings), laborers (about 4,301), and yeomen (about 2,250). Among the 48,463 listings, "farmer" appears 37% of the time, while "laborer" shows up 9% of the time. Perhaps the figure for "laborer" should be raised somewhat, since occupational descriptions were most frequently omitted in urban areas, and it is likely that city residents without designated occupations were day laborers. In addition, since the septennial tallies include some widows, and since the counties listing occupations may not have been representative of all Pennsylvania counties, and since about 10% of all males 21 and older were not taxables, it must be that between 35 and 40% of men 21 and older perceived themselves as farmers. Between 9 and 18% of men would be considered as laborers. These figures mean that for the 89 of every 100 men in Pennsylvania who lived in rural areas, less than half were farmers. The remainder in rural areas were artisans or laborers on farms or in other activities. When the occupations are arranged according to the broader economic functions they served, it appears that about 42% of the taxables were engaged in agriculture, 32% were occupied in manufacturing and mechanical enterprises, and about 10% performed domestic and personal services. In Pennsylvania as a whole, then, one in every three persons was an artisan and there were almost as many artisans as there were farmers.

It is quite likely that occupational titles like "farmer" and "laborer" were not mutually exclusive, for persons could pursue several occupations within a year's time. Among the artisans mentioned, the most commonly mentioned occupation was that of weaver. Weaving was particularly amenable to changes in the seasons, so weavers might also

Table 1. Stated Occupations from the Septennial Lists for Pennsylvania in 1800

Most Frequently Listed Occupations		Occupations Grouped by Economic Sector	
Number	Occupation	Number	Economic Sector
18,097	Farmer	20,347	Agriculture
4,301	Laborer	15,509	Manufacturing and Mechanical (Artisans)
2,250	Yeoman	5,028	Domestic and Personal Services
2,154	Carpenter	2,496	Trade and Transportation
2,002	Tailor, Hatter, Maker of Finished Clothing	934	Professional Services
1,797	Weaver	4,149	Other
1,652	Blacksmith		
1,457	Merchant, Shopkeeper		
1,390	Widow, Spinster		
1,170	Miller		
769	Cooper		
769	Ropemaker		
731	Gentleman, Esquire		
707	Mason, Bricklayer		
677	Innkeeper, Tavernkeeper		
671	Shoemaker		
525	Metalworker		
445	Brewer, Distiller		
394	Doctor, Dentist		
363	Wagon-maker, Wheelwright		
		48,463	Total

Source: These estimates are based upon a sample of 970 occupations drawn from every fiftieth page of those counties listing occupations in the 1800 Septennial Census. Not shown are listings for 115 persons without occupational titles. See Septennial Census of 1800, Division of Archives and Manuscripts (State Archives), Harrisburg.

farm if weather permitted. The frequency of occupations adaptable to weather cycles shows that rural Pennsylvanians may have often changed their principal breadwinning pursuit during the year. The next most commonly mentioned occupations were those of blacksmith and carpenter, and these were also seasonally adaptable. Weavers, blacksmiths, and carpenters alone constituted about 12% of the occupational labor force of Pennsylvania in 1800. Pennsylvania's leading promoter of manufactures, Tench Coxe, noted in 1793 that it was common for tradesmen and manufacturers to live on small rural farms which they cultivated in their spare time, so seasonal shifts in occupational activities happened often.³⁹

Rural Pennsylvania's occupational diversity can be seen most clearly when occupational patterns for remote rural areas are contrasted with those of Philadelphia. *The New Trade Directory for Philadelphia Anno 1800* lists Philadelphia's occupations for that year.⁴⁰ The *Directory's* list demonstrates the amazing gamut of urban occupations. It records occupations for 7,154 persons in 259 trades. Since in the 1800 census of the city there were about 7,600 men age 26 and up and about 10,000 men age 20 and up, this listing probably does not account for about 25 to 30% of the city's adult population. Perhaps the missing workers would appear as laborers in a more thorough enumeration. Nevertheless, Philadelphia's figures show a diversity that even the most remote Pennsylvania townships approach. Certainly there was no more remote and rural a county in the commonwealth than Lycoming, at the edge of the last great expanse of Pennsylvania land to remain unsettled in 1800. Yet even remote Lycoming exhibits great occupational diversity. Its 1800 lists fully account for all 1,265 adult males—63% of whom were farmers and 9% laborers. Yet the Lycoming septennial list shows men with 47 different occupations, about 20% of the 259 listed for Philadelphia. A rural area that included only one village representing 3 or 4% of the population still demonstrated a diversity of economic activities. A count of the occupational identifications of 6,325 taxables in 31 townships of southeastern Pennsylvania's Berks County gives a proportion of 44% who were classed as either farmers or yeomen, while 11% were listed as laborers. Accordingly, a surprising portion of Berks's inhabitants were not primarily agricultural workers. These proportions represent an increasing diversification of Berks's occupational structure since the Revolution. Jackson Turner Main found that in Berks County at the time of independence, one fourth of the men listed in the tax lists were laborers, most of whom were landless. Artisans seemed to be increasing in the county's population, but did not account for more than

10% of the county's people.⁴¹ About two thirds of Berks Countians had been farmers before the Revolution. Perhaps the declining percentage of farmers in Berks County reflects the growing importance of the rural iron industry in that county. At least fifteen ironworks were established in Berks County between 1776 and 1880.⁴² As Arthur C. Bining pointed out, often the farmers upon whose land iron ore was found became ironmasters, thus contributing to the "versatility of genius" of eighteenth century Pennsylvanians.⁴³ Other studies of Pennsylvania localities show similar diversity. Stephanie Grauman Wolf's study of the urban village of Germantown revealed that out of 597 workers listed in the 1793 septennial census, 60 occupational categories were reported.⁴⁴ Robert E. Harper's study of eight Fayette County townships uncovered 399 artisans in some 41 trades in 1796.⁴⁵ James Lemon's examination of southeastern Pennsylvania found occupational diversity in Lancaster County. Near the end of the eighteenth century 30 to 40% of rural taxables were non-farmers.⁴⁶ Regardless of whether they lived in prosperous and well established eastern counties, on the edge of the wilderness, or in the heart of the Alleghenies, rural Pennsylvanians lived in an economically heterogeneous environment.

There are some corroborating occupational statistics for the United States in the early national period that illustrate Pennsylvania's occupational representativeness and point to possible changes accompanying industrialization. Enlistment records in the military section of the National Archives record the occupational backgrounds of American soldiers between 1799 and 1895. A sample of 2,762 enlistees has been drawn from this pool in a recent study of literacy in America. When the U.S. enlistees are grouped into three occupational classifications, "farmers," "laborers," and "others," it appears that Pennsylvania's occupational pattern was representative of the nation. For the years 1799-1830, 33% of the enlistees were farmers, 16% were laborers, and 52% fell into other occupational categories. For the period 1830-1895, 17% were farmers, 29% were laborers, and 54% had other occupations. The 1799-1830 proportion for the nation is quite close to that revealed in the Pennsylvania census of 1800. In the 1800 sample, farmers comprise about 35 to 40% of the occupations, while laborers amount to about 9 to 18% of those counted.

Possibly Pennsylvania's occupational patterns in 1800 foreshadowed those the nation would begin to exhibit in 1830. The enlistee statistics show that the industrializing of America later in the century reduced the proportion of farmer enlistees by half. Perhaps it could be demonstrated that Pennsylvania, too, had such a decline, but well in advance of other

American states, since Pennsylvania was the nation's leader in manufacturing output in the early nineteenth century. Stephanie Grauman Wolf's study of the manufacturing center of Germantown shows an occupational profile that approximates the proportion of farmers characteristic of America as a whole from 1830 to 1895. Professor Wolf found that 11% of Germantown's inhabitants in 1793 were farmers, 13% were laborers, and 54% were occupied in other pursuits. Pennsylvania and her urban village of Germantown were harbingers of social and economic trends the nation at large would experience only later in the nineteenth century.⁴⁷

Records of the ages of Pennsylvanians are extremely rare for the early national years. If such information existed for Pennsylvania, it would be possible to learn whether men have certain occupations when they are young and when they are old, since the septennial census provides occupational information. It might be possible to trace the typical pattern of land and other resources from the time a man entered the labor force to the time he left it. Documentation for such patterns is well established for the mid-nineteenth century, but it is very unusual for earlier times, especially outside of New England, where some age records were kept.⁴⁸ Fortunately, the Pennsylvania septennial census of 1800 does contain one report of age data. The assessors of four townships and part of a fifth in Lycoming County recorded the ages of inhabitants in 1800. Lycoming County was on the edge of Pennsylvania's wilderness. It was settled by New Yorkers, Yankees, and Quakers, so it may not be typical of the state as a whole. But since the Lycoming age statistics are the only ones we have for so early a time in Pennsylvania, they should be examined meticulously.⁴⁹

Table 2 displays the average ages of 558 residents of Lycoming in 1800. These distributions conform amazingly to federal census data

Table 2. The Average Ages of Men and Women for 558 Persons in Lycoming County in 1800

Township	Men		Wives or Widows	
	Number	Average Age	Number	Average Age
Mifflin	107	40.8	—	—
Loyalsock	136	34.5	106	34.5
Wayne	47	42.3	41	39.0
Tioga	121	35.5	—	—
	411	38.2	147	35.8

Source: The Septennial Census of 1800.

reports for 1800. The proportion of men 26 to 44 to those 26 and older is .612 for the septennial data, .622 for the United States, and .609 for the northern states in general in 1800. By combining these age data with marital status information two of the townships supply, we can learn something of age differences in married couples on the Pennsylvania frontier. In the two Lycoming townships for which we have data, Loyalsock and Wayne, the proportion of men who were married climbed rapidly from .12 for men 21 to 24 to .45, .76, .88, and .95 in the five-year intervals 25-29, 30-34, and so on that follow. There was some tapering in this configuration in older age intervals as some men became widowers. The relationship between the ages of both spouses in married couples demonstrates that men were on the average three or four years older than their wives, but there was wide variation depending on whether the statistics were classified by age of man or wife. Married women aged 20 had husbands whose ages averaged 30 years, but this same figure of 30 for the husband generally prevailed until the woman was in her late 20s. It then rose rather rapidly with women in their 30s having husbands about seven years older on the average.

The numbers of men in the various age groups in Table 3 reveal details about population growth in Lycoming County. This table summarizes the distribution of ages in Lycoming. If men did not die, the numbers in each age class would be about 3% larger than those of the next-oldest class. Such a growth rate would be expected, since the federal census shows that the population growth rate in Pennsylvania was averaging 3.5% per year at this time.⁵⁰ Only an abnormal flow of immigrants might distort the trend. The numbers of men in the age classes shown in Table 3 have been adjusted by employing the death

**Table 3. The Distribution of Ages for 558 Persons
in Lycoming County in 1800**

Age Class	Number of Men	Number of Women
21-29	132	50*
30-39	108	53
40-49	86	16
50-59	49	19
60-69	24	6
70-79	8	1
80-89	3	1
100	1	—
	411	147

*Includes 3 women under 21.
Source: The Septennial Census of 1800.

rates in Massachusetts in 1865 for the same age intervals. If these figures were plotted on a graph prepared from the resulting death-free numbers, they would form a very reasonable growth line demonstrating a growth of almost 3.4%. There is some evidence of greater progressive change or linearity after age 30. Foreign born generally arrive in large numbers in their late 20s and these arrivals obviously affect the pattern. Death-free patterns for native born appear with less of a hump, at least as shown with the data for the United States for 1850–1870.⁵¹ It is really quite remarkable that the 1800 Lycoming age data exhibit the same characteristics and, in fact, reflect Pennsylvania's growth rate from 1790 to 1800.

The septennial list of 1800 records occupations of almost all of the 411 men with ages. This list, coupled with the occupational listings the septennial census provides, allows us to study the range and average age for different occupational groups. In a growing and expanding economy, one might suppose, if a man tends to be a laborer when he is young and a yeoman farmer when he is older, then the average age of laborers would be less than the overall average of 38 years and that the average of farmers would be more than 38. If the Lycoming economy was relatively stagnant or stable, the average ages for the two major groups would then be similar to the overall average of 38. The statistical results rather unequivocally portray Lycoming as stable, even stagnant, in 1800. The average age of the 26 laborers was 38 years and the average age of the 267 farmers was also 38 years. This means that age classifications reveal very little difference. These constancies are shown in Table 4. The proportion of the labor force assessors classified as farmers was .64. At every age level of Lycoming society, the proportion of farmers was about the same. The number of laborers constituted 6% of the adult male population, a figure that also held, approximately, for every age group in Lycoming. Artisans, too, showed no signs of becoming prominent in

Table 4. The Proportion of Men in Various Occupational Groupings for 411 Men in Lycoming County in 1800 Classified by Age

Age	Farmers	Laborers	Artisans	Trademen
21–29	.64	.06	.20	.04
30–39	.62	.06	.22	.06
40–49	.69	.09	.13	.05
50–59	.69	.04	.18	.04
60 and up	.63	.06	.20	.03

Source: The Septennial Census. See Table 2 for population size.

older age groups. This was a society exhibiting little movement from age cohort to age cohort.

The available evidence suggests that the Lycoming economy was quite stable in terms of its occupational groupings. Weavers were not becoming more dominant by being in greater preponderance among the young. There are no traces of trends in the figures. Since similar age data are not available for less remote counties in eastern and western Pennsylvania, it is uncertain whether or not other places would exhibit similar stability. The figures do support the claim of historians like Norman B. Wilkinson that the region along the east branch of the Susquehanna remained economically retarded. According to Wilkinson, the operations of land speculation companies like the Holland Land Company promoted confusion about land titles and discouraged rapid settlement and growth in the region.⁵²

The next earliest age data for Pennsylvania seem to be those also appearing in the septennial census files. They are contained in the septennial records from Fannet Township in Franklin County in 1821.⁵³ Although this sample lies well beyond the year 1800, it may indicate whether men tended to be laborers when young and farmers when older. As Table 5 reveals, the changes were not neatly progressive from the age of 20 to 30 to 40. In the case of Fannet in 1821, the tax lists are available, so we can trace asset accumulation with age. Table 5 demonstrates that the average acreage followed age almost exactly. When a farmer was 22 he had 22 acres; when he was 33 he had about 33 acres; when he was 73 he had about 73 acres. Surely this pattern prevailed somewhere in 1800 as it did in 1821. These Fannet investigations of age and achievement do not demonstrate very much occupational mobility in the life cycle, but they do demonstrate the rise in the level of

Table 5. Age and Achievement of 327 Men in Fannet Township of Franklin County in 1821

Age	Farmers	Laborers	Average Acreage
21-29	.38	.18	22
30-39	.34	.18	34
40-49	.56	.14	54
50-59	.58	.03	62
60 and up	.45	.06	76

Source: The Septennial Census of 1821 and Franklin County tax list of 1822, Division of Archives and Manuscripts (State Archives), Harrisburg.

asset accumulation as men grew older. Age was the index of betterment in Fannet Township in 1821.

The records of the septennial census of 1800 challenge scholars to probe further into the confounding diversity of early national Pennsylvania. It is well known that Pennsylvania was the most religiously and ethnically diverse of the American states in 1800. Its occupational heterogeneity, the wide divergence in rates of growth from place to place, and the stagnancy of economic growth in some places and its rapid pace in others may be less well known. The septennial census points to the possibilities for further study of these subjects. The large rural artisan population the census exposes needs to be compared with persons engaged in similar trades in the nation's largest city, Philadelphia. The census is certainly the most comprehensive source we have for information about widows, spinsters, free blacks, single men, and slaves in the commonwealth. Studies of tenancy, landlordship, marital patterns, geographic and social mobility, and age stratification should consider the data it presents. Variations in the use of occupational terms like "farmer," "yeoman," and "laborer" point to a need for a study of the use of these terms in more county tax lists in the early republic. If, as David Hackett Fischer suggests, the late eighteenth century "experienced a social revolution which was more powerful in its causes and more profound in its effects than any comparable happening in modern history," then Pennsylvania was a harbinger of that change.⁵⁴ The septennial census of 1800 is a profile of a rural commonwealth in the midst of that revolution.

NOTES

1. Jackson Turner Main, *The Social Structure of Revolutionary America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965); Gary B. Nash, *The Urban Crucible—Social Change, Political Consciousness, and the Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979); James T. Lemon and Gary B. Nash, "The Distribution of Wealth in Eighteenth-Century America—A Century of Change in Chester County, Pennsylvania, 1693–1802," *Journal of Social History*, 2 (Fall 1968): 1–24; James T. Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1972); Stephanie Grauman Wolf, *Urban Village—Population, Community, and Family Structure in Germantown, Pennsylvania* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976); Robert Eugene Harper, "The Class Structure of Western Pennsylvania in the Late Eighteenth Century," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Pittsburgh, 1969); Jerome H. Wood, Jr., *Conestoga Crossroads—Lancaster, Pennsylvania—1730–1790* (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1979). See also Lee Soltow, "Housing Characteristics on the Pennsylvania Frontier: Mifflin County Dwelling Values in 1798," *Pennsylvania History*, 47 (January, 1980): 57–70.

2. On provincial taxable counts, see Evarts B. Greene and Virginia D. Harrington, *American Population before the Federal Census of 1790* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932); 114-119; Robert V. Wells, *The Population of the British Colonies in America before 1776—A Survey Of Census Data* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 143. Pennsylvania avoided census-taking before 1779. See Septennial Census Returns, 1779-1863 (RG-7), Division of Archives and Manuscripts (State Archives), Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Harrisburg. For a description of these records, see Robert M. Dructor, *Guide to Genealogical Sources At the Pennsylvania State Archives* (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1980), 98-100. Dructor indicates that there is no 1800 Philadelphia County septennial census, but it appears on The Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints Microfilm Number 315-345. Hereinafter all references to the Septennial Census of 1800 will appear in the text.
3. James T. Mitchell and Henry Flanders (eds.), *The Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania from 1682 to 1801* (Harrisburg: State Printer, 1896-1915), Volume 16, 434-437. For other statutes pertaining to the septennial census, see Mitchell and Flanders, Volume 9, 328-332, and Volume 12, 169-171. See also the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776, Section 14, and the Constitution of 1790, Section 4.
4. Contemporary observers recognized that the proportion of taxables to total population was about one fifth. See the [Washington, Pennsylvania] *Herald of Liberty*, October 20, 1800. See also George D. Luetscher, *Early Political Machinery in the United States* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1971), 12.
5. United States Census Office, Second Census, 1800. *Return of the whole number of persons within the several districts of the United States. . .* (Washington, D.C.: 1801).
6. The proportion of Pennsylvania's 1800 free white male population to its total population was quite similar to that of other northern states. About 21.3% of Pennsylvania's total population was 21 and older; for the northern states in general it was 21.2%.
7. The 1801 New York census covered only 85,844 persons in a total population of 618,000 or 13.9%. Connecticut's 1800 census of taxpayers accounted for 35,312 persons of 251,000 total inhabitants, or 14.4%. Vermont's 1800 census enumerated 15.9% of its population, while Kentucky's 1800 census counted 17.6% of its inhabitants. Estimates of the coverage of censuses of taxables for other states have been calculated from the following sources: Franklin B. Hough, ed., *Census of the State of New York for 1855* (Albany, 1857), ix-x (for electors owning freeholds and those not freeholders, but renting tenements of annual value of 40 shillings); manuscript returns of the grand list, Connecticut State Library, Hartford; Joseph Felt, "Statistics of Taxation in Massachusetts and Maine," *Collections of the American Statistical Association* (1847), 487; Vermont General List, Office of the Secretary of State, Montpelier, Vermont (polls 21-64 adjusted with Lycoming ages as described *infra*, fn. 51); Oliver Wolcott, Jr., "Direct Taxes," *American State Papers*, Class 3, Volume 1, 442 for polls 18-70, adjusted to 21 and up with Connecticut and Lycoming data, *infra*, fn. 51; *Summary Amounts, 1783*, Tax Assessment of 1782-1783, Maryland Hall of Records, Annapolis; Tax Lists, Kentucky State Historical Society, Frankfort, and *Journal of the Senate of Kentucky* (Frankfort, 1811), 74; U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States* (Washington, D.C., 1960), Series A195-209, Z1-19 (interpolated values). The Pennsylvania septennial census of 1793 counted about 19% of the commonwealth's inhabitants, but few of the schedules from this enumeration have survived. To compare Pennsylvania taxables with the total population of the commonwealth, see Samuel Hazard, *The Register of Pennsylvania*, Volume 4 (July, 1829): 13.
8. For complaints about the complexity of tax statutes, see Mitchell and Flanders, Volume 14, 229; Volume 16, 375.
9. Mitchell and Flanders, Volume 16, 375-390.

10. Eugene A. Myers, "Tax Legislation in Pennsylvania to 1873," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Pittsburgh, 1946). Pennsylvania's carriage tax expired in 1794.
11. Mitchell and Flanders, Volume 4, 10-29.
12. Lemon and Nash, 9. Main believes that inmates were "adult sons of farmers and indentured servants." See Main, 181. Gary Nash believes they were married tenants. See Gary Nash, *Class and Society in Early America* (Englewood Cliff, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc.), 51-52.
13. See definitions of these terms in *Jowitt's Dictionary of English Law* (London: Sweet and Maxwell, 1959) and *Stroud's Judicial Dictionary of Words and Phrases* (London: Sweet and Maxwell, 1971).
14. Mitchell and Flanders, Volume 16, 383.
15. Mitchell and Flanders, Volume 15, 323.
16. A few contemporary estimates of the number of Pennsylvanians who were tenants exist. The Philadelphia *Aurora and General Advertiser* of February 8, 1796, contained a letter saying that one third of all Pennsylvanians were tenants and that one half of these were poor. The *Lancaster Intelligencer* of October 8, 1805, asserted that seven out of ten Pennsylvanians owned land. If, as Gary Nash suggests, inmates were married tenants, we can obtain a minimum percentage of tenants for townships in which census takers recorded inmates. For the northern Chester County townships of Coventry, Pikeland, Charlestown, and Brandywine in 1800, the proportion of inmates to taxables was 25%, while for the township of Kennett, which was adjacent to the Delaware state line, the proportion was 19%. In two townships of interior Dauphin, East Hanover and Lebanon, the proportion of inmates was 24% of the taxables in 1800. Jackson Turner Main found that inmates comprised about 20% of the population of eight eastern Chester (now Delaware) County townships in 1765. See Main, p. 181.
17. Mitchell and Flanders, Volume 12, 169; Volume 14, 411; Volume 16, 379, 434.
18. Main, 181. The 1800 septennial schedules list singlemen for some townships in Berks, Chester, Cumberland, Dauphin, Somerset, Washington, Wayne, and York Counties.
19. See Jowitt and Stroud; also *Wharton's Law Lexicon*, Fourteenth Edition (London: Sweet and Maxwell, 1946).
20. Quoted in Stevenson W. Fletcher, *Pennsylvania Agriculture and Country Life, 1640-1840* (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1971), 540. Benjamin Rush seems to have applied the term farmer to American cultivators who were proprietors of their land. See Rush to Thomas Percival, "An Account of the Progress of Population, Agriculture, Manners, and Government in Pennsylvania" [October 26, 1786] in L. H. Butterfield (ed.), *The Letters of Benjamin Rush*, Volume 1 (1761-1792), in *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society*, XXX (1951), 401-404.
21. For example, see Jacob Lerch's tax list for Allen Township, Northampton County, December 24, 1801, Northampton County Manuscripts, 1797-1851, Miscellaneous Manuscripts Volume, p. 85, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. A note with the Westmoreland County septennial list for 1800 specifies that "where there is no mark in the column marked occupations opposite to the name, the occupation is farming; the other occupations are all set down."
22. See Jowitt. Census takers in eight Cumberland County townships used both "farmer" and "yeoman." Western counties tended to use "farmer" exclusively, although in Somerset County "yeoman" appears.
23. See quotation from the "Regulation of Servants and Apprentices Act" (1746), Stroud, entry for "laborer."
24. Main, 72.

25. See Caspar Shaffner, Jr.'s, copy of the Borough of Lancaster Assessment Roll [1785], Lancaster County Miscellaneous Papers, 1772–1816, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
26. Benjamin Green's return of personal and real estates for the Borough of Easton, 1806, Northampton County Miscellaneous Manuscripts, 1797–1851, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
27. Septennial census of 1793, Pennsylvania State Archives.
28. Dorothea N. Spear, *Bibliography of American Directories through 1860* (Worcester, Massachusetts: American Antiquarian Society, 1961); United States Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of the Census, *A Century of Population Growth* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1909), 142–146.
29. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, *Laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (Lancaster: George Helmbold, Jr., 1803), Volume 5: 659–660.
30. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Records of the Department of State (RG 26), Bureau of Commissions and Elections, Appointment Books, 1790–1815, Volume 3 (1791–1815), Pennsylvania State Archives.
31. The 1807 septennial census manuscripts in the collections of the Pennsylvania State Archives cover only Derry Township of Dauphin County, Franklin, Montgomery, and York Counties. A list of Berks County's 1807 taxables reported by township appears in the *Readinger Adler*, December 29, 1807. Taxables for 1814 are even rarer: the only 1814 septennial list in the State Archives is for Franklin County.
32. Arthur C. Bining, *Pennsylvania Iron Manufacture in the Eighteenth Century*, Second Edition (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1973), 176.
33. *History of Cumberland and Adams Counties, Pennsylvania* (Chicago: Warner-Bears, 1886), 319; Sherman Day, *Historical Collections of the State of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: G. W. Gorton, 1843).
34. Day, *passim*. The *Franklin Repository* of January 12, 1808, complained of "that spirit of removing to the new settlements in the west, which has been as prevalent as unaccountable" in Franklin County.
35. Joseph Scott, *A Geographical Description of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: Robert Cochran, 1806), 105. For a geographic view of the settlement of Pennsylvania, see John William Florin, *The Advance of Frontier Settlement in Pennsylvania, 1638–1850: A Geographic Interpretation*, Papers in Geography, No. 14 (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Department of Geography, 1977).
36. Letter of Thomas Jefferson to Jean Baptiste Say, February 1, 1804, in Andrew A. Lipscomb and Albert Ellery Bergh (eds.), *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1905), Volume 11, 2.
37. This estimate includes residents of rural towns and boroughs as well as Philadelphia.
38. Complete occupational listings appear in the 1800 septennial records for the counties of Allegheny, Berks, Cumberland, Franklin, Huntingdon, Lycoming, Montgomery, Somerset, Washington, Wayne, and the City and County of Philadelphia. Partial occupational lists appear for Lancaster, Northumberland, Westmoreland, and Armstrong, and York Counties. Only one county has reported occupations in the septennial census of 1786, while only Cumberland, Philadelphia City and County, and a partial report for York list them in the septennial count of 1793.
39. Tench Coxe, *A View of The United States of America* (Philadelphia: Hall and Wrigley & Berriman, 1794), 442.
40. *The New Trade Directory for Philadelphia Anno 1800* (Philadelphia: Way and Goff, 1799).

41. Main, 25.
42. Bining, 173–176.
43. The phrase is that of Benjamin Rush. See Butterfield (ed.), “Information to Europeans who are disposed to migrate to the United States,” April 16, 1790, Volume I: 555.
44. Wolf, 105.
45. Harper, 223–224.
46. Lemon, 127, 147, 268.
47. The study of occupational backgrounds of enlistees appears in a forthcoming book by Lee Soltow and Edward Stevens, *The Rise of Mass Literacy and the Role of the Common School Revival in the United States: A Socio-Economic Analysis to 1870* (to be published by the University of Chicago Press). See Wolf, 106–107. For estimates of occupational proportions in Lancaster, Reading, and York, see Lemon, 128, and Wood, 160.
48. David Hackett Fischer, *Growing Old in America*, Expanded Edition. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978).
49. Jackson Turner Main has matched tax list names with files of birth and death records to develop wealth averages for specific age groups. These data do not seem to be as comprehensive as those reported in the septennial lists for Lycoming. See Jackson Turner Main, “The Distribution of Property in Colonial Connecticut,” in James Kirby Martin, ed., *The Human Dimensions of Nation-Making* (Madison, Wisconsin: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1976), 54–104. The 1800 Lycoming schedules give age data for the townships of Loyalsock, Lycoming, Wayne, Tioga, and part of Mifflin. Only Loyalsock and Wayne report marital data.
50. The annual growth rate is found by dividing the 1800–1810 increment by Pennsylvania’s 1800 population and then dividing the result by 10. For 1810 figures, see Treasury Department, *Aggregate Amount of Each Description of Persons within the United States of America, and Territories Thereof, Agreeably to the Actual Enumeration Made According to Law, in the Year 1810*, (Washington, D.C.: 1811).
51. This method of calculation is discussed in Lee Soltow, *Men and Wealth in the United States, 1850–1870* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), 9–20.
52. Norman B. Wilkinson, “Land Policy and Speculation in Pennsylvania, 1779–1800,” (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1958).
53. Franklin County census lists, Pennsylvania Septennial Census for 1821, Pennsylvania State Archives. The only 1821 census lists in the State Archives are for Columbia, Franklin, Huntingdon, and Mifflin Counties.
54. Fischer, 77.