Procedures for Estimating per Capita Wealth in St.Mary's County, Maryland, 1660, 1704, 1755, and 1774

1660

The year 1660 presents the worst problem for estimating wealth in St. Mary's County because there is no census for that year or near that date. Population must be estimated from a variety of sources.

For St. Mary's County, there are only total figures for taxables in 1648, 1657, and 1667 and a rent roll for 1659 that lists all the landowners. No information exists for the number of households. Luckily, actual tax lists are available for Lancaster and Northampton Counties in Virginia for nearby dates. Lancaster lists only the heads of households and the number of taxables in each. Northampton identifies household heads, names all white taxables, and counts the slaves. There are a handful of free black household heads in Northampton, which were eliminated because we know of none in other counties.[1] For both Northampton and Lancaster, the information for the number of taxables and the number of households allowed the determination of taxables per household.

Two other sources supplemented these tax lists. For Charles County, Maryland, adjacent to St. Mary's, Lorena S. Walsh has created a census for 1660 that estimates total population and the number of taxables, household heads, male inmates, women, and children. Historic St. Mary's City has a biographical file for seventeenth-century St. Mary's County residents made from all the available documents. This file does not catch a large but unknown proportion of people because the St. Mary's County Court records burned in 1831, but it probably includes most men alive in 1660 who were, or became, heads of households.[2]

The first step in determining St. Mary's County population was to use this career file to estimate the number of household heads in 1660. The total number of men in the file alive in 1660 was 244, of whom 98 were on the rent roll as landowners and presumably had their own households. To improve this number, we made the following additional assumptions, based on Menard's studies of the careers of men who had arrived in Maryland as servants by the end of 1642:[3]

---

[1] Russell Robert Menard, "Economy and Society in Early Colonial Maryland" (Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa, 1975), 457, 462 (table A3); Northampton County Order Book 9, 14-15, 41-42 (microfilm, Historic St. Mary's City [hereafter cited as HSMC] History Office, Maryland State Archives [hereafter cited as MSA], Annapolis, Md.); Lancaster County Wills and Deeds, 1652-1657, 174-78, 304-07 (microfilm, HSMC History Office); Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York, 1975), 425.

[2] Lorena S. Walsh has published some of this census and discussed its implications in "Staying Put or Getting Out: Findings for Charles County, Maryland, 1650-1720," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser., 44 (1981), 89-103, but most of what we needed remains unpublished. We are grateful to her for sharing these results, which appear throughout this appendix.The Biographies of Seventeenth-Century St. Mary's County Residents is a paper file created and maintained by the HSMC History Office. The countable elements of this file are in a D-Base 4 computer file at the History Office in Annapolis and at the Department of Research at HSMC.

[3] Russell R. Menard, "From Servant to Freeholder: Status Mobility and Property Accumulation in Seventeenth-Century Maryland," *WMQ*, 3d Ser., 30 (1973), 37-64.

1. that any man, not a landowner, who arrived before 1650 was a householder by 1660 (N = 23); 2. that a man who arrived as a servant after 1656 was still a servant in 1660 (N = 25);

2. that men who arrived as servants after 1650, but before 1656, might have been householders by 1660 and that the same was true for free immigrants who arrived after 1650, but before 1659 (N = 62);

3. that servants who became free after 1654 might have been inmates of the households of others in 1660 (N = 35).

These figures indicate a minimum of 121 households in 1660 and a maximum of 183. The mean of the two numbers is 152.

The second step was to determine the number of taxables in the county in the benchmark year, taxables being white males and black males and females of working age. Records show that in 1648 there were 141; in 1657, 398; in 1667, 688.[4] However, the figure for 1657 included taxables from what became Charles County in 1658, which were subtracted.

The best way to calculate taxables for Charles County in 1657 was to calculate the growth rate between 1642, when 2 men on a tax list for the colony lived in the Charles area, and 1662, when Charles County taxables were 357.[5] The growth rate of 29.5931 produced 97.67 taxables for Charles County in 1657 and hence left 300.33 for St. Mary's. Applying the St. Mary's growth rate between 1648 and 1657 to the years 1657-1660 produced 395.48 St. Mary's taxables in the benchmark year.

This calculation is probably too high, given that Menard in earlier work has demonstrated that immigration was faster after 1660 than in the second half of the 1650s, a period of political turmoil in Maryland.[6] The growth rate between about 1654 and 1660 was likely lower than it was from 1647 to 1654, but how much lower is uncertain. The number 395.48 for taxables was the best available, but only as an upper bound. At 121 households, 395.48 taxables makes 3.2684 taxables per household.

Because the estimation for St. Mary's taxables was rough, it seemed best to test it against the numbers available from Lancaster and Northampton Counties in Virginia for dates in the early 1660s and from Walsh's estimate for Charles County in 1660.[7] The procedure was to multiply taxables per household from these counties by the three estimates for the number of households in St. Mary's to get additional estimates for St. Mary's taxables. The results in various combinations are presented in Table I.

Most of the possibilities in the table were unacceptable. They run from 208 to 816 taxables. Only the range between 300 and 400 taxables seemed reasonable. Less than 300 would produce too great a decline from 1657. More than 400 would not fit well with Menard's finding that immigration was greater after 1660 than before. By this standard, given 121 households, the number based on Northampton taxables per household alone was a possibility, but, combined with Lancaster's contribution, the mean of the two was too high. On the other hand, including the numbers based on Charles County's taxables per household brought a mean for the three counties not far from the St.

[4] Menard, "Economy and Society," 459.
[5] Ibid., 457; Personal communication from Lorena S. Walsh; Menard, "Economy and Society," 457.
[6] Menard, "Economy and Society," figures IV-1, IV-2.
[7] See note 1.

Mary's upper bound; and when St. Mary's taxables were added the numbers were closer yet. Of course, the number for St. Mary's by itself was acceptable by definition. Given 183 households, as opposed to 121, only the numbers from St. Mary's and Charles Counties taken separately were possibilities. At 152 households, St. Mary's stood by itself.

Two of these six possible options had to be discarded, those for Northampton and Charles Counties standing alone. The one for Charles County at 183 households required an unlikely outcome—that all the probables described above for household heads are in fact certainties. Also dubious was the option for Northampton County by itself at 121 households. It seemed wiser to combine Northampton with other counties. Four possibilities remained, three relying on the estimate of 121 households and one allowing the estimate of 152. The calculations that follow were based on these four estimates for St. Mary's County taxables in 1660.

The next step was to estimate total population from taxables by a multiple. Lorena S. Walsh had estimated a multiple of 2.19 for Charles County in 1660, and Darrett and Anita Rutman had determined one of 1.81 for Middlesex County, Virginia, in 1668. A third estimate, of 2.4, made for all of Maryland by Arthur E. Karinen for the period before 1676, seemed too high for 1660.[8] Hence, we took the mean of the estimates from Walsh and the Rutmans, which is 2.0.

With figures available for taxables, households, and total population, the number of males of working age who were not household heads and the number of women and children were obtainable. Subtraction of household heads from taxables gave the count for males who were inmates. And subtraction of taxables from population gave the number of women and children.[9] The four selected options are described in Table II. Our preference is for option 2, which uses the mean of taxables per household for four counties—Lancaster, Northampton, Charles, and St. Mary's—with 121 households.

Table II describes a basic mean household structure for St. Mary's in 1660, but to determine the mean number of wealthholders required that we further break down household membership. Male inmates could be indentured servants, adult sons, or other free males. To make these distinctions, we used Walsh's calculations of male servants to all male inmates for Charles County about 1660: .4348. For option 2, this figure produced 110.0610 male servants, or .9096 per household, and 143.0691 free male inmates, or 1.1291 per household. However, Walsh did not find any adult sons in the records of this newly settled area and did not attempt to distinguish them. For estimating sons, which would fall into Walsh's nonservant category, Northampton tax lists for 1665 and 1667 proved helpful. The list for 1665 showed .126 sons per household, that for 1667, .09 per household. The mean was .1066 per

[8] Walsh has shared with us her most recent calculation, not yet published. For Darrett and Anita Rutman's estimate, see *A Place in Time, Explicatus* (New York, 1984), table 3. For Arthur E. Karinen's estimate, see "Maryland Population: 1631-1730: Numerical and Distributional Aspects," *Maryland Historical Magazine,* 54 (1959), 367. Karinen states that "the smallest ratio suggested by any source for the earliest years is 2.0:1" but does not give the source.

[9] We must plead guilty here to not estimating the number of women who were household heads in 1660. They are not omitted, since they are included with men in the total count of householders, and they need to be there because they were wealthholders. Of 35 estates inventoried over the years 1658-1664, 24 were for heads of households, and 2, or 8.3%, were women, both widows. This percentage is probably higher than would be found in the living population. When time permits, we will consult the tax lists for 1660 and 1663 for Lancaster and Northampton, respectively, to see likely percentages for women household heads in the living population. The neglect here diminishes slightly the number of male inmates, since these have been calculated by subtracting household heads from taxables.
In this appendix, data from inventories are from the St. Mary's County, Maryland, Inventory Computer File, HSMC History Office, MSA.

household. We divided this mean by 2 because, although both counties were settled in the 1630s, St. Mary's lost most of its population during Ingle's Rebellion of the mid-1640s.[10] The result was .0533 adult sons per household. The residual free male inmates were then 1.1291 per household. Hereafter, these residual free male inmates are identified as freemen.

For the number per household of women and children, Walsh's census for Charles County was again a source. She estimated 126 women and 123 children for a total of 249. Thus, .506 were women, and .494 were children. For option 2 in St. Mary's, this ratio gave 189.3098 women and 184.8202 children and a figure per household for children of 1.5274.

Women also had to be divided into wives, adult daughters, female servants, and free adult females who were none of the above. Walsh did not attempt these distinctions. An assumption that adult daughters were half of the number of sons seemed reasonable, given that in these early times daughters married very young.[11] Daughters still at home then became .0267 per household. For estimating numbers for wives and servants, inventories were the only source available. For the years 1658-1664, 14 heads of households of 24 were married, giving .5833 wives per household. Female servants could not be counted from inventories directly because the wealth bias of inventories raised too high their number per household. However, the ratio of female servants to male servants listed in inventories perhaps approximates the ratio within all labor-owning households. From 1658 through 1664, the ratio was 9 women to 22 men, or .4091. Consequently, for option 2, given 110.0610 male servants, there were 45.0260 female servants, or .3721 per household. Since women numbered 189.3098, wives numbered 70.4798, and female servants were 45.0620, then other female inmates were 70.4798, or .5825 per household. In 1660, these most likely were former indentured servants, now free and working for hire.

The resulting mean household structure for option 2 is:

Household Head	1.0000
Adult Sons	0.0533
Male Indentured Servants	0.9096
Freemen	1.1291
Wives	0.5833
Adult Daughters	0.0267
Female Indentured Servants	0.3720
Other Free Female Inmates	0.5826
Children	1.5274
Total	**6.1840**

The same procedure applies to all the options, and the four mean household structures are shown in Table III.

[10] See Russell R. Menard, "Maryland's 'Time of Troubles': Sources of Political Disorder in Early St. Mary's," *Maryland Historical Magazine,* 76 (1981), 124-40.

[11] Russell R. Menard and Lorena S. Walsh, *The Demography of Somerset County, Maryland: A Progress Report, Newberry Papers in Family and Community History* (Chicago, 1981).

Slaves are missing from this analysis of the household. Over the years 1658-1664, 4 slaves of a total of 42 laborers appeared in 35 inventories, but to include them in the calculations here would grossly overstate their proportion of the labor force among the living in 1660. Walsh found only 3 among 212 taxables in her reconstructed census for Charles County. Slaves began to appear in greater numbers in the 1660s as property of several wealthy men who immigrated from Barbados. Their appearance then induced Philip Calvert and probably other leaders to begin switching from servants to slaves.[12] But, in 1660, slaves were undoubtedly a great rarity in Maryland. Their omission from the household will not have any material effect upon the calculations offered here.

The next stage of the analysis was to calculate the kinds and numbers of wealthholders. Indentured servants and wives could not hold wealth, and minor children ordinarily had none. However, minor children whose fathers had died and left them an inheritance present a problem. The county courts appointed guardians to care for the property, but no one has yet devised a way to discover how much property of this kind existed. If the guardian died before the orphan came of age, the child's property was not inventoried as part of the guardian's estate and was not included in inventoried wealth. That is a pity, from one point of view, although it was good for the orphan, whose estate was then exempt from paying the guardian's debts. For the moment, and probably forever, all minor children will have to be excluded from the wealthholding categories.

Wealthholders in the household, then, consisted of at least: the household head, the freemen who were not adult sons, and the free women who were not wives or adult daughters. Whether adult children should be included among wealthholding inmates raised another question. In general, such young people simply contributed their labor to the household pool as part of the farm-building effort. In practice, to include them made little difference, hence our decision to exclude them. Table III shows that, for option 2 of household structure, there were 2.7117 wealthholders per household.

The procedure for determining personal wealth per household and per head in 1660 is a hybrid that applies inventoried wealth to this mean household structure in the living population. Wealthholders in the household were divided into two categories, heads of households and inmates. Inventories provided data to find mean personal wealth of each group over the years 1658-1664.[13] The mean wealth of household heads supplied an estimate for the wealth of the head in 1660. Inmate mean wealth, when multiplied by the mean number of wealthholding inmates in the mean household of 1660, estimated the contribution of inmates. Adding the two gave an estimation of personal wealth per household. Division of this figure by the number of people in the household gave estimated personal wealth per head in the benchmark year. The results appear in Table IV.

The final steps added the value of land. A rent roll—made in 1659 and carefully compared with the St. Mary's biographical files to identify nonresident owners and correct for deaths and transfers—enabled the calculation of the number of acres patented and the exclusion of what was owned by people who did not reside in the county. There were 74,831 patented acres, of which 16,296 belonged to

[12] Lois Green Carr, Report on Philip Calvert, MS in progress, HSMC History Office, MSA.

[13] All values from inventories are deflated by a commodity price index described in P. M. G. Harris, "Inflation and Deflation in Early America, 1634-1860: Patterns of Change in the British American Economy," *Social Science History,* 20 (1996), appendix A, 486-98.

nonresidents, and 950 acres were subtracted because the owners were deceased without heirs. The remaining land came to 57,585 acres.[14]

Determining prices for the land was more difficult. Many landowners simply signed over a patent, with no record of a price. To collect enough data, we had to use all the deeds available between the years 1652 and 1674.[15] Prices for land were few in St. Mary's County because of the destruction of the county records. Luckily, since the capital of the colony was in the county, the clerk of the Provincial Court was there, and some transactions were recorded with him. To add to this data, we turned to neighboring Charles County, for which recorded deeds remain. These yielded a larger supply of prices, but they were much lower than those found for St. Mary's. Since Charles County was a new frontier, land in St. Mary's probably on average brought a higher price, but possibly not as high as indicated by the transactions taken to the Provincial Court. Offered here are two options for land price: St. Mary's prices alone (N = 58) and St. Mary's and Charles prices combined (N = 160).

In both counties, prices for improved tracts were much higher than those for unimproved land. With St. Mary's prices alone, improved land was on average £.23426 per acre, whereas land unimproved was £.0592 per acre. When Charles was added, the figures were £.1705 and £.05467 per acre. Given these gaps in prices, the distinction seemed useful, although it cost 27 of the 160 observations.

How much of the land was improved? A recent study shows that the mean size of tracts that could be identified as having buildings and fences was 200 acres.[16] Hence, it seemed reasonable to assume that any amount of land up to and including 200 acres of each resident's holding should be valued at the price of improved land. The rent roll supplied the acreage of each tract and the total for each landowner, from which it could be determined that close to 20,000 acres of resident-owned land were improved. About 37,585 acres remained unimproved.

Valuing the land was a simple procedure. At St. Mary's prices, 20,000 acres of improved land multiplied by £.23426 came to £4,685.20, and the remaining 37,585 acres, valued at £.0592, came to £2,725.03. The total value of resident-owned patented land was then £6,910.23. At prices for St. Mary's and Charles combined, the results were respectively £3,410.00, £2,054.77, and a total of £5,464.77.

The last step was to divide the total value of the land, first, by the number of households to obtain wealth in land per household, and, second, by the number of people in the household to obtain wealth in land per head. The results are shown in Table V.

The final procedure was to add the value of land to the value of personal wealth to obtain wealth per household and per head. The results appear in Table VI. For simplicity, the summary used in Table I in "Wealth and Welfare in Early Maryland" uses only the preferred choice for household structure, option 2, but the range of choices has been laid out here.

1704

The benchmark year 1704 has a census that supplies much of the essential data that had to be estimated for 1660. The census gives the following information:

[14] Rent Roll 0 (1660), 1-74, MSA, S 18, MdHR 17609.

[15] For these prices and how we obtained them, see Lois Green Carr, Russell R. Menard, and Lorena S. Walsh, *Robert Cole's World: Agriculture and Society in Early Maryland* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1991), 281-82.

[16] Ibid.

People Per Household		
Heads of Households	418	1.00
Free Women and Servants	617	1.48
Free Children, Boys, and Girls	1,065	2.55
Free Men and Servant Men	938	2.24
Servants, Boys, and Girls	151	0.36
Taxable Slaves	326	0.78
Slaves Not Taxed	(130)	0.31
Total	**(3,645)**	**8.72**

The parentheses indicate revisions of the original by Menard.[17]

Determining the structure of the household, the number of taxables, and the number of wealthholders required distinguishing 1) female from male heads of households; 2) male indentured servants from adult sons and other free male inmates; and 3) indentured women servants from wives, adult daughters, and other free women inmates. As before, St. Mary's County inventories were useful, although imperfect, sources. Of 53 inventoried household heads, 4, or 7.547 percent, were women. Consequently, in 418 households, 31.5465 were headed by women and 386.4535 by men. Taxables then became 386.45 male household heads, plus 938 free and servant men, and 326 taxable slaves for a total of 1650.45 taxables. For estimating sons, tax lists for Northampton County in 1665 and Charles and Calvert Counties in 1733 provided a ratio of 5 percent of taxables.[18] That produced 82.52 sons, or .20 per household. As in 1660, daughters were estimated as one-half of sons (41.26 daughters, or .10 per household). Inventories supplied the rest of the needed data. The ratio of male servants to taxable slaves in inventories (15/462.326) applied to the taxable slaves in the census (326) generated 106.28 servants, or .254 per household. The residual 748.12 males were the other free male inmates; they numbered 1.79 in the household. The estimate for wives relied on raw inventory data for married men, who were 29 of 53 heads of households, or .547 per household (228.65 wives). Adult female servants were estimated from their ratio to adult male servants as seen in the inventories (7/15 = .47). Forty seven percent of the estimated taxable male servants in the census population produced 49.95 women servants, or .12 per household. The residual 296.60 women were the free adult female inmates who were not wives or daughters. These were .71 per household. The resulting household structure is laid out in Table VII.

Within the household, wealthholders included its head, free adult male inmates who were not sons, and free female inmates who were not wives or adult daughters. Probably, as earlier, all in the last category were hired women servants recently freed from indenture. The wealthholding status of adult sons and daughters was once more a question. By 1704, adult children might be more likely than earlier to be given their own livestock or have legacies from grandparents or other relatives, none of which ought to appear in the parent's inventory. We offer two choices—exclusion of these children from the

[17] William Hand Browne, ed., *Archives of Maryland*, 1st Ser., 25 (Baltimore, 1905), 256; Russell R. Menard, "Five Maryland Censuses, 1700 to 1712: A Note on the Quality of the Quantities," *WMQ*, 3d Ser., 38 (1980), 620, table II.

[18] Northampton County, Virginia, Order Book 9, 14-15, MS (microfilm); Scharf Papers, box 91, folder 1 (Charles County), MSA, S 1005; Charles Francis Stein, *A History of Calvert County, Maryland* (Baltimore, 1960), 375-81.

wealthholders or inclusion of one-half, who were then counted as inmates. Our preference is for inclusion of one-half.

Methods for calculating personal wealth per household, per head, and per white follow those of 1660. The procedure was to find the mean inventoried wealth for inmates, multiply it by the number of wealthholding inmates per household, and then add the mean wealth of heads of households, thus arriving at personal wealth per household. Dividing this figure by the number of people and the number of whites in the household gave us wealth per head and per white. The results are summarized in Table VIII.

The procedures for calculating the value of land were also similar to those for 1660. A rent roll for 1704 supplied the amount of patented land, and the biographical files, which extended through 1705, allowed estimation of the land owned by county residents (106,688 acres).[19] However, there were very few prices for St. Mary's County. The capital had moved to Annapolis in 1695, making the Provincial Court too inconvenient for recording local transactions. Prices from adjacent Charles and Prince George's Counties and a series supplied by Paul G. E. Clemens for Talbot County had to substitute.[20] For Prince George's, a tract map allowed creation of a series for the Patuxent and the Potomac sides, there being, as in St. Mary's, considerable difference in the quality and, hence, value of the land.[21] In St. Mary's, only 10 percent of the land was of the Patuxent-side quality, which required weighting the overall price for Prince George's accordingly.[22] Deflated, this adjusted Prince George's price was £.22 per acre. The same adjustment for Charles prices was desirable, but no tract map was available to help identify the location of the tracts being sold. Mean land price in Charles was £.203 (deflated) per acre, and that for Talbot, £.21 (deflated) per acre. The mean of Charles and Prince George's was £.21, the same as Talbot, which was the price selected.

With this information, dividing resident-owned acreage (106,688) by the total population (3,645), by the number of whites (3,189), and by the number of households (418) produced acreage per head, per white, and per household. Multiplying by the price produced the land values.

Finally, adding the land values to the values of personal wealth gave total wealth per head, per white, and per household. The results appear in Table VIII.

Distinguishing improved from unimproved land was not possible for 1704, and the effects of this omission are hard to determine. In 1660, only a third of the patented land was improved, but in 1704 the proportion was undoubtedly much larger. The degree of difference is likely indicated by the change in acres per taxable from 154.8 in 1660 to 63.4 in 1704. In addition, improved land was surely developed much more heavily and surely brought a higher price than earlier. The question was: Would the effect be to lower or raise land value per head or per household?

---

[19] On the land, see Rent Roll 7, MSA, S 14, MdHR 17616-1; on the biographical file, see note 2.

[20] Prices for Prince George's County came from Carr's personal files. We thank Lorena S. Walsh and Paul G. E. Clemens for their series for Charles and Talbot Counties, respectively.

[21] Louise Joyner Heinton created a tract map for Prince George's County to show which tracts had once been in Charles County and which in Prince George's. Copies of this invaluable source are at the Maryland State Archives and at the Maryland Historical Society in Baltimore.

[22] We calculated this percentage of best land by comparing a St. Mary's County tract map for 1704 prepared by Menard for Historic St. Mary's City in 1970 with the soil maps for the county published in U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, *Soil Survey of St. Mary's County, Maryland* (Washington, D.C., 1978).

If the 1660 ratios of improved to unimproved land and the price differences that came with improvements had pertained in 1704, the effect on wealth per head for that year could have been to lower it substantially. In 1660, lumping all observations would have increased land value per head (for option 2 of population) to £12.84 from £9.16 at St. Mary's prices and to £9.88 from £7.30 at prices for St. Mary's and Charles combined. Using option 2 for household structure, wealth per head would then have been £20.88 or £17.92, respectively, a difference from £17.27 or £15.34 (seen in Table VI) of 17.3 or 14.4 percent.[23] If a comparable difference had existed in 1704, the value of wealth per head would have been £15.27 or £15.45, down from the £18.47 or £18.68 seen in Table VIII. However, by 1704, the development of land had reached a stage where so large an effect of unimproved land on wealth is unlikely. Distinguishing improved from unimproved land might lower land values somewhat, but the greatly reduced ratio of acres per taxable suggests that the reverse could also be true. For the moment, the values suggested in Table VIII are the best available.

1755

The census of 1755 offers even more detailed information than that of 1704, but it lacks a vital element: the number of households.[24] Luckily, a series of tax lists are available for several hundreds (a local subdivision): one in St. Mary's County for 1754, one in Charles County for 1755, and six in Charles County for 1758.[25] These total 870 households, with 1,241 white taxables, or 1.4264 taxables per household. In the census of 1755, St. Mary's County had 1,784 white taxables. At 1.4264 per household, there were 1,251 households, rounded to 1,250 households.

The census of 1755 offers the following information.

Free White Males, Not Servants, Taxed	1,561
White Men Hired or Indentured	194
White Male Convict Servants	29
Free Mulattoes or Blacks	54
Taxable Slaves	1,648
Total Taxables	3,486
White Taxables	1,784
Free White Men, Not Taxable	64
Free White Women, Not Servants	1,806
White Female Servants, Hired or Indentured	164

[23] In 1660, the difference between making and not making the distinction between the value of improved and unimproved land was: at St. Mary's prices, 57,585 acres was valued at £9,614.23 without the distinction; with it, at £6,910.23. At St. Mary's and Charles's prices together, the land was valued at £7391.91 without the distinction; with it, at £5,464.77. At £9,614.23 and using preferred option 2 for household size, land value per head was £12.85; at £6,910.23, it was £9.24. At £7,391.91, land value per head was £9.88; at £5,464.77, it was £7.30. The differences are £3.61 and £2.58, respectively. Without distinctions between improved and unimproved land, wealth per head then becomes £17.27 + £3.61 = £20.88; with this distinction, it becomes £15.34 + £2.58 = £17.92. All prices are deflated by a commodity price index referenced in note 13.

[24] This census was published in *Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle,* 34 (1764), 261.

[25] The tax lists are in Secretary in Maryland, MSS, MSA, S 244, MdHR 19839.

White Female Convict Servants	13
Free Mulattoes or Blacks, Not Taxable	19
Slave Mulattoes or Blacks, Not Taxable	63
Free White Children	3,609
Servant Children, Hired or Indentured	53
Convict Servant Children	8
Free Mulatto or Black Children	76
Slave Mulatto or Black Children	1,893
Total White Men	1,848
Total White Women	1,983
Total White Children	3,570
Total Free Mulattoes and Blacks	149
Total Mulatto and Black Slaves	3,604
Total Population	**11,254**
Adjusted Total Population	**11,105**

Free mulattoes and free blacks were eliminated, given the absence of information about their wealth. There remained 11,105 people.

To establish household structure, the first task was to disaggregate numbers for free white men and women. How many were heads of households, adult sons and daughters, or other free inmates? And how many males were taxables? Tax lists supplied some of this data. In 870 households, there were 12 untaxed male heads and 55 women heads, or .0138 and .0632 per household respectively, leaving .923 taxed male heads. Taxed sons numbered 178, making .2046 per household. Given 1,250 households in St. Mary's, there were then 1,153.75 taxed male heads of households, 17.25 untaxed male heads, 79 women heads, and 255.75 adult sons.

Earlier assumptions that adult daughters at home were one-half of sons could not be applied to 1755. The age at marriage for women had risen. The best source of information was the administration accounts for 1747-1757. During these years, 109 accounts gave the number and ages of children of intestate fathers, who by law were to receive equal shares of the personal estate. These accounts showed 79 daughters, or .7248 per account, but an unknown proportion were married and therefore not at home. However, the tax lists show .2046 adult sons per household, and the administration accounts show 64 sons, or .5872 per account. Therefore, sons not at home were .5872 - .2046, or .3826 of all sons in the accounts. Applying this ratio to the 79 daughters produced 30.22 daughters not at home. This figure left 48.77 in the household, or .4475 per account. For 1,250 households, this last ratio produced 559.38 daughters.

Why were there so many more adult daughters at home than sons? Were sons more likely than daughters to leave the household? Applying the above ratio to daughters may be distorting the truth, but probably not greatly. Sons were not marrying sooner than daughters. At this time, sons in southern Maryland were in their mid-twenties at marriage, whereas daughters were two to three years younger.[26] But some sons—although not many, given the small number of servants listed in the census—probably

[26] Allan Kulikoff, *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1986), figs. 2, 4.

were hiring themselves out to neighbors. Others might have been serving as overseers of slaves and were not listed as servants. And many others left home in search of opportunities in newly settled areas. Wills and inventories demonstrate that fathers were increasingly unable to supply all their sons with land, and most fathers who were landless had little to offer their children.[27] Migration is the likely cause of the disappearance of sons from the household.

Further differentiating the category of free inmates required estimating the number of wives. Inventories showed 108 married men in 155 households, or .6968 wives per household. Given this ratio, 1,250 households had 870.97 wives.

The next step was to disaggregate the male servants, hired and indentured (including convicts). Once more we had to rely upon inventories and the ratio therein of male servants to slaves and female servants to male servants. In the inventories for 1752-1757, there were 15 male servants (including convicts) to 317 slaves, a ratio of .0473. Taxable slaves in the census were 1,648, hence the estimate of 77.95 male indentured servants (including convicts), or .0624 per household. Subtracting these from 223 (the total of hired, indentured, and convict servants) left 145.05 hired free males, or .1160 per household. Free male inmates, not adult sons or hired servants, then numbered 151.50 (white taxables minus male heads of households, minus male indentured servants, minus free male hired servants, minus adult sons), or .1212 per household. Since these men were taxed, they must have been boarders or relatives capable of work.

Of female indentured servants (including convicts), there were only 4 in the inventories, providing a ratio to male servants of .2667. In 1,250 households, there were, therefore, 20.79 such indentured women (including convicts), or .0166 per household. Since indentured, convict, and hired women together numbered 177, hired women then came to 156.21, or.1256 per household. Subtracting from total free white women (N = 1,806) the female household heads, the wives, the adult daughters, and the hired women left 296.65 other free women inmates, or .2373 per household. These women were not hired servants; hence, they must have been widowed mothers, other female relatives, or boarders.

One last category for household members remains, the untaxed men who were not heads of households. Listed in the census as untaxed were 64 men, of which 17.5 were heads of households. Hence, 46.75 were male inmates too poor to tax. The resulting mean household structure is laid out in Table VII.

From these numbers one can estimate how many household members were wealthholders. Free white taxables per household (taxed male household heads, adult sons, hired men, and other free male inmates) numbered 1,706.05, or 1.3648 per household. The addition of free white untaxed household heads (17.25), female household heads (79), adult daughters (559.38), free hired white women (156.21), and other free women inmates (296.65) brought a total of 2,814.55 wealthholders, or 2.2516

[27] Ibid., 46-47, 76-77; Lois Green Carr, "Inheritance in the Colonial Chesapeake," in Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert, eds., *Women in the Age of the American Revolution* (Charlottesville, Va., 1989), 186-87, 194, table 1. An alternative way to calculate daughters would be to suppose that their numbers had the same ratio to the number of sons as had the number of women in the census to the number of men. A multiplier of 1.073 applied to the 1,848 men enumerated produces 1,983, the number of women. Sons in the accounts were .2046 per household. By the alternative calculation, daughters were .2046 x 1.073 = .2195 per household, and the number of daughters was 274.375. This result raises the number of female inmates, not wives, daughters, or hired servants, to 581.67. We decided against this procedure because a surplus of daughters over sons at home can be explained, but a surplus of these other female inmates over daughters and servants cannot.

per household. This figure included all adult children. If only half were included, the figure would be 2,406.99 wealthholders, or 1.9256 per household. We preferred the first option because, by 1755, long after the farm-building stage, most adult children probably had some property of their own.

Wealth per head, per white, and per household is presented in Table IX. The methods for calculating personal wealth were the same as in the preceding estimates. Values adjusted for reporting rates used figures for adjusted personal wealth obtained by the methods described in Appendix I of "Wealth and Welfare in Early Maryland."

As in 1704, finding the value of land required use of land prices from Prince George's County. A weighted price for St. Mary's used Patuxent-side prices for 10 percent of the land and Potomac-side prices for the rest.[28] These prices represent those for St. Mary's well, so long as the small percentage of Patuxent-quality land there is taken into account. The price had doubled since 1704, £.4212 per acre (deflated) instead of £.21.

The St. Mary's County debt book, a form of rent roll, for 1754 showed 160,697.25 acres of patented land, and the rent roll of 1763 listed 14,818 acres of proprietary manor land, for a total of 175,517 acres.[29] No means exist for determining what proportion was improved, but it was undoubtedly much higher than in 1704. The possible effects on price were probably upward but small. Without the distinction, total land value came to £73,927.76. Land value per head was £6.66, per white head, £9.86, and per household, £59.14. However, nonresidents owned an unknown amount of the land, although the proportion was probably much less than the one-fifth owned by outsiders at the beginning of the century. Acreage owned by nonresidents, when subtracted, would lower St. Mary's land values, but the difference probably would not be substantial. The land values shown are at least an upper bound.

Finally, as again seen in Table IX, wealth in land added to personal wealth gave total wealth per head, per white head, and per household.

1774

Because there was no census for 1774, we had to rely on summary figures for 1783 and on the census of 1790. The use of growth rates between 1755 and these two dates allowed us to estimate the population and household structure for this last benchmark date.[30]

The 1783 tax summary shows a total population of 15,335 inhabitants; 8,838 were white, and 6,514 were black slaves. Free blacks or mulattoes were not mentioned.

The census of 1790 produced somewhat more information:

[28] These prices were obtained from Prince George's County Land Record NN, 329-523, MSS, MSA, C 1237-19. We thank Allan Kulikoff for providing the data for locating tracts on the Patuxent or the Potomac side of the county. See also the Heinton tract map discussed in note 21.

[29] Debt Book 54, 254-55, MSS, MSA, S 12-173, MdHR 17699-2; Rent Roll 44, MSS, MSA, S 18-55, MdHR 17653.

[30] "A Summary Return by the Commissioners of the Tax, Saint Mary's County, Agreeable to the Act to Raise the Supplies for the Year Seventeen Hundred and Eighty Three," Scharf Collection, Maryland Historical Society; Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of the Census, *Heads of Families at the First Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1790: Maryland* (Washington, D.C., 1907), 104-09.

Household Heads	1,530
Free White Males, Age Sixteen, including Household Heads	2,100
Free White Males under Sixteen	1,943
Free White Females, Including Household Heads	4,173
All Other Free Persons	343
Slaves	6,985
Total	**15,544**

Making the assumption that the sex ratios of boys and girls under age sixteen were equal improved this result somewhat. It was then possible to estimate the number of children by doubling the number of boys under sixteen and to estimate the number of women, sixteen and above, by subtracting from the category of free white females the number of girls under age sixteen. There were probably more girls than boys in the actual population, but the difference was not great. The assumption of equality allows rough results:

Household Heads	1,530
Free White Men	2,100
Free White Women	2,230
Free White Children	3,886
Total Whites	**8,216**

Two of the categories covered in the census are omitted here. Other free persons (N = 343) consisted of free mulattoes, free blacks, and perhaps Indians. In the absence of wealth information for these groups, they were excluded from this study. Slaves were omitted from the above list because the 1783 tax list supplied numbers closer to the benchmark date.

Efforts to reconstruct the population of 1774 began by establishing the growth rate of 1.5932 for the whole population from 1755 to 1783.[31] Applied to the years from 1755 to 1774, this rate produced 13,823.9 people in 1774. The growth rate for slaves for 1755 to 1783 was 2.1353, which, applied in the same way, produced 5,384.31 slaves.[32] However, the tax list did not break down the white population by sex and age. For this information, the census of 1790 was needed. The problem here was the considerable migration in the 1780s from St. Mary's County to what is now Kentucky and Missouri. Using a growth rate from 1755 to 1790 might produce distorted results for the year 1774.

The procedure to overcome this difficulty was, first, to use the growth rate (.58752) for the white population, 1755-1783, to estimate the white population in 1790 had there been no migration.[33] The actual 1790 census figure was 8,216 whites, as opposed to 8,838 in the tax list of 1783; using the growth rate .58752 over thirty-five years, the new figure for 1790 was 9,208. The figure 8,216 divided by 9,208 showed the proportion of the population that might have migrated: .1077. The proportion of those who stayed was therefore .8923.

[31] The population in 1755 was 11,105; in 1783, 15,544.
[32] Slaves in 1755 numbered 3,604; in 1783, 6,514.
[33] In 1755, the white population was 7,501; in 1783, 8,612.

The next step—taken on the supposition that this proportion of stayers applied also to men, women, and children taken separately—was to estimate their numbers in 1790 had there been no migration. Dividing by .8923, the 2,100 white men, 2,230 white women, and 3,886 white children listed in the census produced 2,352.47 men, 2,499.16 women, and 4,355.04 children. With these expanded numbers, the growth rate could be calculated for each category of whites for the years 1755 through 1790 and applied to the years 1755 through 1774. The result for the white population in 1774 was 2,107.19 white men, 2,248.35 white women, and 4,017.26 children. Adding in the slaves brought the total population in 1774 to 13,757.1, a difference from the first estimate of one-half a percent.

Table X tests these results. It shows the total population in 1774 as estimated overall and by components. It then shows what the population estimated by components would be with or without adjusting for migration or if the adjustment were divided by 2 to allow for the possibility that many men migrated without their families. The estimate with full adjustment easily fits best the overall estimate of population. Since population breakdowns are necessary for estimating wealth, the fully adjusted estimate by population components (13,757.1) became the figure for total population.

Given that the best fit above postulated that migration was largely in family groups, we estimated the number of households accordingly. Without adjustment for migration, there would have been 1,374.53 households in 1774; with the full adjustment, there were 1,462.24.[34] The latter figure was selected.

To establish household structure and the wealthholders within it required further breakdowns for both the slave and the white population. In 1783, although slaves were recorded by sex and age, the age breakdowns were not the same as those used in the colonial period to distinguish taxable slaves from other slaves. Nevertheless, given the need to make this distinction for 1774 to establish dependency ratios for that date, it was necessary to use the 1783 data. We defined as taxables the slaves age fourteen and above, as opposed to the colonial age of sixteen and above, and applied the ratio of taxed to untaxed slaves on the tax list (.52) to the estimated slaves of 1774. This procedure broke down the 3.6822 slaves per household into 1.91 taxed and 1.77 untaxed slaves. The result exaggerated the number of taxable slaves somewhat but was the best we could obtain.

Methods to find the necessary breakdowns for the white population were more various. Finding the number of adult sons and daughters required borrowing the number of sons per household from Allan Kulikoff's analysis of a census for Piscataway Parish in Prince George's County taken in 1776, and

[34] The calculations were:

Without Adjustment	
Households in 1755	1,250.00
Households in 1790	1,489.00
Growth Rate Over 35 Years	0.5011
Households in 1774 (19th Year)	1,374.53
With Adjustment	
(1,489 households in 1790 divided by .8923 [the proportion of stayers] =	1,668.78)
Households in 1755	1,250.00
Households in 1790	1,668.70
Growth Rate Over 35 Years	.8288
Households in 1774 (19th Year)	1,462.24

the number of daughters from the estimates of 1755.[35] These were .1800 and .4475 per household, respectively. Inventories once again provided an estimate of the number of wives. Over the years 1771-1777, of 156 male householders who left inventories, 110 were married, indicating 110 wives, or .7501 per household. Inventories also provided the figures for female heads of households, 13 of 156 heads, or .0833 per household. Male heads were then .9167 per household. As earlier, inventories served less directly to estimate male indentured servants. The ratio of servants to slaves in estates, when applied to the number of taxed slaves estimated for 1774, gave an estimate of .0203 male indentured servants per household.[36] There were no inventoried servant women. Indentured servants in this area had virtually disappeared from the labor force.

Two additional categories—male and female free inmates not otherwise accounted for—were residuals from the figures for white men and white women.[37] How many from these groups were hired servants or poor people supported by charity—information that had been available for 1755—is unknown but, for most questions, also unnecessary. Whether these people were hired servants, relatives, or boarders, almost all were wealthholders.[38] However, creating dependency ratios for 1774 (see Table IV of "Wealth and Welfare in Early Maryland") required distinguishing hired women servants. For this, we turned to the ratio in 1755 of hired women servants to the sum of hired women servants and other free women inmates who were not wives or daughters. Hired women in 1774 then became .1041 per household.[39] The resulting household structure is laid out in Table XI.

The calculations for personal wealth per head, per white, and per household were carried out as in earlier years, as were also calculations for land values. Prince George's County land prices—weighted for the small proportion of high-quality land along the Patuxent River—again stood for St. Mary's County land prices.[40] A debt book (a form of rent roll) for 1774 listed 188,937.16 acres of land, which, when divided by the number of households, produced 129.21 acres per household.[41] Multiplication by the price (£.684 per acre) produced a value of land per household of £88.38. Division of this figure by the number of people and white people in the house (see Table XI) gave the per head and per white head land values that appear in Table XII.

---

[35] Allan Kulikoff, "The Economic Growth of the Eighteenth-Century Colonies," *Journal of Economic History,* 39 (1979), 82.

[36] Servants in inventories, 1771-1777, came to 4, slaves came to 377, a ratio of .0106. Taxable slaves in 1774 were 1.9147 per household (see Table XI); .0106 x 1.9147 = .0203.

[37] For male inmates who were not sons or indentured servants, we started with the 2,107.19 white men shown in Table X. When divided by 1,462.24 households, there were 1.4410 white men per household. Subtraction of .9167 male household heads, .1800 adult sons, and .0203 indentured servants left .3241 other male inmates, all free. For female inmates who were not wives or daughters, we started with the 2,248.35 white women of Table X. When divided by the number of households, there were 1.5376 per household. Subtraction of .0833 female household heads, .7051 wives, and .4475 adult daughters left .3017 other free females.

[38] In 1755, there were .0374 poor untaxed men per household. Applying this figure to 1774 and tripling it to include poor women would make poor men and women not otherwise accounted for .1122 per household and lower the number of inmate wealthholders from 1.2454 to 1.1332. This change would reduce the total wealth per head shown in Table XII by £.45. The difference is not worth considering.

[39] Hired women servants per household in 1755 are .1250. Female inmates, not wives, daughters, or hired servants, in 1755 are .2373. The sum is .3623; .1250/.3623 = .3450. Hired servants plus other female inmates, not wives or daughters, in 1774 are .3017; .3017 x .345 = .1014 hired women servants.

[40] Prince George's County Land Records BB3, MSS, MSA, C1237-26, MdHR 5724.

[41] St. Mary's County Debt Book 41 (1774), MSA S 12-192, MdHR 17701-7.

Once more, distinguishing improved from unimproved land or land owned by residents of the county as opposed to absentee owners proved impossible. However, by this period the amount and value of unimproved land was undoubtedly very small compared to early in the eighteenth century. This information, if available, might raise the overall price of land and hence raise the estimate of land values. On the other hand, if absentee owners held any substantial amount, say, 10 percent, the estimates offered here are too high. At the moment, these calculations are the best available. The values as shown may still be an upper bound, but these problems do not seriously distort the overall results. The general patterns of growth remain.

The final step was to add land values to values of personal wealth to obtain total values of estates per head, per white head, and per household.