

CHARACTER SKETCH

SILENCE DOGOOD AND THE LEATHER-APRON MEN

Allan Kulikoff

Abstract: This article plumbs the origin and meaning of Benjamin Franklin's use of the phrase "leather apron man" in his first "Silence Dogood" essay, written in 1722 as a youth of sixteen. Wearing leather aprons had long been a marker of plebeian craft labor and class hostility: shoemakers and carpenters, as Shakespeare knew, wore leather aprons; gentlemen did not. From a genteel perspective, calling someone a "leather-apron man" constituted an insult. In his Silence Dogood essay, Franklin transformed the meaning of the phrase "leather apron," turning it into a proud badge of honor, marking the virtuous labor of handycraftsmen. Although Franklin supported the aspirations of "leather apron men" his entire life, his working-class identity did not endure; nor did he ever use the phrase again in his known writing.

Barely sixteen, Benjamin Franklin published a remarkable series of essays in his brother James's newspaper, the *New England Courant*. Every reader of Franklin's autobiography knows the story. Once his father withdrew him from school, he worked for his father, a candle and soap maker. He disliked the work, and his father—fearing he would run away to sea—took him around Boston's workshops. Benjamin finally agreed to an apprenticeship with his brother James, a printer. The experience did not go well for

either brother, but Benjamin—surrounded by a group of writers dubbed the Couranteers—read widely, practiced writing, and secretly submitted contributions to the *Courant*; he kept his authorship secret until he completed the essays.¹

In these essays, Franklin took on the voice of a middle-age widow named Silence Dogood. Her name parodied Cotton Mather; author of the popular *Bonifacius: An Essay Upon the Good* (1710). Mather never kept silent. Nor did Silence Dogood—who championed women, lamented the decline of virtue, and claimed Harvard College was a bastion of elitism, gentility, and ignorance—stay silent. She wrote as she spoke, turning her contributions into a dramatic monologue, full of speech ordinary readers would understand.²

These essays, an astonishing achievement for a seasoned writer, much less a sixteen-year-old, have long fascinated literary historians and scholars. Franklin used the term “leather apron man” in the first essay he wrote; it has elicited little comment. Historians have presumed that he meant artisans, men who made shoes or built houses or printed books. Franklin, several commentators have argued, identified with leather-apron men throughout his long life and remained a member of the “leather-apron class” with a “leather apron outlook” himself.³ But no one has plumbed the origin or the meaning of the term, presuming that Couranteer Nathaniel Gardner invented it a few months before Franklin appropriated it. The story is more complex than this, and its end result shows Franklin, even at his young age, a master satirist, one capable of changing the meaning of words.

In his first two essays, Franklin told Silence Dogood’s life history, one that in some ways resembled his own. Orphaned at birth (her father fell overboard as they emigrated from England), she attended school for a short period. Before her hard-working mother died, she had apprenticed her to a young, unmarried minister. He trained her intellectually and gave her the run of his library, where she learned to love reading. When she reached adulthood, he proposed and she accepted, but seven years later, he died, turning her into an unhappy, if loquacious, widow.

What models could Franklin have drawn on to sketch Silence Dogood, with her egalitarian ethos, salty language, and sharp tongue? Although Dogood’s ideas originated in such works as Daniel Defoe’s *Essay Upon Projects* and the anti-aristocratic Couranteers’ essays, particularly those in women’s voices, finding the origin of her persona and biography proves more difficult. Moll Flanders, protagonist of the Defoe novel, appeared in January 1722,

three months before Franklin wrote the first Dogood essay. Moll's class location and spunkiness resembled Silence's, but her biography was quite different (including stints of working as a prostitute and immigration to the colonies). Franklin probably came across the novel long after he had finished the essays. Aristocratic English women had long debated female education and women's role in society, yet the class differences between these writers and Dogood remained vast. Nor did she come across as a scold or shrew, stock figures in English folklore and drama. Franklin thus drew an original character, perhaps the most vivid fictional sketch by an eighteenth-century colonist.⁴

Colloquial, profane, humorous, and sympathetic, Silence Dogood willingly took on established leaders and ideas. Franklin particularly gave Silence a keen awareness of class differences and an anti-aristocratic political position. She lambasted clergymen (by implication the three-generation family of Mathers, all clerics), Harvard students, fancy dress, overspending, and elite funeral orations, among others, critiques the young Franklin probably shared.

She introduced herself so a reader might "judge whether or no my Lucubrations are worth his reading." As she wrote in her first essay, mimicking Joseph Addison and Richard Steele's *Spectator* in more colloquial language, "The Generality of People, now a days" judge essays by "who or what the Author of it is, whether he be *poor* or *rich*, *old* or *young*, a *Schollar* or a *Leather Apron Man*." These juxtapositions subtly deny class privilege: poor and rich, old and young, scholar and leather-apron man appear on the same plane. In her ninth letter Silence lambasts rich lawyers and clergy; rich ministers, in particular, supported by their congregants, "see nor feel nothing of the Oppression which is obvious and burdensome to every one else." No wonder Franklin hid his authorship from his brother until he finished the series. He hinted, none too subtly, that as a poor youth, scholar, *and* leather-apron man, he deserved the same respect as anyone, no matter age or class, who had attained his accomplishments.⁵

Where did the seemingly strange term "leather-apron men" originate? "Leather apron" had been a common colloquial term in England for at least a century and a half, found in two Shakespeare plays, a polemical work on the evils of fashion, Restoration farces, and even religious tracts. It pointed to the apron—with its useful pockets for nails and small tools—tradesmen (blacksmiths, carpenters, and others) wore; as servant runaway ads in the 1710s and 1720s show, artisan-servants often wore one. But it also marked the lowly status of craft work, at least in the minds of gentlemen, playwrights, aristocrats, and clergymen.⁶

In two early plays Shakespeare uses “leather apron” in ways that go beyond identifying a piece of clothing workers wore. *Julius Caesar* (1599) opens when tribune Flavius orders a carpenter and a shoemaker “Home you idle Creatures, get you home; you ought not to walk/Upon a labouring day, without the sign of your profession.” Then, tribune Murullus demands of the carpenter, “Where is thy Leather Apron, and thy Rule?/What dost thou with thy best Apparell on?” A leather apron and a rule marked a carpenter in Shakespeare’s day—and he presumed much earlier in Caesar’s Rome.⁷

In the *Second Part of Henry VI* (1590), Shakespeare used “leather apron” to satirize the social order. George Bevis and John Holland, followers of Jack Cade who led a 1450 rising against rural taxes and gentry extortion, talk sardonically about rebelling against their betters, local rulers, *and* the king and his court. Shakespeare took a decidedly negative view of Cade’s violence. But he did relate Cade’s (and his followers’) demands in a way that may have elicited approval among workers in his mixed-class audience. Bevis tells Holland that “*Jack Cade* the Clothier means to dress the Commonwealth and turn it and set a new Nap on it.” In response, Holland puns, “So he had need, ’tis thread-bare. Well, I say, it was never a merry World in *England*, since Gentlemen came up.” Bevis parries his wit: “O miserable Age! Virtue is not regarded in Handycrafts Men.” Understanding the rich demeaned handycrafts men, Holland replies, “the Nobility think scorn to go in Leather Aprons,” and Bevis puns back, that “the King’s Council are no good Workmen,” turning rulers into workers. “True,” Holland replies, “yet it is said, *Labour in thy Vocation*; which is as much as to say, let the Magistrates be labouring Men; and therefore we should be Magistrates.”⁸

In the seventeenth century, leather aprons continued to mark craft workers. In 1660 William Houlbrook, accused of being a Jesuit, insisted he was a carpenter, and proved it by coming “out with my Lether Apron before me.” A 1605 advice book for youths related the story of a worker whose friends “fild him with liquor,” then took him “into the Church-porch,” laying “him all along on his backe upon a bench.” He nonetheless appeared graceful: a red cap set “upon his head,” topped by a peacock feather, with “his leather apron turn roun together, and wound about his middle, his hammer hanging (hanger like) by his side.”⁹

Class hostility, similar to that Shakespeare evoked, permeates the meaning of “leather apron,” particularly pointing to those who stepped out of their lowly status, taking on the identity of their betters. A 1592 discourse on the evils of commoners wearing expensive clothing complained about

upstarts who had fetched “their pedigree from their fathers ancient leather apron,” upending the natural, hierarchal order and undeserving of high rank. A 1672 farce related the tale of a doctor who took up smithing. “Gentlemen,” a character explained, “you’ll find him . . . with a leather Apron, and a Hammer by his side, as if he were a real Smith; and he studies as much to be a Farrier now, as formerly a Physician; and as his drink was altogether Wine before, now Farrier-like he studies all sorts of Ale, and drinks them soundly too.” Four decades later, an advice book aimed at young gentlemen warned against London sharpers: the same con man “who one time appears like a Country-Man, at another look like some Mechanick, perhaps, with a Leather Apron, and a Rule stuck by his Side.”¹⁰

Class loathing permeates Thomas Jevon’s popular 1686 farce, *Devil of a Wife*. In that play, a shrewish wife of a lord faces a cobbler claiming to be her genteel husband. Sir Richard, her husband, has disappeared. Thinking she sleeps, she spies “stinking Leather Breeches, and a Leather Apron, here are Canvas Sheets, and filthy ragged Curtains, a beastly Rug, and a Flock Bed.” When the cobbler, named Jobson, insists on his high pedigree and threatens to take his strap and “teach you a little better Manners, you saucy Drab,” she accuses him of “astonishing Impudence!” and threatens to have him hanged. Seeing the source of the stench, she cries, “Oh, soh, how the Beast [Jobson] stinks of Cheese, Leather-Apron, Pitch, Grease, foul Linnel, and old Shoes,” thus defining a cobbler by his vile odors.¹¹

In 1702 libertine and satirist Thomas Brown lampooned this class reversal. Lily C., dead and living in Hell, writes her friend, a furniture maker turned almanac maker, conjurer, and fortune-teller. “As ingenious a Mechanick . . ., as he that Invented a Mouse-trap,” her friend had taken up astrology—that “Noble Science of Heaven-peeping”—becoming famous as he fleeced his clients. But he did well because astrology was “a kind of Liberal Science,” open to all, “from the whimsey-headed Scholar, to the stroling Tinker; therefore your Leather Apron and the Glue-pot are no disparagement to your pursuit . . ., any more than it is a Scandal to a Mountebank to be first a Fool, and then a travelling Physician . . ., by long Study and Experience, in the Noble Arts of Poetry and Physick.”¹²

The first published use of “leather-apron *men*” in England dates from 1710, appearing in a religious tract published by a religious dissenter. It had likely reached Boston before Franklin wrote the first Silence Dogood essay. The author claimed that dissenters posed no danger to church men (those who adhered to the Church of England). Dissenters did seek to maintain religious

toleration by keeping supporters (both churchmen and dissenters) in public office. New persecution, which he feared, would thrust some dissenters into greater opposition while turning "Occasional Conformists" who wished to protect their status into "constant Churchmen." Soon, if "Occasional Conformity should continue, in ten or twelve years the Dissenters would have none but Leather-Apron Men left among them."¹³

The matter-of-fact use of "leather-apron men" built on earlier understandings of "leather apron" and suggests the term required no explanation. The author meant it as an insult—gentlemen and merchants were more desirable church members than workers. Franklin may not have seen the pamphlet, but he surely read Nathaniel Gardner's March 1722 dialogue his brother published. Gardner satirized Cotton Mather's position on inoculation, making Academicus, Mather's supporter, a learned but obnoxious buffoon. Rusticus, who opposed inoculation, asks Academicus for "a Word with you," to which Academicus responds, insultingly, "*Good now, what Business can you have with me? Do you understand Latin?*" Having none of that, Rusticus will "talk in English, *broad English*," but Academicus dismissed his opponents as beneath him: "*I intended to let you knew that I am a Man of Letters, and that . . . all the illiterate Scribblers of the Town (the Leather Apron Men) are proud and vain Fellows,*" and "'tis not possible for them . . . to speak a Word of Truth." Gardner thereby mocked Academicus's (and Mather's) insults, making him appear a small-minded man who loathed all those lacking his learning.¹⁴

"Leather apron" and "Leather-apron men" probably had come into colloquial New England speech, along with the East Anglian twang and Latinate constructions, long before Franklin picked up on it. Even as early New Englanders listened to sermons given in the London "standard" dialect and read books and tracts published in that city, they heard dialects from other parts of England and incorporated elements of all into their speech. By the early eighteenth century, they emulated London's diction and vocabulary. The London connections and London imprints found in the *Courant's* library intensified that language exchange, as did sailors who regularly piled into Boston. At least five of the Couranteers, moreover, had emigrated from Britain or had traveled, worked, or attended university there. All these elements, linguistic and personal, fed into Silence Dogood's monologues.¹⁵

If Franklin hardly invented the term "leather-apron men," he remarkably turned a class-based insult into a badge of honor. He severed it, and indeed Silence Dogood's entire repertoire, from debates over inoculation, the personal invective those works contained, and the genteel satires of Restoration

comedy. Thus separated, “leather-apron man” became an honorific title, a calling, standing beside that of merchant, farmer, and clergyman. As an apprentice, journeyman, and master craftsman, Franklin identified himself as a printer or tradesman, a man who wore a leather apron. In 1727, the year after he returned to Philadelphia from London, he may have named the group of budding intellectuals he founded the “leather-apron club” and petitioned public authorities in their name, but by 1731 he had changed the club’s name to the Junto.¹⁶

Did Franklin have an “enduring working class identity” and celebrate “both his own and others’ labour and craftsmanship,” as Simon Newman has argued? The Junto, the Philadelphia mutual aid and debating society he founded, included master craftsmen, along with men awkwardly positioned between craft and gentility (a surveyor and a clerk), among its members. He did take pride in his craftsmanship and that of others, as depictions of craft work in his memoirs suggests, and he had his grandson Benjamin Franklin Bache trained as a printer. He bequeathed to Bache, by then a prominent Philadelphia printer, all his types and printing implements.¹⁷

That identity as a leather-apron man remained strong. In a 1729 pamphlet espousing paper money, he deemed “Labouring and Handicrafts Men” like himself “the chief Strength and Support of a People.” Such a man “earned his Bread with the Sweat of his Brows.” Franklin included “*Brickmakers, Bricklayers, Masons, Carpenters, Joiners, Glaziers*, and several other Trades immediately employ’d by Building, but likewise to *Farmers, Brewers, Bakers, Taylors, Shoemakers, Shop-keepers*,” the entire free populace of Philadelphia and its hinterlands, save merchants, gentlemen, apprentices, servants, and waged laborers. Paper money would “encourage great Numbers of Labouring and Handicrafts Men to come and Settle in the Country,” thereby increasing its productivity, foreign trade, and consumption, as artisans took advantage of the lower prices a greater supply of money brought. His 1747 tract, *Plain Truth*, which he signed “Tradesman of Philadelphia,” urged the creation of a voluntary militia during wartime, with officers elected by the tradesmen-members. During that war, he organized a lottery to prepare Philadelphia’s defense, then paid most of its proceeds to hard-pressed workers building batteries. Tradesmen reciprocated by protecting his Philadelphia house, when a crowd sought to pull it down, after he appeared to support enforcement of the Stamp Act.¹⁸

Transforming the phrase “leather-apron men” from insult to honorific title raises questions about the class boundaries of the term. Could apprentices, servants, and slaves—all of whom worked, metaphorically, wearing leather

aprons—be counted as leather-apron men? Franklin, at age sixteen, clearly included himself. The leather-apron men depicted in the English texts all worked independently, hiring themselves to clients or selling what they made. By implication, the term excluded dependents. As a master printer, Franklin may have shared that vision: in his 1729 pamphlet, he failed to mention either apprentices or journeymen explicitly. By the mid-1730s, his own household included servants, teenage apprentices, and a nephew (a son of James, with whom he had sparred) who served as Franklin's printing apprentice. The relations between nephew and uncle resembled those of Franklin and his brother—contentious and bickering, mostly over the privileges nephew James thought he deserved.¹⁹

Although Franklin supported the aspirations, labor, and political demands of craftsmen his entire life, he did not have that “enduring working-class” identity that Newman ascribes to him, at least after he retired from setting type and running his press at age forty-two. The phrase “leather-apron men” never appears in his voluminous surviving writings after the publication of the Silence Dogood letters. Nor did Franklin return to full-time printing, even while ambassador to Louis XVI's court. He did establish a printing operation there, where his press printed thousands of diplomatic documents (passports, bonds, loan certificates, social invitations), some personal bagatelles, at least one hoax, and a few longer works. Along with his myriad diplomatic responsibilities, Franklin bought a press, hired a type founder, and bought a foundry. He designed types, forms, and documents; he did set some type and sometimes run the press. But he hired printers to do much of the physical labor of setting type and running the press. He played a gentleman *and* a wild American who wore a fur cap, a man of leisure who built a huge wine cellar and hobnobbed with ladies and lords.²⁰

Franklin portraiture suggests that Franklin reinvented himself as a gentleman. Eighteenth-century portrait painters stood between craftsmanship and artistry; if they wanted to sell paintings, they had to portray subjects just as their sitters desired. If Franklin had wished portraits to depict him as a leather-apron man, he would have insisted a portraitist show him in that manner, much as John Singleton Copley painted silversmith Paul Revere. Revere wore shirt sleeves (sign of a workman), sitting before his tools. Franklin dressed in genteel clothing in all his portraits. His first portrait, painted by Robert Feke around 1746, pictured him as a bewigged gentleman, in ruffled sleeves, standing with his right hand holding his hat and pointing to the ground and his left hand empty, inside his waistcoat. The stance suggested virtuous character and gentlemanly leisure, not the labors of the

middling sort. It originated in classical statues and had become fashionable in portraits of gentlemen and merchants. Three later portraits—painted in London by Benjamin Wilson (1759), Mason Chamberlin (1762), and David Martin (1767)—portrayed him as a new style gentleman. He had become a philosopher (what we would call scientist), conducting electrical experiments or writing at a desk, a lightning strike in the background, but still bewigged and dressed in elegant genteel clothing.²¹

Franklin, along with the Couranteers and many of his later friends, both colonists and English, struggled toward a new class identity, neither proletarian nor gentleman, neither leather-apron man nor merchant. In the eighteenth century it had no name. Their wealth and prominence far exceeded that of the middling sort. Like leather-apron men, they valued labor over unproductive leisure; they dressed like gentlemen but ran businesses; they read widely, corresponded with one another, and practiced philosophy, but had no university appointments. Marx would have considered them capitalists; we might—inaccurately—call them middle class.

Franklin understood these ambiguities of class. While in France, besieged by potential immigrants, he wrote *Information to Those Who Would Remove to America* (1784). He urged hard-working farmers and artisans to emigrate. Americans honored husbandmen and “the Mechanic, because their Employments are useful . . .; and he is respected and admired more for the Variety, Ingenuity, and Utility of his Handyworks, than for the Antiquity of his Family.” Americans valued highly useful men whose “Ancestors and Relations for ten Generations had been Ploughmen, Smiths, Carpenters, Turners, Weavers, Tanners, or even Shoemakers,” more than men who “could only prove that they were Gentlemen, doing nothing of Value, but living idly on the Labour of others.” Men “of moderate Fortunes” could “secure Estates for their Posterity.” Poor migrants “begin first as Servants or Journeymen; and if they are sober, industrious, and frugal, they soon become Masters, establish themselves Business, marry, raise Families, and become respectable Citizens.” Who were the “persons of modest fortunes”? The subtext of the pamphlet encouraged immigration of men, who already had a small fortune, ready to engage in manufacturing or commercial farming. Only they could accumulate eight or ten guineas needed to procure frontier land (about \$1,660 to \$2,100 in 2012 dollars, \$21,000 to \$26,500, when compared to an unskilled laborer’s wage).²²

This excursion into the history of a phrase and its later reverberations in Franklin’s life reveals a crucial element of his character. His egalitarian

and leather-apron persona lasted his lifetime, but it jostled with many others. Franklin—rubbery, slippery, a master of disguises, a taker of pseudonyms—wore many often contradictory masks, not only pretending to be a menagerie of different people, from an Arab potentate to a German prince, but playing in real life many characters. He acted as a rebellious apprentice, a worker worth his hire, a conniving printer bent on chasing his opponents out of business, a community activist who sought city improvement and justice for workers, a moralist bent on perfection, an effete gentleman, an experimental philosopher, a wild American wearing a ratty fur cap, an abolitionist, and so many more. In Silence Dogood, his first persona, sixteen-year-old Franklin found a way to express, with humor and wit, his egalitarian inclinations and his love of strong, quirky people. That he created many other, often contradictory, persona only adds to his achievements.

NOTES

1. J. A. Leo LeMay, *The Life of Benjamin Franklin*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), chap. 5. All Franklin texts quoted in this essay, unless otherwise indicated, may be found in <http://franklinpapers.org/franklin>; in addition, the full set of Silence Dogood essays (with facsimiles of the *Courant* issues) is reprinted at “The Electric Ben Franklin,” <http://www.ushistory.org/franklin/courant/index.htm>.
2. William Pencak, “Representing the Eighteenth-Century World: Benjamin Franklin Trickster,” available at http://www.trinity.edu/org/tricksters/trixway/current/vol%203/vol3_1/Pencak2.pdf; Lemay, *Life of Benjamin Franklin*, 1:67, 74, 142, 144–45.
3. Major interpretations include Arthur Bernon Tourtellot, *Benjamin Franklin: The Shaping of Genius, The Boston Years* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977), chaps. 13–14; Douglas Anderson, *The Radical Enlightenment of Benjamin Franklin* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 16–26, and Lemay, *Life of Franklin*, 1: chap. 7. Both Walter Isaacson, *Benjamin Franklin: An American Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2003), 3 (quote), 127, 149, 425 (quote), 493, 532; and Simon P. Newman, “Benjamin Franklin and the Leather-Apron Men: The Politics of Class in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia,” *Journal of American Studies* 43 (2009): 161–75, view Franklin’s life and political position as that of a “leather apron man.”
4. Daniel Defoe, *The Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Famous Moll Flanders* (London, 1722); Dan Cruickshank, *London’s Sinful Secret: The Bawdy History and Very Public Passions of London’s Georgian Age* (New York: St. Martin’s, 2010), chap. 4, esp. 84–86; Moira Ferguson, ed., *First Feminists: British Women Writers, 1578–1799* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), esp. 1–19.
5. Lemay, *Life of Benjamin Franklin*, 164–65.
6. This analysis is based on searches of Google Books, Early English Books Online, Eighteenth-Century English Books, Early American Imprints, and Early American Newspapers, first series.

7. William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar* . . . (London: H.H., Jun., for Hen. Heringman and R. Bentley, 1684), 2.
8. *Second Part of Henry VI*, in *The Works of Mr William Shakespeare* (London: Jon Tonson, 1709), 6:1509–10; Ellen C. Caldwell, “Jack Cade and Shakespeare's ‘Henry VI, Part 2,’” *Studies in Philology* 92 (1995): 24–35, 44–62, 68–70.
9. William Houlbrook, *William A Black-smith and no Jesuite* . . . (London, 1660), 42; Nicholas Breton, *An Olde Mans Lesson, and a Young mans Love* (London: E. Alld for Edward White, 1605), 48–49.
10. Robert Greene, *A Quip for an Upstart courtier: or, A Quaint Dispute between Velvet Breeches and Cloth-Breeches* . . . (London: John Wolfe, 1592); John Lacy, *The Dumb Lady, or, The Farriar Made Physician* . . . (London: Thomas Dring . . ., 1672), 10; S. H. Misodolus, *Young Man's Counsellor, or the Way of the World Displayed*. . . (London: Robert Gifford, 1713), 59.
11. Thomas Jevon, *The Devil of a Wife, or, A Comical Transformation* . . . (London: J. Heptinstall, 1686), 28, 43.
12. *Letters from the Dead to the Living*, in *The Second Volume of the Works of Mr. Thomas Brown* . . . (London: B. Bragg, 1707, 1st ed. 1702, 1703), 131–32.
13. *The Danger of the Church Enquir'd Into* . . . (London: A. Baldwin, 1710), 7–8.
14. [Nathaniel Gardner], *A Friendly Debate; Or a Dialogue Between Rusticus and Academicus* . . . (Boston: J. Franklin, 1722), 1; Lemay, *Life of Benjamin Franklin*, 137–39, 487.
15. David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 31–42, 57–62; Paul K. Longmore “‘Good English without Idiom or Tone’: The Colonial Origins of American Speech,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 30 (2007): 513–15, 522–24, 527–33.
16. Julius F. Sachse “Franklin as a Freemason,” *Proceedings of the . . . Honorable Fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons of Pennsylvania* . . . at its Celebration of the Bi-Centenary of the Birth of the Right Worshipful Past Grand Master Brother Benjamin Franklin (Philadelphia: Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, 1906), 55–57; Newman, “Franklin and the Leather-Apron Men,” 164–67.
17. Newman “Franklin and the Leather-Apron Men,” 162–73 (quotes on 162–63).
18. Ibid., 166–70; *The Nature and Necessity of a Paper-Currency: A Modest Enquiry into the Nature and Necessity of a Paper-Currency* (Philadelphia: B. Franklin, 1729).
19. David Waldstreicher, *Runaway America: Benjamin Franklin, Slavery, and the American Revolution* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2004), 125–27.
20. Ellen R. Cohn, “The Printer at Passay,” in *Benjamin Franklin: In Search of a Better World*, ed. Page Talbott (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005), 240–59, 262–63, 265.
21. Margaretta M. Lovell, *Art in a Season of Revolution: Painters, Artisans, and Patrons in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 11, 14–21, 26, 41, 46, 98–99, 146, 171, 207, 210, 212; Charles Coleman Sellers, *Benjamin Franklin in Portraiture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1962), 24–45, 55, 68–80, 220–21, 281, 328–40, 409–13; Arline Meyer, “Re-dressing Classical Statuary: The Eighteenth-Century ‘Hand-in-Waistcoat’ Portrait,” *Art Bulletin* 77 (1995): 45–63; Brandon Brame Fortune, with Deborah J. Warner, *Franklin and His Friends: Portraying the Man of Science in Eighteenth-Century America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 26–29, 74–79, 120–22, 135–37.
22. Values computed at “Measuring Worth,” <http://www.measuringworth.com/uscompare/>.