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Abstract
This is the study of one family's work in its expansive local and regional context, and how that work linked together most aspects of colonial life. Stratham, New Hampshire's Samuel Lane was a shoemaker, tanner, surveyor and farmer whose records--diaries, Day Books and miscellaneous papers--chronicle over sixty years of the eighteenth century. This thesis explores many specific devices used to live in that world. The exhaustive routine recorded, monotonous in its repetition, holds the germs of fundamental change.

The record's longevity and single viewpoint emphasizes connections rather than separations in rural family life, highlights complex relationships, and dissolves traditional historiographical dichotomies: male/female; household economy/market economy; agriculture/trade; and urban/rural. Although domestic production offers the illusion of self-sufficiency and market isolation, in reality that production gave the household power to participate in wide ranging markets rather than limiting it to some minimal standard of living.

Because Samuel Lane's life spanned most of the eighteenth century, change is an important, but subtle part of this story. Routine subsumes the dramatic effect of change, but over time similar activities conveyed different meanings. Lane tried to bequeath his children the world of his parents but it had changed, and unconsciously he with it. When he died in 1806 his outlook was more secular, market-oriented and consumption-minded than when he moved to Stratham in 1741. And his children, although raised in this conventional household, had changed with him.

Lane's world formed a social, cultural and economic continuum at any given point in time and over time. Significantly, his account of "settling in the World" included his generation and that of his children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. His life has much to contribute to the discussion of colonial family life and economic behavior. Although he used markets and embraced capitalistic processes in rural New Hampshire, his outlook was traditional. Ironically, in a changing world that fostered the very change it anticipated avoiding.
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ABSTRACT

"SETTLING IN THE WORLD": FAMILY ECONOMY IN COLONIAL NEW HAMPSHIRE THROUGH SAMUEL LANE'S DIARIES

by

Jerald E. Brown
University of New Hampshire, May, 1994

This is the study of one family's work in its expansive local and regional context, and how that work linked together most aspects of colonial life. Stratham, New Hampshire's Samuel Lane was a shoemaker, tanner, surveyor and farmer whose records - diaries, Day Books and miscellaneous papers - chronicle over sixty years of the eighteenth century. This thesis explores many specific devices used to live in that world. The exhaustive routine recorded, monotonous in its repetition, holds the germs of fundamental change.

The record's longevity and single viewpoint emphasizes connections rather than separations in rural family life, highlights complex relationships, and dissolves traditional historiographical dichotomies: male/female; household economy/market economy; agriculture/trade; and urban/rural. Although domestic production offers the illusion of self-sufficiency and market isolation, in reality that production gave the household power to participate in wide ranging markets rather than limiting it to some minimal standard of living.

Because Samuel Lane's life spanned most of the eighteenth century, change is an important, but subtle part of this story. Routine subsumes the dramatic effect of change, but over time similar activities conveyed
different meanings. Lane tried to bequeath his children the world of his parents but it had changed, and unconsciously he with it. When he died in 1806 his outlook was more secular, market-oriented and consumption-minded than when he moved to Stratham in 1741. And his children, although raised in this conventional household, had changed with him.

Lane's world formed a social, cultural and economic continuum at any given point in time and over time. Significantly, his account of "Settling in the World" included his generation and that of his children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. His life has much to contribute to the discussion of colonial family life and economic behavior. Although he used markets and embraced capitalistic processes in rural New Hampshire, his outlook was traditional. Ironically, in a changing world that fostered the very change it anticipated avoiding.

May, 1994
INTRODUCTION

"Settling in the World": Family Economy in Colonial New Hampshire through Samuel Lane's Diaries

Before dawn on Thanksgiving Day, November 21, 1793, Samuel Lane (1718-1806) of Stratham, New Hampshire, lay in bed "recollecting the Many Mercies and good things" for which he was thankful. After rising he wrote out a list of those things. The list was long for in his seventy-six years Samuel had led a satisfying and successful life by almost any standard of the day. From his windows he could look out over his shops and barn to fields beyond, and from his doorway watch the traffic pass on the main road from Portsmouth to Exeter. He could note the time of sunrise by his watch or listen for the chime of the clock from the great room. A certain excitement animated his reflective account; this chilly Thursday held the promise of going to church and hosting a family gathering.¹

Although he could not see it as such, this was a world of his own creation; it grew out of a cultural inheritance founded in religion, family and community. Within that intellectual and spiritual context, Samuel molded circumstances whenever possible to fit an ideal as he understood it, and he was confident that this life was as God ordained. He found no contradiction between the needs of his spirit and "the necessary business of life." On that Thanksgiving morning he gave thanks for physical comforts and luxuries such as clothes, "Bed & Beding" and "my Clock and Watch," not for their own sake, but for their

¹NHHS, Lane Papers, f1r 1-9.
aid in helping him and those around him lead a secure and productive life.

"Competency," "family security" and an agricultural "mentalité" have been forwarded to explain a colonial economic behavior supposedly distinct from a later capitalistic ethos. Samuel's experience illuminates and modifies this research, finding common ground in the competing ideas. The colonial farmer surely participated in markets for profit, but he calculated the rate of return on both an economic and non-economic basis. The financial security of his own generation was a primary goal which usually competed with his children's future needs, and his obligations to the community. In the rural New Hampshire of this period, unilateral self-interested action was a virtual impossibility.

Allen Kulikoff recently wrote:

If we are to understand the place of the colonies and new nation in rural development, we need a more complete metaphor, one that encompasses the farm (and the gender division of farm labor) and the rural community, the local marketplace and the world economy, the sweep of American history and the importance of particular periods and regions within it. The metaphor 'markets and households' embraces many of these concerns.

"Markets and households" are the essence of this Lane family tale. The story of Samuel's "settling" is a story of work - his own, his wife's, his children's and his neighbors'. It focuses on what they did and how

---


they did it. Only in the aftermath, with the deed accomplished, does any sense of his intent emerge. Viewed in this way, the work of one man and his family straddles the neat categories within which historians often analyze the past. If nothing else, Samuel Lane allows us to study farmers and markets, men and women, and children and parents in a way which exposes their interaction rather than their separation. His record illuminates the internal and external dynamics of work within one household, and through that household to the society at large.

Exchange on many different levels animated colonial society. Neighbor Mason paid Samuel at certain times and not others. Their relationship was multifaceted and their respective roles shifted subtly depending upon the circumstance. Even within the family various levels of commerce existed. Household production created an end product owned by the household, not simply its head although he had nominal control over it. Sons’ toil on the land rebounded to them just as daughters’ spinning and weaving might end up in their own chambers as married women. Clearly, inheritance was a joint venture and more than a simple transfer of wealth between generations. The results of domestic production, even when consumed in the household where it was produced, had wider implications. In many cases that output integrated households into local, regional and Atlantic markets by creating the resources necessary for participation in those markets. Far from isolating this farm household from the market, homespun linen allowed the Lane household to buy Madeira wines, and camblet woven on English looms.

The exchanges studied here are based on the extensive written record Samuel Lane left. From 1737 until 1801 he made daily observations in his diaries, 4” x 6¼” booklets, “wherein is Contain’d
1743.
We have had a pretty moderate winter the year past, and in the first of this summer there seems to be a prospect of a good crop of grass, but it was cut exceeding short many ways, some burnt up by the drought and abundance in many places, and devoured by an uncommon devouring worm, which worms came in such innumerable swarms as that they eat all before them, so were so thick in the spring time that they nearly made people sick when moving them, giving them a sudden shock. They were obliged to cut down all the wheat and other crops with all haste, or else the worms would devour all their fruits. They also eat the roots of all the plants, so that people that they would destroy all that the corn came on after the worms. But as it is this way a plentiful crop of the grasshoppers also in other places besides, the worms, destroying all abundance of grain, straw, or English corn, and which devours hay to be exceeding scarce this summer, we have had a pretty general year of health.

ILLUSTRATION 1 - Diary, December 1743 and summary

Page 4
or Pen'd Down Some Remarkable Providences as Thunder and Lightning &c with a general & particular account of the weather: also Some other Remarkables." Each page contains the comments for one month with the days of the week and month noted along the left-hand margin as was common at the time. Weather observations introduce each daily entry; noteworthy events follow. His laconic entries are not always clear; his January 12, 1737 observation, "a pleasant Day: Hannah Marsten died," presumably was no measure of his regard for Hannah.

Samuel probably inherited the practice of record keeping from his father, Joshua Lane, whose less comprehensive journal followed a practice described by Puritan cleric, Increase Mather: "In Order to the promoving [promoting] of a design of this Nature, so as shall be indeed for Gods Glory, and the good of Posterity, it is necessary that utmost care shall be taken that All and Only Remarkable Providences be Recorded and Published." Mather urged "Such Divine Judgements, Tempests, Floods, Earth-quakes, Thunders as are unusual" be noted. Samuel filled his diaries with such observations, but Mather's overriding interest was in the spiritual, "Witchcrafts, Diabolical Possessions, Remarkable Judgements upon noted Sinners, eminent Deliverances, and Answers of Prayer, are to be reckoned among Illustrious Providences." 4 Joshua Lane's journal was more akin to Mather's design stressing the "Divine." Although son Samuel was apt to view events as divine punishments or deliverances in the earlier years, his diaries are overwhelmingly secular in nature.

---

Intensely personal and without pretense, these diaries recorded the weather and how a man coped with its extremes, life, death and sickness in his family and the wider community, the cycle of sowing and reaping, prices and credit, the state of religion, and natural phenomena as comets, eclipses, and hurricanes. In Samuel Lane’s world Washington’s election in 1788 was not nearly as noteworthy as his passing through Stratham on tour the following year. These events were public and important and these “personal” diaries were intended as a public document; his world blurred the distinction between public and private. “Many of my friends and Neibors Enquiring of me whether I Knew a season like this:” he wrote in his later life, “and by looking back in my Journales I find one Something Similar, vizt in 1772.” The year end summaries contain what Samuel himself might have considered public, a summary of the weather, crop conditions, prices, and notable social and political events; he never mentioned his family at the year’s end.

In addition to his diaries the Lane collection includes “a Day-Book of Debt & credit” for many years. These Day Books chronicle exchanges of goods and labor, and help explain the brief, often mystifying, comments found in his diaries. Deeds, surveys, letters, contracts, and other miscellaneous documents round out the collection of Samuel Lane’s papers. The scope of this record is enormous and detail abounds. He noted “Simeons work in 1789. was but 2½ Days, which he finish’d in the forenoon, & went to the Baptist Meeting after Dinner.” Samuel was not prepared to pay Simeon for a full day’s work when he left early – even if it was to go to church.

This record is rarely reflective as written; it gives a day-to-day account of life as he lived it at that point in time. However,
there are two distinct types of writings in the collection. Diaries and
day books are specific in detailing what actually happened as it
happened. He wrote several other documents later which do provide some
reflection on events past, particularly his Journal and a chart, "The
Years of the Life of Samuel Lane." These constitute his reflections on
events and were written well after those events occurred. In the main
Samuel's papers are reflective only in their entirety. His faithful
observation of the weather and its prominent place at the start of each
daily entry points to it as the most important determinant of his daily
activity. Other entries show how, over time, his interests and
activities changed as his family prospered and matured. Perhaps most
revealing is their frequency of appearance and absence; those patterns
reveal intent, behavior and changing mores over almost the entire
eighteenth century. Laurel Thatcher Ulrich recognized this in a
midwife's diary, "it is in the very dailiness, the exhaustive,
repetitious dailiness, that the real power of Martha Ballard's book
lies." Sir William Osler saw force in this type of record. "Nothing
will sustain you more potently," he wrote, "than the power to recognize
in your humdrum routine, as perhaps it may be thought, the true poetry
of life." Samuel's complete record is a rich mosaic, "true poetry,"
and its "power" lies in its comprehensive scope.

The theme of change underlies the life of Samuel Lane's family.

---

5 Charles Lane Hanson, ed. A Journal for the Years 1739-1803 By Samuel
Lane of Stratham, New Hampshire (Concord, N.H.: New Hampshire Historical
Society, 1937); and "The Years of the Life of Samuel Lane," NHHS, Lane
Papers.
6 Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, A Midwife's Tale The Life of Martha Ballard,
7 Sir William Osler, The Student Life, cited by John Bartlett, Familiar
It spanned the eighteenth century, a century of transformation and upheaval, yet on the surface his world appears to have remained exceptionally constant. Even the most elemental political changes, independence from Britain and the ensuing war, barely affected the patterns of daily life for the Lane household. The important influences, those that might disrupt lives lay close to home for Samuel Lane. Because his world was local, he could incorporate many changes into his world view, make them serve his purpose and provide continuity. Basic priorities remained untouched by the social, economic, and political events that buffeted him. The core of Samuel's life was bound by personal and local relationships; that web provided security for his family and by extension for his community.

But his diaries detail the irony of the change resulting from his attempts to maintain the status quo of his parents' world. Divine judgments, Samuel's earlier explanation for "Illustrious Providences," eventually give way to rationale grounded in natural causes or human contrivance. Physical work was central to his life, but grandsons matriculating at the Academy in Exeter or Harvard College were a part of his family's forward motion. He hoped to preserve his world, and by doing so sustain that of his children and their children. However, the future Samuel Lane made for his family was a combination of both old and new. Outwardly, few changes appeared in the routine of family life over the decades, but at his death Samuel's children, pursuing the same work in much the same way he did, were of a different mind and age.

This record, written by a man, focused on men. However, others lurk in the shadows and come to light, if not explicitly, then through continual activity which happens with no apparent motive force. The
space between the lines in Samuel's diaries, once fleshed out, is the
real story. The routine of sixty years exposes relationships and
exchanges that underlay the predominantly male activity recorded. The
work of male and female, both young and old, supported the system of
household production which was at the center of colonial life.

Samuel Lane's cosmos was defined and shaped by relationships that
crossed age, gender, ethnic and social lines. The patriarchal household
may have been a fixture on the landscape, but authority did not flow
unimpeded along clearly delineated lines. Children influenced their
parents, servants their masters and wives their husbands. A daily
routine slightly altered, the return of a purchase of cloth or a dung-
laden hide all provide the clues to redefine relationships often
considered static into fluid networks of interchange. Control and power
rested with males, but family culture circumscribed a rigidly
hierarchical family structure.

Samuel Lane's New Hampshire roots stem from the marriage of his
grandparents, Sarah Webster and William Lane. They moved to a ten acre
land grant in Hampton from Boston in 1686. Joshua Lane, Samuel's
father, was born ten years later. He married a local woman, Bathsheba
Robie, and they raised a large family. Joshua farmed and made shoes,
was a deacon of the church and held town office. Their oldest child
Samuel, absorbed this activity and later emulated it. As an adult
Samuel looked to those years in his parents' household for guidance when
considering his own family's future.

Samuel wrote little of his early years. He went to Hampton's
public school, was tutored briefly in Latin and in his late teens
learned to survey land. This formal education was not the dominant feature of his childhood, but it was important. Samuel was an avid reader who acquired "a handsome collection of books;" his literary interests dulled only with his eyesight. However, the major focus of his education was a five year cordwaining (shoemaking) apprenticeship with his father, during which he also acquired tanning skills and helped his father build a tanyard. This early training in the shoemaking and tanning trades blossomed into a business that supplied footwear to both Stratham's farmers and Portsmouth's gentry. And his training as a surveyor led to an appointment as assistant to the Surveyor of His Majesty's Lands by Benning Wentworth in 1750, the beginning of a distinguished career in that and related fields.

Samuel's twenty-first birthday, October 6, 1739 (old style), marked the end of his indenture with his father and the beginning of his independence. He carried on the trade learned in his father's shop and continued a courtship begun eighteen months earlier with Mary James, the daughter of Hampton weaver Benjamin James. Surely the expectation of marriage to Mary prompted his search, beginning in 1740, for land upon which to settle. Eventually he found an affordable lot in Stratham, a town abutting Hampton on the west, during the winter of 1741. In June he moved to Stratham to supervise the raising of a house, and on Christmas Eve 1741 Mary James and he married. She came to set up housekeeping at Stratham two weeks later.

Thus, by his twenty-fifth year Samuel was well on his way to

---

8After 1752 and the adoption of a new calendar Samuel's birthday was October 18. He noted the change in his 1752 diary, "Sept this year by the Kings Act hath but 19 Days to be according to New Stil and begins 1.2.14.15 &c."
fulfilling the role set out for him by his family and his community, and embraced by him without question. Circumstances forced him from the ideal, which would have been settling in Hampton where both the James and Lane families lived. However, the framework was set for the couple to contribute to the life of provincial society. From this point his own family grew upon, and itself nurtured, the rich and fertile heritage he and Mary had gleaned from their parents' households.

Stratham was one of several "offshoots of Portsmouth," a village developed on the Massachusetts model during the seventeenth century. 9 Settled as the Squamscot Patent, inhabitants were granted town privileges in 1716; it lay on the main road between Exeter and Portsmouth and is bounded by Great Bay, Greenland, North Hampton, Exeter and Newmarket. Stratham has about five miles of waterfront on Great Bay and the Squamscott River, referred to as the Salt River by Samuel. The town's nearly sixteen square miles hosts several hills approaching 300 feet, but mostly "the surface of Stratham is rolling, and the soil very fertile and productive." 10 In 1732 the population of 660 people lived in 99 two story dwellings. 11

Samuel and Mary went about constructing their married life in their new town. He improved his homestead, adding to their house, building shops and digging tanning pits, constructing buildings to carry on his trade and farm, and clearing the additional land they purchased.

---

Mary bore eight children and ran household enterprises which included the dairy, gardens, and textile production as well as the innumerable tasks associated with eighteenth-century rural life.

Recent research finds that farm prosperity depended on the combination of agriculture with other trades in order to use labor productively during slack seasons. Samuel founded his financial success upon his leather-related trades, yet he devoted an increasing amount of time to his farm. "This year Son Joshua Tans in his own yard," he noted on his 59th birthday, "& I having but little help, & much Husbandry work to do, & Strength failing I tan but little, only 9 Hides & 4 Calfskins." His farm came to be the central feature of his activity and a manifestation of "Esquire" Lane's comfortable existence. He sowed wheat, rye, peas, turnips, Indian corn, oats, pumpkins, potatoes, cabbages, tobacco and flax, and cut a good deal of hay to feed cows, oxen, sheep and horses over New Hampshire's long winter. The improvements he made to his lands, the meticulous records he kept, his willingness to experiment with new crops and methods, and his links with the Portsmouth market mark him as an agricultural innovator.

He also surveyed land, locally and in the western towns being

---


settled at that time. Surveying the township of Holderness in 1748 was
"the first time I ever Camp'd in the Woods"; later that year he "Set
out to Perambulate Bow Line", the first of many trips he made for the
Bow Proprietors. In 1754 he was chosen Proprietors' Clerk and in
addition to surveying, he did a considerable amount of legal work,
particularly regarding boundary disputes between Bow and its
neighbors.15

His legal and surveying work, leather trade, and agricultural
surplus necessitated trips to Portsmouth at least twice a month to
transact legal business and for trade on his account and often on those
of his neighbors. The bulk of his trade was the exchange of shoes for
finished, imported goods or staples such as sugar and molasses. In 1768
two Portsmouth merchants alone, Charles Treadwell and Jacob Sheafe,
purchased 92 pair of shoes from Lane. In return he carried back to
Stratham a variety of goods for use in his household and for resale
locally. Molasses, sugar, "bisket", tea, coffee, salt, limes, rum,
brandy, wine, and dry goods - silk, buttons, satin, ribbon, thread,
linen, lace - appeared regularly in his accounts as well as dining ware
and other household items.

However much Samuel traded with Portsmouth's elite - Wentworths,

15 By the mid-eighteenth century proprietors were "those persons, either
resident or non-resident, who had a right to share in the division of
the common and undivided lands" of New England towns. As Proprietor's
Clerk, Lane's duties were: "to serve notices of the meetings to the
members of the propriety; to record all acts and votes passed at all
legal proprietors' meetings; to enter all divisions or sale of land
with surveys and boundaries; to transact all the business of the
propriety between meetings...and to attend to the correspondence;"
Obviously, the clerk played a vital role in the propriety. Roy
Hidemichi Akagi, *The Town Proprietors of the New England Colonies*
(Philadelphia: Press of the University of Pennsylvania, 1924), pp. 4,
64-5.
Sheafes, Treadwells and Wibirds – his main interests were rooted in and around Stratham. The Lanes raised eight children, five daughters and three sons. The sons settled in Stratham, while only one daughter, Martha Boardman, stayed in the immediate area. The other daughters moved to the “upper towns” of Sanbornton and Northwood. Samuel’s exchanges in regional markets not only increased his wealth but also, and perhaps more importantly, preserved it for his posterity. By 1760 large quantities of merchant goods from Portsmouth were entering the Lane household, many of which were destined for his children, particularly for the Lane girls upon their marriage. He collected substantial portions of furniture, cloth, kitchen utensils, and dinnerware, and valued “the things I give to my Daughter Mary Crockett toward her portion Dec 5th 1762” at £1298.16

His sons fit into this overall pattern too. When Samuel and Joshua, his two eldest sons, married he established each on a farm in Stratham. He reserved the homestead for his youngest son, Jabez. Comparing the gifts made to his children by value indicates a bias toward his male progeny. The real property each son received was worth nearly five times more than any gift to his daughters. However, such measures mask the complexity of colonial culture. Ironically, the daughters’ portions linked them more closely to both provincial and Atlantic markets than did the property given his sons. These women began their married lives with a valuable selection of imported textiles, china and a variety of housewares unavailable in rural areas except through trade. The girls’ own spinning and weaving became a part of their portions, and this homespun production also freed resources to

16NHHS, Lane Papers, flr 1-3.
allow the Lane household to become more deeply embedded in colonial markets. Before they took wedding vows, the Lane daughters had been introduced to a consumer culture that would gain increasing momentum in the post-Revolutionary period.17

These marriage portions compare favorably with the valuable farms passed to his sons if viewed in a family rather than an individual context. As husbands were expected to bring substantial real property into a marriage, the combination of that with the household goods created the material basis for founding a family. The equality then is found between family units created, not between brother and sister.18 Thus Samuel sought to achieve a rough equality among his sons and among his daughters as distinct groups. To have sought absolute equality among them as individuals would have created an imbalance and injustice within their colonial world.

Familial responsibility extended beyond the home to include active participation in both town and church affairs. Samuel served in many town offices and was a delegate to the Fourth Provincial Congress in Exeter from May to November, 1775. Closely allied with that service is his personal devotion and Church service. He wrote in 1739:

as I am this day 21 years of age and about to begin in ye world for my selfe I am resolved by the grace of God enabling of me, to begin ye world in the fear of God and to live to his glory so Long as he shall continue me in the world, and to make the word of God my rule, to make christ the pattern of my life...to watch as much over the

inward motions of my heart as the outward actions of my life, to be always exercising my thots upon good objects. to Speak reverently to my Superiours humbly to my inferiours & civilly to all. and to do my duty to all.19

One of those "outward actions" was his selection as a deacon of the Stratham Church in 1765; soon thereafter he was appointed a member of the committee "to obtain a good decent, Convenient Meeting House in the Town." Under the deacon's mantle he kept church accounts, represented Stratham at ordinations in neighboring churches and assisted at the communion table. He became an elder in 1800 and continued to attend services despite his deafness. His faith, manifested in this service, was one of the major building blocks of his world. This faith was so integral to his life that it required little comment in his writings. He felt no need to note the obvious. His outlook, a mixture of acceptance and hope, was typical of the eighteenth century. When his wife, Mary, died it was both "a Holy and Righteous Providence indeed; but an irreparable loss to me & my Children."20

Religion framed Samuel's world. Sometimes his sentiments are explicit: "Distressing Scarcity for provisions in many places &c yet these threatening tokens of the Displeasure of heaven against us are but verry little taken Notice of neither do the Inhabitants of the Land Learn Righteousness;" or "people Seem to be more worldly carnal loose & vicious than ever, Lamentable Lamentable Lamentable."21 Mankind's errant ways remained a puzzle to him throughout his long life. He attended sensational murder trials and public executions to study human behavior in an attempt to identify the roots of human sin.

Certain elements of this world began to unravel during the decade

19NHHS, Lane Papers, flr. 1-3.
20Journal, p. 41.
21diary, 1748.
of the 1760s. Dissatisfaction with imperial rule appeared in New Hampshire and Samuel's experience is probably typical. He was a loyal subject of the King; in 1760 he wrote of George II, "we lost a good king on the 25th of oct." Despite loyalty to the crown, democratic leanings were evident a few years later. His criticism of British policy in previous periods had been clothed in religious rhetoric. "We have had a larg Army at Lake George under Lord Louden," Samuel wrote in 1757 during the Seven Years' War, "but Little or Nothing done against our Enemies; tho' at a Vast Expence." Then the blame for this lay not with the Imperial administration, but elsewhere, "All our Attempts against our Enemies Seem to be frustrated, & frown'd upon by Heaven; Sin greatly prevails in our land & Nation, & the Judgements of God Little Regarded by us in genral So that we Seem to be a People Ripening for Destruction."  

Ten years later the onus shifted to the British government; he protested British policy in November 1767 when he "left of Dr-nk-ng T-a." The use of this code, substituting dashes for vowels, in a political context is significant. He employed it primarily in his diaries to record sexually-related and reproductive activity; barnyard breeding warranted such caution, "S-w took Bo-r [Sow took Boar]." Like sex this political act, boycotting tea, was both necessary and scurrilous, too scurrilous for direct statement even in his own diary. In 1770 he described the Boston Massacre, "4 Men killed in Boston by ye Soldiers."  

By then human hands, and British hands in particular, not divine Providence, instigated the incident. In such sentiments lay the germs for revolution.

---

22 Diary, 1756 Summary.
23 Diary, 3/5/70.
Clearly a proponent of "the rights of America", Samuel served on a town committee that protested the 1773 tea act, and was Stratham's delegate to New Hampshire's Fourth Provincial Congress at Exeter in 1775. However, the notion of complete separation from the crown was a different matter; this colonial was no radical. In January 1776 he helped compose a petition from Stratham to the Committee of Safety at Portsmouth protesting that the committee's actions looked "too much like an open Declaration of Independency, which we can by no Means Countenance." Perhaps the "Pamphlet call'd Common Sense" in his library and "the Most Unnatural Civil War" raging in the northeast changed his views on Independence for later that same year he signed the Association Test, casting his lot with the rebels.24 Conservative by nature and frightened by the unknown inherent in the patriot cause, he described the dilemma of active opposition to British rule in 1775, "in short the Continent are in the Utmost Distress & Confusion & know not what to do."25 His imperial inertia only slowly changed course toward independence. He made no mention of it in his 1776 diaries, but the following year he proclaimed the birth of the new nation on the front cover of his diary, "NB. on the 4th of July last the Grand Congress at Philadelphia Declarr'd the 13 United Colonies Independant on the King of Great Brittain."26 Once committed, Samuel expressed no doubts of his

24 On April 12, 1776, the New Hampshire Committee of Safety requested each town to administer the following declaration, "WE, the Subscribers, do hereby solemnly engage, and promise, that we will, to the utmost of our Power, at the Risque of our Lives and Fortunes, with ARMS, oppose the Hostile Proceedings of the British Fleets, and Armies, against the United American COLONIES." On September 3, 1776 131 Stratham men signed, 42 refused. Albert Stillman Batchelor, ed., New Hampshire State Papers, Vol. 30:2, 145-48.
25Diary, 1775 Summary.
26Diary, 1777.
decision to support the patriot cause.

Amidst the murmurs of rebellion Mary died in 1769. Isaiah Lane recorded her passing, "JanY 30 B° Samuel Lanes wife Died with a consumption." She was 47 and had been sick off and on since her first pregnancy. Except for her final illness, her recurrent "sickness" appears related to her pregnancies. Her "Weakly" condition was relative; Mary Lane gave birth to and raised eight children.

Her passing raised a host of complications for the widower. His devotion to Mary was a mixture of affection and practicality. Mary was "an Agreeable Wife," his most tender description for his mate, but that regard stemmed equally from her role as mother to their family and as his wife. The two roles were inseparable in Samuel's mind, and her death had two dimensions; it was "an irreparable loss to me & my children." 27 The year Mary died only one child, their eldest daughter Mary, had married and left the household. With the exception of nine year old Jabez and twelve year old Martha, the rest of the children were in their teens. Thus, aside from his emotional loss and the cultural imperatives stressing marriage, as a widower Samuel had to consider the logistics of raising his children as well.

Boston diarist Samuel Sewell found himself similarly situated in 1718 when he wrote, "Wandering in my mind whether to live a Married or a Single Life." Alice Morse Earle called this musing "naive." 28 If Samuel Lane too, was considering a single life, that option quickly faded. By the end of 1769 he visited widow Cate and visits to other

27 Journal, p. 41.
eligible women followed. Four years later he married Rachel (Parsons) colcord, a Newmarket widow.29

With his family whole once again, Samuel resumed his work as before. The Revolution was disruptive, especially with respect to money and markets, but it did not upset his routine or life in Stratham to any appreciable extent. After the initial hostilities, New Hampshire was far removed from the smoke, noise and ravages of battle. And Samuel's fatherly duties expanded with his second marriage. As step-father to seven colcord children, he helped them with advice, loans, work and regularly took his wife to visit them. Also Samuel took Rachel's youngest son Benjamin as his apprentice.

The debilitating effects of old age awaited him after the Revolution and peace. While his children provided grandchildren at a rapid rate, death also took its toll on his extended family. Beginning in 1752 with the death of brother-in-law Jabez James, he noted the passing of in-laws and siblings, and in 1792 he buried his oldest daughter Mary Crocket in Northwood. "This year I Did little or no work in the Tanyard;" a 72 year old Samuel wrote in 1790 because "my strength failing, and but little help."30 The year before he fell from his horse returning from Portsmouth and strained his back, another manifestation of his increasingly burdensome failing health. He recorded a litany of afflictions - "Rheumatic Pain", "Shaking Fit", "vomiting", deafness - and the sense of his own mortality sharpened as he made observations such as that of April 27, 1791, "I Measur'd (Assist'd by Grandson James

29 "June 22.1774. I Married my Second Wife; She was Born (at Cape Ann) June [29, 1726 old Stile] She is 7 years 9 Months & 7 Days younger than I am."
30 Journal, p. 56.
Lane) Josiah Thirstons Land: which is the last I ever Expect to Measure."\(^{31}\)

"Made my Self & boy Jms Rollings, Each a pair of Shoes in my 86\(^{th}\) year."\(^{32}\) A simple statement of fact, this 1798 note encapsulates the essence of Samuel's life during his last years. In one respect he looked to a future of declining productivity and deteriorating health. Making shoes had been common a few years earlier, unworthy of notice. Its very inclusion in his diary at this point signified it "remarkable." But it also signified his acknowledgment and pride in his life of work. In a sense those two pair of shoes were a validation of his contribution to the world in which he lived. But making those shoes was a bittersweet achievement and a reminder of a life which was nearing completion. Samuel lived for eight more years; he was blind and deaf when he died on December 29, 1806.

This study is divided into four sections with each focusing on a specific aspect of Samuel's work: shoemaking and tanning; surveying, writing and legal work; trading and mercantile activity; and farming. These sections follow the rough chronology of his life in that the progression here corresponds to his interests as they shifted over time. Just as his parents' interests passed on to him, so did his children take up and build upon the life their parents provided in their home. Thus, his description of "Setling in the World" refers not only to his experience, but also to his children "Setling" in their world.

\(^{31}\)Diary, 4/27/91.
\(^{32}\)Journal, p. 60.
I. "I work'd up my lether"

By 1781 Samuel Lane's youngest son Jabez was 21 years old and working in his father's tanyard. On April 5, a warm spring day with occasional rain, Jabez put ten hides in a vat to soak off the dirt and flesh while his father went to the Exeter court; more than two weeks later he "work'd them," scraping off the debris, and "put them into the Limes" where they remained for six weeks. Jabez wrote in his "Tanyard Journal, "took hides out of Limes...unhair'd & fleshed and laid the Sole Leather 1st Layer June 2nd Day," a day his father was supervising the shearing of sheep. Jabez repeated this cycle throughout the summer until the hides were removed from the tanning pits as leather in the late fall. This process had been repeated on the same site for the previous forty years, first by Samuel and later by his sons.¹

This dimension of Samuel's work, tanning and shoemaking, is most of all a story of his youth and early adulthood. As a child he trained at his father's side to be a shoemaker, and in an intriguing turn of events he also acquired tanning skills. His apprenticeship, independence and own establishment as a household head illustrates a pattern followed by many colonial families. Samuel's education revolved about his work in this sphere, and that work in turn gave him the ability to settle his own family.

Samuel worked at tanning and cordwaining consistently throughout his life, and these crafts were the foundation of his prosperity. They held little glory or glitter. As Edwin Tunis has written, "When the

¹NHHS, Lane Papers, Samuel Lane Diary, 4/5/81, 6/2/81; Jabez Lane, "A Tanyard Journal," 1781.
wind was wrong, nearly every village in early America was within
smelling distance of a tanyard.2 Every town needed a tanner, and
leather-related trades were an important adjunct to colonial
agriculture. These activities point to the crucial link between
colonial life and land; many necessities produced for New Hampshire's
populace were supported by both land and craft skills. This connection
distinguished the rural craftsman from his urban counterpart.

Samuel took in hides from surrounding farms, bought bark for use
as tannin and employed local men and boys as laborers in his tanyard and
shop. In return he produced the leather which became footwear,
clothing, aprons, hinges, horsewhips and a wide variety of other
essential items. The significant number of Stratham residents who
traded with him for shoes or leather identifies these enterprises as
important elements of Stratham's rural economy. And this trade extended
beyond Stratham's borders. His shoes were stocked in the shops of
Portsmouth merchants and worn by that provincial capital's residents.
In fact the consumption of leather grew sufficiently in the cattle-
raising areas of the Northeast so that hides had to be imported to
satisfy the demand. In his diary Samuel mentioned "oversea Hides," and
in 1782 his son Jabez kept accounts for both "Spanish Hides," and "this
country Hides."3

The leather-related trades discussed here open a window on the
internal workings of Stratham's families and economy. Following
Samuel's childhood and early adulthood in Hampton reveals a basic
pattern repeated by his own sons. It illustrates the necessity in rural

2Edwin Tunis, Colonial Craftsmen and the Beginnings of American Industry
areas of training in several fields; small and dispersed settlement meant specialization was rarely a lucrative possibility. Samuel was able to procure the necessary labor for his growing farm through exchange for shoes, and was able to accumulate sizable capital in addition. Although each son served an apprenticeship with his father, a number of other relatives and boys apprenticed with Samuel learning the art and mystery of the trade.

This section explores the mechanics of tanning and shoemaking, the labor system those trades employed and its context within a newly established rural household. Such success in a "lowly" trade would not have been possible in urban Portsmouth or Boston. In agricultural Stratham it provided prosperity, social standing and a future for this family.
"I began to Learn to Make Shoes"

Sometime in the latter years of the eighteenth century, probably in 1794 or 1795 when he was in his late seventies, Samuel Lane prepared a chart summarizing what he considered the main events of his long life. At its head he wrote, "The Years of the Life of Samuel Lane, Born at Hampton oct.6.1718. with somethings Remarkable Respecting Business & Setling in the World, Births of Children & Grandchildren, Deaths &c as they happened in Each year of his Life."\(^1\) He drew horizontal lines creating long narrow spaces on the 18X24 inch sheet of paper. Samuel widened these rows of information as years passed and the number of salient events increased. The striking visual feature of this document is the amount of empty space he left for the first eighteen years of his life; after that he filled each space with happenings both personal and public, from his own marriage in 1741 to the capture of Cape Breton by colonial troops in 1745. Given his proclivity to remember and record it is somewhat mystifying that he chose not to relate more concerning those early years.

In fact the chart really begins with Samuel's adult life, and more detail appears after he "was Rec'd into the Church at Hampton," in his eighteenth year. But family matters he considered private - births, deaths and marriages within his family - appear with regularity only after his marriage in 1741. The recording of these events extended not only to his immediate family, but to children and grandchildren, and he noted the deaths of his extended family including his in-laws. Before his elevation to married household head however, virtually all the

\(^1\)NHHS, Lane Papers, "Years of the Life."
remarks denote milestones in his life as an individual outside of any family context. This was a record of the family he headed and what happened before was not pertinent.

Certainly one unforgettable occurrence was the death of his younger brother Josiah when Samuel was ten. Joshua Lane, Samuel's father, described that illness in his journal:

on munday my son Josiah was taken ill with a feaver though he was able to sit up a spell every Day untill that Day week and we were in hopes every Day that he was Rather Better than worse but on munday-following and so untill Saterday was exceeding ill but then seem'd to be better and we in great hopes his distemper was Broke...but the night following he seemed to be worse and the next day which was Lords Day he was very ill...he continued untill Tuesday night about midnight or Rather past - he fell asleep in Jesus-2

The presence of the deadly throat distemper in the household and the prolonged illness of this five year old child must have thrown the house into alternating moods of hope and despair; his father noted that "his groans were enough to pierce ye stoutest heart." However, that episode earned no mention in "The Years of the Life." All Samuel's writings ignore his childhood.

A citation from Ecclesiastes, "Childhood and Youth are Vanity," is Samuel's lone characterization of his first four years.3 That his own youth required little comment and virtually no detail in "The Years of the Life" substantiates Karin Calvert's contention that before 1750 "society defined children as inchoate adults, and childhood as a period of inadequacy." Samuel expressed this "inadequacy" by white space on his chart; his own youth in Calvert's words had "no positive attributes

---

2NHHS, Lane Family Papers, Joshua Lane Journal.
3Ecclesiastes 11, v. 10.
of its own considered worthy of expression. Such attitudes were
common; Edward Channing's 1836 account summarized William Ellery's
childhood in one sentence, "William, his second son, was born in
Newport, December 22, 1727, and with his elder brother, was entered at
Harvard College, probably in 1743." Calvert found that over the
century "the perception of childhood had changed from one of a period of
vulnerability and deficiency...to that of a vital preparatory stage." Samuel's diary reflects this changing attitude by noting his own
children's milestones; on April 8, 1752 he proclaimed "this Day my Son
Samll being 5 years & 11 Months old finish'd a pair of shoes for his
youngest sister." In his reflective documents the corresponding event
during his own youth was unworthy of note.

Just when the "vanity" of youth ended in colonial America varied
from household to household, but other sources seem to corroborate
Lane's view of his earliest years. John Cotton recommended that the
first seven years of life be spent at "lawful recreation." After that
work or a "calling" was appropriate. In Plymouth John Demos found that
after age six or seven, "the young boy appeared as a miniature of his
father, and the young girl as a miniature of her mother." Apart from
these earliest years of childhood, "there is no sense that each

---

4 Karin Calvert, Children in the House The Material Culture of Early
51-2.
5 Cited in Calvert, p. 73.
6 Calvert, p. 60.
7 Diary, 4/8/52.
8 John C. Miller, The First Frontier: Life in Colonial America (New
by 1790 cited in Calvert; "The first seven years of life are a period
of greater importance in the business of education, than is generally
imagined," p. 61.
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generation required separate spheres of work or recreation.⁹ The emphases, or more properly lack thereof, in "The Years of the Life of Samuel Lane," support this meaning of colonial childhood.

At age five Samuel's youthful existence ended when "he began to go to School to Mr. Wingate." Hampton had provided schooling for its children "to write and read and cast accountes" since 1649, and though no records name the teachers during the 1720's, presumably Mr. Wingate was the teacher in the town supported school.¹⁰ Samuel offered no details about his schooling although it is clear his literacy and arithmetic facility stemmed from these beginnings. It appeared at age eight that education or the ministry might be his vocation. "...I had a Pain in my Knee," he remarked, "which was the Cause of my being Sent to School to Lattin." Mr. Tuck was his "lattin" teacher.¹¹

The statement implies that Samuel was a reluctant Latin scholar. "The Cause of my being Sent to School to Lattin" is almost an apology; he did not go willingly but was "Sent." In fact, this development was an obstacle to overcome and his successful navigation of these dangerous waters came two years later when he stated without remorse, "I began to Learn to Make Shoes." Replacing Latin with shoemaking Samuel reentered the world of Hampton he knew; to him the future lay in continuing the work of his father as a cordwainer, producing tangible goods and contributing to the welfare of his family. For the next five years, until he was sixteen in 1734, he pursued his rightful calling, "I work'd

¹¹Years of the Life."
at the Shoemakers Trade as my Principle Business these years." 12 How different is the outlook of this rural craftsman, from that of the colonial urban elite. Samuel Seabury, the son of an Episcopal minister whose fortunes were in decline, was forced to apprentice to a New York City furniture maker; his thoughts on the way to his indentured service were a world away from those of the young Lane. Seabury wrote, "My cousin was going to college an honor for which I felt I would have given the world - and I was going - even then I writhed at the thought - to learn a trade!" 13

Following in his father's trade rather than an academic life was Samuel's ordained lot, at least to his own and his parents' minds. Schooling was important to him as a vehicle for success in his business and in his personal, intellectual, and religious development. Its importance was grounded in earlier notions that education primarily served moral development. His sense of humor appeared in 1738 when he wrote on the cover of his diary, "by me: Samuel Lane (not) Master of Arts (nor yet) Student in Physick & Astronomy." That year Samuel had nearly completed a successful apprenticeship with his father, and the totality of that experience indicates that Samuel's ambition never included formal education much beyond that offered in Hampton's schools. His aspirations lay with achievements in the various branches of work he pursued. That he would consider being a student at that stage of his life is antithetical to all his prior experience. His comment if anything is ironic, a passing glance at circumstances which lay outside his imagination of his own future. His deference to learned men was a

12 "Years of the Life."
manifestation of the recognition that formal education was pivotal to
certain men, although he did not believe himself to be within that
circle. Samuel's own rise in status coupled with the cultural
implications of the Revolution marked his grandson's matriculation at
Harvard as exceptional, but within his orbit.\footnote{Years of the Life.} Graduating from Harvard
in 1799, Joshua was the first Lane to reach that milestone. However,
the financial situation of his forebears in the late 1730's and their
craft tradition conspired to eliminate this as a possibility, or even a
desirable eventuality, for his grandfather.

During the first half of the eighteenth century in Hampton Samuel
was compelled to follow his father's calling. His father's economic
circumstances, increasingly strained by his growing family, required
that he have help in his shop and around the farm. Shoemaking was a
trade that could be learned at a young age and Samuel was ready and
available early to provide support. A "cohesive world of family and
work," the shoemaker's universe combined with Hampton's circumstances to
alongside his father in the family shop probably sharing many of his
father's tools.

Making shoes required four fundamental steps. First, the upper
part of the shoes and the soles were cut from leather. The uppers were
then stitched together, stretched over a wooden form or last, and tacked
into place. Finally, the uppers, assuming the shape of the foot while
attached to the last, were sewn to the sole. A basic shoemaker’s kit contained eight tools: a knife, awl, needle, pincers, last, hammer, lapstone, and stirrup. An established shop such as Joshua Lane’s would have contained a wider variety of tools and devices to produce shoes of quality. At Lynn, Massachusetts, the center of New England shoe production during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries:

the following tools and appliances were regarded as essential: A lap-stone, hammer, stirrup, whet-board, pincers, nippers, - sometimes– shoulder-stick (one or more), long stick, petitbois, toe-stick, fender, bead, scraper, knives of different descriptions, such as skiver, paring-off knife, heel-knife, etc., awl, bristles, tacks, wax, a piece of sponge, pastehorn, bottles for blacking, gum - and acid in later times - chalk, dogfish skin...stitch-rag, grease, channel-opener - usually called an open-channel - and apron.

Joshua Lane’s shop was quite possibly a room in his house. His will mentions a dwelling house, barn and barkhouse, but no shop.

The raw material for making shoes, animal skins, were plentiful in Hampton’s agricultural surroundings. Livestock supported commercial agriculture in New England although most farms hosted but a few animals. Barreled beef was a staple New England export to the West Indies during this period. Cattle were slaughtered annually and the hides, tanned into leather, served a wide variety of purposes. Soles were cut from tough but somewhat flexible cattle hides. The shoe uppers came from

---

17 David N. Johnson, Sketches of Lynn or the Changes of Fifty Years (Lynn: Thos. P. Nichols, Printer, 1880), p. 31.
18 Joshua Lane Will, 12/16/60, NHHS, Lane Family Papers.
softer leathers made from kid or calf skins which retained their shape
while adapting to the foot's contour.\textsuperscript{20} Most of the hides tanned by the
Lanes came from neighboring farms although their own herd provided some.
In 1737 Joshua Lane tanned five calf skins from his own animals out of a
total of 120 made into leather that year.\textsuperscript{21}

Although the shoemaking process was straightforward, the
shoemaker's craft did involve the "art and mystery" mentioned often in
eyard indentures. Shoe quality varied with design, the quality of the
leather used and the stitching. Of fundamental import was a proper fit.
The long stick and toe-stick mentioned above were measuring devices to
gauge the length and width of the foot. Those measurements were
transferred to the last, a wooden form designed to mirror the foot's
shape; it determined the size, shape and consequently the fit of the
shoe. Accurate measurements and a good eye were necessary to shape the
last which could be altered by building it up with pieces of leather or
planing it down. Fitting a shoe properly would have been an important
ingredient of a cordwainer's success.

During the eighteenth century "the order of the day was the
straight-lasting shoe," and a pair was made from a single last fashioned
to serve both feet.\textsuperscript{22} Samuel was particular with his custom work and
his Day Books contain occasional notes about individual customer's
needs. After he had left his father's service, Samuel made "2 pair
bigness of his right Stout 1, a Size Left Stout," on Mr. Moore's

\textsuperscript{20}R.A. Salaman, Dictionary of Leather-Working Tools, c. 1700-1950 and
the tools of allied trades (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company,
1986), p. 19; A New and Complete Dictionary of Arts and Sciences
\textsuperscript{21}Day Book, 1737.
\textsuperscript{22}P.A. Saguto, "The 'Mysterie' of a Cordwainer:" The Chronicle of the
account. He apparently had lasts for both of Mr. Moore’s feet which
differed sufficiently to refer to them separately. However, they were
“straight-last”ed for one last was used as a model for a pair of shoes.
Samuel made 11 pair of shoes for the Moore household that year; the
shoes for the men all were measured relative to Moore’s lasts; women’s
pumps had more general measurements, “a pair Small womens.” Mr. Moore
also demanded that his shoes be well made, thus Samuel’s reference to
“Stout” shoes. Other customers demanded a good fit; David McCulre
brought “a pair of girls Shoes back that did not fitt he had another
pair for them”23

Lane shoes apparently gained a reputation on New Hampshire’s
seacoast. Five of Samuel’s brothers followed in their father’s
footsteps and the following story about their shoes has found its way
into Lane family lore, “Their [the Lanes] work was of the most
substantial kind. One of them once accused a Trader in Portsmouth of
selling many shoes for Lanes shoes, which they did not make; the Trader
replied that he did it because his shoes sold so much better, for having
their name to them.”24 Whether a fictional account or not, Samuel made
shoes for the households of Portsmouth’s political and merchant elite
including Major John Wentworth and Mark Hunking Wentworth, Daniel
Pierce, Charles Treadwell, Jacob Sheafe and Elizabeth Wibird. His shoes
were sold in the shops of Treadwell, Sheafe, Wibird, Traill and Marshall
as well as others. Apparently in tune with urban fashions, his rural
shop produced shoes demanded in the provincial capital.

23Pay Book, 1751.
24NHHS, Lane Papers, Ebenezer Lane, “Some Remarks and reminiscences of
the Lane Family,” 7/31/1841.
Samuel's success as a cordwainer stemmed in part from a moral commitment to honestly meet the terms of a contract. He provided the best footwear possible, and noted with dismay when he had to use undertanned leather because his stock was used up. The prices he charged offer a clue as to the quality of his shoes. In 1764 a pair of women's shoes sold for £5-10-0 in both Stratham and Portsmouth. Further inland in Bedford, New Hampshire, "John Dinsmoor finished making shoes," Matthew Patten wrote on February 24, 1764, "he has made 7 pair this winter the charges is 14£." Quality must account for some of this price differential; Samuel's customers were willing to pay almost triple what others charged for shoes in the province. He also experimented with design to produce shoes that wore well.

ILLUSTRATION 2 - "The Form of a Jack Top of a Boot

In 1745 he mused, "I think a long quarterd Boot is likely to Set best: See when T. Moors is done which is a pritty long quarter" He wrote down information gleaned from others, such as "Directions for making

---

25 Day Book, 1764; At times Patten provided materials to shoemakers but usually noted it. On December 16, 1763 when Samuel Patterson sewed a pair of soles Patten noted, "I had the soles and thread." With no mention of providing materials to Dinsmoor, the £2 price presumably refers to both materials and making. Patten, pp. 132-4.

26 Day Book, 1745.
Lether Bags from Bill Potte," and "the form of a Jack Top of a Boot." His work provided him a continuous education.

Hampton, first settled in 1638, was a well established community when Samuel started making shoes, and probably little shoemaking was done in the average household, a practice more prevalent in the earlier eighteenth century. Only rarely did he simply cut parts for shoes out of leather and sell them unstitched. This points to widespread use of settled shoemakers to provide shoes for the population. Blanche Evans Hazard characterizes this as the handicraft stage, typified by "work done for a market, on the specific demand of a definite customer." By mid-century this "bespoke work" was common practice in New England, and Lane's accounts corroborate this for New Hampshire's seacoast.

The next stage in the development of the shoe industry was making shoes for retail trade with no specific customer in mind. It allowed for a more efficient use of labor throughout the year because apprentices and hired help could make shoes in slack periods. Although Portsmouth hosted "a number of shoe makers," Samuel's participation in that city's market for retail shoes increased rather dramatically at mid-century as his transactions with various Portsmouth merchants such as Charles Treadwell, Jacob Sheafe and Robert Traill illustrate. On January 26, 1748 Samuel delivered seven pair of women's shoes to "Mrs Treadwel" in Portsmouth, the largest delivery by far that year. Seven

---

27Day Book, 1757.
28Hoover, p. 159.
30Donna-Belle Garvin is working on a "Survey of Craftsmen in the Piscataqua Area." At this time she has found 25 cordwainers from Portsmouth.
years later the Treadwell account contains a litany of such orders:
January 2, 1755, six pair of shoes; January 24 and February 12, seven
pair; and March 6, eleven pair. Almost ten years later he delivered
seven pair of men's, ten pair of women's as well as several pair of
children's shoes to Charles Treadwell's shop in one order; the total
charge was £128.31 To a much smaller extent he carried on a similar
trade in Exeter. Before 1750 there was little mention in New Hampshire
of wholesale shoes or shoes for retail; custom-made shoes met the
demand. However, advertisements such as one of Robert Traill's in
February, 1757 for English shoes appeared more frequently.32

This trend toward production for retail sale was a double-edged
sword. While it contributed greatly to Samuel's prosperity before the
Revolution, it may have raised some alarm signals for him in his later
years. Although he was at the fringes of domestic manufacture and did
not divide specific shoemaking tasks to speed production, he did employ
others to make shoes in his name, a type of putting-out system, and
assumed the risks of marketing them.33 However, his shoes were made by
traditional craft methods. Mass production in shoes had its origins
after the Revolution when women were employed to sew shoe uppers.34

This gender-based division of labor, first evident in shoemaking
households, maintained a system of family production while
coincidentally foretelling its demise. Within the traditional craft and
apprentice systems, women were a dependable source of labor. However,

31Pay Book, 1748, 1754, 1764.
32Hazard, pp. 188-89.
33Hazard, pp. 24-25.
34Mary H. Blewett, "Work, Gender and the Artisan Tradition in New
this coupled with expanding markets and tariff protection from English shoes began to transform the shoemaker's world.\textsuperscript{35}

During the hundred years after 1750 America produced a great number of handmade shoes for domestic and West Indian consumption.\textsuperscript{36} Although prohibited from the British West Indian markets by England after the Revolution, other markets previously closed to America by the navigation system opened. A modernized industry centered at Lynn, Massachusetts developed to meet this demand for shoes and by the early nineteenth century the structure of an emerging industrial capitalism had left its imprint.\textsuperscript{37} An estimated 100,000 pair of women's shoes were exported from Lynn in 1788.\textsuperscript{38} Samuel was aware of these changes. Whether his 1796 notation, "in the Oracle Paper, No 28 tis Said, the shoes annually Export[ed] from Lynn, amount to near, three Hundred Thousand pair," was merely an item of interest to him or an indication of deeper concern is impossible to tell.\textsuperscript{39} Of little direct consequence to him by then, concentration in the shoe industry and the consequent demise of its craft tradition may have been worrisome to a father whose sons were following that trade.

However, at mid-century, Samuel's sons willingly stepped into his shoes just as he had followed his father; they could hope to earn a comfortable livelihood and some social standing. Although the previous generations of Lane men followed various occupations, that pattern changed with Samuel's generation when five out of eight sons pursued their father's calling.

\textsuperscript{35}Blewett, p. 223.
\textsuperscript{36}Mulligan, p. 234.
\textsuperscript{37}Quimby, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{38}Bishop, p. 452.
\textsuperscript{39}Diary, 1796.
It is probable that cordwaining in rural New Hampshire held better prospects than in urban areas as Boston, which may account for increasing numbers of Lanes pursuing that trade after William Lane, Samuel’s grandfather, moved from Boston to Hampton in 1686. Urban craftsmen occupied a social rank below that of merchant, clergyman, government official or attorney.\textsuperscript{40} In the colonial hierarchy of trades, shoemaking fell near the bottom along with tailoring and candle making. In the middle ranks were blacksmiths and joiners with silversmiths and printers at the top echelons.\textsuperscript{41} By mid-century Boston shoemakers generally were poor with declining prospects. Before 1735, eight shoemakers fell within the top wealthiest 10% of Bostonians at probate. The next forty years found only one in that wealth category.\textsuperscript{42} Between 1756 and 1775 eight of thirteen shoemakers died without owning their homes; “In 1790, shoemakers ranked thirty-eighth among forty-four occupations in mean tax assessments.”\textsuperscript{43} In eighteenth-century Boston, shoemaking was not a profitable calling and its future appeared even bleaker.

In the quarter century after 1751 twenty-six of Boston’s poor apprentices were indentured to cordwainers. Of those, only six stayed in Boston;\textsuperscript{44} the remaining twenty went out to country towns where their futures in general were probably brighter. The value of the inventories

\textsuperscript{43}Young, p. 570.
\textsuperscript{44}Young, p. 571.
of 17 shoemakers in Garvin’s “Survey of Craftsmen” who died between 1754 and 1770 was £3243-18-0; 15 listed real estate. Cordwainers statistically were middle class. But those statistics were no guarantee of success in rural New England. On December 29, 1758 the New Hampshire Gazette contained a notice of Stratham cordwainer Elisha Leavitt’s death. He died intestate and his estate was valued at £394-15-00. Elisha and his wife Elizabeth must be accounted among Stratham’s poor. Aside from kitchen utensils which included “old puter,” butter basins, three porringer, and one plate, the household furniture consisted of only “a bed & Beding,” one table, two chests and a “Looking glass.” No shoemaker’s tools appear in the inventory. Claims on the estate made it insolvent; after setting aside a provision for the widow, only £85 remained to settle £269-1-10 in debts. Even were Leavitt’s assets unencumbered by debt, he would have been in the bottom third of probated estates by value. Three years later in 1762, Samuel and Mary Lane presented their daughter Mary a marriage portion of household goods valued at £1298, more than three times Elisha Leavitt’s assets.46

For Samuel, the trade of shoemaker was a suitable prospect in rural Hampton. His father Joshua Lane was reasonably prosperous and better off financially than his own father had been. In addition his

45Garvin, “Survey of Craftsmen;” NHSA Probate Records; Bruce C. Daniels, “Defining Economic Classes in Colonial New Hampshire,” Historical New Hampshire, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1 (Spring 1973), pp. 59-60. Daniels defined five economic classes: wealthy (91-100 percentile), prosperous (71-90), middle (31-70), lower (11-30), and poor (0-10). The average estate value dropped to £2573-3-0 after accounting for claims on the estates.
46Three of the 17 shoemakers above, including Leavitt, were insolvent. NHSA Probate Records. Daniels, pp. 59-60. NHSA, Elisha Leavitt estate, $2390; NHHS, Lane Papers, Mary Crockett’s Marriage Portion, flr 1-3.
trade did not preclude him from social standing and public service. Joshua was appointed to "a Committee of seven Bretheren...to assist the Pastor in many affairs relating to y° Spiritual welfare of this Church & Congregation" in 1738 and was later deacon of the Hampton Church. He was also elected Town Clerk and Selectman for several terms.47

Joshua also acquired considerable property relative to his father's real estate. William Lane's 1731-32 assessment included only "one one-story house" while his son listed: "one one-story house, 3 cows, one three year old, 1 horse, one 1 year old, one swine, 3 acres Tillage and Mowing, and ten acres of pasturing."48 Twenty years later Joshua's holdings had grown to more than 32 acres in Hampton which he described in his will as "my Dwelling House and Barn my Bark house and tan yard with all my Land both planting Land and mowing and pasture Land with my two pieces of Salt Marsh and also my Stock of Cattle horse and Sheep."49 Although no inventory accompanies Joshua Lane's probate records, Probate Judge John Wentworth set the executors' bond at £10,000. Should that figure approximate the value of Joshua's estate, he would have fallen somewhere in the upper middle to prosperous classes of the time.50 Samuel, Joshua's son, furthered this trend by holding church, town and state office as well as acquiring considerable property.

Therefore, Samuel's "Principle Business" of shoemaking, a calling he answered at age 10, held the potential of prosperity and some

47Dow, p. 396, 565, 573.
48Records of Hampton (Old Parish) December, 1731, and January 1732, Cited in Chapman, p. 10.
49NHHS, Lane Papers, Joshua Lane Will, 12/16/60, flr 1-3.
50NHSA, Probate $3326; Daniels, pp. 60-1. In the period 1761-70 prosperous estates were valued between £9,930 and £18,904, middle estates between £9,929 and £18,904.
standing in the community. This trade, rooted in the land and Hampton's rural surroundings, undoubtedly underlay his visions of success. He would later discover the calling was but a means, and that productive work would help sustain a family enmeshed in the community by the relationships it demanded. For Samuel the value of a formal education was tangential to the real work at hand, and it never held the key to real success in the world of eighteenth century Hampton. His future was in putting his skills to hard work. That vision was clarified and set during his years as apprentice at his father's side.
"my Service with my Father"

Outwardly, Samuel's life changed little when he began his five year apprenticeship at age sixteen. His work around the house and farm continued as did his work at making shoes in his father's shop. He shouldered additional responsibilities as an apprentice, but that was part of his obligations and training. In most respects this apprenticeship with his father was typical of craft indentures served throughout the colonial period.

In 1734 the Lane household was large and growing. Ten children, eight boys and two girls, made up the Lane brood, and Bathsheba Lane gave birth to another daughter one month after Samuel's service began. The initiation of this apprenticeship, formally committing his son to full-time labor in his shop and on his farm, must have been a pleasing prospect for Joshua who saw his son setting out on the path to ultimate independence. There is no evidence of a written indenture between the two specifying the obligations of both parties, however clues to Samuel's duties are found in his diary and Day Books covering several years of his service. Judging from these accounts, Joshua planned a broad education for his son of which shoemaking's "art and mysterie" was but a part.

The primary function of the apprentice system was the transfer of skills and knowledge between generations. At its core was the master-apprentice relationship which mirrored the father-son relation in the family. In the social context of the eighteenth century, much of the significance of the system lay in that feature.¹ Thus, its ancillary

¹Rorabaugh, p. 6.
functions were perhaps as important to colonial society as the specific trade skills passed on. The master provided an appropriate role model and moral guidance for the youth and the institution served as a mechanism for social control of adolescent males. That an apprentice was part of a family manifested itself in many fundamental ways. In addition to bequests to his large family, Stratham's Jonathan Wiggin wrote in his will: "I give to my Apprentice Samuel Neal Thirty pounds...Provided he Faithfully Serves His Prentiship out (Besides what I am obliged to Give him by his Indenture)." The institution provided a sense of family security even when the training occurred outside one's own family. In a society that recognized little qualitative difference between child and adult, "it provided safe passage from childhood to adulthood in psychological, social, and economic ways."3

America's system differed from England's by placing greater emphasis on the protection of apprentice rights; one such safeguard was reducing the maximum age of apprenticeship to a maximum of twenty-one years in the colonies.4 This heightened regard for the apprentice in the American colonies suggests a social significance that went beyond the mere supply of labor to the craft economy. Indentures often included provisions for education, reading, writing and sometimes ciphering, "the customary elementary education" in Colonial America.5 New Hampshire law required a master to fulfill these educational

---

2 NHSA, Probate 14:338.
3 Rorabaugh, p. vii.
responsibilities. By emphasizing the individual's development in a number of ways, the colonial system nurtured a craftsman, a citizen and a father. This gave the system a unique imprint and "took care of the entire problem of public elementary education during the colonial period." 

Having already attended school, Samuel was literate when his apprenticeship began, but his education continued during his service. At age nineteen he "went to School to Esq. Palmer to Learn to Cypher and Survey Land." This is the only evidence of any formal education during his apprenticeship. Joseph Palmer was a noted surveyor and Samuel learned his lessons well; six years later he took the oath to be a surveyor of land. Although an eclectic sideline to a shoemaker's trade, this particular training appears to be another facet of his father's attempt to create another generation in his own image. A single entry in Samuel's diary suggests that his father measured land in addition to farming and shoemaking. On April 20, 1754 Samuel traveled to Hampton "to look on Isaiahs land," and that same day "Father also measured for Atnty [Anthony] Pevy & Theo. Rundlet."

There is no mention of Joshua Lane employing any apprentice before Samuel's service. With ten children in the house an apprentice might have been more burden than help. The manner in which his sons served him in succession suggests that labor was only one of several reasons for these indentures. Young Samuel's experience during his five year indenture was an education in its broadest sense; ultimately shoemaking

---

7Seybolt, p. 107.  
8"Years of the Life."  
9Diary, 4/20/54.
might be considered its least important aspect. That he served as apprentice to his father rather than outside the Lane household deepened and broadened the curriculum and probably only intensified the lessons learned. These years shaped the patterns of a lifetime. Samuel’s Day Books show that his father trained him in household and business matters that went well beyond the shoemaker’s trade narrowly conceived.

But this should be no surprise to students of eighteenth-century America. The cradle of colonial labor lay on the hearth; the family was the motivating force underlying the vast human effort necessary to transform New England into a productive landscape. In rural households sons and daughters sowed, spun, churned and did a myriad of tasks for their own households and those of their neighbors without which the family farm would have been economically unviable. Despite the influx of servants into the colonies, Bernard Bailyn notes that “few of them contributed, during their years as bondsmen, to the opening of the land...”10 As Stephen Innes concluded, “family labor was dominant throughout New England.”11

Under the supervision of their parents, daughters helped produce dairy products, garden produce and cloth, and boys toiled in the shops, fields and barnyards. Rural children were essential to the prosperity of their family. Unlike Samuel Seabury who left his father’s home in the city to learn a trade, farm children could expect to find plenty of work at home until their number became so great as to be unmanageable.

10 Bernard Bailyn, The Peopling of British North America: An Introduction (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1986), p. 64. His statement concludes that recruited settlers played a large part in settling the land, however, that does not diminish the role of the family in that effort.
under a single roof. Apprenticeships complemented this labor system. When their own household could not accommodate them, often sons and daughters entered other households to work. Outside their own family their role was much the same; they were to learn from, and labor for, the family to which they found themselves allied just as a son or daughter would. The role of family was central as both supplier of this labor, and as the ultimate beneficiary with its own survival ensured in the next generation. It also meant that lessons in several areas were passed on from master to apprentice.

However, shoemaking was at the core of Samuel's apprenticeship. "The last 5 years of my Service with my Father viz from 16 to 21 years of my age;" Samuel remarked in 1739, "I made 1430 pair of Shoes;" That averages to 286 pair per year or 5½ pair per week. However, in 1760, his "2 Sons Sam 1 in the 14th & Joshua in the 12th year of their Ages made 14 pair of womens Pumps" in one week. And Joseph Lye, an early nineteenth century Lynn shoemaker, made two or three pair a day in addition to other shop chores such as "throwing up shop wood," for a weekly total of about thirteen pair. In contrast, Samuel's rather anemic output undoubtedly allowed for his working for his father outside of the shop.

---


13 The experience of a Rowley, Massachusetts family is one example of this. See Vickers, "Competency and Competition," p. 7.

14 "Years of the Life." Journal, p. 38.

In addition to making shoes Samuel was exposed to the logistical realities of managing a house and farm, and the importance of record keeping to those responsibilities. His first extant Day Book began on the first day of 1736 when Samuel was 17, and recorded loads of wood brought by Jonathan Towle and Stephen Batchelder. That heating season ended with David Smith delivering "a little load," the twenty-third of the winter, on April 3rd. In March Joshua Lane helped his father who lived down the road by paying for a load that Samuel notes went "to grandfather." Each generation supported the others, both older and younger, with its own particular resources and labor. In a similar manner fifty years later Samuel's sons agreed to supply their father with firewood. The Lane household began purchasing wood again on November 2 and finished their fuel purchases with two loads brought by Jeremiah Clough on December 10. In all thirty-four loads of firewood entered the household that winter. Deliveries began again in February the next year; in just about one month forty-six loads came, twice as many as for the corresponding period the year before. Perhaps the winter was colder but more likely there was wood available at a good price; they took only seven loads between October and December that fall making a total of fifty-three loads for 1737.  

Samuel's responsibility was to keep records of who delivered the load and the number of loads brought to that point. Price and payment was outside his province; because Samuel was likely to be at home to receive the wood and because it was good training in bookkeeping this was his duty. He also kept a similar "Account of the Corn we Bye;" although they grew grain on their farm, it was insufficient for their

---

17Day Book, 1736, 1737.
large household. In 1736 he accounted for the purchase of nearly fifty bushels of corn and eight and one-half bushels of barley, oats and rye. The next year the Lanes bought sixteen fewer bushels of corn and the same amount of other grains. Again, Samuel's task was simply to record the purchase; how and when it was paid for was his father's worry.

"Work hired in the year 1736" was another Day Book account tangential to his apprenticeship as a cordwainer but critical to the broader pattern of his training. Perhaps as a result of his oldest son's labor, Joshua Lane purchased 24 acres of land in 1735. To that point he owned less than four acres which explains his dependence upon neighboring farms for grains. However, the acquisition of this acreage placed new labor burdens on a household which previously farmed on a very small scale. Samuel was the only son old enough for heavy field work in 1736; then seventeen years old, his next oldest brother, William, was just thirteen. The account of "Work hired" was a direct result of the vastly enlarged Lane farm.

This list includes the names of people hired to work in the barnyard and fields of the Lane farm. More than one-third, five of the fourteen workers hired, were Lane relatives; the reliance on family then, extended to occasional labor too. The nature of the labor performed reflects the diverse production of this small New Hampshire farm: "harrowing about one acre of corn," "doing flax," "planted Potaters," "mowing great-meadow & barley" and "mowing oats." The Lane farm labor requirements also illustrate the seasonal rhythm of farm work. Mid-April, with the frost out of the ground and mud-season over, was time to clean up after the long winter by "carrying out muck." It could take several days to clean out the winter's accumulation. Then
came preparation of the fields - plowing, sowing and harrowing. The crops were tended to during June and July - weeding, harrowing, hilling and molding corn, and mowing in the fields. The season ended with the fall's harvest. Samuel noted on September 27, 1737, "we finished harvest."  

Samuel did not specifically document whether he worked in the fields along with the hired help during the summer season, but a couple of references in the list of farmyard work as well lower shoe production that season suggest that his responsibilities included work on the farm. All but two notations of farm work are accompanied by the name of the worker as well as the nature of the work done. On May 6, 1737 "Petaters" were planted and that same year on the 27 of September, "we finished harvest." With no mention of outside labor participating, the implication is that Samuel, his father and younger brothers did the work. Given the numerous daily chores agricultural production demanded, particularly on a farm with diverse crop production, it would be surprising if Samuel did not spend a good deal of time helping with the farm work during the summer.

Clearly the Lanes utilized local youth to work on their farm and a lively labor exchange took place between neighbors. The largest segment of the work force in colonial America were youth, boys and girls, who worked in family enterprises or went out to work with other families. For their farm in 1736 the Lanes hired thirty-three days of labor; the

18 Day Book, 1737, 1737.
19 Jackson Turner Main, "Standards of Living and the Life Cycle in Colonial Connecticut," The Journal of Economic History, vol. XLIII (March 1983), p. 103. Main specifically states boys were the primary source of labor, and neglects the contribution of daughters to overall household production.
total was less in 1737, twenty-two and one-half. This pattern of procuring labor had less to do with the demands of the farm than it had to do with the status of the Lane family. Before 1737 Joshua had no pool of family labor to draw upon except for Samuel. By then William was fourteen years old and Joshua twelve, old enough to help with some field work. That may account for less labor hired in 1737. By the end of Samuel's apprenticeship, the family's position had changed and the Lanes may well have become suppliers in Hampton's market for agricultural labor.

The role family apprenticeships played for Samuel's siblings suggests the importance of that institution to the family. Samuel's apprenticeship ended when he was twenty-one and his younger brother William, also a cordwainer and tanner, was sixteen. As William lived at home during those years, he, like his elder brother must have apprenticed with his father. However, Joshua, fifteen years old at the time, became a carpenter and cabinetmaker which suggests that his father focused on the training of one son at a time. Very likely his work could not sustain simultaneously two apprentice sons so young Joshua went elsewhere to learn his trade. Brothers Isaiah and Josiah also took up their father's calling. Each of the brothers who became shoemakers had birthdays at least five years apart which strongly implies they served their father in succession. The exception to this pattern is Ebenezer who was born in 1733; his later teen years fell during Isaiah's apprenticeship with his father. By then Samuel provided the solution for Ebenezer's training and his father's dilemma. Established

---

20 Day Book, 1736, 1737.
and thriving in his trade, Samuel employed his younger brother as his apprentice.\textsuperscript{21}

In Joshua and Bathsheba Lane's household family and apprenticeship were inseparable. Whenever possible sons pursued their father's calling, and the dynamic of the institution was the relationship between master and apprentice, a relation designed to mimic the reciprocity inherent in the relations between father and son. It projected the family system of labor into the larger community of work, but created more than a craftsman. The economic function of the system was at once primary and secondary. One goal was to produce a skilled craftsman, but in Hampton and the many other communities like it, crafts were but an extension of the agricultural society. The apprentice found himself embedded in a culture dependent on the land, and in rural New England it was equally important that the craftsman be prepared to live out a set of moral values which perpetuated family and community. Only if the apprentice emerged from his service trained to serve both the economy and the society, could his service be counted successful. In this manner crafts were an integral support of fundamental colonial social structures.\textsuperscript{22}

The apprentice system described above fits well with the traditional notions of New England's hierarchical social structure. The master-apprentice relation implied authority and knowledge passing in one direction from one generation to the next. However, Samuel's ancillary activities point to a flexibility within the system, and a

\textsuperscript{21}Chapman and Pitts, pp. 17-20.
challenge to the traditional notions of hierarchy, at least within the household. By the end of his service, tanning, a trade he appears to have undertaken out of his own initiative, was one of his most important activities. His father did not have a tanyard when Samuel started his apprenticeship in 1734, and he procured leather by buying hides from neighbors and sending them out to be tanned. In his accounts for 1736 and 1737 Samuel carefully noted the date, weight of the hide and from whom it was purchased in his book. Between October 15, 1736 and January 13, 1737 the Lanes had taken in fifty hides. The next day, Samuel "carried 30 hides to Bradford for Maj' Osgood: weight:1437." On January 25 and 26 they sent eleven more hides, and on the 26 sent twenty-two hides to "mr Clarkson." Fifty-nine of the seventy-nine calfskins taken that year were sent off to neighboring tanners to be made into leather. Of the remainder, Samuel tanned one hide and ten calfskins.²³

In a reversal of their relationship, Samuel wrote about the first year of his apprenticeship, "I began to try to Learn my Self to Tan, with 4 mean Sheepskins - and my Father Seeing I could make Lether, let me Tan Some for him the next year." With no previous mention of his father's ability to tan, it is likely that Samuel's education was a result of observing the process when delivering hides to tanners. The next year he "Taned 27 Sheepskins, 2 Calfskins & 1 Dog Skin," and noted his success: "The calfskins being my Fathers, his Currier sent him word to let that Man Tan all his skins next year, that Tan'd Them 2 - for they were the best Lether he had; which Encouraged me verry much."²⁴

²³Day Book, 1736; "Years of the Life."
His father gave him encouragement also, and the materials to tan as the following table illustrates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>HIDES</th>
<th>CALFSKINS</th>
<th>KIPS</th>
<th>SHEEP SKINS</th>
<th>DOG SKINS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NHHS, Lane Papers, Tanning Book.

The explosion in his tanning output in 1737 is due to his father's growing confidence in his tanning as manifested by the construction of a tanyard on the Lane homestead. His father owned no specific tanning equipment so in 1735 and 1736 Samuel tanned "in Tubbs at my Fathers Well." Samuel's initiative apparently persuaded his father to invest seriously in this venture, and they began to construct a full-fledged tanyard the following year.

The needs of the colonial tanner were modest:

The rude appointments of a tannery, as generally built before this time [1794], embraced a greater or less number of oblong boxes or hogsheads sunk in the earth near a small stream, and without cover or outlet below, to serve as vats and leeches. A few similar boxes above ground for lime vats and pools, an open shed for a beam house, and a circular trough fifteen feet in diameter, in which the bark was crushed by alternate wooden and stone wheels, turned by two old or blind horses, at the rate of half a cord a day, completed in most cases the arrangements of the tanyard.26

---

Recognizing the limitations of tanning in “Tubbs,” Samuel and his father “put down three Tan Pitts: & one Lime Pitt. and one water pitt” in October, 1737. The object of tanning was to permeate the skins with tannin, found in oak or hemlock bark, which chemically altered the skins to prevent their deterioration. It was labor-intensive, dirty and smelly work. Hides were first placed in the water pit for soaking to wash off dirt, blood and loose flesh; Samuel referred to this process as “to put in soak,” and it took anywhere from three to twelve days to loosen this material. The next step was “liming,” soaking the hides in a mixture of lime and water to detach the hair from the hide. When the hair was loosened, the hide was laid over a beam and the hair was scraped off with a special knife for that purpose. Once dehaired, the clean hides were soaked in a mixture of tanbark and water. Samuel first put his hides in handlers, smaller vats in which the hides were agitated periodically and taken out to drain before being returned. Once his pits were built, he would transfer hides from the handlers and lay them flat in pits where they were covered with the tanning solution. Once the solution completely saturated the hides they were removed and hung up to dry.

Samuel’s 1737 Day Book offers a glimpse of the work involved in tanning; that year he tanned 10 hides, 130 calveskins, 8 kips, 55

27 Tanning Book.
sheepskins and 7 dogskins. From March 21 to November 21 he worked 28 days at tanning. In March and April he soaked and limed hides and calfskins, and on "June 13 unhaird 39 calfskins or thereabouts." For the rest of June and July he repeated a continuous process, "Laid away 7 Larg skins, 2nd Layer," "took out 6 calfskins," "Laid away 21 Skins 2nd Layer new hogshed," until he finished on November 21 when he noted, "took out my last calfskins (20) & 1 dogSkin." Of course that notation signaled not the end of his work but the beginning. By that same mild November day he had already taken in fifty hides to tan during the next season.

Joshua Lane's role in this excursion into tanning is unclear. He certainly was familiar with leather and must have had some knowledge of the tanning process. Just as with his farm, it may have been his eldest son's age and potential labor that provided the motivation for this expansion into making leather. However, Samuel's descriptions of these events as well as the lack of evidence that his father possessed any tanning equipment argue otherwise. When his father taught him shoemaking at age ten Samuel wrote, "I began to Learn to Make Shoes." Six years later his experience at tanning seems tenuous and less certain, "I began to try to Tan, only with 4 Sheepskins." The young apprentice was not learning, but trying to do it; he also wrote that he had to "Learn my Self to Tan." These descriptions imply not only that there was no one else to teach him, but also that his father did not sponsor him as he did later with surveying instruction. If Joshua Lane

29Pay Book, 1737.
30"Years of the Life;" Journal, p. 1.
did know the tanner's craft, he did little to uncover its mystery for his son. Given his approach to his Samuel's training, that is unlikely.

His son's success at tanning must have convinced the father that this was not a young man's fancy but a business to be taken seriously. In addition to the "Pitts" constructed in the fall of 1737, that year they also built a barkhouse in which to store bark for tanning. The following spring they bought a barkstone and hung it in the newly constructed bark mill, grinding their own bark for the first time on April 18, 1738. In addition they purchased specialized tanning tools, "a Beaming Knife & Bark Shave" from Major Wingate and dug three more tan pits in the fall.\(^{31}\) Even though Samuel's apprenticeship was drawing to a close by then, his father must have appreciated tanning's benefits sufficiently to want to continue tanning after his son's indentured service ended.

This foray into tanning may account for his lower-than-average shoe output although it is likely that brother William picked up some of the slack as he came of age in Samuel's wake. Of far greater import was the effect of this tanning on his father's balance sheet. Without Joshua Lane's account books to study one can but speculate as to the economic impact of adding tanning to their household production, but it certainly would have enhanced significantly his family's financial position. Using 1739 prices from Samuel's Day book, a man's pair of shoes cost 18\(^{8}\), a woman's, 12\(^{8}\). Assuming Samuel made equal numbers of men's and women's shoes over the course of his indenture, the total value of the 1430 pair he made would be £1072-10-0. In 1739 the price for making a pair using other people's leather was but 4\(^{8}\), making his
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\(^{31}\)Tanning Book.
labor in those shoes come to £286. Thus, the value of the tanned hides that went into his 1430 pair was £786-10-0, 73% of the total cost of the shoes. The labor in the shoe was relatively cheap, only 27% of the total value of each pair. Thus, one can imagine his father encouraging him to branch out into tanning and providing advice and help when he could as the two combined their wits to learn the process. With the average price of a calf skin between four and five shillings, tanning at home presented the Lanes with the opportunity to more than double their income. With a large and still growing family such a prospect must have filled Joshua Lane with a great deal of satisfaction.

In general tanning was a more profitable trade than cordwaining. Between 1630 and 1830 there were twice as many shoemakers as tanners in the Piscataqua region. The value of tanners' estates with inventories from 1754 to 1770 averaged £8678-8-0, nearly three times the worth of the comparable group of cordwainers. Tanners may have commanded more compensation than shoemakers and consequently been worth more because they were a relatively small group.

Samuel was introduced to the marketplace during his apprenticeship, and in addition to recording wood, grain and hides that entered the household and shop, he also learned the double-entry accounting system by keeping his father’s account with Mr. Sibley. Sibley supplied the Lane shop with wooden heels; poplar was the wood of choice for this purpose and what Samuel later bought for himself. Between February and November in 1736 Samuel credited Mr. Sibley with

32 "Garvin, Survey of Craftsmen." She lists 57 tanners and 113 cordwainers. Of the seven tanners with inventories, one was insolvent; all owned real estate. NHSA Probate Records.
33 Pay Book, 1751; Bishop, p. 444.
273 pair of heels at 2s-6d per dozen. That year he recorded as payment for the heels three pair of shoes, two for Sibley and one for Mr. Stephens who worked for Sibley. The Lanes paid the remaining balance in money.\textsuperscript{34}

Although a single account, it comprised a rather complex system of debt, credit and labor that characterized New Hampshire communities during the eighteenth century. Mr. Sibley delivered three dozen heels on February 7, 1736 and bargained for a pair of shoes which he picked up two days later. During the spring and summer various people delivered heels as well as Sibley, Mr. Norris's boy Blake, Benjamin Leavit, and Mr. Stephens. Sibley brought four dozen to the shop on July 29 and picked up another pair of shoes for himself. In August the Lanes paid Mr. Norris on Sibley's account, which may have been a payment for the work Norris's boy had done previously for Sibley. When the Lanes paid £2-7-6 on Sibley's account August 27, he was there to collect and to deliver four dozen more heels. Mr. Stephens brought four more dozen on October 30, and ten days later the Lanes delivered him a pair of shoes presumably as payment for service rendered to Sibley.

This single account kept by Samuel is illustrative of the maze of debt and credit binding Hampton's citizenry together. Over this ten month period in 1736 twelve transactions involved six people besides Samuel. Samuel "Reckoned" the account twice during the year and carried the account over into 1737 when a series of similar transactions took place. This exercise also reinforced the importance of accurate records. It seems that Samuel recorded virtually every exchange involving some form of credit. Such consistency was necessary during a

\textsuperscript{34}Day Book, 1736, 1737.
time when accounts might run for years without being balanced. The
converse of this lesson was that many exchanges settled at the time of
the transaction were rarely noted anywhere, and if such an exchange did
appear in the record it was followed by an "X" denoting payment was made
then and there. Samuel exempted no one from his accounts; family
members, brothers and sisters, expected each other to pay for services
rendered them by their siblings. Even though he planned to forgive his
childrens' debts to him, Samuel recorded them in his Day Books and kept
them open until his death noting "I would not have this account
Demanded...unless I demand it in my Life time."

This account illustrates the practices and patterns of a lifetime of work.

Less detailed and extensive, though, is work Samuel did on his own
account. Limited by the obligations to his father, he still did enough
work on his own account to have 20 individuals indebted to him for a
total of £2-2-7 on December 1, 1736. Some of the items he traded were
horsewhips, aprons, buttons and laces; several unspecified debts are
listed as well. By the following spring the number of people who owed
his account had decreased by ten and he had received £1-1-11 in
payments. As apprentice to a shoemaker he could not trade shoes, but
other leather goods were fair game for his own profit, separate from his
father's. Horsewhips were a hot item at 6d each. By "oct 15.1737:"
Samuel wrote, "Horsewhips I have made already is 41." A list of
purchasers follows including people from Portsmouth, Stratham, Chester
and Hampton. These accounts are not in double-entry form and in the

main represent a single non-credit transaction, unlike the continual trade carried on with Sibley. 36

Again, this account shows that the culture in which colonials lived was neither static nor rigidly hierarchical. The stipulations spelled out in indentures and the reality were not necessarily the same. Philip Morgan found similar discrepancies in his studies of plantation labor in the southern colonies. In contrast to the stereotypical image of gang labor Morgan identified tasking, a labor system where slaves were "assigned a certain amount of work for the day or perhaps week, upon the completion of which they were free to use their time as they pleased." 37 This practice allowed slaves to work on their own account. The individual accounts Samuel developed during his apprenticeship suggests his father employed a system similar to tasking, and allowed his son a certain amount of time to pursue trade of his own. Flexibility characterized this institution whose integrity depended upon the familial culture in which it was centered.

Samuel's own trading took place in the same market networks his father employed. Most of his father's trade was in and around Hampton, although a substantial portion took place at the Isles of Shoals, a fishing community on the group of small islands nine miles off the New Hampshire coast. He traded shoes and fishing boots for oil and fish there. Samuel's diary indicates a nine day trip there in October, 1738, although he may have gone to the islands earlier. On the back cover of his 1736 Day Book Samuel wrote what appear to be reminders of how to

36Pay Book, 1736, 1737.
settle accounts with customers on the islands, "To Take at the Shoals a fish or two of Mr. Samll White he had a pair of shoes," and "Mr Samll Yettons 4 pair shoes £1-3 if he hes it get a Little parcel of Blue[fish]." Mrs. Matthews from the Shoals appears on the list of "What is Due to me" in 1736, all of which points to him trading there before the first diary record of a trip in 1738. Fish oil was a staple of this trade. On a trip from September 30 to October 1, 1737, his father "bought a barrel of oyl of Dn Muchmore price £6+0+0." Over the next two months fifteen people purchased oil from the barrel in quantities of one quart to two gallons. The Lanes themselves were the greatest consumers of this oil using over eight gallons, and drawing out seven gallons on October 29. They used much of this for currying and finishing leather.

Although his apprenticeship honed his shoemaking skills and taught him a multitude more, perhaps the network of traders he became acquainted with was the most important foundation of his future success. He forged links with the prosperous merchants of Portsmouth which connected him to the Atlantic market for goods otherwise unavailable in rural New Hampshire. In his native Hampton he learned the risks and rewards of trade with families in a community setting. His father's business also familiarized him with other towns and their residents. It was such a trio "who traded with my Father" that urged him to settle in Stratham, and during his apprenticeship he sold horsewhips to Stratham's Andrew Wiggin, a later neighbor and customer. His trade at the Isles of Shoals, first as apprentice and later as independent craftsman and
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38 Pay Book, 1736.
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trader, is a vivid example of the usefulness of the networks established during his apprentice years.

In all respects his apprenticeship under his father's tutelage was a success. Samuel remained in his parents' household at a time when his labor was sorely needed. His labor increased the output of his father's shop which helped support a large and growing family. Outside of the shop, he helped with farm and household chores which relieved the burdens on both his father and mother. Following his father's calling provided an element of comfort and stability to both his family and to the greater community at large, ensuring a facet of community order for another generation.

In addition to learning the shoemaker's trade, Samuel also learned the trade of a tanner, which had profound impact on his ability to weather the vicissitudes of colonial New Hampshire's economy and to prosper. But his apprenticeship taught him much more than that. His experience exposed him to the decision-making processes related to running a household and a farm, and the bookkeeping and recordkeeping essential to their proper management. Working with his father insinuated him into the personal and market networks which served him in his trade for a lifetime. This experience illustrated for Samuel the link between household and market which was critical to success in New England's rural economy; family labor was the key to security. He would use that resource as a producer and consumer, and become enmeshed in New Hampshire's and the larger Atlantic economy. As a result, he would later sit at a table appointed with imported linens, season his food with pepper from the East and drink wine from Madeira. The reach of Samuel Lane's local world was long indeed.
Perhaps the greatest achievement of his apprenticeship was the breadth of the education he received. Aside from the formal instruction in surveying during his service, he imbibed a way of life in his parents' household which shaped his life and which in turn he used to create his own world. His understanding and acknowledgment of the fundamental importance of family and community relationships was tempered during these years and his devotion to those social institutions never wavered, despite the winds that buffeted his eighteenth-century world. He became not solely a craftsman, but also a citizen and a father, and the latter two roles were crucial to the support of the former. When his service ended on his twenty-first birthday, Samuel Lane was prepared to enter the world of work, but the greater result was that he was ready to enter the world at large.
"I was out of my Time"

October 6, 1739 was a momentous day in Samuel Lane’s life. The confidence gained by having completed his apprenticeship presumably was magnified by his courtship of Mary James, a young woman from Hampton, begun the previous year. Having satisfied his obligations to his father and having become skilled in several crafts, he was free to pursue his calling and make his way in the world. His last five years had pointed to this day and it was more than a symbolic passage in his mind.

His terse diary entry that day, "I am this Day twenty one years old," belied its significance. Because he never remarked upon his birthday in other years, its very mention at this point marks it as a milestone. The bold writing on the title page of his day book begun then proclaims both pride and intent, "Samuel Lane His Book  Hampton october 6th 1739. this Day I was 21 years old. a daybook of Debt & credit of all my Tradings & Dealings with all Persons I Deal withall."¹ His trade with "all Persons" was now his property; he was an independent artisan.

Although he had discharged the obligations of the indenture with his father he remained in his parents’ house for the next twenty months. It must have been a busy and exciting time in the Lane household.

Thirteen children including Samuel called it home; seven were ten years old or younger. The oldest daughter Mary probably helped her mother with domestic duties and looked after her younger brothers and sisters. William, sixteen in June, would have assumed Samuel’s place as apprentice in his father’s shop with Samuel still close by to offer aid.

¹Day Book, 1739.
and advice; "I work'd in a little Shop I parted off for that use," Samuel wrote, "in one Corner of my fathers Shop." ² Surely, he continued to perform many of the tasks he had as apprentice only now as dutiful son.

But within this familial context, his relationship with his father had changed, a fact Samuel recognized in several ways. In his mind at least, one expectation was clear, he should go out on his own and relieve his family from the burden of his support. Feeling "Uneasie in my present circumstance," he later wrote about his living arrangements at that time, "my Father had a great Family, and I Knew I was Burthensome to them, tho' I paid for dressing my Victuals, which I provided for my Self after the first year; yet as I wanted to Settle, they also wanted I Should." ³ Though his parents may have encouraged him in his efforts "to Settle," his later reflection, when his own household brimmed with dependents, may have misconstrued their motives. This sense of remorse at remaining dependent upon his parents was shared by others at the time. Samuel Seabury's short-lived apprenticeship with a New York City furniture maker left him in a situation akin to Lane's, and Seabury wrote "There was one circumstance however that was a source of annoyance and that was my dependence on my father for boarding and clothes of one of which certainly and perhaps of both I knew he would have been relieved by my continuance at Moneygripe's [his former master]." ⁴ Samuel like Seabury considered himself a burden. In reality he was more likely an asset to the household, farm and craft operations of the Lane homestead, nevertheless in his eyes and those of his
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³Journal, pp. 24-5.
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parents, the time had arrived for him to move on to the next stage of his life. His parents' prodding was born in the desire that their eldest fully break the physical bonds of his youth and apprenticeship and begin the next stage of his life, a stage stymied while he remained in their house.

Joshua Lane was not endowed with an abundance of this world's goods, but he did more for Samuel than would have been expected at the end of a typical apprenticeship. It was customary for masters to award apprentices "freedom dues," a bonus upon the fulfillment of their indentures. These "dues" often were a new set of clothes or tools. There is no mention of a clothing provision at any point during the apprenticeship; undoubtedly it was understood and required no remark. Samuel did receive "near 20l old Ten" worth of Lether to begin with he also gave me my Board the first year; after that, I Boarded my Self." This settlement, although modest, fell within Joshua Lane's means and allowed his son the opportunity to use his skills immediately upon the end of his service to work toward economic independence.

The resources Joshua had available to help his son achieve independence were perhaps more limited than those of his own father. William Lane's second son and fourth child, Joshua married Bathsheba Robie within six months of reaching his majority; anticipating this event his father sold him just over an acre of land, a lot granted by Hampton, for £3. This land allowed Joshua to settle in Hampton, establish himself in his trade and eventually purchase land enough to create a small farm. This appears to have been the only land William
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5Rorabaugh, p. 8.
6Journal, p. 23.
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Lane owned other than his own house lot; his tax inventory for 1732 listed neither acreage nor livestock. Joshua did not apprentice with his father, so the real property transfer was a sale to his son and not "freedom dues." In turn, Joshua Lane treated Samuel more like an apprentice than a son. Although Joshua had more land in Hampton than his father and his son was looking to settle there, none of it passed into Samuel's hands. Probably a combination of factors contributed to this situation. Joshua's property in Hampton was modest and he farmed it to help support his considerable family. In addition Samuel wanted property suitable for a tanyard, and Joshua's land may not have fit that bill. Although Joshua might have been inclined to alienate some of his land for his oldest son, a common practice in the colonial era, his financial circumstances probably precluded him giving much material support.9

Evidence of their changed relationship appears in Samuel's Day Book beginning in 1739. Under "F-A D." father's debt, he listed eight pair of shoes made on his father's account; this is the first appearance of shoes in his accounts for although Samuel was learning the shoemaker's trade, his work and output in this area belonged to his master. As an apprentice shoemaking was his work, but it was his father's business. As an independent craftsman, Samuel was paid for that work, and that account was the material and symbolic basis for his newly earned independence. Laces, a sheepskin, a 18-9 payment to John Simson and six pounds of tobacco round out his father's debt to him. His father owed him for money, cloth and meal in 1736, additional

8 Chapman and Fitts, p. 10.
9 Toby L. Ditz, p. 238.
evidence of Samuel's trade on his own account, but those goods did not
inveade his father's monopoly over his work at shoemaking. The credit
side of the ledger too, reflected the changed relations. In 1736 his
father's credits were sheepskins, money and "a sheep & for Cart: onard
[nearly] 4 pound." The 1739 credits expose Samuel's fondness for cider;
his father paid him three barrels of the popular drink. Cider must have
been included in his upkeep as apprentice; the board given him his
first year out apparently did not include "Syder."10

His first Day Book covered the period from October 1739 until
April 1741, a period during which he lived with his parents and became
engaged to Mary James. This book contains individual accounts for
shoes, aprons, buttons, whips, skins, and oil on the debit side, and
assorted items from money to cheese which he received in payment as
credits. During his apprenticeship he carried only two individual
accounts in his books which extended over a long period, his father's
and Mr. Sibley's, who provided wooden heels at the shoe shop. The other
exchanges noted represent single transactions, completed at the time.
This Day Book with its record of several series of exchanges with a
large number of people shows that as an independent artisan, Samuel had
advanced from merely making goods to finding the market for them.

As in the Day Books that followed this first one, probably not all
his transactions were recorded. If goods of equal value were exchanged
and no balance was on the books, Samuel usually made no note of the
transactions. Therefore his accounts underestimate the volume of his
trade to an unknown degree. By the end of the eighteen months that this
Day Book covered, Samuel had provided goods valued at £40-02-03 and

10 Day Book, 1736, 1739.
received as payments £31-18-07, a balance in his favor of £8-03-08. He
accepted diverse payments as credits on his customers' accounts. The
categories follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skins, etc.</td>
<td>£ 1-15-00</td>
<td>(5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>£ 5-15-09</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>£12-00-05</td>
<td>(38.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jars</td>
<td>£ 1-08-09</td>
<td>(4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Produce</td>
<td>£ 2-10-03</td>
<td>(7.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>£ 1-08-07</td>
<td>(4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundries</td>
<td>£ 6-19-10</td>
<td>(21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£31-18-07</td>
<td>(100.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most surprising and different from his later trade is the amount of
money he received for his work. Cash was his preferred form of payment,
although it often was not easy to bargain for in New Hampshire's
economy. Samuel may have urged money payments on his account more
strongly during this period than at a later time because of his plans
for the not too distant future. Certainly his designs for settling down
and beginning a family were foremost in his mind at the completion of
his apprenticeship and very likely he had a fairly concrete vision of
that future then. Setting up a household was a costly endeavor; with
no prospect of family land he would have to buy a homestead. Direct
payments of cash for his work was the least complicated and risky method
to save for that upcoming expense.

Despite getting nearly 40% of his payments in cash, he was not
satisfied. "Money being Scarce, it was Difficult to get Money for my
work:" and looking back he recalled his strategy from 1739 to 1741:

the best Method I could think of was, to make Shoes & Some fishing
Boots, for the Shoals; and my practice was when I had got a little
Cargo made, to carry them over to the Shoals; and when I could not
get money for them, I would Sell them for oyl, Blubber, & Fish &c: I
have Draw'd off 2 Barrels of oyl in a fall; & Sold it for Corn;
then I would endeavor to turn the Corn into Money; Sometimes get it
ground, & hire a Horse, and Carry the Meal to Portsmouth, and the Cost of that, Eat up all my gain; only I turned my work into Money:”

His Day Book includes “an account of the Corn & meal I Sell in the year 1740 and 1741.” beginning on December 25, 1740 and ending March 10, 1741. Six people, one being his father, purchased 42 bushels for £19-15-3. That his accounts are not comprehensive is evident; the same book notes purchases of just under 4 bushels worth £1-11-06 for the same period.12

Many of the people he traded with in his first years out were from the Isles of Shoals. Of the 74 people listed in his early accounts, 24 or 32% lived on the rocky islands. Samuel went to the Shoals twice in 1739 after his twenty-first birthday, and made six trips there in 1740 spending twenty-nine days on the rocky isles or traveling there. His four-day trip from November 30 to December 4, 1739 illustrates his typical trade. As Hampton has no harbor, Samuel hired Uncle John Nays horse to take him to “little harbour” in Portsmouth where he boarded a boat for the Shoals. He traded with seven individuals upon his arrival that “pretty cool” Monday. In return for a pair of shoes Mr Damral paid him “a Jar 5s money 6s & fish 1s.” He delivered five other pair of shoes to customers that day. The first of December was another busy trading day; he sold two pair of shoes and three calfskins, but most of his business was spent crediting his account with a curried calfskin, five quarts of oil, fourteen pounds of fish, “half a barrel Bluber and 2 DogSkins,” and money. In all, he sold £5-8-3 worth of goods and bought £6-8-3. This ratio of his debit to credit was somewhat unusual, for on two other trips where the accounts exist, he left the islands with a net

12Day Book, 1739.
balance in his favor after similar trading. On his longer stays offshore he also mended shoes, a service not called for this particular trip.  

While he credited much success to his Shoals commerce, he also traded a good deal in and around Hampton; in the period following his indenture about half of his 74 customers were local. Horsewhips were a specialty, and by October, 1737 Samuel already had made 41. The market held and in 1740 he "made abundance of Horse Whips, & Sold many of them by the Dozen at Portsmouth & Elsewhere." This connection with the Portsmouth markets, learned as an apprentice, was later to prove an important outlet for his products. His family also helped his business; 15% of his customers were relatives. Between October 12, 1739 and February 14, 1740 his uncles, Thomas and Samuel, appear in his accounts eleven times as purchasers of goods. They bought shoes, aprons, stirrup leathers, oil, nails, skins and had tanning done. In return Samuel accepted "10 lb 1/4 of cheese," a seat, "Legs for my compos," and transportation, "Sam Lane's Horse to Piscataqua" on December 27, 1739. His diary that day notes "two women Hanged at the Bank;" and he attended that spectacle.  

Samuel's work in the shop continued much as before with his customers the same neighbors, relatives and acquaintances he traded with when apprenticed to his father. He also continued to tan in his father's tanyard although at a much slower pace. His newfound independence is continually proclaimed in entries such as "The first
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hide I bought after my Time was out was of Mr Sam[6] Bearis of Rye."16
That hide was one of eleven hides and eighteen skins tanned that year, a
significant decrease from his last year of indentured service during
which he tanned fifty-eight hides and ninety-four calfskins.

His Day Book entries for 1740 taper off quite dramatically after
the winter ended and it is difficult to gauge the extent of his work
that year; perhaps his circumstances dictated payment on delivery for
most goods so he kept no record. His diary provides no indication of an
interruption of his regular work schedule, although he surely had other
business to think about at the time as he contemplated his future. He
began to accumulate household goods, provide for his meals by keeping
animals, and look for a place to live. He exchanged a pair of shoes
for "a Tin lamp & hour gl[ass] & thread" with Elizabeth Wibird, and
bought cards in 1739.17 And even before he finished his apprenticeship,
he wrote, "I Bo't a Calf & hired it kept, and it is now a COW which is
of great Service toward my Support, for milk, Butter & Cheese." Thomas
Rand's credit in 1739 included "pasturing my heifer a Spell." By mid-
1741 Samuel's livestock included eight sheep and a heifer, besides the
cow mentioned above.18 And finding a place to live became more
pressing as his courtship with Mary James advanced.

With few clues in the written record, Samuel's courting Mary James
is largely a mystery. She was born in 1722, the daughter of Hampton
weaver, Benjamin James. Members of the Hampton Church, both he and
Joshua Lane served for a time on the Standing Committee appointed in

16 Day Book, 1739.
17 Day Book, 1739.
1738. At the same time Samuel "began Acquaintance with Mary James."\(^{19}\) The replacement of vowels with dashes in this circumstance is a code he used throughout his life. Any event with the slightest suggestion of sexual activity was masked by this transparent convention and it was not limited to human sex and reproduction. His barnyard garnered the same respect with such comments as "S-w Pigd." The details of their romance are hidden behind those dashes. However, at the same time Jabez James, Mary's older brother, was wooing Samuel's younger sister Mary. That couple married February 7, 1740, an event which earned but a cryptic comment in Samuel's diary, "Jabez James married."\(^{20}\) In somewhat similar fashion, his wife-to-be Mary James is mentioned nowhere in his diary by name until after the wedding. Their relationship is chronicled in only three brief entries: On September 27, 1741 their wedding banns were posted in a public place, and "the day of our marriage" was Sunday, December 24, 1741.\(^{21}\) Samuel was a bit more specific and actually identified his wife in a reminiscence, "I was married at Hampton by the Rev'd Mr. Ward Cotton to Mary James, Daughter of Benjamin James: she was born March 3rd, 1721/2."\(^{22}\)

Finding a place to live was a high priority for Samuel in 1740. "I try'd verry hard to purchase a House Lott (for I had Not Money to purchase much Land) I tryed in Several Towns, as Hampton, Northill [North Hampton], Kensington &c but could not obtain a Suitable place for a Tanyard, which caused me much trouble & perplexity;" he noted trips to those towns in 1740.\(^{23}\) Unfortunately for him, he was seeking out
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\(^{23}\)Journal, p. 24, Diary, 1740.
land at a time when it was becoming scarce, and consequently more expensive, in older established communities. He was discouraged from settling where land was available and cheap, in inland towns on the frontier, "Epping and Brentwood, was counted too far in the Woods to Settle."  

His compromise was Stratham, a small inland town with frontage on the Salt River which emptied into Great Bay:

Sundry times Strongly invited by Mr Coker, Mr Barker, Mr Hill & others (who Traded with my Father) to Settle in Stratham, and Not Suiting my Self any where Else, I went to Stratham on that Account Several times in the months of January & February 1741, to look out a Suitable place; though it was an unsuitable time; for the Snow was very Deep."  

Not until his third trip there did he purchase what he believed a suitable lot for his home and business. Mr. Coker, "who was very kind," wrote Samuel:

Entertained me Several Nights; and went with me to Sundry places to try to procure a House Lott: and on the 19th day of Feb 1741, I Bargained with Colo Wiggin for a piece of Land on the North Side of his sons Mill Pond Called 2 Acres More or less for 26l, & took a Deed of it & paid him for it, which Exceedingly Rejoiced me, that I had found a spot to Sit down upon; which I tho't would Suit for a House Lott; and a Tanyard by the Mill Pond."  

That Samuel should be "strongly invited" by a group of Stratham residents is not surprising. Stratham was a growing farming community, and a tannery "was a necessary appendage to every village." With hides available from the slaughter of cattle, abundant bark from forested land and many streams, interior villages such as Stratham possessed the resources for tanning. Also, a nearby tanyard saved the local farmer the burden of carrying hides to seaports for tanning. Under such
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circumstances a tanner was an important resource, one of a group, an
early observer noted, that transformed "one of the most hideous,
boundless and unknown Wildernesses in the world into a well-ordered
Commonwealth."28 New Hampshire's growing population demanded leather
which served many purposes from clothing to door hinges. An English
observer praised leather's qualities without restraint, "What an
aptitude has this single material, in a variety of circumstances; for
the relief of our necessities, and supplying conveniences in every state
and stage of life."29

Thus, the calling Samuel received was not uncommon. Attempts to
settle craftsmen occurred often as illustrated by a 1758 advertisement,
"The Trade of a Currier is very much wanted in Middletown, the
metropolis of Connecticut." The attraction? The prospect of
accumulating "a pritty Estate in a few Years."30 Stratham presented
similar prospects for Samuel in 1741; its growth and prosperity held
promise for his also. Settling there was made easier by the assistance
of family acquaintances. Mr. Coker continued to help the young tanner
in his efforts to settle during several days in February when Samuel
tried to arrange for a house frame, but their efforts ended in
disappointment. Several days later, on March 2, he returned to Stratham
and sealed a bargain with William Moore to build the frame for 30£. One
of the skills sharpened during his apprenticeship must have been the art
of bargaining. His first attempts in February to get a frame for his
house ended because he "co'd not obtain to my mind." What made his
agreement with William Moore acceptable is not specified, but the terms
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were certainly more advantageous than his earlier bargaining if the following account of his experience with his house foundation is any indication: "I Lett out my Cellar to Mr ABR Stockbridge to Dig & Stone for 8£ 10s, and he finding it a hard Bargain Desired I wo'd add 30s more to it, which I did, & made it 10£-0s-0d in the whole."\(^{31}\) This incident reveals key elements of his success in business and in life. His sense of value was keen and he bargained accordingly. However, his sense of fairness was a guiding principle and superseded the sharp terms of the contract. Such behavior underlay the extensive and extended business contacts he maintained, in some cases for decades.

Samuel made nine trips to Stratham that Spring to get his lot ready for construction, several more than he had anticipated, for catastrophe struck on April 20 while he was there to clear his lot and dig his cellar: "I...Soon Come to Water; and to my great Disappointment, found it wo'd not do to Set a House there."\(^{32}\) He had spent 26£ for a lot on which he could not build. Luckily for him, although at a cost he could ill-afford at the time, he was able to purchase two acres on the south side of the mill pond adjacent to this first piece. Acquired in two separate transactions, this parcel included a brook for his tanyard and cost a total of 37£. His anxiety at inspecting snow-covered land proved well-founded and although he never openly criticized Colonel Andrew Wiggin or blamed him for selling a wet piece of land, Samuel's comments often imply a criticism that suggest he considered the sale villainous. In lists of hides taken, only Wiggin earned the following rebuke, "I Scrap'd off 2 3/4 lb of Dung

\(^{31}\)Journal pp. 25, 27; NHHS, Lane Papers, contracts, 3/2/41, 7/7/41.
of ½ one hide I had of Coll Wig---." That year he deducted dung from the weight of Wiggin's hides. Distanced at the outset by social status, their relationship only chilled with the sale of this land. On the other hand Joseph Mason helped him by selling adjacent land to the south side of the mill pond where Samuel did build his house and tanyard. Even though Mason drove a hard bargain for one acre and "made" Samuel give him 20£, he is afterward referred to as neighbor Mason, the only Stratham resident accorded that familiar title.

Following Samuel's recovery from his real estate woes, his spring went on much as before. There is little evidence of his shoemaker's trade, presumably because of the time and effort he expended in preparing his move to Stratham. In March his sister Anna was born giving him yet another reason to leave his parents' household as quickly as possible. He traveled to Stratham several times in May to buy the second acre of land from Joseph Mason and to measure it. "I drove my Cow to Stratham to Jn° Thirstons," he remarked on the 28th, "where I had Agree'd for my Board." 33 He was poised for a new beginning.

---

"I Remov'd my Self and what goods & things I had, to Stratham"

On June 11, 1741 Samuel Lane bid Hampton goodbye and went to board in the house of John Thirston at Stratham. The arrangement he described was much like that he enjoyed at his parents in Hampton, "I gave mrs Thirston 3$ a Week for Dressing my Victuals and I had Milk Butter & Cheese from my own Cow of her Make."¹ During the days following his arrival he prepared for raising a house on his land south of the mill pond purchased from Joseph Mason. On the 15th he went to Portsmouth for supplies, and the next morning work on raising his house began.

Thomas and William Moore had contracted to complete the house frame before June first but the problems with his original house site delayed that two weeks. The house was two stories and its dimensions were a modest 28 X 26 feet. Samuel and Mary added to it later to accommodate their large family. The Moores promised that "the work Shall be done, workman like and So as the Frame Shall be Judg'd a good Substantial Frame."² The first floor interior was divided into two rooms, one eighteen feet wide and the other ten. The raising apparently went smoothly for Samuel went to Hampton three days later to work in his father's tanyard, and he spent the night at his parents. Work on the house slowed after the raising; in July he contracted to have an eighteen foot square cellar dug and a foundation built under the frame, that work to be completed by mid-August. Work on finishing the the frame resumed after the foundation was complete.

²NHHS, Lane Papers, contract, 3/2/40/1, flr 1-3.
In the meantime, he did not ignore his tanyard, which was one reason he had such a difficult time finding an appropriate site to settle. His barkhouse, raised on July 1, was 26 x 24 feet in dimension. It served to store unprocessed and ground bark, and to keep it dry so that the tannin would not leach out before being used for tanning. Samuel chose not to cover it until the next year which is an indication that his resources were stretched to the limit with the purchase of the land and construction of buildings in 1741. "I wanted a Tanyard," he wistfully remembered about 1741, and had that fall constructed "a mean Water Pitt with Slabbs," but it was not until the following spring that he put down two tanning pits.\(^3\)

As a result of the delay, he raced the weather to complete work on his house before the cold set in. In August window frames were installed, and for three weeks during September and early October the chimney foundations were laid down, and the chimneys raised. The roof was shingled and the frame boarded in preparation for clapboarding. On September 22 Samuel "Brot home our glass & Sep 24. Divided it."\(^4\)

Once boarded, work on the interior could begin, and he wrote of that fall, "I finished a Room or two in My House as fast as I could, in order to Settle."\(^5\) By then he had a deadline to meet for Mary James and he published their wedding banns on September 27. Inside the house Samuel had the biggest first floor room divided into an eighteen foot square room, the great room, with a smaller bedroom behind it that Samuel used as his shop the first year. He stipulated that the great room have:

\(^3\)Journal, p. 29.
\(^4\)Diary, 1741; Journal, pp. 27-28.
\(^5\)Journal, p. 28.
breast work winscut and mantle-tree-shelfe, & cieling winscut So far as the backroom door, and make two cubbards according to his [Samuel's] desire. and make 3 four pannel Doore, and case the timbers Doors & window, & make window Shuts & put on washboards: likewise hang the doores & window Shuts, and fit Sd room all for lath & plastering; and make any Small Shelves that Shall be necessary in Sd room."6

Although financial constraints forced him to proceed in stages, he wanted their home to be respectfully finished.

Other touches indicate Samuel wanted his house to be more than simply adequate. Timothy Jones promised to "make good handsome fashionable & Strong window crowns to all the windows in Sd Samuel Lanes house. also a Larg handsome Door crown over the fore Door." The rest of the house trim was to be finished by Jones and the exterior prepared for clapboards, work that was finally completed three years later.7 By the end of 1741 the Stratham house was unfinished but liveable. Water was available from the stream that ran by the house; they would dig a well in 1742. Three rooms were finished on the first floor, although Samuel used the northeast corner bedroom as his shop.

In December construction stopped around the house and his attention turned to his work and impending wedding. On a "very pleasant & warm" Sunday in early December, Samuel remarked, "I went to the Bank & bought cloth for my wedding cloaths." As there is no other mention of travel before his marriage, he presumably had a suit made by a tailor in Stratham before December 24, 1741, "the Day of our marriage."8 Nearly two weeks later on January 6, 1742, Samuel went to Hampton and carried Mary Lane and her "goods" to Stratham. To his:

6NHHS, Lane Papers, contract, 10/20/41, f1r 1-3.
7NHHS, Lane Papers, contract, 11/5/41; Diary, 1744, f1r 1-3.
8Diary, 1741.
"great Joy & Satisfaction," he later recounted that he was "comfortably
Setled in my own House; with an Agreeable Wife."\(^9\)

Samuel summarized the momentous changes of 1741 in his diary:

This year has been a very remarkable year with me. I have this year
(by the help of a kind Providence) bought Land to Settle upon
convenient for my business; this year I removed from my native Town
to another; this year I built me a house to dwell in; this year I
rais'd my Barkhouse This year I married a wife: & this year I have
been comfortably carried through many changes & difficulties &
having obtained help from God I am yet a living (though most
unworthy) Samuel Lane."\(^{10}\)

Winter also afforded him the time to look over his accounts and
tally the considerable expense he had incurred in Stratham. The four
acres of land he purchased cost 63s, more than twice what he had planned
to spend for real estate. Expenses for building his house were at least
68s-8s, and his uncovered barkhouse cost 15s-10s to build. Because no
Day Book exists for this period, a conservative estimate of his total
expenses from his extant contracts is 146s-8s. The contracts stipulated
that at least 75s of that total be paid "in Money or passable Bills of
credit," which left him with a debt of approximately 70s. He wrote that
expenses had:

so Exhausted my little Substance, that I was obliged to part with
all I Co'd Spare, to pay for it: I Sold a fine heifer Coming in 8,
to Timothy Jones for finishing my room for 6s; and Eight Sheep I had
wh I also Sold to John Thirston and all but 1 Cow; which I kept.\(^{11}\)

With pockets empty, he resorted to borrowing: "I had nothing left to
procure my years Pork when I began to keep House: but ran into Debt to
Dn Robinson for half a Hog to live on; which he bro't Jan 20 1742."\(^{12}\)

---

\(^{10}\) *Biary*, 1741.
\(^{11}\) *Journal*, p. 28.
\(^{12}\) *Journal*, p. 28.
The newly wedded couple struggled to economize and pay off their debt during the first few years of their marriage. That effort was manifested by using rooms in their house for Samuel's shop and for drying hides during the first winter of their marriage. The struggle continued the following year when on "Dec. 6. Moved into my New Shop, where," he further explained, "I and my Wife lived Chiefly this Winter, to Save Wood."13 Their living in the shop that winter was not necessarily a reflection on the unfinished state of their house; they deemed it respectable enough the previous October to hold Meeting there. But work on the house continued in stages throughout the decade; upstairs rooms were being plastered by Joseph Hill in 1747, six years after the dwelling was first raised.14

Mary's going to housekeeping in Stratham certainly had an economic impact for Samuel. He was paying Mrs. Thirston a relatively small amount for "Dressing" the food which he provided; her 3 shillings per week rate was one-sixth the price of a pair of shoes. In addition Mary would have started a garden, produced dairy products and perhaps begun some textile production. There is no record of what goods Mary James brought into the union with Samuel, but they certainly increased his wealth and doubtless included some of the equipment necessary for domestic production. Benjamin James' Hampton home was a substantial two-story dwelling, but Mary was the youngest of eight children. Her heifer and calf, part of her marriage portion, came to Stratham in May, 1742; with no barn and little pasture, leaving her livestock in Hampton saved the couple paying a local farmer to keep them over the winter.

14Diary, 1742; Day Book, 1747.
The only other clue to Mary's marriage portion is a "Note of Some things left in my House after Sarah had taken here which belong'd to my first Wife," written by Samuel in 1783. Because he specified these goods "belong'd" to Mary, most of them probably were brought by her into their union. The list follows:

8 old Coverlids, Note 2 of them pretty good
3 feather Beds & 3 Bolsters, & 2 pillows & 2 underbeds
1 pair of Mill'd Blankets & 1 pair Linen & Wool Ditto
2 pair of Cotton & Linen, & 2 pair of Tow & Linen Sheets
1 good Boughten Linen Sheet & 1 pair boughten Linen pillow Cases
1 Cotton & Linen Table Cloth for round Table, & 2 Smaller D°
3 Bolster Cases & 3 pair of Cotton & Linen pillow Cases.
Tin Cutlender. 3 qrt. Basons, & 1 old pint Bason. 4 old pewter
plates & 1 Poringre
3 good oval Tables, old Draws. a larg Salt Morter.¹⁵

In addition, Sarah Lane's marriage portion contained a looking glass and "a Suit of old Curtains yt was her Mothers."¹⁶ Taking values from the marriage portions of his daughters, the above items, including the livestock Mary brought with her, was worth approximately £850 Old Tenor.

The large number of coverlids, eight, was unusual but upon reflection perhaps not for the daughter of a weaver. The quantities of other goods are consistent with the portions Samuel later gave his own daughters.

This list almost certainly contained some items brought later from the James Hampton household. A month after her father's death in 1747, Mary went to Hampton with Samuel "to part y° things" from the estate;

Benjamin James bequeathed his three daughters "all my Moveables in my house that I have not already Disposed of to be equally Divided between them." On a "verry warm" last day in June "I went to Hampton with a Horsecart," Samuel noted, "& brought my wives things from Br Jabez°."¹⁷

¹⁵Day Book, 1783.
¹⁶NHHS, Lane Papers, flr. 1-3.
¹⁷Diary, 6/12/47, 6/30/47.
If this varied assortment of valuable textiles is any indication, Mary brought furnishings and housewares to appointment their home fairly comfortably from the beginning of their married life, and probably was the model for the portions that went to their five daughters.

Samuel and Mary added basic pieces of furniture during their early married years. With news of Mary's first pregnancy in early 1743 Samuel "Bo't Flocks of the Cloathiers & made a Flock Bed this year." The flock, refuse wool or cotton, may have been in part the four pounds of cotton wool that he bought at the Portsmouth shop of Captain Wibird on his February 2 trip to the Bank. Joseph Hill made a "Bedsted" in April, presumably to hold this mattress. Other furniture bought from local craftsmen were a table, a little chair, a board or dining table, and six black chairs. After the birth of their first child, Mary, they bought a cradle; in 1746 a month before the birth of Samuel, Joseph Hill made them a "Trundle Bedsted" as they looked to moving the infant Mary into that bed when the baby was born. They purchased furnishings including trays, handirons, a looking glass, and a foot wheel for spinning thread. A sure sign that the couple was out of debt and in more comfortable circumstances came on August 26, 1747 when David Blasdel, a clockmaker from Amesbury, Massachusetts, brought a clock to set in the case made by Stratham joiner, John Barker. The 26e price tag for the clock was far more than Samuel had paid for any other furnishing to that date.

During their first decade in Stratham the couple acquired goods which enabled them to live in increasing comfort. In particular a variety of textiles from Portsmouth shops - mohair, silk, broad cloth,

---

18Journal, p. 30; Day Book, 1743.
19Diary, 1743-1747.
taffity, checked linen, and camblet - as well as cloth woven locally such as "mean 3/4 cloth" and "all wide cloth" entered the household. From this the Lanes had made "gounds," coats, other articles of clothing, table linens and bed coverings. In addition "stockins," garters, wigs and hats made their way inland from the Bank. Kitchen appointments made Mary's life easier; "old puter," a £10 tea kettle, a jet or ladle, a quart rundlet [bucket], spoons, a case of forks and knives, a porringer and vinegar crus[e] [jar], sieves and "a Lanthorn" demonstrate the variety of utensils purchased. Personal items such as a "Chaven Dish" for Samuel and "riband" for Mary were signs of increasing wealth and prosperity. By late summer 1745 Samuel started taking the newspaper regularly.20

The need for many of the goods mentioned was a result of Mary's pregnancies in 1743. Samuel made little note of such events and never made direct references until the birth of a child. His seemingly casual entries, "My Daughter Mary Born between 3 & 4 o'clock after," on July 14, 1744, belie his interest in the health and prosperity of his family. Their welfare was always uppermost in his mind, and he knew the institution of marriage owed its very existence to the ensuing generations. Though he made little mention of events central to the life of a family, when he did note such an occurrence, it definitely marked a milestone.

Mary's pregnancy precipitated several changes in addition to the prospect of a new family member. She had a difficult time carrying her babies, a condition Samuel disguised when he later remarked, "in 1743, my wife began to be Weakley; and I carried her to Portem[ei] to Graney

20 Day Book, 1743-1750.
Hilton: 

Mary's first pregnancy may have ended with a miscarriage in 1743 for there was a flurry of family visits sandwiched between visits to Dr. Sawyer during the first two weeks of August. From July 18-21 Sister Sanborn stayed with the couple providing a helping hand, and on August 8 Samuel traveled to Salisbury to see Dr. Sawyer about Mary's condition. Visits from Lucy and Susanah Sanborn and Brother and Sister Row, and another trip on Samuel's part to Dr. Sawyer followed in quick succession. A similar pattern of family visits and medical consultations attended later pregnancies and given her troubles, it seems likely her first one ended prematurely.

Mary exhibited similar symptoms the following spring. Samuel remarked that she was ill on April 22, 1744, and his sister Bathsheba came from Hampton two days later to relieve his wife of some household chores. On May 27 Mary became sick in the Meetinghouse; after that Samuel seems to have taken great pains to provide her help and ease her burdens during the later stages of this pregnancy. Even before the "crisis" he hired help to assist Mary in the house. Mary Drake, a cousin from Hampton, worked in Stratham during February, 1744, and in June a local girl, Hannah Wiggin, worked there for six days. Mary Drake returned the day infant Mary was born to help for five days and other relatives stepped in to assist the new parents. When Mary Drake left, Samuel's mother came for three days; she was succeeded in turn by her daughter Sarah. Samuel made no note of Sarah's leaving but his father

---

and sister Bathsheba visited on the July 24, ten days after the birth, and Sarah may have gone back home with them.22

The couple relied a good deal on their families' help for the next several years, and a series of visits by Lane and James women always preceded and followed the birth of each child in Stratham. Non-related help appears infrequently during the early years of the 1740s, although they hired help when necessary or perhaps when it was available. A period of sustained household help does not show up in the accounts until 1747 when Comfort Cate worked six weeks in June and July. After that a helper in the summer was a common fixture and increasingly help came in other seasons; Huldah Davis performed "one quarters Service" before June 10, 1751. The only specific reference to child care came in the wake of Susanna's birth in July and August, 1750 when "wid. Thirston [spent] 3 weeks Nursing at 7/6 p week." Her services in that respect were invaluable to Mary with three children aged two, four and six, and a newborn baby in the house. No longer needed as a nurse in August and September, widow Thirston was hired for "work" alone and paid only 5¢ per week.23

In January 1742 the prospect of a family with its consequent expenses pushed Samuel to retire the debt he had incurred building his house. After Mary's arrival in Stratham he remembered that, "Having no creatures to look after this Winter but a Pig; I went to work night and Day, to pay my Debts; and by the last of the Spring I believe I was pritty near out of Debt."24

---

22 Diary, 1743, 1744.
23 Pay Book, 1750.
24 Journal, p. 29.
Samuel retired his debt in much the same manner that he accumulated capital to buy his land, by shoemaking and tanning. However, tanning took a back seat to shoemaking until he equipped his tanyard sufficiently for greater production. With no covered outbuildings, he hung up seven tanned hides to dry in his house during that first winter. His furious pace of cordwaining work consumed much of his own stock, obliging him to buy other people’s leather. He addressed that undesirable situation by constructing tanning pits in May 1742, and probably put his hides in soon after. By the summer his leather stock was completely used up. To continue his work, he “was obliged to take out my new Lether as soon as possible this fall 1742 a little undertand.” Tanning assumed increasing importance in his economic life after the extremely slow years of 1740 and 1741. His output increased, particularly in the period after 1745, peaking in 1758 when he noted, “this year I Tan 57 Hides & 140 Calfskins, which is the Most that ever I Taned in a year.”

His increased tanning production coincided with the tanyard expansion and his use of hired help. Other than the two tanning pits he put down in spring 1742, he covered and boarded some of the barkhouse frame raised the previous year. However, the barkhouse had little immediate effect on his tanning; he used the enclosed section as a barn for his cow that winter. His major effort in 1742 was the construction of a shop. One can imagine that Mary Lane soon tired of dodging tanned hides hanging from her house ceiling, and Samuel making shoes in the first floor bedroom. He had contracted for shop timbers early in 1741

---

25 Journal, p. 29.
26 Journal, p. 37.
although the shop itself was not raised until more than one year later. Sixteen feet wide and thirteen in depth with eight windows, the ceiling was 6½ feet high. His shop was a little bigger than the "ten-footer," or ten foot square shop that was typical of the time. 27 Three years later he moved it from the west to the east side of his house where it stands today.

In 1742 Samuel was still somewhat dependent on his father's tannery at Hampton. For his spring tanning operations, he took his bark "to mr Jewetts to grind, and hired his Mill & Horse to grind it, which is costly." Grinding at another's mill increased the cost of the bark by one-third. In addition he hired "Justice Leavits oxen to hall Bark from mr Jewets." On September 14, 1742 he must have economized when he "went to Hampton to shave & grind bark." 28 The following spring Samuel built a barkmill in his Stratham tanyard, and he proudly noted on June 15, "I ground almost 2 Mills of Bark in my new Mill which is the first that ever I ground in it." 29 Except for finishing his barkhouse which he was still boarding and shingling during the summer of 1743, the basic elements of his tanyard were complete. In 1744 and 1747 he constructed two more tanning pits, and in 1750 he built a tanyard workhouse. By the mid-1740's he had established a productive tanyard on the land he had chosen as "convenient for my buisness."

The other resource he began to utilize to a far greater degree was labor other than his own. He worked alone from 1739 to 1741 except when helping his father. Working in his father's shop, he was in no position to do more than what he could produce as an individual artisan. Also,

27Johnson, p. 23.
28Journal, p. 29; Day Book, 1743; Diary, 1742.
29Diary, 1743.
he tanned little and spent a good deal of his time arranging for his new
life in Stratham. With his wife and business firmly established there
by mid-1742, with debts to retire and with expenses rising, he began to
feel the need for help. His own experience certainly made him aware of
the value of a good apprentice and he wanted to sponsor one. However,
circumstances caused him to harbor reservations about this strategy in
1744, "in these years past I had no Constant Apprentice only Abrm
Perkins 1 year; & James Critchet 2 spells but hired Journeymen when I
wanted help; to Save my Weakly Wife the trouble of a great family." 30
As the year went on economic necessity forced him to brush aside those
concerns and begin to regularly have help "come to live."

The first of his resident helpers, Critchet and Perkins, were
Samuel's cousins, and so he followed a long tradition of taking
relatives as apprentices. Little is known of James Critchet though he
is likely the son of Samuel's aunt, Elizabeth (Lane) Critchet. James
must have helped Samuel from time to time previously for he witnessed an
October 8, 1741 contract while his cousin was boarding at the Thirstons.
The first of his "two spells" came before November 20, 1742 when he left
the Lane household, and the other came after March 1743 when he "come
again." 31 James continued to work for short stints in 1744 and 1745.
During the latter year in January, "Jms Critchit come to Cypher." 32
That is Samuel's last mention of him.

Abraham Perkins, another cousin, provided more sustained help for
Samuel during those first years. 33 On April 18, 1743 Samuel "went to

30 Journal, p. 31.
31 Diary, 1742, 1743.
32 Diary, 1745.
33 Abraham, Born October 27, 1728, was the son of Samuel's mother's
        sister, Huldah (Robie) Perkins.
Rye for Abraham."³⁴ This probably coincided with the end of James
critchet's second "spell" which had begun on March 4. It is likely his
year ended sometime in July 1744. On July 3, Samuel credited David
Huniford "for cutting out two Jackets & Two pair of Breeches 0+1+6."
Two weeks later Huniford made a jacket for three shillings. These
clothes could have been made for Samuel, but his habit was to have only
one article of clothing at a time made for himself. In a later
indenture Samuel specified that his apprentice was to have "one Suit of
Cloaths Suitable to go to Meeting in; and Another Suit, Suitable for
working Days" at the end of his term. Given that the previous February
Samuel spent fifteen shillings on "a pair of Lether Sheepskin Britches
made by David Huniford," the less costly suits were undoubtedly to go to
Abraham for his year's work.³⁵

Abraham Perkins returned in December 1746 although in a different
capacity. In a pattern almost identical to Samuel's own service,
Perkins went back to learn surveying when he was eighteen years old.
The terms of the agreement between the two follow: "I Promise to Make
for Samuel Lane three pair of Shoes a week weekly So Long as I Shall be
Learning the Art of Surveying: and also to tell and Show and instruct
him all that I know in all the Rules and Methods of Tanning of Lether
and to withhold Nothing from him."³⁶ Just where Abraham acquired his
tanning skills is not clear. In deeds his father, James Perkins, is
listed as a Gentleman or cordwainer; Abraham was listed not as a
cordwainer, but as a tanner.³⁷ In addition to his shoemaking, Abraham

³⁴Diary, 1743.
³⁵Diary, 1744; NHHS, Lane Papers, indenture, 6/10/1777, flr 1-3.
³⁶NHHS, Lane Papers, contract, 12/29/46, flr 1-3.
was well enough versed in tanning that Samuel felt his knowledge worth paying for. Like Samuel, Abraham was merging the skills of tanning, shoemaking and surveying.

Encouraged by the work produced from this labor and finding that his household could accommodate another member, Samuel endeavored to keep an apprentice in addition to the occasional local labor that he hired on a temporary basis when necessary. He attempted to fill the void Abraham left with Joseph Jewet, and twenty days later with Jonathan Jewet in October 1744. With no other mention of these two in the record it is not clear whether either or both of these lads worked out to Samuel's satisfaction. Perhaps they were hired for the short term until March 1745 when his brother Ebenezer came to live in Stratham. Only twelve at the time, Ebenezer was to be Samuel's primary helper for the next six years.\textsuperscript{38} By 1745 Samuel had need of a trusted helper around the homestead. His tanning and shoemaking business was growing, and he was obliged to travel more frequently to Portsmouth to sell the goods he produced. Also he was measuring land more frequently in and around Stratham which required him to be away from home for extended periods during the day; within a few years he would be making surveying trips into the wilderness, some that lasted weeks. With Mary Lane at home tending to young children, he could rest easier knowing Ebenezer was there to help.

Ebenezer learned the cordwaining trade from his older brother, worked about the tanyard and farmed. As he grew older, he began to travel extensively for Samuel, taking tanned skins to the currier at Salisbury, Massachusetts, carrying Mary to Hampton, and occasionally

\textsuperscript{38}Diary, 1745.
going to the Bank. He was joined by his other brothers from time to
time. Until his marriage in February, 1746 William came to Stratham
often after his apprenticeship with his father ended in June 1744. When
Samuel was involved at court proceedings in Portsmouth during October
1745, William spent four days with Mary and Ebenezer. In all, William
spent eleven days in Stratham in 1744, and seven days in 1745. 39 Well
after he had settled into family life at Hampton, William continued to
do outwork for his brother as in August, 1749 when Samuel "carried Shoes
to Bill to Make." 40

Brothers John and Isaiah also traveled from Hampton to help
Samuel. John, twenty-one in 1747, spent thirty-one days that year
working in Stratham. He married in 1749 which curtailed his frequent
work at Stratham, however, brotherly collaboration continued. On April
12, 1750 Samuel "Reck'd with Br JnO Lane & I ow'd him 7-3-0 old Tenor
toward making Shoes: then I let him have 3 hides weigh'd 121 lb at 18d
p lb they come to 9-1-6. and now he owes me: 1-18-6 & the odds between a
gallon of oyl & a bushel of Malt." 41 Isaiah traveled less frequently to
Stratham than his other brothers but he too maintained a brisk trade
with Samuel. In 1753 he was indebted to his brother for "upper leather,
gross awls, gross tacks, money £20 left with Father total £27-12-0."
His credits included making twenty-four pair of shoes. 42

Samuel's relationship with brother Ebenezer was the only true
apprenticeship. Ebenezer lived in Stratham and Samuel owned his labor
which he at times sold to his neighbors, as on July 22, 1746, when

39 Diary, 1744, 1745.
40 Diary, 1749.
41 Diary, 1750.
42 Diary, 1753.
Colonel Wiggin had the use of "1 Days work by EbenE." Samuel also clothed Ebenezer in a "Jacket & Breeches" during each year of his service.\(^4^3\) Ebenezer's health during his apprenticeship was poor and Samuel noted on several occasions, such as the twelve days in 1748, that "EbenE went to Hampton not well." He was sickly when his service ended in June 1751; Samuel commented, "my brother Ebenezer who has lived with me Several years went home not well."\(^4^4\)

Samuel's successful relationships with his apprentices continued for the next eight years with the exception of Jeremiah Avery. Bound out to learn "the Art and Trade of a Tanner" by his father John, a Stratham cooper, Jeremiah arrived in the Lane household on May 13, 1754. Samuel noted no details about their relationship other than writing on October 17, "JnO Avery her[d] about his Son," and that young Avery had left in late November. A trial period written into an indenture was common because the boys "seldom had been consulted when they were indentured and many lacked any interest in, or aptitude for, the trade they learned. So in addition to the habit of vanishing in the night, they tended to be lazy and wild."\(^4^5\) In this case "Jeremiah...Lived with Said Lane Last year upon Tryal in order for an Apprentice; Said Partys not Agreeing to Continue the Lad with Said Lane, Said Avery took him away from him." The cause of the dissatisfaction was not specified although both Lane and Avery felt themselves wronged and sought redress through arbitration for their respective losses; Avery "for about Six Months time which Jeremiah...Lived with Said Lane," and Samuel "for

---

\(^4^3\) Day Book, 1746-1749.  
\(^4^4\) Diary, 1748; Journal, p. 35.  Ebenezer Lane lived a long life dying at age 63 in 1796.  
\(^4^5\) Tunis, p. 16.
Learning Said Lad During Said Term." Samuel paid "Moses Boynton By Expense at Averys Arbitration 1+15+0," an indication that his claim was rejected by the arbitrators. The experience steered him away from the unknown and his next apprentice was a second cousin, Marston Prescott.

The obligations of Samuel's indentures probably remained fairly constant throughout the years and followed the pattern of his contract with Thomas Hatch, who lived with him during the 1770s. This indenture dated June 10, 1777 noted that Thomas had "lived with Samuel Lane of Said Stratham Esq" more than three years past and bound him to serve Lane "well and faithfully...in all Lawful Business, according to his Power Witt and ability and honestly and obediently in all things Shall behave himself toward his Said Master and his family." For his part Samuel was to "teach and Instruct" Thomas, "in the Art and Trade of a Tanner, and all Such other Sorts of work and Business as he usually works at, if Said Thomas is Capable thereof." Samuel was to provide Thomas "Suitable Meat Drink Washing and Lodging in Sickness and in health." At the end of his service in October 1779, Thomas would receive two suits of clothes.

The form of this indenture followed those common at the time. Witnessed by two Justices of the Peace and registered by the Stratham selectmen, the agreement afforded both parties some measure of protection, and after the Avery dispute and arbitration in 1754-1755, this would have been an important consideration for Samuel. The injunctions against immoral behavior found in earlier indentures were

46 Rorabaugh, p. 6; NHHS, Lane Papers bond, 5/15/55 fir 1-3; Diary, 1754, 1755; Day Book, 1755.
47 NHHS, Lane Papers, indenture, 6/10/1777, fir 1-3.
48 Seybolt, pp. 23, 29, 34.
replaced during the late eighteenth century by a general statement requiring obedience to one's master. Samuel must have been confident in Thomas's commitment and abilities as he was already a member of the household. Although Thomas boldly wrote under his signature, "I hereby Declare my Satisfaction in the above Indenture," he had misgivings. Five days after signing this agreement, "Tho's ran Away," and the following day Samuel retrieved his new apprentice from Poplin. A previous apprentice also had displayed a wild streak. The Fall's first frost on September 12, 1771 brought Stratham selectmen to Samuel's house "about Ben." His apprentice, Benjamin Clifford, had misbehaved sufficiently to stir the ire of the minister. Samuel referred two days later to "M' Ad-ms Blast about Ben."

Perhaps the use of his code here implies inappropriate sexual activity between Ben and a local girl, which would account for the intervention of the community's moral arbiter.

Except for a period during the 1760's their household in Stratham had an apprentice residing there for virtually all the years of Samuel's working life, although it seems that, like his father, Samuel employed only one at at time. Workers often overlapped as occasional helpers; his brothers, in-laws and past apprentices, stayed to work for short periods. By employing local part-time laborers, Samuel never required more than one permanent assistant at a time. When Marston Prescott's service ended in 1759, there is no further mention of an apprentice until January 26, 1767 when Benjamin Clifford came; he was bound a month later and his term probably ended during the summer of 1773 when

---

49 Diary, 9/12/71, 9/14/71.
Samuel's brother Jeremiah "come to make Ben's Cloaths." In the interim his sons, Joshua and Samuel, served him for approximately eight years until they came of age; Samuel turned twenty-one in 1767, Joshua in 1769.

The other major source of labor was local men and boys who came on a daily basis, or worked by the piece for Samuel. Certainly, occasional local labor sustained his farm as we shall see. However, in Stratham and the surrounding towns there was both unskilled and skilled labor available to assist him and his apprentices to increase his shop's output during these years. One of the most frequent helpers was Samuel Cate, whose work first appears in the 1745 record. Cate made twenty-three pair of shoes in June and July of that year, working in Samuel's shop and using leather supplied by him. A shoemaker by trade, Cate apparently did little or no tanning, and was dependent upon others for his stock of leather. His account of 1749 with Samuel was typical of their exchanges. Over the course of the summer Samuel provided Cate with two calfskins and two sides of sole leather, nine hundred shingles and "rans & awls." In return Cate made four pair of shoes and provided Samuel a thirty-eight pound hide; at their September 21 reckoning Cate owed him £9-6-6. Similar exchanges continued with the exception of shoemaking; Cate did none for Samuel during the fall. He may have been too busy with his own trade to make shoes for Samuel as he had the cash on hand to settle his account. Samuel also had Ebenezer in his shop and his brother John made eleven pair of shoes for him that year. Samuel tanned for Cate and continued to supply him leather. Cate's credits on

---

50 Diary, 1773.
51 Day Book, 1745.
Samuel's account were cash, hides and corn and on January 3 of the new year, he balanced his account with a payment of £2-2-0.52

Samuel had a similar arrangement with Daniel Mason who put his signature to the following agreement on September 26, 1751:

Receiv'd this Day of Samuel Lane thirty Nine Pounds of Sole Lether at 8° old Tenor p lb price of the whole is £:15:12:0 for which I do promise to pay him as follows viz the one half thereof within two months from the Date hereof in Hides at 16 pence p lb old Tenor. and the other half thereof in Making Shoes at 12° p pair for Shoes & Single channel'd Pumps and 20° p pair for Double Channel'd Pumps & to make them in the best Manner & to mend what rips for Nothing; & to do them on Demand.53

The loss of Ebenezer in June coupled with a newly arrived untrained apprentice in August may have prompted this arrangement. Mason made thirty-six pair of shoes in return for leather that year. Samuel's return from this arrangement was 3 shillings on each 15 shilling pair of shoes.54 His return was considerably greater when he controlled the supply of leather. In 1747 Samuel made 13 pair of shoes and mended several pair for £4-11-9 for Thomas Moore using Moore's leather. Out of that he accounted the "price of Making" at only £1-19-5.55 This relationship again vividly illustrates the financial boon of tanning in conjunction with cordwaining.

Another common practice was to exchange instruction for work in his tanyard or shop. The first mention of this is James Critchet, who after his two periods of work in 1743, "come to cypher" on January 16, 1745. The next year Abraham Perkins exchanged shoemaking "So long as I shall be Learning the Art of Surveying."56 Samuel made two such

52 Day Book, 1749.
53 NHHS, Lane Papers, contract, 9/26/51, flr 3.
54 Day Book, 1751.
55 Day Book, 1747.
56 Dairy, 1745; NHHS, Lane Papers, agreement, flr 1-3, 12/29/46.
agreements in 1750; "bargain'd with De Metoon to Shew him a year form this Day for 7l old Tenor:" noted Samuel on October 8, "4l of which I Rec'd this Day; the other 3l I am to have at ye end of ½ year." Earlier in September he made a similar agreement with John Hill of Greenland.57 Rather than considering them competition, workers such as Cate, Hills and Metoon gave him the opportunity to work with a single apprentice, control the quality of the shoes that came out of his shop and increase his output as demand necessitated. Between family and local workers, he appears to have found an ample supply of labor.

There was plenty of work to do at the Lane homestead in the 1740's and 1750's. His sons were young and assumed a major share of the work only toward the end of this period. The variety of different tasks with which Samuel needed help is vividly demonstrated when on September 14, 1752 Samuel "Agreed wth Sam'l Pevy to give him a pair of Shoes his wife & girl for Making my Lime Mortir & turning a pitt Lether & cutting & Shocking & helping to Carry in my stalks and Oct 4 Sam Pevy help'd me 2 or 3 hours in ye Tanyard to make good Sd Bargain about the stalks."58 The tasks required in the tanyard ranged from the unskilled and simple such as carrying hides and grinding bark, to the more complicated tasks involved in finishing leather. And his growing farm operations demanded help from neighbors like Pevy; there was not sufficient household labor to do all that needed to be done during the busiest seasons. However, Samuel always seemed to find the requisite labor in his immediate locale and his business prospered. (See Table 2 below)

57Day Book, 1750.
58Day Book, 1752.
His local trade for specific customers provided the bulk of his business. Most of his accounts in the Stratham area were for individual families and consequently quite small. In January 1745 he wrote in his Day Book, "I began to Shoe Daniel Thirstons wife by the year."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>HIDES</th>
<th>SKINS</th>
<th>SHOES</th>
<th>MENDS</th>
<th>VALUE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>637-18-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>543-18-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>560-14-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>576-02-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>961-15-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1227-08-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1498-02-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1626-14-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1271-00-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1384-10-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1391-06-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1450-04-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prices used to compute these values are averages taken from the Journal, p. 43, and Day Books.

He also "agreed to give Cuffe Nokes for mowing all my grass, his wife a pair of Shoes & child a pair of Shoes 4d to Joseph Mason & a bushel & ½ of oak Bark ground & a Bottle of Syder & all the writing Done before this Day."\(^{59}\) Few families needed more than one pair of shoes per person yearly. However, there were exceptions. The various branches of the Wiggin family were major customers and the "W" pages of every Day Book are full of transactions from that family. Lieutenant Wiggin traded corn for sixteen pair of shoes for his large family from November 10, 1747 to February 20, 1748. Just who those shoes went to demonstrate the complexity of the colonial family: two pair of shoes each went to him, his wife, his daughter Sarah and son Simon; his other sons, Henry and Thomas, and daughter Molley each received one pair; Ann Gipson, a maid in the house who later worked for the Lanes, received a pair and another

\(^{59}\)Day Book, 1745.
Wiggin maid and girl each were made two pair of shoes by Samuel.60

However, wealthy families on the scale of the Wiggins were unusual for Stratham.

The payments he received for work done in Stratham were mainly goods and services produced in that agricultural community. In 1747 he acknowledged the importance of making shoes using leather supplied by others as well as the importance of "farm produce" as a method of payment: "I think I ought to have according to Rule for Making a pair of Shoes w'th other mens Lether 2/3 of a Bushel of Corn or 12 lb of Hide or a calfskin or 12 lb of Beef or 8 lb of Pork or 1½ Hundred of English Hay brot home or a Days work or 1/3 of a cord of wood or 4½-6d in Money."61 Another common practice was for Samuel to take from the stock of leather he was tanning for others sufficient leather to make shoes "& take pay for Making only."62 All manner of goods and services appear in his accounts as payments; grinding corn into meal, foodstuffs, ashes, flax, shoeing horses and iron implements are but a few of the items he took in trade for the output from his tanyard and shop. The needs of the growing Lane household, business and farm were large and varied. These payments served Samuel's business needs as well as Mary's domestic requirements.

His skills coupled with additional labor enabled him to pursue the business he had learned as an apprentice to his father as well as expand his horizons to other markets. Samuel continued his trade at the Shoals and in the fall of 1745 "had of Mr Tuckerman 5 gallons of oyl I paid him 6½ bushels of Corn." The next day one of his helpers around the

60 Day Book, 1747, 1748.
61 Day Book, 1747.
62 Day Book, 1751.
tanyard, Benjamin cotton, paid Tuckerman on the islands with "6½ bushels & a peck of corn +18+9 - also carrying it to the Boat 0+9." More impressive was his foray into the retail shoe trade, as distinct from "bespoke" work for a specific customer. Typical of this trade was a March 18, 1752 transaction with James Moore of Chester when he provided Moore with "3 pair of mens Double Chanel'd Pumps at 15½ p pair & 1 Pair of mens Sh- 13/9 & 1 pair womans Sh 10½ all is 3+8+9." This trade did not necessitate that Samuel travel all the way to Chester to deliver shoes. In September of that year he noted that three pair of shoes for Moore were "left at Folsoms," a tavern in Exeter, a town between Chester and Stratham.64

But most of this retail trade in shoes flowed toward Portsmouth, and it began to take an increasingly important role in his accounts. By the end of the 1740's Samuel was making between eight and thirteen trips a year to Portsmouth, up from two to three at the beginning of the decade; during the next two decades that frequency nearly doubled. His trade with Portsmouth as an apprentice to his father was mostly in horsewhips. The degree of his father's business in the capital is not clear for it never appeared in Samuel's accounts. After settling in Stratham as an independent craftsman, Samuel parlayed that market into a thriving business which by 1750 coincided with a more general trend of "ready-made" or "stock" shoes that was becoming increasingly prevalent from the mid-eighteenth century on.65 Typical of these early exchanges was his trip to Portsmouth on February 2, 1743.

63Day Book, 1745.
64Day Book, 1752.
65Hoover, p. 160.
On a Saturday Samuel described as a "verry cold & fair candlemass," he leased "mr Ambros's Mare" for the eleven mile trip through Greenland to Portsmouth. He carried "5 pair of shoes & 4 a whip" to Charles Treadwell, a merchant he later would deal with extensively. He recorded no purchases at Treadwell's this day. Samuel also took "4 pair womens & 1 pair of girls Shoes" to Captain Wibird's store along with a dozen horsewhips and 19½ pounds of butter. From Captain Wibird's stock he purchased two gallons each of rum and molasses, four pounds of cotton wool and "Sundry other things." A purchase of "1 yard of linnen cloth" and a gimlet came from the shop of Colonel Joseph Sherburn. His account with Wibird balanced out that day, however, total debits, or sales, on his account for the trip were £3-8-10 while credits, purchases, amounted to £2-13-4.

The following table compares Samuel's local and seacoast trade for three years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SEACOAST</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TANNING(*)</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>104-08-6(92)</td>
<td>113-16-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>586-08-6(93)</td>
<td>629-16-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>533-16-0(97)</td>
<td>548-16-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Percentage of total. Tanning here refers to all leather related sales including shoes.

Source: NHHS, Lane Papers, Day Books, 1752, 1760, 1768.

Leather related sales played a significant role in his seacoast business, but declined in relative importance over time in the Stratham area. Despite the high volume of his trade in Portsmouth, most of his sales were to friends and neighbors in Stratham and its adjacent
communities. The next table also points to his local business as the fountain of his prosperity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SEACOAST</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td>EXPENSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>113-16-6</td>
<td>128-15-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>629-16-0</td>
<td>497-09-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>548-16-0</td>
<td>731-09-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NHHS, Lane Papers, Day Books, 1752, 1760, 1768.

The "profit" of £15 6d on his February 1743 trip described above was clearly not typical of his trade as it evolved. The above table reveals a trend which Samuel exploited increasingly; his rural inland production provided the means to tap into the urban Atlantic market linked to Portsmouth and provide his family with goods otherwise unavailable in rural New Hampshire communities.

By the early 1750s the Lane household had grown considerably. Sarah, born on September 30, 1752 was their fifth child and third daughter. Since 1745 an apprentice had continually lived with the family, Ebenezer having been succeeded by Samuel Philbrook in 1751. Apprentices multiplied household chores because "Suitable Meat Drink Washing and Lodging in Sickness and in health" was accorded them. Maids also joined the household from time to time and Henry Herring, Stratham’s schoolmaster, boarded with the Lanes for 45s per week in 1751. With a growing household of young children as well as "a Puppie-Dog" which Samuel had bought from Mr. Pottle in 1744, there was plenty of work to go around. Much of it was of a general nature such as the "washing & Scouring" Huldah Davis did for two days in February, 1754.

66 NHHS, Lane Papers, Indenture, 6/10/77, flr 1-3.
Judith Glanvil's credits in 1750 illustrate the wide variety of tasks different domestic helpers performed, "1 Day making Gownds 1/6 & cutting 2 pr Jacket & britches 1/3 & one Day washing 1/6 & Making my Britches 1/6, before Making part of Eben's Jacked 1/3 price of all is 0-7-0." Another time she spent "2 Days Sowing & making Buttons, & 1 Day Husking."  

After a decade of marriage Samuel and Mary Lane had firmly established their family in Stratham. Samuel's business afforded them the opportunity to acquire land, build a house, tanyard and outbuildings, and furnish that home comfortably over time. In addition, apprentices and servants joined their immediate family allowing Samuel the opportunity to pursue his various businesses and Mary to support the domestic needs of a growing family. They prospered in Stratham's rural economy and Samuel at age thirty-five was probably in more favorable material circumstances than his father. When he wrote on October 24, 1752, "I Set out for Holderness," his work was already branching out into other areas, a circumstance made possible by a strong family base and community support in Stratham.

---

67 Day Book, 1754, 1750.  
68 Hain, p. 107.
II. "Set out to Perambulate Bow Line"

Among Samuel Lane's papers is a list "of a Number of Gentlemen of Character that were in Public offices in church and State, in the Province and State of New Hamp[ford] and its vicinity; of whom I have had some knowledge in their Day; who are now gone the way of all the Earth."¹ The 143 prominent men fell into three categories, heads of the Province and State, members of the Governor's Council, and ministers. Although Samuel fit each name neatly into one of the above three categories, the individuals often wore more than one hat in their various dealings with him. His "knowledge" of some of these individuals, Massachusetts Governors Burnet and Belcher, and Boston ministers for example, probably was limited. However, many of those found in the column of New Hampshire's government officials were involved actively in work Samuel did during this period which can be described as writing or legal: making surveys; writing bonds, leases and deeds; attending to probate requirements; and conducting town and proprietary affairs. In and around rural Stratham Samuel's literacy and knowledge was valued and demanded by those promoting individual and corporate interests within the machinery of the provincial government.

Almost immediately upon his settling in Stratham Samuel began serving as an advisor and mediator to whom Stratham residents could turn for help arranging legal and financial matters. He was a Justice of the Peace for only a brief period in the 1760s so he did most of this work as a private citizen and not as a public official. His authority, however, sometimes stemmed from commissions issued by official bodies

¹"A Memorandum of a Number of Gentlemen of Character," Lane Papers.
such as the town of Stratham. He prepared material for lawyers or for presentation before New Hampshire officialdom either for recording or for litigation in court. And sitting on the bench were some of those individuals "of whom I have had some knowledge in their day;" Meshech Weare, Daniel Warner and John Wentworth. Many more Justices who do not appear on this list were acquaintances through his trade, and work with the Bow Proprietors. The combination of writing and surveying skills meant that he could measure a parcel of land, prepare a deed for the transfer of its ownership and submit it for recording. His ability to consolidate all these tasks made Samuel the logical person for his Stratham neighbors to enlist when engaged in legal and real estate matters, frequent occurrences during the latter half of the eighteenth century as considerable property changed hands among New Hampshire's growing population.

Half of the government officials on Samuel's list of Gentlemen, eleven of twenty-two, were original Bow Proprietors, and he was deeply involved in furthering this group's interests from 1750 to 1770. A majority of Bow's original grantees were Stratham people so Samuel quite naturally fell in with them. As originally set out Bow contained much of present-day Concord and Pembroke, and title to lands lying within the township was hotly contested. Samuel surveyed the town bounds and laid out lots, tried to reconcile conflicting claims both in and out of court, and carried out the numerous duties of proprietors' clerk. Many of the most influential people in New Hampshire government had an interest in the western towns and Bow in particular; this placed Samuel

---

in close proximity to men in positions of political power and thus gave him contacts within the legal system centered in Portsmouth. This status allowed him to accomplish his work with a minimum of interference from unfriendly or indifferent officials.

In New Hampshire's oligarchic and hierarchical political structure Samuel's experience presents a seeming contradiction, for his own position and status did not emanate from the provincial seats of power in Portsmouth, but from Stratham. Viewing this aspect of his work, as an advisor to individuals, towns and to the province, identifies links between the three entities, but more significantly it identifies channels of influence within New Hampshire's hierarchical structure. His experience emphasizes the importance of what Darrett Rutman has called "'horizontal' networks of interacting neighbors that define the local community," and "vertical networks" or links between smaller communities and the provincial and Atlantic community beyond. 3 Ultimately Samuel's success as a mediator between individuals and their government, and between levels of government, had its roots in his local standing. His insinuation into the provincial channels of power came from the authority he commanded among his neighbors.

Viewed from this individual perspective the community studies which have proliferated over the past two decades require some modification. The declension in corporate communalism Kenneth Lockridge chronicled in 17th century Dedham appeared later in Stratham, but resulted in a more diverse, open and stronger, albeit different, community by the American Revolution. The movement "away from a

3Darrett B. Rutman, "Assessing the Little Communities of Early America," The William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Ser., vol. XLIII, no. 2 (April 1986), pp. 177-78.
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powerful corporate impulse...toward an age of pluralism, individualism, and liberty," is less easy to trace in Stratham than in Dedham.\textsuperscript{4} Samuel's life in Stratham supports Robert Gross' focus on the importance of local affairs and relative insignificance of broader national movements such as the American Revolution to the Concord, Massachusetts colonial. Sculpted by local personality and circumstance, such continental movements worked within the dynamic of local issues with an end result particular to an area and its people.\textsuperscript{5} Michael Zuckerman found that "accommodative consensus" became the guiding principle of New England town relations during the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{6} In Stratham the desire, and perhaps even the ability, to achieve consensus was stronger after the religious revivals and revolutionary fervor simply because the larger intellectual framework was transposed into a local context.

Samuel's experience in this respect exposes two significant elements of provincial society. First, his status as one who moved within the circle of "Gentlemen of Character" was a function of his work within his community, not his wealth or family connections. Only a few of the notables he knew were his Stratham neighbors, but that he could draw up such a list is evidence of his entry into numerous networks of social distinction and political power; those networks were closed to an individual who was a tanner or shoemaker alone. Second, he served in a role that implies a society in transition. His work as a mediator between the public and the various levels of government was less

\textsuperscript{5}Robert A. Gross, \textit{The Minutemen and Their World} (New York: Hill and Wang, 1976.).
necessary in an earlier age when oral agreements had the force of law and the local church served as a center of authority. An increasingly powerful provincial government was somewhat alien to New Hampshire's rural populace, which increasingly relied on trusted local individuals such as Samuel to represent their interests in a more legalistic world.

This section explores work which differed sharply from Samuel's tanning and shoemaking trades. His surveying training and the methods he employed in measuring land is followed by a general discussion of the many types of writing services he provided his neighbors and the town of Stratham. Finally, his work for proprietary bodies, particularly for the Bow Proprietors, shows how the conjunction of these skills gave Samuel some measure of influence beyond the borders of Stratham.

Legal and writing work is a broad and indistinct category; I make no separations between the various tasks Samuel undertook here. Individual problems and their solutions overlapped boundaries of town and provincial authority as did his wide-ranging experience. A survey might well involve defining and measuring a property, dividing it among heirs, drawing up deeds and making a return before the Judge of Probate in Portsmouth. Every region had one or more individuals like Samuel who combined these several skills. They were critical to maintaining an orderly and consistent system of property and authority in rural New Hampshire, and binding its residents to that system. He spent increasing amounts of time pursuing these matters as his reputation for skill and honesty grew, and perhaps as his connections in governmental circles deepened. While his other activities - tanning, shoemaking and

7See The Diary of Matthew Patten of Bedford, N.H. (Concord, N.H.: The Rumford Printing Company, 1903) for another individual who served a similar role in the Merrimack Valley Region.
farming - continued unabated, the duration of his surveying excursions expanded from several hours to several weeks at a time.
"I went to School to Esq Palmer to Learn to Cypher and Survey Land"

Samuel first mentioned surveying in the above remark about his schooling with Samuel Palmer in 1736 and 1737. Palmer, a Hampton resident, was "an eminent teacher of Surveying and Navigation, and a practical surveyor and conveyancer."1 Again, Samuel apparently followed his father's lead in this line of work; while he was measuring land for his brother Isaiah on April 20, 1754, he remarked, "Father also Mesured for any Pevy & Theo. Rundlet."2 His father's influence, his exposure to mathematics in his earlier Hampton education and a facility to "cast accounts" steered him in this direction. Certainly his interest was not unusual. Changes in the English land system during the previous century, particularly enclosure and the "Great Rebuilding" of rural England, necessitated more accurate methods of land measurement and piqued a general interest in surveying.3 Across the ocean in New England the pressure of a growing provincial population was increasing land values, forcing settlement further inland and making accurate surveys a high priority.

Realty was a traditional basis of wealth, and since surveying defined that wealth, it was important in the Hobbesian sense as "an art that all mankind know they cannot live peaceably without."4 New

---

1Dow, II:901.
2Diary, 4/20/54.
England's large undeveloped tracts offered the colonial surveyor the potential to achieve a certain prominence for there was little or no prior knowledge of this American "wilderness" on which to base accurate surveys. Very often a surveyor's judgment and skill alone provided the sole guarantee of accuracy. The need for this skill grew over the eighteenth century. Just after the American Revolution, Samuel Seabury, with few other prospects after leaving his apprenticeship with a furniture maker, entertained thoughts of success as a surveyor, "There were men I knew that got their living by surveying." More tangible evidence of surveying's importance in the colonies was the publication in 1688 of Geodaesia; or The Art of Surveying and Measuring Land Made Easie by John Love. Based on the author's experiences in North Carolina and Jamaica, "this was the first work directed specifically to young American surveyors."  

The striking parallels between Samuel's surveys and Love's explications indicate that Palmer likely taught Samuel according to those methods. Love simplified survey procedure by generalizing where possible and unlike his predecessors offered practical advice on the process of measuring in the field. More significantly, Geodaesia was the first text "to consider the surveying of land in America where the conditions under which the field work was conducted differed from those in England." Samuel had his own copy; acquired May 25, 1745, it is number forty on his list of books.  

---

5Mullins, p. 83.
6Candee, p. 11.
8"An Account of the Books I own;" NHHS, Lane Papers, flr 1-3.
Surveying a plot of land involved three distinct but related procedures: taking measurements in the field, plotting those measurements on paper and finding the area or casting up. Work in the field, measuring angles and distances, involved the greatest risk of error. Love's recommended instrument for measuring angles in wooded areas and for the large tracts such as were found commonly in America was the circumferentor, also called a compass. This instrument had a vernier and a sighting bar with which to measure angles relative to a magnetized needle. With few known points of reference on the ground in unsettled areas, magnetic north provided the single control.

One of Samuel's earlier compasses was made by Boston mathematical instrument maker Joseph Halsey. Inscribed with Samuel's initials and the date, 1747, this compass must have replaced the one he lost in January 1746 while measuring Parsons' land. Constructed of wood, its colored compass card measures 180 degrees from north in either direction, has wooden sights and sits on a three-legged stand. Boston, the source of his precision equipment, boasted several instrument makers. Stephen Greenleaf, of "Queen Street, Boston, opposite to the Prison," advertised in 1745 that he made and mended:

all Sorts of Mathematical Instruments, as Theodolites, Spirit Levels, Semi Circles, Circumferences, and Protractors, Horizontal and Equinoctial Sun Dials, Azimuth and Amplitude Compasses, Elliptical and triangular Compasses and all sorts of common Compasses, drawing Pens and Partagarions, Pensil Cases, and Parallel

---

10 Richardson, p. 128.
11 Diary, 1/15/46.
12 This compass is in the collection of the New Hampshire Historical Society.
Rulers, Squares and Bevils, Free Mason Jewels, with sundry other articles too tedious to mention.  

Samuel looked to replace his Halsey compass. When it was damaged in 1749 Stratham blacksmith Nathan Hoag mended it. Perhaps as a result of the accident Samuel "was for a long time troubled about getting a Compass to suit him, at last he had one made in Boston by a Mr. Greenough he read to me [grandson Ebenezer Lane] a letter...stating that it was as good a Compass as could be made in New-England." The degrees of its vernier were cut "very accurately" in brass and Samuel's name and the date, 1754, was inscribed on the instrument. Perhaps Samuel visited Greenough's shop on his four day trip to Boston in September 1753. The following September he began to send shoes to Greenough; on September 1 he debited the instrument maker's account with "3 pair of Pumps Sent by Mr Coker." Greenough sent word that the price of a compass was £12-10-00, and Samuel sent shoes there with Coker two more times, receiving his compass October 24. He used this Greenough compass for the rest of his career.

In Geodesia Love offered several methods of determining angles of a tract. He contended the most accurate method was measuring from a point within the parcel to each vertex, a method practicable only if the land was clear to each side. New England surveyors had fewer

---

14 Day Book, 1749.  
16 Samuel sent three pair of pumps on both September 1 and 25, and another two pair on October 30; all were valued at £12-16-0 Boston money. The compass cost £12-10-0. He passed it on to his son Samuel who gave it to his son Ebenezer. Day Book, 1754; Diary, 10/24/54.
opportunities to employ this method than did Europeans. Cleared land existed mainly in settled communities, a small proportion of the land measured during the eighteenth century. Most surveys were based on a second method, taking the measurements of the angle at each corner. Love described this procedure as taking "the plot of a large field or wood, by measuring round the same, and taking observations at every angle thereof by the semicircle." His depiction of a typical example is shown below.\(^\text{17}\)

**ILLUSTRATION 3 - John Love's Surveying Method**

*Divets Ways to take the Plots of Fields.*

To take the plot of a large field or wood, by measuring round the same, and taking observations at every angle thereof by the semicircle.


This method was not without its problems in the American context as it required a clear line of sight around the lot's perimeter. However, as boundaries needed to be noted and marked in any event, it made more

\(^{17}\)Love, p. 93.
sense to clear along the perimeter lines than to clear lines of sight from a central point within the lot to each corner.

The other field measurements taken were distances, from the central point to each vertex in the first case, and around the perimeter of the parcel in the second. These distances were measured with a Gunter's chain expressly designed for this purpose. This chain had one hundred 7.92 inch links making the total length of one chain sixty-six feet. The chain had a handle at each end to pull it tightly and often contained swivel links to prevent kinks from forming. The surveyor compensated for "Swag" or sag in the chain by inflating his measurements. A surveyor's reputation was built on such judgments; over irregular terrain as much as one chain per mile might be added as compensation for swag.  

Coordination of the chainmen was the surveyor's responsibility and they might require considerable supervision. There were thirty men in the Massachusetts group that surveyed Penacook in 1723; on a Bow trip in 1748 Samuel hired eight chainmen. Thus, Love's seemingly straightforward advice, "Take care that they who carry the chain deviate not from a strait line; which you may do by standing at your instrument, and looking through the sights," might not have been that easy to follow with a large group in a wooded area. The length of the Gunter's chain was a disadvantage in dense undergrowth as the links caught in brambles

---

20 Love, p. 59.
making it difficult to pull horizontal. Love noted that the chain was too long for use in some lands, "especially in America," and advised surveyors to use a half or quarter chain instead.21 Some surveyors found to their dismay that less cumbersome substitutes for the chain such as hemp rope, which was less apt to become entangled in the undergrowth, were unacceptable. The hemp shrank and stretched as weather conditions changed and with that, the size of the lot measured by such means.22

Chains were liable to be damaged during the course of a survey. Pulling them tightly through thick undergrowth might cause them to separate. Samuel noted having his "chain cut off" in 1750 which probably resulted from its being hacked with an ax as chainmen cleared the undergrowth.23 He records buying at least two chains. The one purchased from John Coker in 1752 probably came from Boston; by 1760 Samuel had confidence in a local smith, Nathan Hoag, to make him a chain. Hoag also mended Samuel's chain when necessary.24

The units of measure Samuel employed were standard. Angle measure was in degrees, and linear measure in rods.25 One rod was a quarter chain or 16½ feet. On Samuel's plots and worksheets, distances are always measured in rods or fractions thereof. The rod and chain were also units of square measure. A square rod encompassed a 16½ foot

---

21Love, p. 60.
22Clark, p. 122.
23Diary, 3/31/50.
24Account Book, p. 142; Day Book, 1760.
25The rod was called a perche or pole also. Samuel used the term "rod" only.
square area, one square chain a sixty-six foot square area. One acre was ten square chains or 160 square rods.26

The following example of Samuel's work is typical of his surveying method. On January 6, 1747 Samuel measured a twenty-five acre tract straddling the boundary between Exeter and Stratham which was to be sold by Daniel Foulson to Joseph Hoit. The character of this parcel is nowhere apparent from the documents although it probably was cleared to some extent as it abutted Foulson's "home Place," and one line ran "to ye medow."27 Aside from any wooded or overgrown portions to contend with, weather conditions made the job difficult; "verry cold freezing weather," Samuel noted, "the like seldom known to hold So Long." That was exacerbated by "a cold Driving Storm of Snow verry Deep" two days earlier.28

Love suggested to "always have in readiness in the field a little book, in which fairly to insert your angles and lines;" Samuel did just that in his "Pokitbook" from 1742 to 1749.29 He headed each page with a description of the parcel, here "Land Joseph Hoit bought of Daniel Foulson Measur'd Jan 6.1746/7. p S.Lane" and followed with a series of angles and distances which described the boundaries as well as any distinguishing features of the parcel he felt worth noting. (see Illustration 4) Basically this is the procedure recommended by Love who

26Geodesia contains "A Table of Square Measure" on page 52 which contains the following units: Inch, Links, Feet, Yards, Pace, Perch, Chain, Acres, and Mile.
27The documents relating to this survey are in the NHSA, Stratham Town Records, Lane Survey folder, and in Provincial Deeds 33:257.
28Dairy, 1/4/47, 1/6/47.
29Love, p. 66; NHSA, Stratham Town Records, Lane Survey folder. On its cover is written, "if I it Loose and you it find I pray return it with a willing mind." Other field notes on single sheets of paper exist, but this is the only extant book.
also wrote that "there are scarce two surveyors in England, that have exactly the same method for their field notes." 30

Samuel's plan (Illustration 5) shows the plot bounded by dotted lines with its eleven vertices indicated by a circle at each corner. He recorded measurements at eight of the eleven corners, beginning in the northwest corner. Therefore his angular measures reference the south line of the compass as he sighted along the compass from north to south. The first note, "S 63° E 26r," means that the first section of the northern boundary lay sixty-three degrees east of south and ran for 26 rods. He went around the easterly side of the land taking measures at each of the five corners, then returned to his starting point and went around the westerly boundary taking measurements at its four vertices.

The puzzling aspect of his field notes is that his measurements do not close completely around the lot. There is no description of the southern boundary in the notes, yet it does appear on the final plan. Without those measurements how did he arrive at the final two sides of 5 2/3 and 53 1/3 rods? The deed provides the answer to this mystery. Daniel Foulson had agreed to sell Hoit twenty-five acres which was to be divided from his "home Place," and which lay north of the land Foulson wished to retain. The deed describes the lot "to Begin at the Northerly End of the home Place where I Now Live and So to Extend Southerly into the Lott Carrying the whole Breadth Thereof untill the full Measure of Twenty five acres be Fully Compleated" 31 With the north, west and east boundaries already established by abutting properties, only the southern boundary remained to be determined. Samuel surveyed what he estimated

30 Love, p. 66.
ILLUSTRATION 4

SURVEYING NOTES - "Land Joseph Hoit bought of Daniel Foulson"

Source: NHSA, Samuel Lane's Pokitbook, Stratham Town Records.
ILLUSTRATION 5

"a Plan of the Land Joseph Hoit bought of Daniel Foulson"
to be about twenty-five acres, then ran the eastern boundary in the same
southerly direction until the piece comprised twenty-five acres. He
needed no angular measures for those corners, only distances so that he
could calculate the necessary area to fill out the lot.

After a frigid spell in the field taking measurements, there
remained the task of plotting and calculating the lot’s area. Unlike
Matthew Patten, Samuel rarely noted in his diary when he completed the
desk work associated with surveying and often neglected to note a day’s
surveying in the field. It was first necessary to draw an accurate plan
before calculating area. Samuel oriented his plans to the north
according to the compass bearings taken in the field and drew his plans
to scale; this particular plan had a scale of fifteen rods to the inch.
The improved accuracy of Samuel’s surveys contrast with earlier New
England surveys which only used the eight principal compass points with
no reference to the more precise degree measure, and which were not
drawn to scale. Landscape features described the boundaries on the
earlier surveys, and little specific surveying information was
included.32 Continued subdivision of the land, as well as its altered
appearance accompanying changes in use, demanded the more accurate
surveys of the type made by Samuel.

Aside from the boundary indicated by the dotted lines, eight of
the numbers which appear on the plan represent the triangles into which
Samuel divided this irregularly shaped parcel to “cast up” the area.
Thus, each circled corner also represents the vertex of one or more
triangles. English surveying texts used this method although Love also
demonstrated how trapezoids, circles and regular polygons could be used

32 Candee, pp. 39-40.
to compute area. Thus, triangle 1 in Samuel's plan had a base of 20
2/3 and an altitude of 28 2/3 rods. Using the formula, \( \text{area} = \frac{1}{2}(\text{base})(\text{altitude}) \) he arrived at an area of 301 rods for triangle one.
His computations for eight triangles are labeled and listed at the top of the sheet. Those eight triangles contain sides he measured in the field and total 3850 square rods, or just over twenty-four acres. His calculation in the center of the second row shows his juggling the southern boundary to arrive at the last 150 rods to make twenty-five acres. With an accurate plan drawn to scale there was no need to return to the field to check his measurements. From the relative warmth of his home he could determine the southern boundary's bearing and distance which is given to the right of the areas calculated on Illustration 5, "run N 43 W 52 1/3."

His training led Andrew Wiggin to administer Samuel "the oath of a Surveyor of Land" on February 26, 1743. With this official stamp of approval his surveys could become legal documents. But whether surveying relatively small, cleared seacoast lots or laying out townships in the forests of the eastern frontier, the concepts illustrated above were the basis for all Samuel's work of that nature.

John Love was probably correct in identifying surveyors as one of society's peace keepers. The orderly distribution of colonial lands with clear titles was essential to the development of the province. The breakdown of this system in the Bow township points to both the importance of surveyors and clear titles to land; their absence along
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33Love, pp. 123, 125, 128, 130. Richard Candee's article on the Godseoe's explains the several methods employed during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.
34Diary, 2/26/43.
the Merrimack River led to retarded growth and legal battles lasting for decades. Moreover, Samuel's other skills of a legal nature complemented his surveying and placed him in a niche that was critical to the development and smooth operation of the provincial government in colonial society.
"I made Hoage & Bordmans writing"

Surveying was a useful skill and one that perhaps more than any other of his accomplishments, made Samuel Lane a man of some note in New Hampshire's governing circles. When combined with his legal knowledge and writing skills the value of surveying multiplied. Samuel was able to take raw data and transform it into the forms required by provincial officialdom. Though not a lawyer himself, he was an important intermediary between New Hampshire's citizenry and its royal government.

Samuel was a rural version of Mr. Brown Tymms of Newbury Street, Boston who in 1718 advertised his bookkeeping services as "keeps Merchants & Shopkeepers Books, also writes Bills, Bonds, Leases, Licences, Charterparties, &c. for any Person that may have Occasion, at reasonable Rates."¹ Life in rural New Hampshire presented Samuel with few occasions to keep accounts for commercial establishments. However, he frequently wrote deeds, leases, bonds, advertisements, and lent his expertise to citizens who found themselves having to deal with the system of provincial authority by representing their interests in court and other governmental venues. Depending on a specific case's requirements, Samuel was in a position to ready documents for presentation to either lawyer, judge or registrar. Since land figured prominently in many eighteenth-century transactions, Samuel's combination of surveying and legal skills made him indispensable to his Stratham neighbors. In the lower Merrimack Valley, Matthew Patten played a similar role.

Other skills augmented his utility. As a trader whose dealings with Portsmouth's merchants exposed him to local and Atlantic markets, Samuel was well aware of personal property values and was called upon to appraise estates for probate and for division among heirs. His surveying experience proved helpful in evaluating real property. As a consequence his signature appears often in probate documents relating to residents of Stratham and nearby towns.\(^2\) Also, this placed him in a position to dispose of unwanted property and he sometimes acted as vendue master, or auctioneer, for those properties, a very lucrative position.

The lessons he began at age five in Hampton's school were no abstract exercises, but foundations of an entire aspect of Samuel's life work. Combined with the more specialized cyphering and surveying skills he acquired from Samuel Palmer, his schooling provided a practical basis for work quite distinct from his leather business. Individuals like Samuel made the governmental machinery of New Hampshire work. Without him, a population, largely unschooled in the increasingly sophisticated world where ownership and rights were not based on spoken promises but in written documents, would have been isolated from the very machinery which existed to protect those rights. Ironically, his support of royal authority in this respect may have had unintended and revolutionary consequences. His mediation insulated the citizenry from personal contact with the colonial government while simultaneously binding the people to it and its procedures. Dissatisfaction with imperial rule might have surfaced in milder forms sooner had he and others like him

\(^2\)In the probate records contained in the NHSP, vols 33-39, Samuel's name appears in conjunction with twenty-nine estates from 1745 until 1772.
not provided the expertise to make the government function effectively in the general population's interest; later, when American subjects abruptly came into direct contact with that government the stage was set for the political protest which followed.\(^3\)

In his youth Samuel was already writing for his less literate Hampton neighbors. His 1737 Day Book contains a draft of the following advertisement:

Lost between Dr Sargent's house in Hamp\(^t\)n and John Jannens\(^s\) house in Rye a Saddle with the housen & malepilicon: If any person hath taken up the 3d Saddle & furniture or can give any intelligence of the same to 3d John Jannens Sen\(^r\) they shall be well satisfied Jan 28
1737/8.\(^4\)

Such an advertisement might have been placed in a Boston Newspaper or posted locally; New Hampshire did not have its own newspaper until 1756. There is no other evidence that he wrote for others during his apprentice years, and documentation of this type of work is scarce for his early years in Stratham. In the 1740's (1743-49) he recorded twenty-six entries in his Day Books for writing, an average of less than four per year.\(^5\) However, this statistic is probably misleading and understates the extent of his writing for others. His Day Books document neither all the writing nor surveying work that he undertook.

It is quite possible that he maintained separate accounts that have been

\(^3\)Fred Anderson writes about the contact between British regulars and colonial militia during the Seven Years War. "Such intercultural contact—for that is what it was—largely took place through the operation of the British military justice system, and it gave the colonial soldiers an unflattering, disturbing impression of their comrades in arms." A Peoples' Army Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years' War (Williamsburg, Virginia: The Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1984), p. 111.

\(^4\)Day Book, 1737.

\(^5\)Writing includes deeds, bonds, leases, advertisements, wills or any document of a public nature.
lost. However, his neighbors soon recognized his ability to write effectively and exploited that talent. The incidence of writing work recorded in his Day Books increased over the next two decades. For the decade of the 1750s he averaged over ten assignments a year and over eleven for the first half of the following decade.6 These numbers do not include the considerable work he provided two proprietary bodies, Bow and Holderness.

Sometimes the exact nature of the work performed is not specified such as that done on May 30, 1743, "JnO Barker for writing." However, over time he detailed these entries more specifically; what in the earlier years would have been recorded as writing a bond, was later specified as "a Bond from Perkins." Much of this work in the 1740s involved bonds and deeds. These often were printed forms that simply required names, dates, and sums of money to be filled in the appropriate blanks. At times Samuel simply sold the printed form itself.7 Most often he provided both the form and the writing. The repeated combination of measuring land and writing deeds in his accounts underscores the significance of land to New Hampshire's populace.

As Stratham residents gained confidence in his abilities the tasks assigned him increased in difficulty. From simple deeds and bonds, he soon was drafting counter-bonds and double deeds. The first mention in his Day Books of drafting a will is May 5, 1753; the next year he was called upon to draft a will for his distinguished neighbor, Esquire Moses Leavitt. A year later his involvement in probate matters had expanded "To writing a Bond & Measuring & Prizing Jms Leavits Estate

6From 1751 through 1759 he noted 104 writing jobs and from 1760 through 1764, 59.
7Day Book, 1750.
50/ - taking out Bonds also writing 4 Adverts 16/ -
 In addition, he began to expedite the legal process by taking the will to be proved before the Judge of Probate at Portsmouth. Probate activity had few bounds; Samuel even acted as undertaker at times, "going to the Bank for funeral things" and nailing shut a coffin. 9

The variety of this work was endless. Strictly defined "bookkeeping" as noted in the Boston advertisement above was not a prominent feature, although he did prepare an "Alphabet," an alphabetized index of names, for Thomas Moore's account book, and helped settle an affair between John Veasey and widow Leavit. In that account Samuel apparently researched and set out in an orderly fashion the materials and work Veasey had performed for Leavit, and her payments to Veasey in return. Samuel was hired in part as arbiter and, at the bottom of the long list of services provided by Veasey, noted "the Clearing the Brentwood Farm - The Clearing the Alder Swamp at Stratham - The Picking up Rocks - the Ditching the low ground Clearing the Gutters on the House &c &c I throw'd away." Apparently Veasey could not substantiate his claims for that work to Samuel's satisfaction. 10

He also acted as a banker. In 1755 he wrote a deed from Veasey to John Stockbridge, and the following day went to Hampton for Stockbridge "to hire Money," presumably funds Stockbridge required to pay for Veasey's land. In June, 1761 he spent a day in Portsmouth procuring a marriage license for his neighbor, Joseph Mason. The license cost 6d and his expenses were an additional pound. Samuel's involvement was indispensable to the newlyweds' happiness for he also provided Mason "my
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8 Day Book, 1753, 1755.
9 Day Book, 1745, 1757.
10 Day Book, 1746; NHHS, Lane Papers, flr 1-5.
horse to bring his wife home." This work vacillated from the sublime to the mundane. He wrote forty-eight copies for Nathan Hoag at 3d each in February, 1756, and copied more for Hoag the following year.11

His work involved him with lawyers, an elite group in provincial New Hampshire.12 His Day Books note his first such association with Noah Emery of Exeter who requested a plan of the second division of land in Bow in 1752; Emery still owed Samuel for it in 1755. It appears that some people were reticent or unwilling to deal with New Hampshire's attorneys. Samuel Pevy paid him 6s to go to the Bank to pay lawyer Wyseman Clagett; his diary notes his going to "pay Pevys Debt" in thawing weather which made for "terrible going." He began an account in 1755 with the Register of Deeds, Daniel Peirce. Between March and June in 1756 Samuel gave Peirce seven deeds to record.13 Peirce was also attorney for the Bow Proprietors.

Samuel regularly prepared documents for individuals and corporate groups such as a propriety or the town of Stratham. The roughness of signatures on Stratham petitions and deeds suggests that some residents possessed only a signature literacy, or at best an uneasiness or unfamiliarity with writing. Thus Samuel's skills were essential. His probate work best illustrates his wide range of expertise in legal, mercantile and surveying matters which, when combined helped maintain the legal system and provide equity to the individuals involved.

New Hampshire probate law was similar to that of the other New England provinces, essentially mirroring Massachusetts custom. "Every

11Day Book, 1755-1757, 1761.
12The "Register of New-Hampshire for 1768" lists only eight "Practising Attorneys." NHHS, Collections, vol. I:280.
13Day Book, 1764; Diary, 2/19/65; Day Book, 1755.
Person," had the right "to give, dispose, and devise as well by his Last
will and Testament in Writing, as otherwise by any act executed in his
Life: All such Lands, Tenements, and Hereditaments to and among his
Children, or others, as he shall think fit at his pleasure." If the
individual died intestate, the law prescribed how the estate was to be
divided. A surviving widow received one-third of the deceased's
personal estate "for ever," as well as a life interest in one-third of
all the real property; this was the widow's dower or thirds. The
executor had thirty days to assign the thirds after it was demanded.
The "Residue" was then equally divided among the children, except for
the eldest son who usually received a double share.\textsuperscript{14}

Every will had to be validated, or proved, and recorded by the
Judge of Probate within thirty days of a death. If the estate was
solvent dividing it could proceed quite quickly. However, if creditors' claims on the estate proved numerous, it could take years for the estate
to be settled. When a widow's thirds were set off, the estate remained
unresolved until she too died; upon her death the life interest in her
husband's real property ended and absolute ownership of that property
reverted to the other heirs. Final settlement might take years. Joshua
Maccress of Greenland died in July 1753 and the following February
Samuel measured his land to set off the thirds for his widow Susanna.
She lived a long life and the estate was not settled until October 14,
1811, more than fifty-seven years after Joshua Maccress died.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{14}John D. Cushing, gen. ed., The Colony Laws of North America Series,
Acts and Laws of New Hampshire 1680-1726 (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael
Glazier, Inc., 1978), pp. 34, 102-03.
\textsuperscript{15}NHSA, Stratham TR, Lane Plans; NHSP, 34:444-46.
Samuel's involvement in probate cases varied. The process might take one day as in February 1754, when Nathan Johnson hired him to measure land in the estate of Joshua Haccres noted above. The order for this was written in one hand, possibly that of Andrew Wiggin, the Judge of Probate. However, the boundary description which followed, dated February 14, 1754, is in Samuel's hand as is the attached plan of the land. In other cases he appears to have been entrusted with the entire administration of an estate from writing the will to carrying out its provisions when that time arrived. As noted above, ultimate disposition of the estate often waited on the death of the surviving spouse. John Stockbridge died intestate on February 19, 1782 and soon after, Samuel divided the estate among his widow and children; three years later Samuel still was working for the estate, distributing the thirds among the children after the widow Stockbridge died.16

Samuel's work in probating Satchel Clark's estate demonstrates the delicate role he might play in resolving issues when a neighbor died intestate. Clark died November 4, 1773 leaving seven heirs: his wife, a son, John Clark, and five daughters, Abigail, Else, Hannah, Mary Robinson and Elizabeth Chapman.17 The probate court appointed John Taylor and Thomas Moore Jr. to appraise the estate which they valued at £655-11-10 on December 29, 1773. In early December a New Hampshire Gazette advertisement placed by John Clark, administrator of the estate, asked any creditors to make their demands on the estate.18 Beyond that

16NHSA, Stratham TR, Lane Plans.
17Hannah Clark was the youngest, about twelve years old; Else and Abigail were minors too.
18RC Probate, #4070; New Hampshire Gazette, 12/3/73.
it seems that John Clark did little else to settle his father's estate
during the year following his death.

John Clark's delay in dispersing the estate fell hardest on his
mother who was responsible for the care of three daughters. One year
after her husband's death Elizabeth Clark found further delay
unacceptable and petitioned the court to recognize "the great
Difficulties I am Expos'd to in this Cold Season for want of firewood,
with Sundry other Damages I Suffer for want of my Dower being Set off to
me out of the Estate of my Said late Husband." The petition may well
have been submitted on Samuel's advice. It is written in his hand, and
Elizabeth signified her approval by her mark. Her son John countered
with a petition of his own requesting that the length of his bond be
extended until the following spring explaining "that there are Sundry
very large demands agst sd deceased that if the Stock part of the
personal Estate should now be Sold they would not fetch So much money as
they would in the next Spring." 19

New Hampshire law stipulated that "the Division of the Houses and
Lands...be made by Five sufficient Freeholders upon Oath, or any Three
of them, to be appointed and Sworn by the Judge for that end." 20
Elizabeth's petition listed five Stratham men she wanted as her
committee. Samuel was among the five and named "Surveyor and Committee
Man" by Judge of Probate John Sherburne. He began his work on December
8, 1774. 21 That day he measured Clark's land in Stratham, and the next,
a wretched day of rain and snow, he spent indoors drawing plans of the

19 RC Probate #4070.
20 Cushing, ed., p. 103.
21 The two other committee members who signed the return of the widow's dower
were John Taylor and Thomas Moore Jr.
land and dividing it. In "pretty Cold" weather on December 13 and 14 he
taveled to Exeter and measured Clark's thirty-three acre woodlot to
make a provision for the widow Clark. Samuel spent the next two days to
"Set of wid Clark's thirds at home." His settlement provided living
quarters for her in the "Mansion House" as well as one-third of her
husband's personal estate for her use. On the 27th of December Samuel
drew up "the Return of the Land & Buildings belonging to s<sup>d</sup> Thirs &c,"
and the next morning he went to Portsmouth to file his division of the
assets with the Judge of Probate.<sup>22</sup>

The return of Elizabeth Clark's "Right of Dower, and power of
thirds" documented her share of the house and surrounding lands in
specific detail. She had use of over twenty-seven Stratham acres, and
eleven acres in the Exeter woodlot. The detailed description of her
rights in her former home is not unusual:

Likewise we have Sett off to Said Widow, the Westerly End of Said
House on Said Home place, as far as the Chimney, from bottom to the
top thereof: and the Little Celler under the Easterly End of Said
House; and Liberty to Bake in the oven, and Draw Water out of the
Well: and to pass and repass to and from Said Celler and oven as She
Shall have occasion: we have also Sett her off the East Barn on Said
place; with Liberty of a yard by the Same; and passing and repassing
to and from Said House and Barn, with Teams and otherwise, as
occasion Shall Require.<sup>23</sup>

John received "the Kitchen, and the Closet at the Easterly End thereof,
in the Mansion House...with a Priviledge in the Well;" in addition to
half the kitchen cellar and one end of the largest barn. He also was
allotted the fourteen acres on which the house stood. His youngest
sister Hannah received the shop "for her part of the Buildings," and two
married sisters were granted bedrooms in the house as their share of the

<sup>22</sup>NHSA, Stratham Town Records, Box 3;  Diary, 1774.
<sup>23</sup>RC Probate #4070.
buildings as well as rights to pass and repass through the rest of the house to get to their rooms. John was required to reserve "Liberty for all the other partners in 5th House and Barn of passing and Repassing to and from their Respective parts of the Same, with other Necessary Privileges about Said House, Barn and Well." He may well have purchased his sisters' shares in the house to untangle this somewhat messy division.

The living arrangements implied by the above division, though typical of the time, must have been the source of much tension within the household. Already at odds with her son over the estate, and forced to petition for her thirds, Elizabeth went from being mistress of the house to restrictive partnerships with her children. Even were her children to show appropriate deference to their mother, the psychological loss of status and authority within what was formerly her own realm was significant. The house was divided into clearly delineated areas with each heir having specific rights in an attempt to reduce friction. "Even with carefully drawn boundaries, however, cohabitation was difficult."25

The death of a male household head transformed roles and responsibilities, placing new pressures on mother and children alike. Elizabeth Clark's widowhood certainly must have been confining; abruptly limited to a section of the house, the multitude of household chores, once willingly attended to as filial duties, were put on a contractual basis between mother and children. Also, children might have resented their mother's continued presence as a barrier to their

---

24 NHS, Stratham TR, Lane Plans; folder 3.
absolute and rightful inheritance. Such tension and animosity may have festered years in Satchel Clark's former house for his widow outlived him by sixteen years.

These generational tensions are illustrated in Laurel Ulrich's analysis of Martha Moore Ballard's life. When her husband was jailed for debt, Martha Ballard's son Jonathan, his wife Sally and nine children, although uninvited, moved into her house; she voluntarily confined herself to only one room. As much as possible Ballard attempted to live the independent life to which she was accustomed, all to no avail. She had a room with a fireplace but little firewood, "I have suffered for fire but must bear it," she wrote in her diary, and she slept in her clothes to keep warm. Ballard's position was weaker than that of Elizabeth Clark for she did not enjoy any of the legal protections available to a widow through her right of dower. In one form or another a widow was ensured support, even if given grudgingly by her children. With her husband alive but serving time in jail, Martha Ballard had only her industry, and the goodwill of her son Jonathan on which to rely. That being a bleak prospect, she sought temporary relief in the house of a more obliging child.26

A widow's right of dower was the least support she might receive from her husband's estate. When specifically provided for in a will, the widow had the option of accepting those provisions or taking her thirds. Samuel wrote Moses Leavit's will in 1754 which contained provisions for his wife Anne. Leavit bequeathed her "all my household Goods of Every Sort Which She Brought With her to me," and four hundred pounds in old tenor money. To pay him proper last respects he also

allowed her "a Good Mourning Suit." His will gave her "the Whole Privilege of two Rooms in my house Viz the Middle Room So Called & the Bed Room Adjoining to it at the Same End of Said house with a Privilege In my Cellars Ovens & Well all So Long as She Remains my Widow," as well as a life interest in his "Great Bible." Leavit apparently felt this along with the cash allowance would be sufficient to provide for her wants, but also recognized the passage from wife to widow was an especially burdensome period. To ease that transition he directed his estate to pay for "half a years Provision for herself the next half Year after my Decease and Also half a Years firewood hall'd to my Door for her to burn In her Own Room."\(^{27}\)

This legacy was conditional upon Anne's willingness to renounce "all her Right of Dower & power of thirds unto ...Said Estate both Real and Personal forever."\(^{28}\) It was Moses Leavit's intention to leave all his Stratham real estate to his son Dudley, minister in Salem, Massachusetts.\(^{29}\) Thus, his bequests to his daughters all depended upon their quitting to Dudley all "Right or Claim unto all that part of the Land I have in Stratham." This form of entail was nearly impossible without a will devised in this manner.

Only after the widow's thirds were set off could the rest of the estate be divided and distributed among the deceased's children. Samuel did not begin this process for Satchel Clark's estate until the spring of 1775, two years after Satchel Clark's death. It required two days of

\(^{27}\)NHHS, Moses Leavitt, #1982-62(M).
\(^{28}\)NHHS, Moses Leavitt, #1982-62(M).
\(^{29}\)Dudley had left Stratham ten years earlier under a cloud; unauthorized to do so, he preached in the Stratham church and was bodily removed from the pulpit by the Sheriff. This was but one in a series of events which deeply divided Stratham for more than a decade.
“Measuring & Viewing” Clark’s real and personal property in Stratham, and another day at Clark’s Exeter woodlot, “Dividing the Land there.” Samuel had already measured the parcel to set off the widow’s dower so this procedure was simply one of identifying and marking the bounds of each of the six heirs’ lots. Two days later on April 10, 1775, Samuel was “Measuring & Bounding out the Home place into Seven Shares,” for eldest son John Clark inherited a double share of his father’s estate. Once his work in the field was finished, he spent two and one half days drafting descriptions of each share and writing “a long Return of all the Land and Buildings.” Of the five men appointed as a committee to divide the estate, Samuel appears to have done the bulk of the work. He went “to Cornet Wiggins by appointment,” on April 13 and waited there for two members of the committee, Burley and Chezwell.” They did not appear and he had to go to Newmarket, presumably to get their signatures on the return he had drafted. Between going to Newmarket and chasing down the other Stratham committeemen he spent one day getting the return signed. The following day, despite cold weather, Samuel went to Portsmouth and presented his findings to the Judge of Probate.30

Less than a week after Samuel wound up the Clark estate, Stratham was abuzz with the news of “the Bloody Battle at Concord.” News of the hostilities spread northward quickly; on the day after the battle, Stratham voted to send twenty-five men to Concord. That the populace was nervous can be seen in its easy acceptance of reports that British Regulars had burned the towns of Salem and Ipswich. Samuel noted that this “Set people in a terrible fright.”31 Anxiety continued to manifest

30NHSA, Stratham TR, Folder 3; Diary, 1775.
31Diary, 1775.
itself in false reports of British depredations such as the landing of troops at Hampton in May. But these events had little effect on the rhythm of life in Stratham. Samuel was elected a delegate to the Provincial Congress at Exeter, first attending in May, however, his life and work changed little otherwise. He appraised the widow Jewet's estate in mid-July and continued regular trips to the Bank to transact business there.

Well before his involvement with the Clark estate and the Revolution Samuel had witnessed the economic distress many widows suffered, even when children cooperated in their mother's support. Few women found their finances healthier after the death of their husband than they were before. Thus, the unexpected death of Newmarket's Stephen Emerson on June 3, 1763 placed his wife Lydia in uncertain circumstances.

Stephen Emerson had been an innholder, ferryman and merchant with whom Samuel had traded. Mostly Emerson provided him ferriage across the Salt River; in 1758 Samuel recorded nine trips on Emerson's ferry. That year his ferry also hauled bark over the river for Samuel's tanyard.32 Before 1759 more of Emerson's business revolved around his inn and ferry than around trading, but combining the two provided expanded opportunities. Patrons' accounts illustrate the benefit of this conjunction; on August 5, 1758 Captain Titus Salter of Portsmouth was charged for "two Diners a Bole of tody & fares." Emerson's inn provided all meals, lodging and a wide array of spirituous liquors.33

32Day Book, 1758.
33In 1758 Salter's account with Emerson was £656-8-0; this included meals and lodging for himself and his crew, warehouse and docking charges, and freight charges. Emerson had to sue Salter for payment in
However, Emerson's business enterprises did not pay his bills and he often found himself in court for nonpayment of debt. Between 1755 and his death in 1763, Emerson was the defendant in eighteen nonpayment suits and the plaintiff in another.\textsuperscript{34} Twelve of the eighteen suits were pressed before 1760 and Emerson appears to have relieved this burden of mounting debt by selling his inn to his son-in-law, Samuel Baker, for £5000 in November 1759. The sale included one acre of land along "with the Dwelling house & Wharfe on s\textsuperscript{d} Land & also the Privilege of a Ferry."\textsuperscript{35} After Emerson's daughter Mary married Baker in 1748 he was listed as "yeoman" until assuming the position of innholder with the 1759 purchase.

The £5000 may have helped settle his debts from the 1750s, but Emerson continued to incur debt at even a faster rate in the first three years of the 1760s if nonpayment lawsuits are any indication. In the last three and one-half years of his life he was sued for more than £1528-15-0. He attempted to make good on at least some of his debts; on Philip Fowler's note for £130 dated February 17, 1761, Emerson made a £17-14-0 payment in May of that year.\textsuperscript{36} He may have been a poor businessman or perhaps simply was a victim of the economy during the French and Indian War. He did not splurge on household luxuries; his extravagance was limited to the single silver spoon and £190 worth of clothing listed in his inventory. Otherwise his furnishings were unexceptional and many were described as "old" when assessed by Samuel.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{34}NHSA, Provincial Court Records Index.
\textsuperscript{35}NHSA, Provincial Deeds, 79:118.
\textsuperscript{36}NHSA, Provincial Court Record #17732.
\end{flushright}
The value of clothing and household goods was £595-5-0 old tenor, just over 10% of his total assets.\textsuperscript{37}

From the declaration of war with France in 1756 until peace in 1763, the world was embroiled in a struggle between two imperial powers for Atlantic hegemony. This affected the local economy in several ways. Inflated currency was a constant worry. New Hampshire paid for the war with paper money which depreciated continually.\textsuperscript{38} In 1759, a year that held many British military successes, Samuel wrote, "The War makes Paper Money very Plenty tho' but little worth: and he that is in Debt about this time may very Easily get out, if he is a good Husband." His Journal records similar statements in 1756 and 1763.\textsuperscript{39} Perhaps his shoe prices best illustrate the inflation. From 1748 until 1754 shoe prices were constant at £2-14-0. They rose to £3 in 1755, to £6 in 1760 and to £7-10-0 in 1763. By 1769 the price of a pair had dropped to £6.\textsuperscript{40} Such economic turmoil would challenge many marginal merchants and artisans; Stephen Emerson may have been one victim.

Apparently Emerson was working when he "was Drowned the third Day of June Instant [1763] by falling out of a gundelo by the mouth or begining of the great Bay so Called & Came to his Death by misfortune."\textsuperscript{41} Given his financial position up to that point, it is not surprising that he left an insolvent estate. He also left no will and the judge of Probate, Richard Wibird, appointed William Moore and Samuel Lane to inventory the estate. The choice of Samuel may have been simple coincidence; he was at the Bank in probate court that day working on

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{37}] NHSA, Probate #3004.
\item[\textsuperscript{38}] Belnap I: 321.
\item[\textsuperscript{39}] Journal, pp. 37, 38, 39.
\item[\textsuperscript{40}] Journal, pp. 43-4.
\item[\textsuperscript{41}] NHSA, Provincial Court Record #26375.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
another estate. Administration of the estate was granted to widow Lydia Emerson and her son-in-law, Samuel Baker, and they showed Moore and Lane the estate on July 7. Emerson's assets, valued at £5376-5-0, fall in the middle range of probated estates at this time. Emerson's real estate, "65 Rods of Land, with the Dwelling House & Barn, Warehouse & Wharf on the Same," worth £2650 and two slaves valued at £1600 accounted for the bulk of his assets. Other valuable items were his gundelo, "one riding Chair," livestock and his "wearing Cloaths." Emerson's household items previously noted amounted to only £426-5-0. However, the claims on his estate pushed him out of the middle class and into the ranks of the poor.

Samuel returned the inventory on July 27 and two days later divided the estate's assets between Lydia Emerson and the Bakers. This division of the assets was temporary. Numerous creditors answered the following advertisement placed in three editions of the New Hampshire Gazette during July, "All Persons indebted to, or that have any Demands on the Estate of Stephen Emerson...are desired to bring in their Accounts to Lydia Emerson and Samuel Baker." By October 26th, Judge Wibird found the estate was "not sufficient to pay his Debts, and the Demands due from his Estate," and issued a license for the sale of the real estate to discharge some of the debt. Samuel may have been at the hearing for he was in Portsmouth that day, and on November 1 he and Michael Shute were appointed "Commissioners to Receive and Examine the Claims of the Several Creditors to the Estate of Stephen Emerson." The

---

42 The middle, or 31st through 70th percentile, contained estates valued between £1705 and £9929. Daniels, p. 60.
43 NHSA, Probate #3004.
court gave the two commissioners six months to make a list of claims on
the estate. 45

New Hampshire law provided a specific procedure to settle
insolvent estates. "Two or more fit and indifferent Persons" were to
appraise the estate; Samuel and William Moore served that purpose here.
Furthermore, at least two people were appointed commissioners to examine
and verify all claims by creditors on the insolvent estate. These
commissioners had to make themselves available to meet with creditors.
The probate judge specified how long the commissioners had to examine
the claims and when the list of claims was due in his court. "Debts due
to the Crown, Sickness, and necessary Funeral charges," were to be paid
first, as well as the widow's "right of Dower according to Law, in the
Houses and Lands of the Deceased." Any "Residue" was to go to the
creditors "in due proportion to the Sums unto them respectively
owing." 46

Samuel and Newmarket shipwright Michael Shute served as
commissioners to hear claims. He started the process by advertising in
the New Hampshire Gazette that the commissioners would "examine the
Claims of the several Creditors to the Estate...at the House of Mr.
Samuel Baker, Innholder in Newmarket, on the third Monday of this and
the five following Months from One o'clock to four in the Afternoon." 47
In addition to this Baker and Emerson chose Samuel to sell the real
estate which he did on April 26, 1764.

Acting as vendue master, or auctioneer, was a natural adjunct to
Samuel's other skills, and a profitable endeavor. In this case his

45NHSA, Probate #3004.
46Cushing, ed., p. 100.
commission was 1 penny per pound of the selling price. The property sold to shoemaker Thomas Bartlett of Newbury, Massachusetts for £2300 making Samuel's share £9-11-8. As his daily rate for work on the estate ranged from 4 to 6d, this fee represented a premium. 48 Lydia Emerson relinquished her right of dower in the property in exchange for a one-third interest in the selling price, £766-12-8. It also appears that the Bakers owned part of the dwelling; Samuel wrote a deed which conveyed only "that part of the Dwelling which belongs to the estate of sd deceased." 49

Lane and Shute, not satisfied their list of creditors was accurate by the end of their six month term, asked for and were granted a three month extension; the extension brought forth nine additional claims. In all Samuel spent four full and four half days sitting as a commissioner in 1763 and 1764 and £5331-14-2 in claims were allowed. After expenses for the funeral, estate charges and the widow's dower were paid, £3845 remained to cover the £5331-14-2 liability which paid 11 shillings, 10 pence for each pound of claim allowed. The largest creditor was Emerson's son-in-law Samuel Baker and several significant sums were owed traders in Portsmouth. 50 On August 29, 1764 Samuel noted "I went to Bank to Return Emerson's Comm'r's affair." 51 His involvement ended there.

Samuel's role in Emerson's estate ranged from appraising to writing deeds. Those skills made him the most important of the

---

48 At a vendue of lots for the Bow Proprietors in November 1756, he received 24% of the selling price; that total was £14-12-0. NHSA, Bow Book, pp. 119-22.
49 NHSA, Provincial Deeds, 70:404-06.
50 NHSA, Probate $3004.
51 Diary, 8/29/64.
adjutants appointed by the probate court in this case. His fees totaled £87-16-8 while William Moore was paid £14 and Michael Shute £46-5-0. His variety of skills provided the judge effective assistance in the Stratham area. Samuel's diary shows he continued this work for most of his working life. It also made him a person for neighbors to consult when troubles threatened a family.

John Coker, a friend of the Lane family and one of the men who initially invited Samuel to Stratham twenty years earlier, called him to his bedside on April 20, 1761 to write his will. Coker's presentiment that death was near proved correct; he died two days later. Samuel's work for the Coker estate account began with writing the will, and he followed it through to final settlement. The document does not differ greatly in form from other wills he wrote. Coker, a widower since 1754, had five daughters: one daughter, Mercy, was single; another, Mary Wiggin, was a widow; and three were married, Martha Young, Hannah Fifield and Sarah Marble. Coker made specific bequests to two daughters and two grandchildren, dividing the remainder of his estate equally among all five.

The estate was considerable. Valued at £18028-01-4 by appraisers Samuel Lane and Samuel Veasey, it placed Coker in New Hampshire's prosperous class, or in the 71st to 90th percentile by wealth. Described in the will as "yeoman," his property included seventy acres of land, a house and barn, an old house used to store hay, livestock,

---

52 The introductory paragraph of this will and that of Moses Leavitt, written seven years earlier, are virtual copies of one another. 53 NHSA, Probate #2740. 54 Daniels, "Defining Economic Classes," p. 60. Estates valued between £9930 and £18934 fall into this class for the decade 1761-1770 according to Daniels.
farm produce and farming equipment, £2715 in gold, silver and paper money, and other miscellany including a surprisingly small collection of "Household Stuff." His meager household possessions may have been what remained after providing marriage portions for three daughters. The probate documents give little hint of John Coker's occupation as mariner. Samuel often transported goods on Mr. Coker's Sloop as in 1745 when he credited Coker for the freight of a bag of flax, a bag of feathers and two gravestones to Boston, and it was Coker who procured his compass from Boston instrument maker Thomas Greenough in 1754. However, few possessions remained from his seafaring past except eight yards of canvas, a mariner's compass, fishing lines and some old rigging.

The most interesting issues arise from the will's special provisions. Coker targeted his most vulnerable children for specific bequests over and above the equal share in the estate each was to receive. His unmarried daughter Mercy was given two feather beds, a brass kettle and a cow. Her father undoubtedly intended this to serve as her marriage portion. He also willed each of his fatherless grandsons, Coker and Chase Wiggin, land in Bow, a gun, ten gold dollars and other assorted items. Clearly John Coker made an effort to compensate those in his family whose fate put them at some disadvantage. However, the beneficiary of his other individual bequest was at no apparent disadvantage, "I give unto my Daughter Sarah Marble, her Heirs and Assigns, all the Household-Stuff She brought with her when she last remov'd to my House; which Household Stuff her Husband gave me a Deed

55 NHSA, Probate 2740.
56 Day Book, 1745.
57 NHHS, Lane Papers 1-5.
of a twin three year old Heifer. Sarah is the aberration. Married, but living in her father's house with her marriage portion returned by her husband, her father considered her to be disadvantaged compared to her other married siblings. The handicap must have had roots in a precarious marriage.

The written record reveals little about Samuel Marble and his wife Sarah. In fact Samuel Lane's account of the Marble's shoe purchases is perhaps most enlightening. In March 1750 Samuel made a pair of shoes on Mr. Coker's account for his daughter Sarah. She reappeared there in October 1754 as "Samll Marvels" wife; the couple also had a child who was then old enough to require shoes. From 1755 until the fall of 1758 when the Marble account ended, Samuel made shoes for both the Marble and Coker families.

This relatively innocuous account belies unsettling events in the Marble household. During his first years of marriage Samuel Marble was plagued by debt and he found himself in court four times between 1753 and 1759. When he was twice sued for debt in 1759, the court found for his accusers, and the sheriff jailed him in April when he was unable to post sufficient bond. His father-in-law appears to have helped at some point. Samuel Lane's July 1757 list of "Money due to me" has a £130 debt for Coker and Marble. On New Year's Day 1758, that debt was still on the books. Whether this debt is connected to Marble's lawsuit with John Partridge for a £130 debt is indeterminable; given John Coker's strong financial position, it is possible that he cosigned a

---

58 NHSA, Probate #2740.
59 NHSA, Provincial Court Records. Marble was plaintiff in 1753, suing Benjamin Jenkins, Elphalet Daniell, Thomas Young Jr., and Benjamin Mathes (#27750). More often he was a defendant: 1758, Joseph Alcock (#26505); 1759, John Partridge (#1492); 1759, Isaac Hill (#5049).
note with his son-in-law, hoping this would provide Marble some time to get his financial house in order.

Her husband's recurrent debt and imprisonment may have prompted Sarah's return to her father's household with her children sometime before May 1759 when "Dau' Marble's Shoes" appeared, not on Marble's, but on Mr. Coker's account. Another debit on Coker's account with Samuel Lane is most suggestive; on February 6, 1759 he wrote an agreement for Coker "wth Dudy." "Dud" is defined as "a dull, ineffective, or socially awkward person," and was a term of contempt. Was "Dudy" Coker's feckless son-in-law Samuel Marble? Marble's financial misdeeds were closing in on him in 1759, and he faced imprisonment, or at least the forfeiture of property with the impending lawsuits. If so, the agreement could have been for the "Household Stuff" mentioned in Coker's will. Returning the portion his wife brought with her into their marriage would have shielded that property from his creditors. Certainly financial pressures, and perhaps personal problems, may have contributed to a separation.

Sarah Marble remained in her father's house at least until his death in April 1761. Throughout 1760 John Coker paid for his daughters' shoe mending and his will specifies she was living there. The surprising event is the return of Samuel Marble, now Captain Marble, on his own account in Samuel's 1762 Day Book. Captain Marble's debits included his wife's mending, and pumps for his boy and himself. In Samuel's accounts at least Marble had transformed himself into a captain

---

with credit in the two years since Sarah left him and had reconstructed his marriage.

At first glance this seems an unlikely scenario, but certain aspects ring true. The war may have restricted Marble in pursuing his occupation as a mariner and his financial woes might have been the result of disruptions in trade. As a seaman he could have gone to sea for an extended period after 1759 which might account for his wife moving in her father's house. However, that leaves the question of the bequest and the use of "Dudy" unanswered. It is also quite possible that the coincidence of Coker's demise, the terms of his will and New Hampshire law regarding property gave Marble a second chance to find firm financial ground.

Although the Coker estate was extensive Samuel finished his involvement within two months. Ten days after Coker's death "Samuel Veazey yeoman and Samuel Lane Tanner Both of Stratham," were authorized to inventory and appraise the estate. This procedure took several days; for half a day on May 1st he "overhaul'd" or valued the gold and silver coin and paper money Coker left. It took another half day to look over writings, presumably the notes the deceased held which were eventually paid the estate. Samuel spent two full days appraising land, stock and the personal estate, and almost two more days dividing Coker's effects and writing receipts. During the first two weeks in May, Samuel spent more than five days sorting out this estate. He worked several more days until June 24 when he went to the Bank to record the division of Coker's property.

Joseph Fifield, Coker's son-in-law and executor, paid debts with the money at hand and after expenses the estate was still sizable,
probably close to £16,000 or over £3000 per daughter. Sarah's legacy may well have been the foundation of Captain Marble's resurrection in late 1761. New Hampshire law and custom made a permanent break difficult. Under English law marriage was a sacrament and divorce an ecclesiastical matter. Accordingly, a marriage could be dissolved only if "ruled void at its inception because of bigamy, sexual incapacity, or similar causes." However, Anglican canon law allowed separation from bed and board for "causes such as adultery, cruelty, or desertion." This latter arrangement maintained all legal relations between husband and wife except cohabitation, and neither could remarry.61

New England custom concerning marriage rested on the very different assumption that marriage was "a civil contract" which could be terminated for good cause: bigamy, adultery, prolonged absence or extreme cruelty.62 Unlike old England, the authority to grant a separation or divorce rested not in religious, but in civil authority. In New Hampshire for example, if a spouse at sea was not heard from for three years after clearing its last port of call, "the matter being laid before the Governour and Council, and made to appear, the Man or Woman whose Relation is in this manner parted from him or her, may be esteemed Single, and Unmarried."63 Yet these more permissive laws did not necessarily translate into actual divorces; there was "a reluctance to grant divorces at all."64

62Cohen, p. 119.
63Cushing, ed., p. 10.
64Cohen, p. 80.
Divorce was more than an acknowledgment of family and community disintegration, it was also a disruption of property ownership within the community. Marriage determined a great many property relations and divorce had the effect, unlike any other event, of skewing the orderly ownership and transfer of property. When a woman brought property with her into a marriage control of it passed to the husband; personal property came under a husband’s absolute control and real property while legally his, could not be conveyed without his wife’s consent.\textsuperscript{65} Divorce put male control of property in jeopardy.

Should Sarah have wanted to end her marriage with Samuel Marble her options were limited. She could have petitioned the Governor and Council for a divorce, but approval was a remote possibility given her reasons, perhaps incompatibility exacerbated by Marble’s mounting debt.\textsuperscript{66} Agreements to separate had little force in New Hampshire; as contracts between married partners they were not recognized by law.\textsuperscript{67} However, an arrangement between Sarah’s husband and father would have maintained all legal forms as well as giving her back control of the property she brought to her marriage.\textsuperscript{68} Marble, under increasing fire from his creditors and the courts, might have relinquished that property to his father-in-law with little objection if by doing so he was

\textsuperscript{66}From 1681 to 1764, six petitions for divorce were made to the New Hampshire government; three were granted. Cohen, p. 121. 
\textsuperscript{67}Salmon, p. 59. She concludes that agreements to separate “must have occurred on a regular basis” despite their technical illegality. 
\textsuperscript{68}The dowry portion brought by a woman in her marriage had more than material value to the bride. It established a “material continuity with her natal family when she became a new bride.” Barbara McLean Ward, “Women’s Property and Family Continuity in Eighteenth-Century Connecticut,” \textit{Early American Probate Inventories} (The Dublin Seminar for New England Folklife Annual Proceedings 1987), p. 85.
relieved of the support of his wife and children. Both sides would have
gained from such an arrangement, especially if the marriage were
untenable.

The evidence points to a separation dating from the February 1759
agreement with "Dudy" and lasting until sometime after John Coker's
death in April 1761. Just before his father-in-law's death, on February
14, 1761 Marble paid in cash a three-year old £10-2-0 debt owed Samuel.
In 1762 and 1763, the £63-6-0 in goods and services Marble purchased
from Samuel was paid promptly in stark contrast to his earlier
delinquency. Clearly, Captain Marble had reversed his fortunes for the
time being.69

After April, 1761, his family appears back in Samuel's account
under Marble; the separation apparently was over. During the next
three years a series of land transactions took place involving the Coker
heirs and others, rationalizing the divisions required by the will.
Samuel Lane continued to advise the Coker family although his work for
the estate ended in late June with his being paid £68-10-0.70 He
measured land for the Coker heirs and recorded the deeds.

It seems that Marble parlayed his share of Coker's real property
into a sizable gain after several years. Using the real estate values
assigned by Samuel in Coker's inventory, Marble's one-fifth interest in
the property was worth £2,278. After the round of buying and selling
land from the estate finished, Samuel Marble had acquired a two acre lot
with a house and barn and thirty-two additional acres valued at £5,567
by the end of 1761, and sold his one-fifth interest in other coker

69 NHHS, Lane Account Book.
70 NHSA, Probate #2740.
lands.\textsuperscript{71} At the end of July, 1763, after he sold the last piece of property from the estate still in his possession, Marble's net gain was £6695. His land manipulations stand in sharp contrast to his earlier ventures.

It is not clear whether the Marbles resolved their differences and stabilized their family life, but their marriage was never solid. Lawsuits for nonpayment began again in 1762. Shortly after Samuel recorded "Sam\textsuperscript{1} Marbles Child Dead Born" in December 1769, a legal action in 1770 described Marble as living in Portsmouth.\textsuperscript{72} In September 1771 another young Marble child died. It is probable that the Marbles lived apart at times after 1765. Samuel Lane's account for 1766, notes "Ms Marbles girls mend." The following year, "ms Marble" paid on her account in spinning and scrap iron.\textsuperscript{73} This differs from previous accounts under Captain Marble's name which usually, albeit belatedly, were paid at least partly in cash, and might indicate that the two had split once again. It is possible that Mr. Coker encouraged his daughter to leave her husband in 1759, convinced his son-in-law was in fact a genuine "Dudy." However, perhaps the squandering of her father's estate finally persuaded Sarah that her husband was unlikely to change. For all his faults, Samuel Marble did enjoy the virtue of consistency. A 1782 "List of Prisoners in Exeter Goal" includes "Capt Sam\textsuperscript{1} Marble for D\textsuperscript{O} [Debt]."\textsuperscript{74} "Old Capt Marble" died at Stratham in 1807.\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{72}NHSA, Provincial Court Records, $27089, $28472, $1477, $4734, $6932, $11638, $353, $23364.
\textsuperscript{73}Day Book, 1766.
\textsuperscript{74}Portsmouth Athenaeum, Portsmouth Historical Society Collections, "A List of Prisoners in Exeter Goal."
Samuel's involvement with the Coker family is instructive for several reasons. His role in the probate proceedings was fairly routine consisting of appraising the estate and dividing it among the heirs; later he measured lands for sale, and wrote and recorded deeds with the proper authorities in Portsmouth. He did not act as administrator, since Coker's son-in-law was able and willing to carry out that responsibility, paying bills and appearing himself before the judge of probate at Portsmouth. The estate took seven years to settle, but Samuel finished his work after three months. However, Samuel's role as advisor and friend was perhaps the more significant one here. Ironically, his collaboration with John Coker may have prompted the dissolution of a marriage to maintain a sense of family.

New Hampshire law essentially stripped a woman of the right to hold property when she married. Yet the property she brought to a marriage often meant more than mere wealth, especially in her eyes. During the nineteenth-century westward migration, women attempted to restore a semblance of their eastern life, despite the rough conditions of the overland trail; "in the evenings, or when the trains [wagon trains] stopped for a day, women had a chance to create with these few props a flimsy facsimile of the home." Those "props", "books, furniture, knick-knacks, china...although functionally useless, provided women with a psychological lifeline to their abandoned homes and communities, as well as to elements of their identities."  

Sarah Coker's marriage portion was such a "psychological lifeline." Embodied

---

in those objects was an ideal represented by the life her parents lived, or at the least, that life as she wished to remember it. Thus it was important for her to keep control over her marriage portion. Just as women on the overland trail, alienated from their former lives, felt "pressure to turn back, to retrace steps to the old life," the same impulse may have prompted Sarah to return to her father's house in 1759.  

One obstacle to separating was the issue of her possessions. When they married absolute control of her things fell to her husband. Hounded by creditors, he likely deeded them back to her father without hesitation, the agreement with Dudy. If separated from her husband, at least Sarah had both her personal property and her father's family as an anchor. By drafting this document, Samuel abetted these designs to circumvent the law of property in New Hampshire and protect Sarah Marble's family. The law provided little recourse for Sarah. The larger irony is that two years after the agreement Samuel was confronted with similar circumstances but bereft of help from the deceased. Coker's entire bequest to his daughter Sarah fell under Samuel Marble's control. Still legally married, she had few rights in the property from her father's estate. Her approval was necessary for Marble to sell any of the real property left her, and her signature appears on those deeds. Her interest in those properties ended on April 26, 1765 when she and Samuel Marble sold the last remaining inherited property.

Samuel and John Coker ultimately were frustrated in their designs to restore Sarah to happier circumstances. In New Hampshire marriage virtually was cast in stone; only the death of a spouse ensured the

77Stansell and Faragher, p. 259.
legal dissolution of the marriage vows. Over time, the laws of property prevailed and Coker's legacy meant little to Sarah except lost opportunity. Samuel may have had Marble in mind when he commented on the inflation in July 1759, "he that is in Debt about this time may very Easily get out, if he is a good Husband," His implicit criticism of Marble implies a sympathy with Sarah, and he continued to support her family by making and mending shoes on credit. For the year following the spring of 1766 "Ms Marbles" bill for shoes and mending was £4-6-6. The account was no longer in Captain Marbles name. Unlike former Coker and Marble balances which were paid in cash, she paid in part with a 7 pound iron trammel and "old Hoops" worth 6-9, and paid for another pair of shoes by spinning the following June. Sarah's fortunes inexplicably brightened in July when she paid £3-6-0 on her account. That is the last mention of her in Samuel's records. 79

Samuel's intimate knowledge of the community as well as his long association with John Coker made him advisor and mediator to that family. As much as he might have wished to protect Sarah from the profligate reach of her husband and the long arm of probate law, his ability to do so was limited. However, he remained one to whom she could turn for credit to shoe her young family. Many others in the Town turned to him also, both as individuals and as a corporate body.

79Pay Book, 1766, 1767.
"My Service about the Meeting House"

Samuel Lane was among the "some Thousands in the open air" on Wednesday morning, October 1, 1740 when evangelist George Whitefield preached at Hampton. Samuel's note, "fresh wind," corroborates the itinerant's comment that he preached "not with so much freedom as usual...the wind was almost too high for me." The result was disappointing, "Some, tho' not many, were affected." It wasn't until Whitefield reached York that his northern New England tour begin to impress the populace. During his sermon there he "saw the outpourings of the Lord in his Sanctuary." On the afternoon of October 3 Mr. Whitefield was back at Hampton; both the weather and the response to his exhortations contrasted sharply to that two days earlier. "Preached to several Thousands of People," he wrote, "with a great deal of Life and Power."\(^1\) Charles Clark wrote of Whitefield's short coastal trip, "for northern New England, the revival had begun."\(^2\)

George Whitefield's charisma and evangelism initiated much more than the religious revival known as the Great Awakening to northern New England on this journey to raise funds for a Georgia orphanage; in his wake a system of communal authority founded on the remnants of the Puritan religion and the church was shaken, and in many places collapsed. A consequence of this religious revival for Stratham was a deeply divided community. That division continued to manifest itself nearly thirty years after Whitefield's first New Hampshire sermon on

\(^1\)George Whitefield, A Continuation of the Reverend Mr. Whitefield's Journal, From a few Days after his Return to Georgia To his Arrival at Falmouth, on the 11th of March 1741. The Seventh Journal (London: W. Strahan, 1741), pp. 33-4.

\(^2\)Clark, The Eastern Frontier, p. 280.
that open field in Hampton. Town and church were inseparable in colonial New Hampshire; change in one necessitated corresponding change in the other. "The key to understanding the religious dimension of town life involved the centrality of churches to the organization of local society rather than...formal religious qualifications for public participation."³ Samuel arrived in Stratham just as "Religious commotions" were beginning to surface and disrupt that community.

Towns "were the primary units of political and military organization; they stimulated the founding of religious institutions; they helped promote local economic prosperity; they provided essential social services; and they gave individuals a sense of communal identity."⁴ To exercise that broad authority, the town necessarily drew upon a significant number of residents from "universally recognized pools of leaders."⁵ Samuel's talents and successes in his other areas of work marked him as a community leader and Stratham's voters soon called upon him to serve the Town in several capacities. At various times he was tithingman, pound keeper, town clerk, selectman, auditor and sealer of leather, as well as deacon, and later elder of the church. In addition Stratham and towns like it asked residents to undertake special assignments as Samuel did in the late 1760s overseeing the construction of a new meeting house. Although residents were paid for their work, these positions devolved upon the most respected and trusted

⁵Cook, p. 22.
townsmen. Whether building a meeting house or caring for the indigent, the well-being of the entire community was at stake.

His organizational and writing abilities, his familiarity with provincial officials and procedures, and his evident devotion to the "gospel" made Samuel a person to which the town turned often. Church membership no longer was a qualification for holding town office, but "because churches were a primary meeting place for townsmen in their day-to-day lives, church members were better situated to be active citizens and influential leaders than those outside the churches." In small towns such as Stratham, access to positions of authority was relatively open compared to larger towns; family, wealth and political connections had less to do with selection than willingness and competence. Samuel, an unestablished artisan, moved to a Stratham which hosted no Lane family, but he was elected to a town office within three years, and ten years after his first arrival, the town elected him selectman. He never questioned his role in town affairs despite the attendant hardships. Serving was a duty incumbent upon each member of the community.

Such service was especially difficult in Stratham during the 1740s and 1750s. A church schism affected all town affairs and relationships among residents. Samuel never stopped his discourse with either side of the religious debate and his Day Books list work done for both Old and New Light. However, the division itself was very troubling to him as was the growing secular attitude that accompanied the Awakening's decline. His remarks mirror the position taken in Puritan jeremiads of

6 Cook, p. 141.
6 Cook, p. 40.
6 Daniell, p. 191.
the previous century lamenting a decline in appropriate behavior and
religious fervor, and intimating that woes, both natural and human, were
a result of such human folly. Samuel was a religious enthusiast in the
New Light strain, but was no separatist. He supported the old
ecclesiastical order while maintaining his own religious fervor.

Taking such a position during the ferment of the Great Awakening
is one of the reasons for his continued selection to positions of
authority in Stratham. Town structure and purpose existed to promote
consensus among its residents, "a peaceable Kingdom" in their own
words.9 Samuel's ability to carve out a middle ground between extreme
positions made him the logical person to mediate between argumentative
neighbors. More than any other comments, his lamentations about discord
in the town are the most searching and agonizing. He truly desired
peace among his neighbors, and they turned to him to find it.

Samuel's first involvement in town affairs as an official had its
roots in events that took place before March 26, 1744 when he recorded
"Town Meeting Day. I was chose Tythingman."10 By then the religious
revival sweeping New Hampshire had deeply divided Stratham. A salary
dispute had existed for several years between the Town and its minister,
Henry Rust. The exchanges in 1741 were typical; when the Town Meeting
considered a warrant article "to make an addition to the Revrd Mr Rusts
Salary as last year & to give him more if the Town sees cause," the Town
saw no cause and voted no increase.11 Two years later the Town Meeting

---

9The findings here support Zuckerman's thesis that a system of
"accommodative consensus" evolved in eighteenth-century towns. p. 8.
10Diary, 3/26/44.
11NHSA, STR I:95, 97.
warrant contained a more ominous note. Not only were voters asked to consider a salary increase, the Town Clerk also recorded, "it is Likewise desired by many persons that there might be a commity Chose in Said Town meeting to agree with Sum minister to preach a weekly Lecter." Two weeks later the meeting approved the article for another minister to serve the Town, but not without opposition. Thirty-two voters registered their dissent "Because the two last votes being without Liberty from the Reverend Mr. Henry Rust and a greavince unto him." The lines were drawn between two factions.

Several issues were at stake in the church controversy. Perhaps foremost in many minds was the question of Mr. Rust's privilege as the settled minister. Rust, ordained at in 1718, was Stratham's first minister; the following year he married Anna Waldron, daughter of a wealthy and politically connected Portsmouth family. His ministry appears to have been unexceptional until the 1742 trouble. By law the Town had the right to engage more than one minister, although custom accounted for a single clergyman in smaller towns. Thus Rust's "Liberty" derived from tradition rather than law. However, his loyal parishioners also were concerned for the authority he represented. The Church was the moral authority and force in the community. To some, division of that authority was tantamount to a decline in the community's moral state and to be avoided at any cost. To worsen matters, the New Lights called for substantial modification of Church doctrine stressing justification through an individual's covenant with

12NHSA, STR I: 98, 100.
13Cushing, ed., p. 51.
God and with that commitment, access for anyone to the sacramental church rites.\textsuperscript{14}

Although doctrinal differences created a great gap between the two groups, perhaps the outward manifestations of New Light services were most disgusting to Old Light adherents. The emotional and evangelical style of the New Light preachers often prompted "bodily effects of conversion - fainting, weeping, shrieking, etc."\textsuperscript{15} Samuel noted this novel phenomenon on November 27, 1741, "then People began to cry out, i[n] the Meeting House at the Bank."\textsuperscript{16} In Durham Nicholas Gilman's New Light congregation "made all manner of mouths, turning out their lips...as if convulsed, straining their eyeballs and twisting their bodies in all manner of unseemly postures."\textsuperscript{17} Those who wished to worship in a more formal setting were at a loss when confronted with the emotional outbursts encouraged by evangelical ministers.

Samuel moved to Stratham just as these controversies were taking shape, and as a newcomer he must have felt uncomfortable taking a strong stand. A further complication for him was that he was of two minds on the issue. All evidence indicates his deep devotion to the church and its teachings. He joined, and perhaps organized, a young men's association while residing in Hampton. Its articles are written in his hand which set forth its purpose, "to Glorifie God in the days of our

\textsuperscript{14}Daniell, p. 179.
\textsuperscript{16}Portsmouth minister Rev. Shurtleff "reported 'a general Out-cry' at a meeting held on Friday, November 27, 1741, and the widespread belief among a crowd that evening 'That CHRIST was coming to Judgment' when they saw reflections from a chimney fire in several windowpanes." \textit{The Christian History...For the Year 1743} (Boston, 1744), pp. 384-5, cited by Clark, p. 280n.
\textsuperscript{17}Cited by Daniell, p. 180.
youth: to seek first the kingdom of God and his Righteousness, and to exhort one another daily; we do for the attaining of these things (with the consent of our Pasture [pastor]) form ourselves into a society for the worship of God."

When the revivals began he clearly supported them and counted their effects salutary. He wrote of "the wonderfull concern on the minds of People of a Spiritual nature in Many places":

in the latter end of this year [1741] there Seem'd to be an uncommon concern on the Minds of People about their Souls which concern Seem'd to be very general almost in every Town in this Province as well as the other, and I believe I May Say through the country about this time. it Seem'd to be general on all ages & Sexes Black & White, but chiefly on young People. Many in the Meeting-House at once would seem to be Struck down under the preaching of the word crying out what Shall we do to be Saved. also Some Seem'd to be Struck after the Same manner in their own Houses & about their work, & riding the Road & in Divers Manners: Many Seem'd to be under great convictions & in great terrors: Many also Seem'd to be in great transports of Joy. people in general Seem'd to be very desirous of hearing the word, & Ministers forward to preach it, and for some time there was Lecture almost every Day or Night in Many places: & not only publick but private meetings were very frequent

Enthusiastic about the spiritual renewal, Samuel could not support the growing animosity between revivalists and the established church. Perhaps Stratham's particular situation magnified the antagonisms between people of differing religious persuasions; by the beginning of 1743 Samuel discovered the drawback to the wonderful outpouring of spirit that a year earlier he had applauded. His commentary now emphasized the divisions created by the revivals:

Many People, in some places especially; that a year or two ago, Seem'd greatly concern'd for their Souls, & to have hopeful beginnings; now Seem to run into great extremes on many accounts; especially in exclaiming against Ministers as unconverted, and many

18 James P. Lane, Lane Families of the Massachusetts Bay Colony (Printed by Request, Sept. 1, 1886), p. 55. Samuel's signature appears with thirty-five others.
19 Diary, preface 1741. On 11/27/41 while at Portsmouth he observed, "then People began to cry out, [n] the Meeting House at the Bank."
will separate themselves from their minister & church, & set up separate meeting & meeting-houses, & get preachers of their own way of thinking, to preach to them. They refuse to come to the sacrament, or to have their children baptized by those ministers they call unconverted. These things and many others cause great disturbance in towns, in churches, & in families: ministers & people, husbands & wives, parents & children divided against each other, judging & condemning one another. These separate people are called by many, new-lights & scheemers & the like. These & such like practices cause many people to stumble at, and be much set against what they some time ago, called a good work.\(^{20}\)

Samuel had seen enough to set himself apart from the New Lights, but he was no longer an old light. He endorsed the spiritual enthusiasm engendered by the evangelical movement, but opposed the division it engendered in many congregations. Clearly he was not one of the \"they\" in the above passage. Samuel held the \"itinerant preachers greatly valued by many, and greatly undervalued by others,\" as the responsible party.\(^{21}\)

Stratham's \"Sad Divisions\" in 1744 resulted from \"people striving to bring in another man to preach with Mr. Rust, which makes great uneasiness & contention amongst us.\" The New Light faction first invited Joseph Adams to preach in December 1742, but his strident attacks on neighboring clergy prompted his arrest for libel. He returned to Newbury, Massachusetts, where the New Lights for two years tried to settle him without success. Undeterred by Adams' departure, Stratham's Separates, by 1743 a majority at town meeting, invited a Stratham native, Dudley Leavitt, to preach. Prohibited from using the meeting house by Reverend Rust and the minority supporting him, Leavitt preached in Mr. Coker's house, which Samuel reported was \"fitted up with the seats &c for that use.\"\(^{22}\) In the fall of 1744 the separate faction

\(^{20}\) Diary, 1743 preface.
\(^{21}\) Diary, 1742 Summary.
\(^{22}\) Diary, 1744 preface.
decided to flex its muscle. "We...have agreed with a minister & purpose (God Willing) to carry him into the pulpit in the Meeting house," the "agrieved Brethren" wrote in a September 5, 1744 letter to Mr. Rust, "to preach one part of the day - Desiring that you would forthwith Inform us which part of the Day you will preach." Their warning, "Dont think that we are in Jest," was not idle. On September 30 the Separates carried out their design which resulted in an "unaccountable uproar Made by bringing a man into the Pulpit to preach half the Day with mr Rust."\(^{23}\)

Samuel's description of the meeting as "uproar" was no exaggeration. During the afternoon service when Rust was "at prayer in the pulpit" Leavitt attacked him crying out that he "Could as well Joyn with the Devil as with m'f Rust in prayer." To ensure that Rust's supporters did not miss the point he added that he "Could as well Joyn with the pope in Saying Mass as with...Rust in prayer." A local woman, Dorothy Jewet, abetted Leavitt, taunting Rust to "Come down" from the pulpit, calling him the "Son of the Divel."\(^{24}\)

Such behavior made the breach between the two factions irrevocable. Rust's ties to the prominent Waldron family undoubtedly reinforced a complaint to the Governor made by his supporters. The following Sabbath the High Sheriff, Mr. Packer, forcibly removed Leavitt from the meeting house pulpit. Rust supporters won their lawsuit against Leavitt who left for Salem, Massachusetts, and a similar situation. Denied access to the meeting house there, he was ordained under an apple tree in the fall of 1745.\(^{25}\)

\(^{23}\)diary, 9/30/44.
\(^{24}\)NHSA, Prov. Court $25518.
Samuel's election as tithingman at the 1744 Town Meeting placed him at the center of the controversy. Leavitt's excursion into the meeting house, a breach of the Sabbath, "occasioned Law Business in Town," Samuel lamented, "and was a Damage to Me I being Tything Man that year and obliged to Complain of Such Disorders as was then in Town." The "Damage" had two dimensions. In all he spent thirteen days in Portsmouth at court. The day after Sheriff Packer removed Leavitt, October 8, the King's Attorney sent for Samuel whose testimony before Hunking Wentworth prompted the Justice to send the case to Justice George Jaffrey's court. From there it was remanded to the Court of Quarter Sessions which met for two days in early December. On appeal, it was heard before the Superior Court of Judicature for nine days in March of the following year.27

Certainly the time spent in court was a nuisance. With an infant daughter in the Lane house and tanning work to be done, rehearing testimony about Dudley Leavitt's inexcusable behavior was tiresome. However, the greater "Damage" might have been the necessity of Samuel taking sides in the dispute. His diary recorded his feelings on the issue but the public record is mute concerning his preference. Following the meeting house "uproar" he no longer enjoyed the luxury of remaining silent. Just over one month after that debacle Samuel appeared in the Town record opposing the machinations of the Separates.28 His previous public silence was an attempt to refrain from

26Journal, p. 31.
27Diary, 1745.
28At the November 16, 1744 Town Meeting Samuel's name appears with 60 others in registering their dissent to outfitting another Meeting House for Dudley Leavitt and for defending him at the Town's cost in the lawsuit. STR I:112-14.
taking sides in hopes for conciliation and consensus. After the affair with Leavitt, Samuel could no longer countenance separatism and, despite his inclination toward the religious zeal evinced by the New Lights, cast his lot with Stratham’s Old Lights.

Leavitt’s departure was but a temporary setback for the Separates; their numbers had grown and Samuel wrote that “by far the Major Part of the people Saperate from mr Rust.” During the summer of 1745 they worshipped at the Separate Meeting in Exeter, and in the fall Joseph Adams reappeared in the makeshift meeting house at John Coker’s. Similar sparring matches ensued as the Separate faction tried to have Adams ordained. Samuel continued to register his dissent at Town Meetings when the majority voted to settle Adams. However, Adams had so offended New Hampshire’s clergy by his personal attacks that a Church Council could not be gathered to perform the ceremony. The Separates finally got two New Light ministers from distant parishes to attend, and despite vocal opposition from neighboring clergy, on March 20, 1747, “Mr Adams was ordaine over the Separates in this Town: which was done before Ens. Veazeys House.”29 Thus the New Lights finally had their way, although the General Assembly exempted Rust followers from the support of Adams’ ministry.

Stratham did not host two ministers for very long. Rev. Rust suffered an injury of some sort in July 1748, and although Samuel did not mention details, it precipitated the minister’s decline. The following February Joseph Adams began to preach in the Meeting House in Rust’s stead. A fast for Rust on March 15, 1749 had little effect, and he died five days later.

29Sibley, XI:112; Journal, p. 32.
Although the Town accepted Adams as its sole minister after Henry Rust's death, bitterness lingered. At Rust's funeral, "the Separatists, being the Major Part of the Town...refus'd the Rev. Pall-Bearers the (tho' universally customary) Liberty of the Pulpit," and voted to pay the funeral expenses of £163 if Rust's heirs would drop all claims for salary due. The transparent nature of this generosity was evident to all; eventually the Rust estate won a lawsuit for his back pay and collected more than £3000 from Stratham.\textsuperscript{30} That case was heard in 1751, and as Selectman that year, Samuel traveled to Portsmouth several times in October to appear in court, accept the court's judgment and pay Rust's estate.\textsuperscript{31}

Time alone was insufficient to heal the divisions in Stratham even though Samuel noted in 1752, "It is a very Dead & Maloncolly time with respect to Religion; and 'tis Said that Religion is at as low an Ebb as ever was known."\textsuperscript{32} A Church Convention refused to install Adams in Stratham because of his past attacks on Rust and on neighboring clergy. Technically the Stratham church had no minister and its administration of the sacrament was illicit. In 1753 an attempt to remedy the situation failed. Advised by two seacoast clergy to "Set Apart A day for fasting And Prayer," the Town did so on June 21. Samuel chronicled its failure, "Town Mett & broke all to peices by hearing mr Adams paper."\textsuperscript{33}

Two years later Adams was ready to make peace with the Town and with other clergy. On August 21, 1755 both factions agreed:

\textsuperscript{30}Sibley, V:374; NHSA, Court # 24069.
\textsuperscript{31}Diary, 10/21/51, 10/24/51, 10/30/51.
\textsuperscript{32}Diary, 1752 preface.
\textsuperscript{33}NHSA, STR flr 1; Diary, 6/21/53.
That a Joynt Council of Neighboring Ministers and Churches may be called...to Determine wither the Conduct of Those Brethren that withdrew from the Rev'd Mr Rusts Ministry was Justifiable also whether they can be Justified in Receiving to y2 Communion Such Members of other Churches as are under the Displeasure of those Churches to which they belong.

Further we think it proper Said Council Shall Determine what Shall be Necessary to be done Relating to the Rev'd M¹ Joseph Adams' past Conduct in this place; in order to his being a Regular Minister over this whole Town, and our having Communion with the Neighboring Churches.³⁴

The result of this overture came on January 28, 1756, when the Council - Ward Cotton from Hampton, Nathaniel Gookin from Newmarket and Samuel Langdon from Portsmouth - exhorted both sides to set aside past differences. Mr. Adams, his supporters and the Old Light party each offered confessions and "The Paper of Union" was drafted in Samuel's hand. "Being now convinced of the Evil of Contention," each party pledged "to lay aside all former Grudgings and Annomosities," and "to give no Just occasion of offence to any of the Churches of this Land & Neighborhood." Samuel's was among the twenty-one signatures which included both Old Light and New, and although neither side confessed to absolute wrongdoing, each gave enough ground to satisfy the other.³⁵

The fatigue resulting from more than a decade of constant strife provided the salve to heal the communal wounds.

It remained for Mr. Adams to convince New Hampshire's clergy that he had truly repented before they would accept him into their communion. His January confession was tepid, "Wherein I have at any time Spoken hardly of others, in times past or have been the occasion of any others doing So, I am sorry for it." The Convention may have demanded a more abject apology.³⁶ It met in Stratham on June 22 and 23, 1756 and

³⁴NHSA, STR flr 2.
³⁵NHSA, STR, flr 2.
³⁶NHSA, STR, flr 2.
finally came to terms with Mr. Adams. The next day the Council
installed him, and Stratham once again had a recognized pastor, the last
being the deceased Henry Rust some seven years before.

Perhaps the most striking aspect of this affair is the attempts on
the part of Stratham residents to reconcile after the heat of the
revival cooled. With Henry Rust ill, there was no "uproar" when Joseph
Adams replaced him. A willingness to compromise appears at several
points. In 1752 and again in 1755 Stratham’s people searched for common
ground. At each point compromise was forestalled either by minister or
ecclesiastical council. Even this most divisive of issues did not
dissuade the two parties from seeking conciliation.

Samuel was deeply involved in these events being both town
official and church member. He was enthusiastic over the religious
outpouring inspired by the revivals, and was an adherent of Whitefield’s
preaching. However, the English evangelical was no supporter of
separatism, and neither could Samuel countenance destruction of the
established church order. He appears to have cast his lot with the Old
Lights. In 1742 when he privately bemoaned the divisions that were
cropping up in Stratham and elsewhere, the New Lights were "Scheemers,"
inimical to peace and order in the town. The best evidence of his
confusion and apprehension with local events is his own actions. With
the exception of Jabez, his youngest child born in 1760, he and Mary
took the rest of their children to be baptized at Hampton where there
was no question about the legitimacy of that sacrament. The 1756
settlement calmed their fears. Personally, Samuel had no trouble
following the theology of Joseph Adams, and indeed actively supported
his ministry becoming a deacon of the church less than a decade later.
Perhaps the single most time-consuming community activity Samuel undertook also concerned both town and church, his involvement in constructing a new meeting house. In a move typifying New Hampshire frugality, the 1767 March Town Meeting voted to "Build a New Meeting House on the Spot where the old one Stands, provided the Same may be Accomplished by Selling the Paws, together with the old Meeting House without a Tax upon the Town." 37 Stratham's population more than doubled between 1732 and 1776 and the original structure, built in 1716 was too small. 38 A committee of seven, including Samuel, was chosen to oversee the project, and although church divisions had been buried for more than ten years, tensions still existed. 39 Several divisive issues emerged as the project progressed.

There had been controversy in 1716 over the location of the first Meeting House and Stratham, unable to reach consensus for its site, turned to the Provincial government to mediate. 40 The 1767 committee obviously was feeling pressure from some quarters when it called a meeting to amend the vote to set the new house literally "on the Spot where the old one Stands." The new building, "being Considerable larger than the old House Renders it impracticable to be Set wholly on the Spot where the old on[e] Stands," the committee explained, and further, the new structure "must Unavoidably Extend over a Number of Graves in the Burying place." Common sense dictated the solution, to place the new structure "a little forward of the old one." 41 But the very lengths

37 NHSA, STR flr 3.
38 The old meeting house measured 48 X 36'; the new one was 63 X 45'.
39 The other committee members were Thomas Wiggin, Stephen Bordman, Joseph Hoit, Daniel Clark, John Taylor and Simon Wiggin.
40 NHSP IX:781.
41 NHSA, STR flr 2. The rationale behind this solution was that the site not be "detrimental to any of Sd Inhabitants, by extending the Distance
the committee went to so as not to offend points to something less than unanimity within the town on the subject of the new Meeting House and the committee appointed to oversee its construction.

Two other issues arose early on in the process which imply dissatisfaction within the Town. The first was criticism of the committee's extravagance. The committee met at Chase's tavern on May 25, 1767 and while there Samuel "pd wid Chase Expence Several Meetings before the 25 Day of May (wh I forget how Much)." 42 Wages for this large committee, its expenses as well as this somewhat cavalier attitude toward them, troubled the Town, and those concerns surfaced a week later at the sale of the Meeting House pews.

The town had voted to finance the new House by selling pews to the highest bidders and selling the old meeting house. Selling the pews served a purpose other than providing the bulk of the funds, it rationalized the seating plan. Puritan custom was to seat the meeting house by committee, assigning "each person his or her place, according to rank and importance." A second committee seated the first to obviate any "Grumbling at them picking and placing themselves." 43 Commercializing seating by vendue had the happy consequence of eliminating "grumbling" by allowing an impersonal market do the job. The first vendue of pews was on June 1, but "Manifested a Considerable Uneasiness." Several felt the pews:

42 NHSA, STR, fir 3.
Sold at too high a price, suggesting that the committee appointed to sell them & build said house may have an opportunity of greatly advancing their Estates by pocketing large sums of money for their own private interest over & above a reasonable allowance for their trouble & expence in accomplishing that affair. 44

Perhaps the vendue was the first time many saw the committee in action, seven men sitting around the tavern collecting a wage for little or no apparent work. In addition the wealthier members of the community bought numbers of pews beyond that necessary for seating their family. Samuel purchased four pews that day, and his fellow deacon and committeeman, Stephen Bordman, bought three. After that day's sale and the consequent complaints, the committee, sensitive to the "Uneasiness," reconsidered its procedures.

Before the June 8 vendue, Samuel spent two days drawing the gallery plan and writing the notes for the coming sale. Before any pews were sold that warm afternoon, the assembled, "in order to forward and encourage the building said house; as well as for cultivating of peace & unity between said parties, as well as in the Town..."

Agreed that for the future, no more than three of said committee shall be in pay at a time when acting in that capacity; and that their wages shall be three shillings p day for each man when acting in that capacity, they finding themselves victuals & drink (excepting tavern expenses which is to allowed them) also that each of said committee give up the pews they have already purchased that there may be a better chance for those that want to purchase: and that neither of the committee shall bid off more than one pew apiece at above 20c p pew. 45

The sale went to 11 that evening and continued for two more ten hour days until all but a few gallery pews were taken up. The above

44 NHSA, STR flr 2.
45 NHSA, STR, flr 2. Pew ownership was not without its risks. Owners were responsible for funding the Meeting House, and should construction expenses have outstripped the available funds, each pew owner, "undertaker" in Samuel's vocabulary, was to make up the deficit in proportion to the value of their pews. Any surplus would be returned in a similar manner.
agreement was adhered to; no individual purchased more than one pew on the main floor. Samuel, who had bought three pews at the first sale ended up rebidding and purchasing only one although he also bought two less expensive gallery pews. Deacon Bordman bought only one pew. It is not clear whether those who purchased multiple pews during the first day’s sale were praying on the poor of the Town or simply doing a good work. Samuel initially bid £29 for pew number 25 the first day; after giving it up he bought the same pew for £23-13-8.46 Although pews were an investment to be bought and sold, the concern during that first sale probably was for funding the project with little thought given to inequities in the process created by disparities in wealth.

After the pew sales, the committee’s work stopped for the next two months, and when it met again to consider engaging a master-carpenter, it also chose Samuel as clerk. The committee decided to hire Portsmouth’s Josiah Clark and Samuel went to the capital several days later to talk with him. At Folsom’s tavern in Greenland Samuel had “a Nip of Punch with Clark” while discussing the project. Two days later the committee met with Clark for six hours and he agreed “that for four Shillings p Day (and be found Victuals Drink & Lodging) I will work for them as a Master Workman in Building the whole of the Frame & Steple of Sd House at any time Next Spring or Summer.”47 The committee hired another carpenter, Ephraim Barker, later that fall.

Ephraim Barker and Josiah Clark began their work on the frame the following spring. The foundation was built and the sills were placed by June 11, 1768. Other arrangements were being made for raising the

46 NHSA, STR, flr 2; STR I:160.
47 NHSA, STR, flr 2.
meeting house frame, a gala affair in most communities. The committee planned a "Dress Dinner for Raising," and unlike many similar celebrations, hired Joshua Wingate to prepare the meal rather than have the town's women perform that task. There was "a great rain" on June 14, and the frame was raised in "showery" weather the next day.

Samuel gave no details of the event in his diary, but others have left accounts of rowdy behavior at raisings encouraged by liquor. A 1738 raising in Northampton, Massachusetts included expenses for 10 gallons of rum and setting broken bones for two men. Common sense and dexterity blurred by alcohol made some of these galas fatal. The only record of Stratham's raising is the menu; Joshua Wingate prepared dinners of fish, potatoes, bread and butter. Abundant rum, 20 gallons with sugar to accompany it, and a barrel of cider provided drink. Subsequent raisings, the steeple, spire and bell, also warranted food and drink.

From Samuel's viewpoint the raising was not without problems. In its wake he referred to "old timber used & spoil'd," and to "damage done to things & trouble running after them &c &c." The frame must have been well set for Samuel mentioned no damage from an earthquake five days later. Barker and Clark worked quickly over the summer and by August 12 the committee met to measure and mark out the pews in the building. They met again on November 14 in the Meeting House and a month later Samuel drew a plan of the pulpit stairs. By that point the Town may

48 Earle, Sabbath, p. 8
have been holding Meetings in the new House. There is no record when that milestone happened.

As clerk, Samuel shouldered the lion's share of responsibility for making sure the work continued in a timely fashion. His account indicates he sold the remaining gallery pews, arranged food and drink for raisings, ordered and paid for materials, and inspected the work as it progressed. As the finish work neared completion in 1769 he also determined the financial status of the project. In old tenor money the sale of pews raised £18306 and the sale of the old meeting house £907 for total revenue of £19213. The committee paid out £15700 for expenses which meant a surplus had to be returned to the pew purchasers. This miscellaneous bookkeeping also required him to go around the town settling accounts. This work could be complex and require negotiation; on December 1, 1769 his agenda included, "going to Jos-Clarke to get him to take Greens Debt, & going to Greens & Jo Taylers Jn° Derbons & got his Note & pd mr Tilton 31°/2 & gave Hash order &c Near 1 Day." In addition a dispute between the builders, Clark and Barker, and the committee over unspecified work went to arbitration in August 1769. That affair ended in an award to the Town of £5.50

On March 30, 1770, just more than three years after he was appointed to the Meeting House Committee, Samuel wrote "there is now...Due to me for what I have already done 1-14-9-1 Lawful Money & nothing to pay it in Except the old pickpoles Cans &c left of Raising." Added to that despondent note was mention of more work left him as clerk in collecting on notes and settling accounts. "As it is Customary in all Courts & Societys, to Make Some Generous Grant to any Persons

50NHSA, STR, flr 2.
Employ'd in Such Difficult Feti vague Business," he earlier wrote the committee, "I Rely on your generosity...to allow me Such a Perquisite as Shall be to the Honour of your Station, to Reward one who Can with a good Conscience Subscribe himself your Careful Laborious Honest Book keeper." Samuel apparently was rewarded by the committee at the time of his petition in September 1769, but not for his later efforts. His attitude toward this omission anticipated future trends in town service and not the eighteenth-century practice of service to the town for pay only, "I think not to trouble my Self to keep any further Account about it as to my own time & trouble, but to do it gratis."¹¹

Samuel's work on the Meeting House was only a small part of his community service, the major part of which was the ongoing business of the town. He served eight one-year terms as selectman, twenty years as auditor of the Selectmen's accounts and pound keeper, two as assessor, and four years as town clerk and sealer of leather. Thus, his dedication to the town was continuous over the course of his lifetime. In addition, from 1765 until 1800 when he was made Elder, he was a Deacon of the church, keeping its accounts, attending ordinations in New Hampshire towns and assisting the minister at the communion table. Such work for church and town was unceasing and often involved litigation in both Portsmouth and Exeter.

The Stratham selectmen's account for 1769 in Table 5 shows how the community spent its revenues in a typical year. Perhaps most surprising is the large proportion of the town budget that went toward care of the Town's poor. It is the second largest category and is perhaps a more accurate figure if tax abatements are added to it. In 1769 relief of

¹¹NHSA, STR, flr 2.
the poor included a wide variety of services including: "keeping John 
Morgin one year," "Supporting wid Philbrook in Sickness," "Poark for 
Daniel Davis," making widow Philbrook's coffin and digging her grave, 
"keeping Eunice Davis Child," "making a pare Shoes for Wd Avery," and 
"tea, Sugar molasses for Daniel Davis." 52

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF EXPENSE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Province rate</td>
<td>66-09-00</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (salary/wood)</td>
<td>34-09-08</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Administration</td>
<td>20-18-05</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>1-00-01</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church (minister's salary)</td>
<td>40-12-04</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax abatements</td>
<td>5-15-08</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Relief</td>
<td>59-08-03</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>228-13-05</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Samuel provided more services to the poor in years other than 1769, the 
year his wife died. That year his only service to the poor was 
providing molasses for widow Philbrook. By law the selectmen were 
charged with "the Maintenance and Support of the...Poor," and as 
illustrated above, that could assume a significant portion of the town 
budget. 53

New Hampshire law also recognized the opportunity for abuse of 
this obligation and contained several devices to assess responsibility 
and to minimize a community's liability in this regard. For example a 
widow's thirds were set off before an estate's creditors could collect, 
which attempted to prevent widows from drifting into poverty and 
becoming wards of the town. In addition laws about admission to town, 
first promulgated to prevent undesirables from settling, evolved over

---

52NHSA, STR 7:83-4.
53Cushing, ed., p. 135.
the eighteenth century to prevent towns from shifting the burden of their poor onto other communities. A 1719 act stated:

If any person or persons come to sojourn, or dwell in any town within this province...and be there received, and entertained by the space of three months, not having been warned by the constable...every such person shall be reputed to be an inhabitant of such town, or precinct of the same, and the proper charge of the same, in case, through sickness, lameness, or otherwise, they come to stand in need of relief, to be born by such town. 54

Giving new residents official notification to leave absolved a town from the burden of their support. These warnings were common and some New Hampshire towns, Littleton, Henniker, and Peterboro among them, warned out newcomers as a matter of course to eliminate any potential community liability for their support. 55 Stratham selectmen regularly directed their constable to warn out visitors who had no evident means of support; in 1771 Samuel wrote warrants to warn five people out of the town. 56 However, such action was not always uncontested.

The case of Mary Florence was disputed between Stratham and Exeter for seven years. Like many women Florence suffered economic hardship during her widowhood and sank into poverty. Her house was decrepit and a witness testified that just "before the old house call'd the Widdow Sinklers in Exeter, was pulled down he hered that Mary Florence lived in said house; one morning he went into said house, and saw Mary Flourance their, just ging out of Bad." After the demolition of that house, Mary Florence lived with Cato, the black servant of Rev. Woodbridge Odlin in Exeter. 57

55 Benton, pp. 95-6.
56 N.H.S.A., STR 7:90.
57 N.H.S.A., Provincial Court # 7246.
Florence went to Stratham from Exeter on January 20, 1766 and as she was "Liable to be a Town Charge," just over one month later the Stratham selectmen warned her out and ordered the constable "to proceed forthwith to apprehend the Body of the Said Mary Florence...and Carry her to Exeter and Deliver her to Some of the overseers or Selectmen." Exeter refused to accept the poor woman who returned to Stratham and lived there at town expense while Stratham tried to persuade Exeter to meet its responsibility. After spending £7-16-3 keeping Florence in 1769 and having exhausted all avenues but the courts, in June 1770, Stratham sued Exeter in the Court of General Quarter Sessions. Samuel was not involved in the first round of sparring. The case was heard on March 5, 1771 and the court ruled in Exeter's favor. Stratham appealed and at a Town Meeting on December 16, 1771 Stephen Boardman and Samuel were voted agents "to prosecute the affair against the town of Exeter." They went to Exeter for two days that December, but their involvement inexplicably ended after that. At another meeting on January 13, 1772 Joseph Hoit and William Pottle were appointed agents to continue the case.58 However, Samuel's interest remained. He traveled to Hampton once and Portsmouth twice to hear the case and noted the hearings in his diary. Several days after the verdict, the March 19, 1773 issue of the New Hampshire Gazette commented:

the Famous Cause between Exeter and Stratham...relative to the Maintenance of an antiquated Widow...was at length determined in favor of Stratham, and the Bone of Contention sent to Exeter, from which Place, may she in due Time, have a safe, happy, and easy Transition to Heaven, as there has been so much disputing, where her Residence should be on Earth.59

58 NHSA, STR 2:121, 124.
59 New Hampshire Gazette, March 19, 1773.
Although flippant, the newspaper's commentary pointed to harshness in the law. Mary Florence's time in Stratham could not have been easy. In 1769 three different households were credited with "keeping" her and the following year she moved between two houses. Her dependence on the town for all her needs as well as the disruptions of moving must have been extremely disquieting to an old woman with no family. During her time there both she and Stratham were in limbo. For Stratham's part, it had expended considerable sums on her upkeep, but that was dwarfed by the legal expenses of pressing the lawsuit. Litigation was expensive, but often was the only recourse left to the town in such cases. Samuel spent time in court on other cases for Stratham, and served on several juries. By the 1750s and the flood of court cases related to the Bow Proprietors, he was a well known person in all of New Hampshire's provincial courts.

However, most years were not filled with litigation and "famous" cases. A more typical year was 1751, Samuel's first year as selectman. After the town meeting his fellow selectmen elected him treasurer and deposited the town's money with him. For the year it was his responsibility to collect money and pay the town's bills, either in cash or by order on the money collected and held by the constable. In 1751 Samuel helped negotiate the agreement with the schoolmaster, Henry Herring, who boarded with the Lanes. In addition he dealt with assessing the town, setting the tax rate and paying for the judgment in the lawsuit over Henry Rust's back salary. The routine business of the town took several days - making rates, leasing town lands, contracting

\[60\] The other selectmen that year were Captain George Veasey, Cornet Thomas Wiggin, Deacon Edward Taylor and Andrew Wiggin, Jr.
with the schoolmaster and meeting house sexton, as well as dealing with
issues pertaining to the maintenance of the poor. In 1751 Nathaniel
Pevy was a problem to the town. After the March Town Meeting the
selectmen agreed to meet a week later "to Lett [Pevy] out." John
Stockbridge agreed "to take $d$ Pevy three Months & $d$ Stockbridge to
find him Victuals & cloaths $d$ time for his work." By the end of that
term Stockbridge decided Nathaniel was not worth the bother. For a
second three month stint, "if he [Pevy] holds his reason &c." the
selectmen agreed to pay Stockbridge £18-12-0.61 Pevy maintained his
composure and the Town paid Stockbridge £17-7-0 on September 16.
Whenever possible Stratham, not unlike the overseers of the poor in
Boston and other cities, tried to apprentice needy youth in order to
defray charges to the town. In 1762 Samuel drafted the following
advertisement:

Dorcas Kenison being in a likely way to Recover her health & is now
able to Do Some work. Able Persons that (?) to take $d$ Dorcas for a
time on reasonable Terms as Possible to Save Cost to the Town are
hereby Publickly Notified that they may have oppurtunity to Agree
with the Select Men upon that affair at Mrs Love Chases on Monday
Evening Next at 5 o clock.62

Dorcas, a town ward for quite some time, may have been too well known;
around that time the town paid Moll Haley £16 for "keeping" Dorcas.63

From March 25, 1751 for one year until the next Town Meeting, the
Selectman's Book and Samuel's diary mention his doing town business on
32 days. However, many of the tasks mentioned required much less than a
full day's work. Samuel estimated the "time I Spend in Town Buisness
1751" at 9½ days. His "writing for y° Town 1751" listed writing rates,

61NHSA, STR, fir 1.
62Dey Book, 1762.
63Dey Book, 1763.
warrants, orders on the constable, the agreement with the schoolmaster and the Town Meeting warrant, all valued at £7.\textsuperscript{64} Except for his work in settling the Rust salary lawsuit, all the business was routine, and repeated an annual cycle. This work maintained the underlying town structure in rural New Hampshire during the eighteenth century.

Virtually all Samuel's public service remained within the sphere of the town. Only the Revolution took him beyond Stratham's borders and then only for a short period. British policy after the Peace of Paris in 1763 was troublesome to him, but he remained a loyal subject of the Crown. He was a member of Stratham's Committee of Correspondence appointed February 7, 1774 and supported the Town's resolve "that the Act of Parliament of Great Britain, made for the Express purposes of raising a Revenue in America is Unconstitutional and Unjust; and every Person who Attempts to Execute that Act, is an Enemy to this Country."\textsuperscript{65} A year later he and Deacon Stephen Bordman were Stratham's delegates to the Fourth Provincial Congress at Exeter. From mid-May to mid-November, 1775, Samuel attended "the Congress" for fifty days, yet never detailed any of the sessions in his diary.\textsuperscript{66} For him, all politics were local.

Samuel participated in nearly all town activities with the exception of military service. A drummer for the Hampton troop as a teenager and young man, he petitioned for, and gained a military exemption from Stratham's militia commanders.\textsuperscript{67} He did stand watch when Indians threatened, but purchased a substitute during the French and Indian War when he was called to service; on April 26, 1758 he noted,

\textsuperscript{64}Diary 1751, 1752; NHSA, STR, flr 1.
\textsuperscript{65}NHSA, STR 2:141-42.
\textsuperscript{66}NHHS, Lane Papers, flr 1-3.
\textsuperscript{67}Day Book, 1744.
"Training & I pd £50 to Kenison to go in my room." Otherwise his talents obligated him to pursue town service and, as his ties to Stratham strengthened, he never again found such service damaging, his characterization of his tenure as Tithingman in 1744. As time progressed he served in both the powerful office of selectman alongside that of pound keeper or sealer of leather. Duty, not power or monetary gain, motivated Stratham's residents to serve their town. And although he was most tightly bound to the interests of Stratham, other provincial towns in the 1750s and 1760s enlisted his talents also.

---

68 Diary, 4/26/58.
"I went with Exeter People into y° woods"

Samuel's reputation as a surveyor grew throughout the decade of the 1740s and supplemented his legal and writing skills. His growing competence in this area coincided with the renewal of provincial development at the close of King George's War (1744-48). With the Indian menace temporarily removed, the boundaries between Massachusetts and New Hampshire finally determined by royal edict and a governor eager to build his fortune through speculation in land, the foundation was in place for the development of New Hampshire's vast interior.

"There is an uncommon Stir among People this Fall after Lands in the Woods," Samuel wrote in 1748.¹ A confluence of recent events and long-term trends excited this "uncommon Stir." The precipitating factor was the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle ending King George's War that year. For four years before this the French had incited their native allies to attack English settlements in New England and as far south as New York, effectively stopping new settlement and even causing colonists to abandon certain frontier areas. Stratham had a scare in 1747 and instituted a watch to alarm residents should Indians appear. Samuel watched with his neighbor, Joseph Mason, on April 16, and wrote at the end of the year, "The Indians have Done much Damage the Summer Past."² Although Stratham escaped attack, the danger was real enough on the frontier. In the Merrimack Valley, "Woodwell's Garrison was taken April

¹Diary, Summary, 1748.

A critical factor in fostering settlement of these lands was the final determination of the boundary between Massachusetts and New Hampshire, a bone of contention since New Hampshire was made a separate province in 1679. In 1677 English courts ruled that Massachusetts' northern border extended no "further northward along the river Merrimac than three English miles."⁴ With its charter and that ruling in hand Massachusetts claimed all lands south and west of the river, a significant portion of the lands New Hampshire claimed as its own. However, the charters for Massachusetts and New Hampshire contained contradictory wording and were granted under the mistaken assumption that the Merrimack River ran in an east-west direction over its entire course. New Hampshire disputed the claims of its neighbor to the south.

New Hampshire had attempted several times to gain a favorable settlement of the boundary question but failed even to have the government in England consider the issue. During the 1720s and 1730s Massachusetts granted townships in areas of the Merrimack River Valley that New Hampshire claimed as its own, and this issue acquired a new urgency. The province renewed its attempts to bring the issue before the royal government. New Hampshire's persistence was rewarded.

eventually and his Majesty in Council appointed an impartial commission to study the various claims and make a recommendation to the King in Council. The commission met August 1, 1737 at Hampton, New Hampshire.

When Samuel wrote one month later, "this Day the Commissioners' Verdict was read," he failed to note that the commission came to no definite conclusion respecting the southern boundary. It found that the charters did indeed contain contradictory grants, and that therefore only the King could decide which charter was valid. Much lobbying ensued and New Hampshire was aided enormously by its new agent in London, John Thomlinson, who "completely outgeneraled" the Massachusetts' agents. The King in Council set out a decision on March 5, 1740 which swept aside the issue of contradictory charter grants and based the decision "on principles of justice and equity." Assuming the grants were made on the basis of the Merrimack River running in an easterly direction, the newly settled boundary gave New Hampshire even more territory than the province had claimed. In addition, efforts to obtain an independent and separate governor bore fruit and Benning Wentworth, son of former Lieutenant-Governor John Wentworth, was appointed. New Hampshire emerged an uncontested victor from this struggle with its neighbor.

---

5The commission, appointed April 9, 1736, consisted of "George Clark, Francis Harrison, Cadwalder Colden, Abraham Van Horn, Philip Levington, John Hamilton, John Wells, John Reading, Cornelius Van Horne, William Provost, William Skene, William Sherriff, Henry Cope, Erasmus James Phillips, Otto Hamilton, Samuel Vernon, John Gardiner, John Potter, Ezekiel Warner & George Cornel, or any five or more of you." Each was an official from other provinces. NHSP XIX:274.
6Diary, 9/1/37.
7Fry, p. 262.
8Fry, p. 263.
A boundary determination which secured New Hampshire's title to interior lands, along with a newly appointed governor whose royal instructions urged him to promote settlement "on the Frontiers of your Province," constituted the framework for the rapid and wholesale distribution of large tracts. Before 1732 only fourteen out of the twenty-five towns and parishes granted were actually settled. At the conclusion of King George's War Benning Wentworth compared that record with the experience of the Masonian Proprietors from 1747-49 and was convinced "that Land in the hands of speculators could be distributed and settled more rapidly and efficiently than that parcelled out directly to settlers." He followed the Masonian lead after the hostilities ended in 1748.

Samuel's involvement with town properties began at this time. His previous surveying experience had been measuring individual lots, but on November 11, 1748 he "Agreed with Jerh Veasey to go in y^e woods." In the woods they were to survey the area east of the Pemigawasset River at present day Holderness and draw a plan to accompany a petition to Governor Wentworth for a grant of the tract. "I went with Exeter people into y^e woods," he wrote on November 25, 1748, "which is the first time I ever Camp'd in the Woods." On this thirteen day trip the group perambulated and marked the bounds of the proposed township. Few notes remain concerning this excursion. Samuel remarked on the weather which

---

10Todd, p. 81.
11Looney, p. 7. The Masonian Proprietors were twelve Portsmouth men who in 1746 purchased the rights to land contained in the Mason's title, the royal grant of much of New Hampshire to John Mason.
12Diary, 11/25/1748.
was typically changeable; the end of November was "pretty pleasant for the Season of the year," but the first two nights of December were rainy and then the weather turned cold.

Such expeditions held few comforts. On this trip Samuel carried
"1 Cheeze 1 Cake & Bisket tobacco 2 pipes Blanket compass & Stand Line protractor Dividers Book reading Book coffe Sugar 2 pair Stockins apron." Days were spent running the boundary lines and taking general notes about the land. In the evening the campfire provided light to make a rough sketch of the day's measurements. There were no camps or settlements near. When Matthew Patten surveyed Plymouth just across the Pemigawasset River fifteen years later, except for a logging camp, the closest lodging was near Concord, forty-three miles to the south. Surveying notes indicate that at least seven were in this party. The area had been surveyed before by Ezekial Worthing who had left his initials on one tree.

It is unclear whether Samuel was the surveyor or an assistant on this trip. However, the group was impressed by his work and on June 13, 1750 Samuel "went to the Governor with Mr Ellison," a Holderness proprietor. Two days later he took the oath as Assistant to the Surveyor of his Majesty's Lands in New Hampshire, assuming the authority for "Surveying & Measuring any of his Majesty's Lands following such orders & Directions therein as you Shall from time to time receive from me [the governor] or from the Surveyor." This was broader authority

---

13 Day Book, 1748. Matthew Patten bought food in Penacook on a trip to the same area in 1763, 204 pounds of pork and ½ bushel of ground corn. Patten, p. 126.
14 Patten, pp. 121-22.
15 NHSA, Bow Town Records.
16 Diary, 6/15/50; NHHS, Lane Papers 1-3. The surveyor was Joseph Blanchard.
and a more important position than his appointment in 1743 as "a
Surveyor of Land." With this new commission in hand, and in "extrem
hot" weather, Samuel left for Holderness a second time on June 19, 1750.

The future proprietors of Holderness were more determined in 1750
than two years earlier to obtain their grant. Following the 1748 trip
Samuel noted nothing in his diary related to Holderness until his second
trip there in June 1750. His appointment as surveyor is evidence of
renewed enthusiasm on the part of the group from Exeter. He returned
home after fifteen days, and in mid-July returned his findings to
Governor Wentworth. After a long delay, the petition for Holderness,
"as surveyed and planned by Sam'l Lane surveyor," was considered by the
Governor's Council on October 15, 1751 and finally granted November
11.\footnote{NHSP VI:14.}

His most extensive work for the now Holderness Proprietors came in
the year following the grant of the charter. Samuel met with prominent
proprietors several times to discuss laying out lots in the newly
created township. In May 1752 he "bargained with Jno. Shepard to go to
Holderness." It may be that the proprietors wanted him to go there
during the summer; his trip during June, 1750 must have been
uncomfortable. Matthew Patten wrote of a trip to the same area in
summer, "The reason of my return so quick was the flys was so plenty
that I could not work and there was only one of our Comtee there the
other was gon home."\footnote{Patten, 126. Ebenezer Lane wrote, "After he [Samuel] had been out on
one of those Surveying tours for a long time, the Sun and Black Flies,
the Moschetoes &c had so altered his countenance, that when he returned
home, his Family scarcely knew who he was." NHHS, Lane Papers, "Some
Remarks and reminiscences," p. 3.} Whatever the reason Samuel did not go until late
October when he laid out three sections into house and farm lots. After that trip his involvement with Holderness diminished. He met with key proprietors on several occasions and took a plan of the lots to the Governor, but Holderness was not settled before hostilities with the French and Indians broke out again in 1754. The conditions for settlement unfulfilled, the 1751 charter lapsed and the area was granted to a different group in 1761. Although Samuel's experience with this propriety was limited, it signaled opportunities which became a major vocation over the next two decades.¹⁹

¹⁹Samuel also agreed on January 11, 1749/50 to survey Township Number Six, present day Henniker, for a group which contained many Stratham residents. Spring arrived early that year, and he never got to Henniker as the ice broke up and his party could not cross the rivers. NHHS, Lane Papers 1-3; Journal, p. 34.
"I was Chose Proprietors Clerk for Bow"

Although fifty miles west of Stratham, the Township of Bow and its success was of communal concern to Stratham residents; ninety-one of the one hundred and sixty original proprietors were Stratham people. Like most eighteenth-century proprietors it appears that few of these proposed to leave Stratham and settle in Bow, but the prosperity of this enterprise had ramifications for both individual and community.¹

New Hampshire proprietors were granted tracts of land by the provincial government and became owners in common of that land.² These proprieties were first and foremost corporations to facilitate "the profitable distribution of a land grant, and not solely as a social instrument to aid settlement."³ "One of the outstanding powers of the proprietors" was contained in a Legislative act of 1719; "the proprietors of the common and undivided lands...shall be and hereby are empowered to order, improve, or divide [those lands] in such way and manner as shall be concluded and agreed upon by a major part of such proprietors."⁴ However, distribution of the land and its settlement was not unrelated; settled areas were far more valuable than undeveloped wilderness. Theodore Atkinson made that clear to New Hampshire's London agent, John Thomlinson in 1758:

we Have Generaly thot it advantageous to give a Certain

¹The nature of proprietorship changed from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century in that nearly all the seventeenth century proprietors were residents. The towns and propriety were virtually one and the same. In the eighteenth century, non-resident proprietors were the majority in most town grants.
²Akagi, p. 3.
⁴Akagi, pp. 74, 75.
Quantity of our Own Lotts to Encourage Settlers as for Instance where I have 350 Acres in one Lot I make a Dadd of 50 or 60 acres to Porson he Immediatly Entring & Building a House &c & Putting a family in it which Enhances the Value of the Residue"5

Clearly, many proprietors appreciated the advantages of quick and efficient settlement.

No easy generalizations can be made about the proprietors of New England lands. They varied in occupation and social rank; wealth was not a prerequisite. "Almost any man of whatever station who yearned for a share of frontier territory could somehow find one, either free or at a very small cost." In most proprieties this yielded "a substantial, but not especially distinguished group."6 The Massachusetts General Court encouraged anyone able to pay the £3-5 fee to apply for a share in the soon to be created western townships. Connecticut urged any spirited individual to become a proprietor in its township auctions of 1738 by requiring no payment at the sale; a purchaser had three years to pay. Such widespread participation was limited to some degree in New Hampshire where an elite group of the governor's family and close associates, and members of the government were included in virtually every township grant. Of those named in Bow's 1727 charter, thirty-three proprietors, or about one-fifth, were intimates, family or political allies of Lieutenant-Governor John Wentworth.7

However much New Hampshire's government wanted to fulfill the King's instructions and tame its interior, the salient force driving its proprieties was land speculation, and the gain to be had from property's

5NHSP 18:470.
6Clark, p. 182.
7Well connected Bow proprietors included Massachusetts Governor Shute, Mark Hunking (N.H. Council President), George Jaffrey (N.H. treasurer), Richard Waldron (N.H. Secretary), four members of the Governor's Council, numerous members of the N.H. General Court as well as Wentworth relatives.
appreciation in value. "Bold speculation was one of the characteristics of the eighteenth century in England and America." The waning influence of Puritan morality with tenants eschewing undue personal gain paved the way for an economic and social life reflecting a spirit of risk and chance. Gaming, gambling and lotteries became popular forms of sport. Massachusetts held its first provincial lottery in 1745; only twelve years earlier lotteries had been prohibited by the General Court. And speculation in land fueled speculation elsewhere; "20 Do$ of it being N. York Money," Samuel noted of Bow money he collected in 1777, "I Bo't [lottery] Tickets with it." 

This era of speculation coincided with extended periods of peace in Europe and the American colonies. While serving the Crown on military expeditions during the colonial wars, the colonists discovered a vast interior available for settlement. Also, those wars had stimulated the colonial economy and created merchant capital through supply contracts for British forces. Investment outlets were limited otherwise to fishing, trading and lumbering because of the navigation laws that prohibited investment in manufacturing. Land, therefore, became the primary object for investment and speculation in the colonies. It was the only resource available in significant quantity to absorb America's new capital wealth.

Like his neighbors, Samuel caught this speculative fever, but he also looked to land as a hedge against inflation during King George's War; "This makes me Desirous of Laying my Money out in Land," he wrote in 1748, "which I am trying to purchase but Can't have any opportunity

8Akagi, p. 177.
9NHHS, Lane Papers, Account Book, p. 236.
10Clark, p. 170.
to bye any that Suits me: and Letting my Money out, it Sinks more than one half in the run of one year: this is Discouraging."\textsuperscript{11} Although clothed in somewhat different terms Samuel's motives differed little from others. Massachusetts Governor Belcher "advised a correspondent to put his money into 'uncultivated wilderness lands in this Province' which will 'advance your estate three times faster than money put to interest.'\textsuperscript{12} And Yale President Ezra Stiles noted both the risk and the potential gain of land speculation, "Probably most of the N.H. Rights will become forfeit; perhaps I may clear a few. But Col. Lydias's will become of Value of £50 Sterling each before they revert; and if my Heirs are careful, they may easily secure them forever."\textsuperscript{13}

Early on Samuel made investments in land that were clearly speculative. In April 1746 he bought one-half a proprietor's share in Bow from Simon Wiggin, an original proprietor, and in 1751 bought a right in Barnstead from his brother William.\textsuperscript{14} In addition to these "wilderness lands" he purchased several tracts of land in Stratham and Exeter which he intended to farm and work himself. Thus, he intended his investment in land to serve several purposes, and to a limited extent by 1751 Samuel had tied his fortunes to those of two propertied.

But by then his association with Bow had grown much more familiar. With many of his Stratham neighbors on the list of original Bow Proprietors, it is not surprising that he was called upon to help measure and lay out Bow's common lands. His first work for Bow came in

\textsuperscript{11}Journal, p. 33.  
\textsuperscript{13}Ezra Stiles, "Itineraries," Ezra Stiles Papers (New Haven: Yale University Library, 1976.)  
\textsuperscript{14}NHHS, Lane Account Book.
1748, but his involvement followed a long history of controversy that made Bow "the subject of more litigation than any other town in the history of this state." \(^{15}\) That litigation embroiled Bow in more than four decades of legal and political battles.

Bow's woes were founded in the ambiguous boundary between Massachusetts and New Hampshire that was not settled until 1740 by royal edict. Massachusetts, claiming all lands south and west of a line drawn three miles north of the Merrimack River, made a grant of land at Penacook, present day Concord, New Hampshire, to a group from Haverhill, Massachusetts on January 17, 1726, in part to establish her claim to the region and in part to hinder expansion of the Scotch-Irish Presbyterian settlement at Londonderry. New Hampshire protested this incursion by sending a committee to intercept the Massachusetts surveying party in May 1726 with "a request not to proceed to appropriate their lands for they lay in the Province of New Hampshire, and Massachusetts' making a grant might be attended with very ill consequences to the settlers, and ordered them in an amicable way to withdraw themselves forthwith...\(^{16}\)

Ignoring the warning, the Massachusetts grantees began to settle the area during the winter of 1726-27.

"The Massachusetts are daily encroaching on us," Lieutenant Governor Wentworth stated in a 1726 address to the New Hampshire legislature, and he predicted an unfortunate result, "Pennycook...will certainly be the very bowels of this Province and...will take in the most valuable of lands." \(^{17}\) He countered this invasion with Merrimack

\(^{15}\)Todd, p. 63.  
\(^{17}\)Colby, p. 265.
Valley township grants of his own in 1727: Bow, Canterbury, Gilmantown, Chichester, Barnstead and Epsom. Bow, a grant of eighty-one square miles lying on both sides of the river, was in direct conflict with the Massachusetts settlement at Penacook. Its corporate being grew out of the Massachusetts challenge.

Bow's charter was unexceptional and closely followed the form and substance of other New Hampshire grants. Settlement of seventy-five families during the first three years, each in a house on three cleared acres, was necessary to validate the grant. Within four years the charter required that a meeting house "for the Public Worship of GOD" be built. These time limitations could be extended should hostilities with the Indians renew. Stratham men, Andrew Wiggin, George Veasey and William Moore, were named selectmen for the first year and given the authority to call meetings and attend to proprietary matters. Several months later they held the first meeting in Stratham where the selectmen were reaffirmed by a vote of the proprietors, and other town officers, all Stratham residents, were chosen. In addition the proprietors appointed a committee to survey and lay out lots in the town. It is not clear that any action toward settlement was taken in 1728, for in January 1729 a committee was again chosen to lay out the town. Accordingly, Wiggin, Moore and Edward Fifield, perambulated the Bow boundary in February 1729. Slowly the Bow Proprietors were laying the groundwork for settlement, "A cart-path had been cut through the forest, a survey of lots had been made sufficient to accommodate the admitted

---

18 NHSP 24:489-92.
settlers, and preparations were being made to inhabit the township within the next two years.\(^{20}\)

In the meantime Massachusetts made another grant of Bow land on the Merrimack River south of the Penacook grant to the heirs and survivors of Captain John Lovewell's recent expedition against the Indians, the August 1728 Suncook grant. In spite of the vague land titles created by the conflicting grants, the Massachusetts grantees pursued settlement much more vigorously and established communities; the Bow efforts paled in comparison. Some attempts were made to settle the Bow grant during the 1730's, but the ambiguities and clouded land titles inherent in the contested boundary with Massachusetts deterred the Bow Proprietors from the wholesale effort and expense necessary to contest the Massachusetts' claims and people the township. That obstacle was removed partially with the boundary settlement in 1740 when the disputed areas fell under New Hampshire's jurisdiction. However, the already established Massachusetts settlements remained. Soon after war again intervened and it was not until the October 1748 peace that the Bow Proprietors made a strong and concerted effort to exercise their rights under the 1727 charter.

Samuel's interest in Bow had several roots: his half right in Bow purchased in 1746, his surveying experience, and a more general interest as a member of the Stratham community. His value to the Bow proprietors must have been evident for its November 11, 1748 meeting voted "Jonathan Fifield, Nathaniel Piper and Samuel Lane "a Committee to Perambulate the lines around Bow." Piper was an original proprietor as were two members of Fifield's family; Samuel was the only committeeeman with no direct

\(^{20}\)Colby, p. 265.
connection to original proprietors. This committee was to measure and divide "all good land lying on the NE Side of Bow next to Chichester & Canterbury," and to make a return of the division at the next meeting. To accomplish this it had authority to hire a surveyor, this was prior to Samuel's appointment as assistant to New Hampshire's surveyor Joseph Blanchard in 1750, and four assistants. True to their New England roots, the propriety stipulated these four men were to "work as cheap as they can." In the face of the already established communities at Penacook, renamed Rumford, and Suncook, Bow made belated moves to establish its claim by possession within one month of peace on the frontier.

The committee hired Newmarket's Walter Bryant. A noted surveyor, Bryant marked the boundary between New Hampshire and Maine in the wake of the King's determination, and his name is found on many New Hampshire town plans. Samuel visited him twice before the group went to Bow; on November 23 in his role as committeeeman, he hired Bryant to act as surveyor, and just three days before their departure for Bow they met again. On December 15, 1748, one week after Samuel returned home from Holderness, he set out with seven others for the Merrimack Valley.

The first day's travel took the group to Nottingham where they lodged with Mr. McClary; the next night they lodged at Mecoy's camp in Epsom. Reaching Bow on Saturday, December 17, they located the line

\[21\] NHSA, Bow Town Records, 18th Century fir.
\[22\] The Penacook Grant received a town charter as Rumford by Massachusetts in 1737.
\[23\] "Newmarket Scrapbook" (Collections from The Newmarket Advertiser), p. 23.
\[24\] The surveying party consisted of: Walter Bryant, Surveyor; Jonathan Fifield; Josiah Wiggin; Reuben Hill; Francis Follet; Samuel Leavit Jr.; John Clark; and Samuel Lane.
between Bow and Chichester before going to lodge that evening with
Captain Foster. The next day being the Sabbath the group as a whole
had no qualms attending Suncook Meeting, although one might assume it
enemy territory to agents of the Bow Proprietors. Rainy weather kept
the party close to Captain Foster's where it ran out lots in the
southeast corner of Bow. With the advent of "pleasant weather" on
Wednesday they began to run the boundary line on the southeast and
northeast sides of Bow, camping out two nights. By Friday the party had
reached the Merrimack River on Bow's northwest boundary and from there
went to Eastman's inn and ferry in Rumford for the night. The next day
one of the party, Josiah Wiggin, left for Stratham as the rest of the
party crossed the river on Eastman's ferry and ran six miles along the
northwest border. With no settlements near, they camped that evening
and the next morning four of the six went to meeting at Rumford;
perhaps the prospect of confronting Timothy Walker, minister and leader
of the opposition to Bow's claims, was daunting enough to dissuade two
from attending meeting.

At this point the group pressed harder to finish their
perambulation quickly; prolonged winter camping may have inspired the
party to work faster. On Monday they ran eight miles and Tuesday "we
run (as also we Did a Munday Morning) Near 1 Mile before Sunrise,"
Samuel wrote. Later that day "we...travel'd as fast as we could to the
[Merrimack] River;...but we could not get over as we expected;" and he
continued, "we were going toward the pennicook Ferry & found a Float &

25 Moses Foster moved to Suncook prior to 1743 and "commanded the
garrison in the fort." Presumably the fort doubled as his residence.
It was on the east side of the Merrimack in the southwest corner of
Suncook. Carter I:396, 405; II:98.
cut her out of the ice & went over y° River & Lodg'd at capt Fosters." The next morning they left for Stratham in good weather spending that night in Chester. They returned home on December 29 in "a Storm of Snow 6 or 8 inches Deep & very cold," after a fifteen day journey.\textsuperscript{26}

The hardships of such a trip are disguised by Samuel's terse and businesslike surveying notes, but the challenges and frustrations were described by a more lyric eighteenth-century surveyor:

Upon our NEEDLE we depend  
In y° THICK WOODS our COURSE to know  
Then after it y° CHAIN Extend  
For we must gain our DISTANCE so

Over y° HILLS through BRUSHY PLAINS  
And HIDEOUS SWAMPS where is no TRACK  
Cross RIVERS, BROOKS we with much PAINS  
Are forc'd to travel forth & back....

When WEARY STEPS has brought us home  
AND NEEDLE, CHAIN have some respite  
SCALE and DIVIDERS in use come  
To FIT all for next morning light

And though we're CAREFUL in y° same  
AS HAST & OBSTICLES will yeild  
YET after times they will us BLAME  
When ROUGH WILD WOODS are made a Field.\textsuperscript{27}

The experience of the Bow surveying crew certainly mirrored that of this poet. He points to the difficulties unique to American surveying discussed earlier and their magnification in the frontier woods. Apart from the natural conditions - woods and undergrowth, rivers and winter weather - this group also had to deal with human impediments and frailty. Samuel's account of this trip obliquely hints at two such problems.

\textsuperscript{26}NHSA, Bow Town Records; Diary, 1748.  
\textsuperscript{27}John E. Flynn, Beyond the Blew-Hills (Stoughton, Mass.: Stoughton Historical Society, 1976), cited in Candee, pp. 11-12.
The first problem these lot layers encountered was the existing settlement on Bow's common and undivided lands. On Wednesday the party was measuring by the east corner of Bow "which was the place where we intended to begin to Lay out our 2nd Division of Lotts if we could have found Land enough." That there should be a paucity of land in that "wilderness" area is mystifying except that Suncook too had laid out lots in the same vicinity and its grantees had begun settling there sometime in the early 1730s. Samuel's inability to find "Land enough" was a direct result of that Suncook settlement. By necessity the party searched out appropriate unsettled areas elsewhere for its second division to avoid conflict.

A different sort of human problem may have precipitated Josiah Wiggin's early departure. In one corner of Samuel's rough notes is the following warrant, "to francis follet Bow Baileff," wrote Justice of the Peace Walter Bryant, "make a thorough Search in this Company for a Bill of forty Shilling old tenor valueLost p Sam\textsuperscript{11} Lane Esq\textsuperscript{r} & the person it is found on Bring before me." Wiggin's abrupt departure after an evening at Eastman's tavern casts suspicion on him as the culprit. Certainly the thief would have been aware Samuel was carrying money; he paid the charges at Eastman's for several members of the party. Wiggin's exit also coincided with the sense of urgency alluded to earlier and the division of the group between churchgoers and Sabbath breakers the next day. All this hints at an unpleasant, perhaps divisive occurrence that Friday night at Eastman's.

\footnote{NHSA, Bow Town Records.}
\footnote{NHSA, Bow Town Records.}
\footnote{When Esquire Wiggin left early during a 1758 perambulation, Samuel gave a reason, "Esq\textsuperscript{r} Wiggin went home not well." NHSA, Bow Town Records, 18th century flr.}
Samuel's notes and accounts of the journey's costs point to varying tastes and fondness for liquor. At McClary's in Epsom, individual bills ranged from 12¢ to one pound. Apparently, the daily rate paid each man did not include expenses although members of the party covered expenses for each other at times. Samuel "pd at Eastman's for Clark 8¢ & Follet 8¢ Leavit 8¢, Bryant 7¢-5." He must also have brought along an ample supply of rum, quantities of which he sold Fifield and Follet. In his initial bill of costs to the Bow Proprietors Samuel included the two Sundays as work days even though no work was done. That did not pass muster with Moses Leavit, the Proprietors' Clerk, who crossed out those charges observing "this accompt included Sabbath Days but was not allow'd." Bryant, as surveyor, was paid 3½ per day. The distinction between the proprietors' committee, Samuel and Jonathan Fifield, and the "hire'd men" did not reflect in their pay; each received 35¢ per day for their efforts. Leavit paid the bulk of the surveying party's wages, £16-4-5-0, on February 23rd, the day after the committee made its report of the trip.\\n
31 NHSA, Bow Town Records.
32 NHSA, Bow Town Records.
one hundred and fifty second division lots. To accomplish this the committee departed from its original instructions and located the lots in three different areas of the township. The Bow Proprietors were unable to concentrate the lots in one area as they had in the first division laid out in 1732 before Suncook settlement had begun in earnest. In June Samuel recorded, "Bow Meeting to Draw Lotts &c;" in theory at least, more of Bow's undivided common lands, the second division, passed on to individual proprietors.  

However, the conflicting Bow and Suncook grants raised problems with this distribution. Despite care taken to minimize friction, the first division home lots laid out in 1733, and eight of the larger second division lots were on land already occupied by the Suncook grantees. Bow defined the problem as follows, "a considerable Number of Persons Have Entered into and Taken Possession of Sundry Pieces & Parcels of land lying in the Township of Bow, and Claim the Same as their Property." Fully aware of Suncook's advantage of possession, Bow's July meeting chose a committee to resolve these conflicts. By virtue of its composition it appears this committee was chosen for its ability to awe, rather than to negotiate with the Suncook settlers; it included Provincial Secretary Theodore Atkinson, Andrew Wiggin, Peter Gilman and Clement March among others, all influential members of the Governor's inner circle. This committee had little trouble coming to a "Just & Equitable" agreement with eight Suncook inhabitants who, facing the force of New Hampshire officialdom, decided the best course was to acquiesce to the Bow demands. On August 8, 1749 the "Bow Com[mittee Met &

33Diary, 6/27/49.
34NHSA, Bow Proprietors Records, p. 63.
made Proposals to Suncook people" who signed an agreement on the 24th
relinquishing "all their Rights to any other lands in Bow afor'sd they
hold or Claim by or from any Person or Persons within the Massachusetts
bay" in return for "forty acres of land at least...it is to be
understood that the forty acres be allowed to y's inhabitants where they
have Made Improvments."

This action marked the beginning of the Bow Proprietors' concerted
attempts to either gain control over or compensation from those who
settled there under the Massachusetts grants. It also symbolized
Samuel's ascent within the Bow Propriety. Although not particularly
visible in the public record during this episode, he played an important
role behind the scenes. He helped draw the land divisions which were
the basis for this agreement and provided the committee with that
information. He went to Walter Bryant in Newmarket to "borrow Plans"
ten days before the agreement was signed, and the recording of these
events in his diary signaled more than a passing interest. To have
noted them at all meant that they touched him in some significant way,
and it probably indicates his attendance at the meetings. His first
connection with Bow happened as a consequence of his communal ties to
Stratham, the center of the Propriety. In that context his 1746
purchase of a half-right led three years later to his appointment as a
surveyor. His knowledge of Bow's geography, most proprietors never had
set foot in the area, and his considerable writing and legal skills put
him in the position to assume a central role in the township's
development.

35Diary, 8/8/49; NHSA, Bow Town Records.
But negotiation, although amenable to Suncook, proved unacceptable to Rumford settlers whose community was well established and who had in their minister, Timothy Walker, a leader willing to stand up to the Bow Proprietors. Rumford settlers had every reason to distrust the New Hampshire government. Its right as a town, granted by Massachusetts in 1737, was revoked by New Hampshire in the 1741 District Act. This act denied the validity of the Massachusetts' grant and town charter, effectively voiding any claim to lands granted by Massachusetts, but it did authorize Rumford to collect provincial taxes.\textsuperscript{36} When the District Act expired in 1749 even those limited rights expired, and Rumford had no corporate existence; in legal terms Rumford ceased to exist and simply became a part of Bow. No town meetings were held until 1766.

The problem was succinctly summed up by Walter Bryant in an addendum to the 1749 perambulation, "I...found all the Inhabitance to the south of Canterbury & East Marrimack which are in Rumford to be in Bow."\textsuperscript{37} The Bow Proprietors had no intention of forcing Rumford residents from their homes, but sought monetary compensation for their lost land. Complicating Bow's position was the King's ruling that the Massachusetts and New Hampshire boundary settlement was not to affect private property within the disputed territory. The ambiguity inherent in that ruling gave rise to the particular Bow strategy of initiating trespass suits against Rumford settlers valued for £300 or less, the limit at which suits could be appealed to courts in England. Following this course assured Bow that these cases would be heard in the friendly territory of New Hampshire courts.

\textsuperscript{36}Akagi, p. 167; Bundy, p. 45.
\textsuperscript{37}NHSP 9:63.
A 1742 suit between Thomas Brier of Stratham, a Bow grantee, and Andrew McFarland, a Suncook settler, initiated this pattern of litigation.\textsuperscript{38} This case appears to have been settled out of court and the threat of similar legal action may have helped pave the way for the 1749 agreement between the eight Suncook settlers and Bow. Brier v. McFarland demonstrated the Bow Propriety's determination to exercise its rights through all available means, including the courts. King George's War postponed this struggle between Rumford and Bow, but peace in that theater precipitated renewed hostilities in the other.

Suncook's willingness to compromise with Bow was expressed in 1744 when Suncook chose a committee:

to go and treat with the proprietors of the town of Bow at their annual meeting and to see upon what terms or agreement they will come into with us and see if s\textsuperscript{d} proprietors will take up with such offers or proposals as the province or provinces shall make unto them or some other way so that all controversies or Law suits may be ended for the future that so it may be for theirs and our peace and benefit &c.\textsuperscript{39}

However, Rumford inhabitants were decidedly more determined to fight for the property they had settled and improved. Confronted with Rumford's intractability, the Bow Proprietors renewed their strategy of trespass suits. In 1749 two separate actions of ejectment were pressed against James Mann and John Merrill.\textsuperscript{40} Mann, a Suncook inhabitant, may have settled out of court, but Merrill, with the support of Rumford's Town assembled, prepared to fight a legal battle with the Bow Proprietors.

\textsuperscript{38}NHSA, Provincial Court Record $22667.
\textsuperscript{39}Carter, p. 44.
\textsuperscript{40}NHSA, Bow v. Mann, Provincial Court Record $23326. "the Said James within twenty two years past hath Illegally Entered into the premises Demanded," twelve acres of land valued at £200; Bow v. Merrill, Provincial Court Record $23325.
The suit against Merrill concerned "Fifty Six acres of land more
or Less with the Edifices & Appurtenances" valued at £500. Merrill
operated a ferry over the Merrimack, and this suit sought his ferry
privilege as well as the fifty-six acres.\textsuperscript{41} A jury found for Merrill in
the March 1750 session of the Inferior Court, and the Bow Proprietors
immediately appealed to the Superior Court. However, the Proprietors
failed to pursue their appeal and the case was dropped. In the wake of
the trial they must have apprehended the dangers inherent in this
particular suit. With the tract in question valued at £500, a Merrill
loss would have allowed him to appeal in England, thereby neutralizing
Bow's advantage in the provincial courts. As well, a Merrill win in
England would have set a costly legal precedent and perhaps voided much
of Bow's claim to the lands delineated in its charter. Thus, it dropped
the appeal, but not the cause.

One year and one day after the initial Merrill suit Bow sued
again, this time for Merrill's ferry and only eight acres.\textsuperscript{42} With that
property valued at £300 the Bow Proprietors were assured that this case
would remain within the sphere of their considerable influence.

Rumford, realizing that an adverse decision in any single case would
affect all their property claims, voted "That the Proprietors aforesaid
will be at the Cost of Defending John Merrill," and chose a committee
"to advise and Order Deacon John Merrill how he shall pursue and defend
the action." Also, the meeting authorized the sale of common lands to
underwrite the anticipated legal expenses.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{41}NHSA, Provincial Court Record $23325.
\textsuperscript{42}NHSA, Provincial Court Record $22602.
In a repeat of the previous year's litigation, the Court of Common Pleas jury found for Merrill in March 1751. But Bow's appeal to the Superior court, where a jury was not involved, was successful as was a further review. Merrill requested an appeal in England but was denied because of the suit's value. Bow's strategy appeared to be working. With their property and improvements at risk, Rumford's four hundred inhabitants instructed the Rev. Timothy Walker and Benjamin Rolfe to petition His Majesty in Council for relief in 1753. This grievance accused Bow of "forcing them [Rumford settlers] out of the valuable improvements they and their predecessors have made at the expense of their blood and treasure," but their real hardship was that "they cannot have a fair, impartial trial, for that the Governor and most of ye Council are proprietors of Bow, and by them not only ye judges are appointed, but also ye officers that empannel ye jury."44 To the Bow Proprietors' dismay, the King in Council agreed to hear the case in October 1754.

The King in Council found for Merrill, not on the two substantive arguments propounded by the Rumford defense, but because there was some confusion in the Bow charter over its boundary with Chichester. The two issues on which Rumford hoped the Lords would rule - the validity of Bow's charter because of noncompliance with its condition that the town be settled within three years, and the clause stipulating that private property was not to be affected by King's boundary decision - were not addressed in the Merrill decision. Noting this less than absolute victory for Rumford, the Bow Proprietors pressed another suit against Merrill in 1755.

However, by this time Samuel's role within Propriety had changed substantially; he was now Proprietors' Clerk. While his work with the Propriety had revolved around surveying expertise before 1752, that December he began to note in his diary attendance at Bow's court cases in the Merrill appeal. In 1753 he continued this activity in another case against Rumford settlers. His involvement deepened as he became a vital member of the Propriety's ruling group.

The death of Moses Leavit in February, 1754 opened the door to Samuel's official rise within the Bow Propriety, and on April 4 he was chosen to replace Leavit as proprietors' clerk. Samuel was a logical choice. He was familiar to the proprietors, many of whom were his Stratham neighbors. He also knew the geography of the township and some of the settlers, indispensable knowledge since the prospect of negotiated settlements with established residents was foremost in many proprietors' minds. The breadth of his knowledge and the wide range of his skills made him an ideal choice to administer the Propriety. But his appointment also was something of a social coup. Esquire Leavit was a wealthy landowner and community leader whose prosperity enabled him to send his son to Harvard. A certain status devolved on Samuel in his replacing Leavit as Bow Clerk.

"The central figure in any propriety was the clerk." Elected by the majority of proprietors, the clerk had various responsibilities:

to serve notices of the meetings to the members of the propriety;
to record all acts and votes passed at all legal proprietors' meetings; to enter all divisions or sale of land with surveys and boundaries; to transact all the business of the propriety between meetings, unless otherwise stipulated, and to attend to the correspondence; and to represent the propriety at all occasions.
unless a special committee or agent is appointed in advance in his place.\textsuperscript{45}

The treasurer, surveyor and clerk were the three most important members of the corporation; combining the offices of clerk and assistant to the surveyor, Walter Bryant, compounded Samuel's utility.

His responsibilities included not only those listed above, but also many more because of the extensive litigation in which Bow was involved. He received no salary and was paid for the actual work he did. The rhythm of proprietary business is clearly visible in Samuel's account with Bow. In March he devised the warrant, or agenda, of the Annual Meeting held the first Thursday in April, and notified the Propriety. Before the \textit{New Hampshire Gazette} began publication in 1756, notification had to be publicly posted in the surrounding towns; in April 1754 Samuel wrote "5 Notifications of y. adjourn't of y. Meeting for 5 Towns: at 2/s each."\textsuperscript{46} After the annual meeting he copied the warrant into the record book as well as any action taken at the meeting. In a town devoid of the controversy that continually visited Bow, the annual record might consist of little more than that.

However, Bow regularly continued its meeting to a later date, either anticipating problems or unable to complete business that oftentimes hinged on court decisions. The continued meeting had to be noticed, a warrant prepared and its business copied in the official record. With a number of court cases in progress throughout the 1750s, Samuel spent a good deal of time researching background material for these cases in the records. In 1755 "Meeting at Chases 3 times as. commatee for Searching the Records & Making new Lott papers," "near half

\textsuperscript{45}Akagi, pp. 64, 65.
\textsuperscript{46}Day Book, 1754.
a Day Searching ye Book wth Bryant, and "Drawing a List of ye 20\(^{th}\) tax in Alphabetical order" were typical of the many tasks Samuel performed as clerk for Bow during those litigious years.\(^{47}\)

Merrill's impending case before the King in Council created a flurry of activity: in July 1754 Samuel wrote "his Majy's order in Council & y\(^{2}\) Lord's \\&c 3 Pages in folio," and "ye Vote for ye Agents to Send to England." After the decision went against Bow in 1755 Samuel copied "a long Letter from England of 16 pages in octavo, Small hand at 3\(^{8}/\) p Page."\(^{48}\) Other cases created work for the clerk. In May 1757 he drew "2 Plans of Bow, Epsom Chester Dover, Derry, Exeter, Canterbury, Rumford Notingham \\& all adjacent Towns, for the Court," and he spent the last two days of May at "ye Bank wth ye Records \\&c at the Court \\&c as Evidence at 30\(^{8}/\) p Day."\(^{49}\) "I went to Bank on Bow Case" became a familiar refrain in Samuel's diary.

And as the Bow Proprietors had attempted in the late 1740s, there appears to have been a renewed interest in compromising with Suncook and Rumford inhabitants after the disappointing decision in the Merrill case. Although they continued pressing "actions of ejectment," these cases may have been initiated simply to stabilize Bow's deteriorating bargaining position. The Suncook residents' early inclination to compromise with Bow diminished as they saw Rumford's opposition to the Bow Proprietors yielding some successes. Those victories, albeit limited, must have given hope to their neighbor.

\(^{47}\) Day Book, 1755.
\(^{48}\) Day Book, 1754, 1755.
\(^{49}\) Day Book, 1757. This work stemmed from another trespass suit pressed by Bow in 1753 against Benjamin Rolfe, David Foster and Joseph Hall. True to their strategy, the value of the suit was £300. NHSA, Provincial Court Record #23324.
Bow's desire to compromise also was sparked by mounting legal fees. Samuel was directed to make a list of the money raised by Bow "to be appropriated toward Defraying the publick Expenses of Said Proprietors, in Laying out Lands, in fencing and building Houses thereon, and other Necessary Expenses in promoting the publick good of said Township." From 1732 through 1755, the assessment on each share was £31-5-0, for a total of £5000. Although Bow had voted funds in the 1730s to construct a meeting house and some homes for settlers, most of the money raised from 1748 to 1755 was spent on surveys and legal fees. Mounting a legal battle across the ocean in England was an expensive proposition and colonial money was not accepted as legal tender by the English legal establishment. The Bow Proprietors looked to the provincial government in Portsmouth for help "as the Getting of Sterling money either by way of Bills of Exchange or silver is at Present very Difficult if to be obtained from Private Persons." They asked for a loan of £100 sterling. Bow's investment in public works relating to settling the township was overshadowed by the expenses involved in clearing its title to the land.

The divergence in interests between resident and non-resident proprietors has been cited as a reason for growing conflict between coastal and inland inhabitants. Such conflict certainly existed in Bow's case although the contention cannot be explained by divergent non-resident and resident proprietor interests. Samuel, one of the non-

---

50 NHSA, Provincial Court Record #22602.
51 Bundy, p. 34. For example, the charges for Samuel's first surveying trip to Bow came to £196.
resident proprietors, was on good terms with Suncook residents and was welcomed into their homes; He traded leather goods with residents and he often stayed with Benjamin Norris, one of several Stratham transplants. The line of conflict divided those with links to Stratham and those without, and did not revolve about a general refusal by the non-resident proprietors to invest in the township, the source of friction according to some scholars. It would seem that the Bow proprietors invested in surveys and some building, but mainly in clearing their title to the grant, an investment which yielded little immediate financial gain to the group as a whole. Toward the end of its active involvement as a corporate body in 1765 and with Bow soon to receive town privileges, the proprietors failed to act on a request by resident Edward Russell to pay £300 for three bridges in Bow's second division. But there is no general record of the non-resident proprietors at odds with settlers over investment in the town. Communal links tied the groups together.

However, heavy expenses and few financial returns resulted in a good deal of tax delinquency. Tax sales were authorized by law, but delinquent taxes became such a problem by 1761 that a law was enacted because "the Money to be Raised for Improving the Common Interest is Seldom Seasonably paid & often times not paid at all but by a few who are willing." Bow found itself in a similar situation in 1755 when each share was assessed £15. In the wake of the ill-fated suit in

54 Bundy, p. 82. Charles Clark wrote, "instead of capitalizing on their holdings, proprietors often invested heavily in surveys, fortifications, and public works such as roads and bridges without any compensating gain, at least for many years." Actions of the Bow propriety support this general contention. Clark, p. 172.
England, and with several others pending in New Hampshire courts, money was needed for legal fees. With the loss of the Merrill case, some proprietors seem to have lost heart and Bow held the first of its "Sales of the Part of Sundry Rights...for the payment of taxes due" the following year.

This sale, held at Thomas Chase's tavern in Stratham, conveyed twelve lots over two days. On March 23, seven lots were sold and three days later, five. Over and above the bid for the right, the successful bidder paid expenses, roughly comparable to a buyer's premium at today's auctions. In March those charges were approximately £26 which included a proportion of the charges for legal advice, advertising, the clerk's attendance, the vendue master's fees, the deed and its recording as well as the balance of unpaid tax.\(^{56}\) Samuel attended both days unsuccessfully bidding on four half rights.

That November Samuel acted as Vendue Master and over two days auctioned off eighteen half rights. His percentage was 24% and his fees amounted to £14-12-0. By the next sale in July 1758, he was nearly indispensable. He received fees for selling, 6 pence per pound, attending as clerk, writing advertisements, making copies of the sales, writing deeds and recording all fifty-two sales. His fees over the six and one-half day sale were £162-10-0.\(^{57}\)

An event at the 1758 vendue illustrates the importance of the advice and expertise someone like Samuel could offer New Hampshire's populace. Six months after the sale in January 1759, James Cochran of Londonderry petitioned the provincial government to annul the sale of

\(^{56}\)NHSA, Bow Book, p. 101.  
\(^{57}\)Day Book, 1758.
one lot. Cochran contended he had made a verbal agreement to sell
Francis Carr of Bow a forty acre first division home lot, but the two
had agreed to delay executing the deed. In 1758 the lot was put up for
tax sale while Cochran was out of New Hampshire and "Carr taking yª
advantage of your Petitioners absence & Inattention as aforesaid
attended yª Vendue...& finding your petitioner absent & no other person
present to represent him...desired that said Lot might be Exposed to
sale & that he would bid for it insinuating at the same time that he as
a Suncook Settler was living upon or improving of sª lot." Carr bought
the lot for £51-10-0, a good deal less than the £430 Cochran said the
two had agreed upon.58

"Promises and Agreements by Parole" were common earlier, and with
land titles ambiguous in any case, they further complicated the
establishment of an orderly system of property in New Hampshire.
Accordingly, the Province enacted a 1716 law requiring any conveyance of
land be in writing and attested to in the presence of three or four
"Credible Witnesses." The action taken on Cochran's petition was not
noted; by law the verbal agreement would have been "utterly void, and
of none effect."59 The importance of individuals such as Samuel Lane,
who understood provincial law and procedure, helped regularize New
Hampshire's system of land ownership, and avoid the pitfall in which
Cochran found himself.

More intriguing is that the 1756 sales marked Samuel's first
forays into substantial speculation in Bow land. Prior to this his
holdings consisted of the half right purchased in 1746. He tested the

58NHSP 9: 210-11.
59Cushing, pp. 154-55.
waters at the March 1756 Vendue bidding on four rights; he was close to
the high bid on each. That experience made him a bolder bidder and in
July he bought six half rights out of the twenty sold. These purchases
were entirely speculative; he resold them almost immediately. He sold
two to Bow inhabitants, John Noyes and Thomas Moore of Suncook; the
other rights passed to seacoast residents.60 When Samuel continued this
practice at the 1758 sale, he found himself in an ethically ambiguous
position as both prospective buyer and vendue master. Those present
understood his predicament and obliged him agreeing “that the Vendue
Master Should have Liberty to Bidd as another Man.” Samuel bought eight
rights for a total of £680.61 He held onto portions of these rights,
unlike those purchased two years earlier, and established himself as a
substantial proprietor.

Samuel indulged in one more speculative burst buying four common
rights at a sale in 1774. However, by that point the prospect of high
returns from such investments were dimmer, and the imperial crisis
focused attention elsewhere. And by then his sights had shifted; he
wrote of those later purchases, “Note All the above Common Rights, and
all the other Land I own in Bow, I have given a Deed of, to my Son
Samuel.”62

It was apparent to the Bow Proprietors that the continual
assessment on shares, much of which went toward legal fees, was creating
hardship for some proprietors. This may have contributed to a greater
inclination toward settling the various disputes with the Suncook and
Rumford settlers after 1755. Bow continued to oppose the granting of

60 NHHS, Lane Papers Account Book, p. 1.
62 NHHS, Lane Papers Account Book, p. 4.
town privileges to either group, and in 1750 protested Rumford's request arguing its "great Infringement on Land belonging & within the Charter of sd Town of Bow." The Propriety's arguments and influence prevailed; Rumford's petition was denied. Suncook, always more prone to settle than Rumford, was in the process of negotiation when it petitioned the General Assembly for incorporation in 1758. Bow remonstrated, "there is proposals of accommodation made on Both Sides we Humble Conceive that If they [Suncook] should be favored with there Request it would Strengthen them in their Error & weaken our Just Right & prevent the proposed agreement from being vigorously pursued." The proposal referred to land in Bow's first division which overlapped lots laid out by Suncook. Bow proposed voiding its return of the first division and laying out equivalent lots in other unoccupied lands. The continual legal battles and expense with little to show in return helped prompt this, "quieting the Possessors [Suncook settlers]...on equitable Terms will tend much to promote the Settlement of said Township raise y° Value of the Land & Save the great Expense which inevitably attends Contention." The government agreed paving the way for Suncook and Bow to come to terms. On October 12, 1759 a committee of Israel Gilman, Walter Bryant and Samuel Lane urged the government to grant Suncook's petition for parish privileges and also offered a plan of "a Suitable Spot for to Set a Meeting House &c."

Suncook's incorporation as the parish of Pembroke, together with the

65Carter, p. 68.
66NHSP 9: 72.
67NHSA, Bow Town Records, 18th Century flr.
property agreement, ended the conflict between the proprietors of Bow and Suncook.

Samuel played a role in all negotiations with Suncook, Rumford and the Masonian Proprietors. Timothy Walker, Rumford's minister, attended a Bow meeting at Stratham in February 1759, but that meeting and others were unsuccessful. After that Bow felt its only recourse was more litigation. Talks with Suncook were more successful. In the fall Samuel made two trips to Bow; in September he spent six days "Settling Lines &c." Three weeks later he returned for one week, "Laying out Amendment Lotts." On the first of November, a "very cold day," he "wrote Suncook Deeds at my House & Chases," finally finishing the Suncook affair on November 20 when he settled his account with the committee. His charges for two trips to Bow, thirteen days in all, the expense of his horse and drawing returns and plans of the newly created lots was £111-9-0. At Chase's tavern that day Esq' Smith and Josiah Sanborn, the committee appointed to pay Bow's accounts, paid Samuel £41 and gave him a note for the balance, £70-9-0, on the order of the Bow treasurer, Andrew Wiggin. He spent a total of fifteen days working on this settlement. In 1760 a similar pattern of business emerged with Starkstown [Dunbarton]. However, by then a new spate of lawsuits with Rumford preoccupied the Bow Propriety.68

Since the King's decision in favor of John Merrill in 1755, the Bow Proprietors seemed even more determined to exact compensation for their claims against Rumford. Bow brought another small action against Merrill in 1755, but cast aside its previous tactic of keeping suits within the provincial judicial system by pressing a £1000 suit against

68 Day Book, 1759, 1760.
Benjamin Rolfe, Daniel Carter, Timothy Simons and John Evans. Clearly, this marked a change in strategy for Bow which now openly challenged Rumford to appeal in England. After their successful attempts to compromise with the other Massachusetts settlers, Bow was confident of its case against Rumford's intransigent residents.69

The case against Benjamin Rolfe and the others was heard in September 1760. Its extensive preparation indicates Bow intended this case to secure their title once and for all. Samuel's May 16, 1760 was busy; "My Son Jabez Born about 8. O'clock in yfe Morning," he wrote in his diary. Later that day he looked "over yfe Records wth Esq' Bryant to prepare for Court."70 Two days after a favorable verdict in the Rolfe case he made "6 Copyes of Votes for Com'ees & yf Return of w't they Did &c to put into 2 Cases at Court...also a large Planing Paper to go to England." He took these to the Bank on the following day. His diary and day books note more time that fall consulting with Walter Bryant and attending court, and "in an attempt to make the strongest case possible, new depositions were taken describing the friction and outbreaks of hostility between the Massachusetts settlers and the Bow proprietors and their employees. Efforts were made to settle the boundary lines of Bow

69The 1755 suit against Merrill (NHSA, Provincial Court Record #18847) was valued at £200, well under the £300 limit at which suits could be appealed to England. The 1759 action claimed Rolfe, Carter, Simons and Evans were trespassing on 1,000 acres (#17051). Additional suits were brought by Bow or its agents against Ebenezer Virgin (#16908) in 1760, and against Henry Lovejoy (#6158), Jeremiah Kimball (#6160), Abraham Kimball (#6169), Green French (#6179) and John Chadwick (#6181), all in 1761. See also NHSA, Provincial Court Record #17051.
70Diary, 1760; Day Book, 1760.
with neighboring towns, a new survey was made, and maps outlining the
true boundaries of Bow were prepared." 71

The Bow Proprietors anticipated an appeal in England, and that
eventuality created some problems. Timothy Walker again went to England
to present Rumford’s case before the King in Council; Bow depended upon
its agent in England, Francis Ayers, who received his directions from
Daniel Peirce, the proprietors’ attorney in Portsmouth. Peirce wrote to
Samuel on October 22, 1761, “Mr. Bryent promis’d me that he would call
upon You last Saturday...for a Copy of the Vote appointing Messrs. March
Rindge & my Self Agents for the Proprietors of Bow which Copy is not
seen nor heard of I therefore desire you Send me a Copy of Said Vote.”
However, there was an urgency to Peirce’s request, “if there should be a
Westerly Wind tomorrow we must have it by twelve o’Clock or one at
farthest or we shall miss this Ship and if we should we had as good miss
all the rest.” He ended on a peevish note, don’t “Serve us as Brynt
has done.” There was wind the next day; Samuel took the copy himself
in “a Driving Storm of Rain & terrible high wind.” The usually short
trip to Portsmouth took him four hours, and he made Bow pay for Bryant’s
inattention and his miserable journey; he charged £6, his normal rate
for a full day’s work. 72

These efforts were to no avail; the royal decision favored
Rumford’s claims, and rested on the question of actual settlement and
improvements. Francis Ayers informed Peirce of the outcome and the
strength of Rumford’s “general proofs of their improvements which for
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71 Bundy, p. 52. Bow’s expenses for this case in New Hampshire’s courts
are listed in the plaintiff’s bill of cost and total £110-0-9. NHSA,
Provincial Court Record #17051.
72 NHSA, Provincial Court Record #17051; Diary, 1716; Day Book, 1761.
the present being Unincounterd Shall be considerd as improvements of the whole." He assured Peirce that "if there are any Lands in this Town as Laid out by us which have not been improv'd they The Prop'res of Bow Should take Possession of them, for those are clearly & absolutely their own."73 Ayers' optimism was not shared across the ocean in Portsmouth and Stratham; although the second division was laid out in land claimed by Rumford, virtually no further effort was made by Bow to improve or settle that area. Enthusiasm for further litigation waned with the loss of this case.

Buoyed by its victory in England Rumford renewed its efforts to incorporate as a town. Support for this move was building from an unlikely source, the provincial government. The continual arguments arising from the contested areas had inhibited collection of the provincial tax at a time of necessary and rising provincial expenses during and just after the French and Indian War. The bickering allowed each group to blame the other for its inability to meet its tax liability, and gave the provincial government impetus to settle the conflict once and for all. Rumford was incorporated as a town in 1765, and renamed Concord in hopes of future peace with its neighbor. Bow, a shadow of its former eighty-one square mile self, incorporated a year later holding its first town meeting within the actual bounds of the township in March 1767.

The Bow Proprietors continued to exist as a corporate entity, and considerable undistributed land remained within its new boundaries under the Propriety’s control. Also, Bow did not abandon altogether its claim

on Rumford's lands; this persistence finally yielded some results. In July 1771 the Bow Proprietors agreed to drop all claims against Concord in return for £10 payment for each one hundred acre lot within the former Bow limits. Payments began soon after, but were not concluded until 1787.74

Samuel continued as Proprietors' Clerk until 1783, but by then the functions of the Propriety had lost much of their former meaning. On April 1, 1779 the Bow Proprietors voted Walter Bryant "all the Money Debts Dues Bills & Bonds &c in any Persons hands...Excepting all the Money & Notes in the hands of Samuel Lane Esq' of Stratham."75 By this action the Propriety essentially transferred fiscal responsibility to Bryant and Lane. However, the relationship between the two was somewhat strained. Samuel added to a copy of the above vote, "and yet [Bryant] Notwithstanding has since privately taken the Money Due by one of Said Notes [a note held by Samuel]; and refuses to Deliver it up."76

Samuel remained involved in the Propriety until its end in the 1780s, and though he certainly expected a return for the investment of his time and money, the claim of one historian that "Bryant and Lane were involved primarily in utilizing whatever legal benefits remained to Bow proprietors for financial enrichment" is inaccurate.77 He did take advantage of the tax vendues, selling the majority of rights he purchased there quickly to both residents and non-residents of Bow. Other rights he held on to, again with gain, not settlement, in mind.

74 Akagi, pp. 173-4.
75 NHSR, Bow Town Records, 18th Century flr.
76 NHSR, Bow Town Records, 18th Century flr.
77 Bundy, p. 57.
However, it is difficult to accept the following generalization concerning the third division of lands made after 1772:

It appears that Lane and Bryant made out very well in the third division of Bow. Where no individuals had settled they were able to gain much new acreage from the many proprietors' shares they had accumulated and where persons had settled they typically were able to reach a financial arrangement and gain compensation for their title to the lands in question.\(^{78}\)

By 1777, Samuel held only eight rights out of the original one hundred and sixty.\(^{79}\) Although this was a substantial holding, the work he did for the Bow Propriety was far more significant and remunerative than his speculation as a proprietor. For this endeavor was as much a community, as a speculative enterprise. Many of Samuel's Stratham neighbors had a financial stake in Bow's success and it was to their advantage that it prosper. To see this process in terms of naked self-interest is to lose sight of its various other facets. The history of Bow is a story of the confluence of public and private interest on both the seacoast and on the frontier. Some Stratham residents did move to Bow, and speculative success for them was difficult to separate from success at establishing a homestead there. The one fueled the other for resident and non-resident alike. Except for Rumford and Suncook, distinct groups with separate interests are difficult to identify. Demographic considerations, not proprietary policy and expenditure, are to blame for Bow's lack of success at settling the township quickly; New Hampshire's population was too small to people the large number of towns created during the eighteenth century.

\(^{78}\)Bundy, p. 62.  
\(^{79}\)Those were the original rights of Simon Wiggin, Satchel Rundlet, George Long, William Moore Jr., John Mead, Joseph Palmer, John Piper and Joseph Mason.
Samuel and his fellow proprietors were primarily interested in profits. However, Bow's rapid settlement was inextricably bound to those profits, and those same profits also bound Bow and Stratham together. That speculation and the Wentworth oligarchy were involved should not obscure that fact. Samuel invested in other townships; he held a right in Barnstead for over forty years before giving it to his son Joshua. His involvement in Leavittstown, a proprietary body centered in North Hampton, was deeper. He bought one whole right and one half right in 1769 at tax sales, although he allowed the half right to be sold for taxes. For the next ten years he held various offices in the town and Propriety, moderator, assessor, auditor and served on several committees.\textsuperscript{80} Myriad opportunities for investment surrounded him in New Hampshire.

Yet his commitment to these other townships never matched his interest in Bow. Why Samuel stayed the course with the Bow Proprietors can only be explained by its link to his community. Investments promising high returns existed in other New Hampshire townships and commercial ventures; his tepid response to those opportunities had its roots in Stratham, and that was the reason for his long association with the Bow Proprietors.

Samuel's work for Bow drew upon his many skills as a surveyor, bookkeeper, scribe and legal advisor. Perhaps more significantly, the elite membership of Bow proprietors acquainted him with a network of provincial officials who constituted the power structure of the province. Having an entree in the halls of the governing authority made

\textsuperscript{80}NHHS, Lane Account Book; Effingham Town Records I:73, 75, 83, 85, 99, 105, 109, 119.
his work for Stratham neighbors that much more effective, both building
his reputation in Portsmouth and enhancing it at home. Knowledgeable
persons like Samuel made the provincial government work, and shielded
many subjects from its authority.

Another salutary consequence of his Bow connections was his forays
into the commercial world. New Hampshire's economic power, and the
resulting political power, rested on trade and commerce. Portsmouth's
prosperous merchants and governmental officials were closely linked and
thus Samuel's acquaintance with these individuals could only advance his
commercial prospects.
III. "I went to y® Bank"

On May 5, 1759, a blustery day with "verry high Gust of Wind wh
Makes the Dust flie Like Smuther," Samuel traveled to Portsmouth on
business.1 His activity that Thursday illustrates the importance of the
Portsmouth mercantile community and its markets to his well-being, if
not livelihood. It was a day to reckon his accounts; in each store
Samuel visited, he tallied up his credits and debits with the
shopkeeper. At one of his favorite spots for trading, Charles
Treadwell's store, he "Ballanc'd all acco/fs" with the merchant's son,
Nathaniel Treadwell, and "Pass'd Reacts." After this accounting he then
proceeded to purchase several items there; besides buying textiles,
"tafity," silk, ferit and a half lawn hankkerchief, he bought paper, rum
and biscuit. Samuel had nothing to sell Treadwell that day, but on his
two following visits he took veal, butter, cheese and shoes.

In settling his account with Jacob Sheafe, Samuel found himself
£8-0-3 in the black. He left that shop with two pounds of coffee and a
primer. In Portsmouth's market square he delivered a pair of large
shoes for John Marshall's black servant and also balanced his account at
the shop of Elizabeth Wibird. At Wibirds he purchased four more pounds
of coffee. He also transacted business with printer Daniel Fowle.
After that reckoning, Samuel added to his £8-17-0 store debt by
purchasing two pamphlets and advertising an adjournment of a Bow
Proprietors' meeting in the New Hampshire Gazette. His long day in
Portsmouth may have precluded his tarrying at Enoch Clark's Greenland

1Diary, 5/5/59.
tavern on his way home where he usually relaxed with conversation and a
toddy, and rewarded his horse with a meal of oats.

Samuel's dealings on May 5th reveal the essential nature of his
extensive trade with the merchants and storekeepers of colonial New
Hampshire's capital. He traded agricultural produce and shoes produced
on his Stratham homestead for goods imported from Europe and the West
Indies. But the goods purchased in Portsmouth were intended for more
than simple consumption. Certain goods, textiles, home furnishings and
books for example, were bought both for his family's use and as
repositories for his accumulating wealth. In a volatile colonial
economy wracked by trade disruptions, wars and inflation, such objects
served as relatively safe investments that maintained their value and
served as a vehicle to pass wealth on to succeeding generations.

These simple exchanges mask a complex web of relationships that
linked many Stratham households and farms to Portsmouth and Britain's
Empire beyond. Portuguese wine and West Indian rum made its way to
Samuel's table in part because of butter and cheese produced in his
dairy and homespun linen painstakingly woven by his wife and daughters.
These domestically produced goods, although not necessarily traded
directly in Portsmouth's shops, freed resources with which families
could indulge in imported manufactured goods, and in the process become
less provincial and more powerful players within Britain's worldwide
trading system. Production in the household, the elemental economic
unit in the American colonies, traditionally has been heralded as the
foundation of colonial self-sufficiency. Ironically, goods produced on
the American farm did not insulate New England from trade, but allowed
the colonial to participate more fully in the Atlantic markets. Samuel
Lane's experience is a clear example of this process. He traded for his family and his neighbors, acting as a middleman between them and seacoast storekeepers.

One striking aspect of the record Samuel left is the involvement, however indirect, of all family members in making these market exchanges accrue to the benefit of the entire household. There was a clear gender division of labor in domestic production. Ultimately the end result was distributed to each member of the household, although that distribution was controlled by the parents. While the boys worked in the tanyard, shoe shop and farm, the girls spun and wove, made butter and cheese and other miscellaneous goods such as candles and soap. Most of the Lane assets were purchased from the return on shoes and leather, however, that return was augmented with other products produced by parents and children working together. In total, their household output accorded them the ability to produce a surplus which could be traded to their advantage in Portsmouth. This is particularly evident in the production of textiles by Mary Lane and her daughters.

Samuel was able to furnish his home with goods produced within Britain's empire, but his goals clearly extended beyond his individual satisfaction and a comfortable life. He wanted his children to have the same or better opportunities for their families. Using marriage as the mark of independence, Samuel provided each child a foundation for future success. His sons were given farms in Stratham. His daughters received substantial marriage portions of household goods, "what was considered essential in the way of household furniture and equipment for a young
couple who were children of prosperous rural families. Each time a daughter made her intention to marry known, his trade with Portsmouth increased, reflecting Samuel's and Mary's desire to equip their daughters with the necessities to insure each could establish a successful and productive household. Many of the goods purchased in Portsmouth shops made their way into the portions awarded each daughter. In this way the purchase of imported goods is associated with consumption and use by his wife and daughters. Only boycotts and Revolution intervened to break this pattern; daughters who married later received a greater proportion of domestically produced goods.

Thus Samuel's trading activity must be viewed in the context of the growth and future of his own family. Increased production within his household not only increased family income and wealth, but also reflected his own children's development as they prepared to start their own families. When he traveled down the "wide and beautiful" road linking Stratham to Portsmouth, he was pursuing a grander scheme than the mere exchange of rural produce for imported products. He was building foundations upon which each of his children, once married, could construct equally productive lives.

Colonial economic studies have focused recently on what Winifred Rothenberg calls "the New England debate," a discussion of the role of

---


market forces in the development of the pre-industrial economy.⁴ James Henretta initiated the recent debate in 1978 writing in response to James T. Lemon's *The Best Poor Man's Country.* He argued that cultural considerations, a rural mentalité, shaped the decisions and behavior of the countryside's inhabitants. Subsistence in the short term and preservation of family integrity in the long run "inhibited the free play of market forces." These communal values were incompatible with the individualistic spirit needed to compete in a market economy, a phenomenon which had yet to appear "in the full sense of the term." Henretta concluded that markets remained undeveloped because of a cultural environment, "the 'calculus of advantage' for these men and women was not mere pecuniary gain, but encompassed a much wider range of social and cultural goals."⁵

Henretta's article unleashed an avalanche of research concerned with colonial markets and economic behavior. His main antagonist is Rothenberg who questioned Henretta's assumption that a developed market system for New England farmers did not exist in the eighteenth century.⁶ Both her approach and conclusions differed from Henretta's;


⁶Rothenberg's initial articles, "A Price Index for Rural Massachusetts, 1750-1855," *The Journal of Economic History,* XXXIX, no. 4 (December 1979) and "The Markets and Massachusetts Farmers, 1750-1855," *The Journal of Economic History,* XLII, no. 2 (June 1981), were followed by
she searched for evidence of a market by studying the movement of goods and prices in western Massachusetts. By comparing local prices with prices in urban centers she concluded these prices converged and moved along parallel paths. If farmers "were isolated from the market," she asked, "then by what conduit were these macroeconomic shocks to the general price level communicated to them?" As early as the eighteenth century she found Massachusetts farmers trading in a developing market economy. Rothenberg's definition of a market was influenced by Henretta; "the market economy 'happened'," she contends, "when the economic system became 'disembedded' from the political, cultural, and social systems constraining it, becoming itself a homeostatic system and an autonomous agent of change." She and Henretta differ on when the developed market system emerged fully, before or during America's industrialization.

Others have refined the debate on both sides of the issue. In his study of Chebacco, Massachusetts, Christopher Jedrey echoed Henretta, finding business "enterprises were conceived less as commercial opportunities than as family rights and communal responsibilities." Building on these concepts, the notion of "competency," or household production sufficient to maintain a comfortable standard of living, has been offered as a consensus between the two extremes. Embracing neither capitalist accumulation nor self-sufficiency alone as motives,

competency involved trading in markets for profit to achieve a culturally directed standard of living. Daniel Vickers has explored the notion of competency, "a degree of well-being that was both desirable and morally legitimate," finding "the value of competency defined for ordinary Anglo-Americans the purpose of work."

However, the balance of scholarship appears to ally itself more closely with arguments linking market influence to rural economic behavior because of the framework of the debate. Kevin Sweeney's study of the Williams family in eighteenth-century western Massachusetts concludes, "family ties and personal relationships remained important in shaping colonial and intercolonial commerce, but impersonal market forces, monetary calculation, and legal remedies played more important roles." More recently scholars have asked questions other than when markets appeared. Christopher Clark traces the threads of an emerging capitalism from within a rural market economy during the late eighteenth century. Acknowledging the import of cultural considerations as well as the existence of markets, he asks why people participated in the market. For Clark, "market involvement seems less an inspiration for

activity than a consequence of conditions seated elsewhere in rural
economy and culture."¹⁴ Henretta himself betrayed an ambivalence toward
his own conclusion that "the tension between the demands of the market
and the expectations stemming from traditional social relationships was
a fact of crucial significance in the lives of the pre-industrial
population."¹⁵ His recognizing the very existence of conflicting
pressures points to a system in the throes of change, and the influence
of market forces in the eighteenth-century American countryside.

Samuel Lane's experience bears directly on the above issues. By
the late 1740s he was making decisions that depended upon knowledge of
the markets for money and goods, and he was involved in the purchase of
goods from throughout the British Empire and beyond. His frequent trips
to the Bank and his substantial trade there identify him as one of the
"middlemen" integral to any market. But over time his market-oriented
actions betrayed non-capitalistic motives and hearken back to the rural
mentalité postulated by Henretta. Clearly Samuel understood the market
mechanisms Adam Smith was to delineate, however, his ultimate goals lay
outside the reach of the market on his farm and at his hearth.

Links between rural Stratham's output and markets beyond appear
throughout Samuel's records. The first part of this section
demonstrates his role as a middleman between rural farms and those

¹⁴Christopher Clark, "Economics and Culture: Opening Up the Rural
History of the Early American Northeast," American Quarterly, Vol. 43,
No. 2 (June 1991), p. 286. In "The Transition to Capitalism in Early
America," Alan Kulikoff emphasized the common ground between the two
schools and urged, as Christopher Clark later did, a synthesis. He
writes that the transition "entailed a complex series of processes, at
the same time regional and national, involving household and market and
gender and class relations." The William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Ser.,
¹⁵Henretta, p. 15.
markets. He acted as a middleman in another investment venue, the market for money and his loans to others; the second part investigates that as a function of Samuel's growing wealth. The final sections demonstrate the close connection between his trade with urban merchants and the household production of textiles, as well as the implications of both to his daughters' future.
“bout at the Bank for Neighbor Joseph Mason”

Samuel’s trade with Portsmouth’s merchants was extensive and varied, but not nearly so complex as his exchanges in and around Stratham. At home, flexibility and ingenuity characterized his exchanges with neighbors. These transactions rarely involved cash but typically involved labor, raw materials, or agricultural products. While Samuel did exchange farm goods in Portsmouth shops, that was not a major element of his trade. Leather goods, more particularly shoes, earned him the necessary credits to make extensive purchases in New Hampshire’s provincial seat.

Combining farming and craft skills was common in colonial New England. Farming alone could provide a family a certain measure of comfort and economic security, perhaps a “competency”, but rarely was that prosperity enough to improve substantially the fortunes of sons and daughters within the lifetime of their parents. Like others, Samuel’s family turned to a variety of enterprises to boost its income.

Both talent and circumstance presented Samuel with a number of work opportunities. By the mid-1750s his trade as a tanner and shoemaker was prosperous and growing; he was a surveyor as well as a farmer with over forty acres of land surrounding his homestead in Stratham. But his skills rather than his tillable acreage gave him the ability to increase his estate at a fairly rapid rate. This pattern also appeared in Chester County, Pennsylvania, a much more productive farming region. “It was the money William made at carpentry,” Paul Clemens and Lucy Simler noted about a middling Chester family, “that gave the young Smedleys choices that their neighbors without artisanal
skills presumably did not have." The residents of Essex, Massachusetts displayed similar tendencies. Although most there forged a primary link to the land, and "some relied on the income from a craft more than others did...the possession of such skills was widespread in the village." Thus a reciprocal relationship between farming and rural craft production was an important element in increasing a family's fortune: "rural industry provided profit-making opportunities for a significant number of entrepreneurially inclined farmers, and farming allowed many skilled artisans to maintain themselves in considerable comfort." Samuel's experience clearly reinforces this notion.

Of the family's daily activities tanning and shoemaking produced the greatest revenue, judging by his accounts. This work was the top priority for Samuel and Mary when they moved to Stratham. He sought out and purchased property on a stream for a tanyard and began constructing it soon after moving from his parents' Hampton home. Nearly every year during the 1740s saw improvements to, and expansion of his leather-related trades including a shop, a barkhouse, a barkmill and additional tanning pits. The young couple sacrificed comforts to ensure the success of these businesses. Samuel's Day Books point to a more than adequate return on this venture. The vast majority of entries are related to work done in his shoe shop and tanyard. An intensive study of three years, 1752, 1760, and 1768, reveals that from 66% to 93% of his recorded debits, goods or services he provided others, involved some form of work with leather. During those three years the percentage of

1Clemens and Simler, p. 123.
2Jedrey, pp. 67-68.
total income from tanning and shoemaking ranged from a high of 83% in 1752 to a low of 52% in 1768.\textsuperscript{4} As leather goods always appear to have had a ready market, Samuel's skills provided a steady stream of revenue.

Samuel sold some finished leather locally, to other shoemakers like Samuel Cate who had no tanyard of his own, but the bulk of his sales in leather goods was shoes. The importance of this local trade in leather goods to his financial health is evident in Table 6.

**TABLE 6 - DEBITS (REVENUE) ON LOCAL ACCOUNTS\textsuperscript{5}**
(Amounts in Shillings, Old Tenor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Business</th>
<th>1752</th>
<th>1760</th>
<th>1768</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanning &amp; Shoemaking</td>
<td>3148</td>
<td>21388</td>
<td>13047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Produce</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2247</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Products</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Work, writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveying</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally made items</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Goods</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Goods</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor &amp; Services</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>2553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3804</td>
<td>29018</td>
<td>24915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Samuel Lane's Day Books, 1752, 1760, 1768.

In and around Stratham then, in each of the three years studied, his household derived at least half its income from tanning and shoemaking. However, several trends are apparent in the above figures. Leather-related revenue declined over time as Samuel aged, his sons became more involved in the business and eventually married and left his household. His Journal reflected that change, "this year I Tan about 12 Hides & 24 Skins," Samuel wrote on his fifty-first birthday, "beside

\textsuperscript{4}Day Book, 1752, 1760, 1768.
\textsuperscript{5}In Table 6, tanning and shoemaking include shoe repairs, hides and skins; forest products include firewood, lumber and bark; locally made items include those for both farm and household such as a hay rake or a milk churn; labor & services include his hiring out his sons and apprentices, as well as his oxen and plows.
what my Sons Tan, who Chiefly manage the yard this year.”  

He appears content to have let his sons take over the laborious tasks of tanning at this stage of his life although the production of shoes from his shop continued steadily; as they had previously, apprentices and day help made shoes for Samuel although increasingly from leather tanned by his sons rather than by his own hands.

His accounts show a steady increase in income from the sale of forest products, mostly timber and lumber cut from his lands. In part this reflects his increased land holdings and the harvest of mature trees from some properties. Throughout the 1760s he sold ship timbers to Michael Shute, a Newmarket shipwright, and the substantial increase in his revenue from that quarter, from less than 1% to 12% over that decade, reflects Samuel’s harvest of the woodlands he had acquired.

The significant increase in the miscellaneous labor & services category in the 1760s indicates the growing productivity of his two older sons in their teenage years. Samuel hired out his sons and apprentices to neighboring farmers during the busy farming seasons in the fall and spring. Such exchanges with his close neighbor, Joseph Mason, are regular and substantial. However, this form of revenue was offset to some extent by the labor he hired to work his extensive holdings. In 1760 more than one quarter of his local expenses were for farm labor; with improvements made and the gift of lands to his sons, that percentage dropped to 11% in 1768.  

Table 6 is somewhat misleading in that it is not comprehensive. Certain categories of business may have been recorded in accounts

---

6Journal, p. 41.
7In 1760 Samuel purchased £204-9-0 of general farm labor; that decreased to £66-12-0 in 1768. Lane day books, 1760, 1768.
separate from the Day Books. Surveying and writing are examples of these "absent" accounts. His "Pokit-book" of surveying notes covered the years 1742 to 1749, but there is no direct correspondence between this record and his Day Books. Samuel's 1744 Day Book has five surveying entries; the "Pokit-book" contains notes for eight surveys. Only four of the eight plans correspond to those in the Day Book. Thus, he surveyed at least ten pieces of land in 1744, only six of which he recorded as credits. Underreporting this type of income was total in 1748. His "Pokit-book" contains notes for seven plans and the Day Book reports no surveying jobs. In related business, Samuel dealt extensively with Daniel Peirce, registrar of deeds at Portsmouth, yet Peirce's name appears only a few times in the bookkeeping record. The trend from 1752 to 1760 in Table 6 is a vast increase in surveying income; clearly that business did not drop off to nothing by 1768 as the record in the Day Books alone would suggest. In fact among his papers are five plans of lands he measured for others in 1768. He either kept those accounts elsewhere or was paid in cash for surveying work most of the time.

A similar explanation must be sought for farm income. As he acquired more land and improved it, his income from that quarter appears to have declined from 1760 to 1768. His diary, together with the numerous Day Book entries related to the farm, point to the fallacy of that inference. Many of the specific notations related to farm work are accorded no monetary value in these accounts. The nature of the work done is simply noted and often followed by an "X" or a blank space where

---

8NHSA, STR Survey flr; Day Book, 1744, 1748. There are 125 Lane surveys in the STR at NHSA.

9NHHS, Lane Papers, Plans flr.
the value of that labor would normally appear. These Day Books parallel
the "waste books" used by merchants to record "the day-by-day entries of
goods bought and sold." Merchants, like Samuel, often transferred
these entries into the double-entry form of individual accounts in an
account book or ledger. However, Samuel appears not to have recorded a
transaction if payment was immediately forthcoming or if it was exactly
matched by a corresponding good or service as payment. Thus, although
he noted his extensive labor exchanges with neighbor Mason, he never
bothered to give them a monetary value in the Day Books as they were
balanced by similar services. There is a certain irony attached to the
acknowledgment of this practice on February 18, 1762, "[Benjamin] Cotton
Chop'd a Spell for writing Deed not to be Set down." This single
notation undoubtedly represents a multitude of similar exchanges that
never found their way into Samuel's accounts. The Day Books were a
record of outstanding debits and credits, some of which were carried for
years; on February 29, 1760 Samuel reckoned with Joseph Mason III "to
Ballance an Accot in my Daybook of 1757." However, if the transaction
was complete at the time of the exchange and required no further action,
there was no need to note its occurrence, at least for the specific
purposes of accounting.

Merchant goods were sold out of the Lane household also. There is
a significant increase in this activity during the 1760s, although it
never was more than 8% of household revenue from the local area. This
underscores Samuel's role as a conduit between the market centered in

10 Virginia D. Harrington, The New York Merchant on the Eve of the
11 Day Book, 1762.
12 Day Book, 1760.
Portsmouth and his Stratham neighbors. To some extent he acted as a retail merchant selling finished goods such as pottery, cloth and rum from his own stores of certain goods. He also acted as an agent for his neighbors, a middleman, taking their rural produce to Portsmouth’s market and purchasing goods for them in the shops of various merchants.

Their house probably was not a “store” in any formal sense, but likely only carried a small inventory occupying little, if any, specific space in the house. A typical country merchant in 1756 stocked: Calaminico, Cyprus, Hatt band Crape, Black Silk, fans, Stript Caps, Buttons, Ribbon, Gartering, Neck Laces, Ivery Combs and Cartridge paper. Major Elijah Williams’ western Massachusetts store had two hundred items for sale ranging from necessities to luxuries. Williams stocked china handkerchiefs, silk lace, wax necklaces, combs, ivory, stoneware tea dishes, looking glasses, snuff, tobacco, wine, tea, coffee, chocolate, ginger, cloves, cinnamon and pepper. Although these kinds of goods regularly entered Samuel’s household, there is little evidence that they were resold on any regular basis. He seems to have supplied his friends and neighbors with only with a few products on an irregular basis.

Perhaps his first attempt at retail sales began February 17, 1744 when he purchased a quantity of earthenware. Clearly more than his small family could use, this stock was intended for resale and appears as debits in various accounts. Samuel summarized his resale of this

15 Sweeney, pp. 69-70.
pottery in his 1743 Day Book in a list titled, "Earthen ware Sold
1744." There were twenty-four separate exchanges of forty-two items
with seventeen individuals. Nine men and eight women bought the
earthenware goods which consisted of tea, chamber, and butter pots,
bowls, mugs, basins, pitchers, and pipkins. The total value of the
pottery he sold was £12-13-0 old Tenor. That was certainly a minor part
of his revenues in a year when a pair of shoes sold for about 5
shillings; the total revenue from this line of sales was equivalent to
the sale of eighteen pair of shoes.

This appears to have been a somewhat unusual event as was the
resale of a "Barrel of Bisket of M^c Coker" in 1748. Again Samuel listed
the eight purchasers in his 1748 Day Book. Three people made fairly
large purchases, Mrs. Thirston (36), Morris (39) and Madam Leavit (18).
At six shillings a dozen, biscuit sales totaled £3-4-6. Sales continued
into the new year. In August, 1749, Samuel Peavy bought a dozen
biscuits.17

Sales of oil occurred on a more regular basis from his shop. One
of the staples of his trade with the Isles of Shoals was fish oil, an
item he used a good deal in the course of his work with leather. In his
later years his supply in some cases shifted to Portsmouth. Oil sales
out of his store were frequent.

Samuel was not the only trader in the market for oil; Mary Lane
also participated. "My wife bo't a Barrel of oil of m^e Shapley price
60£ old Ten£" he wrote on October 16, 1760.18 The list that follows,

---

16 Day Book, 1743.
17 Day Book, 1748.
18 Day Book, 1760.
distinction between his "own Store" and the oil purchased by Mary. On
October 29 he filled "My 2 Jars in y° Chamber & 1 in y° Shop" from
Mary's barrel taking a total of 4½ gallons. Samuel withdrew a total of
8½ gallons from Mary's store that fall and winter, 29% of her supply.
In addition he noted oil "Sold out of my own Store:" he provided five
individuals 3½ gallons.

None of the oil sales appearing on this list from either store are
in his alphabetized Day Books although sales of oil do appear there at
other times. This suggests that this oil was indeed Mary's property and
the revenues from its sale went to her, although recording the sales
fell to Samuel who stored the barrel in his shop and distributed it from
there. The "X" which appears after nearly all the names on the list may
be an indication that the transaction was settled at the time of the
sale or it may signify that the money went into Mary's and not Samuel's
accounts. Only Samuel's withdrawals and 2 gallons that went to Cuffe
Nokes are not followed by an "X." Nokes saw Samuel regularly and did a
variety of odd jobs around the Lane farm; their agreements often appear
to have been informal and verbal which may explain why the oil is
missing from Cuffe's reckoning.

Mary's 1760 trade in oil was an aberration. The following year
Samuel, not Mary, bought a barrel. In the account of sales those names
not followed by an "X", Mrs. Marble's purchase for example, do appear in
his alphabetized accounts. On June 17, 1762, Samuel debited "Capt
Marble 2 qts of oyl 40°/"\(^{19}\) Inflation apparently had struck the market
in oil raising the price of a gallon 10 shillings in one year.

\(^{19}\) Day Book, 1761, 1762.
It is not clear why Mary bought the barrel in 1760 although it may have been her acquaintance with Mr. Shapley of Portsmouth that led to the exchange. Samuel usually purchased his oil from Mr. Tuckerman, a resident of the Isles of Shoals. Yet even when dealing with acquaintances one needed to take care. The 1763 purchase from Mr. Tuckerman was fraught with problems. Tuckerman "Ask'd 65£ but ye bottom he abated 5£." When he got the barrel home Samuel discovered it was not full, a fact he corroborated by having James Hill measure it. Again, Tuckerman made amends by promising Samuel six quarts of oil to make up the difference.20

Trading in oil was fairly profitable. In 1760 the Lanes sold oil for £3-10-0 per gallon which yielded a profit of £45 on Mary's 30 gallon barrel. The following year a barrel cost the same price, £60, but the Lanes charged almost 15% more, increasing their profit by £15. These figures alone understated the return to the Lane household. Their own significant consumption of oil meant that those retail profits went into their own pockets rather than those of another trader.

Except for oil, in which they made a regular market, sales of "imports" from outside the immediate area of Stratham were irregular. Indigo, pins, textiles, sugar, molasses, rum and other such goods all left the Lane inventory on a relatively small scale. Other studies suggest that this retail business often was not a full-time activity and may have been more an act of neighborliness or "a form of community service."21 These exchanges may have been more akin to friendly acts

20Day Book, 1763.
rather than business transactions, even though the Lanes were reimbursed for the sales. This intent is suggested by Samuel’s work as a “middleman,” acting on his neighbors’ behalf in Portsmouth.

There are numerous references to Samuel’s acting for his neighbors in shops at the Bank, but his actions in this respect were limited in scope. On April 16, 1755 Samuel “bou’t at yᵉ Bank 2$ Sugar 14$/ 2$ Rice 6$” for Morris Fling. In September he bought a pound of coffee for Daniel Mason. In 1763 Samuel carried Samuel Neal’s calf to the Bank and settled Neal’s account with Charles Treadwell.²² The nature of some exchanges is ambiguous. Lieutenant Wiggin’s wife owed “toward allemode bout at the Bank yᵉ Day Esqʳ Wiggin Died,” but there is no record in Samuel’s Portsmouth accounts for the cloth. It may have come from his family’s inventory of cloth bought at the Bank earlier. So too for “Cloth I bot at yᵉ Bank” that went to Dr. Rust.²³ Samuel’s accounts contain no direct link between this “Cloth” and its purchase in Portsmouth shops. However, the “Sundrys bou’t for Joseph Mason” on May 14, 1759 certainly were purchased on Mason’s orders.

Much of his activity for Joseph Mason falls into this category. Mason was a close friend and lived on an abutting farm. Both families exchanged goods and labor on a regular basis. Little money changed hands in the course of these transactions, with Mason balancing his account in work and agricultural produce; in April 1754 “Mr Mason plow’d & Harrow’d for me better yⁿ half a Day and the Same Day I went to the Bank for him. I Set one against the other.”²⁴ Perhaps these accounts reveal Mason’s aversion to, or at least lack of comfort with

²² Day Book, 1755.
²³ Day Book, 1752, 1762, 1763.
²⁴ Day Book, 1754.
the markets for his farm produce, and this may explain his heavy reliance on Samuel to transact his business in Portsmouth's markets.

Samuel represented more Mason interests in Portsmouth than he did for any other individual or family in the Stratham area. This work, though more extensive for Mason, was typical of what he did for others. On January 11, 1757 Samuel purchased the following goods in Portsmouth for his neighbor:

1 Pint ½ Sweet wine 15/ Nutmegs 4/ 0-19-0
¾ oz Mace 8/6 D° Scinamon 8/6 0-17-0
½ § Raisons 78/ pint oatmeal 3/6 0-10-6
2- 6-6

Sent 34/ money & Sed I ow'd her 3/6
Due to me 1-17-6
- 9-025

Although the above goods were "bout at Bank for nr Mason," it is clear that Mrs. Mason placed the order and paid the advance of 34 shillings. This transaction suggests she was responsible for such purchases and controlled the household cash. Her husband Joseph's trade with Samuel nearly always involved labor or agricultural exchanges; the Day Books never recorded that money ever passed between the two men. Mrs. Mason placed the orders for "merchant" goods and had a good command of the financial status of the Mason account, in this case telling Samuel that she had 3/6 credit on his account. He accepted that and added it to the accounting.

This activity continued. On April 30 Samuel bought more for Mrs. Mason, cinnamon water, tea, loaf sugar and paper valued at £2-4-6.

Including the 9 shilling balance, the Masons owed him £2-13-6. They offset this somewhat the same day; "N° Mason Sent to y° Bank 3 lb Butter 278/ and Money 78/" which prompted Samuel to note in July that

25 Day Book, 1756.
19/6 was still due him. Soon after in August, Mason sent cheese and pork to Portsmouth which added £3-6-9 in credits for Mason. Added to that was £3 the Masons lent Samuel. Thus, by the end of the summer the Masons' had a favorable balance. Having received credit from the sale of pork and cheese on August 8, Samuel returned to Portsmouth the next day buying Mrs. Mason £4-12-0 worth of linen, wool and sugar. By the end of the day on August 9 Samuel made his accounting and found "Due to Ms Mason - 15-3." Three days later the account again turned in Samuel's favor as he paid his debt with a comb worth 13 shillings and a 10 shilling loan.26

What did Samuel get out of this work other than the goodwill of his close neighbors? It seems that goodwill was sufficient in this case. At the shop of Dr. Rogers he purchased raisins at 14 shillings per pound, one quart of wine for 20 shillings, ¼ oz Mace 8/6, and ¼ oz cinnamon for 8/6. These all equal the prices he charged the Masons in Stratham. At Treadwell's store Samuel bought 1 ounce of nutmegs for 25 shillings and 3 quarts of oatmeal for 21 shillings.27 As he did not specify how many nutmegs Mrs. Mason took there is the possibility that he marked them up, but the likelihood of that is slim. For his labors on Mrs. Mason's behalf this day, Samuel took no compensation.

These transactions, although in Neighbor Mason's name, were in reality exchanges between Samuel and Mrs. Mason. Except for the pork credited to the Mason account, all payments to Samuel were either in money or dairy products, both of which probably lay within Mrs. Mason's domain. In 1745 Samuel kept a separate account for "Ms Mason" which

26 Day Book, 1756.
27 Day Book, 1756.
listed as her debits "muzlin," pins and pipes; her credits were money and 41 eggs. Samuel and Joseph Mason exchanged agricultural labor, draft animals and equipment virtually at par. When Samuel noted on April 28, 1753, "I went to y° Bank to Carry N° Masons Veal," the gain from the veal's sale typically would be credited toward shoemaking or purchases in Portsmouth shops, but any money balance apparently was kept under Mrs. Mason's watchful eye. This understanding ended in May 1759 with the £81-15-9 worth of "Sundrys" bought for Joseph Mason at Charles Treadwell's shop; they were for Mrs. Mason's funeral.

In Stratham, markets were not simply a man's world. Half of the eighteen people Samuel sold earthenware to in 1744 were women and virtually all paid for their purchases in cash. Only one purchase, Mrs. Coker's teapot, appeared in an alphabetized Day Book account among her husband's debits. The account of the earthenware purchases made by the other eight women ended at the initial exchange. Three of the nine men who bought earthenware had those purchases debited to their accounts.

When dealing with women, Samuel displayed some discomfort in his price negotiations. In the above account with Mrs. Mason he noted, she "Ted I ow'd her," which may imply some doubt in his mind about her recollection of that balance. In similar negotiations with widow Barker he again seemed to accept her position while implying it might not be accurate, "2 Pigs 1 was Sow She talk'd the price must be 3 Bushels of Corn w'h She Call'd 12f weigh'd 60 lb." "Old Mrs Mason," not Neighbor Mason's wife but his mother, seems to have gotten the upper hand also;

---

28 Day Book, 1745.
29 Diary, 4/28/53.
30 Day Book, 1759.
31 Day Book, 1743-45.
Samuel noted "old Mrs Mason Pps[pumps] Should be 5s pd 3s."\textsuperscript{32} In no instances in his dealings with men were the conditions of the exchange so clearly dictated by the other party. Business agreements with men like that in 1754 when Samuel went to the Bank for Joseph Mason in return for having generally were set down without any ambiguity. "I set one against the other," leaves the impression that the arrangement followed his terms or at the least was a mutually acceptable bargain. This uncertainty only appears in his dealings with women.

His concessions to farm women, although absent in his accounts with Portsmouth shopkeeper Elizabeth Wibird, points to cultural forces at work. Trade embraced many dimensions other than profit and loss. While he sometimes forgave the debts of his own children, he maintained accounts with his siblings and his in-laws. Only once is there any indication of his forgiving a non-family debt. In 1767 Mary Green, a local hardluck case, owed 17 shillings on her account. "Before the above accot I find several Small Debts for mendg Shoes &C which I have not bro't into this accot," Samuel noted, "wh I propose to give to her for ye gift I promis'd her."\textsuperscript{33} Otherwise, instances of forgiving debts, except in his old age when the debtor was a child or grandchild, are nonexistent.

Thus, Samuel's forays into the shopkeeper's world seemed to have been limited and of two distinct natures, either selling a small inventory of goods from the Lane household store or acting as an agent for his neighbors in Portsmouth's markets. Table 6 shows that this was never a significant part of his overall business; tanning and

\textsuperscript{32}Day Book, 1759.
\textsuperscript{33}Day Book, 1767.
shoemaking dominated his family's economic activity. Compared with his total debits in the three years studied, his sale of merchant goods becomes even less significant. Only in 1768 when he sold over £93 pounds of goods acquired from Portsmouth merchants, was this type of business financially rewarding. Then, the sale of merchant goods was less than 5% of the Lane household total revenue. In contrast his leather-related trades represented nearly 61% of revenue that year.

The Day Books understated this activity to some degree, and we have also seen that Samuel often dealt with goods on consignment which probably meant they never entered his books. Although his trade with the Masons' indicate otherwise, Samuel did not forswear all profit in his arbitraging activities between Stratham and Portsmouth. In 1760 he bought butter from Cuffe Nokes for 13 shillings per pound and sold it in Portsmouth to widow Elizabeth Sherbourne for 17 shillings. And his trade in oil always yielded a profit. When acting as a middleman, most often he charged a fixed price for that service alone, rather than a percentage mark-up of goods. Sometimes the rural/urban price differential worked against him; in 1760 he bought flax for a shilling per pound more in the city than he paid his neighbors. That was a rare occurrence and overall his portrait fits that of colonial traders as "unspecialized entrepreneurs engaging in any venture which promised

---

34 In 1752 sales of merchant goods were 25 shillings out of £312-9-0 total revenue or .4%. In 1760 similar sales were £16-9-0 out of a total £2121-5-0, .78%; in 1768 sales were 93-3-0 out of £19561-2-0 or 4.8% of the total. Day Book, 1752, 1760, 1768.
35 Out of total revenue of £1956-2-0, £1186-3-0 came from tanning or shoemaking work. Day Book, 1768.
36 Day Book, 1760.
gain.” 37 Samuel's experience modifies this generalization somewhat in that his "gain" sometimes came in different forms over a period of time.

Samuel's acting as a middleman was not unusual. His Merrimack Valley counterpart, Matthew Patten, performed a similar business. Riding John Bell's horse to Portsmouth in July 1756 Patten carried £37-7-0 of his own money, "& 20l O:T: of the towns and 11-5-0 O:T: of others to do errands for them amounting in the whole to 68-12-0 O:T:" 38 Those errands in Portsmouth certainly involved his settling accounts and procuring goods for his Bedford neighbors in addition to his business with the provincial government for the town. Like Patten, in addition to trading Samuel performed various other types of work related to surveying, the legal system and the provincial government's machinery.

As a trader Samuel depended upon his neighbors' purchases for his modest success, "the normal demand of the community probably took off a good part of the merchant's stock, for his first effort naturally was to satisfy this market." 39 On the other hand the Lane inventory, and sales from it, reflected the wants and material values of the community. Except for the few exceptional items brought to Stratham specifically for sale, the goods were first and foremost intended for the Lane's own use. Their household was more prosperous than most and had the ability to supply the community with goods otherwise available only in Portsmouth. Textiles, sugar, molasses, wines and spirits are often found alongside Samuel's leather-related debits. That these goods were in demand by his own house was a reflection of a similar demand in the

38 Patten, p. 28. 
39 Harrington, p. 87.
community. Like other New England families, their trading "was geared to the needs of their households within the context of the local community, rather than to the demands of production for profit in the marketplace." The Lane household was in a unique position at the intersection of urban Portsmouth's fashions and rural Stratham, and it was perhaps critical to the transfer of culture between the two.

It may be that the appointments of Samuel and Mary Lane's home, a couple of middling status, had a greater influence on the tastes and fashions of Stratham's population that those of the Wiggins or Leavitts. The lifestyles of those wealthy and distinguished families was less attainable, and consequently perhaps less desirable, than most in the community could dream of reaching. In the years before the Revolution, particularly with respect to textiles, the demand for the imports Samuel sold his neighbors might well have been an unintended consequence of his own family's taste and initial purchases of those goods. And in addition to reflecting community taste, Samuel's extension of credit was another magnet for neighbors.

---

41 Jaffee's peddlers played similar roles "as cultural agents promoting the message of social transformation through the purchase of goods." The transformation was to "a new culture, a market culture, in the form of objects." In a like manner Lane's trading provided Stratham's residents avenues to goods from the Atlantic market. pp. 511-12.
"what Money is Due to me by Bond & Note"

The colonial economy was fettered by the low supply of currency in circulation. Frequent references in Samuel's diary from the 1740s through the 1790s underscore the significance of currency, its value and its stability, to the well-being of the provincial. It was either feast or famine with respect to the money supply. Paper currencies often inflated, especially during times of war. ¹ We have already noted Samuel's 1748 observation, "Paper Money Sunk so much in its Value, that makes it Exceeding Difficult Trading one Among another." ² However, with the Peace of Paris in 1763 currency problems of an entirely different nature surfaced, "every thing is plenty this fall & winter Except Money which grows verry Scarc." ³ The complaint arose again in 1765 in conjunction with political events, "the Land is in great Commotion by reason of the Stamp Act...by reason of which Mobbs & tumults of the People are verry troublesome: and Publick Business Stops Money is verry Scarce & Cattle have fell in the price near half within two years." ⁴ That year Portsmouth merchant Henry Sherburne Junior advertised his

---

¹The Bow Proprietors' request for a loan of £100 Sterling from the Provincial government in 1754 reveals one attempt to address this problem. Repayment of the loan, £300 New Tenor plus 6% interest, was to be made within one year. The petition stipulated that the payment "be burnt to ashes in the face of the Gen1 Assembly in order to Sink so much of the Bills of Credit of this Province, emitted for carrying on ye Intended Expedition against Canada." NHSP IX:68.
²Journal, p. 32.
³Diary, 1763 summary.
⁴Diary, 1765 summary. Edwin Perkins found, "the supply of specie was not deficient in the North American economies, "noting that the supply of money increased with the rise in prices. Lane's comments suggest that the fluctuation in money's value was often a greater culprit than the supply itself, although scarcity too was a problem as he noted in 1763 and 1765. Perkins, p. 164.
goods for sale "at the cheapest rate for cash." At such times Samuel might also encourage his customers to pay in cash. On July 8, 1745 he sold Ann Gipson "2 Tea pots if she pays money 9d other pay 1-3." Ann also bought several other items of earthenware that day which she paid for "in Spining." Presumably she would have received a discount for cash payment.

Currency legislation and individual accounts like Samuel's reveal problems of the various provincial paper currencies. Old Tenor paper money was the only currency issued by New Hampshire until 1742 when New Tenor was issued. Old tenor depreciated badly and the government harbored hopes that a new currency would stabilize the financial system. Shoe prices illustrate the failure of these attempts at currency reform. In 1740 a pair cost 18 shillings; a decade later the price had nearly tripled to £2-14-0 or 34 shillings. By 1760 a pair of shoes cost £6-10-0, a more than sevenfold increase over twenty years.

From 1743 to 1754, Samuel's accounts began with the preface, "A Day-Book of Debt & Credit for this year according to New Tenor." But New Tenor was grudgingly accepted, and he appears to have acceded to his customers wishes about which currency to use in their accounts. "Old Tenor was the only money of account" in Portsmouth, whereas virtually all his Stratham accounts were posted in New Tenor. In 1754 John Hill's mother's pumps cost 11/3 New Tenor while in Portsmouth Charles

---

5New Hampshire Gazette, August 2, 1765. The next year Sherburne was still encouraging this, selling his wares "Cheap for Cash or Short Credit." New Hampshire Gazette, July 25, 1766.
6Day Book, 1745.
7New Tenor money was quadruple the value of Old Tenor; 1£ New Tenor equaled 4£ Old Tenor.
8Journal, p. 43.
9McKinley, p. 342.
Treadwell, buying shoes in quantity, paid 40 shillings Old Tenor. Those prices essentially mirror the 1:4 ratio. Surprisingly, outside of the market center, the new currency appears to have been more readily accepted. Samuel followed the lead of the Portsmouth merchants and reverted to the Old Tenor system in 1755, "although I have kept my Accounts for Several years past in New Tenor I propose this year to keep them in old Ten because People generally do So ac". The Province adopted a new currency, Lawful Money, as the money of account in 1765, and Samuel's 1766 Day Book reflects that change. However, certain people resisted this new currency just as they had New Tenor. Samuel always reckoned Charles Treadwell's considerable account Old Tenor; shoes posted on Treadwell's account were £5 Old Tenor while Jacob Sheafe's account listed a pair for 5/6 shillings Lawful Money. Samuel's accounts with most other substantial Portsmouth merchants like Sheafe were accounted in Lawful Money.

Although the state of the currency was of concern to Samuel and certainly affected his market behavior, trade flowed by other means. Clearly credit played an indispensable role in facilitating exchange in New Hampshire and the other colonies. T.H. Breen's study of debt and the tidewater planters affirms the role of credit in the colonial economy, "the operation of the local economy, therefore, depended upon

---

10Day Book, 1755.
12Day Book, 1766.
the informal credit networks. ¹³ To tidewater planters, and to New Hampshire residents, credit carried moral values, combined financial transactions with social relationships, and wove a "mesh of continuing loyalties."¹⁴ It was another social fastener.

Without credit trade would have been limited to transactions involving cash and straightforward barter. A form of barter did take place in the majority of exchanges between Samuel and his customers; W.T. Baxter labeled it "bookkeeping barter" which involved exchanges of goods which were themselves measured in terms of money values.¹⁵ Debits and credits in Samuel's Day Books rarely specify money as a payment to settle an account. Cash never comprised more than 8% of payments to him for Day Book debits in 1752, 1760 or 1768. The same holds true for his expenditures with one glaring exception; in 1760 22.6% of Samuel's payments for his own debts were in cash. That contrasts with his cash payments in 1752 and 1768 which were only 7.1% and 2.5% of his total payments respectively.¹⁶ Thomas Hancock, a Boston merchant, exhibited a similar pattern of rarely settling accounts in cash, "Often, it is true, the entries for goods were mixed up with a sprinkling of cash payments, but some traders could apparently carry on long and elaborate series of dealings without any money whatsoever changing hands."¹⁷

¹⁴Breen, pp. 29-30, 96.
¹⁶Day Book, 1752, 1760, 1768.
¹⁷Baxter, p. 18. Harrington found the same phenomenon, few cash transactions, among New York merchants.
Evidence exists that the use of cash to settle debts may have depended upon local custom as well as the money supply. The Lowrance tavern along Beaverdam Creek in Rowan County, North Carolina was a store as well as tavern ministering to the needs of a frontier population. There money payments were the most common method of settling store debts. From 1755-75, 82% of payments to the proprietor were in cash.\textsuperscript{18} Closer to New Hampshire in Springfield, Massachusetts, money appears to have settled accounts more often than in seacoast New Hampshire. From 1755-67 Springfield shopkeeper Josiah Dwight's store credits were settled in cash 59.1% of the time.\textsuperscript{19} This suggests that local custom rather than macroeconomic forces determined the forms of exchange that transpired. By his not noting cash transactions at the point of exchange, Samuel's accounts understate cash transactions. However, in a geographically small and closely-knit region like seacoast New Hampshire, money may have played a lesser role than the exchange of goods and services to satisfy debts. Even the lack of notes on third parties points to a system of personal exchange with individuals essentially covering their own debts by methods mutually agreed to by both parties.

Whether accounts were settled in cash or not, the presence of credit pervaded the economic system and was indispensable to its operation. "Country merchants liberally extended long-term credit and — whether out of neighborliness or necessity — accepted payment in a variety of forms — farm products, livestock, labor, third party notes of hand, and sometimes even cash."\textsuperscript{20} Business in cities was no different;

\textsuperscript{18} Thorp, p. 405.  
\textsuperscript{19} Martin, pp. 149-50.  
\textsuperscript{20} Nobles, p. 9.
Harrington estimated that between one-half and three-quarters of New
York merchants' trade was on credit. Commerce flowed along lines of
credit, both within and between communities.

Collection of money was a constant problem for the colonial
merchant. Earlier studies attribute this to the shortage of currency,
but again it may be more closely related to locale than money supply.
In the twenty years after 1755, Lowrence's books showed 1958 year-end
balances; most were less than one pound. But half of the 168 active
accounts at Lowrence's Tavern/Store were not settled in full before 1776
with 43% showing no payments at all. Thorp attributes this high rate of
default in part to its frontier location. In contrast to more settled
areas, collection on the frontier was costly and more difficult to
pursue. At Beaverdam Creek credit terms needed to be easy to give
debtors time to raise the preferred form of payment, cash. The median
interval between the last debit and final payment was 14 months with
one-quarter more than two years.

The Lanes experienced fewer problems with paying or collecting
their due. Samuel never went to the extreme of suing for payment
although the New Hampshire courts heard their share of nonpayment suits.
The length of time for which credit was extended varied. Samuel
"Reckon'd & Ballanc'd all acco'ts wth mr Fowle," the Portsmouth printer,
on May 5, 1759. The next accounting occurred nearly four years later on

---

21 Harrington, p. 103.
22 Breen finds a similar phenomenon in Virginia before the Revolution,
"Almost all of the colony's freemen were involved in this vast, largely
informal network of giving and receiving credit." p. 94.
23 Harrington found the collection of debts, "one of the greatest
problems...of the colonial merchant." p. 114.
24 Thorp, pp. 405-07. Default on tavern accounts may have been higher
than that in non-alcohol-related businesses.
March 17, 1763. Only a little more than one year passed after that before the two again settled their account.\textsuperscript{25} For the most part Samuel balanced his accounts with Portsmouth merchants yearly. His neighbors' accounts were balanced periodically at which time some payment generally was made to maintain confidence in the business arrangement. However, it was not unusual for balances to run for several years without final settlement. In 1755 Samuel must have been uneasy about amounts owed him for he made a list "of Some Small old Debts Due to S. Lane." Fifteen names follow along with a description of debit and the date it was incurred. The number of debts and the year in which they were contracted follows: 1752-3; 1753-2; 1754-6; 1755-2; undated-2.\textsuperscript{26} By the end of 1756 three of the debtors had paid in full and three in part. The majority, nine, had made no payment by the end of 1756, but they were from the local area and continued their business with Samuel. Their slow payment was of enough concern to note, but it appears a reminder was generally sufficient to restore both credit and goodwill.

The one area in which debt repayment required harsher tactics was notes. Some merchants made a common practice of "making book accounts over into credit instruments, either notes or bonds;" 40\% of Josiah Dwight's credits were financed in this manner.\textsuperscript{27} Merchants assumed the role of bankers as well as traders by doing so. Samuel rarely employed this practice; out of twenty-four notes due him on New Years Day, 1760, only one was "on acco\textsuperscript{t}."\textsuperscript{28} However, his Day Books make clear that in other ways he increasingly became a source of capital for his neighbors,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{25}Day Book, 1759, 1763. \\
\textsuperscript{26}Day Book, 1755, p. 9. \\
\textsuperscript{27}Martin, p. 158. \\
\textsuperscript{28}Day Book, 1760.
\end{flushright}
lending substantial amounts of money unrelated to his other trades. His 1756 Day Book first notes this on January 20, 1757 with a list "of what Money is Due to me by Bond & Note." Sixteen parties owed him £1326.\(^{29}\)

By the late 1750s he seems to have been conscious of his growing wealth, its complexity and the need to keep a record of it. As of 1757 he began to make an annual or biannual listing of bonds and notes due him. This emphasis may have been instigated in part by his leap into the speculative real estate market with his purchase of rights in Bow at the tax auctions of 1756 and 1758. Before the latter year he never recorded his net profit or wealth in any given year. But on January 1, 1758 he calculated, "after all my Debts are pd I Judg I have 2000 Due to me and by me as above, which is mostly at use."\(^{30}\) Almost every year thereafter he accounted for his increase in wealth. In 1761 he noted, "I Judge I Added in all to my Estate in yt year 2000£."\(^{31}\)

Samuel was not unlike other New England merchants in that the surplus produced from his household's various enterprises required investment outlets. For some general manufacturing, mills particularly, absorbed some of that capital and much went into "a favorite form of investment...the ownership of land."\(^{32}\) In the Connecticut River Valley, "it was especially from the lending of money that the merchant obtained his large holdings."\(^{33}\) Most of these were private bonds and notes although the provincial and Imperial governments issued them also. A bond stated the obligation and its conditions; most were for modest amounts with relatively short terms, between one and five years, and

\(^{29}\)Day Book, 1756.
\(^{30}\)Day Book, 1758.
\(^{31}\)Day Book, 1761.
\(^{32}\)Martin, p. 179.
\(^{33}\)Martin, p. 176.
carried average interest of 5-6%.³⁴ In colonial New England this was "one of the safest and least troublesome ways of investing surplus capital."³⁵

Samuel's loans followed this general pattern. The rates on the notes he accepted in 1760 varied from 6% to nearly 8 per cent and amounts ranged from several pounds to others running into the hundreds.³⁶ Some of the notes he accepted from individuals were payments for real estate he sold, and only a very few resulted from making Day Book debits into notes; the remainder, most of the rest of the notes due him, presumably resulted from straightforward loans to individuals. Out of the twenty land sales recorded in his account book, seven were paid for at least in part from notes he accepted.

One of his first land sales in July, 1756 to William Burley Jr., coincided with the systematic recording of money due him by note. Samuel purchased William Burley's half right of Bow land at a tax auction, July 19, 1756. On the same day he conveyed it to Burley's son. The right was knocked off to Samuel for £24; on January 1, 1757 the younger Burley was indebted to him by note for £34, an indication that he borrowed considerably more than the price of the Bow right. Burley retired this debt promptly and does not appear as a debtor to Samuel again until 1785.

In six other cases, buyers of land from Samuel appeared on his list of debtors by note. Except in two cases, the notes exchanged for land appear to have been retired quickly, within one or two years. The

³⁴Harrington, p. 130.
³⁵Martin, p. 176.
³⁶In 1760 Matthew Patten borrowed 45£ sterling and gave a note for it to Captain John Stark. Patten was to repay "in a year with Interest at 6 per Cent." Patten, p. 74.
two exceptions were land sales to persons residing far from Stratham
during periods of economic instability. It appears that by 1787, the
nonpayment of certain notes in an unsettled economic and political
climate stirred Samuel to press for payment.

In 1786 and 1787 New Hampshire still was recovering from the
economic upheaval of the Revolutionary War and its aftermath. The post-
war depression had stalled business and trade. A currency shortage
complicated this and contributed to the depression. State governments,
reacting to the wartime printing of paper money and consequent
inflation, were determined to restore their credit by creating sound
currencies. This caused a contraction in the money supply, deflation
and increased pressure on already hard pressed debtors. In his diary
for 1785 through 1787 Samuel remarked on the problem of money, "Such a
Scarcity of Money, that (I may almost Say) No body pretends to pay any
Debts, and Scarcely ant[sic] trading, Except Bartering." His comments
have a plaintive, depressed tone, "the Wheels of Business & trade Seem
to be all Still." 37 In Massachusetts these general economic conditions,
combined with high property taxes, excited Shays' Rebellion in the
latter part of 1786. New Hampshire hosted a similar, albeit less
dramatic or widespread, revolt in the same year when a "Mobb" descended
on Exeter in September.

By 1785 Samuel commented on the money shortages in his diary, and
the New Hampshire Gazette observed "The distress that prevails
throughout this State for want of a CIRCULATING MEDIUM is hardly
conceivable:-Complaints are equally heard from the seats of affluence as
well as indigence; and all the consolation we have is - a CERTAIN

37 Diary, 1786, 1787 Summaries.
PROSPECT OF THE EVIL'S INCREASING.— In 1786 Stratham took action; at a meeting in early June the Town formed a committee "to Draw up a memorial to Lay before the General Court Representing opening the port at Portsmouth & Making a Bank of paper Money - which memorial was Read & Excepted by Said Town." Through the summer and fall the Town continued to press the legislature to issue paper money.

The government’s continued inaction prompted responses from other quarters. Signs of unrest were apparent throughout the summer. The house of an Exeter magistrate, Samuel Penhallow, was vandalized three times, its windows broken with clubs. Shays may have provided the spark for a riot in Exeter during a session of the General Court on September 20, 1786. A mob led by Joseph French of Hampstead, John Cochran of Pembroke and John McKeen of Londonderry surrounded the Exeter meeting house in which the General Court was sitting and demanded action on paper money. Peacefully dispersed the following day by the militia, the revolt was another signal of "The distress" New Hampshire citizens were experiencing. However, this protest lacked the intensity and anger of Shays' western Massachusetts Rebellion and the leaders were released after examination by the legislature.

Samuel recalled this distress, "People very Uneasie under Publick Debts & Burdens they complain of, not only in this State, but in Massachusetts, frequent Mobbs are Arising." Those circumstances certainly motivated him to collect on some of his outstanding notes in
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38 New Hampshire Gazette, September 9, 1785.
39 NHS, STR 3:25.
40 Both the Exeter Selectmen and Penhallow offered rewards for information. New Hampshire Gazette, September 21, 1786.
42 Journal, p. 55.
1787. Samuel's method of collection served a triple purpose; he relieved himself of collection burdens, received his money and passed some of it on to his children at the same time for they acted as his collection agents. The instruction to his son-in-law, Joseph Clark, illustrates this procedure: on October 28, 1787 he gave Clark "a Note from Peter & Ezekial Gilman for 10-18-0 Dated aug 5. 1785. Wh with 10 pct Int to this Day is 22.17-0 he is to get it & give me one half & his Wife tother half." 43 In all he turned over eleven notes to his children on similar terms.

Samuel renewed some of these notes just before turning them over, apparently confident that the debtors would fulfill their obligations. Others he considered poor prospects and urged his children "to get [the money] of[f]" them. Overall this strategy did not result in prompt retirement of the notes. It took anywhere from four to seven years for the notes to be paid and some never may have been honored. Col. Stickney's obligation for £18-15-0 first appeared in 1782; by 1786 the balance had grown to £26-12-0. Samuel turned the note over to another son-in-law, Jonathan Clark, in 1787. It took Stickney four years to repay, its value having grown by then to £32-4-8. Samuel received his "half," £14-13-14, on June 24, 1791.44

The note of Peter and Ezekial Gilman, Pembroke residents, perhaps represents an extreme in Samuel's financial dealings. He sold the Gilmans half of a Bow right in August, 1769 and took a note in exchange worth £7-13-0 Lawful Money. Except for shingles they provided Samuel, it appears that the Gilmans made no other payments and by 1787 when

43 Diary, 1787.
44 Day Book, 1787.
Samuel gave it to son-in-law Joseph Clark for collection, it was worth over £20. Money was scarce which forced Clark to take a yoke of oxen and a horse as partial payment, haggling over their value and finally allowing only two-thirds of what Ezekial Gilman felt the livestock was worth. Even then Clark was forced into legal action paying 17 shillings "in getting or Suing for the Debt." Gilman finally settled in March 1793 for £13-17-0. Samuel's half was £6-18-6, but "I took only 6s for my Self," he wrote, "& gave his wife [Samuel's daughter Bathsheba Clark] 7-17-0." This debt spanned twenty-four years, and in a sense continued on even after 1793 for Joseph Clark gave Samuel his own note for 6s. More prompt in meeting his obligations than the Gilman brothers, Clark paid off the note in February 1795 after interest had swollen its worth to £6-6-0.\footnote{Day Book, 1787, 1795.}

Samuel suspected many of the notes he passed on to his children would be difficult to collect on. In the main, those were aberrations and most who borrowed money were prompt payers or at least made sincere efforts to honor their debts. Weare Drake, a relation through the Robie family, purchased a right in Effingham from Samuel in May 1786 for the equivalent of eighty bushels of rye. Although Drake had made several small payments on the note, by February 1793 interest had swollen the debt to £19. "I Just Received your Letter Dated the 25th of jan\textsuperscript{y} in which you would Be glad i would Take up my noat," he wrote Samuel, "i am sorry Sir you want it at the present Time." He took pains to explain his delinquency, "I hav happened to improve on Dry Land the Last Season By which the Drouth and frost hath Cutt me Short," and he went on to reassure his creditor, "Butt hope providence will so favour me in my
Labours that By another Season I Shall Be able to pay all my honnest
debts." That sentiment prevailed among most of the people Samuel lent
money. Drake was overly optimistic about his crops that season and only
paid interest in 1793 and one-third the principle in 1794. He made good
his promise in 1795 and after that his name no longer appeared on
Samuel's list of debtors. Of the thirty-six notes Samuel held on
Christmas Day 1768, only thirteen, or just over one-third, still owed on
their notes three years later. Samuel carried very few debts over the
long term; the two conspicuous cases were issued to parties outside of
Stratham's immediate locale and to some extent distance insulated those
debtors from a sense of personal obligation to repay.

Samuel applied little pressure on his debtors. He never sued for
unpaid debt and in his later years appears to have passed on the
unpleasant task of debt collection to third parties, his sons and sons-
in-law. The moral values Breen emphasizes in his study of Virginia
planter debt were at work in Samuel's Stratham. Family, community or
longstanding business relationships created a cultural milieu in which
credit extension and debt payment were moral and financial imperatives.
However, Samuel's outlook began to shift over time. His deepening
involvement in money markets, and his lists of "money Due to
me...accounting Intt" coincident with accounts of increased wealth,
clearly demonstrate his awareness of the pecuniary advantage of capital
formation. In relations with some people, a money nexus incrementally

46 Weare Drake-Samuel Lane, 2/11/93, Lane Papers, NHHS, folder 3.
47 In 1769 28 of the original 36 remained on his list. In 1770, 20
remained, and in 1771 only 13 were in Samuel's debt. Day Book, 1768-
1771.  
48 Breen contends that "credit is a form of communication and throughout
the world, societies discuss debt in highly moral terms," pp. 29-30.
supplanted a personal relationship. Samuel's use of third parties to collect debts in his later years testifies to a transformation taking place in rural Stratham. Although the financial instruments remained the same, their increasing share of his "portfolio" and consideration as a business are signs of subtle change.

The moral and institutional environment in which business was transacted had changed by the next generation. With their assets in business enterprises and bank stock as well as notes from individuals, the Lane children were becoming dislodged from a context of personal relationships, and the basis of those relationships was shifting from a moral to a legal basis. Less constrained by a culture rooted in personal relationships, Samuel's children could more easily collect on his debts, even when the trust between Samuel and the debtor already had been broken by an overdue payment.

Money "at Use" comprised a growing component of his wealth, and indicates that an emerging capitalistic ethos was at work on Samuel. He certainly understood that a market, regulated by the interest rate, controlled this commodity. He was well aware of, and had respect for, the power of compound interest. "Dr Price Says," he wrote in his copy of The Modern Gazetteer:

one penny put out at our Saviours Birth, to 5 per Cent Compound Interest, would in the year 1781. have increased to a greater Sum than would be Contain'd in 200,000,000 of Earths all Solid Gold: but if put out at Simple Interest, it at the Same time would have amounted to no more than Seven Shillings and Six pence.49

He earlier had shied away from this financial instrument, fearing the currency depreciation associated with King George's War; land was his investment of choice during the 1740s and early 1750s. By the early

49Written in the leaf of The Modern Gazetteer, NHHS, Lane Papers.
1770s this activity routinely added between 65¢ and 75¢ Lawful money to his estate annually, or 1300 to 1500¢ Old Tenor. By the end of that decade his increasingly diverse money lending indicates a shift toward money as a financial instrument with fewer moral connotations; in a complete cultural reversal, such an attitude implied less risk. Both his attitude and strategies had changed since 1748 when he wrote of money, "trust it a little while; by the time you get your pay...your old Stock with your Labour Added to it, will not procure you Another Stock so good as that you have work'd up." 50 His activity as artisan, merchant and middleman provided him capital for these investments, and increasingly he saw these not simply as a return on work, but as financial opportunities in their own right.

Although leather related work provided most of the Lane household revenue which contributed to the family's growing wealth, other production played an important role. The women of the household added to the family's prosperity. Not only did they organize domestic affairs, but also their textile production gave Samuel greater flexibility and purchasing power in the Portsmouth marketplace.

---

50 Journal, pp. 32-33.
"Sister Elizabeth Come to Weave"

Elizabeth Lane's arrival in Stratham "to Weave" during May 1770 appears straightforward enough, but the act is enmeshed within a matrix of activity and events which had significant implications for the household organization as well as its ability to trade in the marketplace beyond. Textiles were of enormous importance to the colonial household and often comprised a significant proportion of the wealth within. "I Judg I have added in the last half year past about 500 old Ten-" Samuel wrote in 1759, and continued "besides much Cloathing in yº family."\(^1\) Cloth, both wearing apparel and chamber furnishings, was necessary for some measure of comfort in New England's climate; like shoes, it carried a relatively high value. Colonials supplemented imported textiles with domestic production early, and this trend continued over the course of the eighteenth century.\(^2\)

The Lane experience illustrates both a gender division, and integration of labor within a colonial household. Although textiles are traditionally associated with women's work during the late colonial period, the operations here demonstrate the intersection of women's and men's work to produce a good that rebounded to the welfare of all who lived under that roof.\(^3\) Weaving and spinning did not result in the

\(^{1}\) Diary Book, 1759.
\(^{2}\) The combination of necessity and restrictive navigation laws with respect to colonial manufacture "tended to increase the amount of manufacturing in the homes." Costly textile imports provided the impetus for local production and exchange. Rolla Milton Tryon, Household Manufactures in the United States, 1640-1860, (1917; Rpt. New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1966), p. 27.
\(^{3}\) Laurel T. Ulrich's current research indicates that textile production shifted from a male to female occupation around the mid-18th century. Mary James is perhaps typical of this trend. Her father Benjamin James
production of a good for domestic use only. As significant was the impact of this manufacture on the family's purchasing power. A family that had considerable need for various types of cloth could satisfy its demand in part through home production, at the same time freeing resources for other types of consumption and investment. It may well be that the Navigation Acts, while never completely stifling colonial manufacture, stimulated American purchases of British manufactures in a manner never intended.

Studying textile production within one household blurs rather than defines the lines between categories of male and female work, or perhaps draws those lines differently. The gender divisions here are drawn within the process of cloth production, not between cloth and other goods. The general rule that men and boys most often were relegated the tasks of cultivation or the production of the raw material, and womenfolk were more often involved in the processes of preserving and finishing applies to domestic textiles as well as food. In the Lane household then, many goods were worked by both male and female hands before reaching their finished state.

The Lane accounts indicate that family labor was owned by the household head, Samuel in this case, but perhaps it is more accurate to state that it was controlled by the head and owned by all. Before their marriages Samuel never credited his children's labor to them, either in

was a Hampton weaver and she, not her brothers, carried on weaving for the following generation.

4Joan M. Jensen, *Loosening the Bonds Mid-Atlantic Farm Women, 1750-1850* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), noted a similar phenomenon with butter produced by farm women, "Butter making enabled large numbers of rural people to participate in the early nineteenth-century American capitalist economy through the purchase of manufactured goods...their increased income allowed them to buy more consumer goods." p. 93.
the home or in the shop. However, that was true for his labor as well. That too, was thrown into the well with the rest. Rhetorically, the wealth and resources of the Lane household were expressed most often as Samuel’s own; he noted the increase of his wealth and he balanced accounts in his own name. He might have believed that he was the sole possessor of all that his family produced. In fact, cultural forces dictated that as a head of household, he owned its production only nominally. The ultimate distribution and disposal of that bounty argues that it more properly belonged to all within.

Samuel divorced control from ownership of his family’s assets in subtle ways. With the force of New Hampshire law behind him, he could dispose of property in any way he saw fit; that he chose certain methods points to another “invisible hand” at work, a hand animated not by market, but by cultural considerations. He and Mary accumulated real and personal property by their own efforts and those of their children with no intention that it would remain in their house. They were putting together legacies for their children which, if assessed in terms of money alone and if kept under parental control during their lives, would have been much less valuable. For all but his youngest child, the beneficiaries of Samuel’s last will and testament would be little richer. The bulk of his assets had found their final resting place long before he found his.

Production of homespun linen demonstrates the processes by which an entire household joined its labor. With a multitude of uses as sheets, pillowcases, bolsters, tablecloths, aprons, shifts, petticoats, gowns, gloves, towels, shirts and trousers, these linens were found in
virtually every colonial home. Peter Kalm observed at Albany, "They sow as much hemp and flax here as they want for home consumption." However, Kalm failed to note that its usefulness spread beyond the home with value also as a market commodity, "too valuable and too readily exchangeable and salable to be kept wholly for farm use."

Linen making was a complicated, labor intensive process and it took more than a year to produce the fabric from the time flaxseed was sown. The cycle began in the fall when the flax plot was plowed over or "broken up," its initial preparation for planting. The following spring the ground was plowed again and then sown with seed. Depending upon the weather in any given year Samuel planted his flax from mid-April to mid-May, although he appears to have been able, or perhaps more willing to plant this crop earlier as time went on. The division of flax cultivation tasks apparently differed from household to household. Martha Ballard's diary recorded her husband planting the flax while she and her daughters weeded and harvested the plants.

The Lane household organized this work differently. Although the record is scanty, it appears that his apprentices and sons assumed many of the cultivating tasks. The day books contain no labor credits for any non-family member ever sowing flaxseed for Samuel although other labor credits related to linen production are found there. Two observations hint at who did this work. In 1766 Samuel Neal hired

7Earle, p. 235.
Joshua and steers for a “larg half Day halling Dung & Harrowing flax,” and on May 1, 1769 Samuel remarked “in all Joshua Sow'd about 1½ Bu. & ½ peck flax Seed.”  

Presumably once they were old enough, sons Joshua and Samuel prepared the ground and sowed the flaxseed.

Flax plots were small as the per acre yield was high; in Pennsylvania most plots ranged from ½ to 2 acres. The land devoted to flax by the Lanes probably fell within that range. Samuel generally planted flax in several spots, perhaps because he acquired flax plots with his various purchases of land and also rotated uses of the land.

In 1777 he recorded sowing more than 2 bushels of seed in four separate areas, behind the house, by Mason’s barn, over the pond and in the low ground. The next year he recorded planting flax in none of those places, but did use them again in succeeding years.

Flaxseed was broadcast like grass seed and germinated quickly; in 1773 they sowed flax on April 5th and Samuel observed eight days later, “my Flax is come up.” The plots required considerable attention, particularly weeding. There are no specific references to weeding flax and the unspecified weeding he did hire may have been for flax or other crops. More likely his children had the responsibility of tending to the flax. Besides weeds, other dangers occasionally threatened the young plants. A hard frost in mid-May 1794 killed the flax that had already come up, and in both 1770 and 1793, “Worms,” Samuel lamented,

9Day Book, 1762; Diary, 5/1/1769.
10Lemon, The Best Poor Man’s Country, p. 158.
11Samuel’s Day Books show flaxseed sown as ranging from ½ to more than 1½ bushels. Nathaniel Bouton’s The History of Concord (Concord: Benning W. Sanborn, 1856), p. 527, puts the seeding rate at 1½–3 bushels per acre. James Lemon cites the Barnard Diary in which one acre was seeded with one bushel of seed. Lemon, p. 267.
13Diary, 4/5, 4/13/1773.
"eat flax very much." 14 With favorable weather and care, the flax would be ripe and ready for harvest in late July or early August, approximately three months after it was first sown.

The stalks were carefully pulled from the ground by their roots to protect the full length of the stalk which housed the fibers, tied in small bundles and left to dry from several days to several weeks until the flaxseed was ready to thresh out. At the Lane's this was male work. Although Mary Lane and her four daughters were available for this work in the 1760s, in 1765 Samuel Neil pulled flax for part of a day and the next year Andrew [Wiggin?] pulled for four days. 15 In contrast, Augusta, Maine's Martha Ballard and her daughters harvested their flax; on August 3, 1787 and two later days she wrote in her diary, "I have been pulling flax." 16 Then the seed pods were broken with a mallet to release the seeds and the waste was separated. Seed could be cleaned in any season if the labor was available. Samuel called this "fanning flaxseed," where the lighter pod chaff was blown away. The seed was used for the next year's flax crop, although a market for seed to produce linseed oil grew later.

Once the seed was separated, the stalks were soaked in water for up to a week and then laid out on the ground to allow the outer stalk to rot. This process, retting, was "spreading" it in Samuel's vocabulary. It remained out from three to four weeks until the outer stalk easily pulled away from the fibers within. Then in September or October the chore of collecting the flax and laying it away to dry began. The Lanes harvested 122 bundles of flax in 1766; the 15 bundles rotted behind the

14 Diary, 5/17/94, 6/1/70, 6/6-8/93.  
15 Day Book, 1764, 1766.  
16 Ulrich, A Midwife's Tale, p. 38.
barn were stored on the barn scaffold along with 35 bundles from the "great knowl." The rest of the flax was stored in the calves pen and the barkhouse that year.\textsuperscript{17}

As much as had already been done, the flax was still a long way from becoming linen thread and remained mostly in male hands during the next stages. Samuel hired three categories of labor, braking, swinging and flaxing, to prepare the flax for spinning by the women. The flax brake was an implement which crushed the outer stalk, detaching it from the inner fiber. Any stalk material remaining after braking was removed with a swinging knife; the fibers were laid on a board and scraped with this wooden knife to remove any tough outer fiber left. It appears that "flaxing," a term Samuel used, is synonymous with "dressing" flax which encompassed the entire process of separating the fiber from the stalk. It was hard and dirty work, but a skillful workman could dress forty pounds per day.\textsuperscript{18} This was done at any time from October to the following spring. Over the winter of 1763-64, Samuel Pevy flaxed for two days in October and for three days the following March.\textsuperscript{19} During March 1772 Joseph Mason was credited for "Breaking & Swingling 132½ flax $4 0\$ old Ten\$."\textsuperscript{20}

Once dressed, the flax passed exclusively into women's hands.

Just as their sons' work about the homestead and farm never entered the Day Book accounts, neither does any mention of linen making by their

\textsuperscript{17}Day Book, 1766. In Southern Canada Kalm noted the flax was harvested for some time before they "spread it in fields, meadows, and pastures, in order to bleach it." It being early September when he made that observation, Kalm might have been observing the roting or retting process, not bleaching which was usually done at a later stage. Kalm II:493.
\textsuperscript{18}Bouton, p. 527.
\textsuperscript{19}Day Book, 1763, 1764.
\textsuperscript{20}Account Book, p. 206.
daughters appear. That labor is "invisible" to our eyes because it was never written in any account, but it was in fact performed by a household member: wife, husband, daughter, son or live-in help. Once the "flaxing" was finished by both hired help and the Lane boys, the flax fibers were then transformed into linen cloth through the efforts of Mary Lane, her daughters and hired girls.

The fibers, "dressed and twisted together in bunches," were still in a rough form.\(^{21}\) Combing, or hatcheling the flax followed. This was accomplished by holding the fibers at an end and drawing them through a hatchel; the same fibers were finished by holding the other end and repeating the process. The short and broken pieces combed out were called tow and were used for coarser fabrics and twine. About one-quarter of the flax actually survived as intact fibers that were spun into linen yarn. A somewhat greater percentage became tow with the rest refuse.\(^{22}\) Samuel paid a premium for combed flax recognizing the value of his daughters' labor. Simon Wiggin's combed flax commanded 4\(^{th}\) more per pound in November 1757 than Widow Wiggin's uncombed flax the same month. The quality of flax evidently varied and it is reflected in varying prices for flax at similar stages of finish. In December 1757 Samuel Pevy's 2 pounds cost Samuel £2; the next month his flax "mean & meanly comb'd" brought only 75\% of that.\(^{23}\) Samuel never mentioned the activity of combing flax. Presumably Mary and the girls did this; Martha Ballard combed flax two days in October 1789.\(^{24}\)

\(^{21}\)Bouton, p. 527.
\(^{23}\)Day Book, 1757.
\(^{24}\)Ulrich, A Midwife's Tale, p. 103.
Finally, the flax was ready to be spun into yarn. Mary knew how to spin when she married, although she may not have owned the small spinning or foot wheel on which to spin linen thread when she moved to Stratham. The couple purchased one from William Gaut less than three years later in 1744. It is not clear who processed the flax bought before then, however, with the purchase of the foot wheel Mary had the ability to make yarn from the flax taken in. They also made wool yarn beginning in 1746 when Samuel began keeping sheep.

The Lanes hired women and girls to help spin yarn from flax and wool and his first notation of spinning is in July 1745, after the acquisition of a foot wheel. There is some indication that the household contained a woolen wheel as well; during the summer of 1747 Comfort Cate spent six weeks spinning, work that corresponds to the "Woolen Webb 103 Skains" produced that year. Samuel detailed the steps involved in producing a finished piece of cloth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woolen Webb 103 Skains</td>
<td>old Tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about 34 lb of wool at 14(^8) p lb</td>
<td>23-16-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinning at 18(^8) p Skain</td>
<td>7-14-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaving 32 yds &amp; (\frac{1}{2}) &amp; (\frac{1}{4}) at 2-6 p yd</td>
<td>4-1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fulling Dying &amp; pressng 22 yds</td>
<td>7-3-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carrying to the weavers &amp; fetching home</td>
<td>2-10-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getting it Spun &amp; Dress'd &amp; greese</td>
<td>3-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48-5-2(^{25})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Samuel sheared six sheep in 1747 which probably yielded him about 18 pounds of wool or one-half the above amount.\(^{26}\) There is no indication of who wove the cloth or for what it was used, but another note refers to "linen & woolen webb for lining - 30 skains for warp & 28 for filling." At other times, mostly in the exception, spinning was

\(^{25}\)Pay Book, 1747.
\(^{26}\)Using his own records from 1772 to 1800, 77 sheep produced 222 pounds of wool or an average of 2.88 pounds of wool per shorn sheep.
done by others in large quantities. In 1754 Huldah Davis worked “2 weeks & 1 Skain over;” the accounting for both time and output here is unusual. Usually girls were paid for spinning by the skain. Beck Seavey spun “33 Skains Woosted @4s” in October 1762 and virtually all other spinning accounts follow that accounting practice. However, on several other occasions women were paid by the week for spinning and Huldah Davis seems to have been paid for two weeks work and for an additional skain after her time was up. The previous year Samuel’s sister Bathsheba spent February in Stratham, spinning and perhaps helping care for the children. In a little more than one month she spun 108 skeins, 36 linen, 42½ woolen, cotton etc., and 30 other unspecified skeins. She received £2-16-6 per week for her work. In general, the lack of correspondence between the amounts spun and woven in Samuel’s Day Books undoubtedly point to spinning regularly done within the household.

The need for greater quantities of cloth as well as their success at producing wool may have been the inspiration for growing flax. Before 1761 Samuel probably bought whatever flax he needed. His first notes about flax cultivation coincide with his leasing Peletiah Crocket a farm for half its yield. In 1761 Samuel’s share included 3 bushels of flaxseed valued at £6, and 22 pounds of flax worth £12. Samuel’s own flax cultivation became a fairly serious endeavor from that point.

---

27 Day Book, 1762.
28 In June 1767 Anne Veassey was paid 40 shillings a week for spinning; she spun 46 skeins in just over 15 days work. In 1778 Samuel accounted for Sarah Mason spinning 33 days and made no note of the quantity of yarn produced. Day Book, 1767, 1778.
29 Day Book, 1753.
30 Day Book, 1761.
This newfound interest might also be attributed to the needs of his family, most particularly his daughters. The Lane household held eight infants, children and teenagers who would have required considerable cloth for bedding, towels and clothing. James Lemon estimated that an average Pennsylvania family at this time needed between ten and twenty pounds of combed flax per person annually.31 Also, Samuel's oldest child, Mary, was seventeen in 1761 and betrothed to John Crocket. Linen making was probably a skill her parents wanted Mary to carry to her new household. Two of her sisters were nine and eleven and at ages to learn and contribute to this aspect of domestic production. Accordingly, not only did they plant their own flax that year, they also purchased a loom. For five days in April John Barker and a helper made a loom, and also provided spools. The local blacksmith fashioned loom irons and a spindle for one of the wheels.32 This loom appears in Jabez Lane's 1810 inventory, "Loom 6 doll[ars]s Reeds & Harness 6 doll[ars]s...Gears to Loom 1.50 cts. Tape loom 0.20 cts."33 With this addition the Lanes were able to produce linen cloth entirely within the confines of their house if they so chose.

Probably the loom was used almost immediately. Mary Lane almost certainly knew how to weave when she married Samuel; her father Benjamin James was a weaver. Bety Hix's twelve week stint "at finishing ye webb on ye 16th of Sept." could refer to spinning yarn or weaving the initial web of cloth on the new loom. With a year old infant, Mary would have required assistance to do both. Hix's work also coincides

31 Lemon, p. 155.
32 Day Book, 1761.
33 RCC Probate #82560S, Jabez Lane Inventory.
with the purchase of two shuttles from the husband of another weaver, Mrs. Allen.³⁴

A striking fact is the steady or slight decrease in weaving contracted for by the Lanes despite their increased need for cloth after the purchase of the loom. Illustration 6 shows the amounts of weaving and spinning hired and accounted for in Samuel's Day Books from 1753 to 1773:

Illustration 6 - SPINNING & WEAVING, 1754-1773
(Spinning in skeins, Weaving in yards)

Jabez, their last son, was born in 1760, and even though daughter Mary was married and left the household in 1762, the need for fabrics must have remained strong. No quantity is attached to the twelve weeks of weaving by Betsy Hix mentioned above so the weaving total for 1762, 13½ yards, seems meager in comparison to the 45 yards in 1761 and the 42 yards in 1763. The 1763 totals may include work done by other women on the Lane loom. In December Unis Kelly, a younger woman, wove two webs of cloth containing 26 yards. She was paid 68 per yard; Lydia Nokes

³⁴Pay Book, 1761.
earned 12\(^\circ\) per yard for weaving ticking that same year.\(^{35}\) There is no mention of weaving hired in 1764 and little in 1765. Larger amounts begin again in 1766, peaking in 1768 with over 189 yards woven for the Lanes by others.

The shape of these trends is less puzzling when juxtaposed with the course of Mary Lane's illness, and death in January 1769. It is possible that the hired weaving from 1761 through 1763 represented a learning curve by Mary and her daughters. Most probably Mary had not woven for the first twenty years of her married life so having an accomplished weaver such as Unis Kelly or Betsy Bix weave on her own loom would have refreshed her memory and acquainted her daughters with the process. After a period of demonstration and learning Mary might have felt confident enough to proceed on her own. However, she did not have much time to perfect her reacquired skill. In 1767 Mary's health deteriorated. Doctor Rust's bill for doctoring Mary was only 12 shillings in 1766. In April and May of 1767 "her Sickness" was serious enough to run up an £18-11-0 doctor's bill. The following year Rust tended Mary "in her last Sickness," and she died January 30, 1769 not quite forty-seven years old. "A Holy and Righteous Providence indeed;" remarked Samuel, "but an irreparable loss to me & my Children."\(^{36}\)

During the final two years of her life, the Lanes hired increasing amounts of weaving probably replacing that which Mary would have done had she been healthy as Illustration 6 demonstrates. In late 1766, the widow Sarah Jenness began to do a good deal of weaving for the Lanes at

\(^{35}\) Other weavers earned more than Unis Kelly. Zebulon Ring and Joseph Mason Jr. earned 6 pence New Tenor per yard or 10 shillings Old Tenor. Laurel Ulrich finds differential rates of pay usually reflected the complexity of the weave.

\(^{36}\)Journal, p. 41.
the lower 6 shilling rate, perhaps on their loom. Samuel credited her with weaving 188½ yards of cloth in 1768. It appears that Jenness helped perform the work curtailed by Mary's declining health.

Patterns of textile purchases in Portsmouth shown below and in the Appendix demonstrate the conjunction of these various family events:

ILLUSTRATION 7 - SPINNING, WEAVING AND TEXTILE PURCHASES, 1754-1773
(Spinning in skeins, weaving in yards, purchases in £, Old Tenor)

The large purchases in 1759, 1761 and 1762 reflect two family circumstances, little household production from the new loom and the impending marriage of Mary to John Crocket. Significant amounts of fabric were purchased for Mary's wedding portion. The sharp decline in store-bought cloth after 1762 is attributable to the wedding's having taken place and increased output from the family loom. Sharp increases in 1765 peaked in 1766, followed by a dramatic decline. Most of these fabrics appear to have been for articles of clothing. The decline in textiles purchased at Portsmouth continued until 1770. Then an isolated

37Day Book, 1768.
spurt of buying in connection with Suse’s 1772 wedding appeared. In
addition the growing troubles with England also may have contributed to
fewer purchases from Portsmouth shops as much of that fabric was
manufactured in England. Homespun was beginning to acquire patriotic
connotations.

After the purchase of the loom in the spring of 1761 the family’s
dependence on Portsmouth shops for cloth diminished significantly. Only
when exceptional events intervened such as a wedding or Mary’s illness
did the Lanes make heavy purchases of imported fabrics. For the first
ten years of their marriage such purchases were exceptions; few
imported fabrics were purchased before the late 1750s. Prior to that
Samuel mostly carried home linen and handkerchiefs from the Bank.
Samuel made thirty-three separate purchases of linen during the decade
of the 1750s and twenty-two over the next ten years. However, from 1767
to 1773 only three linen purchases were made in Portsmouth. Clearly
sources of supply closer to home and within the home provided more
economical substitutes. Linen woven on his loom probably cost 6
shillings per yard; in Portsmouth’s shops that linen cost between 25
and 40 shillings. Thus the savings from their own increased production
allowed them to acquire other fabrics.

The Lane family was growing and daughters reaching the age of
marriage made the purchase of imported fabrics a matter of course. Even
so, the acquisition of a loom and the trade disruptions resulting from
the political situation weaned the household away from these purchases
at a time when they might have grown tremendously. Samuel still had to
plan for the marriage portions of his remaining daughters. By 1759 he
was purchasing materials he rarely, if ever, had bought before. Chintz,
shalloon, tammy, lawn, serge are but a few of the many fabrics that begin to regularly appear as credits. Such fabrics appeared in his accounts until the early 1770s when the Day Books are less complete. Conceivably his trade in English goods at the Bank came to a virtual standstill after 1773.

The Lane girls began to replace the output lost by the death of their mother during the 1770s. More than a year after Mary's death, in May 1770, Samuel observed "my Daughters Learned to Weave," and "Sister Elizabeth come to Weave." Elizabeth remained in Stratham for two weeks teaching 19 year-old Suse, 17 year-old Sarah and 15 year-old Martha. It was too early for Bathsheba, just 13 that month, to learn the intricacies of weaving. Too young to be taught by Mary before her sickness, the girls learned from and their aunt, Samuel's sister Elizabeth. The weaving Sarah Jenness was doing on a regular basis began to taper off about this time, although her work continued on a less regular basis. Coming of age and trained by their aunt, the Lane girls may have taken over the loom in 1770 producing homespun themselves rather than hiring their neighbors to weave.

Mary and Samuel were replicating a pattern of household production learned in their parents' homes. With no record of the goods Mary brought with her to Stratham, it is impossible to discern what spinning and weaving equipment was in her marriage portion. Clearly she was acquainted with aspects of textile production; her presence and state of health during the 1760s was the most important determinant of their textile output. Samuel did his best to carry on in her absence. Two

38Journal, p. 41; Diary, 5/14/70.
years after her death he remarked, "my Deurs Spun 30 Skain." 39 Samuel and Mary wanted their daughters to bring both material goods and useful skills to their marriages to ensure successful unions and productive households. Those lessons took hold and the values they instilled in their children lived on in their grandchildren. On her tenth birthday, Samuel proudly observed that his granddaughter Patty "Spun 4 Skains good cotton yarn". 40

39 Diary, 2/1/72.
40 Diary, 1/28/97.
"the things I give to my Daughter"

Nowhere is the link between the household, local, regional and Atlantic economies so clearly demonstrated as in the use and production of textiles. Another dimension of participation in these markets is the perpetuation of family structures by the transfer of wealth from one generation to the next. Samuel and Mary had every intention of providing their children with the staples necessary to fulfill roles in their own families and within the community. They pursued this strategy irrespective of the child's gender, but they employed different mechanisms for daughters and sons.

The preceding section explores how women, within the specific context of the household production of textiles, played a significant part in the larger colonial economy. Homespun could draw the household into the regional and Atlantic markets rather than insulate families from the marketplace. The marriage portions Samuel and Mary gave each daughter upon her marriage illustrates the needs of a young couple setting up "housekeeping," provides clues about the economic role of the household and hints at hopes the parents had for the future of their family.\(^1\) The Lanes gave their daughters furnishings to help them live a comfortable and productive life in eighteenth-century New Hampshire. More importantly those goods helped fashion a pattern of life that rested upon principles and activities that the girls experienced in their parents' household. These portions were a material manifestation

\(^1\)Nylander analyzes the lists of the Lane marriage portions with a particular focus on the needs of a colonial household and how those needs changed over the course of the late eighteenth century in "Provision for the Daughters."
of Mary and Samuel's culture and the hopes these parents harbored for their children's future. The Lane girls' own spinning and weaving became a part of their marriage portions making the gifts more than "things." The work invested in those items was the most enduring legacy.

The Lane Papers at the New Hampshire Historical Society contain five itemized marriage portions, each headed by "An Account of the things I give to my Daughter [daughter's name] toward her Portion," followed by the date of that daughter's wedding day. These gifts were to be their daughters' legacy, and Mary and Samuel wanted their children to benefit from their success and good fortune when it was most useful, at the start of married life. Samuel would leave little to them when he died.

The five lists are virtually the same in the items listed, their value, and the structure employed to inventory this largess. Beds, bedding and accompanying furnishings head each list with valuable textiles prominent. In 1762 the textiles making up Mary Crocket's best bed were worth £139-17-6 including the bed ticking, pillows and curtains; the textiles for her best bed made up 10.8% of the total value of the portion. Another bed made of homespun ticking was worth £35, 2.7% of the total. Including feathers for the bolsters in these totals increased their value significantly. The "42 lb of Choice feathers" in the best bed were worth £94-10-0; thirty-eight pounds for the other bed, "Some of them Mix'd," had slightly less value, £76. Other bed chamber appointments follow, coverlets, sheets, blankets and cases. The total value of the textiles in Mary's bedding portion, not
including the £170-10-0 of feathers, was £417-17-6 or nearly one-third of the £1298 total.

Table cloths, napkins and towels as well as pillow cases, round out the first section of the portions which, with the exception of bedsteads and feathers, is entirely textiles. In 1762 Samuel bought £147 of those textiles from the Portsmouth shop of Charles Treadwell including "one boughten Bed-Tick Bolster & Pillows," "China," trimming and "Buckram" for curtains, and "Shalloon for a Bed-Quilt." Such purchases of cloth were commonplace throughout the colonies in both urban and rural areas. In 1761 Jacob Treadwell advertised cloth, "Just IMPORTED from LONDON," including "Superfine scarlet, black, blue and cloth colour'd broad cloths; middling ditto; serge's; kerseys; bearskins; whitneys; half thick's; bay's; thicksetts; fustians; black paduasoys; taffity's; chints damask; callamancoes; tammy's; worsted damasks; shalloons" and many more.² Even on the Kentucky frontier during the 1790s, two stores sold forty-two different types of cloth to three-quarters of their customers.³

The Day Books identify local people as doing some of the work for Mary's portion; Moll Haley made the shalloon quilt and Daniel Allen's wife wove fifteen yards of blanketing. In addition Lydia Nokes wove 13½ yards of ticking in August 1762, and Sergeant Samuel Allen wove two coverlets in June and another that December. The total value of those goods and services, £139, is the only textile-related work corresponding to Mary's portion found in the Day Books. The remainder of the

²New Hampshire Gazette, October 2, 1761.
textiles, £174 worth, probably came from the Lane loom or from other local weavers; the items are labeled homespun or are items Samuel typically bought locally, coverlets, napkins, pillow cases and sheets. A glance at the Appendix shows that the Lanes hired at least 43 skeins of yarn spun and over seventy-one yards of cloth woven from 1760 to 1762. Some of the Lane’s significant production of linen yarn and wool prior to Mary’s wedding must have made its way into her portion.

Also the Lane household was using textiles other than those that went into Mary’s portion. The young couple’s intentions were apparent by November 1759 when “Jn” C-----t come 1st t ime,” and told Mary’s parents, “If I Seeking.” ⁴ For the three years from 1760 through 1762 the Lanes purchased textiles amounting to £466-10-0, a bit more than the amount in Mary’s portion. Considering their consumption as a household of ten with an infant, as well as the provisions made for Mary’s “things”, some household production of cloth would have been necessary to supply family needs and create the inventory of textiles for Mary.

That the textile-intensive bedding headed the lists of the five daughters’ portions is significant for several reasons. Taken as a whole this category was the most valuable; Samuel valued Mary’s beds and related furnishings at £657 or just over one-half the total value of her portion. Most of that value rested in textiles and feathers. The other daughters’ portions mirrored this pattern although with weddings after 1776, the proportion of the value of bedding to the whole declined. By Sarah Thompson’s 1783 marriage bedding was only 39% of the total value although nearly the same amount in pounds as Mary’s. By then the limitations on imported material due to the war, the girls’ own

⁴Diary, 11/21/59.
production on the family loom and gifts "out of y° House" combined to
lower both the absolute value of the bedding and its value relative to
the rest of the portion.5

The proportionately high value of the best bed in each inventory
might also have been a measure of Samuel's sense of family integrity
which had its foundations in the future generations. Bed's older
meaning "As the place of conjugal union, and of procreation and
childbirth" may have had significance for Samuel and Mary whose own
experience placed family at the forefront of their lives. The social
and religious ramifications of marriage perhaps invested bedding with
another meaning, that of the physical side of marriage. Preacher Cotton
Mather's explanation that the covenant "appears under the Character of a
Marriage, because from this Time, there is an Union, and not only a
Legal Union, but also a Vital Union, between the Redeemer and the
Believer," might well have been implicit in the positioning and value of
bedding in the portions.6 On the practical level, beds meant comfort
and warmth in an age when observations as "Sauce froze" indicated that
houses were not necessarily an effective defense against cold weather.7

Following textiles on the list is a looking glass, valued at £18
in Mary's case, and then a fairly extensive list of cooking and table
ware made of pewter, brass and iron. The table service probably came
mostly from Portsmouth shops; the dozen pewter plates in Mary's portion
came from Charles Treadwell's shop and other "puter" came from Newbury

5The declining proportion of bedding to the entire portions is obvious:
Suse Lane's 1773 portion contained £698 of bedding, 52.4% of the total;
Martha's 1776 portion had £634 or 48.1% of the whole; Bathsheba's 1777
portion had £554 of bedding, 44.7% of the total. Lane Papers.
7See Chapter IV, "Frosty Mornings and Stinging Fingers: The Effects of
Winter," in Nylander, Our Own Snug Fireside.
and Enoch Clark's Greenland Tavern.\textsuperscript{8} The iron skillets, pots and kettles also were purchased in Portsmouth, but other ironware such as handirons, tongs, toasting irons and heaters came from the forge of a local blacksmith, Nathan Hoag.

Furniture followed with chests of drawers heading that section; in part their value stemmed from their function as a repository of valuable textiles. Only chairs, tables and bedsteads in addition to the chests are listed indicating no pressing need or desire for nonfunctional furnishings in a beginning household.

The latter part of each list indicates what Samuel and Mary believed their daughters' household responsibilities should be in addition to the housekeeping and cooking chores implied by the furnishings already listed. Each portion contained a foot and woolen wheel, spindle, cards for combing wool and "sisers." The lessons learned at their mother's and Aunt's sides were to be continued. Very likely each girl had already accumulated her own sewing kit, knitting needles and the utensils necessary to work with flax and wool yarn so that they do not appear in these lists. A couple of the portions contained sheep to foster wool production in those daughters' households.

Other equipment listed related to the production of dairy products. Mary's 1762 portion lists a butter churn and two milk pails. By Sarah's 1783 wedding dairying equipment had expanded to include two milk trays. Each daughter received a cow, just as Mary James had upon her marriage to Samuel in 1742. Although the records are scanty, it appears that family production of milk, cheese and butter increased

\textsuperscript{8}\textsuperscript{Day Book, 1762.}
coincidentally with textile production during the 1760s. At the front of his 1748 Day Book Samuel noted "Milk bout' of Cuffe;" during February and March he bought 28 quarts. In addition he purchased 7 quarts from Morris before February 20. Throughout the 1750s Samuel's Day Books infrequently note the sale and purchase of butter and cheese. His own herd's increasing production supplanted dairy products he purchased earlier.

The first years of the 1760s seem to have been a watershed in the Lane household and in the parent's attitude toward their children. Perhaps the engagement of Mary coupled with the ages of two other daughters, Suse was 12 and Sarah was 10 in 1762, prompted Mary and Samuel to instruct their girls in textile and dairy production. There is little indication of this in his diary, however, the dairy accounts in the Day Books point to a rather dramatic change in 1760. On April 3, 1760 Samuel bought a butter churn from Jacob Low which eventually went with Mary when she married two years later. Within two months he began to record the sale of cheese in the Portsmouth shops of Charles Treadwell and Jacob Sheafe. By year's end 54¾ pounds of Lane cheese and 11 pounds of butter had been sold whereas there is no record of dairy sales at all the previous year.¹⁰

In contrast, the following year, 1761, Samuel bought 100 pounds of cheese and nearly 24 pounds of butter; he sold 13¾ pounds of cheese and 3 pounds of butter. Mary and her girls had not stopped churning; there was "a most Distressing Drought as ever was known," Samuel observed in September, "which continued till ye 19th of Augt and Entirely Cut of

⁹Day Book, 1748.
¹⁰In 1758 the Lanes sold 12 pounds of butter and 20¼ pounds of cheese; the latter was offset by a 5½ pound cheese purchase.
our hope of almost all the fruits of ye Earth." By that fall he explained their irregular dairy output, "people begin to make Butter which has been Exceeding Scarce." In 1762 their production picked up. while he bought 4 pounds of cheese and less than 1 pound of butter, he sold 10½ pounds of butter, almost 10 pounds more than he purchased.

Although the drought masked any clear trend, household production was increasing before young Mary's marriage. Along with her, their other daughters were reaching productive ages, and sales in Portsmouth of dairy goods increased from £15-14-6 to more than £68 from 1760 to 1765. Stratham butter and cheese appeared in the larders of the messieurs Treadwell and Sheafe, widow Sherburne and Major John Wentworth. By 1782, the year before Sarah, his youngest daughter left, this production warranted its own page in the Day Book, "Butter & Cheese Made & Sold in 1782;" he noted 101½ pounds of butter and 334½ pounds of cheese. That underestimates the total produced as they surely needed some for their own use. By then dairy production was clearly an important part of their output and the responsibility of the women.

In 1782 Sarah probably was helped by her stepmother, Rachel, and stepsister, Eunice Colcord. However, both girls left the household in early 1783; Sarah married Matt Thompson in February and Jabez Lane married his stepsister in January. Eunice and Jabez remained close by
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11 Diary, September 1761.
12 Day Books, 1761, 1762.
13 Day Book, 1782.
14 The conclusions here support the contention of Joan M. Jensen, *Loosening the Bonds: Mid-Atlantic Farm Women, 1750-1850* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), who writes, "During the century from 1750 to 1850, then, the dairy work of both women and men changed significantly. From a peripheral part of farm work, dairying moved to a central place on many farms of southeastern Pennsylvania and northern Delaware." p. 113.
in an adjacent house provided for them by Samuel and Eunice may have continued to help her mother with the dairying. The loss of Sarah’s labor was notable; in 1783 output dropped to 82½ pounds of butter and 177 pounds of cheese.\textsuperscript{15} Even without any girls in the house this production continued, perhaps carried on by Rachel, her slave Dinah and hired help. There are numerous diary entries during the 1790s chronicling trips to Exeter with butter and cheese and it appears to have been a staple of trade with fishermen who stopped to trade at the bridge over the river.\textsuperscript{16} A typical exchange took place on October 2, 1795 when Samuel bought oil from Captain Stover in exchange for twelve pounds of cheese, shoes and apples.\textsuperscript{17}

The portions - their content, structure and consistency over more than two decades - delineated for Samuel and Mary a woman’s household role. These furnishings were not random choices but were included in their daughters’ portions for good reasons; these goods represented the responsibilities of wives and mothers in the colonial home. The Lane boys would receive completely different classes of property. As parents, Mary and Samuel were defining a cooperative household world in which both male and female contributed. Tasks done by men and women might cross over the lines drawn here, but responsibility for the specific areas of household production and management represented in the marriage portions rested with women. This knowledge invests the return of safety to Charles Treadwell’s store less than a month after its

\textsuperscript{15} DAY BOOK, 1782.
\textsuperscript{16} Samuel mentions carrying dairy goods to Exeter at least seven times between 1794 and 1798.
\textsuperscript{17} Diary, 10/2/95.
purchase in 1764 with new meaning.\textsuperscript{18} Although Samuel executed the
exchanges, Mary's advice at the least influenced the purchase of many
furnishings entering their house and represented in the portions. The
textile returns imply that Mary had the final word.

Only some of the expectations these parents had for their
daughters are hinted at in the portions; items not there, but recorded
elsewhere, illustrate different aspirations. Samuel gave Mary Crocket
tfive books "when she Mov'd from me."\textsuperscript{19} Each daughter in succession
received a similar gift; their daughters were to be literate and
educated members of society. Just why books were not included in the
portions is not clear but may be because both sons and daughters
received books. Perhaps books, because they imparted no clear
definition of gender roles, did not belong in the portions. Clocks too,
present this ambiguity. In the fall of 1783 Samuel went to Kensington
and ordered six clocks from Jeremiah Fellows, Jr. for his five daughters
and son Joshua.\textsuperscript{20} Samuel had bought a tall clock in 1747 which probably
went to Jabez and is listed in his inventory.\textsuperscript{21} It is unlikely that
young Samuel was left out and presumably Samuel had a clock for him too,
perhaps from the division of their grandparents' estates. Excluded from
the portions, these two classes of goods hint that the portions were a

\textsuperscript{18} Other returns to Portsmouth shops recorded in his Day Books include a
handkerchief in both 1755 and 1758, chintz in 1760, 1764 and 1766,
taffy in 1764, and galloon in 1771. All but the last occurred while
Mary was still alive.

\textsuperscript{19} Those books were "a Bible Parsons 7 Discourses Bunyon's Sighs From
Hell Earls Sacramental Exercises Erskines Gospel Sonnets." Later he
added "Watt's World to Come Wright on being Born Again." Lane Papers,

\textsuperscript{20} Diary, 10/27/83, 12/9/83, 2/24/84, 6/23/84, 1/6/85.

\textsuperscript{21} RC Probate # 8256 OS.
template for their daughters in their marriages, rather than a strict accounting.

Also, each daughter went "to School to Madm Rust," the widow of Stratham minister Henry Rust. It appears that Samuel increasingly appreciated the value of schooling to his girls as time passed. He first took notice of this in 1754; "Mary began to go to School to Madm Rust," he wrote on June 12, "She there 2 weeks & ½ day before July & Suse 3 days." Mary was ten at the time and Suse was five years old. Mary's formal schooling appears only once more in the record for 9½ weeks during the summer of 1756. Although Samuel made no note of it in 1755, she probably went to school that year too.

Mary, the eldest daughter, seems to have received the least education. Each of her sisters, in a virtually unbroken trend, received more schooling than her immediate elder sister as Table 7 illustrates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TOTAL WEEKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1754, 1756</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>11½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathsheba</td>
<td>1762-66</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>40½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suse</td>
<td>1754-61</td>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>1757-61</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>1759-66</td>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>86½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane Diaries, 1754-1766.

The curriculum of Madam Rust's school is nowhere indicated nor is whether it was different for boys and girls. While some sources point
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22Henry Rust's first wife, Anna Waldron, was the daughter of an influential New Hampshire family. She died in 1733 and he married again two years later a widow named "Marthaw." Little more is known about her. Sibley V, p. 372.

23Diary, 1754 back cover. Between 1754 and 1766 Samuel remarked about that year's schooling with Madam Rust at the end of the year on the back cover of his diary.
to these differences, Samuel's only clue may suggest a similarity. In 1754, Mary's first year of school, Joshua, aged six, also went to Madam Rust's school for several weeks. However, he attended during August when none of the Lane girls are noted as having gone. Whether the nature of his lessons with Madam Rust differed from that of his sisters is not clear. Jabez attended Latin school, but these are the only mention of the Lane sons attending school, however all were literate.

After the Revolution, girls and younger children irrespective of gender "began to attend schools in special summer sessions, when boys were working in the fields." The education of the Lane girls anticipated this development, but more importantly echoed the sentiments of Abigail Adams who propounded the minority opinion that "if we mean to have heroes, statesmen and philosophers, we should have learned women." The growing emphasis Samuel and Mary placed on the education of their daughters indicates that they early had begun to abandon the notion that a woman's education should be limited to her preparation for marriage.

The importance of literate daughters is also apparent in gifts of books to the children. Here the link between religion and education is clear. The overwhelming majority of books in his library concerned religious topics so it is not surprising that most of the books he gave away were religious in nature. Clearly he expected his children to
cultivate religion in their own households and gifts of books were meant to foster that process. Each daughter received books that were unequivocally religious such as Dodridge's "Four Sermons on the Religious Education of Children." His sons' books were similar but a few secular titles passed to them like Douglas's "History of America," or Gouge's "Young Man's Guide." In Samuel's mind, the horizons of reading matter for males were wider.

Those horizons widened further in gifts to grandchildren; perhaps the intervention of the American Revolution made this shift possible. His later gifts of books indicated Samuel's acknowledgment that reading might have other practical uses. To grandchildren he gave The Present State of North America, Love's Surveying, Present for an Apprentice, The Complete Farmer, and "7 Books for my grand children viz School of good Manners" among others. His great-granddaughter even received a novel, Robinson Crusoe. Religious works continued to dominate his gifts of books; however, the qualitative change in the subject matter points to an evolving view of education's role in the family.

These books as well as schooling for the Lane children point to the importance of education for both adolescent and adult during the latter eighteenth century. Samuel's emphasis on literacy had its roots in emerging educational trends. Bernard Bailyn noted an attitudinal change where education shifted from an unthinking cultural transfer to an activity that was "deliberate, self-conscious, and explicit."28 In addition mothers' assuming the responsibility for children's education

by the end of the century necessitated early education for girls.\textsuperscript{29} The differential Laurel Ulrich found in boys and girls education before 1750, with girls taught to read while boys learned writing and ciphering also, probably had no place in Samuel Lane's plans for his daughters.\textsuperscript{30} He already had entered the new era.

The American Revolution's impact may have accelerated this process. That both boys and girls receive an education may have come from a nascent notion of citizenship in an emerging nation. As individual responsibility became the keystone of the democratic process, "civic virtue" became an essential element for its present and future health. The role of the mother as teacher of future citizens developed, and as Linda Kerber observed, "If the Republic indeed rested on responsible motherhood, prospective mothers needed to be well informed and decently educated."\textsuperscript{31} Samuel's republican sympathies may have anticipated this with the education of his daughters beginning in the 1750s.

The formal education Samuel and Mary provided their daughters was but another legacy which, along with the household goods, was an investment in the survival and prosperity of family. These parents provided daughters with household furnishing so that they could immediately set up a more than adequate home upon their marriage. In addition, through the skills learned in the Lane household including sewing, spinning, weaving, and dairying as well as their education in Madam Rust's school, Mary and Samuel had ensured to the best of their ability that their daughters also would be good mothers to their

\textsuperscript{29}Deighton, p. 558.
\textsuperscript{30}Ulrich, Good Wives, p. 44.
\textsuperscript{31}Kerber, p. 200.
grandchildren. This legacy to their daughters made provision for their childrens' present comforts and future well-being.

Samuel Lane's forays into the world of trade accomplished several goals. He turned his tanning and shoemaking skills into credit with Portsmouth's merchants. This was particularly valuable in the volatile eighteenth-century economy when local shortages were commonplace. Moreover, his trade in Portsmouth gave his family the opportunity to consume goods from worldwide markets. He generated wealth at Stratham for exchange with his neighbors and with Portsmouth merchants. Thus wine from the Portuguese islands and tea from the Far East found its way to their Stratham home.

However, merely noting the consumption of those goods would mask more important purposes. There is a strong correlation between imported goods and the portions Samuel and Mary reserved for their daughters upon marriage. Many of those goods, particularly imported textiles, were destined for the young brides. Purchases at "the Bank," especially well documented in Mary Crockett's portion, show Samuel's deliberate planning for a daughter's wedding several years in advance of the event.

Exploring the marriage portions and household textile production also clarifies the effect of homespun manufactures on Atlantic trade. Ironically, homespun drew this colonial household more deeply into markets for English goods by making resources available to purchase imports. The Lane household, by producing some of its own linen and woolens, was able to purchase large quantities of imported textiles and other goods. If this was typical, home manufacture may have made
Americans more dependent on English goods before the 1770s than has been thought.

Samuel's trade served more than his immediate family. He served as a "middleman," acting on behalf of his neighbors at the Bank. He also was a minor merchant himself, selling some items from his own stock to local residents. However, this appears to have been a courtesy rather than a major aspect of his business.

Samuel and Mary had a clear idea of what each of their daughters should bring to a marriage. The tangible manifestation of that scheme was specified in the marriage portions. But as both partner in marriage and mother, their daughters were to be more than brides accompanied by a spinning wheels. When Mary Crocket went to housekeeping with her husband, she was prepared to fill an economic, social and cultural role as wife and mother. Mary and Samuel had designs for their sons too, but as husbands and fathers, their boys traveled a different route to fulfilling their household roles.
IV. "Son Joshua's Teem Plow'd for me"

At the end of 1762, "the Most Difficult and Most Remarkable year on Many Accounts (I believe) that ever was known in New England," Samuel wrote the longest yearly summary found in his diaries. He had much to write about for a cycle of climatic extremes reached its zenith that year with a "most hard sever Cold long Winter" followed in the spring by a drought for the second consecutive year. After noting the "Starving Condition" of many families, he continued:

when the Spring & Summer came on Rich & Poor almost in Genral were all Buyers of Provision; and by the Spring, Many of our good Farmers we[re] almost Destitute of Corn & Meat: So that had not Providence wonderfully Appear'd for us by Sending Provisions from other Countrys, it Seems Many People Must have perished with Hunger.¹

That year even good husbandry failed to counter New Hampshire's harsh environment, and life continued on a fragile balance. Despite those circumstances Samuel's activity that spring had gone on much like any other year in the cycle of work to prepare for planting, although lingering snow delayed field work. As late as April 12 a drift of snow in the road by the pound measured four feet deep.² He could not begin plowing his fields until the next day.

While many in New Hampshire were suffering the consequences of the drought in 1762, the Lane household was reasonably well off. Samuel's unstated conclusion in the above passage is the success of their family farm after two decades in Stratham. This involved more than mere prosperity, it continued to be a life and death matter. During that lean year Samuel did not buy imported corn, but was able to sell hay, 4½

¹Diary, 1762 Summary.
²Diary, 4/10/62.
bushels of corn, 85 pounds of beef, veal and lamb, and small amounts of other produce to his neighbors. His purchases indicate no dire need, small amounts of veal and turnips, 2 pigs and ½ bushel of rye. This contrasts sharply with earlier years. In 1753 and 1754, two relatively fruitful years, he noted purchase of 54½ bushels of Indian corn and 11 bushels of English grains. By 1762 the Lane farm could supply its own basic needs and produce a surplus, even in that year of extreme drought. The Lanes had achieved a "competency" or "degree of comfortable independence." 

Land was crucial to rural competency and to Samuel's vision for his future and that of his children. In rural Stratham work alone could not guarantee security. Land conferred a degree of independence from nature and market and social status on its proprietor, and helped prepare for the future. Increasingly Samuel applied his resources and interest to improving his farm although its financial return alone did not justify that investment. After satisfying his own needs, his primary goal was to provide land for his sons.

Thus, on the eve of his eldest daughter's marriage Samuel and Mary had established a prosperous farm which not only employed members of their household but neighboring men and boys as well. They accomplished this through the purchase of adjacent properties, over time piecing together lands which supported pasture, meadows, tillage and orchards. To establish a productive farm was a family goal from the start, and that aim overshadowed all the other reasons for engrossing realty.

---

3Day Book, 1762.
4Day Book, 1754.
Land's usefulness did not end there. Samuel purchased farms and land not contiguous to his own farmstead which, at first glance, appear simply as other outlets for his growing capital. Only in the late 1760s did his plans for those lands become clear; from the very beginning he and Mary were planning to endow their sons with "portions" just as they were their daughters. For their sons though, the parents intended farms and land, the wherewithal to participate in the agricultural economy upon their marriage. The best way to ensure the integrity, stability and future prosperity of their family was to supply both sons and daughters the means to create productive economic units in the context of the family-based economy of rural New Hampshire.

His records suggest the growing importance of agriculture to his family. The unfailing reports of daily weather are linked to agricultural concerns, for of all his various activities, farming and its success was most dependent upon the weather. The events of 1762 point to the harsh realities of eighteenth-century northern New England; more than a century and a quarter after its first settlement, famine continued to threaten the region. Moreover, the ownership of land held social connotations for Samuel. After thirty years in Stratham he became known as Esquire Lane, a title he never discouraged and unquestionably relished. Long before Thomas Jefferson propounded the agrarian foundations of republican ideology, Samuel Lane was living its tenants. His agricultural pursuits completed a long journey from shoemaker to esquire.

The previous section investigated the links between household production, and trading in regional and Atlantic markets. Samuel's actions demonstrate a clear market orientation which influenced family,
neighborly and community relations. Price competition played its role in all markets, including the local market. In preparation for building a house in 1768 Samuel solicited bids and noted, "JnO Barker told me Window frames 4t & Sashes 5$/Each - & Jms Merrill 3$/ & Sashes 4$/ or 3/9." Clearly a market mentality was at work in Stratham, and Samuel did not hesitate to use it to his advantage. He hired James Merrill to make his window frames.

The debate over markets in the eighteenth century necessarily has been linked to the issue of farm self-sufficiency. The foundations of the traditional argument are grounded in the classic work, History of Agriculture in the Northern United States 1620-1860. Percy W. Bidwell and John I. Falconer wrote, "Self-sufficiency was a striking and important characteristic of the colonial farm. The farm family produced for themselves food, clothing, house furnishings, farm implements, in fact practically everything they needed." Given that assumption, logic demanded that trade was of little import to rural towns, particularly in an age when urban populations were small. According to them the growth of an industrial labor force during the nineteenth century alone, loosened restraints on markets, drew agricultural goods out of the countryside and integrated the farm into regional and national markets.

Bidwell and Falconer reiterate this theme throughout their work, and they found neither village nor city hosted significant markets for farm produce. Tables enumerating "Markets for northern farm products" and observations that "there were...a great many streams of trade
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6Day Book, 1767.
trickling from the back country to the seaports in New England
notwithstanding, their conclusion remained firm, “trade of any kind was
of small importance in rural communities.” Clear agrarian myth had
distorted their appraisal of the evidence.9

Recent scholars have reframed this debate and more properly
defined “self-sufficiency,” as “versatility.” The evidence shows that
however varied the individual farmstead’s output, from soap to food and
clothing, it was not sufficient to sustain the standard of living
enjoyed by the typical American colonial. Necessity forced the farmer
to participate in regional markets.

Bettye Hobbs Pruitt’s study of tax assessments and probate records
in 1791 Massachusetts “clearly indicate that many farms, especially
poorer ones, could not have been self-sufficient in food.” Finding
individual farms without the requisite feed for livestock or implements
for crop cultivation, “it was the interdependence of farms that made
many of them viable,” therefore “the influence of the market was quite
real.”10 Others have adopted this microeconomic approach, studying

8Bidwell and Falconer, pp. 136, 141, 129.
9Max George Schumacher’s The Northern Farmer and his Markets during the
Late Colonial Period (New York: Arno Press, 1975), originally written in
1948, concluded that the northern farmer was “largely independent of the
market,” because of market limitations and the inability of farms to
produce a significant surplus although he too was ambivalent. Elsewhere
he recognized the existence of a profitable market. In 1952 Rodney C.
Loehr specifically refuted the assertion of Bidwell and Falconer that
colonial farms were self-sufficient. (“Self-Sufficiency on the Farm,”
recent agricultural history of New England, Howard S. Russell’s A Long
Deep Furrow Three Centuries of Farming in New England (Hanover, NH:
University Press of New England, 1976), reaches a similar conclusion,
“self-sufficiency certainly was the first objective of nearly all early
farmers,” but he acknowledges that over the colonial period the farmer
began to produce for markets. pp. 112-13.
10Bettye Hobbs Pruitt, “Self-Sufficiency and the Agricultural Economy of
Eighteenth-Century Massachusetts,” The William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd
Ser., vol. XLII, no. 3 (July 1984), pp. 338, 355, 364.
farms as individual economic units. Carole Shammas supports Pruitt concluding that households and communities spent one quarter of their income on imported goods. Although much of the produce raised on the farm was consumed right there, the individual farm household could not satisfy all its needs:

"The growth of the colonial population, European Atlantic ports, the British shipping industry, indentured servitude, and chattel slavery all stand as testimony to the voracious appetite of Western consumers for the new market commodities, and there is no evidence that Americans did not fully participate in that commercial world." 11

Evidence from the growing field in colonial consumerism lends credence to this portrait of the eighteenth-century American as increasingly involved in markets for consumer goods. 12

Such approaches differ significantly in method from Winifred Rothenberg's technique which employs aggregate economic data and market theory to establish the existence of vital markets for agricultural produce in America. Implicit in her studies is the underlying market behavior of America's nascent capitalist, the farmer. It is to this issue, the intent and motives of the farmer, that the market debate has evolved. The existence of local, regional and imperial markets has been established, however, the extent of colonial participation in those events.

11 Carole Shammas, "How Self-Sufficient Was Early America?" The Journal of Interdisciplinary History, Volume XIII, Number 2 (Autumn 1982), p. 268. Of thirteen categories of agricultural goods grown on a typical Pennsylvania farm, nine were consumed completely at home; only four of the categories, wheat, rye, fruit and flax were available for sale to produce a surplus for trade. p. 251 James Lemon lends implicit support to these arguments in his study of Pennsylvania agriculture, The Best Poor Man's Country By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the "agricultural village had become, in social terms, an anachronism." pp. 108-09.

markets, the means by which that participation occurred and the rules
governing the farmer's economic behavior remain elusive.

In the wake of James Henretta's argument that an agricultural
mentalité influenced rural behavior, a new emphasis on the goals and
aspirations of the colonial American has emerged, as well as on the
transformation of those goals into a useful reality for the family. His
thesis that farm families "were enmeshed also in a web of social
relationships and cultural expectations that inhibited the free play of
market forces," has served as a call for the study of colonial economic
behavior. More recently Christopher Clark has urged a synthesis
between the two approaches, one that considers the quantitative evidence
in the context of the social and cultural dimensions of rural New
England. Perhaps the concept of "competency" holds the greatest
prospect of helping answer this question. Daniel Vickers has propounded
this idea most clearly and forcefully. He considers the moral and
economic dimensions of "independence" along with the material standard
of living emphasized by Baker and Paterson in their study of early
nineteenth-century Massachusetts. Henretta and Vickers differ on the
extent of, and processes by which New England's culture affected the
economic behavior and work of the colonial in rural America.

This section studies both the diverse agricultural practice of the
family farm as well as its place within the context of a rural family
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13 Henretta, p. 19.
14 Christopher Clark, "Economics and Culture: Opening Up the Rural
History of the Early American Northeast," American Quarterly, vol. 43,
no. 2 (June 1991), pp. 279-301.
15 Vickers, pp. 3-29.
16 Vickers, pp. 3, 11; Andrew H. Baker and Holly Izard Paterson,
"Farmers' Adaptations to Markets in Early-Nineteenth Century
Massachusetts," in The Farm, Peter Benes, ed. Annual Proceedings of the
and community. For sons, farm production paralleled the household production of daughters; whether female or male the goal was to pass on useful skills that would serve them as mothers and fathers. The first two parts study Samuel’s acquisition of land in Stratham and the farm buildings he constructed to maintain his operation. The two staples of New England agriculture, field crops and livestock, are then taken up in succession. The discussion concludes with the role of land and agriculture in the design for his sons.

Samuel Lane’s record is instructive. He rarely articulated his aspirations, nor did he detail specific goals of his multifaceted business; his record is one of actions taken. Although actual practices differed over time, their substance remained remarkably constant throughout the more than sixty years his records cover. Competency was an ideal which rested comfortably with Deacon Lane. He directed his household toward, and achieved the circumstances for it. Culturally imposed restraints do not deny the existence of markets; they did steer him to some markets and not others, and certainly influenced the distribution of his gain. More significant is that he relinquished control over his accumulated wealth during his own lifetime. His daughters’ portions and sons’ landed gifts betray his disinterest in absolute control over property for its own sake; his principal motive was concern for his family’s security. For Samuel security implied a comfortable living standard, a degree of independence from a fickle marketplace and environment, and enjoyment of the goods bought, or produced in the course of his household’s everyday life.

Security transcended the bounds of the present and included his family’s past and future. The knowledge that his sons and daughters
founded their families in at least as favorable circumstances as his own was an important goal; the maintenance of a continuum from life in his father’s Hampton home to the birth of his great-grandchildren was central to all his actions and was an everpresent reality. In his copy of The Larger and Shorter Catechisms he wrote: “as I desire to do all the good I can to my children & others) while I live; So I desire to do some good with what I Leave behind me when I am gone.”17

Samuel’s spending and investment decisions manifested that purpose. Just as his daughters used their legacies to help forge the world that was to be theirs, Samuel harbored a similar vision for his sons that played itself out in Stratham’s fields and forests.

17NHHS, Lane Papers, The Larger and Shorter Catechisms.
"Laying my Money out in Land"

Six pages bound in the front of Samuel's ledger recording "all the Land that ever I bought (as near as I can remember)" emphasize the importance he attached to this resource. As the main source of wealth and income in America, land "immeasurably enhanced" the colonial quality of life. It was indispensable to almost every aspect of the Lane family's livelihood whether tanning and shoemaking, surveying, producing woolens, linens and dairy goods, or cultivating crops. Control of sufficient land determined the economic and social success of each venture. Almost without exception in eighteenth-century America, both law and custom invested this control in men. For Samuel only outright ownership, freehold tenure, ensured his family's independence, well-being and security. "Competency" in rural America implied the ownership of land.

Samuel purchased land for a variety of reasons. We have explored his buying and selling of unsettled lands in western New Hampshire as a manifestation of both community enterprise, the case of Bow, and as speculative ventures, his land in Effingham being one such example. We have also noted Samuel's use of it as a hedge against inflation, especially during wartime when paper money flooded provincial economies. But his main interest was in the lands he acquired around Stratham,
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1NHHS, Lane Account Book.
3Richard Bushman makes a similar point about the importance of land, "For the traditional peasant, land was a source of nearly every human need - nourishment, warmth, clothing. Landowners derived income from their property during illness and old age. Land was both subsistence and security. Planning for a season, a life, or for coming generations turned on the acquisition and use of land." p. 238.
lands he worked and improved, and whose value resulted from the income
he and his sons derived from its agricultural potential. He considered
his speculative lands commodities; I "think it to be a pretty good
Lot;" he wrote of a fifty acre lot in Pittsfield, because of its
"abundance of Pine Timber & good Wood &c." However, Samuel never
described his Stratham lands in the same manner. Those lands fit into
an intricate pattern of farming, and their full potential would not be
realized in the short term, but only in succeeding generations.

The site's prospect as a tanyard guided Samuel's initial purchase
of Stratham land. That led him to negotiate with Colonel Andrew Wiggin
in 1741 for a lot abutting a pond through which a Mill Brook ran. When
it proved unsuitable for building, Joseph Mason sold him land on the
south side of the mill pond, which made his two lots contiguous. Those
four acres afforded him space enough for tanning but hardly constituted
a farm. However, his father's example counseled patience. Joshua Lane
bought his first Hampton property, one acre, from his father in 1717,
the year before Samuel was born. He added 31 acres and 298 rods of land
to that parcel over the next 36 years.\(^5\) Much of the land Joshua
purchased was marsh or improved land so that his 33 acre total probably
was sufficient to support many of his family's food needs. That
experience offered Samuel the expectation that he too, could piece
together a farm over time.

Samuel began acquiring farmland soon after his marriage. In 1743
Joseph Mason sold him 2½ acres of low wet land lying between two

\(^4\)Samuel's son-in-law, Jonathan Clark, estimated, "there is Pine timber
enough on it, to Make 200,000 Boards." Lane Account Book. William
Cronon discusses the notion of land and its resources as commodities in
the second chapter of *Changes in the Land*.

\(^5\)NHSAR, Provincial Deeds 60:318; 40:401-03, 405-07.
branches of the mill brook lying to the east of his house. Samuel called it "my swamp," but that was hardly a term of opprobrium to the eighteenth-century farmer. Grasses suitable for hay grew abundantly in marsh land or lands lying along river and stream beds; lowland meadows produced 2 to 3 tons of hay per acre. However, this particular parcel apparently had been neglected by Mason and was not immediately productive. That spring, just at the time he bought the land, a flurry of fencing activity appears in his Day Book. His accounts delineate his need for land. Samuel took hay out of neighbor Mason's meadow, and he purchased an additional 1¾ loads of it that year to feed the mare, 2 cows and one calf he kept over the winter of 1743-44.

There is no mention of any activity in the "swamp" during 1744 even though his herd of stock increased as did his hay purchases. But during 1743 and 1744 Samuel was building a barn and improving his tanyard, activities which strained his limited resources, and that may explain his neglect of the parcel. This inactivity ended the following spring. Before June 10, 1745, he hired 25½ man days of labor, including his own, to clear the 2½ acres. On that warm June day he noted "I Lett my Swamp out to Daniel Thirston to clear." Those efforts bore fruit. On August 1, Richard Crocket mowed the "swamp," and two days later Moses Thirston hauled a load of hay from it. Although Samuel continued to
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8Diary, Day Book, 1743.
9Over the winter of 1744-45 he kept 3 cows, two calves and a pig. He bought 2½ loads of hay that year.
10Day Book, 1745.
11Day Book, 1745.
buy hay from others, he was on the road to foddering his livestock from his own land.

Trying to put together a farmstead in Stratham presented certain challenges. The town had been settled for well over a century and available open land was somewhat scarce although easier to come by than in older Hampton. Without sufficient capital to buy an entire farm lot, acquiring land on the main road between Exeter and Portsmouth meant that he had to persuade neighbors to sell him small parcels carved from their own holdings. That was not always an easy task.

By 1745 the Lanes were in a position to continue their acquisition of lands adjoining their houselot. The logical person to approach was Andrew Wiggin, the landowner with the greatest holdings in that area and who sold Samuel his first two-acre lot. During the winter of 1745-46 Samuel approached him about selling up to ten acres, and pleaded his case, "I wanted to Seek pasturing for my Creatures."12 His lack of pasture and growing herd of stock was a logistical problem. Samuel's 1745 Day Book outlined the machinations of a farmer without sufficient pasture. In May and June he remarked:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 20</td>
<td>put my cows in Ben Leavits pasture &amp; took my horse out &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>afterwards put my horse in 2 Days with the cows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9</td>
<td>took out my cows &amp; put in my horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17</td>
<td>put my cows in &amp; took my horse out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19</td>
<td>took my cows out. June 20 Horse &amp; cows both out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 23 &amp; 24</td>
<td>cows were in &amp; June 29 &amp; 3013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This game of musical livestock continued throughout the summer.

Wiggin remained noncommittal over the winter and put Samuel off with the excuse that he needed to look over the land before deciding.

It lay across the road from Wiggin's house and had lain unused for some

12 NHHS, Lane Papers, flr 1-4.
13 Day Book, 1745.
time. Samuel "pray'd him to go as Soon as he could," and even offered him a horse on which to view the land. The colonel declined the offer.

Samuel resumed his inquiries during the summer of 1746, when the cause of Wiggin's indecision became apparent. Wiggin went to Samuel on other business and the subject of the land was raised again. This time the colonel gave Samuel permission to stake out the land with his son, Esquire Bradstreet Wiggin. Soon after Bradstreet went to the shoe shop and Samuel recounted his most recent conversation with the elder Wiggin. Bradstreet also hesitated, and Samuel, sensing a reluctance asked him "after some considerable talk...whither he was willing I Should have the Land and what am I Should return to his father." Bradstreet's response must have been a disappointment, but it did clarify the issue, "he told me he could not Say he was willing any Land Should be Sold."

The younger Wiggin added that the property "twas his fathers and he might do what he pleas'd about it," but the son's opinion undoubtedly influenced the colonel's decision.

Perhaps there was tension between father and son over this issue for when they next met Bradstreet advised Samuel "to let it alone a week or fortnight longer." Finally on July 23, the Colonel came to Samuel's house and together the two went to measure ten acres of land; the colonel set the price on the spot, £225.14 Although hungry for land, Samuel balked at the price and over the course of the next two weeks bargained with the colonel. It appears that the two reached a satisfactory price but, for reasons unknown to Samuel, Wiggin still refused to sign a deed or take any money. Determined to get an answer

14Although he did not specify it, this figure is most likely in Old Tenor currency.
Samuel went to the Colonel's house, and there the cause of the reluctance was explicitly revealed; Wiggin told him, "that there was a reserve that if his Son was willing." Further conversations ensued, but Samuel ended this account on a melancholy note, "but all Signified Nothing." 15

His attempt to purchase this land is instructive. In an older settlement like Stratham land was neither readily available nor cheap. One with the resources to buy a farm outright probably would have had an easier time than did Samuel, who had to persuade his neighbors to diminish their own holdings if he were to increase his. Andrew Wiggin's ambivalence in this matter may have resulted in part from a sense of accommodation and neighborliness. Even had he no intention to sell his land, perhaps he saw his indecisiveness as indicating to Samuel his serious consideration of the request, and thus the desire to appear a good neighbor.

Certainly the process of alienating this tract raised the issue of conflicting interests between generations. Colonel Wiggin owned much property in that locale, and was not using this particular parcel which was overgrown with brush. However, his son opposed the sale. The Wiggin family, original holders of the Swamscott Patent, owned extensive property in Stratham; a small ten acre tract was probably of marginal value to the father nearing the end of his life. Considerable land would pass on to Bradstreet whether or not he sold this piece to Samuel.

15The account of his attempt to purchase this land is contained in a four page memorandum. NHHS, Lane Papers, flr 1-4. Included in the Lane Papers is a deed written in Samuel's hand conveying ten acres to him from Andrew Wiggin dated January 8, 1746/7. The stated price is £56-5-0 Lawful Money, equivalent to £225 Old Tenor. This was the agreement between the two that was never consummated. Lane Papers, flr 2-4.
Even though his father might have been at the stage in his life where
the land meant little, son Bradstreet conceived of it as his legacy and
was loath to have that diminished. Their cultural perspectives probably
differed little, but the generational difference caused each to perceive
this episode quite differently. In the context of his extensive
holdings, Andrew Wiggin's experience might well have indicated that the
land would be little use to his son. Looking ahead, Bradstreet saw it
as security as he faced an unknown future.

In 1752, nearly six years after these negotiations, Samuel
purchased 22 acres from Andrew Wiggin, a plot which contained the
disputed ten acres from 1746. The timing of this sale suggests
Bradstreet's opposition determined the Colonel's earlier refusal.
Bradstreet died in July, 1752 and on September 29 Samuel went with
Andrew Wiggin to see the land. Seven days later, Wiggin signed the
deed. While Bradstreet was alive there was no further discussion about
the land between Samuel and Colonel Wiggin. His prompt sale of the land
after his son's death suggests that his personal reservations about
parting with the land were minor.

The problem of engrossing land was an important consideration to
young families in New Hampshire's established seacoast communities.
After his purchase of the swamp in 1743, Samuel had to wait nearly ten
years before he was able to buy more adjacent property. Patching
together the ninety-six acres that eventually comprised the Lane farm
took thirty-six years. It contained the whole of Joseph Mason's former
fifty acre farm as well as abutting land. Table 8 summarizes the
progression of land purchases made for the Lane home farm. His
daughters' families, either by choice or necessity, took a different
droute to secure their family farms.

Table 8 - Land Purchased for Home Farm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SELLER</th>
<th>ACREAGE</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Andrew Wiggin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Joseph Mason</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Joseph Mason</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Andrew Wiggin</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>Benjamin Hoag</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>Joseph Mason Jr</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Nathan Hoag</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>Emersons' Heirs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td>Joseph Mason</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NHHS, Lane Account Book.

The experiences of Joseph Clark, Jonathan Clark and Matthew
Thompson, all sons-in-law of Samuel, stand out in sharp contrast to
Samuel's efforts at acquiring Stratham land, and point to the different
circumstances on the seacoast and frontier. One month before his
marriage to Susanna Lane in February 1773, his father sold Jonathan
Clark 80 acres of land in Northwood, "together with the House and Barn
Standing thereon." Jonathan's brother, Joseph, purchased 50 acres of
land in Northwood the year before his marriage to Bathsheba Lane in
1777; one year later he purchased an additional 15 acres. Together the
two parcels comprised their farm. And Matthew Thompson bought "one
whole lot of Land in Sandbornton" in 1777, six years before his marriage
to Sarah Lane.16 In the sparsely settled western towns, each suitor
easily bought land enough to support a family without having to wait for

16 NHSA Deeds, Clark-Clark 179:280; Norris-Clark 108:224; Chandler-
years, and at relatively inexpensive prices when compared to land prices in Stratham. Perhaps the experience of their relatives by marriage, John and Mary Crockett, helped point them to New Hampshire’s interior.

Mary, the oldest Lane child, married Stratham tanner and cordwainer John Crockett in 1762. Just where they lived after their nuptials is not clear. The first record of John owning land appears in 1765 when he bought 4 Stratham acres from James Cate. Three years later Ephraim Crockett, John’s father, sold him 8 acres with buildings on the Country Road; probably this was the property that they called home for the first years of their marriage. The young Crockett homestead had grown to twenty acres by April 1777, but that was too small a farm to support their family of six children. Three of John Crockett’s brothers had left Stratham for Gorham, Maine and established farms there; perhaps their successes and the birth of yet another son, James, on April 14, 1777 forced the couple to reevaluate their existence in Stratham. Samuel accompanied his son-in-law to Northwood on November 18, 1778 where Crockett signed a deed with Elias Philbrick for 55 acres of land with buildings. Three days later the two were back in Northwood measuring the land Crockett had bought. One of those buildings must have been a house for at January’s end Samuel wrote in his diary, “John Crockett & Family Remov’d to Northwood.”

John and Mary’s aspirations appear to have mirrored those of their parents; competency dictated that John Crockett supplement his skills as a tanner and cordwainer with a viable family farm of his own. However, after fifteen years of marriage in Stratham, the Crockets had small holdings and a large family. Their example must have been a clear

---

lesson to their siblings and peers in the community. Unless blessed with family land as were William and Martha (Lane) Bordman, opportunity lay in the less settled western towns. When Samuel followed a similar strategy 30 years earlier leaving Hampton for Stratham, towns farther west such as Northwood were not viable options. Perhaps his father proffered the advice he later recollected, “Epping and Brentwood, was counted too far in the Woods to Settle.”

The recurrence of Indian warfare severely limited the safe areas for settlement then. By 1760 the line of settlement in central New Hampshire was west of the Merrimack River which offered Samuel’s children opportunities not available to him. One advantage of more areas open to settlement is clear; the Crockett’s fifty-five acre Northwood farm cost only £23 more than the proceeds from the sale of his twenty Stratham acres.

Acquisition of land was only the first step in the process of establishing a productive farm. Very often land required improvements, and whether in Northwood or Stratham, the effort expended to transform wild or overgrown land into productive acreage was considerable. The land Bradstreet Wiggin opposed his father selling Samuel was surrounded by farms yet lay unused and neglected. This 22 acres was east of the Lane house and north of Samuel’s swamp and the mill brook. He intended the land to be pasture and hayfields, and he wasted little time in starting to clear it. After the 1752 harvest and an eighteen day surveying trip to Holderness, Samuel began work on his new land.

---

18 Journal, p. 25.
19 See the maps in Clark, pp. 66, 335.
20 The £166 lawful money John Crocket paid for 12 acres in Stratham would nearly have paid the £195 that his three brothers-in-law together paid for their farms in Northwood and Sanbornton.
Samuel outlined the steps he undertook to ready the land for pasture in "an account of the Work I do on y° Land I bought of Coll Wiggin Calling Victuals & Drink & work at 24° p Day & oxen 20° p Day."²¹ First, trees were cut and the logs removed, followed by digging or pulling out the stumps. After the bigger trees were cut, they cleared brush and put it in piles to be burned in the spring. Most of this activity took place from December to April. Other than clearing the land, fencing it was the most labor-intensive task. Throughout January and February workers hauled fencing materials to the site for the log fence. On March 22, 1753 Samuel and Ben Mason cut stake timber for the fence and the next day hauled it to the land. Almost a month after that they split the stakes and began putting up the fence. The stakes served to hold logs in position as they were laid one upon the other. Several days later, working with a crew of seven others on a cold April day, Samuel "was hurt by the fall of a tree."²² The injury did not stop Samuel from traveling; two days later he went with his family to Hampton for daughter Sarah's baptism, but it did stop the fencing work for nearly a month. They resumed that on May 14.

When they began fencing the pasture again, Samuel referred to "making a cross fence."²³ This probably crossed the land, dividing the parcel into two fields, one for hay and one for stock grazing. Twenty-

²¹Diary, 4/20/53.
²²Diary, 4/20/53.
²³It is possible but unlikely that this refers to a "zig-zag," criss-cross or Virginia fence, a type of fencing rarely used in New England. The rails essentially supported themselves because their ends were crossed with the next section at an angle creating the zig-zag shape. Its advantage was that lighter stakes and less digging was required than for standard post and rail fencing. See Howard Russell, A Long Deep Furrow, pp. 185-91, for a discussion of the types of fences and methods of their construction.
two acres was more than sufficient to pasture his small herd of animals, and he almost certainly used the fence to keep animals out of his hayfield. With the completion of the cross fence on May 30, the planned improvements were nearly completed. The final task was the construction of bridges over the mill brook to connect his swamp with the newly improved pasture. The twenty-two acres adjoined Samuel's land across the brook, but otherwise was surrounded by the land of Colonel Wiggin, Nathan Hoag and Joseph Mason. Samuel had a right of way over Joseph Mason's land from his swamp, and bridges over the brook connected his pasture to that passageway.

Table 9 shows the totals of the work done on the land:

**TABLE 9 - WORK IMPROVING LANE PASTURE, Nov. 1752 - June 1753**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF WORK</th>
<th>MAN-DAYS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting up logs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauling wood and logs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stumping</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting bushes</td>
<td>9½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing and related tasks</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making bridges</td>
<td>3½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General labor - clearing</td>
<td>25½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oxen (yoke day)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (LABOR)</strong></td>
<td><strong>95½</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane Papers, Day Book, 1752.

*1 man-day is the labor of 1 man for 1 day. 1 yoke day is the work of a pair of oxen for 1 day.

Samuel estimated the cost of this 95½ days of labor, "reckoning in Provisions," at £106-8-0 Old Tenor, 9.7% of the purchase price of the 22 acre piece. 24 Certainly those costs exceeded 10% of the land's value if

---

24 Although he does not specify "Victuals & Drink," rum was undoubtedly the "Drink." Over the same period Samuel purchased 7½ gallons of rum in Greenland and Portsmouth.
the bridge and fencing materials, the additional clearing and fencing work, and the plowing and sowing hayseed done in 1753 and 1754 are factored in. Thus, even on relatively clear land the costs of improvement could be substantial.

After a winter and spring's work, the new field was rough at best. After years of lying fallow weeds, bushes and trees had crowded out the grass, and any remaining grasses would have been of poor quality. Samuel pastured his stock in the new field in 1753, but planned to sow grass seed following its use as pasture over the summer. His cows played their part also; their browsing served to keep down the bushes and weeds, and they graciously provided manure to plow into the soil.

Clearing began again in September when Samuel and his apprentice set fire to the brush to get rid of it and add nutrients to the soil from the ash. He began plowing the land on November 19. Breaking up land in that condition was hard work for both man and beast. On that day his crew - "w^m Pottles 2 oxen & plow & Sam^l Neals steers N^2 Mason & 2 oxen 20^8 And^2 Wiggin & 2 Steers 15^8. mySelf & Sam 20^8," a total of eight oxen, three men and a boy - spent half a day plowing. The following two days five men with oxen and plows worked the land.25 Clearing and fencing the field continued the following spring. Almost certainly the new field was in no condition for haying during 1753. However, that year's work bore fruit in the following: "we Judge I Cut 6 Load of Hay in my New Field," Samuel recorded after the hay season ended in July 1754.26

---
25 Day Book, 1753.
26 Day Book, 1754.
For the immediate future the new field relieved Samuel of his pasturing woes. Although he lamented in 1748, "I am trying to purchase [land] but can't have any opportunity to bye any that suits me," and what would have suited him best was Stratham farmland, the next best alternative was the 26 Exeter acres he and Nathan Hoag purchased the next year. Not a prime property, "we co'd not get any where to lay our Money out better which Daily Sunk in its Vaille in our hands," Samuel later wrote of the problems they encountered in Exeter:

we improved it together about 14 months; when we Meeting with Difficulty with the Cattle in y^e Pasture, Hoag being Discouraged, I Set a price, & he chose to Sell his part: then I owned it all; but it being So remote, was not profitable to Either of us; and I Sold the whole...to Mrs Odiorne I think in 1757, and was glad when I had got rid of it.27

Its Exeter location was an inconvenience and added expense. In November 1752, Moses Kenison charged Samuel 9 shillings to bring a heifer from Exeter to Stratham.28 Also, leaving valuable stock unattended in a distant pasture caused enough anxiety to justify his hiring pasture in Stratham for six sheep and a calf in 1752. The problem with the cattle which so discouraged Nathan Hoag probably related to the integrity of the fences. Samuel hired Daniel Thirston to mend the fencing in 1752, but he was not satisfied finding that work "verry poorly" done.29

The trials of piecing together farmland which beset Samuel during the 1740s lessened by the mid-1750s. In 1757 Benjamin Hoag sold Samuel 18 acres abutting his 22 acre parcel, and he was able to buy several other small contiguous lots to consolidate his holdings. The crowning

28Another example of additional expense was transporting hay from Exeter to Stratham. On June 19, 1752 Samuel Cate hauled hay from Exeter with two teams for £1-10-0. Day Book, 1752.
29Day Book, 1752.
step in this progression was his purchase of the 44 acre Mason farm in 1777. With that he owned nearly 100 acres on either side of the mill brook. Why his landed fortunes turned at that point is uncertain, but a combination of factors probably contributed to this success. Samuel was certainly in better financial circumstances as time passed and negotiated higher prices for the land he bought. He paid a low of £13 per acre for his first Stratham lot, and a high price of £147 to Nathan Hoag in 1760. Even discounting the latter for inflation, Samuel was paying more for property in real terms.

Also, sellers’ ages and changing personal circumstances played a role. Like Andrew Wiggin, Joseph Mason and Nathan Hoag probably had less need for land as they aged and were more willing to part with parcels on the periphery of their property. When Mason sold his entire farm to Samuel in 1777, he used the proceeds to buy another farm in Epping. Samuel noted a series of exchanges during in 1777 which detail Neighbor Mason’s purchase from Daniel Wilson on February 13 and Samuel’s purchase of Mason’s farm the following day. On April 4 Samuel traveled to Epping and paid Wilson some money, and again on the 30th when “pd Wilson all:” he wrote, “& nF Mason all but 10f for wh I gave him a note without Interest.”

Ever since Mason aided Samuel by selling the house lot in 1741, Samuel’s affection for him never wavered. He helped Mason move his goods to Epping; Thomas Hatch, Samuel’s apprentice, “went to Eppin wth nF Mason gratis” on February 15, and both he and Samuel helped transport their neighbor’s goods westward on several other occasions.

30 Diary, 2/13/77, 2/14/77, 4/4/77, 4/30/77. Mason agreed to pay Wilson £4500 old Tenor for 50 acres “together with the buildings thereon.” Samuel probably paid Wilson the £4500 and Mason another £1500. NHSA, Deeds 109:147.
31 See Diary, 2/15/77, 2/17/77, 2/18/77, 2/19/77, 3/3/77, 3/8/77.
At times neighborly relations were affected by misunderstanding and confrontation resulting from parcels defined by few fixed or natural bounds. Surveying was inexact at best, and boundary descriptions relied on impermanent monuments such as stakes, stone piles and trees. To eliminate unpleasantness and the expense of conflict between neighbors, often agreements were drafted to clarify the ambiguities of ownership and the responsibilities of abutters. Samuel entered into such an agreement with Dudley Leavitt in 1757 after he bought land from Benjamin Hoag so that "a full and final Division of fences between Said Lands, may be made and had; forever hereafter." After dividing ownership and responsibility for the upkeep of fences, the two further "Agree'd...that Notwithstanding the fence between them is Somewhat Crooked; yet it is their full Intent and Meaning that the Line between their Said Lands Shall be a Straight Line." To insure the agreement would be honored by both parties including their heirs and assigns, they agreed to a £100 bond.32

Not all such encounters between neighbors ended so amicably. An arbitrators' decision dated April 11, 1766 details a "Controversy concerning Some Incroachments- that 5th Lane made upon the Mill preveledge" claimed by William Pottle, Simon Wiggin and Jonathan Wiggin." Samuel apparently overstepped his boundaries, cutting timber and grass on the others' property and fencing land he did not own. Rather than suing in a provincial court with all the attendant expense, both parties bound themselves "to the Judgement & final Determination of" a five member committee of local men. Samuel lost his case on all

32NHHS, flr 2-2, Agreement Leavit-Lane, 5/17/57. There is a similar agreement between Lane and Andrew Wiggin III dated 4/7/60.
counts, had to reimburse the complainants for their losses, move his
fences and pay the costs of the arbitration. However, the opposing
party's tactics so upset Samuel that he displayed emotions nowhere else
found in his written record.33

In a February 5, 1766 letter addressed to the Reverend Joseph
Adams, the Stratham minister, William Pottle Jr. and Jonathan Wiggin
accused Samuel of being "guilty of the Breach of the tenth Commandment
much to the Damage of us as well as Some others." They asked the
preacher "to take proper Notice of the Same and that the Matter may be
Inquired in."34 Hardly in the same league with adultery or theft, in
this case the 10th Commandment - "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's
house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his servant, nor
his maid, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his" - referred
to the above property dispute. Samuel must have become aware of the
accusation around February 28 for that day he went to see "Pottle &
Jona".

Most distressing to Samuel was that this disagreement would be
taken out of its secular setting and contested in the church. He was
incensed and called it "the Devils work." "I have been treated
reproached vilified," he wrote in the draft of a letter to the Reverend
Adams, but most heinous of all was the "complaint made to the Chh
without previous Seraphine Steps." The accusers "left no
stone...untarn'd to Slander & reproach me," Samuel wrote, and:

    if the Nature of the thing Should lead me to bee Earnest & even warm
    I hope you will Excuse me Considering the Extraordinary Accusations
    bro't against me many of which must be look'd upon by you Gent'n to
    be altogether incredible, & even nothing but perfect Calumny.

33NHHS, Lane Papers, flr 1-4.
34NHSA, STR, BOX 2.
With the dispute out in the open and the complaint framed in religious terms, Samuel's moral reputation in the community was at risk. The personal nature of this attack made the stakes in this contest high, thus it is not surprising that Samuel expressed such depth of emotion. He explained that "oppression will make a wise man mad." 35

There followed at least four meetings with various parties including those who would become arbiters in the dispute as well as church deacons and elders. The arbitration began on April 1 and concluded on April 11 after three meetings. The different tone Samuel used when referring to his accusers suggests that he believed William Pottle to be the instigator of the trouble. "I went to Pottle & Jonas," he wrote, using Wiggin's given name; it was "Pottles Arbitration" when noted in his diary. 36 Samuel moved his fence within a month of the arbitration, but the hurt and recrimination lingered. Perhaps to resolve any remaining hard feelings Samuel and the church elders met on May 20 with Mr. Pottle, William Pottle's father, in hopes of quieting any remaining controversy. Samuel never mentioned the affair again; perhaps the intercession of Pottle's father helped calm the waters.

The constant disputes attending the transfer and ownership of land dissuaded few from aspiring to ownership. Even as Samuel pieced together farmland on his homeplace, he was acquiring properties elsewhere in Stratham with several purposes in mind. In his bargain with John Piper in 1761, Samuel bought 19½ acres at Great Hill and nearly six acres of salt marsh as well as Piper's farm. The Great Hill land was both pasture and woodland and Samuel purchased an additional 7

35 NHHS, Lane Papers, fir 1-4.
acres there in 1768. He also acquired 5 acres of woodland at Walnut Hill. Much later he added to his holdings of woodland with the purchase in 1790 of 52 acres straddling the border between Exeter and Newmarket. These lands gave Samuel versatility; the salt marshes provided hay and the woodlands produced lumber for sale and for firewood.

Despite his land acquisitions during the 1750s, Samuel wanted to farm still more acreage. Stratham selectmen (he was one) leased him the 30 acre parsonage for £5 in 1751, although Samuel made no mention of this arrangement in his own accounts until 1760. The parsonage lay just north of his property on the Country Road. In 1760 the lease was a losing proposition; the high cost of labor put him in the red. His costs, including planting, harvesting and rent, were £174 and the resulting income from 30 bushels of corn, as well as beans and potatoes was £125. He noted the sad conclusion of this episode, "Lost 49-0-0."^37

That loss on his lease did not deter him from buying more property. Perhaps most impressive was his purchase of other farms in Stratham. Table 10 illustrates the three farms, and two houses on relatively small lots Samuel purchased between 1756 and 1786. His designs for three of these properties became evident when his sons married. He viewed the others as investment opportunities, or perhaps as community support in his purchase of the town parsonage land. In all Samuel purchased about 306 acres of land in Stratham in addition to several houses and barns.

The Piper farm purchased in 1761 lay north of Samuel's own house on the Country Road beyond the land of Andrew Wiggin. Its price was

---

^37 Day Book, 1760.
substantial, but after 20 years in Stratham, Samuel's various businesses were thriving and he could well afford the £356 purchase price.

TABLE 10 - STRATHAM FARMS PURCHASED, 1756-1786

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SELLER</th>
<th>ACREAGE</th>
<th>PRICE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Morris Fling</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>10-10-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>John Piper</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>356-10-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>George Veasey</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>135-00-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>John Robinson</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>160-00-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Wiggin</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>36-08-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


However, with that acquisition he may have reached the limit of his ability to farm his land at that point in time. His situation differed from many farmers who often looked to hire sons out because there was not enough work on the family farm. In early nineteenth-century Rowley, Massachusetts, the 50 acre Jackson farm "provided barely enough, even in the summer season, to keep Caleb, his father and mother, brother Samuel, and sister Sally employed." For Samuel in 1761 with two sons sixteen and fourteen, an apprentice working in the shop and on the farm, and other responsibilities pressing, particularly his work as clerk for the Bow Proprietors, he had reached the limit of his labor reserves without having to spend more time himself on his 50 acre farm. Until his sons were a bit older his solution was to lease the Piper farm.

Peletiah Crockett leased the farm in 1761, not long after Samuel bought it on February 4. The arrangement served both parties well. Peletiah was the brother of John Crocket, who Samuel had instructed in tanning and who was engaged to Mary Lane. Just after taking up the lease Peletiah's first daughter was born. Tenancy served several

38Vickers, p. 4.
purposes for all involved. The land was productive immediately and enjoyed improvements with no extra effort required by Samuel. The Crocketts owned little Stratham property, therefore leasing this farm allowed Peletiah to remain near his parents, begin his own family and save money. Moreover, with the marriage of John and Mary looming, this lease forged another link between the two families.

The agreement allowed Samuel half the farm’s produce with the following exception, “Pasturing about the Value of 3 Cows at y e Hill & privilieg of Cutting 2 Load of Salt Hay on y e Marsh where I please & Liberty of Selling y e 2 acre piece of Marsh, & Apples for family use.” Crocket was obligated to repair and maintain the fences, to deliver half the cider to Samuel’s dwelling house, to stock the land with 2 cows and 4 sheep matching Samuel’s stock, and to allow Samuel the right to go into Piper’s former house to get his half of the English and Indian corn. The house itself must have been in some disrepair; the lease specified that the English corn “be winnowed at the House.” He tore down the house in 1768.

The versatility and productivity of this farm is revealed by “the Incomes of my Farm improv’d to the halves by Pelh Crocket this year 1761” shown below. That income, £33-10-0 (£670 Old Tenor), represented a 9.4% return on the £356-10-0 purchase price of the Piper farm. Not only did this arrangement make Samuel a more productive farmer, the rate of return was higher than the typical 6% he was getting for his “money at use.”

Peletiah Crocket’s tenure as tenant lasted only one year yet his experience corroborates Edwin Perkin’s contention that leasing was a

---

39 Day Book, 1760.
strategy aimed at farm ownership during the eighteenth century. Perkins estimated that one could accumulate enough capital to purchase a farm in three to five years working another's property.40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wool</td>
<td>26-00-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>17-12-00(24.7#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese</td>
<td>52-00-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veal</td>
<td>12-14-00(50.5#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calfskin</td>
<td>3-16-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apples</td>
<td>12-00-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cider</td>
<td>90-00-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax seed</td>
<td>4-00-00(1 bu.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax</td>
<td>12-00-00(22#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>7-10-00(2.5 bu.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Corn</td>
<td>120-00-00(30 bu.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes, Beans</td>
<td>21-00-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>154-00-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasturing</td>
<td>135-00-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>669-04-00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NHHS, Day Book, 1761.

The year on Samuel's Piper place must have solidified Peletiah's finances. He purchased 50 acres in Gorham, Maine on May 31, 1762, and a house lot there in 1764. It is not clear exactly when his family moved, but his daughter Phebe was born in Stratham on July 4, 1762, and daughter Rebecca was born in Gorham in 1767.41

Samuel may not have leased the farmland again, however, he did rent the house to Samuel Neal. Neal, formerly an apprentice of Jonathan Wiggin, worked in Samuel's shop making shoes and did occasional labor.42 Unlike the previous year, Samuel worked at the "lower place" himself in 1762. He sowed rye and fenced in April, and pastured his cows there in May; Neal's rent conferred no rights to the land and he paid Samuel an

---

40Perkins, p.59.
42NHSA, Probate 14:338.
additional charge for pasturing his cow there. Neal rented the house for several years; on February 20, 1766 the two "agreement to Ballance all accot" (Except House Rent)."\(^{43}\) When they began to rent the house Samuel and Elizabeth Neal had four children; another son followed in 1764. There are no records of Neal having owned any land; he continued to live in Stratham, sired five more children and died there in 1790.\(^{44}\)

Paul Clemens and Lucy Simler's study of Chester County, Pennsylvania found a growing "cottager" class of landless tenants that provided wage laborers for the area.\(^{45}\) That trend is absent from Stratham because the capital necessary to stock a leased farm was sufficient to buy and settle land in the frontier townships. In 1775 an observer pointed out that tenants were uncommon in New England because the lower classes "aim at saving money enough to fix them into a settlement; their industry rarely fails of its end, so the evening of an industrious life is universally that of a little planter in the midst of all necessaries."\(^{46}\)

For Peletiah Crocket leasing the Piper farm from Samuel was the final step in his quest for property. Depressed real estate values after a prolonged period of speculation certainly helped Crocket.\(^{47}\) And Peletiah knew from Samuel's example that "by and large, productivity gains and increases in property values accrued to those families that

\(^{43}\)Pay Book, 1763, 1766.
\(^{44}\)Emma E. Brigham, Neal Family (Springfield, Mass.: 1938), p. 22;
Priscilla Hammond, "Vital Records of Stratham, New Hampshire 1700-1867," p. 31. Neal may well have possessed property although no record exists. Many deeds went unrecorded, particularly if the property passed between family members.
\(^{45}\)Clemens and Simler, pp. 112, 117.
\(^{46}\)American Husbandry, pp. 48, 53.
actually cleared and worked the land. 48 In New England, those families also owned the land, so Peletiah worked his way out of the lease as quickly as possible.

Samuel's several skills positioned him to succeed at acquiring property, although it did not come without hard work and perseverance. As a surveyor, he knew about land and its value, and his writing skills allowed him to write the deeds and agreements that facilitated property transfers. His work as a tanner and shoemaker provided the capital to buy real estate, and his farmland reciprocated by providing hides and skins for his business. Most important, land afforded his family security that was available through no other vehicle. As a hedge against the bouts of mid-century inflation, as a source of food at a time when periodic droughts had "Multitudes...beging for a handful of corn," and as a mechanism to inculcate values and a way of life in his children, the family farm was indispensable. But land itself was not sufficient; improvements to, and cultivation of the land underlay the promise of security and competency.

48Perkins, p. 60.
"Raised an Addition to my Barn"

TO BE SOLD or LETT, A Farm lying in Stratham, distant eleven Miles from Portsmouth, and four from Exeter. It contains One Hundred and Fifty Acres of Mowing, Tillage and Pasture Land, with several Acres of Salt-Marsh, has a fine Growth of young Wood upon it, an Orchard, and a large Dwelling House and Barn.

New Hampshire Gazette, March 20, 1772

Samuel Lane would have read the above advertisement with interest even though he was well acquainted with the property and the circumstances surrounding its sale. It lay just down the Country Road from his own farm, was Moses Leavitt's former home and part of Dudley Leavitt's estate. Paine Wingate, the controversial minister at Hampton Falls, purchased the farm and settled on it. Samuel measured the farm for Wingate in May 1773, an event which inaugurated a long friendship between the two. The description lists the essential elements of an eighteenth-century farm, although a purchase price of £450 Lawful Money (£9160 Old Tenor) and 150 acres were a larger than the average.¹ The farm had six categories of land: mowing, tillage, pasture, salt marsh, woodland and orchard. Buildings mentioned were a house and barn. These characteristics of the landscape, coupled with careful stewardship and good agricultural practice, accounted for much of New Hampshire's prosperity.

Most of the entries in Samuel's diary are related to cultivation of the land. Successful farming depended on the weather. Rain, or the lack of it, affected the timing of spring and fall plowing, and Samuel's records of rainfall help explain the condition of the crops in the fields. There was little he could do about the weather; he noted it

sometimes with amazement when unusual circumstances prevailed, but with little emotion. God's will alone, not human hopes, could provide relief from the climatic extremes Samuel recorded. But there was much else that humans could do to reduce the risk of poor crop yields and the threat of famine.

Samuel did his best to follow good husbandry practice and it appears that he devoted increasing time and effort to his agricultural endeavors even though farming was not as profitable as some of his other businesses and trades.² Surrounded by the fairly large farms of wealthy landowners like the Wiggins and Wingates may have heightened his own aspirations and led him to put more effort into farming than otherwise might have been warranted. After 1770, on deeds and other documents, he was infrequently labeled tanner or cordwainer, his earlier titles, but "Esquire" or Deacon Lane. The fortunes of his land and their continued prosperity, were a basis for his elevated position in the community. Thus, the acquisition of land, its improvement and use were the critical elements of his journey from shoemaker to Esquire.

Buildings and agriculture went hand-in-hand in colonial New Hampshire. Because of the climate, farm families spent a good deal of time inside processing the produce cultivated during the short growing season. There was probably no structure on the typical farm unrelated to agriculture in some way. The first structure Samuel built on his lot in 1741 was a dwelling, but we have already noted that "having no Barn," that first winter, he dried seven hides in the house. Dairy products,

flax, wool, fruits and vegetables all were processed inside. The separation between the activities of dwelling and farming was narrow indeed in the colonial farmhouse.

After erecting his house, Samuel's next priority was his leather trades. Clearly, he believed those skills were the foundation of his financial prosperity in the early years of his marriage. He seemed somewhat ambivalent towards the gain to be realized from farming; "having no Creatures to look after this Winter but a Pig;" he wrote in 1742, "I went to work night and Day, to pay my Debts."\(^3\) At that point then, farming was a distraction from the real work at hand, paying down his £70 debt by working his leather. However, farming was never far from his thoughts.

Much of his energy during 1742 went into constructing his tanyard and building a shop. The first winter of his marriage he boarded his cows with others; the second winter his animals stayed at home in the barkhouse which he had roofed and sided that summer. Even though he owned only four acres of land, a barn was a necessity and he built one during the summer of 1743. Samuel realized, like those before and after him, that "successful farming in New Hampshire without a barn has never been possible."\(^4\)

The barn he raised was modest, 36 feet wide and 20 feet deep. On July 11, 1743, Samuel credited Bradstreet Wiggin £5 for a barn frame. That cost fell between the £4 he paid for the frame of his 24 x 26 foot barkhouse and the £18 materials and labor cost to raise his house

\(^3\)Journal, p. 29.
frame.5 This barn had several levels for hay storage with a scaffold at the front, a main scaffold over the center aisle and a scaffold in the northeast corner.6 Although adequate in the early years when his farm was small, as his acreage increased, this barn proved too little. His purchase of Morris Fling's property in 1756 included a barn which he called his "little Barn," but soon after even that added space proved inadequate for his farm's increasing output. He added an "End" to the front of the barn in 1761, doubling the structure's size. After this addition Samuel mentioned a new storage area, a scaffold over the cows at the front of the barn.

A 1782 addition at the other end, closest to the mill pond, mirrored the 1761 structure. Samuel called it his "New Brn," and that year he put hay on his "New Scaffold." By the 1780s he mentioned specific areas designated for horses, cows and oxen. The Lane barn was less grand than that of Timothy Walker, Concord, NH's minister.

Walker's barn was 40 x 100 feet with perpendicular aisles, a granary, scaffolds and bays for livestock. There was a lean-to on the south side for cattle and horses.7 Samuel's additions created the 36 x 60 foot building with a single center aisle and six bays on either side which stands today on the Lane property. He continued to use his "little Barn" for hay storage as well. These structures were probably similar to others in the area. Elizabeth, widow of prosperous Stratham farmer

5Day Book, 1743; NHHS, Lane Papers, 5/20/41 contract, flr 1-3; 3/2/41 contract, flr 2-3.
6See Day Book, 1760, "where I lay my hay."
7Walker, "The Farm of the First Minister," p. 17.
Satchel Clark, was accorded use of the "least Barn" as part of her dower; the 50' long main barn was divided among three of her children.8

There was no indispensable need for other farm buildings. In 1769 Samuel built a corn house to store Indian corn after it was husked. Known today as a corn crib, the structure was designed to keep rodents away from the grain; his purchase of a rat trap implies this was a nuisance. The only other mention in his papers is a "Shed" built at the same time as his new barn in 1782. This probably was the "new ox house" in which he began to store hay in 1783; most likely this was a free-standing structure and not like Timothy Walker's lean-to because of its overhead for storing hay. Samuel's several references to a "horse house" in the early 1780s probably refer to the barn bay for horse stabling because at other times he notes storing hay "over Horse & Cows."9

Samuel and Mary were able to provide shelter for their livestock, but after ten years of marriage similar concerns arose over shelter for their growing family. By 1752 Mary and Samuel had four children with another on its way. Their house, 26 x 28 feet in dimension, was two stories and had six rooms, and they decided to enlarge it that year. There is no record of this addition's size; "I think to build my Cellar 8 feet Wide 10 Long 11 Deep," he mused, but may have decided not to dig a full cellar under the addition.10 Those dimensions, if in fact the size of the addition, would have added only two rather small rooms to

---
8Satchel Clark's inventory was valued at £655-11-10 Lawful Money (£13,112 Old Tenor). If Daniels' economic class scheme has any meaning for 1774, Clark's estate would place him among the prosperous in New Hampshire. RC Probate #4070; Daniels, p. 60.
9Day Books, 1781-84.
10Day Book, 1752. He only dug a partial cellar under the house in 1741.
his house. The two story addition had a bedchamber on the second floor with a garret above. The first floor may have been designed as a new kitchen. When he rebuilt chimneys three years later he noted "my Backroom Chimney Now is 6½ X 4½ feet wide my Mantletrees 4 1/3 high," and compared it to "Abrm Tiltons Chimney 5 X 3 feet." That year he constructed three chimneys, probably one at each end of the house and a third in the back addition. He penned a memorandum "to Make all y° Stockholes & cupboards & Shelves I can and hearths as big as I can." Also references to "making Cupboard Cheesepress &c" as well as the "old oven" reinforce suggestions that the new addition provided space for a kitchen at the rear of the house.\textsuperscript{11}

Another reason for moving the kitchen may have been linked to wells and the water supply. Their original well was in the front of the house and adequate for the needs of a young family. However, the combination of a larger household and the severe drought in 1749 might have taxed the old well's capacity. However tenuous the link, the drought and the well were tied together in Samuel's mind. When he remembered that "Anthony Pevy began to Dig my 2\textsuperscript{nd} Well behind my House," he immediately followed it with a comment about "the great Drought" in 1749.\textsuperscript{12} Were Samuel and Mary considering an addition at that time, a well outside the new kitchen would have made sense.

If the effort and expense expended to dig this well is any indication, clearly it must have been needed. Anthony Pevy began digging on October 1 and "quitted" after working "a Spell" on November 3. After 27 days he appears to have made little progress although

\textsuperscript{11}Pey Book, 1755.
\textsuperscript{12}Journal, p. 34.
Samuel wrote that they "come to water" on the 15th. Two days after Pevy left the job a different crew began work on the well. William Burley began blasting with powder on a regular basis throughout November. Another setback came on the 20th when the well caved in. Finally on December 5, the digging finished. From December 8 to 11 they stoned the well; one of those days seven men worked together on the project. The cost was impressive, £172 including labor, tools and materials. Samuel later revealed the cause of the difficulty in his Journal, "my Well...has been very costly in Diging & Blowing 8 feet in a Rock."  

The Lane house was most likely a modest affair although Samuel took some pains to appoint it fashionably. The exterior was painted clapboards. Painting was not very common in the 1740s and Timothy Walker wrote to his son in 1757, "One article we have at present under consideration is, whether or no to paint ye outside. Am advised to do it by ye best Judges & particularly Col. Rolfe."  

Samuel hired Timothy Jones to "make good handsome fashionable & Strong window crowns...also a Larg handsome Door crown" in addition to other exterior trim. The appearance of their house was of some concern to the young couple.

Most likely the interior layout was typical. The division of Satchel Clark's house among his heirs in 1774 suggests a similar design although the Clark homestead had a central chimney. His widow was allotted "the Westerly End...as far as the Chimney, from bottom to the top thereof," and the children were allotted the kitchen at the back of

13Journal, p. 35.
15NHHS, Lane Papers, flr 1-3.
the house, the bedroom with a chimney above it, a corner bedroom "with
the back Entry Way," the chamber and the garret.\textsuperscript{16}

Although it took several years to complete, the interior of the
Lane house was plastered, and the great room was finished with wainscot,
four panel doors, and casings for the windows, posts and doors.\textsuperscript{17} It
was somewhat smaller than Timothy Walker's Concord house built in 1734.
The Walker house was 40 x 20', two stories, and had a one story 20 foot
square ell. Like the Lane house, it had three chimneys. Although
stylistically different, it appears that farmers' dwellings, whether on
the seacoast or in the interior, were alike in basic respects.\textsuperscript{18}

When Jabez Lane was born in 1760, eight children and two adults
lived in the house as well as an occasional servant or boarding
schoolmaster. Although respectable, this modest dwelling was not on a
par with neighboring homes of the affluent Wiggins or Leavitts if
Jabez's later actions are any indication. Upon inheriting the house in
1807 he immediately tore it down and built another on the same spot.

A farm required few buildings. However, successful operations
depended upon housing for people and animals, storage for grain and hay,
and areas to process a variety of goods. The farm might host other
separate structures depending upon its specific production, but no farm
could succeed without a house and barn. That two structures alone could
serve such a multitude of purposes reinforces the reality of the
inseparability of family and farm.

\textsuperscript{16} RC Probate #4070.
\textsuperscript{17} NHHS, Lane Papers, flr 2-3.
"Indian Corn is exceeding forward"

On a "very pleasant" late September day in 1776 Samuel "carried 30 Bushels Corn to Bank." In and of itself that activity was common enough; agricultural produce regularly flowed seaward from New Hampshire's hinterland. But several circumstances mark this as an important event. The amount, 30 bushels, was quite large and equivalent to an acre's yield or one-third Samuel's entire annual production. But this corn probably was not his; he didn't begin his own harvest until more than two weeks later. At year's end Samuel drew the context for his September trip, "this part of the Country has been Supply'd of its own raising; for none co'd be bro't by Water, because of the War."*

Even though the British Regulars evacuated Boston in March, 1776, the war affected New Hampshire. Samuel's trade with Portsmouth that September day may signify an equally significant revolution in New Hampshire's economy, what Richard Brown calls "the great transition to modern agricultural capitalism." In many respects Samuel had made that transition. Central to the transformation was the employer-employee relationship which by the mid-nineteenth century "had become a relatively impersonal, commercial relationship." Taken literally, labor relations on that basis would have obviated any of the social and cultural machinery at work in Stratham. Samuel hired a good deal of

1Diary, 9/25/76.
2Diary, 10/11/76, 1776 Summary.
farm labor from outside his household on a wage, or commercial basis. The paternalism of an earlier age was dissipating in Samuel's Stratham world, and attempts to impose patriarchal control over labor was "a rearguard action."\(^5\) Perhaps Samuel's frustration with John Stockbridge, a lad who was helping him with his hay, stemmed from this structural change. On August 7, 1797 Samuel noted John "come late in aftn very thick cloudy & likely to rain, offerd & insisted on going to Mow." His weather remarks for the period, "cloudy & much rain about this time," suggest Samuel objected to mowing in damp weather, but John Stockbridge "insisted."\(^6\) This was another subtle measure of the family labor system's disintegration.

Nevertheless, culture continued to temper this transformation in Stratham. While Samuel never completely embraced the commercial ethos, nor turned "to supplying specialized, urban markets for a living," his changing methods, crops and marketing indicate incremental adaptations and responses to economic stimuli outside of Stratham's immediate locale.\(^7\) After more than thirty years in Stratham, his farm had commercial dimensions which would have proved very unsettling had they existed when he settled there in 1741.

Although uncomfortable with some of its aspects, certainly by 1776 Samuel was adapting to the growing commercialization in New Hampshire's agricultural sector. The hostile British presence in the colonies may have been the motive force, but by 1776 New Hampshire was "Supply'd of its own raising," quite a change from its earlier dependence on grain imported from the middle colonies. That transition came about because

\(^6\) NHHS, Lane Papers, flr 5; Diary, 8/7/97.
\(^7\) Gross, "Culture and Cultivation," p. 42.
of the actions of many farmers like Samuel who improved land, and constructed buildings to facilitate farming. Gradually the colonial modified the landscape and environment to meet his agricultural needs. Even then, the New Hampshire environment was not particularly hospitable. A short growing season, extreme weather and rocky soil all contributed to the farmer's hardships. Certain crops grew poorly in the northern regions; wheat especially fared poorly and was imported from the mid-Atlantic region to provide flour for bread. Despite a multitude of obstacles, using a combination of crops and methods from both the old world and new, the New England farmer not only adapted, but also prospered.

During a mid-century visit to New Hampshire James Birket commented, "The ground in this Country is mostly alight Soil, Inclined to be Sandy & some places more of a Gritty & Gravelly nature and not capable of bearing Much dry weather." Stratham's soil was an exception to that evaluation. The town's historian praised it as "a land...of exceptional fertility," relatively free of the rocks and steep hillsides that plague much of the interior. The latter assessment is the more accurate of this tract lying along the Exeter River. Stone walls do not proliferate as in other nearby towns and Samuel's own records of clearing the land and farming it do not detail burdensome problems with rocks or fertility. However, the Stratham farmer's task remained formidable nonetheless.

8Clark, Eastern Frontier, pp. 9-10.
9Birket, p. 10.
The cycles of farm work varied little over Samuel's sixty years of husbandry. Weather alone interrupted those patterns of cultivation. His diverse agricultural practices suggest a willingness to experiment with new methods of farming, rather than any attempt at self-sufficiency. He was one of the "agricultural innovators" who tried new methods of cultivation, utilized local labor efficiently and profitably and established market links locally and in the wider region.\textsuperscript{11}

During his stay in New Hampshire, Birket also learned that New Hampshire's "Chiefs grain is Maize or Indian Corn of which they plant a good deal but not Enough for their own Consumption being obliged to Import large Quantities from Maryland & Virginia Also from New York & Philadelphia,"\textsuperscript{12} As Samuel's acreage increased, he planted more corn and had less need to buy it at market.\textsuperscript{13} From 1743-45 he bought 50 bushels, an average of 16.5 bushels a year; in 1753-54 he bought 27 bushels of corn a year to satisfy the appetite of a growing family. But by 1768 the Lane household, having lost only one daughter to marriage, no longer depended on the markets for grain. That year they bought 4½ bushels, and sold 2½ bushels.\textsuperscript{14} That likely was an accounting imbalance only, and the corn credits were payment in corn for goods and services the Lane household rendered others. Their own production more than met their household needs by that time.

As their tillable acreage grew, corn production absorbed more family resources. It was a labor-intensive crop and its cultivation was

\begin{footnotes}
\item Sweeney, p. 60.
\item Birket, p. 10.
\item Colonials distinguished between Indian corn, maize, a variety unknown in England at the time, and English corn, a term denoting four European cereals: wheat, oats, rye and barley. Here, I use corn to refer to the American variety, maize.
\item Pay Book, 1743-45, 1754, 1768.
\end{footnotes}
packed into a relatively short growing season. Planted in early May, corn was harvested in mid-October with the advent of killing frosts.\textsuperscript{15} It appears that in the early years Samuel planted corn in relatively small disparate patches where land was available. In 1750 he planted part of his swamp in corn and at other times planted corn on the other side of the mill pond from his house. Those references do not appear every year which suggests some sort of crop rotation. Corn cultivation combined English and native American practice.

Many plowed their ground in November after harvest, a process called "breaking up." Plowing was repeated in the spring prior to planting. There is a unanimity among observers, past and present, that American farm implements, particularly the plow, and their use were inadequate at best.\textsuperscript{16} The author of \textit{American Husbandry} was especially critical:

Worse ploughing is nowhere to be seen...Thus, in most parts of the province [New England], is found shallow and unlevel furrows, which rather scratch than turn the land; and of this bad tillage the farmers are very sparing rarely giving two ploughings if they think the crop will do with one; the consequence of which is their products being seldom near so great as they would be under a different management.\textsuperscript{17}

Apart from his low regard of the American farmer in general, this author also criticized the design and construction of the plows used in New England. Plows were light; the share and moldboards were wooden and their cutting angle was too blunt to cut into the soil effectively.

Even when the moldboard was sheathed with metal, damp soil adhered to it

\textsuperscript{16}See American Husbandry, p. 81; Jared Eliot, Essays upon Field Husbandry in New England (Boston, 1760); Bidwell and Falconer, pp. 87, 123-4; Russell, pp. 183-84.  
\textsuperscript{17}American Husbandry, p. 81, cited by Bidwell and Falconer, p. 87.
and it required constant cleaning. The plow bottom might be shod with metal, but an iron plow cast in a single piece was not made in America until 1797.\textsuperscript{18} Because the friction was so great, the effort to control and pull a plow required at the least two men and a yoke of oxen. Often two or three yoke of oxen were necessary with one man driving the plow and the other standing on the drawbar beam to force the plow deeper. Only one or two acres per day could be plowed with these "rude, clumsy" plows.\textsuperscript{19}

Breaking up Samuel's new field in 1753 took three days during a spell of "pretty pleasant weather for the Season." On November 19 his brother, Isaiah, came from Hampton to help plow. Assisted by Samuel Neal and young Andrew Wiggin, the three plowed half a day with William Pottle's plow and two oxen, Neal's steers, and two steers belonging to Andrew Wiggin's father. Presumably Isaiah stayed and worked the next two days; Andrew Wiggin is credited with "following plow" for both days. On the 20th, John Hill brought his two oxen and two steers to pull Pottle's plow over Samuel's field. On the final day of plowing that year, William Pottle, using his two oxen, his plow and Samuel Neal's steers, plowed for Samuel. It is not clear whether or not Samuel helped with the plowing, but it is likely that he did. They were breaking up the land he bought from Colonel Wiggin that spring, land which had not been plowed for quite some time. Samuel's Diary notes that he chose to wait until the night of the 21st to go to Hampton to get his leather, implying that he spent the daylight hours plowing.

alongside the others. That is his last mention of plowing in 1753 and the next day it snowed a few inches.20

Depending upon the weather, spring plowing took place in April or May with similar patterns of exchange to arrange for the requisite draught animals, labor and implements. Samuel bought his own plow in 1763; he credited a neighboring blacksmith, Nathan Hoag, with plow plates and plowirons weighing 21½ pounds.21 Before then he always hired the use of a plow. His purchase of a plow may have coincided with his two older sons reaching their middle teens. Before 1763 Samuel hired all his plowing. That year plowing first appeared as work Samuel provided others. Just a little over a month after he bought his plow, he plowed one day for Mr. Adams, charging the minister for his labor and a helper's, two oxen and the plow. That year Samuel "bought" five days of plowing and "sold" three days; he hired plowing to break up in the fall which required a heavier plow. In 1768 he bought "a Breaking-up Plow" to complement his two oxen, six cattle and other plow. With livestock, equipment and two sons aged 20 and 22 years-old he provided others 5½ days plowing and was able to plow all his land using only family's resources in 1768. The coincidence of his sons' maturing, his purchase of equipment and his increasing acreage made household labor an integral component of his agricultural ventures.22

After plowing, planting could begin. Colonists adopted the native practice of planting the seeds in widely spaced hills with four seeds in each. The rhyme, "One for the squirrel, one for the crow, one for the

20Day Book, 1753.
21Day Book, 1763.
22Day Book, 1763, 1768.
cutworm and one to grow" explains the rationale for this practice.23 Were any of the predators unsuccessful, multiple stalks might grow from one hill. The hills were at least four feet apart, and there was ample open ground for weeds to flourish, many of which accompanied the human migration from Europe during the seventeenth century.24 This necessitated the labor-intensive process of weeding described by Timothy Dwight:

The ground is afterwards [after planting] broken, sometimes with a harrow, made in the form of a triangle, and sometimes with a plough; each drawn by a single horse. In stony grounds a larger plough is used; and is drawn by a yoke of oxen. The ground is then cleaned with the hoe. The process is repeated at least three times, and not infrequently four; at the last of which the earth is raised to the height of from four to six inches, around the corn, and is denominated a hill; whence every planting is called a hill of corn. The hill is made, to give a better opportunity for the roots, which, when the stalk is grown to a considerable height, shoot from it several inches above the surface, to insert themselves in the ground with more ease, and less hazard of failure. These roots are called braces; because they appear to be formed for the sole purpose of supporting the stalk.25

Each of the three weeding had a distinct purpose. The first called "weeding," was "a simple cutting up of the weeds." Next came "moulding" which created a small hill around the plants "dishing towards the centre." The final step, "hilling," made the hill taller.26 Samuel followed a regular schedule for cultivating his corn. Planting took place between May 1 and May 23. It usually took only a few days if other work and the weather cooperated. The plants usually

---

came up within a week of planting. Weeding started at the end of May or early June and was completed by the middle of the month. Moulding began about two weeks later and hilling about two weeks after that. Weeding took the longest. Once the ground was loosened up between the hills the successive stages were easier to accomplish. Samuel’s diary entries for 1767 outline a typical year’s cultivation of corn:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 11</th>
<th>Began to Plant</th>
<th>May 23</th>
<th>finished planting low ground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 8</td>
<td>began to weed</td>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22</td>
<td>began to mold</td>
<td>June 25</td>
<td>finished molding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 9</td>
<td>began to gather</td>
<td>July 9</td>
<td>finished hilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 6</td>
<td>finished picking</td>
<td>Oct. 15</td>
<td>finished gathering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>above</td>
<td></td>
<td>corn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1767 all this work was done by the Lane household; there is no record of outside labor assisting. Samuel probably planted less than three acres in corn. Where tax inventories list his land use, there are never more than three acres in tillage, and there is no reason to think he deviated from that pattern in 1767.

Once gathered the corn was husked and stored. Concord’s Timothy Walker set off a section of his barn as a granary. Most likely the Lanes followed the common practice of storing their corn in the house attic. In 1758 Samuel recorded that “Indian Corn...Stunk in our Chambers.” He constructed a “Corn-House” in the spring of 1769. This anticipated a later practice when “early in the [19th] century separate corn-cribs had become customary farm buildings to store the ears.”

Husking appears to have been a task reserved for women and children in

---

27 Thomas C. Thompson estimated that Matthew Patten plowed one-half to two days, planted nearly one day and reaped three to five days; those estimates include all Patten’s crops, p. 149.
28 Hylander, Snug Fireside, pp. 207-08; Earle, Home Life, p. 139.
29 Diary, 1758 Summary.
30 Russell, p. 367.
the Lane household, and it was not the customary "frolic." On an
October Friday, Concord's Timothy Walker "Brot my corn from yº Middle
Intervale. At night had a husking." A Kingston, N.H. husking bee
lapsed into a scene "of vile lewdness" according to the schoolmaster.
Although such activities may have had redeeming social value and
"encouraged hard work and responsibility to the group even as they gave
opportunities for sexual experimentation and carousing," these events
were not hosted by the Lanes. Samuel's only record of husking is in
1750 when he credited Judith Glanvil for one day of husking.

The entry for Judith Glanvil's husking, immersed among washing,
sewing, and making buttons is revealing in that it documents that
husking went on in the home although there is no other specific mention
of it. Were it a social event, a husking bee, Samuel surely would have
noted it. Because this was work done by women within the household and
not sold to others, no account was made. The same holds true for the
boys' work, although that probably was recorded more often as a labor
exchange with neighbors. The performance of a task by a son or daughter
which traditionally lay in the other's sphere of work may have commanded
more attention, but such observations are extremely rare. When "Son &
Dau² Bordman & girls come & began to hall my Wo[od]" in February 1792,
it may have been noted because women were helping with this
traditionally male task, or because it marked a family visit. Even
though work like Judith Glanvil's husking had a market value, Samuel did

32 George Francis Dow, Everyday Life in the Massachusetts Bay Colony (New
York: Benjamin Bloom, 1935), pp. 117-18; Alice Morse Earle also
33 Ulrich, Midwife's, pp. 146, 147.
34 Day Book, 1750.
35 Diary, 2/5/93.
not account for it when it took place within the context of household production.

A creeping commercialism also may have had an effect on this family's approach to husking. The husking bee was as squarely located in a social and cultural matrix as it was an economic. Viewing husking solely as work, an economic necessity, and placing it on a commercial basis as was done with Judith Glanvil in 1750, may be another subtle manifestation of an economic transformation.

The number of ears harvested probably did not vary much from year-to-year except for the effect of weather and predators on the crop. The practice of hilling corn, alien to today's farmer, had a pragmatic purpose and illustrates the risks a farmer faced; "a very great Storm of rain & wind, and Thunder," Samuel observed in July 1751, "hes bent the corn & hurt it very much." Two weeks later he marveled at corn's recuperative abilities, "The Indian Corn which was terribly broke & bent down...rises up to admiration and turns up Crooked like a Bow, tho' it hes vastly hurt the crop & Some people think the ear never fill'd after." The crop was a disappointment because many ears of corn had "no kernals on the Cobb a Considerable Distance from the Cud thot to be by reason of the Storm," although some was salvaged.  

Other natural phenomena provided constant threats to the crops. Samuel mentioned the effect of drought on his crops in twenty out of his sixty years of farming in Stratham. While droughts "Pinch'd y\textsuperscript{e} fruits of the Earth pretty much," wet weather also took its toll. In 1758, "a very Wet Summer," Samuel noted, "so that with Wet and Frosts our

\footnote{Diary, 8/29-30/51, 7/31/51, 8/12-14/51, 8/22/51.} 
\footnote{Journal, p. 85.}
Indian Corn being backward & verry green...Stunk in our Chambers." An unexpected frost alone might take its toll. "A verry great frost," on August 29, 1752, "kill'd ye corn stalks, So that they immediately turn'd white; also kill'd Beans and almost every green thing: and corn being then in the Milk, it was So Blasted (especially in the out Towns) that there was hardly any Sound corn this year; and people were putt to it for Seed."38

Besides climatic perils, other predators stalked New Hampshire's farms. Worms, grasshoppers, mice and a fungus called "moldew" or rust plagued Samuel's fields and orchards. In 1743 a combination of factors produced devastating results for many:

and in the first of this Summer there Seem'd to be a prospect of a good crop of grass or Hay but it was cut exceeding Short many ways, Some burnt up by the Drought, and abundance in many places was Devoured by an uncommon devouring worm, which worms come in Such innumerable Swarms as that they eat all before them, & were so thick in mowing time that they mearely made people Sick when mowing there grass, which they were oblig'd to cut down with all Speed or else the worms would devour all their grass. they also eat the corn So that people that they would devour it all, but the corn come on after the worms left it, So that there was a plentiful crop. the grasshoppers also in other places exceed the worms & destroy'd abundance of grass & english corn; all which devourers caus'd hay to be exceeding Scarce this Summer.39

Such disasters were not uncommon. His year-end summaries note worms and grasshoppers 11 times, mildew or rust in five years and mice damage once. Unfortunately, the farmer had few remedies other than beating the predators by harvesting early, although in 1788 Samuel mentioned that "The worms have Eat orchards verry much; and Some People Tars their Trees."40 Most obvious in his comments is the relationship between

---

38 Diary, 1752, 1758.
39 Diary, 1743.
40 Journal, p. 92.
these events and the availability and market price of the affected goods.

Samuel never recorded his acreage planted with corn. In Massachusetts counties just to the south, 84.1% of the grain yield was corn in 1801. Correlating acreage to yield, Samuel’s 2½ acres of corn would have produced 60 to 75 bushels. His yield estimates are very general. From 1741 to 1800 Samuel assessed his corn yields as follows: exceptional (plentiful, great) - 10 years; good (comfortable) - 24 years; "midling" - 14 years; and short (slim, scarce, light) - 13 years. Just what defines those categories in terms of quantity is unclear, but his record of grinding corn provides a hint of his yield. Samuel never made a complete account of the grain he had ground, but those during the early 1780s appear fairly comprehensive. At that time he generally ground his grain at his neighbor, Captain Wiggin’s mill. Wiggin ground at least 64½ bushels for Samuel in 1779. Presumably most was Indian Corn. Samuel made a special note when the grain was rye; in 1779 only ½ bushel was designated as rye. The next year, from January to November 13, Captain Wiggin’s account contains dates and amounts ground, and Samuel summarized this work, “I think Capt Wiggin has ground 58½ Bushels Since we Reckon[ed] & 31½ not posted. Apparently Samuel’s arrangement with Wiggin assumed a direct exchange, perhaps shoeing his family, for grinding a certain quantity of grain. That entry implies Wiggin ground close to ninety bushels in 1780. Samuel credited Wiggin with grinding 38 bushels with one designated “new Rye” in 1783, 59 bushels from June 1784 through December 1785 and 15½ bushels from

---

41 Bidwell and Falconer, p. 90.
42 Compiled from year-end summaries in the Journal and the Diaries.
January to August, 1786. That the amounts decreased after 1783 is no surprise for a son, daughter and step-daughter were married that year and left his household.

Those numbers correspond to yield estimates made by contemporaries and historians. Jeremy Belknap put the average yield for corn at thirty to forty bushels an acre, and William Douglass at twenty-five. Recent scholars are less optimistic estimating from 15 to 25 bushels per acre. The 1772 tax law accounted one acre of arable land to produce 25 bushels of grain. If the amounts ground are any indication of his yield, Samuel must have produced in that range or better, which easily would have provided for his family. In his study of Pennsylvania, James Lemon estimated a family of five would require 30 bushels of corn annually for its own consumption. Presumably the New Hampshire family needed more, substituting corn for wheat in breads. "Corn is not to be bought this winter 1762," Samuel wrote, "and many People are obliged to use flour and Bisket for their Common bread." The less expensive and locally available corn was the apparent choice for baking and that increased its per capita consumption in New England compared to the mid-Atlantic provinces.

Corn was but one of the grains Samuel cultivated and American Husbandry's author wrote in 1775, "The crops commonly cultivated are, first, maize, which is the grand product of the country, and upon which
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43Pay Book, 1780-89.  
44Belknap III:100-01; William Douglass II:205.  
47Journal, p. 72.
the inhabitants principally feed. It is not to the exclusion of common wheat, which in a few districts is cultivated with success.\textsuperscript{48} Because of the problems with wheat, Samuel also planted rye, oats and occasionally barley. Some blamed New England's climate for wheat's failure, "it is the climate of this province which entirely regulates its agriculture, and...render[s] the culture of common wheat not near so advantageous as that of maize."\textsuperscript{49} However, Samuel connected poor English grain harvests with "rust" or "meldew." His first mentioned of this was in 1763 when "a Midling crop of English grain" was "much hurt by mildews or Rust." The black stem-rust first appeared in New England during the 1660s, contributed to the decline of wheat growing in New England and increased its dependence on the mid-Atlantic colonies as a source for wheat. Even with imported grain "wheat bread had become practically unknown on farmers' tables throughout most of New England" by 1800.\textsuperscript{50}

Black stem-rust was bothersome, but did not stop Samuel from growing wheat. His yearly summaries mention wheat only five years out of sixty, but his daily entries indicate that he sowed both summer and winter varieties on a regular basis. Stratham was more fortunate than other areas and apparently produced good wheat. He commented on a new variety of wheat introduced in the late 1770s which farmers hoped would resist the rust:

This year [1780] there has been a Remarkable Demand for Siberian Wheat for Seed. And the principle part of it that ever has been Rais'd in these parts before this year, grew in Stratham & Newmarket; and it having a name for yielding great increase Many

\textsuperscript{48} American Husbandry, p. 37.  
\textsuperscript{49} American Husbandry, pp. 34-5.  
\textsuperscript{50} Bidwell and Falconer, p. 93.
People came from almost all parts, far and near after it for Seed.  

Siberian wheat was no more immune to the black stem-rust than its predecessor; in 1781 drought combined with the disease to "cut off our English grain (especially Siberian Wheat) very much and considerable Wheat So blasted, that it was not Reap'd."  

Only barley was discontinued by Samuel as a crop. Both winter and summer wheat, oats and rye appear with regularity in his diary. He sowed summer grains in April, before corn was planted, and harvested them during late July and early August. Winter wheat was sown in September, winter rye in October or early November. The winter varieties generally were harvested one or two weeks prior to the harvest of the summer grains.  

These grains were cut with a sickle; the scythe was used for mowing hay. One man could harvest an acre of wheat a day. Samuel's harvest of English grain probably have could been done in one day, but because it was sown on diverse parcels and was of different types, it took several days. In 1769 he reaped his winter rye on July 28, his summer rye on August 5, his wheat on August 7 and finished his English harvest three days later on August 10. With limited acreage in these grains, probably none of the above days were filled with that harvest. The stalks were cured and dried in shocks until late fall when outdoor husbandry activity diminished and then they were threshed in the aisle of the barn with a flail, and stored.  

Samuel's yields varied depending upon the weather and the areas he planted. In 1788, he sowed 7 pints of Siberian wheat behind the barn.

---

52 *Diary*, 1781.
and reaped 1½ bushels from it, a fourteen-fold increase; one peck of the same seed sown over the road yielded only 2 bushels, an eight-fold increase.\(^{53}\) In the twenty years between 1777 and 1797 his largest wheat yield was in 1786 when 5 pecks of seed produced 7½ bushels. In 1784 an unrecorded amount of seed yielded 18½ bushels of rye. Some years he sowed his wheat and rye together in the same field.\(^{54}\) Jeremy Belknap "reckoned profitable" 20 bushels of wheat from an upland acre and 10-15 bushels of rye.\(^{55}\)

Samuel was not always sure which crops would return him the greatest gain. When he leased the parsonage land from the town in 1760 he spent £174 which included the costs of dung, hauling it and plowing it into the soil, planting, weeding, moulding and hilling the crops, fencing, gathering and haying, and the rent. His marketable harvest was 30 bushels of corn as well as beans and potatoes, all valued at £125, presenting him a £49 loss. Hoping other crops might be more profitable he sowed wheat, rye, flax, oats and peas the following year. The costs involved were considerably less, £100, but the lease still lost money. The 8½ bushels of wheat and rye, flax and peas, and 4 bushels of oats netted only £68, another loss.\(^{56}\) His other reason for switching may have been crop rotation to bolster the soil's fertility, however, the complete change from one year to the next suggests he was seeking a profitable yield.
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\(^{53}\) Diary, 1788.
\(^{54}\) Diary, 1786, 1784, 1777. Russell notes that "as natural fertility decreased and disease increased, farmers seeded rye and wheat together." The bread made from this mixture, well known in England, was called meslin or maslin. pp. 132-33.
\(^{55}\) Belknap III:100-01; Bidwell and Falconer, p. 101.
\(^{56}\) Day Book, 1760, 1761.
Contemporary observers commented on soil fertility and mostly lamented the New Englander's neglect of good practice in this respect. In general historians have found the use of manure was ignored; Belknap noted "very little use is made of any manure excepting barn dung." Several mentioned the limiting effect manure shortages had on cultivation. Allowing livestock to range freely made collecting dung impractical, and Jared Eliot noted that dung "cannot be had for Love nor Money." Scientific theory held that dung helped keep the soil loose allowing roots to come into contact with more soil. This system encouraged the farmer to keep the soil loose and broken up so that the roots could grow easily. Samuel used the available dung for cultivation of his crops, but he never indicated just why he believed it good practice.

Another criticism of colonial practice was the lack of crop rotation. The author of American Husbandry wrote, "they [New England Farmers] have not a just idea of the importance of throwing their crops into a proper arrangement, so as one may be a preparation for another, and thereby save the barren expense of a mere fallow." Without any specific mention of his planting plans, it is not clear to what extent, and on what basis, Samuel rotated his crops. It appears that he did to some degree; in 1777 he sowed English grain over the pond and at Masons. In 1779 it went into the ground by the barn, at the knowl above and by the old barn, and in 1781 he planted his grains on Lamprey's

57Sweeney, p. 63; Belknap III:102.
58American Husbandry, p. 58; Eliot I:17.
60American Husbandry, p. 39.
knowl and by the old barn. Stratham's coastal location may have made rotation somewhat less significant than in inland areas. Salt water and tidal silt naturally renewed the salt marshes, and the resulting hay produced a manure of high quality which was very productive when applied to upland fields.

Samuel never mentioned soil fertility in connection with poor harvests either out of ignorance or because his cultivation methods did not deplete the soil. But even in his early years, when he owned neither cart nor steers to pull it, he hired labor and equipment to "hail dung" which suggests that he was conscious of good husbandry practice in this regard.

Orchards supplied other important crops for both household and market, and Jeremy Belknap wrote, "no good husbandman thinks his farm complete without an orchard." The chief use of apples was for cider, "the common drink of all its inhabitants [Massachusetts], rich and poor alike." Samuel did not own a cider press and had others make his cider. In 1763, the year of Samuel's greatest production, Jethro Hill made him 53 barrels which sold in Portsmouth for 5 or 6σ a barrel. He carried cider regularly to customers at the Bank for consumption there or for export. The New Hampshire Gazette advertised in 1765, "WANTED 40 or 50 Barrells of CYDER, immediately - Enquire of the Printers."

Later, son Joshua made cider for Samuel. Although orchards were never a
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major part of the improved acreage of the average farm, the author of *American Husbandry* remarked that in New England these "are reckoned as profitable as any other part of the plantation."\(^{67}\)

Samuel was a farmer in the Jared Eliot school, a system labeled by Christopher Grasso as the experimental philosophy of farming. At mid-century Eliot was well aware of the shortcomings of New England's agriculture, but his philosophy had practical roots. "Our Reasonings and Speculation without Experience are delusory and uncertain," Eliot wrote in his first essay; "it used to be the Saying of an old Man That an ounce of Experience is better than a pound of Science."\(^{68}\) Samuel embraced that sentiment and gathered information wherever and whenever possible to aid in the cultivation of his own crops. It is more than simple coincidence that he went to his pasture at Exeter and at Dow's the day after he wrote in his diary, "I Saw grass mow'd at the Bank yesterday."\(^{69}\) He did not begin to mow his hay for more than two weeks, but his observation in Portsmouth prompted him to check his grass in Exeter. And notations such as those found at the end of his 1777 Diary suggest his interest in experimentation with improved yields his goal:

\begin{quote}
**Hemd\(^{2}\)** Some Say all round Seed Sho'd be Sow'd at the full of y\(^{e}\) Moon

**Hemd\(^{2}\)** Some Say turnip Seed Sow'd in the Increase of the Moon will run too much to tops: and if Sow'd in the wane to root.\(^{70}\)
\end{quote}

Samuel's library contained only two books related to agriculture, *George Cooke's Complete Farmer* (1770) and *Samuel Deane's, The New-

\(^{67}\) *American Husbandry*, p. 42.
\(^{68}\) Eliot 1:15.
\(^{69}\) Diary, 6/29-30/53.
\(^{70}\) Diary, 1777.
England Farmer (1790). Published after more than three decades of farming, their advice probably had little impact on his husbandry. His own experience and that of those around him was his teacher in the practice of farming; it combined observation, experimentation and very little formal learning from the meager literature that existed. It served him well and his farm prospered. But simply by being in his library, those books are evidence of an attitude which sought out, and accepted change which led to improvement. That outlook helps explain Samuel's acceptance of commercial practices while only slowly modifying his underlying moral and cultural values.

His methods made his farm successful. While in years of drought some people begged for corn, Samuel's farm always satisfied his family's needs, and even provided comfort. In many ways the record indicates that livestock suffered during those lean years, so that his family would be secure. Nevertheless, Samuel positioned himself to provide for human and animal needs, even in times of extreme shortage.

---

71 George Cooke's work is $138 on Lane's list of books; Samuel Deane's, $200 and purchased by Samuel on 12/6/90.
"Drove my Calves to Jno Leavits Pasture"

The irony of his position in October 1763 could not have escaped Samuel. On October 13 he wrote "Jo Young Demanded Hog money." One of Stratham's haywards, Young wanted Samuel to pay 12 shillings Sterling as a penalty for allowing his four hogs "to go at Large out of his own Inclosure knowing the Same Swine to be then & there going at Large not yoaked & Ringed according to Law." Samuel appeared before Andrew Wiggin, Justice of the Peace, on November 8, 1763 to answer Young's complaint. At "Youngs Hog Court" Samuel's straightforward defense undoubtedly was a quandary for Wiggin. The 1760 law covered all swine, "Excepting they shall be by accident let out of such Inclosure," and Samuel claimed that exception here. Esquire Wiggin's decision is not recorded.1

This altercation is ironic because between 1754 and 1800, Samuel Lane was elected Stratham pound keeper twenty-seven times, and held that post in 1763 by virtue of the same March Town Meeting that elected Young hayward.2 An anachronism today, the eighteenth-century pound keeper was a peace keeper as well who mediated disputes arising from the large livestock population inhabiting Stratham's pastures and barns. Horses, cattle and swine often breached the rude fences designed to keep them in enclosures, or out of cultivated fields. In addition to the damage swine inflicted, the animals were being hurt on the public ways.3 The

1Diary, 10/13/63, 11/8/63; Lane Papers, writ Young - Lane, 10/19/63, flr 3; New Hampshire Laws 3:215-17.
3One of the reasons for the 1760 act was that "the Owners of them [swine] are often Losers by the Damages those Animals sustain, by running in the Streets and High Ways." New Hampshire Laws 3:215.
pound keeper helped control this problem and maintain the peace when roving stock caused damage to neighboring property.

Samuel found himself on both sides of the fence. He charged Nathan Hoag 23 shillings for pounding twenty-three hogs on October 20, 1756; including the pound fee those unguarded hogs cost Hoag £1-10-8. But in 1763 Samuel's own swine were the culprits. Under a legal system wherein citizens themselves executed many laws, such ironies were not unusual.

The support and regulation of livestock were important considerations for the town fathers as well as Stratham's farmers. In 1732 Stratham counted 964 animals valued at £1716, sixty percent of estate values and twice the value of Stratham's land. Keeping animals required significant resources. Throughout the colonies farmers mirrored Samuel's efforts to convert land into pasture and hayfields for their livestock. The consequence of these attempts at year-round control of farm animals' lives was far-reaching; "the effects of that control ramified through most aspects of New England's rural economy, and by the end of the colonial period were responsible for a host of changes in the New England landscape." Making New England amenable to stock required creating upland hayfields and pasture sown with European seed, an improved system of roads, extensive fencing and the extermination of predators such as the wolf. This transformation of the New England prospect played an important role in the viability of the farm. Stock not only provided power to break and cultivate the

---

4Day Book, 1756.
6Cronon, p. 128.
soil, but also was a significant market commodity. To a large degree, Samuel's farming and shoemaking business, depended upon these "creatures."

"Before I was 21 years old," he wrote in his Journal, "I Bo't a Calf & hired it kept, and it is now a Cow...which is of great Service toward my Support, for Milk, Butter & Cheese: I also have a heifer, & eight Sheep." During the two years he lived in his parent's household after his apprenticeship ended, he paid his mother for preparing his food which presumably included butter and cheese from his cow's milk. Later, boarding at John Thirstons in Stratham, a similar arrangement continued, "I gave Mrs Thirston 3® a Week for Dressing my Victuals and I had Milk Butter & Cheese from my own Cow of her Make." Except for one cow, he sold these animals to help pay for his house. A cow's dairy production was very important, even to a single male.

Although indispensable to a family, keeping animals required extensive resources. In New England's climate cattle were left outside during late spring, summer and early fall when there was adequate pasture. Tax law reflected the opinion that four acres of pasture were necessary for one cow. During the winter, stock had to be housed and fed in a barn; before he built a barn in 1743 Samuel either paid others to winter his cow or kept it in his barkhouse. In addition, hay had to be mowed, hauled to the barn and stored for winter feed. Grass from wet lowland areas supplied the New England farmer with plentiful hay during the early colonial period, but by the 1740s farmers were creating

\[7\text{Journal, p. 26.}\]
\[8\text{Journal, p. 26.}\]
\[9\text{Robinson, p. 36.}\]
hayfields out of the uplands to meet the increasing demand. Much of the clearing that took place was not to create land for tillage, but to support more cattle.

Thus, the acquisition of lands detailed earlier was in large part necessary for the support of livestock. Until 1749 when he and Nathan Hoag purchased their 25 acre Exeter parcel, Samuel was necessarily limited in the number of animals he could keep. Even then, going to Exeter for pasture and hay was an added burden. The emphasis placed on pasture in Samuel’s Day Books reflects its economic significance. Despite their joint ownership of the Exeter land, Samuel and Nathan Hoag strictly accounted for the livestock pastured there. Tallying “our Pasturing at Exeter in 1749,” Samuel noted Hoag kept “2 Steers all Summer coming in 5- & a Heifer coming in 2 - 2 oxen,” while his own use was “2 Steers coming in 4 all Summer- 2 Steers coming in 5. 2 months & 20 Days - mare 13 Days.” The reckoning followed, “Set my 2 yoke against Hoage’s 2 yoke & my cow against his heifer & pay him for half my mare.”¹⁰ Throughout the first decade of his residence in Stratham there are numerous charges for his keeping animals in other peoples’ pasture. After 1753 this was less of a problem although it does appear as an occasional credit.

As his farm grew so did his stock of animals. His livestock numbers appear to fit the pattern of a typical colonial farm. Bidwell and Falconer estimated the Eastern Massachusetts average to be: 1 or 2 horses; 1 or 2 yoke of oxen; 15 cattle including 5 dairy cows; 15 swine; and a flock of 10 to 20 sheep on half of the farms. A Stratham farm such as the Lane’s probably was more like the average in Falmouth,

¹⁰Day Book, 1749.
Maine for 1760: 1 horse; 2 oxen; 3 or 4 cows; 1 or 2 swine; and a flock of 9 or 10 sheep. Table 12 provides the numbers of Lane livestock from his yearly tax inventory.

**TABLE 12 - LIVESTOCK INVENTORY, 1759 - 1798**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>HORSES</th>
<th>COWS</th>
<th>STEERS</th>
<th>OXEN</th>
<th>SHEEP*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Day Book, 1759-98; NHSA, Stratham Town Records. *Sheep totals are the number of sheep washed and sheared recorded in the Diary and Day Books.

The numbers of livestock generally correspond to the acreage Samuel farmed in any given year. When the tax law changed during the Revolution to reflect New Hampshire's pressing need to raise more revenue, inventories became more specific about land usage. Although the records are sketchy for 1772 through 1778, it appears that Samuel

---

11 Bidwell and Falconer, pp. 105-06.
had approximately 15 acres of hay lands and 40 acres of pasture in Stratham.\textsuperscript{12} Using New Hampshire tax law as a guideline, his pasture could support 10 cows or steers; the greatest number of animals he kept in any year, including cows, steers, oxen and horses was 13. His hay fields produced a significant amount of hay. Tax law defined acreage which yielded one ton of hay as an acre of mowing land; an observer in 1775 estimated that lowland meadows produced between two and three tons.\textsuperscript{13} Assuming an average of two tons per acre on his combination of lowland and upland hayfields, Samuel produced about thirty tons of hay a year which would support more livestock than he ever kept.\textsuperscript{14} On the rare occasion when he noted hay by the ton his yield is at the upper end of that estimate, three tons per acre of hayfield. In 1781 he laid away 720 cocks or 36 tons of hay cut from 12 acres; the following year's yield was slightly less, 691 cocks or 34 tons of hay.\textsuperscript{15}

A recent assessment concludes that "the generally small size and poor quality of cattle resulted not from lack of feed but from lack of concern about feed quality and care."\textsuperscript{16} James Birket offered kinder words in 1750, "their Cattle are small but Seemingly very strong, having Short thick bodies and Short Limbs."\textsuperscript{17} Commentators, both past and present, are more critical finding the cattle "thin, scrawny, and

\textsuperscript{12}In 1773 he claimed 15 acres of mowing land; the next inventory, 1778, the same amount of land appeared as mowing. There is no note of pasture land in 1773, but he listed 40 acres in 1778 which decreased to 30 acres in 1779 and remained at that number through 1785. Day Books, 1772, 1778-1785.
\textsuperscript{13}Robinson, p. 40; American Husbandry, p. 42.
\textsuperscript{14}Ships bound for the West Indies with livestock aboard carried between 200 and 500 pounds of hay for each horse, cow or sheep. Russell, p. 119.
\textsuperscript{15}Day Books, 1781, 1782.
\textsuperscript{16}Lemon, p. 163.
\textsuperscript{17}Birket, p. 13.
sickly" because of poor breeding practice and care. The first cattle in New Hampshire, a "coarse Danish cattle," were imported by John Mason in 1633, and little concerted effort was made to improve breeds through scientific breeding programs until the end of the eighteenth century. The author of American Husbandry minced no words in his assessment of the New England farmer in this respect:

...most of the farmers in this country are, in whatever concerns cattle, the most negligent ignorant set of men in the world. Nor do I know any country in which animals are worse treated. Horses are in general, even valuable ones, worked hard and starved: they plough, cart, and ride them to death, at the same time that they give very little heed to their food; after the hardest day's work, all the nourishment they are like to have is to be turned out into a wood, where the shoots and weeds form the chief of the pasture; unless it be after the hay is in, when they get a share of the after-grass...This bad treatment extends to draft oxen; to their cows, sheep, and swine; only in a different manner, as may be supposed.

Repeated comments in Samuel's diary confirm the hardships endured by cattle, especially in 1762. After a "most hard Severe Cold long Winter," he observed that:

Many People having large Stocks of Cattle, & but few of them fit to Kill, presumed to keep them over, on a little Hay, trying to keep them alive by Corn Brouse &c hoping for a Moderate Winter; but the Winter proving verry hard Many Cattle & Horses & Swine & abundance of Sheep & Lambs Died; tho' indeed not So Many as might Justly have been Expected in So Scanty a Season.

"Brouzing Cattle in the Woods" was a traditional way to feed cattle over the winter, but that too, was "Difficult" in 1762. It is interesting that even though Samuel appears to have taken relatively good care of his cattle - he wintered them inside even if that required leasing space in another's barn, and he acquired adequate pasture and...
hay fields to feed them - he tacitly accepted their inferior treatment by others as the norm. His comment that not nearly as many cattle died as "might Justly have been expected" suggests that he too, was inured to their generally poor care.

There are times when he specifically notes an interest in the improvement of his cattle. While cattle were expected to fend for themselves over the winter in many cases, to browse in the woods, those that fed their steers hay sometimes found themselves short and substituted corn. The farmer observed the correlation between feed and work cattle could do. "People were oblig'd to give their Cattle much corn this Winter for want of Hay:" Samuel wrote in 1750, "and 'tis observ'd that oxen were Never in better Heart to Plow than they are this Spring."22 During the drought years of 1761 and 1762, "People were put to Difficulty to get their Plowing done for want of Hay."23 But those lessons generally were ignored; grain was too expensive a commodity for most New Hampshire farmers to feed cattle.

The standard for successful care of cattle seems to have been their basic survival. The harsh New Hampshire climate made that a sufficiently important and elusive goal, and it diverted attention away from the more ambitious goals of improving the breed. In 1749 Samuel wrote of "the Uncommon Difficultys People have been put too for a living themselves," and added "but More especially to keep their Cattle alive." That suggests the climate presented problems equivalent to those of human survival, and that minimum and maximum standards for cattle care

---

22 Diary, April 1750 Summary. Thomas Anburey agreed, "Indian Corn is certainly the heartiest and most strengthening food for cattle and poultry, and gives their meat firmness and excellent flavor." Cited in Russell, p. 135.

23 Diary, 1762.
merged into a single effort to see them through the long winters. The special measures taken to keep livestock alive in 1749 meant "many go 40, 50, or 60 Miles into the Woods, to Cut Meadows; and Drive them [cattle] into the Woods & Brouse them: Some cut leaves off trees & carry into their Barns &c for Cattle to live on in Winter."24 At the same time European observers lambasted American farmers for "the worst notions imaginable" with respect to cattle care, an assessment which indicates that the Europeans underestimated the hardships colonial farmers labored under.25 Certainly Samuel's concern for his cows suggests otherwise. When Black calved in April 1790 he noted she was twenty-five days late; five years later when she had twin calves, he noted her age.26 Similar observations, although rare, point to an interest in his herd. In 1791 he observed that "tis Said Cows are likelyest to Stand to ye Buling when they have almost done runing."27 That mention as well as the his breeding record indicates interest that went beyond the mere survival of his herd.

That interest was well placed as cattle served several purposes on the colonial farm providing power for crop cultivation, and meat and dairy products for the table and for export. Not until the late 1750s did Samuel begin to keep steers for work. Before then he hired his plowing done by others. As draft animals, "oxen were particularly suitable for work among tree stumps and rocks; the single chain running from yoke to load was an ideally simple tackle."28 Steers became the chief draft animal because sleighs, carts and farm implements were too

---

26Diary, 4/17/90, 3/2/95.  
27Diary, 1791.  
28Ebeling, p. 71.
heavy for horses. And after a useful life of work, cattle provided meat. Although described by contemporaries as smaller than English stock, and Kalm wrote "the cattle degenerates by degrees here, and becomes smaller," such observations do not seem to justify the nearly unanimous conclusion that New England cattle were "small, semi-starved, ill-formed, and unproductive animals" because of the farmer's inattention.\(^{29}\) The extraordinary efforts taken to keep the animals alive precluded more sophisticated measures to improve the breed during the eighteenth century. This neglect of cattle stemmed largely from circumstance rather than from design.

However roughly treated in comparison with those of England, New England cattle helped redress the trade imbalance caused by grain imports. Both live animals and meat were exported to the West Indies and other North American colonies. Samuel's constant mention of beef prices implies its significance as a commodity. In 1790 he specifically mentioned the export market for beef, "Abundance of Beef Kill'd and Ship'd off, at a pretty good price, for Money; 16\(^{6}\) & 18 & Some 20\(^{6}\) a Hundred."\(^{30}\) Also he sold cattle on the hoof in Stratham and Portsmouth.

The livestock market made the New Hampshire farm viable; an observer remarked, "the farmers find great advantage in keeping a large part of their farms for pasturage, as they are thereby enabled to support large herds of cattle and flocks of sheep which much improve their farms." He estimated that nearly 14% of the exports by value from New England in the decade before the Revolution were some form of livestock.\(^{31}\) Samuel

\(^{29}\) Kalm, cited in Bidwell and Falconer, p. 107; Bidwell and Falconer, p. 107; also Ebeling concludes that cattle were "thin, scrawny, and sickly," p. 71.
\(^{30}\) Journal, p. 95.
\(^{31}\) American Husbandry, pp. 42, 44.
reserved more than ten times his tillable acreage for the support of livestock; throughout New England this particular activity used more land than all other agriculture combined. "Grazing animals were one of the linchpins that made commercial agriculture possible in New England."\textsuperscript{32}

That Samuel considered cattle a market commodity is clear in his writings; he wrote in his 1745 diary, "I brot my Beaf home from the wid Jones'." He clarified the meaning of "my Beaf" in his Day Book when he credited Widow Jones for one month's pasturing of his cows.\textsuperscript{33} In his eyes those cows were destined for his own table and those of others. His diary contains the annual schedule of beef slaughter. Late fall ushered in "killing time," when the weather was cold enough to help preserve the meat. Samuel usually killed a cow in November or December. The heifer he slaughtered on October 23, 1762 weighed 272 pounds, and he accounted for "Beaf I parted with Oct 23." as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Marble</td>
<td>67 lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Veasey</td>
<td>12 lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wid Chase</td>
<td>19½ lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MΣ Mason lent</td>
<td>6-6 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dille</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis about</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Samuel sold the 123 pounds for 5 shillings per pound which yielded him £30-15-0, though not all his beef sales were local as in the above account.\textsuperscript{34} Veal, beef, lamb, mutton and pork all appear in his Portsmouth accounts. The 149 pounds not "parted with" may have gone to the seacoast or helped feed his family. Carole Shammas estimates that

\textsuperscript{32}cronon, p. 139.  
\textsuperscript{33}Diary, 11/23/45; Day Book, 1746.  
\textsuperscript{34}Day Book, 1762.
each member of a colonial household consumed 50 pounds of beef annually; James Lemon's Pennsylvania study puts consumption at a slightly lower level. Samuel's ten member household could have consumed as much as half the beef he raised. His cows weighed a good deal more than his heifers, although much less than dressed steers weigh today. The heifer he killed on November 19, 1763 weighed 264 pounds dressed; one month later the meat from his cow weighed 414 pounds. His cows usually fell in the 400-450 pound range. An ox provided a bounty of meat. In January 1765 his "fat ox" gave 721 pounds of beef in addition to its hide and tallow for a total of 886 pounds.

Cows were important also for the diary products they provided, both for consumption at home and for trade with others. As early as 1743 the Lanes were producing butter and cheese for sale. Although there is no mention of dairying in his diary, he sold a total of 31 pounds of butter and 16½ pounds of cheese on four separate occasions in Portsmouth that year; locally he sold 11 pounds of butter and just over 5 pounds of cheese. In 1761 Samuel regularly sold dairy goods, but only rarely took them as payments. The large variations in butter and cheese sold from year to year - in 1765 he sold £68-6-0 worth while the following year the total was only £16-2-0 - suggest that quite a bit may have been exchanged on the local level. As has been noted, in 1782 and 1783 the Lanes produced enough dairy goods for Samuel to devote a separate Day Book page to this trade.

35Carole Shammas, p. 252n; Lemon estimated that of the average 450 pounds of dressed beef, the Pennsylvania household would consume 250 pounds and sell 200 pounds. p. 163.
36Diary, 11/19/63, 12/16/63, 11/27/65. This is comparable to the dressed weight of Timothy Walker's cattle, 400-500 dressed pounds. Bidwell and Falconer, p. 108.
37Day Book, 1743.
The Lane output was modest compared to some other farms in New England, but probably typical. Large Rhode Island estates produced several thousands of pounds of cheese annually with the largest dairy hosting 110 milk cows that produced 13,000 pounds of cheese at mid-century. \(^{38}\) New Hampshire boasted no such operations on that scale. \(^{39}\) Milk production in general was low by modern standards. A cow giving four quarts a day was "very good" with one quart being closer to the norm. It took two gallons of milk to make one pound of cheese, one gallon for a pound of butter. \(^{40}\) Thus, dairy products required significant resources.

Clearly household women had the responsibility for milk, butter and cheese. Each daughter received a butter churn as a part of her portion and she undoubtedly knew how to use it by the time she left the house. But their responsibilities probably went beyond processing the raw milk, to milking cows and tending calves. \(^{41}\) In Hallowell, Maine "Martha Ballard milked cows, fed swine, set hens, and more than once trudged 'up the Crik' looking for a wandering calf." \(^{42}\) However, the boundaries of this work were not clearly defined by gender; Caleb Jackson Jr. "milked the cows before sunrise" on a September morning in 1802 yet his mother and sister lived in the house at the time. \(^{43}\)

Samuel never mentioned milking cows himself, nor is there any suggestion of his routinely tending cows. In fact his diary hints that

\(^{38}\) Russell, pp. 160-61.

\(^{39}\) Job Colcord told Samuel in 1797 that "Noah Robinson of Wakefield had bro't down 45 Hundred to Butter this year." That probably was the output of many farms in the Wakefield area. Diary, 1797.

\(^{40}\) Lemon, *Best Poor Man's*, p. 163.

\(^{41}\) Russell, p. 315.

\(^{42}\) Ulrich, "Martha Moore Ballard and Her Girls," p. 75.

womenfolk did these chores. Of all the animals on the Lane farm, only cows were named with unfailing consistency. Although Samuel owned cows before he married, his first mention of a cow by name, in this case "Brown," came in 1752 when his daughter Mary was eight years old.44 From that point all cows had names expressing physical characteristics – Black, Brown and Whiteback, or names characterizing their personality – Gentle, Blossom and Flower for example. No other animals, even steers and oxen, animals with which he worked closely, warranted such familiar treatment.45 His girls may have tended the calves and cows, named them and milked them alongside their mother. His entry for April 3, 1789 may indicate a long-standing relationship between Lane women and their dairy herd, "Eunice come. Jentle c-l-d."46

Cattle were important to the farm for many reasons, but most of the meat eaten in the colonies was pork. It preserved better than beef and retained its flavor longer after being smoked, pickled or salted. Samuel revealed the importance of pork to his family's diet in 1741: "I had nothing [no money] left to procure my years Pork when I began to keep House: but ran in Debt to Dn Robinson for half a Hog to live on; which he bro't Jan 20 1742 weighed 167 lb at 14d pr lb. I had 2 quarters of Beaf of Jn6 Hill for my work this fall."47 Carole Shammas estimated that colonial households consumed 50% more pork than beef; Lemon found Pennsylvania households ate twice as much pork as beef.48

44On 12/31/45 he wrote "young cow calved," but on 4/5/52, "Brown C-lv'd."
45The one exception is his single mention of a ewe by name. On March 20, 1779 he noted in his Diary, Smut L-md."
46Diary, 4/3/89.
47Journal, p. 28.
48Shammas, p. 252n; Lemon, p. 166.
The Lane household began keeping swine in the spring of 1743 when Neighbor Mason sold them a sow and three piglets; that October they slaughtered the sow for the family’s winter pork supply. The problems with untended swine earlier alluded to as well as their growing numbers required some form of enclosure; in 1748 Samuel still had no adequate hog shelter and that winter his neighbor, Nathan Hoag, took “a Pig to keep over 51 lb at 4d 1/2 p lb.”49 John Leavitt spent more than half a day on November 3, 1749 “Making Hogspen.”

Swine were fairly easy to keep, and although they were often left to browse the woods in less settled areas to the west, Stratham’s hogs were more likely to be restrained and fed in the barnyard. Their feed consisted of kitchen and dairy waste, and sometimes they were finished on corn and root crops such as turnips and potatoes.50 Like settlers on the frontier, seacoast farmers might also resort to forest browse in lean years. The 1761 drought followed by a long hard winter created a corn shortage by February 1762; Samuel heard a rumor that “tis Sad many Swine have already Died for hunger in the woods.”51 With lambs, sheep and horses that year dying for want of hay, and another drought in 1762, farmers took measures to ensure feed for their hogs. On September 30, Samuel noted that people were gathering acorns, and the result was salutary, “Abundance of good Pork has been fatted this fall by Beech Nuts & Acorns and but little Corn has been wanted for that end, which has Vastly Saved our Corn.”

49 Diary Book, 1748.
50 Bidwell and Falconer, p. 111; Sweeney, p. 64.
51 Diary, February 1762.
52 Diary, November 1762.
Their own livestock supplied the Lane household with beef and pork after 1742, but they did not slaughter the animals themselves. John and Moses Thirston, Benjamin Mason, Zebulun Ring and John Davis are some of those credited with “killing.” From 1742 through 1769 they dressed an average of 408 pounds of beef and 447 pounds of pork annually for Samuel. The weights of both cattle and swine increased over time. By the 1760s his cows regularly weighed more than 400 pounds dressed, the largest being 453 pounds in 1767; before 1759 no cow was heavier than 400 pounds. Swine too were fatter. Before 1753 his hogs ranged between 189 and 303 pounds. After 1753, and coincident with his purchase of pasture land from Colonel Wiggin, hog weights rose to 412 pounds in 1761. He called “measley” a hog weighing 220 pounds butchered on November 5, 1764. Twenty years earlier that weight was closer to his average.

Samuel moved to Stratham with eight sheep which he soon after sold to help pay his expenses. He next bought five sheep from Joseph Mason in January 1746 and thereafter kept a flock. Again, his lack of pasture and mowing acreage probably restricted the size of his flock. By 1746 he had increased the size of his farm by several acres, but even then he continued leasing pasture for his sheep. “Brot sheep home,” he wrote on November 25, 1746, a reference to his flock’s grazing on another’s land. Sheep were important for wool as well as meat. Lamb and mutton were popular in Portsmouth and appear repeatedly in his accounts with

---

53 Day Book, 1742-69. The beef average is calculated without data from 1762 and 1765 which appear to be aberrations. In 1762 he had 918 pounds of beef, in 1765, 1774. Using those years raises the average to 497 pounds annually. In 1762 he probably slaughtered more because of feed shortages; in 1765 he slaughtered a yoke of oxen although there was no shortage of either beef or hides that year.
residents there. The conjunction of killing two lambs on October 20, 1752 and his going to the Bank the next day is no coincidence.

The flock of sheep may have been tended by the women of the household although the gender line dividing the various tasks of tending sheep is not clear. Shearing and slaughtering sheep was definitely man's work in the Lane household; washing the sheep prior to shearing may have been done by both male and female. During the seven years between 1747 and 1756 for which records exist, Samuel had his sheep washed and sheared by a hired man in the late spring. From 1757 until 1797 he credited various men in his Day Books with shearing sheep, but never paid them for washing, although his diary records that event taking place many of those years. The combination of those records suggests that household labor began washing sheep in 1757. From 1797 until 1800 he hired both washing and shearing again.54

This pattern coincides with the evolution of the Lane family. Mary Lane was preoccupied with infants and young children during the first two decades of her marriage. Samuel, concerned for her health, probably hired washing sheep to lighten her workload. Such concern is not surprising for he deferred boarding an apprentice because of his wife's weak condition. In 1757 daughter Mary was 13 and her brother Samuel was 11, old enough to wash sheep. Labor from within the household washed the sheep until 1787. The last two girls left in 1783, but Eunice Lane remained nearby and may have continued working with the flock with her mother until 1797 when Samuel again hired a laborer, John Thirston, to wash and shear his sheep; Thirston had shorn the sheep only for the four years before that.

54Day Books, 1747-1800.
Evidence from other households indicates that women played a major role in raising sheep. Martha Ballard not only washed fleeces, but also assisted in lambing. Samuel's records provide only a scintilla of evidence that the Lane women had more involvement with raising sheep than processing their wool. February 1763 is the first mention of lambing in his diary when he recorded "1st Sheep Lambed 16th Day;" after that he recorded lambing irregularly. However, that initial comment signifies the first lambs since young Mary Lane, by then Crocket, left after her marriage. Perhaps Mary and her mother tended the flock, and with her departure in the fall of 1762, Samuel paid more attention to the sheep. Managing the flock - feeding, grazing and lambing - may well have lain within the female domestic sphere in the Lane household when circumstances permitted.

There was a horse or two most years on the Lane farm, but its value to farming operations was less significant than that of other animals. Steers and oxen were the preferred draft animal for breaking up, plowing and harrowing because farm implements were heavy and poorly designed. To Samuel, a horse was most important as a means of transportation and for powering his tanyard's barkmill. Horses are rarely mentioned in connection with his farming activity.

Owning a horse was also a status symbol; frequent exchanges involving horses indicates that some households owned none. Before his purchase of a horse in April 1743, Samuel depended upon others for his transportation. In January and February of that year he used Mr.

---

55 Ulrich, Midwife, p. 264.
56 In 1732 Stratham had 134 household heads and 117 horses; some households had more than one horse. In the 1742 tax inventory 23 households were listed; 9 had no horses, 11 had 1 horse and 3 had two horses. Holbrook, pp. 13, 16; NHSA, STR.
Ambrose's mare to go to Hampton and Portsmouth several times. When it came to recalling the his first horse, his Journal betrays a hint of pride as he wrote of that mare, "the 1st Horse Kind ye' ever I owned," even though it cost but £12.57 Over the next two months he bought his tack from Cuffs Nokes, "a Saddle & Houzen," a pair of fetters, bridle bits and a spur as well as other old bridle bits from Mr. Pottle.58 A horse, like swine, was both convenience and trouble to Samuel; during the spring of 1745 he paid Samuel Peavy for "part of a days work & finding my Mare."59

During their first decade in Stratham, pasturing his horse was as great a problem as was pasturing his cattle. In 1745 Benjamin Leavit agreed to pasture Samuel's horse and his cows. After July 15, Samuel listed twenty-eight "days the Horse was out." On September 17 the two "agreed...to take my Horse out of his pasture. he was in only one night after ye' 13th of Sep. & that night he got into his [Leavit's] Lot." Not only was scheduling and paying for pasturage a burden, the horse had no respect for Leavit's fencing. In all that year "B. Levit kept my Horse about 2 months & a week."60

Samuel rarely owned more than one horse at a time as Table 12 shows, and even when he owned a horse, he occasionally used equine services of others. While pasturing his mare at Exeter between September 19 and 26, 1750, he hired Widow Barker's mare to grind bark. He sold his mare to Nathan Hoag on April 1, 1747 and did not replace her until June 29. During those three months he used Ensign Jewet's horse

58Day Book, 1743.
59Day Book, 1744.
60Day Book, 1745.
to go to Hampton several times, and also to Portsmouth, Kensington and Boston, as well as to grind bark. Whenever the horse carried two people as on April 30 when he took Mary to Hampton, he noted "went Double." He returned to Stratham alone, but three days later when he went to Hampton alone and brought Mary back home with him, they "come double."61 At the end of that period, he purchased the horse from Jewet. More common was Samuel's lending his horse to others. In his 1745 Day Book is such an account which lists thirteen individuals who hired his horse for a total of thirty-three days. In return for using the mare to ride to Meeting fifteen times, Daniel Mason made fifteen pair of shoes for Samuel.62 These accounts delineate an extensive exchange of horses as well as cattle. Like much of his trading activity, leather-related production helped underwrite equine expenses. On August 23, 1766, Jonathan Wiggin's wife's pumps were exchanged for Wiggin's "Stalyon to Mare."63

A horse was particularly important to Samuel because of his widespread travel to Portsmouth and Hampton, to his currier in Salisbury and to Bow and other western towns. Only a horse could provide the speed and flexibility to meet his various commitments as a trader, surveyor and Proprietors' Clerk. In the context of both his farming and business commitments, his desire for additional land to support horses and other livestock is readily understandable.

To maintain the numbers of animals he did, land for pasture and mowing was critical. He could not rely on others, for in years of drought his access might have been restricted. Most of the increases in

61 Day Book, 1750, 1747. In his History of Concord, Bouton described "rode double - that is, the wife with her husband, seated on a pillion behind him." p. 528.
62 Day Book, 1745.
63 Day Book, 1766.
his total acreage were for pasture and mowing, and with that came more variety in the type of hay fields he owned. William Douglass explained the three varieties of hay, "Salt-hay is from salt or Spring tide marshes; fresh hay is the natural growth of inland marshes; English or upland hay, is the herbage imported from Europe."64 Samuel's hay was a combination of the three. His original lot bordered the mill pond and stream, and he augmented those lowlands in 1743 with his "swamp," another parcel on the brook. He bought uplands such as the twenty-two acres from Colonel Wiggin which he made both mowing and pasture. The popular grass to plant in these "artificial meadows" was timothy or Herd's grass mixed with clover. Thought to be indigenous to the Piscataqua region, it was a variety Samuel definitely used later and he probably sowed it when improving his upland fields.65 He also acquired several acres of salt marsh on Chestley's Cove with his purchase of John Piper's farm in 1761. In his detailed accounts of where his hay was cut from 1761 until 1784, he lists thirty-seven separate areas from which he took hay. Of those, fifteen refer to lowland areas, nineteen to upland fields and three to salt marshes. That variety offered security even in the driest years when hay would grow in lowlands and salt marsh.

The Lane hay fields produced as many as 43 tons of hay in 1784, and as little as 15 tons in the drought-ridden year of 1761. Most of the hay was English or fresh, from uplands or fresh water marshes. In "unfruitful" summers such as 1764, nearly half the crop, 8 out of 19 tons, was salt hay. The absolute yield of salt hay remained fairly

64Douglass II:209.
65"I had a peck of Herd's grass Seed." Diary, 1794.
stable at six to seven tons per year which in a more typical year would have put salt hay at a far lower percentage of the total.

Samuel commented on other "livestock" infrequently. Birket observed that New Hampshire's residents "have plenty of Poultry as Geese Turkeys, dunhill fowles Ducks &c. tame." 66 Samuel credited Widow Leavit with a pair of geese, two chickens and six eggs in November 1747, and in 1759 and 1763 he hired butchers to kill geese. 67 Over forty years later he mentioned geese again as well as turkeys. 68 He first mentioned bees in 1761. That August he took twenty-four pounds of honey. Several years later his production had increased dramatically. On September 10, 1764 he "took Bees, wth 112 lb of Honey." 69

By the end of the 1760s Samuel had acquired land enough to sustain his animals, even in lean years. But land and livestock alone could not ensure a colonial farm's survival and success. Another critical element was labor. Extensive exchanges of labor between neighboring households characterized Stratham's rural economy. During the first twenty years of their marriage both Samuel and Mary employed many people to help them accomplish their respective tasks. But the exchange between households diverts attention away from the major reservoir of this resource, the household itself.

66 Birket, p. 13.
68 Diary, 12/20/50, 3/16/91, 5/8/91, 3/19/94.
69 Diary, 8/25/61, 9/10/64.
"...Make my lame leg as long as the other"

Samuel Lane clearly had concerns about the younger generation in 1755. His apprentice, Samuel Philbrook, did something which caused mischief enough in January to warrant the terse diary entry, "Sam!" Eleven months later Philbrook and Jonathan Leavit were up to "villany."\(^1\) The nature of this villainy finally came to light when Samuel wrote thirty years later, "S. Philbrook & J Leavit attempted to turn over my little House & other Villany."\(^2\) Perhaps it took Samuel more than three decades to put that boyhood prank in perspective, but in 1755 it was hardly harmless behavior in his eyes. His children's generation embodied his hopes, and these villains certainly made him uneasy for the future. In 1755 his sons were learning to tan and make shoes, as well as doing chores about the house and farm. Within a few years however, Samuel anticipated that their labor would become integral to the Lane farmstead. Increased land holdings and livestock meant the need for more labor, labor that previously had been supplied partly by apprentices and neighboring households. His sons were crucial to the animation of Samuel's vision for the future, and their labor was necessary to its success. By 1785 time had diminished any repercussions of the earlier "Villany," and his children had fulfilled their promise.

Dimensions of that promise changed over time. Children were expected to contribute toward maintaining and furthering a standard of living which ultimately would provide a foundation for their own married lives. Although both sons and daughters played a role, males stole the

\(^1\) Diary, 1/14/55, 12/5/55.
\(^2\) Diary, 1791.
limelight. Enmeshed in a legal and cultural environment which placed men in control of property, no matter how much value women added to the household economy, sons were indispensable to complete the cycle from one generation to the next. Because land was the foundation of rural prosperity, and because male labor worked the land, sons gave their parents hopes for security and for "competency" in their old age. Thus, sons were accorded a preeminent position in the transfer of assets between generations, as well as serving as caretakers to their aging parents.

Although traditional interpretations stress that colonial labor was scarce relative to the quantity of land, labor exchanges occurred frequently, and a labor reservoir existed particularly during deflationary periods and recessions. But in farming communities such as Stratham, those exchanges took place on a regular basis irrespective of the state of the economy, and few colonial farms were self-sufficient in labor. Neighborly cooperation was vital to working a farm during both busy and slack times of the agricultural year. However much conflict and tension existed within these small communities, collaboration in the form of labor exchanges took place, helping individual households and the community as a whole achieve "competency" or a comfortable measure of security.

---

3Lemon, p. 179.
4For cooperation among Maine farm families during the nineteenth century see Thomas C. Hubka, "Farm Family Mutuality: The Mid-Nineteenth-Century Maine Farm Neighborhood," in The Farm, pp. 13-23.
Samuel hired many laborers with a variety of skills to clear his land in 1752-1753 and to cultivate his annual grain crop. Kevin Sweeney found the Williams family of central Massachusetts in similar circumstances: "they also employed neighbors indebted to them by exchanges in the local market and wage laborers who may have been relative strangers. At critical times of the year, the Williams called upon neighbors to work off debts by ditching, plowing, mowing hay, and harvesting grain." There is no hint of permanent wage laborers in the Lane record except perhaps for the "old England man" he hired in 1743 to work for him in the shoe shop "Some times." Stratham was typical of the New England found by the author of *American Husbandry* who remarked that day laborers "are not common in the colonies." Samuel depended on his own kin, and the families around him to work his farm.

As his farm and family evolved so did his use of labor. In the early years when his acreage and family were both small, the farm's labor requirements were modest and could be satisfied by himself, his apprentice and a relatively small number of neighbors. He always required some specialized labor as he owned neither the cattle nor equipment to do the various tasks of cultivation on his tillable land until 1768. Other than those requirements, his hiring of non-family labor varied depending upon his sons' ages and marital status.

As his sons matured, Samuel hired less outside labor. The value of work done about his farm during three years, 1752, 1760 and 1768 show an increasing dependence on hired help until the mid-1760s; then the number of days bought and sold crossed paths and the Lane household

---

*Sweeney, p. 65.*

*"Years of the Life," 1743.*

*American Husbandry, p. 54.*
became a net supplier of agricultural labor to the Stratham market.\(^9\) By the late 1780s, after his sons had married and left his household, Samuel once again became a net buyer of labor. That sequence of events was common in the life cycle of a farm family with children.\(^10\) Table 13 shows the days of labor he hired and sold between 1743 and 1768 in five year intervals:

**TABLE 13 - AGRICULTURAL LABOR EXCHANGED 1743-1768**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DAYS BOUGHT</th>
<th>DAYS SOLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>32½</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td>32½</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>49 2/3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure includes 42 days spent clearing the 22 acres bought from Col. Wiggin.*

Source: Day Books.

When their family was young the Lanes relied most heavily upon the labor of Samuel and his apprentices. His brother Ebenezer, who lived at Stratham from 1745 to 1751, occasionally worked for others as on June 17 and 19, 1745 when Daniel Thriston used him and a horse "almost 2 Days to plow;" Ebenezer's labor accrued to Samuel's account.\(^11\) After he left, Samuel Philbrook apprenticed to Samuel, working on the farm as well as in the shop. In the detailed account of the 76 labor days to improve the 22 acres bought from Andrew Wiggin, Philbrook worked 7, Samuel worked 20½, and neighbors provided 48½ days.\(^12\) The Lane household provided just over one-third, 36½ of the labor, to improve that parcel in 1753. Samuel himself supplied 27½ of the total labor on that

---

\(^9\) In 1752 the value of work he hired was £21-12-0 Old Tenor, in 1760, £204-9-0, and in 1768, £66-12-0.


\(^11\) Day Book, 1745.

\(^12\) Day Book, 1752, 1753.
project. However, clearing the land was an extraordinary project in addition to the routine work of running his shop and farm.

That account is unusual in providing rare detail of who in the household did the work. In general there was no need to account for that labor since it belonged to the household, just as there was no need to account for transactions with others when an even exchange by value took place. Thus, it is rare to find the actual work done by family members in his writings; only labor that required accounting, labor hired from or provided to others, found its way into the Day Books. Samuel's detailed account of work done on the 22 acre parcel was a documentation of the land's improvement, and presumably validated its increased value in his mind.

"Marriages must abound greatly," wrote the author of American Husbandry for the benefit of his English audience, "in a country where a family, instead of being a burden, is an advantage."13 Such a proposition would have been self-evident to the Stratham farmer. He realized that labor lay on his own hearth and also that his use and control of it was temporary. There were precious few years between the time his sons were old enough to be productive and when they began families of their own. Often this manifested itself in competing power relationships between generations. The stakes in this competition were high; Daniel Vickers contends that "the single force that mobilized more labor in Early America than any other was the parental and sexual authority internal to the family."14 Children's expectations to become

13American Husbandry, p. 53.
independent farmers themselves underlay that force, and large families
with limited land in older communities presented sons with "an unhappy
fact," that for many the prospect of settling on a farm in the community
of their birth was remote.\textsuperscript{15} This circumstance created tension between
parents and children, as well as between children themselves.\textsuperscript{16} However
much fathers wanted their sons to begin their own families, that
eventuality destroyed a vital source of labor. It was with mixed
emotions that parents bestowed their blessing on betrothed couples.

Samuel was in a more favorable position than many. His resources
allowed him to buy land enough in Stratham for his own needs and those
of his sons. Experience served as his best teacher. As an affianced
young man he had looked to settle in his familial community, Hampton,
with little success. His father was unable to offer much financial
assistance and his choice of Stratham to settle was a second choice,
necessitated by financial constraints. That lesson was not forgotten as
he acquired various properties in Stratham.

His sons had no certain future as they matured during the 1760s,
but their father was making efforts to ensure they would be able to
settle in Stratham. Samuel satisfied the competing needs of different
generations through a cooperative system of ownership and production.
The roots of colonial diligence and industry were in the widespread
ownership of land, according to the author of American Husbandry.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15}Gross, Minutemen, pp. 83-4.
\textsuperscript{16}See Gross, Minutemen, p. 89; also Vickers, "Competency," especially
P. 23.
\textsuperscript{17}American Husbandry, pp. 50-4.
Samuel tapped that vein to provide a secure future for his generation and for that of his sons.

Obligations encumbered the Stratham farms that Samuel deeded each of his two eldest sons on June 3, 1774. Young Samuel's obligation mirrored that of his brother Joshua which follows:

I promise to my Father Samuel Lane of Stratham that I will yearly and seasonably every year during his natural life render and deliver to him or his order the one compleat half part of the meat produce & income of all that shall grow on that twenty seven acres of land which he bought of George Veazey, with the edifices thereon which premises he my said father has given me a deed of bearing even date with these presents and that I will pay & deliver said produce when demanded.

Thus, while cutting his sons free from the household, Samuel controlled a portion of their labor through the above agreement. The evidence suggests that Samuel never demanded the due guaranteed him. However, his intent is clear; his sons remained obligated to their family in some measure even though they were household heads themselves. This procedure indicates that Samuel hoped for cooperative rather than competitive ventures with his sons, and all the evidence points to his success in achieving that goal.

In fact the record suggests that both generations found the agreement beneficial. In 1798 Samuel divided a 52 acre parcel of woodland in Newmarket, the Oak land, between his three sons and gave Joshua and Samuel Junior their deeds; Jabez received his deed seven years later. At that point his sons agreed to a new obligation with their father which reflected the changed circumstances of their

---

18 Joshua Lane and Samuel Lane, Jr. Obligations, June 3, 1774, NHHS, Lane Papers, flr 1-3.
19 NHHS, Lane Papers, letter Jabez Lane-Samuel Lane, Dec. 1799, flr 6.
respective families. Joshua's agreement follows and again, there are no substantial differences between it and that of his brother:

I promise to my Father Samuel Lane, that he Shall have the whole use & improvement of all the Land he has given me a Deed of, which he Bought of John Robinson - also one third part of the Salt Hay on that piece of Salt Marsh he has given me a Deed of in Chestlys Cove So Called, to be Delivered in his Barn yearly & every year During his Natural Life - and also that I will procure for him, halled to his Dwelling House, cut, Split up fit for his fire, yearly During Said Term, four Corde of good fire wood; one half of it good hard wood; the other half Hemlock & pine; and more if he wants it - also that he Shall have the Use of that piece of Wood Land in Epping which he has given me by Deed...and likewise that 20 acres more or less of wood land in the oak Land so Called, which he has given me a Deed of. Note the incomes if not Demanded in his Life time, is not to be Demanded by any person after his Decease.20

The differences between the 1774 and 1798 obligations are significant. After twenty-five years the encumbrance on the sons' home farms' production, probably never demanded by their father, was removed; their freehold status was complete. In 1798 Samuel imposed restrictions only on lands apart from his sons' farms. The new conditions reflected Samuel's continued desire for familial cooperation in addition to his changing needs as he aged. His reservation of "the whole Use & improvement of" certain lands must be considered the equivalent to old-age insurance. Those lands were available to him, should he need the income, but only during his lifetime. The articles Samuel specifically enumerated point to his own awareness that his age, eighty at the time, was limiting his ability to arrange for basic necessities - firewood, cut and delivered, and hay for his smaller number of livestock. In 1774 he reserved one-half the salt hay from Chestley's Cove; by 1798 he needed only one-third. Salt hay may be the one article that Samuel demanded of his sons on a regular basis. In late August, 1788 he wrote

20Joshua Lane and Samuel Lane, Jr. obligations, June 25, 1790, NHHS, Lane Papers, flr 1-3.
in his Diary, "Joshua got in our last Salt Hay, & Spred flax." That it was "our Salt Hay" is telling. Technically Joshua was fulfilling his 1774 obligation, but in Samuel’s mind the activity was shared by both he and his son. The family bonds of labor with their myriad implications remained alive in Samuel’s mind, if not his son’s.

During this process of passing lands to his sons, Rachel Lane renounced her dower, or power of thirds, in those lands. However, Samuel was not cutting his wife off from all means of support should she be widowed. He bequeathed her his right to the property she brought into their marriage as well as $100 to be paid over the span of five years after his death. Rachel controlled considerable property when she married Samuel, which reverted to her upon his death. Her first husband, Gideon, bequeathed her “one Half of my Real Estate During her Life to be... Also I give her my Negro gairl for Ever (called Dinah) Also I give her the whole of my Household Goods During her Widdowhood and the one half in case She Should marry again and the one half of my Live Stock.” Gideon was more liberal than most husbands granting Rachel the use of his real estate irrespective of her marital status. Many husbands ended that use if their wives remarried. The provisions of Gideon Colcord’s will undoubtedly influenced the provisions Samuel made for his second wife.

Even though the range of control he exercised over his sons’ labor narrowed after they left his household and started their own, their

---

21 Diary, 8/28/88.
22 New Hampshire law specified that any property, real or personal, owned by a woman entering marriage became the legal property of her husband.
23 Gideon Colcord’s estate was valued at £8430-1-8 Old Tenor. As a widow Rachel’s share in the estate was worth £4452; married to Samuel it was worth only slightly less, £4071-15-0. RC Probate 40410S.
cooperative relationship continued. His second son, Joshua, married
Hannah Tilton in 1769 when he was twenty-one years old. The couple
spent their first year of married life in a new house Samuel built on
the Piper farm he bought in 1761. That farm was destined for his eldest
son Samuel so this arrangement was temporary. Samuel needed to find
property for Joshua. Just one month after Joshua's wedding he placed
the following advertisement, "WANTED a small settlement convenient for a
Tanners Trade of about 40 or 50 Acres of good Land; for which Cash will
be given (if it suits) by Samuel Lane of Stratham."\textsuperscript{24} Samuel was
willing for Joshua to settle beyond Stratham's borders if his eldest was
settled within.

No such compromise needed to be struck. Joshua moved to George
Veasey's farm on Rocky Lane, purchased by his father in 1770. This farm
was twenty-seven acres, adjoined another that his father bought the
following year and was within two miles of his father's farm, a location
which promoted their continued cooperation. The Veasey house was in
some disrepair; Samuel replaced the sills and undertook other
improvements to provide his son's family a good dwelling. The couple
moved in on November 1, 1770 and that same month Samuel began an account
"of Some things done for Son Joshua."\textsuperscript{25} It included putting two windows
in the house, supplying fencing materials for "yard fences" and other
fences, nails for the house and barn, and rocks and bricks for the
foundation and chimney.

Father and son made a concerted effort to improve the property in
1771. Samuel provided six cattle and their feed for plowing Joshua's

\textsuperscript{24}New Hampshire Gazette, 12/29/69.
\textsuperscript{25}Day Book, 1769-72.
fields in April. On May 16 Samuel "went to view Joshua’s House," and one week later they "hew’d Timber for Josuhas Leen to." In mid-June they tore down the chimney, fixed the house foundation and began to rebuild the chimney. On July 1, Samuel wrote "Calley Avery Merrill & my Self...began to frame Joshua's Leanto."

The lean-to was fairly elaborate with several windows, two doors, shelves and cupboards. After the structure was finished, Samuel hired James Merrill to paint the whole house. In late August Samuel continued improving Joshua's farm; he used the rocks hauled there from his house and "Ston'd Joshuas Celler & Dary &c." Exactlly two months later work on Joshua's shop chimney started. Finally on November 25, 1771 Samuel finished his work for Joshua that year. Samuel's tally for all the work done at Joshua's during 1770 and 1771 was £52-19-0 lawful money or £1059 old tenor, which included all materials, labor, food and drink except for Joshua's labor.

The project for 1772 was Joshua's dairy. In June Samuel hauled more rocks to Joshua's farm for the foundation and began work on June 24. The last remark concerning his work for Joshua came in July when they "finish'd Joshuas Sinkroom." Samuel also provided a cheese press for the dairy.

The account of the work Samuel did for Joshua was for his own use; he never collected for any of the work. At the same time he kept a separate account with Joshua; debits included 1 pound of powder, ½ bushel wheat, 1 gallon molasses, the labor of Ben and his oxen for "1 long Day getting in Stalks" and sole leather. Joshua's credits were 1

---

26 Diary, 5/16/71, 5/22/71.
27 Diary, 7/4/72; Day Book, 1769-72.
day of planting and making a pair of boots and shoes. As time passed Samuel appears to have forgiven, and even stopped recording, his son’s debts that accrued in the course of their exchanges with each other.

Joshua’s only account in Samuel’s “Great Book” is brief:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1788 May 28.</td>
<td>pd Simon Pottle for you</td>
<td>2-17-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789 May 15.</td>
<td>To a Cow I bo’t of Tuftin Philbrook</td>
<td>3-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 31. To money lent you 7 Dollars</td>
<td>2-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 3. 1789.</td>
<td>To a Cow I had of Edwd Sanbon</td>
<td>3-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Son Joshua C't

Apr 2 1792 By keeping a Calf you had with the Cow you had of Tuftin Philbrook on my Acco’t on the 15th Day of May 1789 which Calf is this Day bro’t home, with her Calf by her Side wh Calf you had Agin. Also See his Cr in my Day book 1790 also his note

The credits in the 1790 Day Book consist of farm work by Joshua, his sons and his steers, as well as making two pair of shoes. By 1792 Joshua’s account was mostly fiction; at the bottom Samuel left a memorandum, “I think not to Demand this Acco’t of Son Joshua.” So that his executor would not miss the point he added, “I would not have this account Demanded of Son Joshua unless I demand it in my Life time.”

In 1792 Joshua, the head of his own household for over twenty years, had entered a reciprocal relationship with his father in which their roles were reversed, or at least interchangeable. Each relied on the other for help, and just as if they were members of the same household, neither felt the necessity to reckon their account with the other.

Diary entries of Joshua’s work — carrying cider, beef and hay to Portsmouth, plowing, hauling dung and other miscellaneous work — are common enough to suggest that collaboration between father and son continued on a regular basis. Notes and exchanges of goods were a different matter. Until 1792 and the above account, Samuel appears to

---

28Lane Account Book, p. 209.
have collected on loans made to his sons. And certain items were gifts to daughters but not to sons. Samuel ordered six grandfather's clocks from Kensington's Jeremiah Fellows on October 27, 1783 for his eldest children. On December 4, Joshua paid his father 40 shillings "toward his Clock." The clock arrived on December 9 and Samuel paid Fellows $28. That same day Joshua paid his father 20 shillings, and on February 21, 1784, 66 shillings. Joshua's cash payments were the equivalent of $21; he paid the balance by the use of his steers.29

Joshua and his father had one other arrangement that is documented only for 1772. Samuel bought the Robinson Farm to the west of Joshua's on Rocky Lane in 1771 and Joshua farmed it to the halves the following year. He returned his father income derived from rye, oats, corn, hay, flax, cider, cabbages and pasturing steers to the value of £11-17-0. It is not clear how long this arrangement continued; Samuel deeded Joshua the land in 1784.

Samuel treated his eldest son, Samuel Junior, in a similar manner. One can imagine some awkward situations in the Lane household after Mary Lane's death in 1769. Both father and son were courting at the same time. On December 5, 1769 the father wrote "S-m1 went to see H-n C-te [Hannah Cate]." The familiar code indicates that romance inspired this meeting. When Samuel went to the Bank and "w-d C-t-s [widow Cates]" three weeks later, it may have been on his own account or that of his son's. If the former, his own interest in his son's future mother-in-law was fleeting. Two weeks later Samuel was in Newmarket visiting "W-

29Diary, 10/27/83, 12/4/83, 12/9/83; Day Book, 1783.
d-w F-1s-m [widow Folsom].” 30 Whatever the situation, it did not dampen
the ardor of the young couple; they married October 25, 1770. 31

His eldest son’s marriage allowed Samuel to finalize his plans for
settling his sons. When the younger Joshua married first, the only
option Samuel had was to move them into the new house specifically built
for his eldest son. The father raced during the year before his eldest
son’s nuptials; Samuel found property for Joshua, and moved him there
one week before his older brother married. The former Piper farm was
then available for young Samuel and his bride.

Samuel wanted no any ambiguity among his two older sons about
their future and his homestead. In 1770 Jabez, the youngest son, was
ten years old and lame; that circumstance as well as Samuel’s need to
support his own family were deciding factors in dedicating his farm to
Jabez. Thus, neither older son needed to worry about acquiring land on
which to live and farm with their families, nor did they have to wait
for their father to retire from farming and divide his land before
beginning their families. Samuel’s intent was clear early on; to
eliminate any right of dower in the properties, he gave Samuel and
Joshua deeds to their farms in 1774 just before his second marriage. If
not apparent before, it must have been apparent then that his own farm
was to go to Jabez.

Although Samuel was remarkably even-handed in passing on property
to his children - his daughters’ portions attest to that - he did make
subtle distinctions in the transfers of realty to his two sons. 32

---

30 Diary, 12/5/69, 12/27/69, 1/11/70, 3/15/70.
31 Hannah Cate was born in Greenland, May 14, 1747.
32 Samuel later added a note at the bottom of Mary Crocket’s 1762 portion
which attests to his preoccupation with evenhandedness, “Marys Weding
Samuel initially received the larger 43 acre farm, with a new dwelling house; Joshua's farm contained 27 acres and a refurbished farmhouse. Each son paid their father a modest £5 for their farms. Samuel favored his elder son and namesake in other ways. On June 3, 1774 when Samuel transferred the farm's deed to Samuel Junior, he also passed title to 24 acres of land at Stratham's Great Hill and about 2 acres of Salt marsh at Chestley's Cove. There was no symbolic purchase of these additional lands by his son; the father transferred them "for & in consideration of the Love goodwill & affection which I have & do bear towards my beloved Son."33 That year Samuel had transferred to his namesake 69 acres of Stratham land as well as a dwelling house and farm buildings, although, as previously noted, he reserved half the income from the 43 acre farm.

Samuel treated Joshua in a slightly different manner. On June 3, 1774 he also gave Joshua the deed to his farm in exchange for £5 and a reservation of half the income. But that was the extent of his transfer to Joshua until ten years later. In January 1784 Samuel gave Joshua the 32 acre farm abutting his to the west, 2 acres of salt marsh in Chestley's Cove in Stratham, and a 5 acre parcel in Epping. It took Samuel ten years to balance the legacies of his two elder sons in Stratham lands.

However, in the intervening years he had made another gift to his son Samuel, all the right to his lands in Bow, which consisted of one original right, seven 20 acre lots and several other parcels. These lands continued to be speculative in nature and their value depended

Gounds was Chence Cost 60£ Since then I gave her a Stuff gound to make it as good as a Silk one." NHHS, Lane Papers.

33NHSA, RC Deeds 150:102.
upon the determination of lawsuits and settlements with Bow's neighboring towns. The one other gift to both Samuel and Joshua came in 1790 and was roughly equivalent, 15 acres to Samuel and 20 acres to Joshua of the "Oak Land" in Newmarket.

Although these gifts of realty to his two older sons appear equivalent, Samuel acted according to a pattern Toby L. Ditz found in eighteenth-century Connecticut, that "property holders made fine discriminations among their heirs." In that province limited real and personal property in most families created a tension between parents' desire to pass on an intact family estate and this desire to provide for all children.34 To a limited degree Samuel seems to have favored his eldest son. He received more acreage in Stratham, albeit a modest amount, but the quality of those lands and their value was greater. The Piper farm lay on the Country Road, the main highway between Exeter and Portsmouth, and contained more of the valuable low lands for pasture and hay fields than did the Veasey Farm on Rocky Lane. Samuel paid Piper about £6729 for the farm, acreage at Great Hill and salt marsh he gave to his son. Adding more Great Hill land, the gifts to Samuel in 1774 totaled £7529 exclusive of the improvements Samuel made to the farm. That same year Joshua's land was worth £2700. Added to this in 1784 was the Robinson farm and 2 acres of salt marsh making Joshua's Stratham property worth £6100 not counting any improvements.35 The value of Joshua's land was one-fifth less than that of his oldest brother.

Magnifying this discrepancy were the improvements Samuel made to the

34Ditz, p. 247.
35On October 10, 1771 Samuel tallied up the work done on Joshua's house, "this fall & Summer I did abundance of work on Joshua's House, to the Value of about 1000£ Cost with Stuff old Ten£." Journal, p. 42.
properties. Samuel's house was new, replaced a dwelling his father felt inadequate and was more valuable than the renovated dwelling passed on to the younger Joshua. Perhaps this relatively small discrepancy reflected Samuel's timid embrace of traditional inheritance patterns. His work with estates as legal advisor and surveyor often involved double shares passed on to eldest sons. Son Samuel's dwelling and its location conferred a somewhat greater status on him than would have Joshua's farm. Perhaps more telling is the ad Samuel placed in the *New Hampshire Gazette*; his ambivalence at settling the younger Joshua in Stratham combined with the other factors was not equivalent to a "double share," but his eldest son did receive a bonus.

Also, the gift of Bow lands to Samuel Junior is significant, at least in its symbolism. As Proprietors' Clerk to Bow, Samuel had invested many resources in the success of that venture. The Proprietors, who by the 1780s were essentially Walter Bryant and Samuel Lane, continued to press their claims in the courts. Having his namesake assume an interest in the Bow Propriety undoubtedly had emotional implications for Samuel. Although the power and value of the Propriety was much diminished by 1780, Samuel found comfort in having his eldest son maintain the connection to those lands.

Samuel's own life demonstrated that household needs changed as families aged.\(^{36}\) He had prepared well, anticipating the material needs of his children as they married and had children of their own. At that important transition from single to married son or daughter, Samuel gave each child a major share of their "portion" of his estate when they needed it most. That property symbolized more than an increase in mere

\(^{36}\)Main, p. 159; see also Ulrich, *Midwife*, chapter 2.
wealth but was a manifestation of a larger revolution in their status which included community membership as an independent householder, participation in the political process as a voter, taxpayer and office holder, and admission to the church. With these gifts Samuel provided his children the material foundation to enter their community as full members.

Comparing the gifts to his children on the basis of gender is misleading if considered on an individual basis. Samuel's perspective encompassed not individual sons or daughters, but their families, and he sought some rough equivalency between family units. Each daughter received about £1300 in household goods from their father; Samuel anticipated that their spouses would contribute the real property necessary to form a stable household. His expectations were sound. Each daughter took from his household a substantial quantity of domestic goods to furnish the home provided by her husband. On the other hand his sons brought land and dwellings to their unions; there is little mention of any household goods accompanying them courtesy of their father. Although valued considerably more than the daughters' portions, the property he gave his sons was encumbered. Considering families and not individuals, his children emerged from their weddings on a fairly equal footing; each child had a home, in most cases a farm, and the domestic requisites for the wife to set up a productive household.

On an individual level, "formidable gender inequality was still a feature of colonial practices." However, by applying the egalitarian ideal to families, colonials such as Samuel provided a measure of justice to the system and mitigated the conflict between providing for

---

37Hain, p. 160.
all progeny and leaving landed estates intact as much as possible. These practices anticipated the trends shifting inheritance practice away from entail and primogeniture, attitudes that were weak in New England but continued to have some influence before the Revolution. Nowhere does Samuel display the European emphasis on maintaining family lands for the sake of some family ideal; perhaps his artisan background colored his outlook in this area. Land was the means to settling a family, but there was no magic associated with specific lands in reaching that goal.

Samuel's success in settling both sons and daughters in their own households is clear when looking at where his children settled. Most families would have preferred to have their children comfortably settled in their own town, but land scarcities in older towns precluded many from reaching that ideal. Four of Samuel's daughters eventually settled away from Stratham, two in Northwood and two in Sanbornton. As we have seen John and Mary Crocket first settled in Stratham on a small parcel of land; 15 years later they succumbed to the lure of cheap land and bought a farm in Northwood. Only the Bordman family had sufficient resources to set up Martha and William in nearby Durham. Thus four out of five local families with sons who married Samuel's daughters were unable to provide land enough for their sons in the community. On the other hand Samuel settled all three sons on substantial Stratham farms.

Perhaps Samuel's biggest dilemma was his youngest son Jabez. Born in 1760, Jabez was "naturally of a weakly constitution, and lame in one knee from the age of about 6 years, so as to be obliged, at times, to

---

38Bitz, p. 249, 251.
39Gross, p. 181.
use a crutch, and generally walk with a cane."\textsuperscript{40} Jabez used the term "cripple" himself to describe his condition. In 1791 Samuel remarked on Jabez's tax strategy, "Jabez thinks not to give in his Head Except other Cripples do. but the Select Men Rated him."\textsuperscript{41} Samuel first mentioned this handicap February 12, 1766 when "Jabez taken with his Knee Pain."\textsuperscript{42} Perhaps Samuel saw the parallels with his own lameness and Latin schooling as a child, and followed his father's strategy. Jabez started to prepare for college, but the Revolution aborted those plans and he adopted his father's trade.\textsuperscript{43} For five weeks during the winter of 1778 Jabez worked with Mr. Foster and "learn'd to make Cloth Shoes," Samuel reported, "and Does Considerable at that and other light work."\textsuperscript{44}

The evaluation that Jabez could accomplish only "light work" was perhaps as much a product of Samuel's imagination as reality. In addition to cloth shoes, Jabez made leather shoes as well, and worked in his father's tanyard. In 1781 and 1782 together father and son tanned 32\% hides and 50 calfskins. By 1785 Samuel's output had dropped to 6 hides and 11 calfskins, and Jabez tanned 9 hides and 25 calfskins on his own account.\textsuperscript{45} Also, this "cripple" was healthy enough for other forms of work. He plowed, hoed in the rye, went on trading trips to Portsmouth and to the curriers with hides, and by the summer of 1800, "Son Jabez has undertook to get my Hay;" his father wrote, "& most of my

\textsuperscript{40}Edmund J. Lane, "A Genealogy and brief History of the Lane Family in New Hampshire," NHHS, unpublished manuscript, 1839, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{41}Day Book, 1791.
\textsuperscript{42}Diary, 2/12/66.
\textsuperscript{43}Edmund J. and James P. Lane, p. 32.
\textsuperscript{44}Journal, p. 48; "Considerable was 127 pair of cloth shoes in 1782. NHHS, Jabez Lane Day Book, 1782.
\textsuperscript{45}Journal, pp. 52-53, 55; NHHS, Jabez Lane Tanyard Journal.
other work. Perhaps Jabez was lamer through a compassionate father's eyes than his physical condition warranted.

Jabez was only eight years old when his mother died in 1769. Within two years of her death both his brothers married and settled their own families making Jabez the lone boy in a house with four older sisters. Soon after Mary's death Samuel looked to rectify his unnatural unmarried state by visiting eligible widows. By 1774 he was charmed by Newmarket's Rachel Colcord, recently widowed by her husband Gideon. His courtship of Rachel began in earnest on February 22, 1774 when he went to her house for some boards and enjoyed a "Pipe & Sydr" while there. A scant two months later, on April 20, he proposed. Rachel responded that she would "think on it," but surrendered "1 K-ss." Over the next two months she gave Samuel no definite answer, and informed him that another gentleman was courting her also. Undeterred, Samuel made several more visits, took her to see Stratham and gave her "8 Choklates." She rewarded his persistence; on May 30 Rachel Colcord accepted his proposal and later told him she was very pleased and surprised that any man would have gained her hand so soon after her first husband's death. They married in June and she went to live in Stratham that September.

Rachel and Gideon Colcord had six sons and one daughter. It seems likely that two of her children moved with her to Stratham, Eunice (age 7) and Benjamin (age 9). Job, aged 14 at the time, was apprenticed to a trade, and his three older brothers, Gideon, Nathaniel and Josiah probably remained in Newmarket at the Colcord homestead. The Colcord

47 Diary, 1774; He remarked of Rachel, "She was Born [at Cape Ann] June 29 1726 old Stile & her Birth Day comes on July 10 N Stile. my Wife is 7 years 9 M^o & 7 Days younger y^n I," Journal, p. 44.
children eventually dispersed with the exception of Gideon who remained on the family farm. Four of the brothers emigrated to Maine with three settling in Parsonfield, a town bearing their mother's maiden name. The youngest boy, Benjamin, eventually settled in Northwood, very likely because of his Lane relatives living there.

Upon his marriage to Rachel in 1774, Samuel's household nearly doubled in size overnight. The turmoil within caused by the merger of two households was matched outside. Conflict with the royal government would erupt into open warfare within a year; however, that conflict affected the Lane household only indirectly. Increased taxes, shortages, inflation, Samuel's service in New Hampshire's Congress and rumors of British soldiers invading the Province constantly made the family aware of the war, but rarely interrupted their daily routine.

It is not clear what each of the Colcord children did immediately after their mother's marriage to Samuel. Although Josiah was to serve out his time with his mother until age twenty-one as specified by Gideon Colcord in his will dated September 16, 1773, there is no evidence that he lived in Stratham before he reached his majority in 1776. His mother may have had him serve his remaining time in Newmarket where she retained one-half interest in the real estate during her life. Rachel was to see that Job and Jeremiah each "be Fitted for and caused to be Taught Such a Trade as he Shall Chuse at the Expense of my wife."48 By 1786 Job Colcord had a family and visited Stratham with them that year for four days. Jeremiah Colcord had married and moved to Parsonfield by 1792 when Samuel took Rachel there on a five day visit. With little
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48 RC Probate, Gideon Colcord Will, 40410s.
mention of either in Samuel's diary, it is clear that their training
came from outside the Stratham household.

The combination of the two families seems to have been embraced by
both parents and children alike. Eunice, the only daughter in the
colcord house, entered the Lane household at an exciting time; within
the next few years two stepsisters, Susanna and Martha Lane, both
married. Jabez acquired a male companion in Benjamin, something he had
lost with the marriages of his two brothers.

The only Colcord children consistently mentioned in Samuel's diary
during this period are Benjamin and Eunice. Benjamin, the youngest son
and only eight years old at the time Gideon Colcord made his will,
required more care than his older brothers; Rachel's husband directed
her to "Bring him up Until he is fit for a trade" as well as to prepare
him for a trade of his choosing. Samuel and Rachel decided that those
directions could best be satisfied in their own household. Benjamin
grew up with, and apprenticed to his stepfather Samuel. When "Jabez,
Eunice, Benj & Dinah had the Measles," in the spring of 1783, they
were, along with their parents, the remaining members of the combined
Lane and Colcord families residing in Samuel's Stratham house. Dinah, a
slave, belonged to Rachel.49

As far as the records show Samuel treated Ben as he did any
apprentice. The first mention of Ben working for Samuel is in May 1778
when he plowed on his stepfather's account.50 Throughout the 1780s he

49Diary, 3/11/86, 3/15/86, 1/12/92; Doane B. Colcord, Colcord Genealogy
(Coudersport, PA: Mahlon J. Colcord, 1908), p. 50; Journal, p. 54.
50Benjamin Colcord's indenture to his stepfather may have started prior
to May, 1778; Samuel's Day Books between 1772 and 1778 are missing.
However, Ben was thirteen at the time and at the age for his time to
begin.
appears regularly in Samuel's accounts performing agricultural labor for others. There is no indication as to whether Ben learned the trades of tanning and coddwaining as well. He left Samuel's service in 1787; that April Jeremiah Norris made "Bens freedom Suit."\textsuperscript{51} Some time later Ben moved to Northwood, and in 1795 he married Hannah Batchelder of Northwood. The same year he borrowed £6 from Samuel, presumably to help with the expense of setting up a household.\textsuperscript{52}

Like the Lane family, the Colcords visited one another often, even after they moved east to Maine or west to Northwood. Samuel's diary chronicles a succession of family visits and the Colcord men had no qualms about staying with their mother and stepfather in Stratham. Samuel exhibited an interest in his extended family, noting significant events such as visits, illness and deaths, but did not record births as was his custom with his own family. His interest extended to trading with Gideon Colcord and lending several of the Colcord boys money even though they lived at some distance by that time. Loans to Jeremiah and Job first appear in 1785 with their brother Gideon joining them the following year. Ben borrowed money the year of his marriage in 1795 as noted above.

In addition, Samuel helped in other ways. He lent Gideon Colcord shoe leather several times in the latter half of 1780, but with a talented coddwainer married to his mother, Gideon may have decided that shoeing his family himself was not worth the effort. After borrowing leather from July to December, on December 21, 1780, Gideon had his wife's shoes made by Samuel. After that point until at least 1783,

\textsuperscript{51}Pay Book, 1787.
\textsuperscript{52}Pay Book, 1795-1800. Samuel wrote in his diary on January 22, 1800, "Benj Colcord pd me."
Samuel made shoes for the Colcords; Jabez made their shoes the following year. In return Gideon provided Samuel with corn, flax, hemlock bark, a pig and carpentry about his house and barn. 53 Samuel made Nathaniel Colcord's shoes in 1784; Nat paid his debt in 1789 by "choping Wood." 54

Although their mother's marriage alone tied the Colcord boys to Samuel, he assumed the role of surrogate father. His stature in this respect may have risen considerably with the events taking place under his roof in Stratham. Perhaps Jabez and Eunice's June 1783 trip to visit their siblings in Sanbornton was to announce their intention to marry. The only other mention of this event came in October when Samuel announced, "Son Jabez Married 2nd Day." Eunice was sixteen and Jabez twenty-three at the time.

With respect to his legacy from his father, Jabez was always treated differently from his two older brothers. Samuel may have made this distinction for any one of three reasons: that Jabez was his youngest son; that he married a stepdaughter; or that he was lame. In the first case Samuel compensated for Jabez's youth by adopting the common practice of ultimogeniture, or passing the family property to the youngest son. Its advantages favored nearly all the interested parties. Samuel did not have to relinquish his farm before he was ready to retire nor did his older sons need postpone establishing their own families in hopes that the family farm would eventually pass to them. 55 Samuel was able to settle each older son on a farm of his own, and he could

53 Day Book, 1780; Account Book, pp. 245-46. The account suggests that Gideon Colcord had two children, Rachel and Daniel. Daniel may be the "Dan" that worked for Samuel in 1789.
54 Day Book, 1784.
55 Greven discusses this in chapter 8.
continue to use his own farm to support his own children and
stepchildren free from those pressures.

When Jabez and Eunice decided to marry, Samuel and Rachel were not
ready to relinquish their home to the newlywed couple. Their solution
was to settle Jabez and Eunice in the Mason farmhouse Samuel had
acquired with Neighbor Mason’s farm in 1777. It was a nearly perfect
resolution to their dilemma. The house was on the property Samuel had
designated for Jabez, and only 100 rods east of his own house; Jabez
could work alongside his father on the farm, in the shop and at the
tannery which was to be his, and live in a separate dwelling on the same
property. In the months before the two were married, Jabez set about
fixing up the house: reshingling the roof, clapboarding, repairing and
whitewashing the chimneys, and adding and repairing windows. Unlike the
repair of his two brothers’ houses, the account for this work is in
Jabez’s own account book, not that of Samuel. The total, £9-8-0,
includes 20 days of Jabez’s own labor, £3 worth, but it is not clear who
paid the bill, Jabez or his father. 56

The couple moved into their new home on October 20, eighteen days
after their wedding. Jabez’s new status as household head did not alter
the cooperative work relationship between father and son. Jabez
continued his work in the various Lane enterprises as he had before.
Benjamin Colcord remained in Samuel’s house with his mother and
stepfather; he had four years left in his indenture to Samuel. By its
outward appearance the union appears to have followed the pattern of
Samuel’s other daughters and sons with the husband bringing the real
property, and the wife personal property to the relationship. However,

56NHHS, Jabez Lane Day Book, 1783.
this particular relationship had a few interesting twists. Eunice brought one-half her parents’ household goods to her marriage, and Gideon Colcord’s will also directed that she be paid £5 “at the age of Eighteen years or at marriage Day.” At his death in 1773 Gideon Colcord’s estate was valued at £421-10-1, and £32-13-8 of that total was household goods. It appears that Eunice would have brought several beds and bedding, table linens, a couple of desks or chests of drawers, chairs, tables, fireplace utensils, kitchen and dining ware and a spinning wheel to her marriage. However, their value, about £16-6-10, or £326-16-0 Old Tenor, was one-quarter of the value of the household goods in each of Samuel’s daughters marriage portions.

As his stepdaughter and a member of his household for nine years Samuel may well have assumed the role of surrogate father and felt obligated to give the couple a portion of household goods to complement the things Eunice received from her father’s estate. In an extraordinary move compared to his other sons’ marriages, Samuel first made a list “of Some things left in my House after Sarah had taken hers which belong’d to my first Wife.” On October 20, 1783, the day Jabez and Eunice moved to their new home Samuel made another list headed, “I gave Son Jabez out of y® above things as follows vizt.”

- 1 feather Bed that was his Mothers
- 1 Bolster
- 1 good Wool Coverlid
- 1 Mean Ditto
- 1 Mill’d Bed Blanket
- 1 Linen & Wool Ditto
- 1 Cotton & Linen Sheet
- 1 Tow & Linen Ditto
- 1 Bolster Case
- 2 Cotton & Linen Pillow Cases
- 1 Bedstead

57RC Probate 404108.
Samuel's roles as father and stepfather merged with the wedding of Jabez and Eunice. Was Jabez asking his own father, or Eunice Colcord's stepfather when he approached Samuel and "asked your consent in Marrying?" Several reasons - fairplay, justice and perhaps responsibility as surrogate father of the bride - prompted him to provide the young couple both personal and real property to ensure their success. The strength of tradition, family ideals and continuity combined to vary the procedure in this aberrant case, but produced a result similar to that achieved by the marriages of his other sons and daughters.

Jabez was different for another reason, his weak constitution and lameness. Perhaps this disability caused Samuel to regard his youngest son as less competent to deal with worldly matters. In the case of Joshua and Samuel Junior, their father gave them the deeds to their farms within a few years of their marriage, a move precipitated by Samuel's engagement to Rachel. He hesitated to do the same for Jabez. Although he made out a deed to Jabez for his 93 acre farm as well as other Stratham lands the year following his son's marriage, Samuel kept possession of this property, giving only assurances that the property ultimately would pass to his youngest. Jabez had fallen into an ambiguous status; he was neither freeholder nor a dependent in his father's household. He kept his own accounts and carried on his shoe business independent of his father, but his tannery work was sometimes indistinguishable from Samuel's. And their farming appears to have been

58 Day Book, 1783.
59 Letter, Jabez Lane-Samuel Lane, Dec. 1799, NHHS, Lane Family Papers, flr 6.
a cooperative venture also. After 1783 Samuel's diary mentions Jabez plowing, carrying hides to the currier and trading in Portsmouth for him. There was some division of the lands on the farm between the households of father and son, and Samuel often noted work he performed for Jabez. In September 1784 Samuel "Sow'd 6 qts Rye in upper field; & Jabez" - and he mentioned hauling wood for Jabez several times. When son Samuel brought his father five barrels of cider in October 1789, "Jabez had 1 of them." 60 They kept their livestock separate and Samuel noted specifically when Jabez's cattle went to the Bank. 61

The appearance of a cooperative and harmonious relationship between father and son masked Jabez's tension and anxiety over his situation. The 1784 deed to his Stratham farm was not recorded until January 23, 1800. Such delays were not unusual in the transfer of property between family members, indeed many transfers went unrecorded, but in a December 1799 letter to his father, Jabez voiced his concern about his status, and relationship with his father. Addressed to his "honoured father, Deacon Samuel Lane," Jabez wrote:

Before I entered the stage of action, I was led by your own declaration to Suppose, I should have some solid foundation to rest upon, for the support of my family, or else in my state of incapacity for hard labour, I should not have made the Experiment, until I had, by some means or other, acquired property, or perhaps not at all. - after I had asked your consent in Marrying, and likewise asked you to give me some real Estate, which you declined saying it was as Safe in your hands as mine, I laid aside for a number of months my plan of entering into a family state, - I mentioned to one of my Brothers, my determination, which was not to marry, 'till I had some real Estate I could call my own, - he said that was the way you did by him at first, but in a little while after, gave him a Deed without any more asking; and you would do the same by me in a little while, he tho't I need not be concern'd about it...but when year after year roll'd away and it was not done, I felt by degrees, more and more uneasy.

60 Diary, 9/9/84, 2/25/86, 10/7/89.
61 See Diary 6/17/80, 11/18/93; Day Book, 1787.
Thus, the Lanes were not free of the intergenerational tension that so many colonial families harbored. It appears that Jabez could lay aside his uneasiness and quietly accept his predicament until the disparity between his own and his brothers' situations widened; in 1798 Samuel gave his older sons title to additional lands and Jabez could contain his unhappiness no longer, "my disappointment and tryal was as great as it was possible for me to bear." 62

Jabez's letter had two purposes, to express his long repressed sentiments and to persuade Samuel to pass him title to the property. His arguments must have struck a respondent chord in Samuel who knew firsthand the trials of a young couple with little property, and who had seen similar situations among his friends and neighbors in Stratham. Jabez pointed out the advantages his brothers enjoyed holding title to their property, particularly the income that had accrued to them, income Samuel would not account as their share in his estate. In addition, brothers Samuel and Joshua had sold some of the land and passed some of it on to their own children, options unavailable to Jabez. He was in his prime, "I am now in the fortieth year of my Age find my Self Surrounded by a large, and consequently an expensive family," while he observed that his "Brothers have arrived at that period in life when their families are decreasing, they are now Small in comparison with mine." 63 He asked plaintively, "when in the name of common sense, will it be necessary for me to have property, if the present is not the time." 64

62 NHHS, Letter, Jabez Lane, Dec. 1799.
63 By 1799 Eunice and Jabez had five children; the oldest was fifteen and the youngest, five.
64 NHHS, Letter, Jabez Lane, Dec. 1799.
Jabez sought to reassure his father that a transfer was in everyone's best interest. He outlined the various ways in which his father's intent might be thwarted either by chance or malice if left in the hands of others after his death. As for Samuel's support, Jabez promised his father, "you might ease yourself of that care, which must be a burden at your time of life as I should be willing, to carry on the whole place, and render you, in conjunction with my Brothers, as much produce of every kind, as you should want to expend."65

Samuel's burdensome old age and sense of mortality lent support to Jabez's letter. As early as 1785 when he was sixty-eight years old, he went to visit family in Sanbornton and predicted that visit was "perhaps y'o last time."66 In 1790 he remarked, "my Strength failing," and in 1794 a litany of complaints began including pains in his feet and legs, deafness, shaking fits and vomiting. His declining health as well as his own sentiments concerning the disposition of his estate may have combined to make Jabez's arguments irresistible. His son wrote him, "you used to say you intended to make my lame leg as long as the other, (to use your expression) and my eldest brother told me a number of years ago, that he told you, he was willing you should give me, as much as you did him & B' Josù both (on account of my being lame)."67 Samuel simply may have been waiting for his son to broach the subject; on January 23, 1800 Jabez entered in his journal, "I went Exeter put Deeds on record."68
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65NHHS, Letter, Jabez Lane, Dec. 1799.
66Journal, p. 54. It was not. His last trip there was in 1791.
67NHHS, Letter, Jabez Lane, Dec. 1799.
68NHHS, Jabez Lane Journal, 1/23/1800.
The deed Samuel executed in 1800 was the one drafted in 1784, three months after Jabez and Eunice’s marriage. It essentially followed the scheme outlined in the letter. Jabez received 103 Stratham acres, 93 of which were lands constituting the home farm, which Samuel indicated was “a part of his portion out of my estate.” Although his brothers were obliged to pay their father £5 in return for their farms, Jabez’s was an outright gift.\textsuperscript{69} Compared to Joshua’s 61 acres and Samuel Junior’s 66\% acres, Jabez was indeed compensated for his lameness. And more land followed. In 1802 his father gave him a 50 acre lot in Pittsfield, and three years after that 17 acres of Oak Land in Newmarket. Jabez gladly signed the obligation “to my honoured father Samuel Lane Esq\textsuperscript{70} that he shall have the whole use and improvement of all the Land he has given me by Deed.”\textsuperscript{70} Samuel’s youngest entered the new century with a peace of mind not enjoyed since his marriage to Eunice in 1783.

By 1805 then, Samuel Lane had disposed of the bulk of his estate. Each daughter was married and had left his household with a valuable selection of domestic goods and skills with which to establish a home in the image of her parents’. This custom was so ingrained that Samuel carried it over to his stepdaughter Eunice, whose household received items from his personal estate as well from her father’s estate.

During the last two years of his life Samuel owned no real estate at all; he had transferred all title to his sons retaining enough income from those lands to live out his last days in comfort. Just as his daughters produced textiles for their portions, his sons too,

\textsuperscript{69}NHSA, RC Deeds 152:459.
\textsuperscript{70}NHHS, Lane Family papers, Jabez Lane Obligation, 1/14/1800, flr 6.
contributed to their portions by working alongside their father, cultivating and improving the lands which later became theirs. From a landless artisan in 1741, when he went to Stratham to purchase a lot on which to built a house and tanyard, Samuel had risen over the years in both wealth and community stature. He was a prosperous farmer with large holdings on Stratham's main thoroughfare, and though in some years many around him suffered shortages, his "competency" precluded that hardship from attending his family. In addition, at a time when land scarcities obliged neighbor's sons to settle on western lands, Samuel settled each son on a substantial farm, insuring both their future and his own security as old age approached. Toby Ditz's study of Connecticut inheritance practices concluded that, "the urge to retain land within a family line or to accumulate it...was subordinated to two other concerns: to use Family property to set up as many households as possible and to pass on the status of independent freeholder to sons."71 Starting out his adult life as a landless shoemaker, Samuel Lane established family properties for each of his children to enjoy. He was exceptional in that his accomplishments allowed him the luxury to keep his property intact, as well as to settle an appropriate portion on each of his children, goals which eluded so many during the latter half of the eighteenth century.

71 Ditz, p. 256.
V. CONCLUSION - "my Father Died 7 o'Clock evening"

This study examines the course of one family's life through the eighteenth century in northern New England. However, it is not simply the story of the Lane family. In an intimate and personal society, it illustrates relationships that served many purposes on many levels and which defined the social structures of the eighteenth-century world. The record Samuel Lane left is complicated. Its scope, duration and constant repetition reconstructs the cycles of colonial life - annual cycles of household work, of agricultural practice, of craft practices and of town life; and the longer cycles of family life, of church life and of town life. Samuel's sixty year record identifies ebb and flow in a continual motion as well as incremental, yet permanent change which accompanied the individuals and institutions of colonial New England.

As these cycles emerge from the record so too does the cultural context which maintained, and was maintained by, the connections between individuals and groups in colonial society. Its unitary viewpoint and unifying feature of work emphasizes that cooperation rather than competition between men and women, parents and children, country folk and town residents, masters and servants was essential to the success of the society and economy. The experience documented here minimizes divisions in that society and reorients issues from household or market, to household and market. Clearly culture circumscribed the uses to which Samuel put the markets, but not his participation in them.

And this experience also points to a sharp distinction between the treatment and roles of men and women, but also refines the notion of equality within the broad outlines of the family. While unfair by
today's standards, Samuel's different treatment of sons and daughters with regard to their legacies promoted an equality of a different sort which fostered family and complemented its culture.

Samuel's last diary entry in December, 1801 was typically cryptic, "pretty cold." By then his activity was limited by failing health, and most of the entries detailed weather observations or family visits, deaths and births. In his seventies ailments took increasing precedence in the diary. On February 20, 1794 he wrote, "I was taken with a Rheumatic Pain in my Right foot; which held about 4 Months. then went into my left foot, & held about a Month." His foot problems were recurrent and by 1802 he could note, "My great toes began to be Sore as Usual & held about a Week." In 1796 he referred to himself as "very Deaf."¹ Dizziness, sickness and vomiting accompanied his last years and although he noted them in various writings, it was without remorse, bitterness or anger. His life had, and would continue to fulfill God's will.

Toward the end of his life Samuel probably did not realize that his legacy to his children had not simply recreated the world he had known, but had provided his sons and daughters the resources to succeed in the social and economic climate of a new country and century. The last comment he ever wrote came on his eighty-fifth birthday, "I enter'd the 86th year of my Age."² Deaf and nearly blind by then he wrote no more. Three years later his grandson, Edmund Lane remembered seeing his grandfather in his second floor room, "He was sitting in his easy chair

¹"Years of the Life;" Journal, p. 61.
²Journal, p. 61.
upright his hands lying beside him his eyes open but being blind he did not see me & deaf did not hear me...his beard unshaven for a week or more, and his white hair hanging loosely over his head."\(^3\)

Although he was roombound for his last years, the seeds he had sown were at work with new results. Jabez left papers that are neither as extensive nor complete as Samuel's, but the parallels to his father are striking. Among them is a "Catalogue of Books owned by Jabez Lane," as well as an "Account of the Things I give my Daughter Martha Mathes Towards her Portion out of my Estate."\(^4\) Jabez's sense of family continuity mirrored that of his father, but subtle differences appear also.

Samuel was content to let his own skills support his family. His main investments were in his farm and tanyard. Outside investment took familiar forms, land and loans of money. Although other outlets for capital existed around him, especially mills and stocks of merchant goods, he remained conservative. Jabez, a skilled craftsman and a large landowner himself, availed himself of commercial opportunities his father avoided. On November 20, 1781 Jabez "Sent a Silver Dollar to bilboa by Jer Colcord, as a Venture." Perhaps he had second thoughts about this speculation: he spread his risk on March 9, 1782 by selling one-quarter of the "venture" to his sister Sarah. Their return was equivocal. In June he wrote, "we Received 4 yds & above ½ of gause. he [Jeremiah Colcord] had half for his Trouble, remains for us 2 yds and ½ & Better." That return was inducement enough to try again, however, the second venture was less salutary. In August 1782 "sent half a Dollar to

---

\(^3\)Edmund J. Lane, "his remembrance of his Grandfather," 10/28/83, NHHS, Lane Family Papers.

\(^4\)NHHS, Lane Papers, flr 6.
Sea By Jer Colcord," Jabez noted in his day book and later added "which I Lost." Another sign of Jabez's changing outlook was his half interest in a sawmill purchased in 1797. His father speculated too, but in the more traditional vehicles of land and an occasional lottery ticket.

Perhaps the different outlooks of father and son are most clear in the symbolism inherent in Jabez's actions immediately following his father's death. On Christmas Day 1806 Jabez wrote in his journal, "Father taken worse."

Four days later Samuel died in his sleep. Although Samuel's house had served his family well, Jabez had more ambitious designs for a dwelling. Within a month of his father's death, he began to cut timber for his new house frame. While the widow Rachel still resided in Stratham, preparations for the new house continued unabated; Jabez took down the well house and moved the shop. On April 2, 1807 Jabez took his stepmother to her residence in Newmarket for good; four days later he began to take down the chimney of the house she had lived in for thirty-three years. By the end of that year he wrote, "This year I took down the House that was my fathers and built a new House which I moved into Oct 26th having lived in the old House [Neighbor Mason's house] very Comfortably 24 years, In all which Time there was no breach made in our family, the Lord prepare us for what is before us."

Comfort, "competence" and security, underpinnings of Samuel's world, were not quite adequate for Jabez. Clearly his religious outlook and dependence on the divine will echoed that of his father's, but that

---

5Jabez Lane Day Book, NHHS, Lane Papers.
6Jabez Lane Journal, 12/25/06.
7Jabez Lane Journal, 1/22/07, 3/24/07, 3/25/07, 4/2/07, 4/6/07.
alone was not enough for complete satisfaction his post-colonial world. Jabez's ambitions were colored by the growing commercial environment around him, one manifestation of which was a more commodious dwelling for his considerable family.

Jabez lived only three years in his new house succumbing to illness in 1810. But even in death, his notion of security differed from that of his father's generation. Jabez left a substantial estate of over $8000 including his Stratham property, a farm in Lee, and personal goods, but the inclusion of $500 in Exeter Bank stock sets it apart from the world of Samuel Lane. Jabez intended that the income from the stock would support Eunice for seven years after his decease. Such a financial vehicle was never used by Samuel; his security rested in the land and in other individuals. Jabez was a part of the new economic and financial climate which would spur economic growth during the nineteenth century. Although available to Samuel in his later years, those devices could not have provided him the security necessary to live out his last years in competency, peace and comfort.

---

8 RC Probate #825608.
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### APPENDIX - TEXTILE PRODUCTION AND PURCHASE, 1743-1785

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SPINNING</th>
<th>WEAVERING</th>
<th>FLAX</th>
<th>WOOLENS</th>
<th>PURCHASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>32.66</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>47.675</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>38.175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>264.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>51.175</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>123.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.5+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>261.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>190.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>294.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>21.5+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>334.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>137.33</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>40.25</td>
<td>179.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>189+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.75</td>
<td>208.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>129.75</td>
<td>1.5+</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43.25</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>16+</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>170.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>18+</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NHHS, Lane Papers, Diaries and Day Books, 1743-1785.
Explanatory Notes - Appendix

The totals here are only those represented in either Samuel Lane's Diaries or Day Books. Thus, any textile work, spinning or weaving, done by Mary Lane or her daughters is not included here.

Spinning - number of skeins spun.

Weaving - number of yards woven.

Flax - number of skeins of flax yarn. From 1743 to 1765 the quantities here are based on purchases of flax from others. I assumed 300 of combed flax produced 150 skeins of yarn. After 1765 the Lanes purchased little flax, but Samuel began recording the amount sown on his farm. The quantities are based on the amount of flax sown assuming 1 bushel of flax sown produced 300 of flax.

Woolens - pounds of wool. Lane sheep were shorn annually in late May or early June. In the 1770s Lane sheep averaged 2.87 pounds of wool per sheep shorn.

Purchases - value in pounds, old tenor. This category includes purchases of finished textiles, excluding clothing, bought in Portsmouth or the Stratham area. The only "finished" product included here is handkerchiefs.