

JACKSON TURNER MAIN

Society and Economy in Colonial Connecticut



PRINCETON LEGACY LIBRARY

SOCIETY AND ECONOMY
IN COLONIAL
CONNECTICUT

SOCIETY AND ECONOMY
IN COLONIAL
CONNECTICUT

Jackson Turner Main

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

Copyright © 1985 by Princeton University Press
Published by Princeton University Press,
41 William Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08540
In the United Kingdom:
Princeton University Press, Guildford, Surrey

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
will be found on the last printed page of this book

ISBN 0-691-04726-X

This book has been composed in Linotron Galliard
Clothbound editions of Princeton University Press books
are printed on acid-free paper, and binding materials are
chosen for strength and durability. Paperbacks, although satisfactory
for personal collections, are not usually suitable for library rebinding

Printed in the United States of America
by Princeton University Press
Princeton, New Jersey

CONTENTS

List of Graphs and Tables	vii
Introduction	xiii
One On Population	3
Two On Property and Status	28
Three The Distribution of Property in the Seventeenth Century	62
Four The Distribution of Property in the Eighteenth Century	115
Five The Laborers	174
Six The Farmers	200
Seven The Craftsmen and Professionals	241
Eight On Traders, and a Summary	278
Nine The Leaders	317
Ten Conclusion	367
Bibliographical Essay	383
Index	385

GRAPHS AND TABLES

GRAPHS

4.1	Personal Wealth, Estate Inventories	118
4.2	Personal Wealth, Adult Men	119

TABLES

1.1	Age Distribution of Adult Men, Seventeenth Century	10
1.2	Life Expectancy of Adult Men Living in 1670	11
1.3	Age Distribution of Adult Men, 1670-1770	15
2.1	Converting Probate Population to Living Population	45
2.2	Distribution of Debts, New Haven Probated Estates	46
2.3	Probate Coverage, Men on Tax Lists	48
3.1	Value of Probated Estates, Seventeenth Century	66
3.2	Acres Owned, Men Aged Forty to Sixty	68
3.3	Distribution of Personal Wealth by Age Group, Living Population, 1640-1659	70
3.4	Distribution of Personal Wealth, Probate Population	71
3.5	Distribution of Total Wealth, Adult Males	72
3.6	Clothing of Married Men, Seventeenth Century	74
3.7	Value of Books Owned, Pre-1660	75
3.8	Value of Books Owned, 1690-1699	76
3.9	Gross Personal Wealth by Value of Books Owned, 1680-1699	76
3.10	Median and Mean Value of Tools	80
3.11	Ownership of Servile Labor, Seventeenth Century	81
3.12	Occupation, Wealth, and Cash, Seventeenth Century	83

GRAPHS AND TABLES

3.13	Consumption Goods, Married Men with £200 Personal Wealth	91
3.14	Distribution of Consumption Goods, Seventeenth Century	92
3.15	Levels of Living, Pre-1660	95
3.16	Levels of Living, Seventeenth Century	96
4.1	Economic Classes, from Tax Lists, Eighteenth Century	116
4.2	Distribution of Taxable Property	117
4.3	Distribution of Taxable Property by Age over Time	117
4.4	Personal Wealth, Adult Men	121
4.5	Share of Personal Wealth, Top Decile	122
4.6	Distribution of Real Estate by Value over Time	124
4.7	Taxable Wealth by Age, Eighteenth Century	136
4.8	Distribution of Personal Wealth by Wealth Class, Eighteenth Century	139
4.9	Requisite Consumer Goods for Levels of Living, Eighteenth Century	142
4.10	Percentage of Adult Men at Each Level of Living, Based on Consumption Goods	143
4.11	Levels of Living, All Men, 1640-1774	146
5.1	Ownership of Slaves by Wealth Class	181
5.2	Age of Migrant Workers on Tax List and at Death	188
6.1	Acres Owned by Young Farmers	201
6.2	Houses and Tools Owned by Young Farmers	203
6.3	Value of Consumer Goods, Young Farmers	204
6.4	Composition and Value of Established Farms	207
6.5	Acres Owned by Established Farmers	208
6.6	Value of Realty, Farmers with under Forty Acres	210
6.7	Consumption Goods, Farmers with 120 Acres	220

GRAPHS AND TABLES

6.8	Acres Owned by Grandfather Farmers	229
6.9	Value of Realty, Grandfather Farmers	230
6.10	Personal Wealth, Grandfather Farmers	230
6.11	Consumption Goods, Grandfather Farmers	231
6.12	Acres Owned by Retired Farmers	232
7.1	Standard of Living, Shoemakers, Weavers, and Tailors	245
7.2	Acres Owned, Carpenters and Joiners	251
7.3	Millers' Land and Consumer Goods	252
7.4	Value of Books Owned, Ministers	269
8.1	Inventoried Property of Sailors	287
8.2	Age at Death of Ships' Captains	290
8.3	Personal Wealth, Traders, 1745-1774	299
8.4	Standard of Living, Traders, Seventeenth Century	300
8.5	Cash of Active Traders Aged Forty to Sixty-nine, 1660-1669 and 1760-1774	302
8.6	Acres Owned, Traders, 1750-1774	307
8.7	Proportions of Age Groups in Each Occupation, Living Population, 1660-1730 and 1760-1774	310
8.8	Age Structure of Each Occupational Group, Living Population, 1660-1730 and 1760-1774	312
9.1	Occupations of Leaders	333
9.2	Distribution of Leaders' Personal Wealth, 1650-1775	335
9.3	Value of Leaders' Consumer Goods	336
9.4	Value of Books Owned by Leaders	337

APPENDIXES

1A	Demographical Characteristics of Adult Men in 1640	21
1B	The Coverage of Probate Records	22

GRAPHS AND TABLES

1C	Age at Death, Men with Probated Estates, 1640-1659	23
1D	Age at Death, Adult Men, from Tax Lists	24
1E	Age at Death, Men with Probated Estates, 1670-1774	26
1F	Age at Death, All Town	26
1G	New Haven Age at Death	27
2A	Price Changes in Connecticut	57
2B	Prices of Real Estate	58
2C	Determination of Bias in Probate Records	60
3A	Distribution of Real Property, Living Population	99
3B	Consumer Goods by Gross Personal Wealth over Time, by Age	100
3C	Distribution of Men's Clothing by Gross Personal Wealth, Seventeenth Century	103
3D	Distribution of Books by Gross Personal Wealth and Towns, Seventeenth Century	104
3E	Ownership of Debts Receivable by Personal Wealth, Seventeenth Century	105
3F	Personal Wealth by Occupation	106
3G	Economic Characteristics of Seventeenth-Century Towns	107
3H	Personal Wealth by Age	108
3I	Real Wealth by Age	109
3J	Standards of Living	112
3K	Levels of Living, Seventeenth Century	114
4A	Probate Records Used	152
4B	Distribution of Personal Property, Adult Men	153
4C	Distribution of Consumption Goods	154
4D	Distribution of Debts Receivable by Occupation and Value	155
4E	Ownership of Stock in Trade	156

GRAPHS AND TABLES

4F	Distribution of Wealth by Age	157
4G	Distribution of Personal Wealth by Age	158
4H	Distribution of Real Wealth by Age	160
4I	Consumer Goods by Marital Status	162
4J	Eighteenth-Century Standards for Levels of Living	163
4K	Levels of Living, Probate Population	164
4L	Composition of Classes, Standards of Living by Life Cycle	165
4M	Levels of Living, Probate and Living Populations	166
4N	Standards of Living by Active and Retired Grandfathers	173
5A	Number and Sex of Slaves, Eighteenth Century	197
5B	Summary Table, White Laborers	198
5C	Property of Free Laborers, Estate Inventories	199
6A	Property of Farmers, Older Fathers	235
6B	Crop Yield per Acre	238
6C	Property of Retired Grandfather Farmers	240
7A	Occupational Choice of Artisans' Sons	271
7B	Characteristics and Property of Artisans	272
7C	Characteristics and Property of Professional Men	275
8A	Merchants' Consumer Goods and Levels of Living	314
8B	Distribution of Traders' Consumer Goods	315
8C	Components of Personal Wealth Owned by Traders over Time	316
9A	Age at Taking Office by Cohorts	359
9B	Social Origin of Leaders	360
9C	Leaders' Age at Death	362
9D	Leaders' Property	364

INTRODUCTION

This book originated over a dozen years ago when I began a survey of colonial probate estate inventories in order to plot the distribution of property over time and place. Such an outline would enable someone working in local history to place a particular society within the general framework, purging intensive local studies of their principal bias.

At the same time broad generalizations about the nature and direction of change in colonial society and economy needed testing. The most popular interpretation posited a comparatively democratic, equalitarian, near-subsistence society, beginning in the seventeenth century, and sometimes associated with cooperative attitudes, at least in New England. These communal qualities gradually retreated before a process of Anglicanization, characterized by the emergence of a wealthy, powerful upper class dominating a poor, often servile proletariat. This change occurred partly because small-scale subsistence agriculture gave way to large landed estates raising staple crops with a heavy investment of capital (especially in labor), or to trading and financial centers dominated by merchant-capitalists. The evidence for this interpretation derived at first primarily from the "Tidewater" South and the northern cities, presently supported by studies of New England towns that indicated an economic decline, Malthusian pressure on the land, a hardening of class lines, and the same growing inequality.

An alternative hypothesis originated with the conviction that the colonists became increasingly unlike the Europeans, more American, for a variety of reasons including the frontier environment, the tradition of dissent in religion, an emphasis on liberty in politics, and the belief in the individual's ability to rise from poverty to wealth. In general the proponents of this view argued for economic and social progress, for increasing wealth available in some degree to a majority, rather than stagnation or decline. Thus they viewed colonial society favorably and optimistically, with the Revolution tending to affirm the march of progress and democracy.

Further to complicate matters, occasional dissidents suggested that no evolution in either direction occurred, but that the society and economy moved either cyclically, in a straight line, or (as in a multiple-

INTRODUCTION

choice question) all of the above. By the mid-1970s we seemed to confront anarchy. Each hypothesis was supported by data and seemed valid for at least some times and places. A scientific approach required that we either test each of these hypotheses or discard the whole lot and proceed empirically with a large-scale accumulation of data. So I began, but when I reached Connecticut I found such riches of then untapped sources that I never left. What follows constitutes not the intended large framework but a progress report.

At first I took notes only on what seemed important categories of contents within the inventories, along with the name, title, residence, and age of the decedent. Halfway along, the need for information on family status appeared. A little later I learned about the significance of consumer goods, and the first draft revealed that I needed to work out the requirements for various standards of living at different stages in the life cycle. Little guide to these topics then existed in the literature and as a result I was obliged to retrace my steps and enlarge my coverage. Also, because my initial purpose was limited I did not bother to enter any of the data on a computer. Ultimately my data bank grew until a computer would have been very handy indeed, but by then I had already completed most of the tables.

The study as originally designed consisted of Chapters Two to Four and bits of the rest. Even as expanded it still excludes subjects that we are coming to expect in a book on social history and skims over topics that merit fuller treatment. Indeed, each of the chapters and even some parts of chapters could well become monographs with a little more research, such as the social and economic history of the colony's ministers or the characteristics of the first settlers. Women scarcely appear in my account, though the sources furnish a quantity of information. In this case the need for a full treatment was so evident that for me to include a few pages would be almost insulting, and I leave that book for someone else. The same is true of Indians. Blacks receive a little more attention only because most of them enter the probate records as property. The book indeed consists of a series of related essays, not a definitive treatment of social history. However, I think it does accomplish the objective of an accurate general guide to the social and economic history of the period, a foundation for the more detailed research of future scholars.

My primary professional obligation is owed to the courteous, capable, and intelligent staff of the Connecticut State Library in Hartford. Financial support has come from the Research Foundation of the State University of New York and the National Endowment for the Humanities, which provided a fellowship to the Center for Ad-

INTRODUCTION

vanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences during 1980-1981 supplementing a sabbatical from SUNY Stony Brook. Many of the Fellows at the Center were extremely helpful. Above all I thank my beloved wife Gloria and my three children.

Boulder, Colorado
July 1984

SOCIETY AND ECONOMY
IN COLONIAL
CONNECTICUT

ONE

On Population

This chapter exists quite by accident. I was trying to discover how many of the men who died in early Connecticut turned up in the probate court, in order to judge the reliability of the records. Using the published estimates of population and a commonly assumed death rate, I found that, until 1720, we seemed to have inventories of the estates of almost nine out of ten.¹ Indeed, during one decade the proportion exceeded 100 percent! Something was wrong: either the death rates were higher than we had supposed or the colony contained more people than the published estimates indicate. A fresh start on the problem was called for before I could proceed.

Tax lists for almost any time and place show a lot of people with little or no property, and we need to know whether such men were young, in which case their poverty was a (perhaps) temporary condition, or middle-aged. Partly for this reason we cannot interpret data on the distribution of wealth until we know the age structure of the society. Also, using estate inventories—our most important source—requires a knowledge of the age structure of both the “decedents” and the living population, because the former are much older. Half the men featured in the probate records had reached the age of fifty, whereas half of those still alive were in their twenties and early thirties. Older men are wealthier because they have been accumulating property for a longer time than average. So, to discover the wealth of the living by extrapolating from the wealth of the dead we must discover the age structure of both groups and adjust for the difference.² Moreover, we

¹ Including those without inventories but leaving wills, we seemed to have all but 7 percent. Evarts B. Greene and Virginia D. Harrington assembled data from the published *Colonial Records* in their *American Population before the Federal Census of 1790* (New York, 1932). These give the number of taxables living in the town. See J. H. Trumbull and Charles Hoadly, eds., *The Public Records of the Colony of Connecticut* . . . 15 vols. (Hartford, 1850-1890). To find the adult male population one subtracts men under twenty-one. I am arguing that we must add back a considerable number for those excused or accidentally omitted, so that the adult males were more numerous than commonly supposed and probate coverage accordingly less.

² For this adjustment see Gloria L. Main, “The Correction of Biases in Colonial American Probate Records,” *Historical Methods Newsletter* 8 (1974-1975), 10-28.

ON POPULATION

should follow the changing situation of the people of colonial Connecticut as they move through a typical life cycle, from the child to the young single person to the newlywed, then the parent of youngsters, of teen-agers, of grown children, of grandchildren, and into old age. Social history demands that we study every sort of people with equal respect and in the same detail, especially if four-fifths of the population—the women and children—are almost excluded.

These reasons, and others as will appear, compelled an extensive though selective investigation of the colony's demography. Flaws in the sources kept enlarging the scope of the investigation. Thus where dates of birth were lacking a date of marriage or of a first-born might serve, but only if the average age at marriage was known for at least some of the people, so that fact had to be determined. Changing patterns of population over time required study of the demographic shifts during the whole period. The search for answers, far from being dull, was like a detective story, a piecing together of the evidence to solve a whole series of problems, the enterprise made the more fruitful because of the contrasts that appeared between the characteristics of colonial Connecticut's demography and those of other times and places. And some interesting facts emerged.

I started with the earliest settlers, to determine their ages upon arrival, estimate their number, discover the dates of their deaths, compute their life span and death rate, and compare the number of deaths recorded in probate with the actual frequency. These data would yield, among other inferences, the solution to our very first problem: why we find an unexpectedly large number of inventories. For this undertaking the records furnish reasonably complete lists of the settlers resident about the year 1640 for five of the eleven towns: New Haven and Stamford on the coast and Hartford, Windsor, and Wethersfield up the Connecticut River.

The first colonists of New Haven landed in 1638.³ The town contained some seventy "free planters" by the next June and in 1640 confirmed its survival with the erection of a meetinghouse. By 1645 about 340 men had resided in the town at least briefly. Of these, one-third simply disappear, probably among the two out of five immigrants known to have left the colony. The settlement reminds one of the early Ches-

³ Lists of early settlers in C. J. Hoadly, ed., *Records of the Colony and Plantation of New Haven*, 8 vols. (Hartford, 1857), 1:91-93; genealogies and notices in Donald Lines Jacobus, *Families of Ancient New Haven*, 9 vols., 1922-1932 reprinted in 3 vols. (Baltimore, 1974). This is a work of exceptional value, complete and accurate. I treat New Haven and its neighbors as part of Connecticut though actually they remained independent until 1664.

ON POPULATION

apeake ventures or of a mining town. It was mostly male and among those whose ages we know, more than half were in their twenties and another couple of dozen were still teen-agers. If we classify the latter as men, 64 percent had not reached the age of thirty, leaving aside those who vanished. Few had married and no doubt the great majority were poor laborers.

Genealogists have spent a good deal of time on such of the survivors as founded families, but have discovered the exact birth dates of only forty-three, with approximations for another twenty-six. These dates enable us to estimate the men's average age at marriage, usually assumed to be twenty-five for the seventeenth century. New Haven's was thirty, reflecting the later age at marriage in Old England, where some men had already wed, but especially the shortage of women in the new colony. Using this figure, or the consequent assumption drawn from the birth date of a first child, we arrive at the following age structure of adult men in 1640: age twenty to twenty-nine, 59 percent; age thirty to thirty-nine, 24 percent; age forty to forty-nine, 12 percent, and over fifty, 5 percent. None had reached the age of sixty.

Since so many of the early settlers simply vanish, it may seem presumptuous to comment on the average age at death or the life expectancy of men at particular ages. However, we might forget about the transients and focus on those who remained to buy land, become permanent residents, and, in most cases, marry and die in the colony—the founding fathers of New Haven. Among these the age at death was high because they had already survived for nearly thirty years. We know the death dates for 130 individuals present in 1640, among whom the median age at death was fifty-eight, varying with the date of birth as follows: born before 1600, sixty-nine; born 1600-1609, sixty; born 1610-1620, fifty-five. The last figure records the life expectancy of men aged twenty to twenty-nine in 1640. It seems high, considering the problems of a new settlement, exceeding that of Maryland by a dozen years, but, as we will discuss later, Plymouth settlers apparently outlasted them.⁴ We cannot tell anything about the death rate at this point because of an excessive number of missing men. During the 1650s the death rate of those adult men we do know about was only eighteen per thousand. Of course most men were still young,

⁴ Immigrants into seventeenth-century Maryland who reached the age of twenty-one would live only twenty-three more years, compared to thirty or more in New Haven. See the discussion by Russell H. Menard, "The Immigrants and Their Increase: The Process of Population Growth in Early Colonial Maryland," in *Law, Society, and Politics in Early Maryland*, ed. Aubrey C. Land, Lois Green Carr, and Edward C. Papenfuss (Baltimore, 1977), pp. 88-110.

ON POPULATION

which keeps the figure down. Since some of the transients surely died without record, we must suspect a higher death rate and a shorter life expectancy.⁵

The first New Haven settlement, then, reminds us of the Chesapeake colonies in that both contained mostly young single men who either died soon or left the colony. From 1638 to 1645 only a little more than a hundred women aged sixteen or more had arrived (that we know about), being outnumbered almost 3.5 to 1 by the male immigrants. In the latter year, since some men had left, the sex ratio was 2.2 to 1. Although some of these women had already produced children and the rest married young—under twenty—their small number prevented a boom in population. Worse, the town was an economic failure, and so many men gave up and left that the population was not growing at all. This situation began to change, however. Most of the men who survived married eventually, the proportion of men who died single declining from 37½ percent in the 1640s to 25 percent in the 1660s. The young girls soon became mothers and many children survived. Thus the unstable village dominated by young males gave way to permanent families, and New Haven came at last to resemble not her Chesapeake predecessors but her sister villages up the Connecticut River.

The lists of early settlers in Hartford, Windsor, and Wethersfield come from “taxables” in 1654-1655, an estimate of 150 “settlers” for Hartford in 1639, genealogies in extensive histories of Windsor and Wethersfield and a more limited one for Hartford, together with additions from probate records.⁶ These sources permit a reconstruction of the population in 1640. By that date the three communities, founded in 1634 and 1635, included nearly three hundred adult men. Forty percent were in their twenties and the median age was thirty-three. Only a little over half of the earliest settlers had married. The young bachelors of Hartford had to wait until they were over thirty, on the average, before they found wives, though in Windsor they married at twenty-eight and in Wethersfield at twenty-seven. In the last, there was only one woman over sixteen for every two men. The situation was

⁵ Probate records furnish inventories for twenty-four. Jacobus (*Families of Ancient New Haven*) adds five who died without inventories and three more may also have died there during the decade. The adult male population in 1655 was about 170. Boundaries for the death rate per thousand men are 17.1 and 18.8.

⁶ Greene and Harrington, *American Population*, p. 52n; Henry R. Stiles, *History and Genealogy of Ancient Windsor*, 2 vols. (Hartford, 1891-1892); Lucius B. Barbour, *Families of Early Hartford* (Baltimore, 1977); Henry R. Stiles, *The History of Ancient Wethersfield*, 2 vols. (New York, 1903).

ON POPULATION

alleviated, however, by the removal of many of the men. One-fourth of the early emigrants into the three towns left the colony, usually headed north into Massachusetts, and another group moved to found new communities in Connecticut, so that their society was almost as mobile as that of New Haven.⁷

So far we are struck by the resemblance between the colony's early settlers and those of the Chesapeake. Relatively more women had arrived, to be sure, but not nearly enough to go around, and young men, almost all with little property, predominated. But one big demographical difference appears: far more of them survived and their children, too, lived to have families of their own. In Maryland the young male—and presumably female—immigrant of twenty-one lived for another two decades or a bit more. The life expectancy in the West Indies was probably even less. In contrast, the New Haven women who reached age twenty-one survived into the fifties and their Wethersfield sisters even longer, while the men lived for thirty years after their arrival. The median age at death in Hartford was 62½ years and in Windsor, fully 70. These men, being mature when we meet them, would of course greatly exceed the population as a whole in longevity, but the figure is impressive, exceeding that in New Haven by a decade. The peculiar age structure helped to keep down the annual death rate, which during the 1650s was seventeen per thousand for adult men in Hartford and only thirteen in Windsor.⁸

The pioneers of Connecticut, then, did not all arrive in family groups. Over half of even the adult men were single. It was a young population with over 40 percent in their twenties and only one-fifth having reached the age of forty. The shortage of mature women raised the men's average age at marriage to thirty. Unlike the British settlers in the Chesapeake and the West Indies, they did not die young of disease, malnutrition, or Indian attacks. Collectively they lived to be over sixty and

⁷ Linda Auwers Bissell shows nearly half of the Windsor men leaving that town. "From One Generation to Another: Mobility in Seventeenth-Century Windsor, Connecticut," *William and Mary Quarterly* 31 (1974), 79-110. My figures differ slightly but we reach the same conclusion. The total in my sources was 285, with a median age of thirty-four, but there was a great deal of moving in and out of the town and I guess at an additional 5 percent of young bachelors. In Hartford I find that 28 percent left Connecticut and 16 percent moved to another town. The basic source is a "mill rate" list for 1655, which included transients, supplemented by data identifying grants of lots and rights to temporary inhabitants.

⁸ In Hartford, twenty-two estates entered probate during 1650-1659, three did not, and one additional person probably died, out of 170 adult men present in 1654. Windsor that year contained about 145 men. Fourteen estates entered probate and four other men probably died also.

ON POPULATION

the man or woman of twenty-five would survive another thirty-five years. While over one-fourth left the colony soon after arrival, those departures helped to dispose of young single men for whom wives and perhaps even jobs were lacking. Settlers who remained fared well.⁹

The next adequate set of records comes a generation later, about 1670, when we can draw, first, on eight tax lists;¹⁰ second, data on New Haven from Jacobus; third, a modern census for the colony assembled from the foregoing and other records;¹¹ fourth, the number of taxables reported to the legislature by the towns; and finally, probate records. Each of these contains flaws but all are essential sources.

The tax lists by law omitted some men: ministers, men over seventy, and soldiers on active service. The towns forgave others their rates, notably paupers, and also an occasional skilled worker whom the town wished to attract. Elisha Hart of Windsor never appeared on the lists although he lived there for many years, because he was both insane and poor.¹² Also the names of servants, slaves, and males age sixteen through twenty do not appear, their rate being paid for them by their masters or fathers or guardians. The same was true of older men if they remained or became dependent on someone else. Furthermore, although the assessors tried to catch the migrants they sometimes failed. Thus the number of persons taxed, the so-called "polls" or heads that the towns reported to the legislature fell considerably short of the total population.¹³ In addition, from a colonywide point of view, newly established towns sometimes obtained an exemption for a few years.

⁹ For detailed data see Appendix 1A.

¹⁰ Elizabeth H. Schenck, *History of Fairfield, Fairfield County, Conn.*, 2 vols. (New York, 1889-1905), 1:334; Guilford and Middletown lists in the Connecticut State Library, Hartford; Richard Anson Wheeler, *History of the Town of Stonington, . . .* (Mystic, Conn., 1966), p. 67; Stiles, *Wethersfield*, 2:912-14; Edwin Hall, *The Ancient Historical Records of Norwalk, Conn.* (Norwalk, 1847), p. 61; E. B. Huntington, *History of Stamford, Connecticut from Its Settlement in 1641, to the Present Time . . .* (Stamford, 1868), 25-26; and *Some Early Records and Documents of . . . Windsor, Connecticut 1639-1703* (Hartford, 1930), pp. 87-89.

¹¹ Jay Mack Holbrook, *Connecticut 1670 Census* (Pamphlet, Holbrook Research Institute) (Oxford, Mass., 1977).

¹² Charles William Manwaring, comp., *A Digest of the Early Connecticut Probate Records*, 3 vols. (Hartford, 1904-1906), 1:320.

¹³ The degree to which the tax returns were deficient determines the multiplier that the historian should use to determine the total population from the polls. If, for example, the town reported 100 polls, and if one subtracts one-fifth for men under twenty-one, multiplying the remainder by 5 equals 400. Historians have generally used such a formula: polls times 4 equals total. But we must add all those persons whom the collectors missed—at least 10 percent and perhaps twice that number because of migration, varying with the town. The true multiplier therefore becomes 4.5 or even 5.0, as used here.

ON POPULATION

My revised data suggests a total for Connecticut in 1655 of 1,200 men, or presumably 6,000 persons.¹⁴ Considering the number of men who supposedly had entered the colony during its first decades, probably not far from 1,000, the number seems low, with a growth rate of only 1.2 percent annually despite some continued immigration. The failure to grow between 1640 and 1655 reflected considerable emigration and a lopsided age structure, since many immigrants were young single men who did not produce adult sons for over twenty years. More seriously, women of marriageable age were in short supply.

Beginning about 1660, however, the second generation began to appear as taxables, emigration lessened after a brief exodus to East Jersey and Long Island, and a few more settlers arrived. The recorded adult male population abruptly spurted. New Haven town furnishes an exaggerated example. About 230 men were present in 1647 but only 170 remained ten years later, including relatively few young men. By 1668 the total had recovered to 219 (including Wallingford), the proportion of men in their twenties jumped, and there were numerous boys in their late teens. The same was true of women: the colony was ready for a population boom.

The course of this explosion is revealed not only by the taxables reported to the legislature but—in a sort of inverse way—the deaths recorded in the probate court.¹⁵ By the last third of the century these had become so numerous as to equal if not exceed the number predicted by the male population as indicated by the polls. We have now explained this miraculous completeness: there were more men than the tax lists indicate. Still, the probate court reported a very high proportion of the deaths, at least four out of five during the half-century after 1660.¹⁶ The researcher finds the appointment of an administrator or executor, the posting of a bond, the probate of a will, an inventory of the person's property, the settlement or distribution of an estate. From a demographic point of view, we can add to the population men not

¹⁴ In 1654 the reported taxables totaled 777 but that did not include the towns in New Haven's jurisdiction—Guilford, Milford, Branford, and New Haven itself, nor did it include the district of New London. If they grew at the same rate as those for which we do have data, they contained 566 taxables, so that the whole adult male population totaled about 1,315, minus boys of sixteen to twenty (one-sixth of the men aged sixteen and up), plus those exempted from taxation, and wanderers.

¹⁵ Microfilms of probate court records are located at the Connecticut State Library, which also contains the originals for the Hartford and some other districts. Selections from the Hartford records to 1750 appear in Manwaring, *Early Connecticut Probate Records*, which also contains a list of all the districts and all the towns, with the dates of their founding and the districts to which they belonged. Most of the records for the New London district prior to 1700 have been destroyed.

¹⁶ See Appendix 1B.

ON POPULATION

appearing on the tax lists, and by discovering the birth date of the decedents learn the longevity of the population. Thus the combination of probate records, assessment lists, and collective genealogies enables us to analyze the population of Connecticut during the late 1600s.

By 1670 the age structure of the colony's people had stabilized. At first, as we saw, young men predominated and old men scarcely existed. The population remained quite young—the high birth rate saw to that—but the median, among adult men, rose from thirty-two to nearly thirty-six and men over sixty now became common, though still scarcely one in twelve. The relative decline of men under forty reflected a continuing emigration of that age group, the diminished immigration, and the trend toward a "normal" age distribution as native-born residents replaced newcomers. The much larger proportion of older men resulted from the survival of the first settlers, since a man of thirty in 1640 would have reached seventy in 1670. A further slight increase in the septuagenarians, coming, so to speak, at the expense of men in their fifties, would presently complete the change in pattern.

The large population on this set of tax lists and other sources, with considerable information concerning the dates of death of these men, permits a discussion of how long Connecticut's settlers lived. If we consider only the people on the lists, the general age at death would be rather high because the men were in their thirties to start with. Those in 1640, taken together, lived to be over sixty—about thirty years for the "average" man (not for someone just turned twenty-one). This figure is certainly higher than the reality because so many youngsters vanished, some of whom must have died; an age at death of fifty-nine is more likely. By 1670, as the population aged, it had risen to sixty-three.

TABLE 1.1
Age Distribution of Adult Men, Seventeenth Century (percentages)

	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+	Total	Median	N
Five towns, 1640	42.2	34.9	15.8	5.5	1.6	0	100.0	32.3	493
Nineteen towns, 1670	35.8	25.4	15.7	15.4	5.4	2.1	99.8	35.6	1,451

NOTE: Many ages must be inferred from the age at marriage, assumed to be twenty-eight to thirty in 1640 if it occurred in the colonies (depending on the town), twenty-five if in England or on the 1670 list. "Unknowns," consisting of men for whom we have no clue, are numerous. They are incorporated into the table by assuming that they were single, and allocated among the age groups accordingly. In 1640 about 10 percent of the men vanish and may have left before that date. I guess that half were still present.

In 1670 probate records and genealogies add 20 percent to the men on tax and other lists. If we depended entirely upon such lists for 1670 and excluded the unknowns in both years, the proportion of men aged twenty-one to twenty-nine would drop to 35.6 in 1640 and to 29.7 in 1670. The medians would become 33.9 and 37.4.

ON POPULATION

A better measure is the life expectancy of each age group. Probate records furnish this information because the death of every man who reached the age of twenty-one appeared there potentially, so that our population, or pool, should consist of all adult men. Actually, as we have seen, 15 or 20 percent of the estates did not enter the court, but these were spread over the entire age spectrum.¹⁷ There remains a catch: as entries in the probate records begin the data is distorted by the youth of the population. During the 1640s the median age at death was barely forty ($N = 51$) and if anything probably less, since half of the "unknowns" were single and only one is known to have left children. During the next decade the figure rose by three years, but not until the 1670s did the age distribution of the population raise the age at death to forty-nine, after which it stabilized at about fifty.¹⁸

The ample information furnished by the sources allows us to trace the life expectancy by cohorts. Thus we can identify over 400 men who had reached the age twenty-one to twenty-nine by 1670, the "cohort" of the decade 1641 to 1649. These lived for thirty-three more years, so that a man of twenty could expect to reach fifty. The newlywed of twenty-five survived until his late fifties, while the average person in his mid-thirties would nearly celebrate his sixtieth. From a

TABLE 1.2
Life Expectancy of Adult Men
Living in 1670

<i>Age group</i>	<i>Years to live</i>	<i>N</i>
21-29	33	454
30-39	24	313
40-49	19	208
50-59	13	198
60-69	12	71
70-79	8	19

¹⁷ The probate records, like tax lists, omit some men about whom we know almost nothing. I reduced probate coverage by 4 percent to allow for them and incorporated them into the age structure. They probably died at a younger age than other men: I know this to be true of servants, and the general situation of obscure men would tend to an early death. If so, the age at death of all the men age twenty to twenty-one becomes just fifty instead of fifty-three, the same as the median age at death shown by probate records (see Appendix 1C); and for men of twenty-five, about fifty-five years.

¹⁸ Eliminating the deaths attributable to King Philip's War would send the age back up to fifty-three, counteracting the adjustment for omissions. But I think fifty a fair estimate.

ON POPULATION

practical point of view, the Connecticut man would almost always live long enough to marry, could normally expect to see his children enter their teens, would commonly preside over their marriage, and had a nearly fifty-fifty chance of becoming a grandfather.

How many years one has yet to live on this earth is an important matter to us as individuals and for historians as well. It affects men's ability to acquire property, to care for their children and assist them as they marry. It supplies or deprives a society of leaders experienced and wise. A long life expectancy influences the number of children and the growth of population. It is, in short, an excellent index of the health and welfare of a society. How does Connecticut compare with her sister colonies of Massachusetts Bay and the Chesapeake? Our men and women¹⁹ lived for at least ten years longer than those in Maryland but perhaps not as long as their neighbors to the north. We will elaborate the point presently after discussing trends during the eighteenth century, but we pause to comment on the factors affecting life expectancy in the seventeenth.

During the earliest years the average immigrant did not live quite as long as the colonial-born group that followed. In New Haven the settlers born from 1610 to 1619 who were still alive in 1640 lived to be fifty-five, but since some would have died before that date (remember that the town was founded in 1638) the true figure is probably closer to fifty.²⁰ Some may have been in rather poor condition when they immigrated, though the men in charge of the movement would certainly have preferred a healthy group. More importantly, the trip and the new environment, especially the winters, would have injured even the best-treated. We will see in Chapter Five that servants died earlier than the sons of established families. It is common knowledge that sailors, laborers, and migrants do not live as long as men more sedentary and enjoying an above-subsistence standard of living. Men with these characteristics continued to arrive throughout the seventeenth century, though in much smaller numbers, and the society itself always produced a class of poor or otherwise disadvantaged, including

¹⁹ New Haven's native-born women of the first generation lived until their mid-sixties, actually a bit longer than the men. The median age at marriage had risen from eighteen to twenty-two. Only one-sixth died during childbearing age eighteen to thirty-nine. The data here is based on 94 out of 150 women, the age at marriage being known for 35. The sex ratio of men to women was 113:100 or, excluding women under twenty-one, 123:100.

²⁰ We know of only two individuals out of eighty-two dying in their twenties. The true figure is surely between eight and twelve.

ON POPULATION

servants and slaves. Other factors that killed men before their prime included the dangers of sailing, the hazards of farm life, and war.

Counteracting these were several decided advantages of residence in Connecticut. Wars were infrequent. The diseases of the Chesapeake were almost absent and, indeed, the first really serious pestilence did not occur until 1689. After the mid-1640s the overwhelming majority of the people were born in the colony. Finally, that great majority were not servants, slaves, mariners, migrants, or occasional laborers but farmers, craftsmen, and others of like situation whose standard of living was usually well above the subsistence level.

We now turn to a survey of Connecticut's population during the century after 1670. From fewer than 10,000 settlers in that year the number of people exploded to 200,000 by the time of the Revolution.²¹ That growth might have been achieved by doubling every twenty-five years—an annual rate of nearly 3 percent. But in fact the rise proceeded unevenly. Between 1675 and 1715 the annual increase was only 2.5 percent because of the various wars and their attendant losses through deaths on the campaigns and epidemics brought back by soldiers and sailors.²² After the close of Queen Anne's War, however, the colony boomed both economically and in population. The West Indies furnished a market for exports and plenty of good land remained. The annual growth of 2.5 became fully 3.5 for a period of forty years, at least among adults. Newcomers continued to enter, especially from Massachusetts, while emigration slowed (if New Haven's experience is typical). Virtually all of the women married, at an average age of twenty-

²¹ Bruce C. Daniels makes it 15,800 by working backward from the census of 1756 and assuming an annual growth rate of a little under 3 percent. *The Connecticut Town: Growth and Development, 1635-1790* (Middletown, Conn., 1979). We both agree that the colony contained more people than commonly supposed (notably in 1730), but we differ on the early population. I have started with 1,450 men in towns other than the New London district (increasing Holbrook's figures by 22 percent) and adding the latter to obtain 1,874 adult men (Holbrook's 347 plus my 22 percent). Multiplying the result by five yields 9,370, by 5.5, 10,307. Incidentally, if we apply a growth rate of 3 percent annually the polls reported to the legislature in 1676 (less Rye) equals the number of men almost exactly. I think this correct, and that one should multiply the number of polls by 5, not by 4, as in Greene and Harrington (*American Population*, p. xxiii).

²² If the proportion of decedents' estates entering probate remained stable and if polls equals adult men, then estate inventories as a percentage of men fluctuated between a low of only 11 percent during the period 1700-1709 to over 20 percent during the 1680s and 1710s, the deaths in the latter decade being heavily concentrated during 1712 and 1713. The epidemic killed between 5 and 8 percent of the men, depending on one's count. The year 1689 took a comparable toll. After 1713 probate coverage declined, and the figure of 13.7 percent as a proportion of the men during the 1720s ought I think be increased by a fifth or even a fourth, since another epidemic occurred in 1727.

two, and overcame infant mortality so as to double the population every twenty years. By 1730 it had reached 50,000, by 1740 65,000, and by mid-century, when several Massachusetts towns were annexed, nearly 100,000.²³

After 1756 the rate of growth abruptly slowed to 0.015 annually, according to a census of 1762, picked up to 0.026 through 1774, and then dropped again to 0.014 between 1774 and 1790. The first and last of these numbers owe something to war, but the years of peace also registered a reduced rate of growth compared with the earlier period. We will discuss the reasons in some detail presently. The major factor was a rising tide of emigration that not only dampened growth by the removals but, because the emigrants were young, reduced the number of births.

The death rate among adult men remained about the same during the entire century after 1670, varying with wars, peace, and pestilence. In the 1670s it had been eighteen per thousand. A good set of assessment lists about 1730 indicate the same level.²⁴ Another set covers the years 1751 to 1773, from which we extract a rate of twenty-two, the war years accounting for most if not all of the difference.²⁵ As we have seen, all of these estimates involve an uncomfortable amount of guesswork, but Connecticut's death rate was clearly stable unless a slight rise occurred at the very end of the colonial period.

The age structure of the men we can determine from tax records, comparing the 1670 population with those of about 1730 and 1770.

²³ The starting point in 1708 presupposes that polls still equaled adult men. The evidence comes from assessment lists in Norwalk (1687), Windsor (1702), Stamford (1701), Greenwich (1694-1696), and a reconstruction of Wethersfield's population in 1700. Hall, *Norwalk*, p. 172; "Taxes under Andros," *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* 34 (1880), 371-82; Windsor list in Connecticut Historical Society, Hartford; Huntington, *Stamford*, pp. 173-76; Charles Henry Stanley Davis, *The History of Wallingford, Conn.* . . . (Meriden, 1870), pp. 429-30; Stiles, *Wethersfield*; Daniel M. Mead, *A History of the Town of Greenwich*, . . . (New York, 1857), pp. 54-55. Daniels furnishes an excellent discussion of the question. *Connecticut Town*, chap. 2.

²⁴ The tax lists are in the Connecticut State Library except that of Waterbury, for which see Joseph Anderson, *The Town and City of Waterbury*, . . . 3 vols. (New Haven, 1:303-309. The others are for Wethersfield, Glastonbury, East Guilford, Groton, Torrington, and Bolton. All these include the number of polls for which each taxpayer was responsible, so that we can search for such dependents, usually sons but sometimes an elderly father, a servant, or a slave. Reconstruction of the adult male population becomes easier with lists of that type though they are never complete.

²⁵ They consist of Goshen (1741, 1751), Milford (1768), Wethersfield (1771-1773), Glastonbury (1768), and a series for Bolton, most importantly that of 1769, all in the Connecticut State Library, and Durham (1766), in the *Conn. Hist. Soc., Collections* 21 (1924), 190-99.

ON POPULATION

TABLE 1.3
Age Distribution of Adult Men, 1670–1770 (percentages)

	21–29	30–39	40–49	50–59	60–69	70+	Total	Median	N
1670	36	25½	16	15½	5½	2	100½	35½	1,451
1730	35	28	16	12	7	2	100	35	1,360
1770	32½	26	15½	12	9	5	100	37	2,084

Age structure shows very little change during the first sixty years. The population remained young, as one would expect from its exceptional growth during the years before 1730, and such limited emigration of young men as took place was probably counteracted by immigration from Massachusetts into the northern towns. By 1770, however, this stable situation had changed in two ways: fewer young men were living in the colony and considerably more people were older.

We would expect age at death to show corresponding slight variations. The men of Holbrook's 1670 census as supplemented from other sources, including men of all ages, died at a median age of about sixty-three. The median age at death of men on the 1730s set was sixty-five and that of the final tax lists reached sixty-six as we would predict. The probate records reveal the median age at death for a different pool, consisting of every adult reaching twenty-one. Between 1670 and 1740 it had varied around fifty-one. A combination of economic depression and wartime deaths then reduced the figure to forty-eight until the return of peace in the early 1760s, after which it shot up to fifty-three and then to fifty-six and a half.²⁶ The first figure is reasonable as a rebound from the war (the same high level appeared after King William's War) and reflects also the older age structure displayed by the tax lists. The second figure, however, is far too high and we must either investigate some new bias in the probate records or discover a major demographical change.

Such a change might consist of an increased life expectancy of different age groups—of cohorts. We had found that men born during 1641–1649 who survived until 1670 lived another thirty-two or thirty-three years after reaching age twenty-one. Probate records indicate that this life expectancy for men in their mid-twenties remained virtually the same over a period of eighty years, men born during 1710–1719 surviving only a little longer than the cohort of 1640–1649, that is, to age fifty-eight. The probate records, as we speculated, may miss a few

²⁶ See Appendix 1E.

ON POPULATION

drifters who would lower the average, but nothing suggests a change over time.²⁷

Other sources confirm a general stability. In New Haven, men born during the 1640s and 1650s, if they attained their majority, died at sixty and a century later they had improved upon that by two years.²⁸ Wethersfield's twenty-one-year-olds seem to have gained more—from fifty-nine to sixty-three, but the sons of the colony's leaders lost a year and a half, from sixty-four to sixty-two and a half. The age at death of men on tax lists, who to repeat had already reached their mid-thirties, rose from 62.4 in 1670 to 63.3 a generation later, 64.9 in 1730, and 66.4 at the close. All of these sources contain an upward bias because they exclude migrants and occasional residents such as slaves and childless men, and the leaders' sons were obviously favored by the environment. We therefore return to the probate records. Here we find a fundamental continuity: men of age lived for some thirty years, with fluctuations but no secular change until the final decade. From all this we conclude that the life expectancy for men who reached age twenty-one was as low as thirty-one years for the immigrants, but improved to thirty-six or -seven for those born in the colonies between 1640 and 1690 and at most another two years thereafter, depending upon our adjustments to the town genealogies. This table summarizes these results, except that the very earliest settlers did not live quite as long:

	20	30	40	50	60
Seventeenth-century	36	30	24	18	13
Post-1700	38	32	25	20	14

This survey raises two problems: the situation at the end of the period, and this life expectancy, which differs from that commonly accepted for New England. Modern estimates for seventeenth-century Massachusetts predict that men of twenty-one years would survive for another forty-four to forty-eight years. Our figure for Connecticut is at least ten years lower, actually as close to the expectancy for Maryland's native-born whites (twenty-six years) as to that of Massachusetts. So also our average man of thirty, prior to 1700, will live to be only sixty, ten years less than that for the Bay colony, and so on through every age group.²⁹

²⁷ See Appendix 1F.

²⁸ See Appendix 1G.

²⁹ Massachusetts life expectancies are summarized in Maris Vinovskis, "Mortality Rates and Trends in Massachusetts before 1860," *Journal of Economic History* 32 (1972), 198-99. See also Daniel Scott Smith, "The Demographic History of Colonial New England,"

ON POPULATION

Are we to suppose a less healthy environment along the Sound and up the Valley? It seems unlikely. Instead, certain methodological differences may be responsible. First, the procedure followed here included deaths found in probate records and widened the investigation to include not only residents of the towns but also migrants. Our survey of particular towns yields a result much closer to the Massachusetts communities in question, especially in the case of Windsor. Secondly, the Massachusetts towns were all primarily rural and agricultural whereas many in Connecticut were not, or much less so, such as New Haven, Hartford, and Wethersfield. All of these contained an above-average number of young sailors, laborers, and servants. Finally, the Connecticut probate data covered the entire colony, or a large and typical part of it, and the tax lists of 1670 and 1730 included a good sample. These two sources yield a lower life expectancy than studies of particular towns, the probate records in particular incorporating men who are underrepresented by other sources and who died younger.³⁰ The data for Salem in the eighteenth-century shows a life span below that for Connecticut, and presumably Bostonians died even younger. Connecticut did not contain a Boston or even a Salem but in a sense duplicated them through a dozen lesser trading centers. Probably a general survey of Massachusetts would yield lower estimates for the colony as a whole and life expectancies close to ours.

The other problem arises from the records for the final decade of the colonial period, which show some demographic changes for the first time since the earliest years. First, tax lists indicate a population older by two years, a rise for the proportion of men over sixty equaling a decline in those under forty. Second, the age of men whose estates were inventoried in the probate court rose by three years during 1765-1769 and three more years after 1770. Again the number of older men rose sharply while the younger declined, a change substantially greater than that of the tax lists. Third, a considerable reduction occurred in the growth of population, beginning before 1756 and continuing for twenty years. These new developments might have several causes: fewer births beginning about 1725 or at least by 1730; a longer life expectancy (though this would not slow the rate of growth); substantial emigration of the young; or some new bias in our sources.

An examination of the tax lists does not show any distortions other

ibid., 165-83. The life expectancy in Massachusetts at age 40 was 31 more years, at 50, 23½ years, and at 60, 16 years compared with Connecticut's 24, 18, 13.

³⁰ The life expectancy before 1700 for a servant reaching age twenty-one was only thirty-two and for poor orphans thirty-four to thirty-five more years compared with the thirty-six for men generally (perhaps thirty-seven without the servants and orphans).

ON POPULATION

than those already considered and allowed for. The probate records are another matter: they are now biased against the young, with too many older men. The true median age at death was 52.5 rather than the 53 of 1765-1769 and the 56.5 of the next five years.³¹ The records err, but correcting them still leaves an older population: that was real. The death rate seems to have risen a little, as one would expect with a changing basic age structure. We are left with fewer young men and a diminished growth in population.

Was there a reduced number of births? New Haven data does show a decrease³² and the replacement rate of Connecticut's leaders diminished late in the colonial period. A depression during the 1730s and 1740s may have contributed, as is often the case; but we need detailed research to be certain. Be that as it may, the movement out of Connecticut into other colonies is well known. Again the New Haven data furnish a case study. The proportion of first-generation native men born 1640-1649 who left the colony averaged 3 percent, which remained essentially unchanged until those born after 1730. At that point it rose to 9 percent and then reached 11 percent for the cohort of 1740-1749.³³ This exodus may have reflected declining opportunity in Connecticut but that is doubtful, for reasons we will discuss later. The attractions of other areas are, however, unquestioned. Victory over the French and their Indian allies encouraged a movement north and northwest into Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and New York, to land much cheaper and in some cases better than any remaining in Connecticut, while some pioneers penetrated into northern Pennsylvania. Many of those who died outside the colony waited until after the Revolution to move (Jacobus gives the place of death but not the date of emigration), but the men born 1730-1749 would probably have left during their twenties and thirties, meaning for most of them

³¹ The six assessment lists cited above and Jacobus's genealogy of New Haven together with various other records furnish over 600 deaths for the period. These supply a distribution and a median of 52.5 years. They also show a slight increase in the death rate, consistent with an older population.

³² The decrease was not due to more single women or an older age at marriage. A trial run into Jacobus's *New Haven*, letters A through C, shows no reduction in the proportion of women who married among those born 1710-1719 compared with the cohort of 1680-1689; almost all did. The median age of those who married during 1700-1709 was 22 and thirty years later it was 21½. N = 39 and 80.

³³ The Ns for the last two cohorts are 398 and 523. The total number leaving the town averaged 20 percent of a given cohort until those of 1730-1749, when it rose to 25 percent. At first over half of the migrants simply shifted to a nearby town and one-fourth left for a farther place in Connecticut. By the final period, however, three-fourths removed some distance and half left the colony entirely.

ON POPULATION

before 1776, not after 1783. Even if we take only half of the increase in emigration shown by the New Haven figures, those departing would account for the older population, lower rate of growth, and fewer deaths of young men revealed in the tax, census, and probate records.

We conclude, then, that during the closing years of the colonial period the character of Connecticut's male population began to change, featuring fewer young men and more older ones. This may have been accompanied by a small increase in the life expectancy and slightly fewer births. Primarily the change resulted from the emigration of young men and women after the French and Indian War.

By the end of the colonial period the thousand men who immigrated to Connecticut had grown to nearly forty thousand, principally through the efforts of the residents themselves, for total emigration probably equaled immigration. This growth began quite modestly because the first generation did not consist exclusively of husbands and their fertile wives, as we commonly believe. Instead, not far from half of the men arrived unmarried and the settlements contained only half as many women as men. The population was young and died at an earlier age than their successors. By 1660 circumstances were improving. Many of the single men died or left and a new generation of native-born residents was coming of age, so every man might find a wife. Life expectancy increased by several years and the political settlement in England combined with the West Indies trade improved the people's prospects. Population then increased rapidly until about 1675.

At that point the rate of growth slowed again to a more moderate though perfectly respectable rate. We will see later that a sharp economic downturn during the 1680s did not entirely end for several decades. A series of wars, and epidemics following some campaigns, cost lives and property and limited geographical expansion. After 1713, however, a period of peace and prosperity inaugurated a spectacular increase, as far as population is concerned, until the Seven Years' War, when the rate of growth reverted to a more sedate level. Meanwhile the age distribution of the population, at first so very young, had reached an equilibrium that endured, testifying to the colony's famous stability, until the same war. After that event the modest emigration out of the colony increased. The loss of young men and women not only slowed population growth and shifted the age structure upward but also meant that their children would be born outside the colony, to the same effect. At the same time a slightly longer life expectancy also resulted in an older population.

Yet that life expectancy was less than we have previously believed. Some years ago a highly reputable genealogist asserted emphatically

ON POPULATION

that New Englanders commonly reached their seventies, and, in fact, we have noted that several modern studies found that a man of thirty (though not of twenty-one) might do just that. The flaw in our genealogist's statement arose from the fact that the people she was studying left descendants and therefore had married. Subtract single men from our equation and the chances of a long life do indeed jump. The reality in Connecticut and probably in New England generally is more modest and did not remain entirely stable. The original settler at age twenty-one reached fifty but little more; the second generation added a few years, and the next may have also improved a bit, until by the end of the colonial period a young man might expect to live until age sixty—but not seventy—and his wife survived still longer. Insofar as a long life indicates a good one, the people of Connecticut fared well. For more evidence on that we turn to a study of their property.

APPENDIX 1A

Demographical Characteristics of Adult Men in 1640

AGE AT MARRIAGE

<i>Date born</i>	<i>Under 25</i>	<i>25-29</i>	<i>30-34</i>	<i>35-39</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Total</i>
Pre-1600	10	16	17	13	30	56
1600-1609	8	21	18	22	31	69
1610-1619	<u>25</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>115</u>
Total	43	91	56	50	29	240

AGE AND MARITAL STATUS

<i>Age in 1640</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Uncertain</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Probable % of men</i>
21-29	113	24	4	141	42.4
30-39	32	105	8	145	34.9
40-49	4	69	2	75	15.8
50-59	0	27	0	27	5.5
60+	0	8	0	8	1.6
Unknown	55	4	11	70	

AGE AT DEATH (PERCENTAGES)

<i>Age in 1640</i>	<i>21-29</i>	<i>30-39</i>	<i>40-49</i>	<i>50-59</i>	<i>60-69</i>	<i>70+</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>N</i>
21-29	4.0	11.9	29.8	16.6	17.9	19.9	100.0	53	151
30-39	—	6.3	23.2	24.2	25.3	21.1	100.0	58	95
40-49	—	—	15.6	28.9	24.4	31.1	100.0	63	45
50-59	—	—	—	25.0	31.3	43.7	100.0	68	16
60-69	—	—	—	—	50.0	50.0	100.0	—	2

SOURCES: New Haven (see note 3), Windsor, Hartford, Wethersfield (see note 6), and Stamford, for which see E. B. Huntington, *History of Stamford, Connecticut from Its Settlement*

APPENDIX 1B

The Coverage of Probate Records

During the 1640s and 1650s few wills or inventories appear in the probate records as might be expected from a very young population, a good deal of emigration, and perhaps inadequate agencies of enforcement. From 1660 to 1669 ninety-four inventories were entered for the towns of New Haven, Hartford, Windsor, Stamford, and Wethersfield. From other sources we can add nine more men who certainly died during those years and another seventeen whose year and place of death are doubtful, so that the proportion for whom we have inventories falls between 78 and 91 percent. Since some of the unknowns surely survived the decade or moved away almost at once to a place unknown, the most likely proportion is a midpoint of 85 percent. The annual death rate for adult men would then be about eighteen per thousand and the median age at death forty-eight years, both reflecting a still-young population.

Exceptionally full data for the 1670s permits a second test using Holbrook's "census" and genealogies. Excluding the New London district, for which probate records are missing, the adult male population in 1670 totaled about 1,470. Of that number 74 removed themselves from the pool by leaving the colony and vanishing, so our population at risk is approximately 1,400. We know that 182 left inventories within ten years and 27 died without them. Forty-five disappear from the records without trace. Therefore the proportion of decedents who left inventories ranged from 90 down to 72 percent. How many of the unknowns should we expect to have died before 1680? Their age was young—at least one-third and probably half were under thirty. Judging from what we know about the age of men at death, they would normally contribute less than 15 percent to the total even with a war, and King Philip's War caused little loss of life in Connecticut, mostly among men who were under twenty-one in 1670. We need only a dozen for them to meet their quota, so to speak. Once again the midpoint seems fair, namely 81 percent.

Finally, to complete this discussion for the seventeenth century, the tax lists for Norwalk (1687), Windsor (1686), Derby (1681), Lyme (1688), Middletown (1679), and, to trespass a little, Windsor (1702), Stamford (1701), and New Haven (1704) show 319 men dying dur-

APPENDIX 1C

ing the decade after the date of the tax of whom 274, or 86 percent, left inventories. In addition, 62 are unaccounted for of whom 18 probably died also (based upon their ages), so that once again the coverage for inventories was 81 percent, and a few more left wills or other traces in the probate data. No age bias appears, incidentally.

APPENDIX 1C

Age at Death, Men with Probated Estates, 1640-1659

<i>Age</i>	<i>1640-1649</i>	<i>1650-1659</i>
21-29	9	8
30-39	16	39
40-49	13	40
50-59	8	19
60-69	4	10
70 +	1	5
Single	5	12
Married	4	1
Old	1	0
Total	61	134

APPENDIX 1D

Age at Death, Adult Men, from Tax Lists

<i>1655 set</i>	<i>21-29</i>	<i>30-39</i>	<i>40-49</i>	<i>50-59</i>	<i>60-69</i>	<i>70+</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Left/ Unknown</i>
New Haven	6	17	26	36	40	39	164	58½	12
Hartford	1	6	18	29	32	44	130	63½	6
Stamford	1	3	11	11	11	11	48	58	4
Windsor	0	4	15	22	40	47	128	64	6
Wethersfield	2	6	18	17	17	25	85	59	1
Total	10	36	88	115	141	166	556	62.1	29
<i>1670 set</i>									
Branford	1	5	5	9	9	6	35	57	2
Fairfield	4	11	14	21	27	29	106	61	3
Farmington	1	3	10	11	20	25	70	62	5
Greenwich	0	0	4	3	7	7	21	—	7
Guilford	2	5	8	22	27	13	77	60	5
Haddam	0	5	2	7	8	6	28	59½	2
Hartford	1	6	23	35	33	61	159	64½	8
Middletown	—	1	7	12	14	22	56	66	0
Milford	2	5	10	14	26	23	80	64	1
New Haven	4	9	15	27	51	50	156	64	4
Wallingford	0	3	3	2	5	22	35	72	3
Norwalk	1	2	12	14	7	19	50	60	6
Stamford	3	2	13	17	14	14	63	58	5
Stratford	0	5	9	19	29	18	80	62½	2
Wethersfield	3	11	13	27	25	33	112	61	6
Windsor	2	12	19	31	49	53	166	64	2
Total	24	85	167	266	351	401	1294	63	61
<i>1700 set</i>									
Norwalk	3	2	13	11	11	23	63	63	17
Derby	1	2	4	5	8	8	28	63	2
Lyme	1	5	8	8	9	23	54	66	7
Windsor	4	21	20	31	56	131	269	69	24
Greenwich	2	4	8	14	17	15	58	62	4
Stamford	4	12	19	20	18	25	98	58	17
New Haven	7	21	39	65	96	163	391	66½	0
Wallingford	3	10	9	14	25	59	120	69	2
Total	25	77	126	168	240	447	1083	66	73

APPENDIX 1D

<i>1730 set</i>	<i>21-29</i>	<i>30-39</i>	<i>40-49</i>	<i>50-59</i>	<i>60-69</i>	<i>70+</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Left/ Unknown</i>
Waterbury	1	2	18	14	18	48	101	67	6
East Guilford	0	5	11	19	20	39	94	66	10
Groton	4	10	22	36	44	100	216	68	45
Glastonbury	4	7	23	22	35	49	140	64	8
Bolton	2	5	12	10	18	31	78	65	18
Wethersfield	9	19	35	50	66	147	326	67½	32
Total	20	48	121	151	201	414	955	66.8	119

Final set

Glastonbury	12	20	39	48	55	144	318	67	21
Goshen	2	14	13	11	9	44	93	67	11
Bolton	8	27	27	51	66	156	335	68	57
Milford	12	30	50	75	101	206	474	67	32
Durham	2	12	18	30	25	74	161	67½	16
Wethersfield	24	41	66	98	137	268	634	66½	71
Total	60	144	213	313	393	892	2015	67.1	208

SUMMARY, AGE AT DEATH, PERCENTAGES

	<i>21-29</i>	<i>30-39</i>	<i>40-49</i>	<i>50-59</i>	<i>60-69</i>	<i>70+</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Median</i>
1655 set	1.8	6.5	15.8	20.7	25.3	29.9	100.0	62.1
1670 set	1.9	6.6	12.9	20.6	27.1	30.9	100.1	63.0
1700 set	2.3	7.1	11.6	15.5	22.2	41.3	100.0	66.0
1730 set	2.1	5.0	12.7	15.8	21.0	43.4	100.0	66.9
Final set	3.0	7.1	10.5	15.5	19.5	44.3	99.9	67.1

NOTE: The Windsor list used for the 1700 set is that of 1702. The 1730 data for Bolton combines names of 1731 and 1738. In the final set, the Goshen figures uses lists of 1741 and 1751 and Bolton those for 1756 and 1769. Nearly half of the unknown group had left the colony about whom I had no information. As a test, I kept track of the men who left New Haven during the late colonial period and found that they lived longer than those who remained. Probably that information is biased but certainly I have no reason to believe that they survived for any shorter time than the men who remained, so I have eliminated them without prejudice. The reader should remember that the population at risk includes adult men of all ages, not men as they reached twenty-one.

To the men named on the tax lists I have added others from probate records and genealogical sources.