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ABSTRACT

This study examines the process of recruitment and the social makeup of active-duty militiamen in seventeenth century New England. King Philip’s War, 1675-1676, was the first military crisis to strike Massachusetts Bay Colony that required mass popular participation. The colonial government responded by impressing over a thousand men to fight, employing a recruitment system that evolved from the time of the colony’s founding in the 1630s. The Massachusetts militia system was a hybrid of the English militia as reorganized by Queen Elizabeth, but with sizeable safeguards put in place against changes made by King Charles I in the 1620s. The founders of Massachusetts saw Charles I’s “Perfect Militia,” especially its recruitment practices, as overly nationalistic, at the expense of local control. Thus, the Massachusetts system was centralized in command, but recruitment decisions were designed to be local, first practiced by elected officers, and, after 1652, by a unique new institution, the town committee of militia, made up of community civilian and military leaders.

When faced with a military emergency, Massachusetts Bay established composite companies of militiamen to fight the enemy, leaving the town militia companies generally intact for home defense. While the colonial government in Boston decided the number of men each town would call up, the determination of exactly who would be pressed remained a local choice. By 1675, this life-or-death decision was exclusively preformed by the town committees of militia.

The heart of this study is an extensive social portrait of the militiaman who served during the war from Essex County, Massachusetts and the twelve communities (and militia committees) that impressed them. Essex towns, which represented all five major community types in colonial Massachusetts, offer the perfect microcosm for understanding military recruitment in seventeenth-century New England. The details of the lives, families, and actions of the 357 enlisted soldiers offer a new and exhaustive appreciation of early American soldiers and the communities that sent them into battle.

Conventional historical wisdom asserts that the universal military obligation of the colonies, which forced all males from sixteen-to-sixty to serve in the militia, created seventeenth-century armies that mirrored society. This study proves that untrue. Unlike most adult males in colonial Massachusetts, the vast majority of men chosen for impressment were unmarried and childless, attesting to the society’s strong commitment to protect families from harm in the event of casualties. Significantly, the militia committees of every town also impressed a considerable majority of men who had some negative factor in their past or present, whether it was their low economic standing in town, criminal behavior, short residency, participating on the “wrong” side of a community dispute, or a combination of those factors. Town committees of militia did not chose men equally from the population; they carefully selected soldiers who would be least missed by the town and its families if they were killed in combat. Despite a widespread belief to the contrary, based on the idea of a universal military obligation, even the earliest American soldiers were not representative of their society; they were more the “Rabble” of their communities than their “Flower.”
... the Ruine of a choice Company of young Men, the very Flower of the County of Essex, all called out of the Towns belonging to that County, none of which were ashamed to speak with the Enemy in the Gate . . . .

--Rev. William Hubbard, describing Captain Thomas Lathrop's Company, ambushed at the Bloody Brook on September 18, 1675 in his *The History of the Indian Wars in New England*, 1677.

Resolved that from the Massachusetts bands / Be pressed on service some Hurculean hands . . . . Our walking castles, men of noted worth, / Made all of life, each Captain was a Mars, / His name too strong to stand on waterish verse . . . .

--Benjamin Thompson, describing the colonial soldiers and officers of King Philip’s War in his contemporary epic poem, *New England's Crisis*, 1676.

... the object of history is, by nature, man . . . . Behind the features of landscape, behind tools or machinery, behind what appear to be the most formalized written documents, and behind institutions which seem almost entirely detached from their founders, there are men and it is men that history seeks to grasp. . . . The good historian is like the giant in the fairy tale. He knows that whenever he catches the scent of human flesh, there his quarry lies.

--Marc Bloch, *The Historian's Craft*, 1941
THE FLOWER AND RABBLE OF ESSEX COUNTY
INTRODUCTION
THE FLOWER AND RABBLE OF ESSEX COUNTY:
THE MILITIA AND MILITIAMEN OF KING PHILIP'S WAR

In August 1675, the town of Marblehead, Massachusetts, was ordered to send five of its sons to war. They were to join Captain Thomas Lathrop as he marched west to defend the towns of the Connecticut River Valley. The war between many of the region's Indians, led by the Wampanoag leader Metacom, or King Philip, and the New Englanders of Massachusetts Bay, Connecticut, and Plymouth had been raging since July. As the enemy attacked, the colonists soon realized this was not the typical isolated raid they had seen in the past; it was all-out war. In August, Marblehead's Committee of Militia made its selections and impressed five men for service: William Dew, Samuel Hudson, John Merrett, Mark Pittman, and Thomas Rose. The five readied their seldom-used weapons, put their affairs in order, and said goodbye to their friends and families before marching out of town. The town waited anxiously for news of their safe return. When the report finally came, it was devastating. Four of the men had been killed in the ambush at Bloody Brook on September 18, 1675. Less than two months later, as horrific reports from the frontier continued to pour into town, the militia committee received another warrant; this time thirteen Marblehead men were needed. They were to join in a treacherous winter campaign to crush the Narragansetts in Rhode Island. The town
reeled at the news—would this group of its citizens also be annihilated? Who should the committee send?

War or the threat of war was an almost constant companion of the people of seventeenth-century America. New Englanders fought three major conflicts during the period and endured numerous incidents, raids, and threats of war, keeping the possibility of battle on the minds of most New Englanders. The most important of these seventeenth-century conflicts was King Philip’s War (1675-1676), a truly cataclysmic event in New England’s history: no family escaped its touch.¹ There can be no doubt that such armed conflict shaped colonial society in numerous ways. At the very least, it made the militia, the organization colonists depended on for protection, a principal institution of colonial life. Certainly John Adams thought so, naming the militia one of the four institutions (along with towns, schools, and churches) that ensured “the liberty, happiness, and prosperity of the [New England] colonies.”² As important as this history is, the story of the militia in the colonial era is not only of the military structure itself or the battles, but of the men who served and the reasons their society chose them, out of all its citizens, to fight for its survival. Unfortunately, most historians of colonial New England, including military historians, have overlooked this vital topic.

Most traditional military histories of the colonial era are either narratives of military conflict or detailed descriptions of the militia system, neither making a concerted


effort to place military affairs fully into the wider scope of colonial history. While indispensable as background material, these studies do not answer fundamental questions about the impact of the militia on life in colonial America. This began to change in the 1970s and 1980s with the emergence of a "new military history," a stepchild of the "new social history." Described often as the "War and Society" school of military history, it moved beyond the traditional focus on tactics, leader, battles, and institutions, the so-called "Drums and Trumpet" approach to the military's past. New military historians sought to examine military history in all of its facets, with a clear focus on social effects of the military and conflict, and to link the military experience to the broader themes of

---


the nation's past. Yet, the question soon emerged: how different was this “new” military history from its predecessor?

In an important review article in 1981 entitled “The Social History of the American Soldier: A Review and Prospectus for Research,” Richard H. Kohn, one of the founders of the new military history, argued that

In the last two decades scholars of the military have begun to abandon the old preoccupation with strategy and battle, but few practitioners of the “new” military history have chosen subjects that are frankly social . . . . In point of fact, historians have neglected one of the most pervasive experiences in American life, one especially suited to the new social history. Because of the vast literary and statistical source material, examining service in the military ought to reveal much about the American population and society and, even further, begin to explain the significance of that service and fix it firmly in the mosaic of American history, where it has always belonged.6

He urged that this crucial task begin with a scholarly inquiry into the identity of the American soldier. For Kohn, historians needed to deconstruct the historic myths of the American citizen-soldier with the tools of social history in order to truly understand the American military experience.

Kohn warned that historians needed to cast a suspicious eye on the old assumptions, especially the idea that American soldiers “comprised a representative cross-section of the American population.”7 While scholars and even the public, to a

---


certain degree, realize (especially in post-Vietnam War America) that the country’s soldiers were not and had not recently been representative of American society in general, the myth of a representative citizen-soldiery in America’s past continued. The idea that early American wars were fought by sacrificing citizen-volunteers, who left their farms only to return after they vanquished the enemy, is still a potent and widely-believed symbol of American historical exceptionalism. The truth behind that symbol, and similar myths about America’s military past, was Kohn’s objective for new military historians. In order to uncover the true American soldier, Kohn laid down a plan of action,

First, historians must discover who served, who enlisted in a community and who did not, whom the draft caught and who escaped: their age, ethnic background, wealth, occupation, length of time in the community, and whatever additional information can be gathered or wrung indirectly out of the sources. Except for a few case studies, this basic spadework work has never been done, and, until it is, any theories or generalizations about soldiers will not be persuasive. Further, understanding the true identity of the soldiers means grounding them in the communities and times in which they lived. From the profusion of community studies . . . scholars can begin, for a particular age or group of enlisted men, to establish a benchmark from which to trace the nature and impact of military service . . . . Historians must find all of this out . . . .

Without knowing the specific worlds they left, scholars can not fully comprehend American enlisted men beyond the stereotypes...

It is from this challenge that the current examination of the soldiers of King Philip's War and the communities in Essex County, Massachusetts, that recruited them originates. The benefit of this type of study, which grounds the soldiers in their communities, is that it not only uncovers the true nature of the colonial soldier, but offers important insights into the nature of the society that sent them to fight. A town's actions at a time of conflict, when the very survival of the settlement is at stake, offer an unparalleled vantage point to observe the concerns and values of that community.

Despite the fact that war and military institutions offer a window into New England society, relatively few social historians have bothered to look through it. Many display a long-held bias against anything resembling military history, even when the topic is more correctly seen as a sub-field of social history. While they have studied every other aspect and institution dealing with the formation and development of colonial societies--churches, families, land ownership patterns, farming techniques, and so on--social historians seem reluctant to examine one of the crucial institutions of colonial survival, the militia. Not a single major book in the first wave of "new social history" written in the 1960s and 1970s examined in any detail the militia's place in New England society. This trend continued among most subsequent social historians of colonial America.

---


10 Kohn, "Social History of the American Soldier," 553-554.
There were exceptions. The most important of these works came from T.H. Breen. Creating his own synthesis of colonial America, Breen gave a prominent place to the militia and armed conflict in his examination of colonial New England. In his collection of essays, *Puritans and Adventurers*, Breen defended his focus by explaining that “military matters occupied a large percentage of the settlers’ time . . . . After all, their very survival depended on a strong defense.” Breen argues that civil-military relations between English armies and English Puritans was one of the most compelling reasons John Winthrop and his followers left England in the 1630s. He also maintains that it was those negative experiences that led to the creation of a hybrid militia in New England, mixing older ideas of an Elizabethan militia system with Puritan beliefs about the institution. The militias, in turn, influenced and were influenced by the Puritans’ response to other institutions of society, most importantly local government and the congregational church. While in no way writing a social history of the militia, Breen’s analysis of the centrality of war and the military to colonial maturity was a clarion call to the field.

---

11 Bruce Daniel’s *The Connecticut Town* argued that the militia was central to the development of towns and scrutinized the communal nature and unifying effect of militia elections and the opposite effect of militia company divisions. Bruce C. Daniels, *The Connecticut Town: Growth and Development, 1635-1790* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1979), 132-139.


15 Breen seems to call for a social portrait: “The colonists apparently made no attempt to exclude persons from the militia because they were poor or because they were servants and the Bay trainbands may have represented a broader cross section of society than did their English counterparts.” As the arguments made below will show, Breen was more correct than he knew. See Breen, “Covenanted Militia,” 34 (my emphasis).
Meanwhile, the field of social history, somewhat bypassed in the late 1980s and 1990s, continued to produce new works examining New England. While many historians used new methods and drew heavily on cultural history, anthropology, archeology, and material culture to inform their conclusions, the blinders that prevented many from including military topics still existed. Yet a growing number of scholars began to develop an interest in the military aspects of colonial culture. One of the best examples is Gary Nash's *The Urban Crucible.*\(^{16}\) Nash argued that the stress of fighting and paying for the wars of the eighteenth century had a profound effect on the New England colonies. Richard Melvoin’s 1987 book about frontier Deerfield in Massachusetts, *New England Outpost,* posits that war was the most crucial element in that town's development.\(^{17}\) By the late 1990s and early 2000s, more studies have begun to treat the militia as an important part of colonial development.\(^{18}\) A number of recent regional studies examine the role of the militia in town formation and progress, including David Jaffee’s *People of the Wachusett* and Roger Thompson’s *Divided We Stand.*\(^{19}\) Mary


\(^{18}\) One fine example is Louise A. Breen’s examination of the elite of Puritan Massachusetts, which has at its center an analysis of the influence militia office and militia officers had on the enhancement of an elite in Puritan New England, an elite, she argues, that falls far from the traditional portrait of Massachusetts leadership. See Louise A. Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprises among the Puritan Elite in Massachusetts, 1630-1692* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

\(^{19}\) David Jaffee, *People of the Wachusett: Greater New England in History and Memory, 1630-1860* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999); Roger Thompson, *Divided We Stand: Watertown, Massachusetts, 1630-1680* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001). Jaffee links the founding of towns in central Massachusetts to its citizens’ experiences as “Indian Fighters” and argues that war was central to the establishment of the region. In *Divided We Stand,* Roger Thompson looks at the impact of militia service and training on the town’s young men, arguing that “membership in the militia seems to have been the vital glue that bound these groups [young men from various towns] and others in Middlesex county together.” Thompson continues with an analysis of the effects of that social cohesion on the town,
Beth Norton’s 2002 study of the Salem witchcraft episode, *In the Devil’s Snare*, links both accusers and the accused to the previous decade’s Indian wars, arguing that war experiences and stories, along with actual militia service, so traumatized the entire society that it erupted years later in witchcraft accusations and trials.\(^{20}\)

Most important are two 1999 studies.\(^{21}\) The first is a town study of Ipswich, Massachusetts, written by Alison Isabel Vannah. Vannah’s massive dissertation, “‘Crotchets of Division’: Ipswich in New England 1639-1679” describes the development of Ipswich at great length, including an exhaustive sketch of every family in the town.\(^{22}\) In a chapter called “the rebuke of God,” she highlights the importance of the militia and offers a detailed description of the men Ipswich impressed for King Philip’s

\(^{20}\) Mary Beth Norton, *In the Devil’s Snare: The Salem Witchcraft Crisis of 1692* (New York: Knopf, 2002). While Norton does not offer an extensive social portrait of the militiamen (or former militiamen) per se, her argument does link their service with turmoil in post-war Essex County. Norton acknowledges that the idea was also present, but not fully developed in James E. Kences, “Some Unexplored Relationships of Essex County Witchcraft to the Indian Wars of 1675 and 1689,” *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 120, no. 3 (1984): 179-212.

\(^{21}\) Two other recent studies of King Philip’s, written by cultural historians, deserve mention, even if they have little to do with the military’s place in the war. Jill Lepore’s, *The Name of War: King Philip’s War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf: A Borzoi Book, 1998) is an innovative study of the language of war and the societies that utter those words, both during the conflict, and, more importantly to Lepore, after the fighting ends. The book is more a study of the cultural language of war and Indian-white relations, using King Philip’s War as a case study, than an attempt to place King Philip’s War in the context of the development of Puritan New England. It has even less to say about the nature of the militia or the social makeup of the militiamen, although it does offer important insights into their reasons for fighting, what they thought of the enemy, and the conduct of the war on both sides. See especially Lepore, *Name of War*, 3-18, 71-121. James D. Drake’s 1996 dissertation “Severing the Ties that Bind Them: A Reconceptualization of King Philip’s War” (Ph.D. diss., University of California—Los Angeles, 1996) and his subsequent book *King Philip’s War: Civil War in New England 1675-1676* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999) offer a unique perspective, seeing the war not as a clash of cultures, but a civil war among two peoples who had established in the preceding forty years a single, interdependent society. The dissertation (to a much greater degree) and the book offer a detailed narrative of the forces that caused the breakdown in the hybrid society of New England and the aftermath of the war for both parties. Unfortunately, Drake’s work neglects any attempt to examine how the militiamen who fought the war fit into this pattern.

\(^{22}\) Alison Isabel Vannah, “‘Crotchets of Division’: Ipswich in New England, 1633-1679” (Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1999).
War, based on her extensive knowledge of every facet of their lives. She places militia service and the effects of the war directly into the story of the town, making it a crucial aspect of understanding the town and the people who lived there.

The other work that addresses important issues about the militia, soldiers, and community is Jenny Hale Pulsipher’s 1999 dissertation on the war, “The Overture of this New-Albion World.” Pulsipher’s study focuses on the transforming qualities of the war for both the colonists and native Americans. In a chapter entitled “Divisions,” which details the corrosive effect of the war on colonial and Indian society alike, Pulsipher argues that the demand for military manpower and the impressments that fulfilled that demand were a major strain on the cohesion of New England society, a strain demonstrated by draft evasion. To make matters worse, resentment flourished when the wealthy in society hired substitutes to fight for them, engendering the personal animosity of common folks towards them as well as anger at a system which allowed the wealthy to avoid their civic duty. Pulsipher follows her discussion of substitution with an important discussion of resistance to impressment and the divisions it wrought on society, while her last section deals with the divisive effect of war on the frontier towns. Pulsipher’s dissertation is one of the first studies to raise issues of the militia and the men who served (or resisted) it as crucial elements of the social history of New England. While her arguments are vital to a true understanding of communities at war, she does not address

---


the question of who the colonial soldier was or why he was chosen. Thus, while some progress has been made, more work needs to be done. As Richard Kohn argued more than twenty years ago, “Social historians have much to gain from such rich records and also much to learn, for military service resides properly within the broader history of American society . . .”27

Despite the moderate progress made by social historians in studying war and its effects on society, it might be expected that the practitioners of the “new military history” must have made significant progress in this regard. Unfortunately, relatively few military historians have done much digging at the roots of the American soldier, even after Richard Kohn’s 1981 article showed them where to dig. Yet even before Kohn’s call for a systematic study of American fighting men, John Shy, one of the founders and premier practitioners of new military history in America, offered general impressions on the militia and the men who fought under its banner during the colonial period. In his seminal 1963 article, “A New Look at the Colonial Militia,” Shy argued that the militia was an ever-changing institution, which developed alongside the colonies themselves.28 Following Shy’s lead, several historians began to scrutinize the social structure of military forces in colonial America. Regrettably, every study focuses on soldiers in the eighteenth century; not a single major study examined the militiamen of the seventeenth century.29

---


29 While crucial to an understanding of King Philip’s War, George Madison Bodge, Soldiers in King Philip’s War, reprint of 1906 3rd ed. (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1967) does not offer an in-depth analysis of the soldiers of the war beyond the period and length of service. It does offer some
The best known of the studies of the eighteenth-century soldier is Fred Anderson’s *A People’s Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years War*. Hailed as a breakthrough in new military history, Anderson scrutinized muster lists to discover the age, residence, birthplace, occupation, and condition of service of the Bay Colony’s eighteenth-century warriors, offering a detailed social portrait of them. Contrasting the colonials to British troops, he found that Massachusetts’ soldiers were “by no means colonial proletarians” but instead “products of a society and economy that constantly generated males who were temporarily available for military service.” These young men, waiting to inherit family lands in a “prolonged dependence” from their mid-teens to their mid-twenties, could either hire themselves out as farm labor or escape their families’ grip by accepting reasonable pay to join the colony’s military forces. In a corrective to Shy’s earlier supposition that the soldiers were, as time went by, culled from the less prosperous members of society, Anderson argued they were “Some of the Sons of the Best Yeomen of New England.”

---

30 Fred Anderson, *A People’s Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years’ War* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1984).

31 Anderson, *A People’s Army*, 26-62. Anderson, did not, however, take the data from the muster lists any further; he did not trace the soldiers back to their communities.


Another important study, which focuses on one colony’s military past, is Harold E. Selesky’s *War and Society in Colonial Connecticut*. While not offering a systematic study of Connecticut’s soldiers during King Philip’s War, Selesky does offer a description of them based on his extensive reading in the colony’s records. His interpretation mirrors Anderson’s work on the soldiers of the eighteenth century: “Most towns seemed to have drafted young bachelors first, thereby placing the heaviest burden on their least affluent members. For most of these young men, poverty was a temporary condition; they could look forward to earning or inheriting more wealth, as they grew older. Not all soldiers had bright prospects, of course, but neither were the companies filled with ‘lowly Expendables.’” Selesky’s analysis of the soldiers of the seventeenth century is based only on a general familiarity with the sources and not a detailed investigation. He does include an in-depth analysis of Connecticut troops who fought in the Seven Years’ War from 1755 to 1762.

Other works followed a similar pattern. While Stephen Eames, in his 1989 dissertation “Rustic Warriors,” conducts an examination of New England soldiers in the imperial wars of the long eighteenth century, it is a discussion limited to the most basic biographical data on the men. In a short introduction to his edited genealogical listing

---


37 Selesky does point out that the men of the seventeenth century were drafted or impressed, making them different from Anderson’s volunteers of the eighteenth century.


of Massachusetts' soldiers from 1723 to 1743, Myron O. Stachiw offers a social portrait of 48 out of 163 men who volunteered for expeditions to the West Indies in 1740. Tracing the men back to their communities, Stachiw groups the men into three categories: young sons of locally prominent families who volunteered for adventure; middle sons of less wealthy families who joined with the expectation of winning land or booty; and men with little or no property who enlisted to escape debt, servitude, or the law. Stachiw's excellent, if minor, study concurs with the work of Anderson and Selesky. Following this trend of studying eighteenth-century colonial soldiers, James Titus and John Ferling offered their own perspectives on the soldiers of Virginia in two important studies, while a number of important works attempt to establish a social portrait of soldiers during the American Revolution, with varying degrees of success. Despite the attention on the men of later colonial American conflicts, there has never been, until now, a systematic study of the workings of the seventeenth-century militia in society, particularly of recruitment practices and the men who fought New England's early wars.


41 Stachiw, ed., Massachusetts Officers and Soldiers, xiii-xxiii.

The soldiers of King Philip’s War were impressed by the members of their town committee of militia. Recalling the days of the Elizabethan militia in England, the colonists of Massachusetts Bay had constructed a militia system controlled on two levels; the governor, Court of Assistants, and General Court at the colony level managed the military command structure, especially during wartime, leaving control of the local trainbands in the hands of the towns’ own militia committee. Like deputy lords lieutenant from Elizabeth’s England before them, the town militia committees exercised enormous powers, the most important being the authority to decide which of the town’s citizens would fight when war broke out. Local control of recruiting was a safeguard against abuses of impressment, which the colonists had experienced at the hands of Charles I’s nationalist lords lieutenant in the late 1620s and early 1630s before leaving England. When recruits for England’s dangerous overseas expeditions began to be culled from the once-protected trainbands, filled with middling folk, rather than the normal lower strata of society represented in the general militia, the Puritans became aware of the true potential of a corrupt military power. They vowed to set up their militia differently, to keep community rule a vital element in the militia structure. Local control of the Massachusetts militia was first achieved by the election of officers. But by the late 1660s that safeguard, which had caused its own kind of strife and disorder, had been replaced by the committee of militia system. When King Philip’s War erupted in 1675, the committees in each town were in charge of gathering the necessary men to defend the colonies. Thus, for the most part, the men who drafted the militiamen lived alongside them and knew both their strengths and weaknesses.
The question “Who were seventeenth-century colonial militiamen?” is a vital one, yet there have been relatively few attempts to find the answer. For most historians, whether they are specialists or not, the question was simply answered by the militia law of the period. Militiamen in the seventeenth century consisted of every adult male between the ages of sixteen to sixty years old.43 The statute, which established the colonies’ universal military obligation, is so well known and constantly reinforced in monographs and textbooks, that further study of the militiamen of the period seemed unnecessary. With a universal military obligation for males over sixteen, common sense dictated that the societies’ soldiers were a cross section of the community.44 Conventional wisdom implied that the town militia companies directly reflected their (male) communities. While this may have been true in the peacetime militia companies of each town, it was far from the case during wartime, when special fighting companies were raised. Yet this important distinction has been lost on many.

Even careful social historians, who had dedicated themselves to detailed studies of the minutest topics, took the militia statute at face value, even into the eighteenth century. In one example of many, Robert Gross’s extensive study of colonial Concord, The Minutemen and Their World, goes into great detail about the pre-Revolution life of the community.45 Gross examined family associations, church relations, the town’s economic web, and inter-family conflicts. Yet, when it came time to examine the


44 Even this is a somewhat false assumption, since many men were excused from militia service by law, the actions of local courts, or militia committees.

soldiers who fought in the famous battle, Gross forwent a study of the soldiers’ identities; writing just a single page on what he called “a citizen army of rural neighbors . . . that included nearly everyone between the ages of sixteen and sixty.” Gross is in no way alone in this view. Even specialists in military history have been thrown off-course by the universal military obligation, assuming it created seventeenth-century armies that mirrored the whole of society. Many military historians who have addressed the question of active soldiers did so based on their knowledge of the universal obligation and a broad reading of colonial sources, without a detailed social examination of the soldiers or their communities.

In this tradition is John Shy’s “A New Look at the Colonial Militia.” Although originally published forty years ago, the 1963 article is still considered by most military historians the single most influential article on the colonial American militia; it is even now cited regularly and is often re-published in essay collections on military and colonial history. In looking at the soldiers of seventeenth-century colonial America, even active-duty soldiers, Shy argued that “whatever the process of selection; military organization and social structure seem as yet undifferentiated. In the beginning, of course, this is true quite literally: social and military organization were the same thing. When John Smith wrote of ‘soldiers,’ he meant only those inhabitants who at that moment had guns in their hands and who had been ordered to help Smith look out for danger.” While Shy maintained that the situation changed rapidly in Virginia, he contended that the change

46 Gross, The Minutemen and Their World, 70.
47 Shy, “New Look.”
came later in New England, which, because of the strength of its towns, was able to maintain its militia system on a universal level much longer. To Shy, New England soldiers of the seventeenth century mirrored New England society. However, Shy claimed that as the enemy changed from Indians in the seventeenth century to European imperial rivals in the eighteenth century, New England’s militiamen changed as well. A “changing character of recruitment in the eighteenth century” altered the universal military obligation of the seventeenth century into a selective obligation (or opportunity) in the eighteenth, as “a growing number of those that did the actual fighting were not the men who bore a military obligation as part of their freedom.”

Thus Shy argued that by the eighteenth century, soldiers had become lowly volunteers who fought for land and booty, not middling citizen-soldiers fighting because of the universal obligation. Shy admitted at the time that his arguments were based on broad readings in colonial sources and that the “Evidence gathered so far is not full nor does it admit of any quantitative conclusions.”

The information presented here, based on an extensive examine of the social history of the soldiers and their communities, offers the necessary quantitative data to form new conclusions. The data show that the broad universal obligation of the seventeenth-century militia did not create armies that mirrored society as a whole. The seventeenth-century militiamen selected to serve as active combatants in wartime were

---

49 Shy, “New Look,” 37-38. Shy admits that this change happened between 1650 and 1750, but the tone of the article indicates that change in New England occurred later, sometime in the eighteenth century.

50 Shy’s argument about the social makeup of eighteenth-century soldiers has come under attack by Anderson, Selesky, and others. See Anderson, A People’s Army, 26-62; Selesky, War and Society in Colonial Connecticut, 166-194; Eames, “Rustic Warriors,” 313-322.

not a cross-section of the sixteen-to-sixty-year-old male population of the colony; they were not even close. The locally-controlled impressment system, where each town’s committee of militia decided upon the criteria for choosing soldiers, created armies of predominately social misfits, not “typical” New Englanders. The military, at least the active, wartime military, and society were differentiated. Even in the early colonial period of the seventeenth century, social and military organization were not the same thing; the universal military obligation was not universal during wartime in New England.

In addition to offering a new social portrait of early colonial armies and soldiers, a close examination of the process of impressment highlights numerous lessons for the historian of New England society as a whole. Militia units and committees of militia were a part of almost every town’s social and political fabric. The actions of these groups, especially the militia committees in wartime recruitment, offer important insights into the place of the militia in the town’s life. A close examination of the type of men the town’s militia leadership thought most expendable is an excellent indicator of the ideals the townspeople held. While many of the values exhibited in military recruitment reinforce principles historians have long associated with colonial New England, what is surprising is the strength of some of the persisting values in an era (thirty-five to forty years after settlement) thought to be undergoing sweeping changes and a lessening of community and religious cohesion. Or perhaps it is not that surprising; militia

recruitment seems to have been an important arena where the old-guard town elite could engage men and families they differed with, did not trust, or did not know well.\textsuperscript{53}

This is seen in the preference of many militia committees to press young men for service from families that were not among the town's original founding families, as was especially the case in Rowley and Andover.\textsuperscript{54} Thus preferential treatment of original families, a well-studied pattern in New England's religious, political, and land-ownership dealings, was present in militia transactions as well.\textsuperscript{55} This preferred treatment highlights the persistence of strong bonds between original town-founding families more than thirty years after the first settlement of most of the towns. Other aspects of impressment present evidence of town leaders preserving their core families. Some towns, particularly Topsfield and Marblehead, chose town outsiders (men who lived on the fringes of town society, either physically or figuratively) to do their fighting, preserving principal town families from harm.\textsuperscript{56} In an attempt to protect upstanding families, almost every militia committee pressed men with criminal pasts (if there were any in town) into military service, with those men who had committed crimes against authority figures almost assured a place in a combat company. The committees tried to preserve town harmony in

\textsuperscript{53} This was common in the religious arena, especially over the issue of the Half-Way Covenant. For an overview, see Bremer, \textit{Puritan Experiment}, 161-167; Robert G. Pope, \textit{The Half-Way Covenant; Church Membership in Puritan New England} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

\textsuperscript{54} See Chapter 4 on Rowley and Chapter 5 on Andover.


\textsuperscript{56} See Chapter 3 on Marblehead and Chapter 6 on Topsfield.
a time of crisis by ridding towns of troublemakers or those who did not fit in. Thus, men who found themselves on the “wrong side” of a religious controversy also often felt elite displeasure in the form of an impressment warrant. Recruitment for King Philip’s War offered town elites, sitting on powerful militia committees, yet another way (in addition to warning out, criminal proceedings, and civil suits) to rid their towns of sources of conflict and disorder. This task was given a divine air when the colonial government declared the war a symptom of God’s displeasure at the loss of the “Puritan Way.” Not only does this strengthen arguments about New Englanders’ disdain for those who brought disorder to their communities, it argues that as late as the 1670s, the elite still had effective local mechanisms to control, or at least punish, such behavior.

In addition to this sinister side to militia recruitment, the process of impressment highlights the type of men that town elites wanted to protect from harm, offering valuable clues to historians of the values New England society held dear. As well as protecting sons of original families and core town members, militia committees went to considerable lengths to protect the stability of Massachusetts families in time of war. The centrality of the family in Puritan New England is well documented.

---

57 See especially Chapter 4 on Rowley. A religious controversy was also instrumental in the recruitment of men from Newbury, see Goodman, “Newbury Social Foundations,” 91-173.

58 For the efforts of one town to rid itself of troublemakers, see Chapter 3 on Ipswich and Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 692-722.

59 There are some historians who claim that local control had been weakened or lost by the 1660s, as witnessed by the fights over the Half-Way Covenant and other religious controversies, town election disputes, and even militia controversies. See Bremer, Puritan Experiment, 141-185.

experience of recruitment for King Philip’s War demonstrates in a measurable fashion just how important family stability and cohesion was to town leaders and communities.

Committees of militia during the war impressed relatively few married men (less than a quarter of the total).61 Despite the large numbers of men needed to fight the conflict, which the New Englanders almost immediately perceived as a total-war, militia committees proved very reluctant to press married men. Such men were crucial to the stability of their families; in many ways they were the most important member of the household.62 Husbands were “prince and teacher, pastor and judge in his household.”63 They were partners to their wives and fathers to their children—husbands were indispensable to family stability. Most importantly, as Lisa Wilson argues in her book Ye Heart of a Man, a husband in colonial New England “felt a unique obligation to support his family. This was society’s expectation as well: providing was a husband’s legal responsibility, his sacred duty, and his unique burden.”64 Husbands could not fulfill this most crucial economic duty if they were sent off to war. When married men were pressed for duty, the General Court ordered towns and militia committees to find

---

61 See Table C-2 in the Conclusion.


63 Bremer, Puritan Experiment, 114.

64 Wilson, Heart of a Man, 99.
assistance for their families, hoping in some small way to make up at least the family’s loss of economic stability.\textsuperscript{65}

The need to protect family stability also prompted the committees of militia in several towns not to press a family’s eldest son. The committees realized the important role that eldest sons played in the long-term stability of families. First-sons were not only able to contribute more to the economic well being of their families than most younger sons, because of their maturity, heightened skills, and more developed strength, they also had a unique role to play in the continuation of the family line. They received the choicest lots of land from their birth-families at their father’s demise and they often had the task of caring for their mothers after the father’s death.\textsuperscript{66} In order to promote the economic stability of families and to ensure the families’ long-term prosperity, militia committees limited recruitment of the all-important eldest sons whenever possible.

A study of militia recruitment during war and the identity of seventeenth-century colonial soldiers thus has much to offer social historians of colonial New England. In addition to lessons on town power dynamics and values, the examination here of the smallest towns in Essex County offers a rare glimpse into the workings of the formative years of town institutions, especially of the militia and militia committees.\textsuperscript{67} The scrutiny of small towns also presents a unique view of the interactions between towns


\textsuperscript{67} See Chapter 6.
that were forced to work together to provide for the common defense. The conflicts that erupted between these towns, or between various neighborhoods within the towns, indicate that even in time of conflict and war, inter- and intra-town relationships in New England were anything but tranquil and cooperative. This offers another layer of analysis to the neglected study of the relationships between New England towns, which too often have been studied in isolation from each other. The study of recruitment during war and the identity of the New England soldier of the seventeenth century thus offers important insights not only into the military history of colonial New England, but the social, political, and local history of the region as well.

As the first and last seventeenth-century war of mass participation in New England, King Philip's War offers the best perspective to study the process of impressment and to reconstruct the identities of the early colonial soldier.\(^6^8\) At the heart of this effort, a social portrait of every soldier pressed into an active company or garrison from Essex County, Massachusetts was constructed; 357 biographies inform the conclusions of this study. Essex County was chosen for the diversity of its towns, which range from commercial Salem and agricultural Andover to isolated Wenham (See Maps I-1 and I-2).\(^6^9\) In all, twelve Essex towns, their militias, militia committees, and soldiers,

\(^6^8\) For Massachusetts Bay, the Pequot War (1636-1637) was a rather small affair in terms of men sent and King William's War (1689-1697) was fought by mostly volunteers and saw no mass militia call-up. King Philip's War mobilized the entire society and touched every family. Some may argue that the Pequot War was a war of mass participation for Connecticut, which was much more involved in the fighting and much smaller in population than Massachusetts Bay. See Selesky, *War and Society in Colonial Connecticut*.

were examined.\[70\]

The identity of the soldiers of the county was determined from a number of sources. The main resource in identifying them was George Madison Bodge's *Soldiers in King Philip's War.*\[71\] Bodge, a meticulous historian of the late nineteenth century, combed the account ledgers of John Hull, the wartime treasurer of Massachusetts Bay, and reconstructed muster lists, based on pay records, for every company and every soldier from Massachusetts Bay involved in the war.\[72\] He also used, and included in the book, hundreds of primary documents from the war, including a large number of the documents in the Massachusetts State Archives' colonial collection, including actual muster lists. In addition to active-duty soldiers, Bodge lists any person who received any payment from the colony during the war.

---

70 In 1675, Essex County did not contain the towns of Salisbury or Haverhill, which belonged to (old) Norfolk County. (Old) Norfolk County disappeared in 1679 when New Hampshire became a Royal Province. At that time, the towns were placed in Essex County. In 1793, Massachusetts named a newly-formed county south of Boston Norfolk County. Because Salisbury and Haverhill were not in Essex County during the war, their soldiers are not treated here. See Benjamin F. Arrington, ed., *Municipal History of Essex County in Massachusetts*, Tercentenary ed., 4 vols. (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., 1922), 40-41; William Francis. Galvin, ed., *Historical Data Relating to Counties, Cities, and Towns in Massachusetts* (Boston: New England Historic Genealogical Society, 1997); Louis S. Cook, ed., *History of Norfolk County, Massachusetts 1622-1918*, 2 vols. (New York: S.J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1918).

71 George M. Bodge, *Soldiers in King Philip's War.* (Boston: Printed for the Author, 1891); Bodge, *Soldiers* (3rd ed.).

Map I-1
Counties in Massachusetts, 1675-1676*

*(Old) Norfolk County and York County were in New Hampshire and Maine and are not on this map.

Map I-2
Essex County Towns During King Philip’s War, 1675-1676

Source: Modified from Daniel Vickers, Farmers and Fishermen, pg. 4.
In all, at least 434 Essex County men received some kind of payment from the colony during the war.\(^73\) Twenty-four of these men were officers or non-commissioned officers, 357 were enlisted men in active-duty companies or garrisons, and 53 men were paid for some unknown reason. While the men with unknown service could have served in a fighting company, it is more likely, given the large record base available on the active fighting units, that they were paid for some other service during the war, from providing troops with military supplies to working on the farm of an impressed man to assist his family.\(^74\) Of course, all men of military age (between sixteen and sixty years old) during the war were militiamen and served in their town watch or on local patrols. These men, fulfilling their normal civic duty of militia service under the universal obligation, were not compensated, nor considered active-duty soldiers; they are not studied here.\(^75\)

\(^73\) Bodge listed some men as hailing from a specific town; others had to be investigated to discover which town they were from and if they belonged in this study. The Essex companies’ muster lists were scrutinized and the names compared to town and vital records to determine if a man was from an Essex town. Town histories were also used to determine which men in the companies belonged to which towns. While the information presented here is the most accurate possible, a number of men moved from town to town, making it very hard to determine their residence. This was a common practice, especially among the later generations of New Englanders. These men, if a determination had to be made, were placed in the town that recruited them. For migration within New England, see Linda Auwers Bissell, “From One Generation to Another: Mobility in Seventeenth-Century Windsor, Connecticut,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 3d ser., 31, no. 1 (1974):79-110; Susan L. Norton, “Marital Migration in Essex County, Massachusetts, in the Colonial and Early Federal Periods,” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 35, no. 3 (1973):406-418; Thomas R. Cole, “Family, Settlement, and Migration in Southeastern Massachusetts, 1650-1805: The Case for Regional Analysis,” *New England Historical Genealogical Register* 132 (1978):171-185; Susan L. Norton, “Age at Marriage and Marital Migration in Three Massachusetts Towns, 1600-1850” (Ph.D. Diss., University of Michigan, 1981); Daniel Vickers, *Farmers and Fishermen: Two Centuries of Work in Essex County, Massachusetts, 1630-1850* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 132-133.

\(^74\) There are examples of both types of payment in Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.)*. For the General Court’s decision to pay men who farmed for pressed soldiers, see Shurtleff, ed., *Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.*, 5:65.

\(^75\) The proof for this is the lack of payments for any number of men known to stay in their towns and fulfill their regular militia duty of town watch. Perhaps the best-known case of this is frontier Andover, which was on constant watch and whose numerous town militiamen conducted nightly patrols. Yet, only those soldiers from active companies, and three others with unknown service, were paid by the colony during the
Bodge’s Soldiers’ in King Philip’s War was not the only source for the soldiers’ identities; town histories and genealogies were also used to discover the names of Essex County soldiers. Several of the town histories and genealogies, however, proved to be inaccurate, listing men as serving with the wrong company or listing men as veterans who simply could not have served. To correct this situation, only those men that could be confirmed by the muster lists in Bodge’s work or the lists in the Massachusetts State Archives were treated as active-duty soldiers in this study. While it is almost certain some men who served from the county are missing from this study, there is little doubt that most of those that served from Essex County are represented in this final register of soldiers.

If regular militiamen were paid for normal military service in town, almost every male in Andover would surely have been compensated for his wartime service. See Chapter 5.

For an example, see the listings of soldiers in John J. Currier, History of Newbury, Mass., 1635-1902 (Boston: Damrell & Upham, 1902), 493-513. Almost half of the soldiers reported by Currier as impressed or serving soldiers do not appear in any colony record.

The 1680 realignment of militia regiments in Massachusetts Bay, based on population and taking place only five years after the war, shows a similar pattern in number of militia units and the distribution of soldiers, to Essex County units in King Philip’s War. For example, Ipswich, the largest contributor of troops during the war, also has the largest number of companies in 1680. See Millar, “Militia, the Army, and Indepedency,” 49. There are no data on the 1675 population for specific towns in Massachusetts Bay that could be used to compare the percentage of soldiers each town contributed to the number of inhabitants to establish if at least the correct ratio existed for county service. That would strengthen the argument that most soldiers had been identified. Complicating that process is the fact that while historic demographers have established a ratio of militiamen to citizens, this is a ratio of all militiamen in society, the sixteen-to-sixty-year old males. This would not be useful to determine 1675 populations for Essex County towns even if the number did exist, because only the count of active-duty soldiers, not all males sixteen to sixty, exists. Despite this, the extensive research into colonial, county, town, and militia records undertaken for this study has discovered, with a reasonable rate of accuracy, the majority of the soldiers from Essex County. For the population data that do exist and the demographic formulas, see Terry L. Anderson and Robert Paul Thomas, “White Population, Labor Force and Extensive Growth of the New England Economy in the Seventeenth Century,” Journal of Economic History 33, no. 1 (1973):634-667; Harold Arthur Pinkham, “The Transplantation and Transformation of the English Shire in America: Essex County, Massachusetts, 1630-1768” (Ph.D. diss., University of New Hampshire, 1980); William I. Davison, “Essex County Wealth Trends: Wealth and Economic Growth in 17th Century Massachusetts,” Essex Institute Historical Collections 103, no. 4 (1967):291-342; William I. Davison, “Essex County Price Trends: Money and Markets in 17th Century Massachusetts,” Essex Institute Historical Collections 103, no. 2 (1967):144-185; Richard Archer, “New England Mosaic: A Demographic Analysis for the Seventeenth Century,” William and Mary Quarterly 3d ser., 47, no. 4 (1990):477-502; Archer, Fissures in the Rock.
Once the soldiers were identified, social portraits of each were constructed using primary and secondary sources. This process, known as historical prosopography, allows a thorough examination of the men, their families, and the communities they came from. The records for Essex County are extremely rich and offer a detailed glimpse into the lives of the men and their communities. Vital and church records were used to determine birth, marriage, and death dates of the soldiers and their families, both their birth families and their own family if married. Probate records of the men themselves, and in many cases their fathers, gave details about the soldier’s or his family’s social status, from which a classification system and rank were established. Town records shed light on town offices held, taxes paid (and the family’s ranking in town) and any controversies in town that divided the population. Court records told of civil suits and

---


79 For using probate records, see Kevin M. Sweeney, “Using Tax Lists to Detect Biases in Probate Inventories,” in Early American Probate Inventories, ed. Peter Benes (Boston: Boston University Press, 1987); Daniel Scott Smith, “Underregistration and Bias in Probate Records: An Analysis of Data from Eighteenth-Century Hingham, Massachusetts,” William and Mary Quarterly 3d ser., 32, no. 1 (1975):100-110; Peter Benes, ed., Early American Probate Inventories, The Dublin Seminar for New England Folklife (Boston: Boston University Press, 1987). A categorization of socio-economic status was constructed which ranked the men and birth families. Both the family’s economic records and political power were taken into account in this regard. Elite families had considerable wealth, worth over £800, or immense political power, such as an Assistantship or a long-time member of the General Court or both; they were colony leaders. Leading families were upper to upper-middling in wealth, worth £300-800, and held occasional colonial office and frequent town leadership positions, most often as selectmen. Middling families, the vast majority of families in the county, were of middling wealth, worth £100-300 and held occasional town offices, sometimes as selectmen, but usually lower offices such as fence viewer. Subordinate families were worth less than £100 or in debt and rarely if ever held any political power. For information on wealth, see Davisson, “Wealth Trends;” Manfred Jonas, “The Wills of Early Settlers of Essex County, Massachusetts,” Essex Institute Historical Collections 96, no. 3 (1960):228-235; Donald Warner Koch, “Income Distribution and Political Structure in Seventeenth-Century Salem, Massachusetts,” Essex Institute Historical Collections 105, no. 1 (1969):50-69; Gloria L. Main and Jackson T. Main, “Economic Growth and the Standard of Living in Southern New England, 1640-1774,” Journal of Economic History 48, no. 1 (1988):27-46.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
criminal cases, and offered a host of other data.\textsuperscript{80} Family genealogies, often a treasure trove to the social historian, offered details on all of the above and more, when treated with caution.\textsuperscript{81} Town histories and modern town studies advised of town and religious divisions, family rankings and connections, and myriad other information. While some information has undoubtedly been lost, in the end an immense database of information about the men, their families, their communities, and their place in those communities inform the conclusions here.

Chapter One examines the militia system of Massachusetts Bay. It begins with a short history of the militia in England and examines the mixed history of the Massachusetts Bay Puritans' reaction to that institution, rejecting its nationalistic tendencies under Charles I while basing their own militia on the English system under Elizabeth I and James I (while adding safeguards to preserve local control of the trainbands in New England). The conditions of Massachusetts militia structure and law before King Philip's War are considered and the development of the institution into the war is tracked. A comprehensive analysis of the formation and subsequent development of the all-important committees of militia follows. An understanding of the committees, which ensured local control of impressment, is crucial to any appreciation of the


seventeenth-century soldier. The chapter concludes with a look at changes made to the militia system during the war.

An investigation of the specific practice of recruitment and impressment appears in Chapter Two. It begins with a review of the practice in England, under the lords lieutenant of Elizabeth I and James I (who pressed men for overseas campaigns only out of the general militia, not England’s trainbands) to the frightening change under Charles I’s more centralized structure. Vowing to avoid the abuses of Charles’s “Perfect Militia,” the colonists of the Bay Colony erected a different system for impressment, at first based on volunteerism. However, as threats intensified over time, Massachusetts changed its recruitment system from volunteerism to impressment in the years before King Philip’s War. A comprehensive examination of the process of impressment by town committees of militia during the war follows, and ends with a discussion of draft resistance, substitution, and volunteerism. This section details the fundamental nature of community-based recruitment, key to understanding New England’s seventeenth-century soldier. The chapter ends with a narrative of the Essex County companies and their actions in the war, designed to offer an insight into the nature of the war for those impressed and the militia committees that impressed them.

The next four chapters, the heart of the study, offer a detailed examination of a number of the towns of Essex County and their actions during the war. Each chapter, which deals with a different type of town, begins with a short history of the town, moves to a history of the militia structure in the town and its militia committee, and then examines the men pressed for service from that town and draws conclusions as to why
they were chosen. Each town’s militia committee, practicing a strict community control of impressment, had its own criteria and thus its own categories of men they pressed as soldiers. Any true understanding of the colonial soldier is necessarily rooted in a close examination of the towns and their actions. Chapter Three deals with commercial and market towns, the largest and most populous in the county, by offering case studies of Ipswich and Marblehead. Chapter Four looks at the subordinate towns by examining Rowley, while Chapter Five concentrates on the agricultural town of Andover. Chapter Six scrutinizes Essex County’s isolated towns of Topsfield, Wenham, and Manchester.

Even though the twelve Essex County towns were different in their impressment goals, as befits a local impressment system, some general patterns do emerge. The conclusion connects that information and offers a portrait of seventeenth-century colonial American soldiers based on data from all the towns. The soldiers of King Philip’s War were not the volunteer citizen-soldiers of American myth; the great majority of them were pressed into service, most grudgingly, some with defiance, some with outright evasion. Their own town’s militia committee, in an important example of the local control of the military so dear to the Massachusetts Bay colonists, chose them. The men were relatively young, in their twenties on average, and unmarried. Most important, almost all had some issue that made them a target for impressment, whether it was their families’ socio-economic status in town, a past criminal act, or a lack of connection to their town. Many were a part of “the Rabble,” few were of “the Flower.”

---

82 The town classification system is modified from Archer, *Fissures in the Rock*.

portrait of the soldiers and the communities that pressed them presented here proves that despite a legally instituted universal military obligation, seventeenth-century Massachusetts Bay did not have a universal or representative active-duty military during wartime. This conclusion, when added to the growing scholarship on eighteenth-century colonial soldiers, offers a promising beginning to our understanding of American soldiers throughout history, the communities that sent them to fight, and the societies they helped to build and defend.
CHAPTER ONE

MASSACHUSETTS BAY’S MILITIA SYSTEM: A HISTORY OF THE MILITIA AND THE TOWN COMMITTEES OF MILITIA

Any appreciation of the colonial soldier of seventeenth-century New England, and why and how he was chosen by his society, must begin with a detailed examination of the military institutions of Massachusetts, their English background and subsequent New World development. In particular, the role of the uniquely New England institution, the town committee of militia, is crucial to that understanding. The militia committees held the power of life or death for their towns in their hands; yet, they have been virtually ignored by historians. Few treatments even mention them.¹ To comprehend Massachusetts society at war, and especially how that society chose which men were to fight during the war, one must understand the militia system and especially the Committees of Militia “in the severall tounes” because of their most important and far-reaching power, the power to impress their fellow citizens into active service.

The 1628 Charter of the Massachusetts Bay Company gave the company and its “chief commanders, governors, and officers . . . and others there inhabiting” the ability, or duty, to provide “for their special defense and safety, to incounter, expulse, repell, and

resist by force of arms” all enemies to the colony.2 The governor and General Court of Massachusetts Bay took this charge seriously, writing that it was as important to the success of the “City on a Hill” as their preparations for a godly church: “as piety cannot be maintained without church ordinances and officers, nor justice without laws and magistrates, no more can our safety and peace be preserved without military orders and officers.”3 Understandably, the colonists looked to the military tradition of England in order to establish their own military system.4

The English Background

England’s military tradition of employing subject-soldiers to defend the realm had deep roots in Anglo-Saxon history. The Assize of Arms in 1181 and the Statute of Winchester in 1285 both required all able-bodied men in England to keep arms for use in defense of the kingdom.5 With Europe in the midst of a military revolution in tactics and organization, brought about by the widespread introduction of gunpowder to Europe’s armies, the Tudor monarchs (1485-1603) were responsible for large changes in the

---


4 New Englanders looked to the Tudor and early Stuart (pre-1640) military systems to plan their own systems. There is very little evidence in the primary or secondary literature that they incorporated any later (post-1640) English military thought into their militia systems. For a different view, see Walter Weston Jr. Colby, “Adaptations of English Military Institutions in Seventeenth-Century New England” (M.A. thesis, University of Detroit, 1952), 40-41.

ancient condition of the militia. While Mary Tudor had attempted to reform the militia, she was unable to complete the job in her short reign. The urgent task fell to Queen Elizabeth I. While the law prescribed that men between the ages of sixteen and sixty, with a few exceptions, were required to keep arms for militia service, few men had any training in the use of those weapons. England’s deplorable military condition was even worse when placed in the light of the ever-increasing professionalism of the rest of Europe’s armies in the sixteenth century. With the hostility of Spain urging her to action, Elizabeth set about reforming her military establishment in the 1570s.

Although it was considered impossible to adequately train all of them, Elizabeth retained a universal service obligation for every male subject in the general militia. However, in 1572 she established trainbands throughout the nation; intending the new units to be made up of the more desirable members of society, including gentlemen,

---


8 The following is a very limited examination of Elizabeth’s militia reforms. For a much more complete picture, see Beckett, Amateur Military Tradition, 2-59; Boynton, Elizabethan Militia; Cruickshank, Elizabeth’s Army; C. H. Firth, Cromwell’s Army: A History of the English Soldier During the Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Protectorate, Reprint of 1902 ed. (Novato, Calif.: Presido Press, 1992), 1-33; John S. Noland, “The Militarization of the Elizabethan State,” Journal of Military History 58, no. 3 (1994): 391-420.

9 For a comparative look at the different military systems in Europe at the time, see J. R. Hale, War and Society in Renaissance Europe, 1450-1620 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985); Tallett, War and Society.
merchants, farmers, and sturdy yeoman. They were the men of the all-important rising middle-class. The English militia was organized along county lines, with a lord lieutenant being the chief military officer for each county. In 1572, Elizabeth ordered her lords lieutenant in every county to take from the general militia “a convenient number of able men [to] meet to be sorted in bands and to be trained and exercised” in the new ways of war. The government even planned to distribute weapons based on class and ability, with those in the upper classes (“the strongest men and best persons”) given the best new weapons while “the least” would be given older, less complicated arms.

The trainbands were defensive troops only, by law and tradition meant to serve only in England, not overseas. Thus, for offensive forays into Europe, England had to rely mostly on impressments from the untrained men of the general militia, not the men of the trainbands. Numerous contemporary observers commented on the quality of men obtained this way. Writing in 1587, the military critic Barnaby Rich observed, “In

---

10 The idea of special units or trainbands did not begin with Elizabeth (there were numerous volunteer units of similar makeup); however, she was the first to create the units in a uniform way and to do so nationally. See Boynton, *Elizabethan Militia*, 90-125; Rutman, “Militant New World,” 24-25.


13 Quoted in Rutman, “Militant New World,” 25.


England, when service happens, we disburden the prisons of thieves, we rob the taverns and alehouses of tosspots and ruffians, we scour both town and country of rogues and vagabonds.\(^\text{16}\) The government even let men out of jail and shipped them immediately to the front as reinforcements at numerous times during the period.\(^\text{17}\) To make matters worse, many of the "rabble" described by Rich and others began to join the trainbands in order to escape press gangs gathering men for overseas expeditions, turning the bands into a haven for the very element the government wanted to avoid in its elite forces.\(^\text{18}\) Thus, while the Elizabethan reforms appeared on paper to greatly improve the English militia, in practice the institution was still largely untrained and ill prepared, especially when compared to its European counterparts.

This system continued through the reign of Elizabeth I and James I. With the coronation of Charles I in 1625, however, the military in England underwent another transformation. Whereas his father, James I, had expressed little interest in the military, the same was not true of Charles I, who vowed to set up a "Perfect Militia." Soon after his coronation, Charles dissolved all the old trainbands and set up new ones with a property requirement for entrance, restoring them to the stable, merchant-based, middle-class as Elizabeth had originally planned.\(^\text{19}\) He also modernized all militia weapons and placed veterans in the trainbands to train them in real warfare tactics.


\(^{17}\) Cruickshank, \textit{Elizabeth's Army}, 26-30; Tallett, \textit{War and Society}, 86-87.


Charles greatly strengthened the role of the lords lieutenant and levied huge
numbers of men for active military service; the number of soldiers impressed by Charles
in peacetime was double those levied under Elizabeth in time of war.\textsuperscript{20} He undertook
numerous incursions on the continent and the armies for those expeditions caused
considerable trouble back in England. On their way to coastal towns to disembark for
war, many soldiers razed the English countryside. When the fighting was over, many
army units, back in England waiting payment and discharge, spent their time pillaging
English towns and villages.\textsuperscript{21} The people of England came to see their own armies as the
enemy, equally as dangerous to property and life as a foreign foe. At the same time, the
lords lieutenant had tremendous new powers, which they and their deputies used not only
to provide for the realm’s defense, but also, as time went on, to persecute Puritans. The
heavily Puritan East Anglican counties of England were important embarkation points for
English armies and, as T.H. Breen has argued, were deeply affected by this military
abuse.\textsuperscript{22} This was the military atmosphere in England when the Puritans fled to
Massachusetts Bay in the 1630s. They took their negative memories of Charles’ “Perfect
Militia” with them.

\textsuperscript{20} Breen, “Covenanted Militia,” 29.

\textsuperscript{21} Breen, “Covenanted Militia,” 30-32.

\textsuperscript{22} Breen, “Covenanted Militia,” 31-32.
The Formative Years in Massachusetts Bay, 1630-1672

As early as 1631, the Massachusetts General Court began to look after public safety in the new colony, requiring all men who traveled anywhere outside of Boston to carry a weapon and for each home to be stocked with arms. However, with the cruelty of Charles I’s “Perfect Militia” fresh in their collective memory, the Puritan founders of Massachusetts Bay set out to establish a different militia, a militia rooted in the Elizabethan tradition. Although universal military service for all males between sixteen and sixty was retained, the idea of an untrained militia coexisting alongside select trainbands was dropped. In its place, Massachusetts attempted to erect a system of all trainbands, where every male in the militia, not only a select few (as in the case of Elizabethan trainbands), were vigorously trained and well armed.

---


26 In the first year of settlement, the militia of Massachusetts trained as often as once a week. The frequency of these trainings was dramatically reduced over time. In addition, the Massachusetts Bay Company hired professional military men, such as Captains Daniel Patrick and John Underhill, to move to the colonies to train the men. For one example of a contemporary manual of arms, see Thomas Jenner, The Military Discipline Wherin Is Martially Showne the Order for Driling the Musket and Pike (London: Thomas Jenner, 1642). There is an extensive literature on the development of training in the Massachusetts Militia, see Marie L. Ahearn, The Rhetoric of War: Training Day, the Militia, and the Military Sermon,
The main militia unit was the company, organized and based in each town. An officer, usually a captain, who often had the assistance of a lieutenant, an ensign, and a few non-commissioned officers, sergeants and corporals, commanded each town's company. In a entirely new development, the officers, as early as 1636, were nominated for their positions by the men in their companies, creating what T.H. Breen called, a “Covenanted Militia” along the lines of the participatory leadership model of Massachusetts' governments and churches. Later, at various times, regimental officers, and even the military commander of the colony, were nominated by their men and their places confirmed by the General Court, a practice so routine that most men believed they were electing their officers outright. The election of officers was born out of both the spirit of broad popular participation in the ruling of the colony and memories of the

27 Radabaugh, “Militia of Colonial Massachusetts,” 2. There was considerable change over the period (1630-1672) in the requirements and the number of men needed in each town militia for it to become a “full-strength” company that warranted a captain as its commander. Some smaller towns had lieutenants or sergeants in charge of their “companies,” while other small towns or villages were combined with bigger towns to create a unit big enough to be at full-strength. For these details in the various towns of Essex County, see the chapters below. For the changes over the years, see Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs. and the sources in note 23.


untrustworthy and sometimes treacherous English military officers of the “Perfect Militia.”  

The few professional military men in the colony, especially Captain John Underhill, were appalled by the idea of having recruits choose their commanders; however, the practice remained, with a few difficulties, until 1668. In that year, the General Court reclaimed its sole right to “nominate, choose, and appoint” all commissioned officers except the commander in chief, who was still elected.  

The General Court felt that militia elections were an “excess of democracy,” causing disharmony in several towns and that the men were abusing the franchise requirements of the colony. Despite its retraction of direct election of officers by their men, one of the strongest safeguards against military abuses, the civilian government of Massachusetts retained strict control of its military.

The town companies in Massachusetts, composed of every male in a town from sixteen to sixty, were never intended to become offensive fighting units as a group.  

While the town company might form as a unit to defend the town in the case of an alarm or attack, the entire company was not expected to be sent out of town on an offensive mission; that would leave the town utterly defenseless. In times of emergency or war, offensive or scouting parties would be formed by recruiting men from various town

---


companies into a composite company. This would leave some men in each town for defensive purposes and still allow the colonial government to marshal troops for offensive missions. This was a hybrid of the English system, with its two separate forces: untrained militia for offensive missions and trainbands for defense. In Massachusetts, each militia unit was treated as a trainband, so arrangements had to be made to provide offensive troops out of those units, unlike back in England where the bands were rarely used for offensive forays. This was the system used, in a very limited respect, to assemble troops for the few military emergencies before the 1670s, including the Pequot War in the 1630s and problems with the Narragansett Indians in the 1640s. However, the system was not truly tested until King Philip’s War in 1675.

The State of the Massachusetts Militia Before the War, 1672-1675

The government of Massachusetts Bay began codifying and publishing its laws as early as 1641. Massachusetts first assembled together its militia laws into a single statute in 1643.35 The Book of General Laws and Liberties was first published in 1648 and in many subsequent editions thereafter.36 The 1672 edition of The General Laws and


36 See The Book of the General Laws and Liberties Concerning the Inhabitants of the Massachusetts Collected out of the Records of the General Court, for the Several Years Wherin They Were Made and Established, and Now Revised by the Same Court, and Disposed into an Alphabetical Order, and Published by the Same Authority in the General Court Holden at Boston, in May 1649, (Cambridge, Mass.: Printed according to order of the General Court, 1660); John D. Cushing, ed., The Laws and Liberties of Massachusetts 1641-1691: A Facsimile Edition, Containing Also Council Orders and Executive Proclamations, 3 vols. (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1976); Massachusetts General Court, The Book of the General Laws and Liberties Concerning the Inhabitants of the Massachusetts Collected out of the Records of the General Court for the Several Years Wherin They Were Made and Established, and Now Revised by the Same Court and Dispersed into an Alphabetical Order and Published by the Same Authority in the General Court Held at Boston, the Fourteenth of the First Month, Anno 1647 (Cambridge, Mass.: Printed According to Order of the General Court and are to be solde at the shop of Hezekiah Usher in Boston, 1648); William Henry Whitmore, Colonial Laws of Massachusetts, Reprinted from the Edition of 1660, with the Supplements to 1672: Containing Also, the Body of Liberties of 1641 (Boston: Published Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Liberties of the Massachusetts Colony, its subsequent supplements, and militia laws passed by the General Court from 1672 to 1676, offer a complete picture of the state of Massachusetts’ militia establishment at the time of King Philip’s War. The nine-page “Military” section of the 1672 General Laws deals with the state of the militia in the law of the colony up to that time. The General Court spent a significant amount of effort and time, especially in the 1660s, establishing Massachusetts’ militia system in considerable detail. The court assured that strict civilian control over the military was maintained at all times by legal statutes, funding limits, and direct operational control of militia officers and units.

The 1672 law begins with the organization of the militia, stating that the military forces of each county (named regiments, such as the “Essex Regiment”), both foot and horse (infantry and cavalry respectively), were under the command of the sergeants major by order of the City Council of Boston, 1889); William H. Whitmore, ed., The Colonial Laws of Massachusetts: Reprinted from the Edition of 1672 with the Supplements through 1686 (Boston: Published by the Order of the City Council of Boston, 1887). For the establishment of these law codes, see Thorp L. Wolford, “The Laws and Liberties of 1648,” in Essays in the History of Early American Law, ed. David H. Flaherty (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1969).


39 The concern over an abusive military, born out of their English experiences, is best seen in the resistance to the establishment in 1638 of the professional Artillery Company of Massachusetts Bay (in 1786, renamed the “Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts”). Governor Winthrop and others were concerned the group would become an instrument of independent military power and a possible threat to the government in the colony. See Oliver Ayer Roberts, History of the Military Company of the Massachusetts Now Called the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts, 1637-1888 (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1895); Louise Breen, Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprises among the Puritan Elite in Massachusetts, 1630-1692 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
in each county. The sergeants major reported directly to the highest military officer in the colony, the sergeant major general, along with the governor and General Court, or, in time of war, the Council of War. Despite the fact that the county sergeants major were appointed and could be removed by the General Court, a considerable safeguard, the sergeants major of the counties look suspiciously like English lords lieutenant in their power to organize and command the militia. However, there were real differences.

While the sergeants major for the various counties, including Essex County, were required to bring their entire regiment together for a mass military drill every three years (the Essex Regiment was slated, by the law, to form in 1675 for its regimental muster and drill); they were prohibited from doing so more frequently.

There was also a strict prohibition that the sergeants majors could not “drawn out of the said County to any Regimental exercise” any of that county’s militia units, creating a safeguard against the types of abuses that were common in the English system. Amazingly, they were also not permitted to march the regiment or any part of it out of the their county during time of war, unless given specific permission from the General Court, council, or the major general; an exception was made if “it be in Pursuit of the Enemy

---

40 Massachusetts had been the first English government to institute its military into permanent regiments, drawn upon county lines, in 1636. By doing so, the colony even lead England, which did not adopt regular regiments until 1642 during the English Civil War. See Rutman, “Militant New World,” 672.

41 Sergeants major of the counties had been elected by the militiamen until the April 1668 law of the General Court which rescinded militia elections in all cases but the “major General and Admiral by Sea,” Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 4: Pt. 2:368. Interestingly, the 1672 law goes into great detail on the procedure for electing a sergeant major of the county if one shall be “removed or discharged from their places.” Whitmore, ed., Colonial Laws 1672, 107. This procedure is confusing given the 1668 prohibition on electing officers. It appears to be a portion of the law held over in 1672 despite the fact that the procedure was no longer in force, as it was superceded by the 1668 statute. For information on lords lieutenant, see note 12.

upon a Rout." In addition, sergeants major, unlike their English brethren the lords lieutenant, had very little control over the recruitment of men for active duty. However, they were given broad powers to oversee the officers under their command, by calling them together for meetings about military training and to set the fines for delinquent soldiers. Thus, like so much of the militia system of Massachusetts, the role of the sergeant major, even as late as the 1670s, was a hybrid of old English practices and Massachusetts conditions.

The 1672 codification of military law details at length the all-important town companies. The size of a full-strength foot company was set at sixty-four soldiers (not including officers). A full-strength company would be led by a captain, who would be assisted by a lieutenant and an ensign, all to be appointed and given commissions by the General Court. All inferior officers (sergeants and corporals) were “to be chosen and appointed by the Commissioned Officers in that Company.” Smaller towns, which could not muster the required sixty-four soldiers for a full company, were to be commanded by a sergeant or “Inferior Officer only to teach and instruct them in the exercise of arms.” The sergeant major of the county also had the option of combining smaller town units together to make a complete company. Militia officers were to “take care that their Soldiers be well and completely Armed and shall appoint what Arms each

---

soldier should serve with; Provided two thirds of each Company be Muskquetiers” while the rest carried the pike.\(^{48}\)

The companies were to be inspected and drilled six days a year. The drill was usually held on the town common; where the men practiced marching, skirmishing, ambushing, developing battle formations, and firing their weapons in concert.\(^{49}\) The law required “Every person above the age of sixteen years shall duly attend all Military Exercise and Service as Training, Watching, Warding, under the penalty of five shillings for every fault.”\(^{50}\) However, there were several categories of men excused from training, including:

- Magistrates, Deputies and Officers of Court, Elders and Deacons, the President, Fellows, Students, and Officers of Harvard College and professed School-masters,
- Physicians and Chyrurgeons allowed by two Magistrates, Treasurer, Surveyor General, Publick Notary, Masters of Ships and other Vessels above twenty tuns,
- Fisherman constantly employed at all fishing seasons, constant Herdsmen and such others as for bodily infirmity or other just cause, shall by any County Court or Court of Assistants . . . be discharged; . . . also such as dwell on remote farms, or have a Ferry to pass shall be exempt . . . and all Farms distant above four miles from the Place of Exercising the Company or have a Ferry to pass over, that have above twenty Acres of Land in Tillage and twenty Head of Great Cattle upon such

\(^{48}\) Whitmore, ed., *Colonial Laws 1672*, 108. It is telling that the officers were given the choice of which arms each man under his command would carry. This mirrors the 1572 English practice of assigning weapons based on the class and abilities of the soldiers. See note 14.

\(^{49}\) Radabaugh, “*Militia of Colonial Massachusetts,*” 14.

\(^{50}\) Whitmore, ed., *Colonial Laws 1672*, 109. In 1645, boys between ten and sixteen years were to be instructed in small arms and bows unless their parents objected, see Shurtleff, ed., *Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.*, 3:12.
a farm, shall upon reasonable allowance to the Company, have one man excluded from ordinary Trainings.\footnote{Whitmore, ed., \textit{Colonial Laws 1672}, 109.}

Also exempt from militia duties were """"Negroes and Indians,"""" except for a brief period from 1652 to 1656 when they were included in militia trainings.\footnote{See Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 3:268 for the inclusion of """"all Scotsmen, Negroes, and Indians inhabiting with or servants to the English."""" For the subsequent exclusion (of all but the Scots) see Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 3:397. It is not clear whether these groups ever actually trained with their local militia companies.} The men who did appear were to be exercised in the military arts of the day. The men also had their weapons closely scrutinized by their officers. Those not supplying the correct arms (based on extensive description in the law) were to be fined ten shillings for """"each defect.""""\footnote{Whitmore, ed., \textit{Colonial Laws 1672}, 108-109.} The law made provisions for those too poor to procure arms and ammunition; the colony would provide the arms and the man, if single, would be put out to service by a magistrate or constable to pay for them.

An official, known as the clerk of the band, was responsible for inspecting each man's weaponry over the course of the year. The clerk was also empowered to keep the company's muster roll and be on the constant watch, during training, for """"any defect by absence of Soldiers or other offenses that may fall out in time of Exercise.""""\footnote{Whitmore, ed., \textit{Colonial Laws 1672}, 109.} The law stipulated that after informing the company's officers, he lay out and collect any fines for any variety of defects in arms, attendance, or behavior.\footnote{This made the post extremely unpopular with the soldiers. The General Court instituted a forty-shilling fine, for anyone refusing to serve as a clerk of the band, if so assigned. Whitmore, ed., \textit{Colonial Laws 1672}, 109.} More serious infractions were to be dealt with by the officers, who had the...
power to punish such Soldiers as shall commit any disorder or contempt upon any
day or time of Military Exercise or upon Watch or Ward, by Stocks, Bilboes, or
any other usual Military punishment, or by fine, not exceeding twenty shillings, or
may commit such Offender to the Constable, to be carried before some
Magistrate, who may binde him over to the next Court of that Shire [county], if
the cause so require, or commit him to Prison.⁵⁶

In a May 1672 addition to the codification, military punishments were further defined as
“Riding the Wooden Horse, or by Bilboes, or lying Neck and Heels or acknowledgement
at the Head of the Company;” punishments which could also be administered to soldiers
who missed two training days in a row.⁵⁷ Judging from the amount of time the issue was
discussed and the laws that were passed, the legislature was quite concerned with
misconduct during training.

One of the most pressing problems on training days was the tendency for the men
to treat the exercise as a social gathering, drinking and shooting weapons into the air.⁵⁸
By 1672, the General Court declared that all soldiers, after training, “shall repair to their
several Quarters and Lodge their Arms, immediately after the dismission upon Training
Days and whoever shall either singly or in companies remain in Arms, and vainly spend
their time and Powder by inordinate shooting in the day or night . . . shall be punished by
their Superior Officers order upon the next Training Day at the head of the Company by

⁵⁷ Whitmore, ed., Colonial Laws 1672, 204.
⁵⁸ For a discussion of training days, see Ahearn, Rhetoric of War; French, “Arms and Military;” Gildrie,
“Defiance, Diversion, and the Exercise of Arms.”
sharp Admonition or otherwise with any usual military punishment."\(^{59}\) The same punishment was prescribed for those soldiers who "disobey the lawful commands of their Superior Officers upon any Training Day, either in time of exercise in the Body, or otherwise refusing to perform any service which their Officers in their discretion shall judge expedient in order to the furthance and promoting Military Work \ldots\)\(^{60}\) Any refusal from a soldier to obey his officer was a serious affair; there is evidence that this independent streak in Massachusetts militiamen was one reason the government had done away with the election of officers in the 1660s.\(^{61}\)

In addition to training, the other military duty most men participated in was military watch and ward. Ward was the normal policing of the town, usually attended to by the town constable; however, he could call upon armed militiamen if the need arose. Military watch was usually only performed in time of alert or war and was charged with the protection of the town from outside enemies.\(^{62}\) The 1672 law orders that watches of militiamen be set after sunset every night by the town’s military officers and kept by the soldiers until they were dismissed by their officers the next morning. Towns were charged with providing a "sufficient Watch house \ldots\) and a safe and convient place to keep all such powder and ammunition in toune."\(^{63}\) The men on watch were forbidden to set off a gun after the watch was set (except in the case of emergency) under penalty of a


\(^{60}\) Whitmore, ed., *Colonial Laws 1672*, 114.


\(^{63}\) Whitmore, ed., *Colonial Laws 1672*, 112.
forty-shilling fine. The law also set up a detailed proscription for the rules of conduct of the watch when encountering disorderly persons in peacetime (the watch was warned not to hazard the killing of anyone except in self defense) and how to raise an alarm in the case of danger in times of war.

Massachusetts established a cavalry arm to its militia in 1652. The 1672 militia law set down extensive regulation of the makeup and employment of the cavalry troops. Troops with at least forty men were considered full-strength and assigned three commissioned officers, a captain, lieutenant, and a cornet (instead of an ensign). Troops raised in a county were to be under the command of that county’s sergeant major. Troopers were required to “keep always a good Horse and be well fitted with Saddle, Bridle, Holsters, Pistols or Carbiners and Swords . . . and having Listed his Horse, shall not change or put him off without License from his Captain or chief Officer” under a penalty of five pounds for each defect administered by the clerk of the troop. To offset the expense of these requirements, the colony exempted troopers from paying normal county rates, a sizable incentive to serve as a trooper. Even with this exemption, however, the added expense of owning a horse and all of the necessary equipment caused the government to institute a property requirement to join a troop; by 1672 troopers would only be admitted if they (or their parents, if they lived at home) paid “in a single Country Rate for one hundred pounds estate and in other respects qualified as the Law

64 Whitmore, ed., Colonial Laws 1672, 111-112.


provides. Troopers were to attend six training days annually and were to, in the case of an alarm, "fit himself in all respects for service and shall speedily repair to the Guard in the Town" with the penalty of five pounds for failure to report. However, troops could not be drawn out of their county, except in pursuit of the enemy in a rout, without the express order of the sergeant major general of the colony.

The Town Committee of Militia in the Militia Establishment 1652-1675

The last section of the 1672 codification of militia law highlights the powers and duties of a uniquely New England militia component, the town-based militia committees. Concern over the 1652 Anglo-Dutch War had prompted the General Court to establish a new command structure to oversee the militia in Boston; they called the group the Committee of Militia. The organization was to "consist of the magistrate in the sd towne & the three chief military officers inhabiting the sd towne . . . that the sd committee of militia shall have power to appoint military watch, when they shall se cause, for the safty of the towne and country." The 1652 Act also stipulated that similar committees be created in Charlestown, Salem, Ipswich, and "all other towns within this jurisdiction where there is one or more magistrates . . . & in those towns where no magistrate hath his abode, the deputy or deputyes chosen by sd towne . . . with

---

the chief military officers of such towns or townes.”72 This was an entirely new development in the militia system; no such group appeared in the English militia.73 T.H. Breen has argued that as early as the 1650s, the General Court, worried over several controversial incidents surrounding militia elections in Newbury and Ipswich, was beginning to reconsider the prudence of an officer corps elected by its subordinates.74 The advent of the militia committees was a part of their solution, placing both civilians and militia officers in control of local militia bands.

The new committees of militia in the towns were thus another layer of civilian control over the militia, even in times of conflict, whereas before, the militia officers alone in each town assumed great powers during a crisis. The 1652 act gave the committees various powers, most importantly “power of counsell for the best ordering of the militia of their several towns, till the General Court or councell of the country can be informed.”75 The committees, not the militia officers themselves (although the committees included militia officers), would authorize the mobilization of a town’s militia “upon all occasions of alarme or any invasion” and would see to it that the town company “strengthen their quarters & to oppose any approaching or assaying of them in

---


73 There was an attempt, in the 1643 law, to establish officials called shire lieutenant in each Massachusetts county to deal with some of the administrative functions of the militia system, which had been reorganized on the county level. See Shurtleff, ed., *Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.*, 2:42-43. The shire lieutenant would have been a counterpart to the county sergeants major. However, no shire lieutenants were ever appointed in Massachusetts Bay. It is likely that the office too closely resembled the much-feared lord lieutenant of England. See Colby, “Adaptations,” 35-37; Wright, “Massachusetts Militia Roots,” 5-6.


any way of hostilitie." The General Court clarified its position on the power of the committees in May 1654 when it wrote “it is by this Court declared, that the committee of militia in the several towns hath power to supress all raysinge or gathering of soldiers, but such as shalbe by authoritie of this gouymen." The General Court had come to doubt the ability of the militia officers alone, those men elected by their troops, to order those men to stand down if passions became heated, as they had during some militia election controversies. The memory of an uncontrolled army, under corrupt lords lieutenant back in England, still haunted many. The committees of militia were the government’s attempt to prevent that type of disorder from recurring in Massachusetts Bay. The elected officer corps had proven it was not up to that task; the government hoped the militia committees would be.

In August 1653, the militia committees were given a new and very important power. The General Court ordered “That all warrants for impressing men for warr shall henceforth be directed to the committee of militia in each town, to execute the same by the cunstable.” The committees were given the sole power to choose which of the young men from their community would be called out of the town’s company for active duty service; for many of the young men, the decision of the committee would mean the difference between life or death. This power had once been in the discretion of the

76 Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 3:269. In the case of an attack, perhaps from the Dutch at New Amsterdam, the town militia committee was also required to pass on any intelligence about the attack or the foe to the sergeant major of the county regiment, who in turn would inform the governor and General Court.


78 Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 3:321. For a discussion of the constable’s role, see Samuel Freeman, Town Officer, or, the Power and Duty of Selectmen, Town Clerks... And Other Town Officers as Contained in the Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; with a Variety of Forms for the Use of Such Officers to Which Is Prefixed the Constitutions of Said Commonwealth, 8th ed. (Boston: Printed by Joseph T. Buckingham for Thomas and Andrews, 1815).
elected militia officers, now it was to be more broadly based in the joint civilian-military militia committees. At the end of the Dutch crisis, in October 1654, the committees were ordered by the General Court “to release their soldiers under presse & warrents given out to these ends & purposes.”\textsuperscript{79} Those men pulled out of the towns’ militia companies and called to active duty by the committees were sent home. While the committees were established in response to the Dutch crisis, they did not dissolve with the end of the emergency in 1654. Instead, they grew into one of the most vital elements of the militia system in Massachusetts Bay.

The role of the town committees of militia was clarified and the committees given heightened powers as time passed. During another Dutch crisis, this time in August 1664, the General Court clarified the makeup of the committees, declaring that “the commission officers of horse in the towns where they dwell shall be added thereto & hereby are appointed & impowered to be of the committee of militia for such tounes where they dwell, any lawe or custome to the contrary notwithstanding.”\textsuperscript{80} The emergency also inspired the General Court to remind the militia committees for Boston and the other towns of their various duties:

\begin{quote}
you are hereby required to take into your care & Chardge the soldiery, great artillery & fortification within your towne, and precinct & harbor, & to see that the peace be kept; and in case any shall act upon the shoare or water, in ship, barque, or boate, contrary to the peace & safety of the toune or country, yow are them to repress by force of armes or otherwise, and doe all things that is requisite
\end{quote}


in your wisedome for the preservation of the peace of the country, and to comand all to assist yow therein, who are hereby required to yield their obedience to yow; & yow are from time to time to observe all orders yow shall receive from the General Court, councill of the collony, or major generall.  

These instructions, given while the colony was preparing an expeditionary force of volunteers to attack the Monhatoes, lay out for the first time in precise detail the government’s expectation of the various committees in safeguarding their towns.

In May 1667, the General Court expanded the duties of the militia committees further by instructing them to take charge, together with the town’s selectmen, of the fortifications in each town. The men were “to erect or cause to be erected within their tounes, either inclosing the meeting houses, or in some other convenient place, a fortification, or fort, of stone, brick, or earth, . . . in which fortification the women, children, & aged persons may be secured in case of any sudden danger, wherby the soldiers may be more free to oppose an enemy.” The committees of militia also organized the labor necessary for the task.

The militia committees had gained considerable power from the time of their inception in 1652 to the time their duties were codified in 1672. The militia committee portion of the 1672 act brought all of the committees’ duties together under one statute for the first time. The committees were to be made up of any magistrate or magistrates living in town, or in the case of no magistrates, the town’s deputy or deputies to the General Court, together with the three chief military officers (from either foot or horse

---

companies) or "the greatest part of them." In times of emergency, any three of the committee members could act as the entire committee; when they had the power to "order and dispose of the Militia of their Town for their own safety and defense." The ability to order the disposition of the militia in town during a time of crisis was also extended to the local troop, who were to "duely attend such service as the Committee of Militia of that town shall require" in times of trouble. The 1672 codification continued by confirming the committees' sole power to issue "all Warrants for impressing and raising of soldiers for any expedition . . . who may execute the same by Constable and the said Committee are herby impowered and required to supress all raising of soldiers but such as shall be the Authority of this Government."

A later addition to the 1672 codification, on May 15, 1672, allowed for some of the coastal towns (including Essex County's Salem and Marblehead) and their militia committees to "be allowed . . . the County Rate for this next year for, and towards the finishing and repairing the several Forts there, and that each of their Rates be committed into the hands of the Committee of Militia in each of the aforesaid towns by them speedily to be improved." This control of funds for the town's fortifications was totally new and added considerably to their power, at the same time taking power from the town selectmen who had controlled such funds earlier.

86 Whitmore, ed., Colonial Laws 1672, 111.
In December 1673, the colony mobilized a force of over five hundred men for a possible expedition against the Dutch fleet which had appeared in American waters; the militia committees of each town were entrusted with the job of impressing, listing, and arming the newly created army.\footnote{Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 4: Pt: 2:573. For the Dutch threat, see Ward, United Colonies, 270-275.} Apparently, this order caused some confusion in the town committees, for in January 1674, the General Court issued a clarification that the impressment order was only for the men to be “listed and fitted with firearms & required to be in readiness at all warnings to attend the service of the county,” not actually to be called up.\footnote{Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 4: Pt: 2:575.}

The power of the town committees of militia was expanded one last time before the outbreak of King Philip’s War. In 1668, when the General Court asserted its sole right to choose all militia officers, it had no idea how difficult the task of recognizing suitable men in each and every town would prove. As the crisis with King Philip grew and the possibility of war turned to probability, the General Court sought help in filling officer spots, while making sure not to open any discussion of the possibility of renewed elections by the militiamen:

Whereas the allowing & appointing of all commission military officers in this jurisdiction belongs properly and only to this Court by law and is found both peaceful and satisfactory, and inasmuch as this Court may not be acquainted with many useful and fit persons for that Service. It is therefore hereby ordered, that henceforth it shall & may be lawful for the committee of militia in the several tounes where there shall be neede to present two or three meet persons in their
Established as a civilian safeguard to the militia system in the 1650s, at a time when the General Court was beginning to question the prudence and power of electing officers, the militia committees had come full circle. Ironically, they were no longer needed to safeguard against the disorder and controversies of officer elections; they were given the sole power to nominate all officers to the legislature. A committee’s power in the local militia system was second only to the General Court’s, which gave the community-based committees wide discretion in local militia affairs. Massachusetts had preserved community control of the militia, once embodied by the local election of officers, by instituting the town militia committees as a joint civilian-military resident command structure. Militia committees would not only name any enlisted men to actively serve during war; they played a large part in picking any new officers to lead the towns during the coming calamity. The Massachusetts militia, established in the 1630s, and in a constant state of change and adjustment right up to 1675, was about to face its greatest challenge.

The Militia Establishment During King Philip’s War, 1675-1676

When King Philip’s War broke out in the Plymouth Colony on June 20, 1675, the authorities in Plymouth immediately alerted the government in Massachusetts Bay. The

---


91 This did not apply to the officers put in charge of expeditionary companies during the war. The General Court appointed those officers when the company was established. See George Madison Bodge, *Soldiers in King Philip’s War*, reprint of 1906 3rd ed. (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1967).
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Massachusetts General Court was not in session, but during its first meeting after the beginning of hostilities on July 9, 1675, the Court began to prepare for war, voting for several war rates (taxes) and empowering constables to amass supplies for an army.\footnote{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:43-44.}

The legislators also ordered that troopers, traditionally exempt from paying county rates, pay the war rate.\footnote{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:45.} However, the language of this first wartime session highlights a cavalier attitude toward the conflict (which had not yet struck Massachusetts, as the fighting was centered in Plymouth Colony). Throughout the records, the Court talked of “the present expedition against the Indians,” as if one mission would settle the conflict; there was no mention of a general war.

By the October 1675 meeting of the General Court, after Indian attacks laid waste several towns in western Massachusetts and the Massachusetts militia had suffered several setbacks, including the ambush at Bloody Brook in western Massachusetts, the earlier cavalier attitude disappeared and the Court discussed seriously “the present warr with the Indians.”\footnote{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:47.} At the October 13 meeting, the legislature made several changes to the militia structure to meet the conditions of the war. Court members, following recommendations from commanders in the field, changed the makeup of the forces in the militia: “Wheras it is found by experience that troopers and pikemen are of little use in the present warr with the Indians ... all troopers shall forwith furnish themselves with carbines ... and also be lible, to be impressed by the committee of militia in the toune where they live, to serve as foot soldiers during the said warr; provided one fourth part of

\footnote{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:47.}
the troopers in each town be reserved for the use of the county as such, and all pikemen are hereby required forthwith to furnish themselves with fire arms . . . as the law requires musketeers to be furnished." The necessity of changing one-third of all militiamen from the pike to the musket, in the middle of hostilities, prompted the government to order one thousand muskets from England and to pay for them out of public funds. The weapons were to be distributed to the towns, where the selectmen were to raise funds for their town’s portion.

The next item on the General Court’s October agenda granted more military power to the town committees of militia. They would assume control over the entire population in times of attack. The committees were to:

- settle and dispose the several inhabitants of their respective towns . . . into one or more garrisons, all persons in the several towns, upon penalty of five shillings per day, being hereby obligated to labor in and provide such fortification or fortifications as they [the committee of militia] shall agree upon; and all inhabitants to attend their places in such fortification or garrison as they are appointed unto, and in case of alarm or invasion, to appear at and for the defense

---


96 Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 5:47-48. This late change in armament during the war is possibly the reason almost every town reported some soldiers as wanting weapons when they were impressed for active duty. It seems probable those men, who had been required to own weapons by militia law prior to the war, had been pikemen who had yet to acquire their new musket. This is also the conclusion of Michael A. Bellesiles, Arming America: The Origins of a National Gun Culture (New York: Knopf, 2000), 61, 117. For a further discussion of arms during the war, see French, “Arms and Military;” Patrick Mitchell Malone, “Indian and English Military Systems in New England in the Seventeenth Century” (Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1971); Patrick M. Malone, The Skulking Way of War: Technology and Tactics among the New England Indians (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993); Harold L. Peterson, Arms and Armor in Colonial America, 1526-1783, reproduction of 1956 ed. (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Ltd., 2000).
of such places . . . no inhabitant or soldier to leave his station upon any employ whatsoever but according to order from the chief officer.97

Small frontier towns were allowed to evacuate their women and children to the next defensible town, their husbands joining that town’s garrison. The militia committees were further ordered to inspect their town’s stocks of arms and ammunition, to “alter, augment, and dispose as they judge meet” those supplies, remind the clerks of the bands to regularly inspect the towns’ weapons, and order those townsmen who had been exempted from trainings to furnish weapons in case they were needed for service.98

Also in that October 1675 session, coming to the realization that this crisis was larger than any they had faced before and would require large numbers of soldiers in the field, the General Court passed a series of “Laws and Ordinances of War . . . for the better regulating their forces, and keeping their soldiers to their duty & to prevent prophaness, that iniquity may be kept out of the camp.”99 The regulations were born out of a concern for a loss of godliness many Puritans felt had caused the war, a need for military discipline for effective army operations, and a concern about the conduct of the troops while on campaign.100 The first three ordinances dealt with the loss of the “Puritan

---

Way" and began to rectify it, at least in the army.\(^1\) Soldiers were warned first not to "blaspheme the holy & Blessed Trinity . . . upon paine to have his tongue bored with a hott iron."\(^2\) This regulation, along with the second and third regulations against "unlawful oathes, & execrations, & scandalous acts in derogation of Gods honour" and the "often and willing" absence from public worship, were meant to begin society's reclamation of its religious heritage through the practices of its soldiery.\(^3\)

The need to inculcate discipline for an effective chain of command and effectual army operations was the driving force behind the next section of the regulations. The men, who had never before been fashioned into a true fighting force and had not been trained as such (training days notwithstanding), were in need of a strong statement of what the government expected of them as soldiers in an army. This required that the men realize the importance of the chain of command; this was not the time to question the authority of militia officers' or any part of the command structure. The time for militia

---

\(^1\) During the war, there were numerous attempts to reform civil society back to the ideal of the founding fathers of the colony. See Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 5, at 5:59-63, for calls for reform.


dispute and protest, a common occurrence during peacetime, was over.\textsuperscript{104} This section of the regulations began by reminding the men to mind their officers and never to argue with or strike one, upon pain of death. Death was also the penalty for men who left the army without permission. Rule seven told men to be quiet in the ranks, upon pain of imprisonment, so “the officers may be heard and their commands executed.”\textsuperscript{105} An additional capital prohibition against men who would “resist, draw, lift, or offer to draw or lift his weapon against his officer, correcting him orderly” was made.\textsuperscript{106} Provost marshals and other officers were also to be obeyed. Any soldier who did “utter any words of sedition or mutiny” was also to be put to death; while those who heard “mutinous speeches and not acquaint their commander with them” was to be “grievously” punished.\textsuperscript{107} The fact that most of these infractions were punishable by death is telling; the General Court was taking no chances with the independent spirit of the Massachusetts militiaman during war.

An equally pressing concern of the Court was the conduct of the army in the field. Their (and/or their fathers’) English experiences had made most Massachusetts settlers wary of any form of powerful army. Long-dormant memories of uncontrollable English

\textsuperscript{104} The frequency of these small disagreements and militia protests in peacetime is surprising. See the chapters below on the various towns in Essex County, especially the Rowley and Topsfield sections. See also George Francis Dow, ed., Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts, 8 vols. (Salem, Mass.: Essex Institute, 1911-1918); John Noble and John Francis Cronin, eds., Records of the Court of Assistants of the Colony of the Massachusetts Bay, 1630-1692, 3 vols. (Boston: Pub. by the County of Suffolk, 1901); Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.; Samuel Eliot Morison, ed., Records of the Suffolk County Court, 1671-1680, 2 vols., Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Vol. xxix-xxx. Collections (Boston: Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 1933); Adolph Frank Michalek, “Social and Economic Problems in Essex County as Revealed in the Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts, 1636-1683” (M. A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1931).


soldiers and Stuart armies raiding the English countryside most likely prompted the General Court to pass this section of the laws of war; these rules had never before been needed because Massachusetts had never before fielded such a large army.  

Even with an all trainband militia, there was real concern in the government about the ability of its own soldiers to behave. Rule twelve prohibited drunkenness, punishment for officers being a loss of their position, while a court martial would discipline enlisted men. “Rapes, ravishments, unnaturall abuses, and adultery” were to be punished by death; while fornication and “other dissolute laciviousness” was to be punished at the discretion of the officer, “according to the quality of the offense.”  

Pillaging, in the form of theft or robbery, was to be punished with restitution. Murderers were to be executed. The legislature had done its best to preclude any of the abuses of soldiers on campaign, a real problem in the memory of many, by instituting a harsh set of statutes and punishments against the problem.

The last four regulations in the rules of war were focused on precise problems of discipline in the ranks. The regulations seem to be based on experience, as if the legislature was responding to specific information of wrongs committed by soldiers in the field. Rule seventeen stipulates that all soldiers on watch or at drill be completely armed as the regulations set forth. Soldiers who “shall negligently loose or sinfully play away their armes at dice or cards or other wayes” were to stay with the army as pioneers (engineers) or scavengers until they could furnish themselves with new arms.  

---

108 See Breen, “Covenanted Militia.”


colony's ever-short supply of ammunition and gunpowder was the issue in the next section, which made it a capital offense to "spoyle, sell, or carry away any ammunition committed to" the soldier.\textsuperscript{111} Soldiers were warned about outstaying a pass away from his company, upon the loss of their pay. Lastly, the regulations clarified what was meant by the terms "grevious punishment" ("disgracing, cashiering, the strappadoe, or riding the wooden horse to fetch blood") and arbitrary or punishment at discretion, which precluded any punishment that threatened life or limb.\textsuperscript{112} These twenty rules of war were crucial to regulating the conduct of the Bay Colony's soldiers during the conflict.

In addition to the rules of war for its active-duty soldiers, the General Court also issued a series of regulations clarifying the command structure in and the duties of garrison soldiers in October 1675. The men were to be "under the comand and dispose of the chief military officer for their improvement, wither as scouts, warding, watching, fortifying of garrison places, or remooveing and taking away that which may endainger the peace and safety of the people in the place."\textsuperscript{113} The legislature also addressed those soldiers who had been issued weapons by committees of militia for earlier campaigns, instructing them to return the arms to their rightful owners once such service was over.\textsuperscript{114} The committees were required to certify, before any soldier had been paid for his service, that he had either used his own weapon for service or returned a borrowed weapon to its rightful owner.\textsuperscript{115} Militia committees in the towns were also ordered to assume the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[111]{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:50.}
\footnotetext[112]{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:50.}
\footnotetext[113]{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:50.}
\footnotetext[114]{Most of these men were probably former pikemen. See note 96.}
\footnotetext[115]{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:51.}
\end{footnotes}
power to "heare, determine, and setle the whole accounts of the several tounes respecting all disbursments of armes, ammunition, horses, furniture, provisions, &c" that were to be sent into the colony's wartime treasurer.\textsuperscript{116} This greatly expanded the power of the committees in each town. They were now in charge of every aspect of a town's defense: its impressment decisions, officer nominations, war accounts, fortifications, garrison assignments, military intelligence gathering, and the command of the town in case of an attack. As early as October 1675, the wartime powers of the committees of militia in the towns were second only to the power of the General Court itself.

While the records of the General Court are full of references to the militia and the conduct of the war, the next change in militia law or structure did not come until February 21, 1676. The government, sensing that flexibility in troop movement was paramount, gave the county sergeants major and other inferior officers the permission to take their troops out of their county if "engageing, pursuing, or destroying the enemy" as long as it was not expressly "contrary to particular order from a superior officer or authority."\textsuperscript{117} The Court thus rescinded one of the safeguards against the army, realizing it was in a fight for survival. The legislature overturned another of its orders in February 1676, when it reinstated restrictions against impressing troopers into infantry units.\textsuperscript{118} In the beginning of the war, the government believed that troopers were of little use against the Indians, but experience had taught them the opposite; the scouting abilities and swift response of cavalry were absolutely necessary. All troopers were needed in the saddle


and were no longer to be drafted away into active-duty foot companies. The February 21 meeting also saw the General Court draft a law regarding volunteer soldiers and officers. While volunteering was not widespread, there were undoubtedly some volunteers in almost every company and some companies, most notably those led by Captain Samuel Mosley, were made up almost entirely of volunteers.\(^\text{119}\) This had created a problem of command; many volunteers felt that their status gave them the right to choose which (and whose) order to obey. The legislature dealt with problem by statute, decreeing “that all such persons so listing themselves [as volunteers] shall be subject to all such martial lawes as are or maybe provided for the well ordering of the forces of this jurisdiction.”\(^\text{120}\)

This changed in May 1676, when Captain Mosley and the General Court drew up a unique agreement about the status of his volunteer soldiers, their privileges, and the duties they would assume.\(^\text{121}\) Committees of militia were even involved in the raising of these volunteers; they were “to take subscriptions from persons willing and able to beare the charge of wages and provisions for the supply of these volunteers . . . ”\(^\text{122}\)

The February meeting of the Massachusetts legislature also saw an expansion of the duties of the militia committees in order to improve town defenses; too many Indian raids on the towns were being allowed to take place. Fearing that the law pertaining to garrison soldiers (especially about watches being kept) was not being followed, the Court

---

\(^\text{119}\) Captain Mosley, a former privateer from Jamaica and since the 1650s a resident of Boston, raised a large number of independent companies of volunteers during the war, made up of servants, apprentices, foreigners, sailors, and boys too young to enroll in the militia. Mosley and his men had a reputation for independence on the battlefield. See Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 59-78.


\(^\text{121}\) Mosley was such a successful commander that the General Court allowed him great authority and wide latitude in his command and placed him, for all intents and purposes, outside the normal command structure. See Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 5:94-96.

instructed the militia committees to ensure their garrison soldiers adhered to the law. They were to provide “that a considerable part of the soldiery, by turns, in the several parts of the respective townes, be improved in scouting and warding, to prevent the skulking & lurking of the enemy about the said townes, & to give timely notice of approaching danger . . .”¹²³ The committee members were to see that brush was cut down along the highways (to lessen hiding places for the enemy) and ensure that young men, even below militia age, attend militia trainings in order to acquaint themselves with the institution. The government was preparing for a long and bloody war. The committees were instructed to ensure that town watches were kept until the sun rose and that scouts were then sent to reconnoiter the surrounding area for Indians.¹²⁴ The February 21 meeting also saw another round of impressment orders sent to the committees.¹²⁵

The orders for the committees did not stop there. They had become the main instrument of control in many towns. The committees were to make payment to anyone who killed or took prisoner any Indian skulking outside a town: “three pounds per head or prisoners so taken” as long as it was provided with the evidence.¹²⁶ The Milton (Norfolk County) committee was ordered to enforce the General Court’s directive that people not leave their towns and to “require those that are withdrawn to return to their places again” lest the defense of the town be compromised.¹²⁷ In Maine, where civil

administration had collapsed, the militia committees were given powers usually reserved for town selectmen. They were ordered to make and collect nine rates and to “audit all accompts of the charges expended in the warr” in their proximity.\footnote{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:76.}

By May 1676, the war was having a drastic impact on the ability of families to survive. With the war almost entering its second year, so many men, including large numbers of young, adult sons (essential farm labor) and even some married men, had been called up for service that the ability of many families to farm their land was suffering. The General Court ordered those families in trouble to be assisted. Town selectmen, not the militia committees, were to “impresse men for the management and carrying on of the husbandry of such persons as are called out from the same into the service, who have not sufficient help of their oune left at home to manage,” to oversee their labor, and pay them.\footnote{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:78. It is quite possible this was done to make the selectmen feel more useful and less stripped of power; it is also possible that the Court thought the militia committees already had many duties and this was best left to the selectmen.} The militia committees were too busy for this task and they were about to get busier. In the same meeting, the Court lamented, “great disappointment the country hath suffered by reason of non appearance of soldiers impressed for severall expeditions.”\footnote{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:78.} They ordered that all impressed persons who did not show up were to be fined a hefty four pounds (troopers to pay six pounds) and if their refusal was accompanied “with refractorines, reflection, or contempt upon authority; such persons
shall be punished with death or some other grievous punishment.\textsuperscript{131} The duty to enforce the strict new order was given to:

the committee of militia in the severall tounes where the offense is comitted are hereby impowered and required to call before them all such as shallbe delinquents. . . and on conviction of their neglect, to give warrant to the constable to levy the said fines, which said fines shallbe improoved to purchase armes for the tounes use, provided it shallbe in the power of the council [the colonial council in Boston] upon the petition of any person agreived, and just reason alledged and prooved, to make abatement of the said fines as in their wisdom and discretion they shall judg meet. And it is hereby ordered that return of all neglects and defects in the cases aforesaid be sent to the committee of militia in the severall tounes, who are hereby required to take care for the strict execution thereof.\textsuperscript{132}

The committees of militia were thus given the role of judge and jury over those who were evading the impressment orders the committees themselves issued. While the law did establish a mechanism for review, and possible reversal of the cases by a higher authority (the colonial council), the power of the militia committees continued to grow.

By May 1676, the frontier of Massachusetts was in a state of shock and ruin after almost a year of hard fighting. Many towns had been destroyed or abandoned. Hundreds of families were scattered to the far corners of the colony, as women and young children were spirited away to the relative safety of the coastal towns, while their husbands, sons,


\footnote{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:79. For information on a case of draft evasion with anti-government speech, which probably inspired that part of this act, see the section on Manchester in Chapter 6.}
and sweethearts were sent off on expeditions or assigned to garrisons. In frontier towns that had not been abandoned, the militia committees were placed in control. The committees were to divide the men in the listed frontier towns into scouting parties, one for each day by turn, which would scour the nearby landscape looking for the enemy. The committees were also to select suitable officers for each party and see that they were paid from the colony’s treasury. For “the more effectually carrying out of this work, . . . the soldiers abroad in service apperteyning to said towns [were to] be returned home, and they freed from the impress during their attendance to the service above said for their own and the country’s defence.” Chief military officers in towns were also required by this new law to send aid to neighboring towns in case of attack, as long as that aid could be “spared with safety at home for the security of the distressed.” Andover, in Essex County, was one of the frontier towns singled out in this order, and the town’s soldiers soon came home to protect their own garrison houses. At the same time, the committees of militia were required to press additional men for war service, a task that was increasingly more difficult as more and more men refused to serve and failed to show up for duty. To help combat the shortage of troops, the General Court authorized and

---


136 For information on draft evading, see Black, “Social Welfare,” 141-147; Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk*, 137-138, 184-187; Jenny Hale Pulsipher, “The Overture of This New Albion World:” King
organized the raising of friendly Indians into companies to fight on the side of Massachusetts Bay.\textsuperscript{137}

The crisis on the frontier had grown so dreadful by 1676 that the government became convinced every outpost must be defended. Too many towns were being abandoned and the shrinking frontier was inching ever closer to Boston, which had been in a state of near-shock since February, after Indian attacks came within ten miles. In order to assure the holding of the frontier, the General Court instructed at the same May 1676 meeting that “it shall not be in the liberty of any person whatsoever, who is by law enjoyned to train, watch, ward, or scout, to leave the town he is an inhabitant of, upon any pretence whatsoever, without liberty first obtained from the committee of militia in the town to which he doth belonge, or in the case of their denyall, then by the council of the common-wealth, upon the penalty of twenty pounds . . .\textsuperscript{138} If such a person had moved away before or left after the order and did not return when ordered to by the militia committee, the twenty-pound fine would be taken out of their estate. The militia committees now held every frontier town citizen’s future in their power, not only did they decide who was sent out to fight, they decided who could and could not leave a town under threat. To make sure those in garrisons attended their duties, the Court further ordered that “no person capeable to assist in securing the garrison [house or fort] he belongeth to shall absent himself, by going out of toune, without acquainting of and liberty obtained from the commander of said garrison, upon penalty of five shillings for


\textsuperscript{138} Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:81. This was not the first time people had been ordered to stay in the frontier town, but it was the first time it was enacted as a law. See Puglisi, \textit{Puritans Besieged}, 84-88.
each offense in that kinde, that so the danger to which the garrisons in the respective
tounes are exposed too by frequent absence of such as are for the defense of the them
may be prevented.”\footnote{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:81.} The government was serious about stopping the outflow of its
frontier citizens, especially males, which was “enfeebling the remote parts of the country
and tending to the damage of the whole.”\footnote{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:81. For a discussion of the frontier towns, see Chapter 5 “The
J. Puglisi, “Legacies of King Philip’s War in the Massachusetts Bay Colony” (Ph.D. diss., College of
William and Mary, 1987).}

From May 1676 to August 9, 1676, the General Court did not meet. As the war
began to wind down, with the defeat and capture of more and more Indians, the
government saw little need to issue new laws or militia regulations. The August meeting
was dominated by discussions of a letter from the king in England. On August 12, just a
few days after the meeting, forces under Plymouth’s Captain Benjamin Church killed
King Philip. With the war basically over in southern New England, there is no mention
of militia or the committees again until the September 1676 meeting of the legislature.\footnote{The war was just getting started in Maine, see Emerson Woods Baker, III, “Trouble to the Eastward: The Failure of Anglo-Indian Relations in Early Maine” (Ph.D. diss., College of William and Mary, 1986). For information on Church, see Benjamin Church, \textit{Diary of King Philip’s War, 1675-76}, Tercentenary ed. (Chester, R.I.: Published for the Little Compton Historical Society by Pequot Press, 1975); Benjamin Church, Thomas Church, and Samuel Gardner Drake, \textit{The History of Philip’s War, Commonly Called the Great Indian War, of 1675 and 1676}, Reprint of 1716 Boston, 2nd ed. (Exeter, N.H.: J. & B. Williams, 1829); Richard Slotkin and James K. Folsom, eds., \textit{So Dreadfull a Judgment: Puritan Responses to King Philip’s War, 1676-1677} (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1978), 370-470.} Yet the committees of militia in the towns were still active in the war’s aftermath. They
were ordered to sell all the horses the county had acquired for the war and to send the
money to Boston; the upkeep on the horses was a great expense and was no longer

\footnote{Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:81.}
necessary. For the most part, however, the colony tried to recover from the calamity that had befallen it and to begin the enormous task of paying for the war. While fighting was still ongoing in Maine, in many ways military matters took a back seat until the next major conflict, King William’s War, broke out in 1689.

The Town Committees of Militia at War: An Appraisal

The “Committees of Militia in the severall townes” of Massachusetts Bay were crucial players in the waging of King Philip’s War. They held immense power, second only to the General Court itself. Militia committees were charged with the oversight of all aspects of the military in their towns, which in time of war was crucial to the town’s survival. They held the power to appoint each town’s military watch and the power to order out the town’s militia in the case of attack or alarm. In reality, they could command the entire population of the town during wartime, placing citizens in garrisons and making sure no one left town without their permission. The committees of militia chose which of the town’s sons and fathers would be sent off to fight in dangerous expeditions, holding the very power of life and death over many of those men. They also held the power of judge and jury over those men who did not report when impressed. The committees also, in effect, chose the officers of each town’s militia by making recommendations to the General Court. They oversaw all accounts dealing with the

---


military in town, including all money paid to erect costly fortifications. On the frontier, the committees of militia were put in complete control of the towns, deciding which families could leave towns in danger and assuming duties, such as taxing the population, which were the province of selectmen.

During the war years, the committees became even more important to the government of the towns than town selectmen, especially in those areas under threat of Indian attack, which was the entire society by 1676. The town records of the period bring this fact home. Almost all of the records, kept by the selectmen of each town, virtually ignore the war in the 1675-1676 period. The records are full of normal town business, local elections, property disputes, or local ordinances passed, yet they rarely, if ever mention the war. Other than a possible reference to a war rate, these town documents are silent about how each town handled the calamity around them. The reason was that the selectmen did not handle the war, the committees of militia did.

The selectmen, whose power in many towns was considerable before the war, became marginalized during the war. While there may have been some overlap of members of the two groups, the new power arrangement does seem to have caused some discomfort. The General Court might have sensed this and acted accordingly.

Selectmen, not the militia committees, were given the task of finding help for their citizen


145 No record of any meeting for any militia committee survives. It is not known if any of the small meetings, five men at most, were held publicly (it is doubtful) or if any record, other than the muster lists or reports, was made of the decisions or discussions at the meetings. Other than muster records, there are no published records of such meetings and no originals exist in the Massachusetts State Archives.
families that had lost labor when sons and husbands were impressed, even though this type of wartime duty seems more in keeping with the duties of the committees.\textsuperscript{146}

Whether this was done because the militia committees were too busy, or to give the selectmen a wartime purpose, is hard to determine. In the same May meeting, the General Court answered a petition from the committee of militia in Cambridge, which complained that it was having a hard time getting the citizens to labor on the town's fortifications. The legislators ordered that the selectmen "joyne with the militia [committee] for the finishing thereof, and for their furtherance heerein doe referr them to the lawes already published."\textsuperscript{147} It seems clear that the militia committee was not getting the assistance it needed from the selectmen, as had been required in a May 1667 law, and was forced to ask the legislature to intervene.\textsuperscript{148} Intervene it did, reminding the selectmen of the law and ordering them to assist the militia committee. The loss of power of the selectmen, as evidenced in these cases, along with the detached record of the war in the selectmen's official town histories, demonstrate the immense power of the militia committees in Massachusetts towns at war. None of those powers was more important than the power of impressment.


\textsuperscript{147} Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:89.

CHAPTER TWO
THE PRACTICE OF IMPRESSMENT, COMMITTEES OF MILITIA,
AND THE COMPANIES OF ESSEX COUNTY DURING KING PHILIP'S WAR

Just as the history of the Massachusetts militia system is important to any comprehension of the identity of the seventeenth-century colonial soldier, a clear understanding of the procedure by which those men were recruited is necessary in order to understand who the soldiers were and why they, and not their neighbors, were picked to serve. In their quest to create their own perfect militia, the colonists of Massachusetts Bay constructed a unique system, based in many ways on the English militia of Elizabeth I and James I, but with some important modifications based on experiences in Charles I's England and their new situation in America. By 1675, Massachusetts had established a trainband militia system run at the local level by powerful Committees of Militia.¹ The committees held both military and administrative powers and were, in conjunction with the county sergeant majors, replacements for the English lords lieutenant, those royal officials in charge of the English militia establishment, but with important safeguards.

¹ This was quite different from the two-tiered system in England with its general militia and trainbands, run by lords lieutenant. New England militias were rather special in this regard. Most historians would argue, correctly, that the election of officers was the most sweeping difference in the Massachusetts militia from the English model. However, that privilege had been revoked in 1668. By the time of King Philip's War in 1675, the most important elements of the militia of Massachusetts were the all-trainband system and the militia committees. See T. H. Breen, “The Covenanted Militia of Massachusetts Bay: English Background and New World Development,” in Puritans and Adventurers: Change and Persistence in Early America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980); Darrett Bruce Rutman, “A Militant New World 1607-1640: America’s First Generation: Its Martial Spirit, Its Tradition of Arms, Its Militia Organization, Its Wars” (Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 1959); Jack S. Radabaugh, “The Militia of Colonial Massachusetts,” Military Affairs 18, no. 1 (1954): 1-18.
The most important duty of both the lords lieutenant in England and the committees of militia in Massachusetts Bay was to choose which men would be impressed for active service.\(^2\) The crisis of King Philip’s War swelled the number of men pressed for service far in excess of any previous experience in the colony’s history. Knowledge of the nature of impressment, both under the old English system the colonists had rejected and under the new system they had established, is essential to understanding the way Massachusetts fought the war and why it chose the soldiers it did.

The English Background of Impressment: The Lord Lieutenant System

Lords lieutenant were first appointed in England during the reign of Edward VI in 1549.\(^3\) Queen Mary greatly strengthened the role of the lords lieutenant with the Arms Act of 1558, which reorganized the militia on a county basis. Before 1558, the English militia had been organized only on a local level, which led to great inefficiencies.\(^4\) Lords lieutenant were appointed by the Crown and were tasked with mustering, training, inspecting, and levying men in their counties for active duty service, either in England or oversees. They were also responsible for collecting money from the gentry and nobles.

---


for all military expenses, known as "coat and conduct money." By establishing the lieutenancy, the monarchy was taking the militia establishment, especially the impressment of men, out of strictly local control. In his dissertation, Victor Stater makes a convincing argument that the lord lieutenant system created a delicate balance of military command and control, with lieutenants having to juggle the needs of both the Crown and their counties, a precarious situation which could place their standing in either community in jeopardy.

Lords lieutenant were always noblemen, often the most powerful man in their county. Many were also privy councillors with very high connections at Court. Assisting the lords lieutenant were deputy lords lieutenant. Each county had two or three deputies culled from the foremost members of the local gentry. In England’s large counties, they had the local knowledge and influence to ensure the various duties of the lieutenancy were carried out. Even so, they had large territories to control. Exclusive local control was no longer a feature of the system, especially by the 1630s. The growing lack of local control of the military system under Charles I and his “Perfect

---


6 See Thomson, Lords Lieutenants, 38-40. Thompson argues that the advent of the lords lieutenant took impressment out of the hands of the sheriffs and that there was little resistance to this move against local military control in the general population. In his study, Cruickshank argues that the local officials, especially the justices of the peace and sheriffs, had become so corrupt that many saw the raising of troops as the perfect opportunity to solicit bribes from their townsmen. Cruickshank, Elizabeth’s Army, 20-24.


Militia" was a main concern of the Puritans who left England to start the Massachusetts Bay colony. Many counties also had muster-masters. These were professional, experienced soldiers who were to take charge of training the men in the county and assisting the lords lieutenant in all things military. Rounding out the personal of the system were local justices of the peace and sheriffs, who had some duties during musters and troop levies.

Under Queen Elizabeth, the militia had been split into trainbands and the general militia. Lords lieutenant and their subordinates were responsible for both groups; they oversaw the maintenance and training of the trainbands and the impressment of men from the general militia for overseas service. The call-up of men for foreign service, along with a possible call-up of trainbands for local defense in case of an invasion, was the lieutenancy's most important military function. The process of levying soldiers was also the most complicated aspect of any lieutenant's duty and required a whole host of actors, from the king and the Privy Council down to village constables. The process began when the king and council decided how many soldiers to call up and divided the levy by county. The lords lieutenant from the various counties were given their quotas,

---

11 Breen, "Covenanted Militia," 29. See also Stater, "Lord Lieutenancy in England," 26-36, who argues that the lieutenancy was a hybrid of local and national control until the monarchy of Charles I, when Charles tried to nationalize the institution.

12 While all lords lieutenant were noblemen, not all had military experience. See Stewart, "Arms and Politics," 208-211; Stater, "Lord Lieutenancy in England;" Thomson, Lords Lieutenants.

13 See Chapter 1.

14 For the political importance of the lords lieutenant, see Stater, "Lord Lieutenancy in England;" Thomson, Lords Lieutenants.

15 This example comes from the days of James I and Charles I and thus refers to the "King." The process worked in a similar way under Queen Elizabeth, although the system was newer and less well defined. The source for this example is Stater, "Lord Lieutenancy in England," 161-167.
the rendezvous for the troops, and the date they were needed; they in turn told the
numbers to their deputies. Some lieutenants did nothing more than that, while some were
very involved in the process.

The deputy lieutenants did the real work of the press, first apportioning the
request down to the town and village level. They also had to collect money to equip and
feed the men until they were turned over to the king’s officers at the ports and transferred
to the Crown’s expense. The deputies usually had the awesome task of choosing which
men to actually press into service.\footnote{16} They would then issue warrants to the local
constables to deliver to the pressed men. It was here that the dual nature of the lord
lieutenant system can best be seen. The deputies (or lords themselves in some counties)
had to balance their national duty, to provide the Crown with able soldiers, with their
local affiliation and concern for their communities. It was here that problems sometimes
erupted, especially as Charles I began to centralize the militia establishment.

Which men did the deputy lords lieutenant decide to press? It is a question
greatly complicated by law and custom.\footnote{17} It also depended upon the duty for which the
deputies pressed the men. Custom dictated that the sturdy yeoman of the trainbands were
to be retained in England, even within their own counties most of the time, for the


\footnote{17} On the state of the English militia and how it was mobilized, see Ian F.W. Beckett, \textit{Amateur Military
Tradition 1558-1945}, \textit{Manchester History of the British Army} (Manchester, England: Manchester
Army}, 24-26; D. P. Carter, “The "Exact Militia" in Lancashire, 1625-1640,” \textit{Northern History: A Review of
the History of the North of England (Great Britain)} 11 (1976): 87-106; C. H. Firth, \textit{Cromwell’s Army: A
History of the English Soldier During the Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Protectorate}, reprint of
Lieutenancy on the Eve of the Civil Wars;” Noland, “Militarization,” 398-401; Stewart, “Arms and
Politics,” 211-216.
defense of the realm.\textsuperscript{18} The trained soldiers of the bands were not usually eligible to be pressed for overseas expeditions.\textsuperscript{19} For many reasons, including higher costs and the Crown's unwillingness to lose men of the better sort, the soldiers pressed for foreign service came from the mass of the general militia, men from sixteen to sixty who were generally untrained and often lacked weapons.\textsuperscript{20} The majority of impressments in Tudor-Stuart England, except for the period of the invasion threat from the Spanish in 1580s, were call-ups of the general militia for service on the European continent or in Ireland.\textsuperscript{21} This fact had a direct impact on the type of people drafted for service.

The trainbands had always been envisioned as containing the better sort of people in the country. As Lindsay Boynton argues, "With unfailing regularity the [queen's] Council called for well-to-do householders, farmers, franklins, yeomen, or their sons, to fill the trainbands."\textsuperscript{22} That was the reason these men were exempted from overseas service; they were needed for a strong home defense and no one wanted to endanger the country by their departure.\textsuperscript{23} This caused two problems. First, it triggered a rush of men

\textsuperscript{18} Men listed in the general militia and not in the trainbands were no longer trained or even inspected to ensure they owned weapons. See Boynton, \textit{Elizabethan Militia}, 46-48, 90-126.

\textsuperscript{19} There were occasions, especially by the 1590s on, as the invasion threat lessened, that some members of the trainbands were impressed for overseas service. See Noland, "Militarization," 399-401; Beckett, \textit{Amateur Military Tradition}, 26-27. Cruickshank argues that while this did occur, the "trained men, however, were only a small part of the troops sent abroad . . . ." Cruickshank, \textit{Elizabeth's Army}, 25.


\textsuperscript{21} The trainbands were instrumental in English preparations for a Spanish invasion in the 1580s, see Fissel, \textit{English Warfare}, 56-61.

\textsuperscript{22} Boynton, \textit{Elizabethan Militia}, 108.

\textsuperscript{23} There were other reasons the better sort were chosen to man the trainbands. They were the most likely to be able to afford and learn to use the new weapons (especially firearms). The trainbands were also though of as reliable if the Crown needed to use them to put down an internal revolt. See Boynton, \textit{Elizabethan Militia}, 109; Stewart, "Arms and Politics," 212. It has also been argued that getting many master-less men

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
into the trainbands by those who wanted to avoid overseas service. In 1601, the Earl of Hertford, lord lieutenant for Wiltshire and Somerset, complained of this after watching a muster of the local band, saying he found “many hired persons, manservants, and inhabitants of the meanest sort such as have ever been held fitter for foreign service.”

While many of the trainbands had been “corrupted” by the influx of draft-evading men of the lower sort, most of the bands, especially those in London, still consisted of the rising middling order. The earl was most upset that these “meanest sort[s]” were no longer eligible for “foreign service” now that they were safely in the bands. That highlights the second major problem with the trained band exemption: England’s expeditionary armies of the period were largely made up of untrained rabble.

When the deputy lieutenants set out to fill their quotas for overseas forces, they did so from the general militia and thus from the lower reaches of society. Deputies or constables went looking for men to press and turned to the troublemakers in their villages or towns as the first prospects. “Nearly every village had one or two young men it could safely spare for the wars;” Victor Stater writes, “many had men they positively delighted in sending away. The press was sometimes seized upon by the deputies as the perfect solution to the problem of an anti-social or troublesome neighbor.”

There were many examples of this type of selective recruitment. Stater relates the story of Samuel

---

24 Quoted in Stewart, “Arms and Politics,” 212.

25 For the London trainbands, see Stewart, “Arms and Politics,” 211; Firth, Cromwell’s Army, 10, 17; Boynton, Elizabethan Militia, 122-125, 192-215. The trainbands with the worst records of attracting the lower sort were restored to their former status as holders of the middling sort in the 1610s and 1620s. See Beckett, Amateur Military Tradition, 35. The practice itself was reiterated as policy by James I. See Fissel, English Warfare, 86.

Hubbard, a wife beater pressed in May 1627 by deputy lieutenants of Middlesex. When the constable found him, Hubbard was in the bed of another man’s wife. Stater observes, “There could have been few people unhappy to see Hubbard march off to Plymouth.”27 It was not always so easy for the pressing officials. In his article on the 1639 call-up for Bishop’s War, Stater relates the story of constable John Plowright, who had considerable trouble making his quota. The impressment warrant had arrived open “so that all the idle and young fellows which most feared or were fittest for the service had notice beforehand to convey themselves out of the way.”28 Unable to procure any town vagabonds, Plowright was finally able to press a passing stranger in town.

In some areas, whole groups of undesirable men were swept into the army. In the 1560s, Newgate Prison was emptied and the prisoners sent to reinforce the garrison at La Harve.29 In 1597, the government authorized the impressment of seven hundred vagrants from the neighborhoods of London for the expedition to Picardy.30 Accounts of the poor quality of soldiers pressed by this system were frequent in the military literature of the time. Professional soldiers warned about the use of such “poor specimens” in the armies; sometimes the queen agreed, especially when the men were in such bad shape that she had to spend money clothing them for service.31 As time went by, the Privy Council began to see the wisdom of recruiting a slightly better sort into the expeditionary forces;

28 Stater, “Lord Lieutenancy on the Eve of the Civil Wars,” 284. This article offers an important first-hand glimpse at the process of impressment in England. Stater also offers examples of the length some men went to avoid the press; one man even cut off his own toe to disqualify himself for service (p. 291).
29 Cruickshank, Elizabeth’s Army, 27; Fissel, English Warfare, 86.
30 Fissel, English Warfare, 86-87.
31 Cruickshank, Elizabeth’s Army, 28.
orders went out to the lieutenants to select the men more carefully. Some lieutenants were even reprimanded for the poor quality of recruits they sent. The system was awkward, placing the officials between their local interests and national ones. "The press was a delicate business . . . " Stater writes, "If possible, single young men were sent to the army; preferably men with no local ties. The wandering poor and the sturdy beggar were the ideal candidates, but they were not always enough of these to satisfy the king’s conductors." It was then the deputy lieutenant faced a hard decision, forced to press soldiers from among the local population of young men with wives and children at home. Soldiers had to be sent to the Crown, even if that might leave families at home without any support. Still, if officials spared the local population and recruited only the worst men, "if they leaned too much towards the needs of their county and neighbors, they risked the severest displeasure of their lieutenant, the council, and even the king." The lord lieutenant system under Elizabeth I and James I had two demanding masters, local and national interests.

That system changed, and not for the better, under Charles I. Under his plan for a "Perfect Militia," the system was made much more national in outlook, causing trouble in the counties and towns. Local traditions and customs of impressment were pushed aside by increasingly nationalistic lords lieutenant, who impressed men for foreign service that before would have been exempt. In particular, there was a growing use of the trainbands for overseas expeditions, upsetting the balance and sending many middling

men to die in the fields of Europe or Ireland. This angered many and meant, as T.H. Breen argues, that "after 1625 they [lords lieutenant and their deputies] became the most active, the most visible, and the most despised royal officials in the land." The Puritan founders of Massachusetts Bay were determined not to live under such military tyranny. They made certain their system would be different, more like the older Elizabethan system, but with a twist: their militia impressments would be carried out by locally responsible, elected officers, and later, by local committees of militia.

Massachusetts Bay Impressment at Work: The Early Period 1630-1675

With the establishment of the militia in Massachusetts Bay in the 1630s, the Puritans created a military force based on a combination of Elizabethan military thought and their own high regard for local control. It took a long time for this system to be fully tested under fire; there was not a major conflict in New England for more than forty years. While Massachusetts had called out a few militia units for service in the Pequot War and subsequent emergencies, the militia system was not truly challenged until King Philip's War in 1675-1676.

In 1636, Massachusetts sent a force of ninety men to take vengeance on the Indians on Block Island for the murder of John Oldham; all ninety men were volunteers. In 1637, Massachusetts Bay decided to join the Connecticut and Plymouth colonies in their war against the Pequots. Some Massachusetts men did serve in this

---

36 Breen, "Covenanted Militia," 29.

37 For a fascinating look at early Puritan resistance to the power of the lords lieutenant in England, see Stater, "Lord Lieutenancy on the Eve of the Civil Wars."

capacity. However, the number was small, as Connecticut forces won the war's key battle before most of the Massachusetts forces were sent.\(^{39}\) In all, fewer than two hundred Massachusetts soldiers served actively during the conflict, around twenty in the main battle at Mystic Fort.\(^{40}\) These men were raised by quota in the several towns through a mixture of volunteerism and impressment. The Massachusetts General Court placed a limit on the press, ordering that the towns “may impress such as are not freemen, at their discretion.”\(^{41}\)

With the end of the Pequot crisis, events settled down somewhat. Between 1638 and 1655, Massachusetts raised small numbers of soldiers to deal with Indian threats or to exact tribute from tribes only five times.\(^{42}\) The method of recruitment was far different from the system in England, where impressment from the general militia reigned. Because the number of troops needed for these small early emergencies was so minute, most of the men who fought in them were volunteers, although a few were pressed by


\(^{42}\) David Richard Millar, “The Militia, the Army, and Independency in Colonial Massachusetts” (Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1967), 72-73.
their local militia commander and, after 1653, by a militia committee. This was generally the case until the 1670s, when the system began to break down.

A good example of the old volunteer system and its faults was the call-up of men for the Second Anglo-Dutch War (1664-1667). Although militia law made provisions for impressment by the town committees of militia, early campaigns (they can hardly be called wars) were so small that impressment was unnecessary. Instead, the General Court ordered in May 1664 that “there shall be voluntary soldiers in this jurisdiction for his majesties service agt the Dutch, not exceeding the number of two hundred.” The commissions which placed Captains Hugh Mason and William Hudson in command gave specific instructions on how to raise the men: “Yow may or shall, by beate of drume or drumes in each of the tounes & plantations within this jurisdiction of the Massachusetts, proclajme & publish this your power and comission; & leave under your comand & conduct all such persons as shall willingly lyst themselves for that service.” To assist in the recruitment drive, the General Court issued instructions:

To all serjants, corporalls, & drummes in the respectiue companjes within this jurisdiction. Yow & every of yow are hereby required, in his majesties name, upon the request & desire of Capt Hugh Mason or Capt Willjam Hudson, or either of their officers, to assist them to publish such proclimations within your toune as they shall communicate to yow for the raying of voluntary soldjers for the

43 Millar, “Militia, the Army, and Independency,” 63-65. For a different view, see Rutman, “Militant New World,” 744.


service . . . & to returne to them a list of names of such as offer themselues willingly to that service; hereof yow and every of yow are not to faile.⁴⁶

There were immediate problems with this effort. Only one hundred men were raised, not the two hundred originally called for, despite the fact that the men had been promised they would have to serve only six weeks, unless the mission was accomplished earlier.⁴⁷ Two questions submitted by the commanders to the General Court also shed some light on this recruitment drive: they asked whether men without weapons should be refused and what men were to be refused because of a prior legal engagement, such as minors or those under an indenture or apprenticeship.⁴⁸ It is readily apparent from these questions that the type of men culled from the “beating of the drum” was less than satisfactory.

When the next crisis arose, the government changed its approach to recruiting. During preparations for a call-up during the Third Anglo-Dutch War in 1673, the General Court planned to use impressment exclusively.⁴⁹ While the volunteer system had worked to a certain extent in the minor struggles before the 1670s, it was quickly becoming unfeasible, as Massachusetts’ experience in 1664 had demonstrated. It is unclear whether the reason was a lessening of civic duty among the second generation of Puritan settlers, a sense that the threat was not as pronounced as it had been in the earlier days of


settlement, or the lack of financial incentive to volunteer in an increasingly commercial society. The old system was broken, a lesson that was to be quickly discovered during King Philip's War.

Impressment in King Philip's War: The Town Committees of Militia at War

While the General Court may have believed in the summer of 1675 that the new war would be small and quickly ended, like so many incidents in preceding years, by October they saw that the conflict was different. The government ordered the entire militia mobilized and directed commanders to prepare all of their units in "a posture of warr." This crisis would not be fixed with two hundred volunteers; the entire society would need to muster for the fight. However, the colony's leaders, (who had established the militia system in law for just such a situation), were able to keep true to their ideals of a military impressment controlled locally by a mixture of military and civilian leaders through the Committees of Militia in the towns.

The locally controlled committees acted much more like the original Elizabethan lords lieutenant, deciding who went to war with the interests of the locality in mind; it is a perfect example of "persistent localism," that fierce determination by the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay to control community affairs locally and fight any outside intervention. An incident that highlights the seriousness of local control took place during the war in Beverly, Massachusetts. After the battle death of the town's militia

commander and militia committee leader, Thomas Lathrop, the General Court appointed John Hathorne to the post. This was immediately protested by the town, which wrote the Court “praying for a substitution of a nomination made by themselves,” stating that “while the gentleman may be worthy to lead a far more honorable company than ours, yet in regard of his distance of place . . . he is wholly in a manner incapable to be serviceable unto us, especially in times of war, either by impressing soldiers . . . .” Even though Hathorne lived just across the river in Salem, the people of Beverly thought it too far, especially when it came to knowing which soldiers to impress; local control meant local control. The General Court agreed with the citizens and appointed a native to Beverly’s militia committee.

While militia committees had to press a pre-determined number of men, they decided which men to press. The bulk of soldiers impressed for King Philip’s War closely resemble overseas recruits during Elizabeth’s time, some of the least desirable members of society. While the men recruited in Massachusetts were not nearly as degenerate as the majority impressed into Elizabeth’s overseas armies (many of whom had come to service when the jails had been opened), they were in most cases not characteristic of the majority of Puritan society. The absence of vast numbers of truly sullied men is due more to the fact that Massachusetts simply did not have, relatively, as large a population of troublemakers to recruit as England did. If it had, there is little

---

52 Quoted in Edwin Martin Stone, History of Beverly, Civil and Ecclesiastical: From Its Settlement in 1630 to 1842 (Boston: J. Munroe, 1843), 168-169.

doubt the militia committees would have impressed even more of them. Yet, during King Philip’s War, the town committees of militia fulfilled their duty to send men to war by picking mostly those the town could afford to lose, much as Elizabethan deputy lieutenants had done in the past. In addition, the committees retained, much as had their English forefathers before them, the finest of their men to stay home to protect the community from harm.

The practice of impressment during King Philip’s War was very different from the older practice of beating the drum for volunteers. This distinction is lost in most histories of the conflict. In almost every discussion of recruitment, there is a mistaken belief that the process during King Philip’s War followed earlier practices. Even the very first Massachusetts company raised for the war was created through impressment. In June 1675, the General Court sent notice to the militia committees of Boston and surrounding towns “You are hereby required in his Majesty’s name to take notice that the Gov. and Council have ordered 100 able soldiers forthwith impressed out of the severall townes according to the proportions hereunder written.” This is the same language used by the Court during the 1673 crisis, when impressment was chosen as the primary means
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\[56\ \text{Quoted\ in\ Bodge,\ Soldiers\ (3rd\ ed.),\ 47.}\]
of recruiting necessary manpower. There is no mention of volunteers and certainly no instructions to the militia to “beat the drum” looking for any. A crisis was at hand and the vast majority of men were needed for service. While there were a few volunteers in almost every company, every recruitment order from the General Court during the war except one refers to impressment of men as the optimum method for filling the ranks.\(^5\)

The practice of impressment during the war deserves close scrutiny. The town militia companies themselves could not be sent in total; that would have left the towns defenseless. Instead, composite companies, based on the county regiments, were formed. When the need for such new expeditionary companies (or a company) was perceived, the governor and council, or the General Court if it was in session, decided on the total number of men needed.\(^5\) Officers to command the new composite companies were also named and given the necessary commissions.\(^5\) While this was sometimes done when a town called for assistance, it occurred most often in response to a call for additional troops by area commanders or in response to a plan of the United Colonies to assemble an inter-colonial army.\(^6\) The command majors (or sergeants major, depending on how the order was written) of each county were then given their county’s quota of men. An example clarifies the process. In May 1676, the court wrote:

---


The whole Court, being mett together, ordered that the major for the county of Essex, Daniel Dennison, Esq, forthwith issue out his orders to the committees of militia in the severall tounes in that regiment for the raying of their severall proportions of eighty able foote souldjers, well and completely armed, & furnished with ammunition & sixe days prouission for each souldjer.  

The major of the county regiment was thus ordered to proportion the target number of soldiers among the towns in his county and inform the militia committees of their quotas. The committees of militia, consisting of the town’s top three military officers and any magistrates living in town or, if there were none, the town’s deputy (or deputies) to the General Court, would meet to decide which men from town would be sent to fight. The militia committees were servants to two masters during these meetings. For the good of the whole society, the committees had to impress “able souldjers” from their town, yet at the same time, local interests compelled them to protect their town from serious loss if those soldiers were killed. For frontier towns especially, retaining able soldiers in the community for home defense was a priority. The committees displayed a preference for pressing single men over men with wives and, as the war dragged on, for married men over married men with children. Transients were desired over stable town citizens, while men with criminal records were also sent to the front in large numbers. Once the decisions were made, town constables were given warrants to issue to the chosen men. The militia committees also generally wrote a report to either the major of the county or

---


62 These preferences were enacted into law by the General Court during the crisis in Maine in 1677, see Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 5:144-145.

63 For information on the official policy of the use of transients in the post-King Philip’s War era, see Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 5:123.
the General Court itself, listing their choices and detailing the soldier’s preparedness. These reports offer an important glimpse into the type of men sent and their fitness for the coming fight. Many list problems with the soldiers’ equipment; a lack of muskets was especially prevalent in the early days of the war.64 A message from the Marblehead militia in response to the Narragansett campaign call-up is a case in point:

Marblehead 2 November 75

to the honnored major generall now sitting at Salem,

responding to your honners warrant: we have given your honner this list of the men’s names impressed here at marblehead according to your honners warrant for the counties service and for this present Expedition: Also for there clothing wee doe certifie to your honner that they are to the beast of our apprehensions generally well clothed and for armes wee doe certifie to your honner that they are all of them well provided with fier lock musketts powder bags bullets and powder; as for cuttlesses and swords wee doe certifie your honnour that wee can not geett them; if wee could have gott them wee would: nothing else at present and [illegible] your honneres servant to command

richard norman, ensign 65

The militia committee had done its job. At that moment, it was up to the constable to inform the men they were now soldiers “on the county service.”

64 One possible reason for this is the switch in armaments made by the General Court in the early days of the war, which substituted the one-third of the militiamen carrying pikes to firearms, creating an all-musket force.

In addition to their normal duties, the constables during King Philip’s War had a large number of extremely difficult wartime tasks to fulfill. They had to collect war taxes (sometimes several a year), ensure that the watch and ward was kept, and, most important, deliver and oversee impressment warrants issued by the town’s militia committee. Drafted men were given the warrant by the constable and expected to show up at the appointed place and time ready to march off to war. While many men did their duty and showed up, it was never an easy job for the constable, especially as the war dragged on and bad news from the front came home to the towns. As early as September 1675, the Secretary of the General Court, Edward Rawson, wrote to Major Pynchon, the commander of the western theater, “The slaughter in your parts has much dampened many spirits for the war. Some men escape away from the press, and others hide away after they are impressed.”

This problem only worsened as many began to believe that the committees of militia were unfairly targeting certain types of men for service. This was especially true when certain families were asked to send numerous sons while other families were spared the press. Numerous servants were also pressed into service, some multiple times. One such incident caused Sudbury’s minister, Edmund Browne, writing on behalf of a widowed parishioner whose only servant was impressed time and again, to question the fairness of the system; “The poore fellow hath nothing to fight for (or land or cattle) as

66 For information on the duties of a constable, see Samuel Freeman, Town Officer, or, the Power and Duty of Selectmen, Town Clerks ... And Other Town Officers as Contained in the Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; with a Variety of Forms for the Use of Such Officers to Which Is Prefixed the Constitutions of Said Commonwealth, 8th ed. (Boston: Printed by Joseph T. Buckingham for Thomas and Andrews, 1815); John Fairfield Sly, Town Government in Massachusetts 1620-1930 (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1967), 39-40.

67 Quoted in Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 143.
many have both... wth choyse of able persons in their familys, of wch not any one hath
bin impressed, ... I heare ... it may stirr up evill blood or Spirits if impresses
continue.”68 Jenny Hale Pulsipher argues, “It is hard to say whether poorer men were
unfairly targeted, as some alleged. What is clear is that there was a significant
undercurrent of resentment in the colony, enough to make the Council cautions...”69
The colonial government warned the militia committees “complaint had been made by
some against committees of militia in several townes” and cautioned them to “carry it
impartially in the execution of warrants for Impressing soldiers.”70

That resentment was beginning to manifest in the increasing practice of draft
evasion. As the war dragged on, more and more men hid from the press. The constables
were required to try to find the men if they hid and if they did not, others had to be
pressed in the absent soldiers’ place. The constables began to threaten parents with
service if they tried to protect their children from serving in the war.71 A letter from
Major Daniel Denison describes a Salem incident:

... only you may please to understand that some of the persons now returned
[impressed] hath withdrawn themselves. Although warning hath been left at the
places of their abodes and their parents required to be ready to goo in their stead if
their sons should fail (we feared also lest the service should be neglected) other

68 Quoted in Jenny Hale Pulsipher, “‘The Overture of This New Albion World:’ King Philip’s War and the
Transformation of New England” (Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1999), 245.


70 “Massachusetts Council to Committee of Militia at Woburn, 154 March 1676” volume 68, document

71 For the role of parents (and masters of servants) in resisting impressment, see Pulsipher, “Overture,” 252-
254.
men warned to make up the number of 28, which is our towne's proportion if any of those now returned should fail. . . . those three last, very lusty young men [those warned they may have to take the hiding men's places] Under a safe press and not discharged but required to attend when called, have by the artifice of their parents, absconded for the present, though their parents hath beene required to bring them forth or be ready themselves to march.72

As the letter demonstrates, impressment was not an easy task.73 Relating an incident from Connecticut where the impressment warrants were opened and became generally known in town, Leach explained that when the constable made the rounds, not a single man on the list was available.74 Pulsipher argues that resistance to impressment was rampant as early as the December 1675 Narragansett campaign and grew considerably as the war continued.75 As the war dragged on, many young men became adept at avoiding numerous drafts, "skulking from one Toune to Another"76 According to the General


73 Later in the war, whole towns, especially those on the frontier, would petition to be excused from impressing its young men to retain them for town defense, a situation allowed by the General Court in certain circumstances starting in May 1676. See Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 5:79-80; Pulsipher, "Overture," 254-255.

74 Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, 185.

75 Pulsipher, "Overture," 247-261. Pulsipher makes an important argument about divisions in society that caused the resistance and heightened it. She examines the resistance to impressment by all social strata in society, including resistance or assistance to resist offered by groups such as colony and town leaders, parents, masters, and whole towns. She concludes "The extent and nature of resistance indicate widespread pitting of levels of authority against each other, as well as a strong sense that individual needs could, frequently, trump those of the colony at large." She further concludes that resistance to impressment meant that many men who did ultimately serve were newcomers to the towns they were impressed by, a finding that fits with the evidence below. See Pulsipher, "Overture," 255-256.

76 Quoted in Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, 185.
Court, such men were liable, if caught, to be pressed against the quota of whatever town apprehended them.77

As the war proceeded and avoiding the draft became common, the government was forced repeatedly to issue laws against draft evasion. By May 1676, the situation had grown so drastic that the General Court passed a stringent law to deal with the situation. "Taking into consideration the great disappointment the country hath suffered by reason of non appearance of soouldjers impressed for severall expeditions," the government ordered that every person "neglecting to make his appearance according to order, every such foot soouldjer shall pay the sume of fower pounds, and every trooper shall pay the sume of sixe pounds."78 Not only was it difficult to find men, it was sometimes dangerous for the constables. At least a few constables were attacked, either verbally or physically, when fulfilling this duty. John Elithrop, the constable of Manchester, was first verbally abused and later beaten by one Samuel Leach, an impressed soldier.79 Leach was severely fined for his actions. While physical violence was not a common occurrence, it was a constant threat to the constables issuing militia committee warrants. Taking such special circumstances into account, the General Court added a section to the May 1676 anti-resistance law, ordering that if the non-appearance

77 "Orders from the General Court," volume 68, documents 106 and 117, in Felt, "Massachusetts Archives Collection."

78 Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 5:78-79. William Black and Jenny Pulsipher argue that fines and other punishments were almost never enforced to the fullest extent possible under the law. Pulsipher argues this was an element of the division rampant in the colony at the time. The colonial leaders did not enforce its laws to the fullest extent because they feared that focusing on society's problems would tarnish their image or demonstrate how ill-prepared society was to fight a war. See Pulsipher, "Overture," 250-261. See also William Grant Black, "The Military Origins of Federal Social Welfare Programs: Early British and Colonial American Precedents" (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1989), 144.

79 For complete details, see the section on Manchester in Chapter 6. See also George Francis Dow, ed., Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts, 8 vols. (Salem, Mass.: Essex Institute, 1911-1918), 6:132-134; Pulsipher, "Overture."
was accompanied by "refactorines, reflections, or contempt upon authority," the men
would be put to death or punished with "some other grievous punishment."  

Some men had been exempt from the militia before the war and were not
generally regarded as eligible for service during it. Magistrates, ministers, elders and
deacons, students and professors at Harvard, shipmasters and full-time fishermen, along
with several others, were not enrolled in the militia. Indians and Negroes had also been
stricken from the militia rolls, although friendly Indians were increasingly used as scouts
and in volunteer companies as the war went on. The law stated that no man could be
impressed "that is necessarily and sufficiently exempted, by any natural or personal
impediment, as by want of years, greatness of years, defect of minde, failing of sences, or
impotency of limbs."  

Men whom the quarterly courts had excused from militia service
or trainings were generally regarded as exempt from the press as well; most of these men
were too old for active duty anyway. Yet they were not without value; the colony
turned to them in the early days of the war to furnish sorely-needed weapons. Any man
"of estate within their tounes as are, by the county courts or committees of militia
exempted from ordinary trainings" were required to pay an additional price of three
weapons or such arms the committee deemed necessary; those that did so were assured
their exemption would continue: "all such persons as shall be assessed, and shall


with the Supplements through 1686 (Boston: Published by the Order of the City Council of Boston, 1887),
73.

82 There are over a hundred instances in pre-1675 Essex County of men exempted from militia training.
Most had to pay an annual fee for their absence "to the support of the company." Some were old, some
lived a long way from the training field. For representative examples, see Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court
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accordingly prouide three fire armes, shall be freed from being sent abroad to the warrs, except in extreme & utmost necessity." These types of exemptions were dangerous, however, because the public perceived that the wealthy could avoid personal service. To combat this, the General Court cautioned committees of militia to take care to limit the exemptions as the war dragged on.

Another way to avoid service during the war, hiring a substitute, also caused resentment in the colony. Although there is no mention of this procedure in any Massachusetts Bay militia law or statute enacted before 1675, there is little question it was practiced during the war. The question is how often it took place. Jenny Hale Pulsipher claims that most substitutes, hired by men of means from among men of lower rank, were hired in towns with unequal wealth distributions. Most substitutions, she contends, occurred in the two commercial centers of Massachusetts, Boston and Salem. Both towns had large numbers of wealthy merchants and larger numbers of men who needed cash. While there is no doubt that the practice occurred everywhere, most of the evidence for it comes from Boston. The best-known instance of substitution comes from one often cited court case from Suffolk County Court. In May 1676, Eleazer

---


87 Connecticut also didn’t seem to have many substitutions in the early years of its militia. See Selesky, War and Society in Colonial Connecticut, 23-27.
Phillips sued John Smith of Lynn “upon the condition that hee [Smith] would serve him [Phillips] in the Service of the Country as a Soldier at Blackpoint; after the receipt of which [money and arms from Phillips] he [Smith] never went forth, but absented himselfe from the said Service whereby the said Phillips is greatly damnified for wont of his mony armes & ammunition & is also liable to bee impressed again.”

Pulsipher includes other examples in her study, all but one from Boston. While substitution was available as an option, it seems strange that it does not appear more often in Essex County records. There are few, if any, cases of substitution gone awry in the Essex County Quarterly Court records, a troubling fact when one considers that Essex was full of young men, like the transient fishermen of Marblehead, who would have been prime candidates to hire themselves out as substitutes. If it occurred with any frequency in Essex County, it would stand to reason that more court cases, such as the Suffolk case, would appear, but they do not. It can only be assumed that the practice was not widespread in Essex County during the war.

There are few muster records that report men volunteering for service during the war, with a few notable exceptions. At least one group of volunteer troopers was raised during the war. More memorably, Captain Samuel Mosley raised at least two all-volunteer companies in Boston during the war. They were made up of “apprentices or

---


89 Pulsipher, “Overture,” 245-246. The non-Boston example is from Essex County and has Zachary Curtis of Topsfield serving as a substitute for a “Mr. Bourne of Salem.” See Chapter 6 on Topsfield for details.

90 For the court records, see Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.* In particular, a case against John Layton of Rowley deals with substitution. See Chapter 4 and Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 6:89.

servants and probably many boys not yet enrolled in the militia and therefore not subject to impressment . . . [including as well] a sprinkling of Frenchmen and . . . ten or twelve privateers."\(^9\) Mosley and his men were notorious and the General Court even had to pass laws reminding them they were subject to militia law and the chain of command.\(^9\)

On the other hand, they were very successful in battle and their service highly desired by the colony.\(^9\) The Massachusetts Bay volunteers, as well as Plymouth volunteers before them, were given special incentives to fight; Mosley and his men were to divide among themselves any "benefit that may accrue by captives or plunder . . ."\(^9\)

While the number of these all-volunteer units was relatively small, there were, in every town, some men who came forward to serve of their own free will. They did so for

\(^9\) Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.)*, 63. At least four men from Essex County served with Mosley, one each from Ipswich and Gloucester and two from Salem. For an interesting discussion of these forces, see Black, "Social Welfare," 135-137.


\(^9\) Many historians credit these types of volunteer units, especially those placed in the field by Plymouth Colony under Captain Benjamin Church, with winning the war. See Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk; Benjamin Church, Thomas Church, and Samuel Gardner Drake, The History of Philip's War, Commonly Called the Great Indian War, of 1675 and 1676*, reprint of 1716 Boston, 2nd ed. (Exeter, N.H.: J. & B. Williams, 1829); George William Ellis and John Emery Morris, eds., *King Philip's War: Based on the Archives and Records of Massachusetts, Plymouth, Rhode Island and Connecticut, and Contemporary Letters and Accounts, The Grafton Historical Series* (New York: The Grafton Press, 1906); Daniel Strock, Jr., *Pictorial History of King Philip's War* (Boston: Horace Wentworth, 1851); Russell Bourne, *Red King's Rebellion: Racial Politics in New England, 1675-1678* (New York: Atheneum, 1990). Felix Zarlengo is the most strident in these claims, stating that "The Bay Colony was finally able to bring victory out of defeat only with the assistance of volunteer bands of bounty hunters who were largely outside the militia structure which the General Assembly had worked so hard to mobilize." Felix John Zarlengo, "Politics of Defense in the New England Colonies, 1620-1746" (M.A. thesis, Brown University, 1965), 20. This is an oversimplification of the situation; without the regular militia to provide manpower for protective garrisons and regular expeditionary forces to fight major battles such as the Fort Fight, the volunteer units would not have been able to function in their role as seek and destroy raiders. There is no doubt, however, that the volunteer units were important to the conduct of the war; alas, none were of Essex County (most were raised in Plymouth) and are out of the scope of this study. For a slightly different look at the topic, see Guy Chet, *Conquering the American Wilderness: The Triumph of European Warfare in the Colonial Northeast* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003).

\(^9\) Shurtleff, ed., *Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.*, 5:95. Plymouth soldiers were encouraged to join these special units by a pledge made by the colony that "lands captured in the war would be held as security for militia pay." See Black, "Social Welfare," 143.
any number of reasons, from a sense of civic duty to a desire to escape their town or family or to enjoy a paying job, no matter how low the pay.\textsuperscript{96} Douglas Leach argued that the threat of conscription itself induced some men to volunteer.\textsuperscript{97} Yet, there was no special incentive to those who volunteered. Connecticut, which had done most of the fighting of the Pequot War, did grant land for service early on in its history. Thirty-six Connecticut Pequot War veterans were eventually given over three thousand acres of land for their service.\textsuperscript{98} There is no evidence that Massachusetts gave land to any enlisted man for their Pequot War service; land for service was not a consideration for most men in Massachusetts Bay if they volunteered for service in regular companies during most of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{99} No reward was offered Massachusetts Bay soldiers except regular pay, which was quite low, since the colony always tried to keep the cost of wars down.\textsuperscript{100} On average, enlisted men made around eight pence a day, which amounted to two to three pounds for their service of around six to nine months.\textsuperscript{101} While this was not small change and undoubtedly useful to many soldiers, it was not enough to set them up as independent adults free from the control of their birth families, and it was certainly not

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{96} See the town chapters for examples of men who probably volunteered.
\item \textsuperscript{97} Leach, "Military System of Plymouth," 350.
\item \textsuperscript{98} Marcus, "Militia of Colonial Connecticut," 60-61.
\item \textsuperscript{99} See Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs; Rutman, "Militant New World." The one time a land grant was made to regular soldiers (not in a special volunteer company) was during the Narragansett campaign in December 1675. The colony offered the men, after they were already impressed and assembled in their units, land if they fought well. This reward for good service was not an incentive to volunteer, as the men did not know of it before they were enlisted. For the offer of land, see Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, 124.
\item \textsuperscript{100} For the colony's attempt to keep costs down by limiting service, see Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 4: Pt. 2: 121-122.
\item \textsuperscript{101} For pay amounts, see Selesky, War and Society in Colonial Connecticut, 23; Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.).
\end{itemize}
enough to buy a farm.\textsuperscript{102} While the number of men who volunteered was never high, that number shrank as the war went on and the news about from the front got worse. In the end, the town committees of militia impressed the vast majority of men who fought for Massachusetts Bay during King Philip’s War. This was definitely the case in Essex County.

\textbf{Essex County Men at War: The “Essex Companies” Join the Fight}

While men from Essex County fought in numerous units and in many different capacities during the war, soldiers from the county made up a sizeable portion of eight active-duty units, six infantry companies and two cavalry troops (See Table 2-1).\textsuperscript{103} The activities of these “Essex Companies” are important to an understanding of the nature of the war for the men from Essex. They also offer a glimpse into the minds of the town committees of militia, who heard frequent reports back from their soldiers and took stock of that intelligence when recruiting the next group of men to press into service.

\textsuperscript{102} For wealth and prices in Essex County, see William I. Davisson, “Essex County Wealth Trends: Wealth and Economic Growth in 17th Century Massachusetts,” Essex Institute Historical Collections 103, no. 4 (1967): 291-342; William I. Davisson, “Essex County Price Trends: Money and Markets in 17th Century Massachusetts,” Essex Institute Historical Collections 103, no. 2 (1967): 144-185. In his book \textit{A People’s Army}, Fred Anderson argues that Massachusetts soldiers of the French and Indian War in the 1750s-1760s were induced to volunteer for provincial service by “relatively large sums of cash” which made “military service . . . a reasonably lucrative proposition, providing cash income to hasten his [the soldier’s] attainment of independence . . . and perhaps an accelerated entry into real manhood.” Fred Anderson, \textit{A People’s Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years’ War} (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 26-62, at 39.

\textsuperscript{103} These “Essex Companies” were the units with a sizeable number or proportion of men from Essex County that were active in the war in southern New England from June 1675 to September 1676. They do not include any companies, even if made up of mostly Essex men, who were sent to Maine. Those men are beyond the scope of this study.
Table 2-1

Essex Units in Active Service—King Philip’s War, 1675-1676

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAIGE’S TROOP</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATHROP’S COMPANY</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLETON’S COMPANY</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARDINER’S COMPANY</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOLE’S COMPANY</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROCKLEBANK’S COMPANY</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANNING’S COMPANY</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHIPPLE’S TROOP</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
King’s Philip’s War began in Plymouth Colony in June 1675, after the alleged murderers of John Sassamon, an Indian confidant of the authorities at Plymouth, were executed.\textsuperscript{104} Fighting broke out when Wampanoags began attacking the town of Swansea on June 24; Massachusetts Bay came to its allies’ aid almost immediately. The first troops left Boston on June 26: a regular infantry company raised from the ranks of Boston’s militia companies under Captain Daniel Henchman, a company of volunteers, mostly from Boston, under Captain Samuel Mosley, and a cavalry troop under Captain Thomas Prentice which was raised from Suffolk, Middlesex, and Essex counties.\textsuperscript{105} On June 29, Major Thomas Savage arrived in Plymouth from Massachusetts with reinforcements, including another infantry company and the troop of Captain Nicholas Paige. Paige’s command, with thirty-six officers and men, included a number of men from Essex County.\textsuperscript{106}

Nicholas Paige, who originally came from Plymouth, England, lived in Boston by 1665 and was active in the troop before the war.\textsuperscript{107} When he was appointed captain of the troop sent with Major Savage, John Whipple of Ipswich was named the unit’s

\textsuperscript{104} This narrative of the war focuses on the involvement of the Essex County based units; it is in no way an exhaustive history of the war. In addition, there were numerous Essex County men who served with other units not related here. For information on the causes of the war, see Philip Ranlet, “Another Look at the Causes of King Philip’s War,” \textit{New England Quarterly} 61, no. 1 (1988): 79-100; Yasuhide Kawashima, \textit{Igniting King Philip’s War: The John Sassamon Murder Trial} (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 2001); James David Drake, \textit{King Philip’s War: Civil War in New England, 1675-1676} (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999). The most complete modern narrative of the war is still Leach, \textit{Flintlock and Tomahawk}. Other worthwhile studies of the war are Eric B. Schultz and Michael J. Tougias, \textit{King Philip’s War: The History and Legacy of America’s Forgotten Conflict} (Woodstock, Vt.: Countryman Press, 1999); Jill Lepore, \textit{The Name of War: King Philip’s War and the Origins of American Identity} (New York: Alfred A. Knopf: A Borzoi Book, 1998); Pulsipher, “Overture.”

\textsuperscript{105} Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 27. The cavalry of Massachusetts had been organized into a large unit called the Three County Troop well before the war, see Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:6.

\textsuperscript{106} At least seven out of the thirty-six, possibly more. See Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 90.

\textsuperscript{107} Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 85.
lieutenant while Thomas Noyce of Newbury became the cornet, indicating the heavy Essex County character of the troop. Paige and his cavalryme were deeply involved in the early days of the war.\textsuperscript{108} Along with Major Savage's command, the troop moved into enemy territory on the morning of June 30, traveling toward Swansea (See Map 2-1). They discovered the remains of the Indians' first attacks: several burned English homes and a number of upright poles, upon which were placed the severed heads and hands of several colonists. After a halt to bury the remains, the men continued on to find a number of Indian villages hastily abandoned, the enemy having escaped by canoe into Mount Hope Bay. After checking the rest of the Pokanoket peninsula, the troops returned to Swansea. While the majority of the army lingered at Swansea, deciding on their next move, Paige's troop of Essex County men were assigned to patrol the area. On at least one patrol, the troop engaged a number of Wampanoags, including a minor sachem, and killed a number of the enemy, taking revenge for the colonists they had buried days before.

In early July, Paige and his men moved west with the army into Narragansett territory on a diplomatic mission intended as a show of force to keep that tribe neutral. Their goal met on July 19, Major Savage's command (including Paige's unit) joined with Plymouth forces in an attack on a great cedar swamp near Swansea where the Wampanoags, including King Philip, lay hidden. Attacking into the swamp, the Massachusetts and Plymouth forces, especially the troopers and their horses, had a difficult time maneuvering in the treacherous landscape which was covered with extensive underbrush. Everywhere they turned, they received fire from a quickly

\textsuperscript{108} The Paige company narrative is based on Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 85-101; Leach, \textit{Flintlock and Tomahawk}, 53-67; Schultz and Tougias, \textit{King Philip's War}, 42-54.
Map 2-1
Theater of King Philip's War, 1675-1676

retreating enemy. Confusion reigned supreme as units of the army advanced, became separated and confused and began to fire at anything that moved in the brush, endangering each other. The English lost seven or eight men in the fight and only managed to “capture” some abandoned wigwams and one old Indian man, who told them that Philip had escaped early in the fight. As night approached, the commanders decided to withdraw, it had been a very frustrating day for them. English commanders applied the lessons of the day to their tactics and decided to abandon the offensive policy of trying to engage the enemy on his home territory. They believed they had Philip and his soldiers localized and decided to establish a few small forts to garrison the Mount Hope peninsula, along with a small mobile force to harass the enemy and cut off his food. The officers surmised it would only be a matter of time before the Indians surrendered. Accordingly, they sent four out of the five Massachusetts units back home, including Captain Paige and his troop—who returned to the Boston area by August. Paige’s service was over for the duration, although some of his men, especially his subordinate officers, would fight again. The English plan to trap Philip was a major blunder; he soon escaped and the war grew as more Indian groups joined the uprising, which soon raged across southern New England.

In August, the Nipmuck Indians, allies of Philip’s Wampanoags, attacked and laid siege to Brookfield in central Massachusetts, the first time the colony had been directly attacked. While no Essex County companies were actively engaged at Brookfield, two were raised and sent to the northwestern frontier of the upper Connecticut River Valley to counter the growing Indian threat there. Captain Samuel Appleton, militia captain and deputy to the General Court for Ipswich, was placed in command of an infantry company
in late August 1675.\textsuperscript{109} The large company, over 100 strong, was made up of men from Ipswich and the surrounding towns of Essex County, with some additional soldiers from Boston.\textsuperscript{110} Appleton's command, along with Captain Mosley and his volunteers, marched to Hadley on the Connecticut River north of Springfield in early September. Appleton and Mosley remained in the Hadley area on patrol, keeping close council with the commander of the entire area, Major John Pynchon, the prominent leader of Springfield.\textsuperscript{111} There was great concern that Indians hiding nearby intended to attack one of the valley towns. Other forces soon joined the companies, including another Essex County company, under Thomas Lathrop.

Lathrop, from Beverly, had extensive experience in the militia, having been the lieutenant of the Salem militia as early as 1644 (under Captain Hathorne) and a captain of the semi-professional Artillery Company in 1645. He even had combat experience, during the Pequot War and on an expedition to Acadia in 1654-1655.\textsuperscript{112} Lathrop and his command were raised for the Brookfield siege, but they were not actively engaged there, having arrived too late. Lathrop's company joined with a unit under Captain Richard Beers and moved north to Hadley to join the growing army there. The mounting concern over Indian attacks forced the abandonment of the frontier town of Northfield and a Council of War decided that the army should take a defensive posture to defend the rest

\textsuperscript{109} The Appleton and Lathrop narratives are based on Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 142-204; Leach, \textit{Flintlock and Tomahawk}, 84-127; Schultz and Tougias, \textit{King Philip's War}.

\textsuperscript{110} Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 143. Surprisingly, Appleton's commission as a captain of one hundred men was not dated until September 24, 1675, many weeks after he and his company left for the west.


\textsuperscript{112} Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 133-134.
of the towns by strengthening their garrisons. On August 24, learning that a local group of formerly peaceful Quabaug Indians had crept off armed into the night, Captains Lathrop and Beers led their companies in hot pursuit. They caught up with the Indians at Hopewell Swamp and battle ensued. Nine English soldiers, including some of Lathrop’s men, were killed during the sharply fought skirmish. Lathrop and Beers withdrew, leaving the Indians to continue on their way.

Fighting continued into September, witnessed by numerous small Indian raids on the towns of the upper valley. On September 4, Captain Beers and his men were ambushed, losing more than half of their thirty-six men, including the captain. It was decided to evacuate Deerfield on September 17 and Captain Lathrop and his Essex men were sent north to bring the inhabitants down to Hadley in safety. As they made their way toward Northampton, the warriors of Lathrop's Essex Company felt they had little to fear; the Indians did not generally attack large bodies of troops. As they escorted the wagon-train evacuating Deerfield, not one flanker or vanguard was thrown out. It was later reported that many of the men had stacked their weapons in the carts and started to pick wild grapes growing by the trail.\textsuperscript{113} In a small clearing the Indians attacked; hundreds of warriors charged the bewildered and outnumbered soldiers. Muddy Brook forever became Bloody Brook as Lathrop and most of his command were killed. Hearing the frantic calls of Lathrop’s bugler, who had escaped the carnage, Captain Mosley and

his company hurried to the scene where they rushed the Indians, scattering them. As Mosley's unit and the few survivors from the ambush struggled back to Deerfield that evening, they were taunted by Indians in the distance who joyously held aloft as trophies clothing from Lathrop's men bodies. The next day, Mosley and his men went back to bury sixty-four English dead, including Captain Lathrop. A contemporary historian of the war, the Rev. William Hubbard, called September 18, 1675, "that most fatal day, the saddest day that ever befel New England, . . . the Ruine of a choice Company of young men, the very Flower of Essex, all called out of the towns of that County, none of which were ashamed to speak with the Enemy in the Gate."\footnote{Hubbard, \textit{History of the Indian Wars}, 113. For information on Hubbard, see Kyle F. Zelner, "William Hubbard," in \textit{Encyclopedia of American War Literature}, ed. Philip K. Jason and Mark A. Graves (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2001), 175-176.} It was a disastrous day for the people of Essex County, one they and their militia committees would not soon forget.

The mood of the army in the valley was at a low point after the ambushes of both Beers and Lathrop. The mood was no better in the east, where authorities started having difficulty filling militia quotas; many men began to evade the warrant-bearing constables. Indians continued to raid all along the Connecticut River, even burning houses on the outskirts of Springfield itself, the major town of the region. On October 4, Pynchon's force at Springfield, including Appleton and his men, received intelligence that a major attack was planned for Hadley; the army marched to the town's defense. During the night, a friendly Indian arrived with word that Springfield was the real target. When Pynchon and Appleton arrived in the town the next morning, they found it ablaze and the Indians gone. The enemy had burned some thirty homes and twenty-five barns with their contents, along with Major Pynchon's mills. Some fifty homes on the west side of town
and the outlying areas were unharmed; the majority of the citizens were safe in the garrison houses, only three were killed in the attack. However, over forty families were now totally homeless and destitute, having lost everything in the attack. The entire region was coming undone. Major Pynchon wrote the Commissioners of the United Colonies, advocating abandoning the practice of hunting the Indians and moving to a defensive posture of strong garrisons for the remaining towns, a request that was denied. His town in ruins, Pynchon relinquished his command of the western theater, being “more and more unfit and almost Confounded in my understanding.” Samuel Appleton of Ipswich was commissioned a major and made the new commander in chief for the western theater.

Appleton was now in command not only of his own company of Essex men but of a combined force of around five hundred men from both Massachusetts and Connecticut. While Appleton inherited the Connecticut troops, he also inherited the troubles of command. There was general disagreement over how to proceed with the war and the Connecticut troops, responding to their leaders, did not agree with Massachusetts’ policy, especially with Appleton’s interpretation of it. Despite the almost daily squabbles over command, with letters back and forth between Appleton and the governments at Boston and Hartford, the army remained on alert. They were again concentrated in the

---

115 Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 145.

116 Quoted in Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, 96. Pynchon had asked to be relieved as early as mid-September; and the Massachusetts council had acted on his request on September 28, although word had not yet reached Springfield. Thus, Appleton had been in command, in reality, since October 4, the day before Springfield was attacked. Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 146.

117 This controversy over command, which was at times heated and displays the differences between the colonies of Massachusetts Bay and Connecticut under United Colonies command, is examined in detail, including many of the primary documents, in Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 145-152. See also Thomas.
Hadley-Hatfield region, with Appleton and his Essex Company stationed at Hadley. Numerous patrols and forays were undertaken with no success; the army tried very hard to protect the towns while waiting for an opportunity to strike at the enemy. On October 19, the Indians, believing they had drawn the colonial army out of the town on a ruse, attacked Hadley in large numbers. They were quickly surprised; the town was still defended by Appleton’s company and others. Appleton’s army forced the Indians to fall back, sustaining heavy causalities. Early the next morning, the Indians were seen retreating from the area. The English regained some of their lost confidence, having driven the enemy away.118 The Hatfield fight was the last major action in the Connecticut River Valley that year, but it was not the last fight of the year for Major Appleton and his Essex men.

In mid-November, Appleton, having advance warning from command in Boston of a shift in strategy, held a Council of War to decide on the defense of the valley. He left small forces in the west to garrison the river towns, released the Connecticut troops under his command, and marched the bulk of his army back to Boston. However, many of his company were not released from duty, despite their long and hard history of service. Appleton was instead placed in command of the next phase of Massachusetts’ war plan. The United Colonies had decided to launch a preemptive strike on the Narragansett tribe; the Indians were officially neutral, but many colonial authorities believed they were aiding Philip’s warriors and might be ready to join the war on his


While the commissioners did not relish sending an army into the worsening winter weather, the commissioners decided the time was right for an attack. It would be the largest colonial force assembled in North America up to that time, an army one thousand strong. Command fell to the veteran but aging General Josiah Winslow, governor of the Plymouth Colony. Each colony was expected to muster an assigned quota of men; Massachusetts Bay, as the largest of the three colonies involved, raised six infantry companies and a troop of cavalry, around 540 men in all.\textsuperscript{120} Two of those companies were made up largely of men from Essex County, Major Appleton’s company (Appleton was, in addition, the commander the Massachusetts detachment of the army) and a new company raised out of almost every town in Essex, commanded by Salem’s Joseph Gardner.\textsuperscript{121}

Gardner, the son of one of Salem’s most prominent families, had extensive militia experience. He was a lieutenant in Salem until the town’s company was divided into two and he became captain of one of the two infantry companies. As such, he was an important member of the Salem militia committee and was well acquainted with the


\textsuperscript{120} For the details, see Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 179-184.

\textsuperscript{121} For the final list of the men from Essex in Gardner’s company by town, see “A List of ye names of Captain Gardiner’s Souldiers named as Impressed for the service of the County, December 1675,” volume 68, document 98 in Felt, “Massachusetts Archives Collection.” The same list appears in Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 166-167.
soldiers in town. Orders to impress men for the Narragansett campaign came from the Commissioners of the United Colonies, stating that since the winter campaign would be extremely arduous, as well as dangerous, the militia committees should press only men of “strength courage and activity.” The Massachusetts companies, including Appleton’s 136 men (of which 61 were “new men” and 75 “old soldiers” from the valley campaign) and Gardner’s 102 soldiers, mustered on the common at Dedham on December 9. There they were placed under the overall command of General Winslow. Major Daniel Dennison of Massachusetts read a proclamation to the men from the Massachusetts Council, “that if they played the man, took the Fort, and drove the Enemy out of the Narragansett Country, which was their great Seat, that they should have a gratuity in land besides their wages.” While this was not an enlistment bounty, being proclaimed after the men were already impressed, it was an incentive for the men to fight well.

The army of Massachusetts and Plymouth troops marched and sailed for two days to arrive at Wickford, Rhode Island, from which they would invade the Narragansett


123 Quoted in Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, 119.

124 For Appleton’s men, see Waters, Goodhue, and Wise, Ipswich in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, 200-201.

125 The following narrative of the Narragansett Campaign draws heavily from Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 179-205; Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, 112-144; Church, Church, and Drake, History of Philip’s War, 54-64; Hubbard, History of the Indian Wars, 134-157.

126 Quoted in Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 180.

127 The promise was kept, although not until 1728, when the colony established the Narragansett grants on the New England frontier. See Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 406-441.
territory. On December 13, the army moved closer to the enemy, setting up an advanced base at Smith’s Garrison (now Warwick, Rhode Island) and patrolling in the vicinity. A number of Indians were captured by patrols, including “Indian Peter” who agreed to guide the English. On December 15, the army entered negotiations with an Indian named “Stone-Layer John” who had lived among the English for a number of years and learned the trade of stonemason. While the negotiations (thought by some to be an Indian ruse) continued, a number of Indian warriors crept into the outskirts of the colonial camp. They began sniping at soldiers as soon as “Stone-layer John” left, killing several soldiers from Captain Gardner’s Essex Company. Later, several more militiamen were killed on in ambush as they set out to bring Major Appleton’s company, camped some distance away, back into the main camp. On December 18, 1675, Winslow, leaving a small force to occupy Smith’s Garrison, marched south and met up with the Connecticut forces. Using intelligence offered by their Indian captives, the legion moved toward the Great Swamp where the Narragansetts’ main town was located. As they encamped in an open field on the edge of the swamp that night, a blinding snowstorm began, making their night even more miserable. That was not the only reason the men slept fitfully; the attack was planned for the next day.

About one the next afternoon, the army came at last to the main Narragansett town in the middle of a stone fortress being built in the swamp. As luck would have it, they reached the walls at one of the few unfinished areas. The Massachusetts forces were out front (with Captain Mosley and his volunteers in the van) followed by the men from Plymouth and Connecticut. The first companies from Massachusetts rushed the opening, where almost immediately Captains Johnson and Davenport were killed. While the first
companies swarmed into the breach, without a plan or effective leadership, they were soon forced back out as the Indians reorganized their defense. By this time, the rest of the army had reached the fort and a second assault was made; the Narragansetts fell back into the town before the superior numbers of the English. The fighting inside the fort walls moved from wigwam to wigwam as the colonial soldiers, led by the Massachusetts companies, made their way through the fortified town.

Captain Gardner and his Essex militiamen were in the thick of this fight, having been one of the first companies through the wall during the second assault. Captain Benjamin Church, the renowned Indian fighter and a personal aid to General Winslow, related the story of the fighting of the Gardner's company firsthand:

They [Church and a small force of thirty Plymouth men] entered the swamp and passed over the log that was the passage into the fort, where they saw many men and several valiant Captains lie slain. Mr. Church spying Captain Gardner of Salem, amidst the wigwams in the east end of the fort, made towards him; but on a sudden, while they were looking each other in the face, Captain Gardner settled down. Mr. Church stepped to him, and seeing the blood run down his cheek lifted up his cap, and calling him by name, he looked up in his face but spake not a word; being mortally shot through the head. And observing his wound, Mr. Church found the ball entered his head on the side that the English entered the swamp. Upon which, having ordered some care to be taken of the Captain, he dispatched information to the General, that the best and forwardest of his army,
that hazarded their lives to enter the fort upon the muzzells of the enemy’s guns, were shot in their backs by them that lay behind.\footnote{128}

The fighting continued, the English eventually gaining control of the grounds of the fort, although there were hundreds of Indians still in their wigwams.

The hour was growing late and there were still many Narragansetts hiding in the fort. General Winslow ordered the burning of the fort to rout the Indians who had not yet escaped. While Church argued this was unwise because the army could have used the shelter of the wigwams for the night, his objections were overridden. No one knows how many Indians, mostly women, children, and the elderly, died in the fires; surely the total was in the hundreds.\footnote{129} As the weather threatened to turn even worse, General Winslow worried that the Indian fighters who escaped, along with others in the area, might counterattack. He ordered the army to collect its wounded and move out, leaving most of the English dead behind. The army had lost around twenty in the attack and two hundred wounded, some severely.\footnote{130} The troops retreated toward Smith’s Garrison through the night, most finally arriving at two the next morning. At least twenty of the wounded never made it, dying on route. The next few days at the base saw more of the wounded succumb; within a month after the fight, the death toll among the army was seventy to eighty. The wounded, whose treatment was hampered by the poor conditions at tiny Smith’s Garrison, were slow to recover; many had been further injured during the

\footnote{128} Church, \textit{History of Philip’s War}, 58. For information on Church, see Richard Slotkin and James K. Folsom, eds., \textit{So Dreadfull a Judgment: Puritan Responses to King Philip’s War, 1676-1677} (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1978), 370-391.

\footnote{129} Estimates of Indian dead vary widely, one of the best estimates is at least ninety-seven warriors and anywhere from three hundred to one thousand women, children, and the elderly. See Drake, \textit{Civil War in New England}, 119-120.

\footnote{130} Leach, \textit{Flintlock and Tomahawk}, 131.
nighttime retreat through the snow as frostbite took its own toll. Sailors from Rhode Island finally moved the wounded to Newport by ship the week after the fight. The force paid an especially heavy price in officers; seven of fourteen company commanders, including Captain Gardner, were killed. Major Appleton’s losses were four men killed and eighteen wounded.\textsuperscript{131} Gardner’s Company, in addition to losing its commander, lost seven enlisted men killed and ten wounded in total at the Fort Fight and before.\textsuperscript{132} The army was in such a bad state that it was declared temporarily unfit for duty. Virtually all military operations ceased while the colonies recovered from their great “victory.”

With the death of Captain Gardner, his lieutenant, William Hathorne, son of the prominent magistrate of Salem by the same name, assumed command of the company. Hathorne led the men through the remainder of the battle and the retreat. Major Appleton and his men remained with the army as they tried to prepare a further offensive. The lack of an organized fighting force in the aftermath of the Narragansett campaign was of great concern to colonial authorities and they quickly went about recruiting new forces. As early as Christmas Day, only six days after the Great Swamp Fight, the Commissioners of the United Colonies called for a new army of one thousand men to take the field; there was a great desire to strike the Narragansetts before they could recover from their defeat at the Great Swamp. Reports that King Philip was with the main body of Narragansett warriors made them an even more important target. However, raising new troops was increasingly difficult as men began to evade the press in great numbers.\textsuperscript{133} One of the

\textsuperscript{131} Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 158.

\textsuperscript{132} Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 167.

\textsuperscript{133} Leach, \textit{Flintlock and Tomahawk}, 141.
first companies formed for this mission was pressed out of the towns of Essex County and was lead by Captain Samuel Brocklebank of Rowley.

Brocklebank, as captain of Rowley’s militia, had led the town’s militia committee in recruiting men for the Narragansett campaign before he was chosen to lead a company after the Fort Fight.\(^{134}\) The company, with fifty-seven pressed men from Essex County and Boston, arrived in Winslow’s camp at Smith’s Garrison, along with two other companies, around January 10, 1676. The march to join the army had been harrowing; many men suffered from frostbite and eleven froze to death during the journey.\(^ {135}\) Brocklebank’s men were the first reinforcements the army received and were a welcome sight. Soon other Massachusetts troops arrived, including a company under Nicholas Manning from Salem.\(^ {136}\) Manning had fought in the first campaigns of the war with Captain Prentice’s troop and was commissioned a captain to take a relief company to the Narragansett army in early January. He and his thirty-seven men joined the army in time for their renewed offensive. By late January, the army, now somewhat recovered from the Fort Fight and with the arrival of fresh troops, seemed ready to renew the offensive.

General Winslow departed his camp on January 28, beginning a campaign that became known as the “Hungry March.” While the general thought the troops fit to resume operations, it is apparent that many of his men did not. A small number of men from Plymouth even deserted on January 29. When questioned later, they “displayed a bitterness which undoubtedly was shared by many other soldiers who had not gone so far

\(^{134}\) For information of Brocklebank and his company, see Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.*), 206-217.

\(^{135}\) Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.*), 201.

\(^{136}\) For information on Manning and his men, see Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.*), 277-278.
as to leave their units. In all likelihood, the trouble centered around such matters as a strong distaste for further winter campaigning, shortage of food, and perhaps the fact that the army had not obtained good quarters . . . .” 137 There is little question that morale in the army had reached a low ebb. While the army resumed its march in pursuit of the enemy, it was never able to catch the main body of Narragansetts, despite chasing them for over sixty miles through the snow. While the army fought a few small skirmishes, they captured or killed few of the enemy and Winslow was never able to bring about the climactic battle he desired. During the march, the colonial army quickly ran out of rations and was even forced to kill and consume some of their horses. Finally, realizing that the army would not catch the Indians in its condition, Winslow dismissed the Connecticut men and marched the Massachusetts and Plymouth forces to Boston, which they entered on February 5, 1676.

Once in Boston, Major Appleton retired from military service and he and his company finally returned to their homes. Appleton and many of his men had been in the thick of the fight for six months, from the Connecticut River Valley to the Fort Fight to the Hungry March. They deserved a rest. Captain Hathorne took Gardner’s men back to Essex County as well. Captain Brocklebank’s company was also allowed to return home, but they were called up again less than a week later and sent to Marlborough to garrison the town and protect the frontier. Marlborough, in central Massachusetts, had become a military command center on the frontier, a supply hub and a transit area for troops and commanders. 138 The people of the town felt secure with troops in town, but frightened

137 Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, 141.

138 For information of the situation in Marlborough, see Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 207-217.
when the soldiers left on campaign. Consequently, the General Court established a military garrison to protect the town and its vital function as a military focal point. Captain Brocklebank and his unit served as the Marlborough garrison until April 1676, when they were ordered to undertake another expedition. Captain Manning and his Essex company also continued the fight until August 1676 (as demonstrated by their pay records), yet the details of that service are unknown. \(^{139}\) It is quite probable that they, too, were engaged in garrison duty, as the bulk of active campaigning was switching to special volunteer companies by mid-1676.

Another company with Essex ties, that of Captain Jonathan Poole, also spent considerable time in garrison duty at Marlborough and other Connecticut River towns. \(^{140}\) Poole had been an officer under Major Appleton during the valley campaign of 1675. Appleton appointed Poole a captain when he was promoted to commander of the western theater. The General Court had not approved of the major's actions, but when they met Poole, who Appleton had sent to Boston with dispatches, they were so impressed by his manner they restored the commission. When Appleton left the valley to command the Massachusetts army at the Fort Fight, Poole was placed in control of all garrison forces there. He remained there as commander and president of the local Council of War until April 1676. Many Essex County men who served with Appleton later served with Poole as garrison soldiers. Captain Poole served personally from the fall of 1675 to March 1676. That month he requested to be relieved of his command, as a supporter wrote the General Court, Poole needed to leave “to repair to his very much suffering family at least

\(^{139}\) Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.*), 277-278.

\(^{140}\) For details on Captain Poole and his men, see Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.*), 258-261.
for a little while." His request was granted and his forces turned over to Captain Turner on April 7, 1676. Undoubtedly, some of the Essex militiamen who served with him stayed on garrison duty for the remainder of the war.

As the Essex men under Poole, Brocklebank, and Manning stayed alert on garrison duty, the war took an ominous turn in the early months of 1676. In February, the town of Lancaster was attacked, an event chronicled by the captivity narrative of Mary Rowlandson. With the attack on Lancaster and no offensive colonial army in the field, many Massachusetts frontier towns, and even some interior towns, exhibited increasing alarm about Indian attacks. People kept close to their town's garrison houses and local officials begged the colony for more defensive troops. It only got worse in late February when the enemy attacked and burned the towns of Medfield and Weymouth, the latter on the Atlantic coast; no longer was this a "frontier" war. The General Court sanctioned an official Day of Humiliation on February 23, while it issued new laws instructing towns to tighten their defenses. Novel defensive ideas were also proposed; the legislature proposed building a wall from the Charles River to the Concord River as a barrier to interior Indian attacks. The towns, many in Essex County, which would have to furnish the supplies and labor for this "Great Wall of Massachusetts," argued that the plan would never work and that they had enough trouble building garrisons houses of their own. In

---

141 "Reverend John Russell to the General Court, March 16, 1676," volume 68, document 163 in Felt, "Massachusetts Archives Collection."

response to another order by the Massachusetts Council, a committee of Essex County leaders, John Appleton (brother to Major Appleton), John Putnam, and Thomas Chandler, toured the county to inspect the defenses of the various towns. Their March 29, 1676, report showed most of the towns well fortified or well on their way to being so, with the exception of Marblehead, whose inhabitants deemed garrisons “needless” and Wenham, whose inhabitants did not even appear to discuss the situation when the committee requested it.143

A new army, under Major Thomas Savage, was organized in early March, including soldiers from Connecticut and around three hundred Massachusetts men, including Captain Brocklebank and his Essex command. The army was based at Marlborough. Included in this army was the last of the Essex County units raised during the war. Recruited for the task in March 1676, around thirty-one Essex men served a cavalry troop under the command of Captain John Whipple. Whipple, from a prominent Ipswich family, had been appointed cornet of the Ipswich troop before the war began.144 He served as the lieutenant of Captain Paige’s troop at the beginning of the war and was commissioned a captain in March 1676 to join the army under Major Savage. The expedition of the army began with dissent among the officers and men, centered on the question of employing Indian scouts; unbridled hatred of all Indians, friendly or not, increased as the war persisted.145 The army operated in the Connecticut Valley for the


144 For information on Whipple, see Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 282-283.

145 For the full story, see Leach, Flinock and Tomahawk, 161-163; Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 212-225. See also Lepore, Name of War; Drake, Civil War in New England.
next few weeks, but was brought back east to protect the increasingly threatened settlements there.

While the force was stationed around Springfield, Captain Whipple’s troop had been sent in pursuit of a small number of Indians who had killed a number of men and women from the town. The enemy had also taken a number of women and children captive; Whipple’s troopers were dispatched to rescue them. As Whipple and his men got close, the Indians killed the two children captives and struck the women on their heads with hatchets, leaving them for dead before fleeing. Whipple and his men recovered the bodies and one woman who had survived and returned to camp, letting the Indians go without a chase. George Bodge credits a popular rhyme of the period to this incident, although it misnames Whipple as Nixon: “Seven Indians and one without a gun, \ Caused Capt. Nixon [Whipple] and forty men to run.”146 There is little question the captain was widely know for his failure; in April 1676, the Massachusetts Council wrote to his commander Major Savage to raise the question of the “Rebuke of God upon Capt Whipple . . . it is a great shame and humbling to us.”147

On March 18, scouts in northern Essex County reported Indians massing near Andover and Haverhill; Major General Dennison dispatched troops to the area, but none of the enemy was found. The situation on the western frontier had grown so perilous that the colony decided to abandon several towns there, including Groton, Lancaster, Wrentham, and Mendon. On March 28, the town of Marlborough was attacked while the

146 Quoted in Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.),* 283. Bodge, the most distinguished historian of the men and officers involved in the war, states in defense of his assertion that “Nixon” was in fact Whipple, that “I know nothing of a Capt. ‘Nixon.’” No commander with that name appears in any colonial records of the war.

147 Quoted in Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.),* 282.
inhabitants were in church. With the majority of its former defenders out with Major Savage, including Brocklebank's Company, the few soldiers in town could defend only their garrison houses against the enemy. Captain Brocklebank and his Essex men rushed back to the town, only to find it in ruin. Brocklebank wrote the Massachusetts Council on March 28, 1676, “this may let you understand that the assault the enemy made upon the town of Marlborough upon sabbath day did much dammage as the inhabitants say, to the burning of 16 dwelling houses besides about 13 barns.”

While a small force from the town followed the enemy and killed some as they slept that night, the town had had enough. The civilians were evacuated, leaving the town as a military outpost only. It seems as if Captain Brocklebank and his men had had enough as well. He requested to be released, citing the fact that he and his men had been in service since early January without pay and noting their frustration of not defeating the enemy, stating “[We] doe little where [we] are.”

The request was denied; the colony needed every man. A few short weeks later, the crisis hit close to home for the Essex men. On April 8, the frontier assaults hit Essex County itself when Andover was attacked.

By mid-April, the General Court decided they had to stop the slow erosion of the frontier; a stand had to be made. That stand fell to the town of Sudbury, now the westernmost frontier town with a civilian population. That Sudbury was only seventeen

---


149 “Captain Daniel Dennison to the Massachusetts Council, March 27, 1676,” volume 68 document 179 in Felt, “Massachusetts Archives Collection.” See also Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 214.

150 On Andover, see Chapter 5.

151 The following narrative of the Sudbury Fight is based on Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 218-231; Schultz and Tougias, King Philip's War, 210-220; Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, 172-175.
miles from Boston highlights how desperate the situation had become. On April 19, large
december: numbers of hostile natives gathered in the vicinity of Mount Wachusetts, intent on
attacking Sudbury the next day. Around five hundred warriors invested the town on the
evening of the twentieth and attacked the next morning. The inhabitants were housed in
strong garrisons and the Indians had to content themselves with burning several
uninhabited homes. Help came from nearby Watertown and the men of the two towns
were able to push back the attackers to the western side of the Sudbury River, out of the
main part of town.

As that fight was taking place, Captains Samuel Wadsworth and Brocklebank,
hurrying from their base at Marlborough with their companies, (totaling fifty or sixty
men), saw a party of retreating natives and pursued them. Suddenly, several hundred
warriors confronted the two companies; they had fallen into a trap. Almost surrounded,
Wadsworth, Brocklebank and their men fought their way to nearby Green Hill. There
they fought for their lives throughout the afternoon. Forces from Sudbury tried to break
through to the now surrounded units, to no avail. As the afternoon wore on, the Indians
set fire to the brush on the hillside, blinding and choking the colonial defenders. In a
moment of panic, a few of the militiamen began running down the hill to escape. This
caused others, who could barely see, to think a retreat was underway and they followed.
As the colonial defenses splintered, the Indians, sensing a rout, fell on the men and
hacked them to pieces. Both Wadsworth and Brocklebank were killed, along with at least
forty of their men. Only a few escaped the carnage, finding their way off the hill amidst
the smoke. Following the slaughter, the enemy withdrew from the town. The next day, a
force of men from Sudbury, along with a contingent of Christian Indian allies, crossed
over to bury the dead. The few remaining soldiers of Brocklebank's command were sent home to Essex County.

In May, Massachusetts began preparations for a new offensive. Tactics were changing as the colony employed more Indians as scouts. Much of the offensive capability of the colony was turned over to volunteer companies like Captain Mosley's. These companies were given more latitude to pursue the enemy without formal battle plans. The men in these companies were motivated to enlist and fight by a new and more liberal policy that allowed the soldiers to keep plunder and profit from any captives they took.\textsuperscript{152} Captives, sold as slaves in the West Indies, became very valuable.\textsuperscript{153} Both Plymouth and Connecticut had made these types of force changes even earlier. Perhaps best known were Plymouth's units of mixed colonial volunteers and friendly Indian forces under the command of Benjamin Church.\textsuperscript{154} While there were a few men from Essex County in these types of new units, none of the companies was based in the county. The only Essex County unit in active service in the closing months of the war in southern New England was Captain Whipple's troop, which remained on patrol until they were discharged in September 1676.\textsuperscript{155} The war was coming to an end over the summer of 1676 as a number of important battles were fought and large numbers of Indians were defeated, their leaders captured. At the end of July, Philip's wife and son were captured and sold into slavery. On August 12, Captain Benjamin Church and his company of

\textsuperscript{152} Leach, \textit{Flintlock and Tomahawk}, 197.

\textsuperscript{153} For the practice of selling captives into slavery, see Lepore, \textit{Name of War}, 150-170; Drake, \textit{Civil War in New England}, 135-136.

\textsuperscript{154} See Church, Church, and Drake, \textit{History of Philip's War}.

\textsuperscript{155} Some Essex men would soon find themselves pressed for service in Maine, but that is beyond the scope of this study.
Plymouth men and friendly Indians cornered and killed King Philip not far from his home at Mount Hope, the place the war had begun. Church and his men, along with others, continued to round up errant Indian leaders; by October the war in the south was over and the colonies started the long road to recovery. The militia veterans had much to recover from as well. Impressed into service by their towns’ committee of militia, the men of the Essex County companies had done their duty and many had paid the ultimate price.

**Impressment in King Philip’s War: Conclusions and Beginnings**

Some historians have commented on the arbitrary nature of the militia committee system that sent these men to war. Leach, in *Flintlock and Tomahawk*, mused that

“Possibly the town authorities have a grudge against some ne’er-do-well or a certain

---


157 The causality for the men of Essex County are at least 55 men killed in action (KIA) and at least 24 wounded in action (WIA). The figures for KIA, which come from many sources, including town histories, vital records, probate records, and Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.*) are quite reliable. The figures for men WIA are not; there is little question that many more than 24 Essex men were wounded during the war. It is more likely that those 24 men had wounds that incapacitated them after the war, thus generating a record of the wound. The 55 men killed, when compared to the total number of enlisted men in known companies, gives a death rate of 14.8%, considerably higher than the total estimates for the war of a 8-10% rate. See Steele, *Warpaths*, 108. This is understandable considering that three Essex County companies were engaged in three of the deadliest battles of the war, Bloody Brook, the Fort Fight, and the Sudbury Fight. Total causality figures for the war vary widely; the most recent scholarship argues that anywhere between 800 and 1,300 colonial soldiers died and additional number of civilians, up to 1000 lost their lives. This is often simplified to around one in ten of every man who fought; making King Philip’s War the deadliest per capita conflict in American History. The Indians lost at least 3,000 dead, decimating the New England tribes. See Jerry Keenan, “King Philip’s War 1675-1676,” in *Encyclopedia of American Indian Wars 1492-1890* (New York: Norton, 1997), 117-120; Bert M. Mutersbaugh, “King Philip’s War (1675-1676),” in *Colonial Wars of North America, 1512-1763: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Alan. Gallay (New York: Garland, 1996), 339-341.
family that has proved uncooperative in civic affairs. Such a person usually finds himself at the top of the list.”158 While Leach was correct in his assessment of the final result of many impressment drives, his characterization of the process is flawed. Leach argued that the system was highly decentralized and unregulated, writing “how the sixteen men [in his hypothetical example] are chosen out of the town’s population is no concern of the central government at Boston . . . . Perhaps the selectmen of the town will hold a meeting at someone’s house to decide who can best be spared by their families . . . . Although the method of selection may be haphazard, it at least has the virtue of being flexible.”159 The committee of militia system, which Leach failed to mention, was very organized and regimented and was established by the “central government at Boston.”160 George H. Martin offered a more enlightened critique of the committee system:

This seems a large power to put into the hands of a few men, to select from all the eligibles in town the persons to be sent on military expeditions. What principles of selection they acted on, we do not know. The phrase “all things considered” [in the 1689 Militia Committee Act] left much to the fallibility of human judgment, and we can imagine that the selection seemed as mysterious as the choice of the women grinding at the mill, of whom it was predicted “one shall be taken and the other left.” That there should be much masculine anger and much

158 Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk*, 104. For another example of this view, based on Leach’s work, see Eugene Francis Madigan, “Development of the New England Colonial Militia, 1620-1675” (M.A. thesis, Kansas State University, 1975), 21.

159 Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk*, 103-104.

feminine bitterness and many personal and family feuds resulting from this
system of impressment was inevitable.\textsuperscript{161}

Martin's concerns echo those of the people of Massachusetts over two hundred years
earlier, who had begun to question the methods of the militia committees as the war raged
on.\textsuperscript{162} The examinations below, of the towns of Essex County and the soldiers chosen to
fight by their militia committees, attempt to shed some much overdue light on these
"mysterious" choices to determine just what Massachusetts Bay's militia committees'
"principles of selection" really were.

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{162} Pulsipher, "Overture," 246-247.
CHAPTER THREE

ESSEX COUNTY'S COMMERCIAL AND MARKET TOWNS AT WAR: IMPRESSMENT IN IPSWICH AND MARBLEHEAD

Essex County contained a number of important commercial and trading towns that dominated the region and played an important part in the Massachusetts economy.

The most important of these towns was undoubtedly Salem, which by 1670 was the colony’s second largest port and a major shipping center in the growing Atlantic world.1 Salem was dominated by merchants and artisans and was bristling with economic activity, having lost most of its outlying sections when they, in turn, became towns in their own right.2 Commercial centers like Salem were densely populated and had greater

---


2 Beverly, Marblehead, and Wenham had all begun as sections of the town of Salem. By 1670, Salem consisted of the town and Salem Village, a farming community west of the commercial town, which eventually became the town of Danvers. Tensions, which were already present in the 1670s, between the two parts of Salem had a great deal to do with the witchcraft episode that broke out in Salem Village in 1692. See Paul S. Boyer and Stephen Nissenbaum, *Salem Possessed: The Social Origins of Witchcraft*
degrees of both wealth and poverty than other towns, as well as greater inequity in each.

Yet, as important as Salem was to Essex County, so, too, were the other commercial and market towns in the county.3 Towns such as Newbury and Lynn were important towns in their own right as chief regional trading towns and agricultural and population centers.4 Marblehead and Ipswich, the towns examined here, were also important towns in the

---

3 In his study, Richard Archer sets “Commercial Towns” and “Secondary Political and Economic Centers” into two categories when categorizing the towns of New England. While this typology is useful, a look at just Essex County places these types of towns in the same category, based on their economic, demographic, and social situations. Archer lists Salem as a Commercial Town and Ipswich, Newbury, Lynn, as Secondary Centers. To this is added, in this study, Marblehead, (which Archer labeled as Subordinate), based on a close reading of the Essex County records; despite its close ties to Salem, Marblehead was not a typical subordinate town in Archer’s sense, because of its commercial nature. See Richard Archer, *Fissures in the Rock: New England in the Seventeenth Century* (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 2001), 144-146, 1164-166. For a different look at the towns of Essex County, see Harold Arthur Pinkham, “The Transplantation and Transformation of the English Shire in America: Essex County, Massachusetts, 1630-1768” (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of New Hampshire, 1980).

county and the colony. Ipswich, the most populous town in the county, was a major center for agriculture and trade, while Marblehead was enmeshed in the trans-Atlantic fishing trade. These five towns, Salem, Ipswich, Newbury, Lynn, and Marblehead, as the home of a large number of Essex County's citizens, supplied an overwhelming percentage, almost seventy-five percent, of the soldiers impressed in the county during the war. The largest percentage of those men came from the thriving town of Ipswich.
Ipswich

Situated almost in the middle of the county’s Atlantic coastline, Ipswich ran inland more than ten miles. The town’s lands were bisected by the Ipswich River, along which, about four miles inland from the sea, the town center was located. It was surrounded by the neighboring towns of Rowley to the north, Topsfield and Wenham to the west, Manchester to the south, and Gloucester to the southeast. Founded in the early spring of 1633 under the energetic leadership of John Winthrop, Jr., son of the governor, Ipswich was already well on its way to prominence. The town established mill and meetinghouse alike that first year, while laying out streets to begin the assignment of house lots. Nathaniel Ward, the town’s influential first minister, arrived in the early years, as well as the former governor, Thomas Dudley. While both Dudley and Winthrop eventually moved on, Ipswich continued to include a sizeable number of prominent men in the county and the colony, including the Rev. William Hubbard and Samuel Appleton. As the town grew, with a large influx of settlers from the East Anglia region in England, it developed a decidedly mixed economy, much like that of the settlers’ home in England.
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The town showed "a heightened awareness . . . of the important role of merchants, tradesmen, artisans, and manufactures" as well as agriculture. In addition, the town had a large number of prosperous yeoman. Ipswich was becoming a powerful town; only four years after its founding, it ranked second only to Boston in wealth and population, a distinction it retained throughout the seventeenth century.

By the late 1650s and early 1660s, the townspeople had amassed substantial capital, although it was not shared equally; there was a great disparity of wealth in the town, especially between Ipswich's large landholders and merchants with direct economic ties to England and those inhabitants just trying to make a living. In addition, the leaders of Ipswich's local government, chosen from among the leading citizens, stayed in office for long stretches, many serving almost yearly in the same office, especially the selectmen. David Grayson Allen points out that these circumstances allowed the top ten percent of the town's original families to control almost half of the town's wealth. This, in combination with a East Anglican consciousness which "divided men into specific political gradations, leaders, freeman, commoners, and inhabitants . . .," stratified the town. In turn, this furthered, in the privileged families, an intense dislike of anyone who tried to upset the town's economic, political, or social balance. To combat these forces, the town's leadership went to great lengths.

---

8 Allen, *In English Ways*, 136-139.
In her dissertation on Ipswich, Allison Vannah goes into great detail in examining the “town’s efforts to close ranks against undesirables.”\(^{11}\) The town “closed” itself to future commoners in 1659 by declaring that anyone who did not have a house built in town as of that date was forever excluded from the privileges of commonage; they would get no more land in Ipswich.\(^{12}\) This made the future in town especially bleak for non-first sons, who did not expect to inherit the family homestead.\(^{13}\) Sale of land to newcomers by established residents was alarming and infrequent.\(^{14}\) Soon after the town closure, the town leadership brought court cases to remove a number of men who had refused to leave when warned out by the town, including a number of former servants who had lived in Ipswich and tried to return after an absence.\(^{15}\) The town also cracked down on inhabitants it deemed “undesirable” with a variety of harsh actions and fines to those in town that “entertained” them; by the 1670s, even “strangers of ‘honesty and ability’ would have to be vouched for by their hosts, security posted, and a license obtained for them to remain in town.”\(^{16}\) Ipswich even attempted to create a place for these “undesirables” to go when it sponsored a new town on the frontier at Quabaug.\(^{17}\)

\(^{11}\) Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 696. Vannah’s study is remarkable in its encyclopedic knowledge and in-depth analysis of the town.

\(^{12}\) Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 693.

\(^{13}\) This was not as large a problem in wealthier families, who were likely to have homes on several of their pieces of property, which could be divided among the various sons.

\(^{14}\) Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 723-782.


\(^{16}\) Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 702-704.

\(^{17}\) Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 708-722.
The attempt to purge Ipswich of undesirable residents, along with a constant campaign to cleanse the town of sin, especially sins instigated by the lower orders, led to a rise in court cases in the 1670s. This in turn led to a backlash, as “some in town began to bristle with resentment towards the upper echelons, while some in the upper echelons openly expressed disdain for those in the lower echelons.” The town became even more stratified when, in an attempt to enlarge the meetinghouse, a crisis over the seating in the building caused an open split between ranks in town. In this stratified and contentious atmosphere, the calamity of King Philip’s War unfolded.

The civilian-military leaders of Ipswich’s Committee of Militia were solidly a part of the town’s upper echelon. The militia committee in Ipswich consisted of the town’s militia captain, Daniel Dennison, who was also the colony’s major general; Lieutenant Samuel Appleton, who was also one of the town’s deputies to the General Court; his brother John Appleton, captain of the town’s cavalry troop; and Mr. George Gittings, the other deputy. It is possible that up to three other men, John Whipple, cornet of the troop, and Thomas French and Thomas Howlett, the ensigns of the infantry company, served at times as well. There is some question as to how much time Major Dennison was able to spend on the military affairs of Ipswich alone, since he was in charge of the entire colony’s war effort. When Samuel Appleton left to command a

---

18 Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 810.

19 Daniel Dennison held simultaneous titles of captain of the Ipswich company and major general and commander in chief of Massachusetts Bay. He was referred to as “Major Dennison.” For information on him, see Daniel Dennison Slade, “Major-General Daniel Dennison,” New England Historical Genealogical Register 23 (1869): 312-335. For information on the others and their commissions, see Waters, Goodhue, and Wise, Ipswich in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, 160-162; George Francis Dow, ed., Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts, 8 vols. (Salem, Mass.: Essex Institute, 1911-1918), 1:117; George Madison Bodge, Soldiers in King Philip’s War, reprint of 1906 3rd ed. (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1967), 142, 282; Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 243-244, 1037-1045.
company in August 1675, his place on the militia committee was probably filled by one of the town’s ensigns or Cornet Whipple. All of the men on the committee at the beginning of the war are ranked by Vannah as either colonial or local elite, while even the junior officers fall into the upper middle socio-economic category; all were among the town’s most powerful leaders.\textsuperscript{20}

Alison Vannah points out that the town leaders, who blamed “undesirables” for any discord in Ipswich, continued the practice in the early days of the war; “The town of Ipswich needed someone to blame for the cataclysm of war, a war that symbolized righteousness against evil and called into question the right living of the godly. Looking around them, the godly saw in their midst newcomers and poorer folk who breached communal rules and who dared to cross social boundaries by wearing the clothing of their betters. Sins against the social order could lead to catastrophe.”\textsuperscript{21} Vannah makes the case that this led to a heightened number of presentments to the law courts at the beginning of the war. Looking at the choices made by the militia committee, the impressment of undesirable elements in town played an even more crucial role in Ipswich’s continued effort to rid itself of troublemakers and the lower sort.

Men from Ipswich served in almost every phase of the war. The town sent at least eighty-eight men to fight during the war as enlisted soldiers in active companies.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{20} For the rankings, see Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 1021-1139.

\textsuperscript{21} Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 834.

\textsuperscript{22} In her dissertation, Vannah claims that about a third of the town served, or around 180 men served from 1675 to 1677. There are a number of reasons the number in this study is different. Vannah included on her list those soldiers from Ipswich who served in Maine during the 1676-1677 period, a sizeable group not included in this study. In addition, she used the muster lists in Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.) without culling out those men who were paid for some service, but can not be placed in an actual fighting or garrison company, as this study does. She also uses, with caution, a listing of soldiers from Ipswich in Waters, Goodhue, and Wise, Ipswich in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, 218-224, which includes, as she states, some men not of
The main impressment drives for Ipswich came in August 1675, when Captain Appleton formed his company for service in the Connecticut River Valley; in November 1675, when Appleton returned to Ipswich needing men for the Narragansett campaign; and throughout the later months of the war when troopers and garrison soldiers were recruited in substantial numbers. A large number of Ipswich men, twenty-seven (31 percent) served in at least two different military units, most often an infantry company and then a garrison. This was in large part due to soldiers serving with Appleton being transferred from his command to various garrisons in the Connecticut River Valley. Ipswich men were present at almost every major campaign and battle of the war, from the August 1675 Mount Hope campaign to the final roundup of Indian leaders in 1676.

In total, 105 Ipswich men were compensated by the colony for some service during the war. Seventeen of those men have no known connection to a fighting unit or garrison. They could have been paid for providing the army with supplies or working farms for men who had been impressed. It is also possible that they did serve with a garrison or active unit, but the records of their service are lost. This study focuses on the eighty-eight men with known active duty or garrison service. The Ipswich militia committee was given the largest burden of any of Essex committees during the war, raising almost a third of the county's troops for wartime service. Unlike smaller and more static towns like Andover or Rowley, Ipswich's size and the mobility of some of its population must have made this difficult. Yet, its large population of around 440 militia-

---

Ipswich. Because of this discrepancy in the number of men who served, Vannah's conclusions are use carefully here. See Vannah, "Crotchets of Division," 836-842, 847-855, especially note 17.

23 For details, see the narrative of Essex companies during the war in Chapter 2.

24 For the law on paying substitute farmers, see Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:65.
age males also offered the militia committee some advantages that small towns did not have. Even with the county’s largest impressment quota (for eighty-eight men, more than 20 percent of the population), the committee could pick and chose its soldiers from the town based on a wide number of variables, something small towns often could not do with their small population bases. With a number of options to choose from, the type of men impressed by the committee from the town’s population is a mirror of how the town military leadership perceived its citizens and their value to the town.

The Ipswich Committee of Militia chose men slightly older than the average age to serve during the war. Of the eighty-eight men who served, the age of forty-nine (56 percent) are known. The average age of the Ipswich men at the time of the war was

25 Vannah estimates the 1675 number of adult males (16-60) in Ipswich at 470; she further argues that 30 men in town had been exempted from militia service because of their age or some other condition. See Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 847-848, note 17.

26 Vannah, who argues that Ipswich sent a much higher number of men to serve (as many as 180) subsequently claims that a higher percentage of Ipswich men served, as much as 45 percent of the town’s population. However, as noted in note 22 above, her count of men includes all men paid in the years 1675-1677, including men who served in 1676-1677 in Maine and she makes no attempt to ascertain their actual service. While the number of men who served from Ipswich is probably in the middle range of the two estimates, the numbers offered here are most likely closer to the true number of active soldiers during King Philip’s War, 1675-1676. See Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 840-855. For a comparison to smaller towns, see Chapter 6.

27.3 years, slightly above the county’s average of 26.6.\textsuperscript{28} Ipswich had five enlisted men in their forties, including a 41 year old and two men at 42 years of age; 10 percent of the town’s soldiers were in this age range, old for a soldier. The committee also sent twelve men in their thirties, 25 percent of Ipswich’s recruits. The town further impressed seven men in their teens, or 14 percent of the force. The vast majority of the men sent with known ages, 51 percent, were in their twenties.\textsuperscript{29} Yet, despite this high percentage, it is odd that in a town where a quarter of the males were in the 18 to 30 age bracket (around 117 men), traditionally the most desired age of a soldier, even more of the town’s soldiers did not come from that group.\textsuperscript{30} In addition, the town sent a large percentage of first sons of Ipswich families off to war. Normally protected as the main guarantors of a family’s future success, it is surprising how many first sons were sent.\textsuperscript{31} Out of the eighty-eight men, the birth order for forty-one is known (47 percent). Of those men, 51 percent were

\begin{notes}

\textsuperscript{28} The average age of enlisted men (26.6 years) in Essex County is based on this study’s count of enlisted soldiers in a known company, which totals 357 soldiers, with birth data known for 195 of them (55 percent). The median and modal age is 25 years old. The average age for all Essex County men paid (officers, non-commissioned officers, enlisted men, and men paid without a known active company) is 27 years old, which comes from a total of all 434 men in this study with known birth dates, which is 248 (57 percent of the total). See Appendix 1.

\textsuperscript{29} These numbers are similar to Vannah’s figures, despite the difference in the populations of soldiers. See Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 839-840, 852.

\textsuperscript{30} For the population estimate, see Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 839.

\end{notes}
first sons of their families, a much higher number than in most towns. In addition, twenty-three of the eighty-eight men sent were married, almost 25 percent. This is very high indeed; Ipswich sent a higher percentage of married men than any other Essex town. Why did the town send so many older men, valuable first sons, and married men to war? Clearly, while age, birth order, and marriage were factors in impressment, the committee had more important things in mind.

In her study of Ipswich’s soldiers, Alison Vannah contends that the men sent from Ipswich represented the various geographic regions of the town in equal numbers, arguing against any regional preference for impressment. But equality is not the case when it comes to the men’s occupations. Of the eighty-eight men sent off to fight, the occupations of fifty of the men (57 percent) is known. The mixed economy of Ipswich is evident in its soldiers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number &amp; Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>15 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades</td>
<td>14 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>14 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman/Seaman</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 See Chapter 4 on Rowley and Chapter 5 on Andover.

33 Marriage records come mainly from vital and court records, see Vital Records of Ipswich; Dow, ed., Essex Probate Recs; Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs.

34 Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 840, 852.

35 Occupational data comes from a number of sources, most often court and probate records. See Dow, ed., Essex Probate Recs; Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs. See also Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 1022-1139.
While this distribution may look equal, there were far more farmers than tradesmen, servants, and fishermen in Ipswich in 1675, especially among sons of the age likely to be sent off to war.\textsuperscript{36} There was a clear bias in the militia committee toward sending non-farmers off to war.\textsuperscript{37} There is no doubt that large landholders were powerful enough in the town’s leadership to protect their sons from the press. As proof of their power in this regard, Vannah points out that not a single tenant farmer was impressed, even among her larger population of soldiers. She argues that their absence “as soldiers suggests that they were protected from service by their landlords, who undoubtedly secured their own interests in the face of war.”\textsuperscript{38} It is not hard to imagine that these influential men also protected their sons from service as well.

While the number of servants who served does not seem out of proportion, Vannah notes that the number of servants who served in her study represented over 75 percent of the servants in town.\textsuperscript{39} This fact seems to argue, not surprisingly, that the elite would rather send a servant off to fight than their own flesh and blood.\textsuperscript{40} The employment of a number of fishermen suggests that the committee believed that these men, often transient members of the community, were easily removed from town without  

\textsuperscript{36} Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 841. Vannah’s distributions are slightly different, since her population is different and she does not differentiate between officers and enlisted men. She shows soldiers among the following categories, 2.25% Gentlemen, 1.68% Merchants, 28.65% Tradesmen, 28.09% Agricultural, 22.47 Servants, and 16.85 Unknown. See Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 852.

\textsuperscript{37} The bias is also a product of the fact that Ipswich was a society at war. With a large population and many refugees streaming into town, the militia committee must have taken farm labor into account in their desire to preserve the towns’ food supply.

\textsuperscript{38} Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 841.

\textsuperscript{39} Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 841-842.

\textsuperscript{40} This somewhat dulls the argument made by Jenny Pulsipher that masters went to great lengths to protect their servants from the press. See Jenny Hale Pulsipher, “‘The Overture of This New Albion World:’ King Philip’s War and the Transformation of New England” (Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1999), 252-255.
much impact on the community. While the data on the soldier’s occupations suggest a certain bias by the militia committee, it is in no way the only one demonstrated.

The rift in Ipswich between community leaders and the lower orders was played out in the impressment of soldiers for King Philip’s War. Of the eighty-eight men pressed out of the town, seventy-two of the men (81 percent) had at least one negative factor against them in the minds of the committee of militia. These negative factors took many different forms, classified in five categories. The first and most important in Ipswich, as well as overall in the county, was the social status of the soldier in the town. Especially in Ipswich, which had become socially stratified to an extreme degree even before the war, one’s place in society, or more likely for many of these young men, their families’ place in the town’s pecking order, played a large part in determining whether they went off to war or not. Out of the eighty-eight men pressed into active companies from Ipswich, sixty men (68 percent) were classified as falling into the lower echelons of the town’s economy. Since historians of wealth in Essex County maintain that only around 25 percent of the population was in the lowest economic strata, this is an important finding. These Ipswich men were classified by Alison Vannah as coming

---

41 See the section on Marblehead below.

42 This factor was less important in smaller towns, where the families were more closely related and the wealth distribution was less severe. See Chapter 5 on Andover and Table C-5 in the conclusion.

from lower middle or lower families or being underlings in town, beholden to someone else, most likely a master, for their economic position.44

The militia committee, made up of members of the town’s elite, was representative of those elements in town that had come to “openly express disdain for those in the lower orders” by 1674.45 There is little doubt that the elite saw impressment as a way to clear the town of some of the sons of the lower orders, especially when the opposite meant that the sons of the elite would have to serve. For years they had ordered undesirables out of town and even taken many to court to force them to leave; this was a perfect opportunity to be rid of them.46 To further single out these men, few of them were commoners (those due to receive land allotments from the town in the future), making them even less likely to turn into upstanding members of the town’s economy.47

The second most important negative factor to the militia committee, based on the number of men impressed, was crime. Twenty-three of the men sent had criminal records, almost 26 percent of the men pressed from the town.48 This is a much higher

---

44 Throughout most of this study, a different scale for discerning the families’ place in a given town’s economy is used, as described in the Introduction, pg. 30 note 79. However, Vannah’s systematic and exhaustive study of Ipswich’s economy and every families place in it is substituted in this section because of its scope and authoritative nature. For her methods and listings, see Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 117-204, 567-688, 1022-1139.

45 Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 810.

46 For a discussion on the town’s policy on warning out, see Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 696-722.

47 For her analysis of commoners as soldiers, see Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 840, 853.

48 For criminal records, see Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs. The Court of Assistants for Massachusetts dealt with capital crimes, although no Essex soldier who had been in that kind of trouble with the law still lived in the county in 1675-1676. See John Noble and John Francis Cronin, eds., Records of the Court of Assistants of the Colony of the Massachusetts Bay, 1630-1692, 3 vols. (Boston: Pub. by the County of Suffolk, 1901). For the criminal justice system, see Edwin Powers, Crime and Punishment in Early Massachusetts, 1620-1692: A Documentary History (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966); George Lee Haskins, “Law and Colonial Society,” in Essays in the History of Early American Law, ed. David H. Flaherty (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1969); Edgar J. McManus, Law and Liberty in Early New
rate of criminals than in the general society. In his book *Crime and Punishment in Early Massachusetts, 1620-1692*, Edwin Powers calculates that in all of Essex County in a given year, only eighty-five criminal cases were brought to court, spread throughout the twelve towns.\(^4^9\) Even taking Ipswich's large population into consideration, only around twenty cases a year from the town could be expected.\(^5^0\) Crime, no matter how small the infraction, was not to be tolerated by the town's elite, particularly when they were convinced that the war had been brought about by the sins of the lower sort. This was especially true when even the General Court offered an opinion of the linkage of the two, listing all of society's sins, including most of the crimes commonly prosecuted in the county courts, that had brought about the war.\(^5^1\) While criminals had been undesirables in Ipswich before, warranting punishment and possible expulsion from town, once the war started the need to rid the town of these men was even greater, a need the militia committee could fulfill.\(^5^2\)

The men presented to the court were guilty of different crimes, some more serious than others. Some men had angered the wrong people. One prime example of this is Samuel Hunt, who had a series of run-ins and dueling court cases during 1674-1675 with...

---


\(^5^0\) Based on Ipswich's percentage of impressment in the county, which was based on population. Ipswich sent 25 percent of the county's soldiers; if its population was 25 percent of the county, it would be responsible for around twenty-one crimes a year out of the county's eighty-five crimes.

\(^5^1\) For the idea that the war was God's punishment for sin, see the declaration to that effect by the General Court in Nathaniel Bradstreet Shurtleff, ed., *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England. Printed by Order of the Legislature*, 5 in 6 vols. (Boston: W. White, 1853), 5:59-63.

\(^5^2\) For her assessment of crime in 1660-1670s Ipswich, see Vannah, "Crotchets of Division," 805-836.
Samuel Appleton, the town’s militia lieutenant and a prominent member of the militia committee. Hunt accused Appleton of “detaining a horse” Hunt’s son had taken. The court found against Hunt and fined him for a pernicious lie on behalf of Lieutenant Appleton. Hunt had been in trouble before in town: his daughter had caused a stir in the meetinghouse throughout the 1660s by disturbing the services and his son had also been presented for the same, “Laughing and talking and spitting and striking boys with sticks and throwing things into the gallery.” Samuel Hunt’s wife Betty was so often on the wrong side of the town leadership that Vannah says of her, “The magistrates hated to see Betty Hunt coming and did their best to avoid her.” It is no wonder Hunt found himself marching off to war.

Other men had their share of problems that offended the Ipswich leadership and probably landed them on the constable’s impressment warrant. Seth Story had cut and carried away valuable marsh grass from the town commons. Thomas Knowlton had also been admonished for being disorderly during public worship and breaking the meetinghouse’s windows in 1674. Richard Prior, one of the married men drafted by the committee, had been prosecuted for fornication in 1666; in the 1670s he was again in trouble and jailed for living apart from his wife for over four years. He later escaped jail, only to be returned to prison until he promised to stay with her. Edward Neland had

---

54 Quoted in Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 814.
56 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 4:46-47.
57 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:311.
been presented as far back as 1659 for excessive drinking and was still indulging to excess into the 1670s. Drink was also the problem of John Browne; in 1675, he was fined for drinking, idleness, and stealing cider.

John Chub was almost as much a problem for the town’s leaders as Samuel Hunt. Chub, who had been fined for killing another man’s horse in 1669, was in trouble time and again in the early 1670s, striking another man’s servant, chaining up a public highway, and, perhaps most importantly, trying to act above his station by “excess in apparel, beyond that of a man of his degree.” Freegrace Norton, the town’s miller, had been hauled into court in 1674 to answer questions about the accuracy of his scales, a problem the court declared “a great misdemeanor being in the public trust, either through falsehood or extreme negligence.” Norton’s crime or negligence affected everyone in town, but most often, and importantly, the large elite landowners who had their grain ground at the mill. Norton’s attempt to cheat the town did not go unpunished; he was fined. But, perhaps more seriously, he found himself serving under Captain Appleton once the war started. Thomas Dennis and his wife were similar thorns in the town elites’ sides; they had affronted the marshal, “done the selectmen wrong,” stolen from Major General Denison, and been presented for “oppression in . . . trade.”

---


60 Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 6:72.

61 Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 4:124-126, 5:141, 303, 6:27. Sumptuary law violations were an extremely touchy spot with Ipswich’s elite; they were rigorously enforced, see Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 805-816.


It was not only the lower-middle class that gave the town fathers fits; many of the servants who found themselves drafted into the colony's forces had also been in trouble with the law. In 1673, Nathaniel Emerson and Richard Pasmore were admonished for drinking stolen wine; in addition, Pasmore was found guilty of "carrying himself irrevently and Unchristianly upon the Sabbath day... wispering during service to smaller boys and setting a bad example." In the same year, John Thomas was fined and imprisoned for "attempting the chastity of Elizabeth Bassit and running away from his master;" he was also made to add a year and a half on to his service to pay his master, Mr. Daniel Epps, for time lost and the fine. In 1664, then servant George Stimson had broken into the house of the prominent Daniel Epps and stolen several items, threatening Epps children with death if they told who had done the deed. Stimson and his accomplices were fined triple damages, whipped, and had time added to their service. Stimson's partners had all left town by 1675, yet the crime was so frightening, being aimed at one of the town's elite, that even after ten years, it appears likely the memory of it spurred Stimson's impressment. The sheer number of men from Ipswich with criminal pasts pressed into service and the relative seriousness of their crimes, or the fact they were aimed at the elite, is a clear indication that the militia committee was using impressment as simply one more tool to rid the town of troublemakers.

Men who had serious debt problems, along with a number of men with no known connection to Ipswich, made up an equal number of soldiers on the town's muster rolls.

---

65 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:140.
While normal operating debt was common in colonial New England, men who had been
singled out and taken to court for their excessive debts were noticed by the elite in town.
Four men in Ipswich had this type of serious debt; interestingly, all four also had criminal
problems in town.\(^6\) Four other men impressed by Ipswich had no known connection to
the town.\(^6\) Whether they were impressed while in town on business or if they were men
who had come to Ipswich in hopes of avoiding the press in their home towns, these four
men had no records of living in town.\(^6\) As such, the militia committee had little to lose
by pressing them; with a number of war refugees in town already, the last thing the town
needed to do was feed draft dodgers.\(^7\)

Two men in town had negative marks against them for making trouble with the
town itself. One is Samuel Hunt, who sued the selectmen on several occasions, while the
other is Joseph Jewett, whose family sued the town in court over the closure of the town
commonage.\(^7\) These men had made no friends among the town elite. The last category
of negative factors that weighed on the Ipswich militia committee's mind was that of
multiple infractions. Nineteen men in town (22 percent of the eighty-eight pressed) had a
number of different strikes against them.\(^7\) John Knowlton, who was in the lower-middle
ranking in town had both crime and debt problems while John Thomas, who was counted

\(^{6}\) Freegrace Norton, John Knowlton, John Browne, and Thomas Dennis.

\(^{6}\) Andrew Burley, Samuel Crumpton, George Timson, and Simon Groe.

\(^{6}\) See Chapter 2 for the practice of impressing men trying to hide from their hometown press.

\(^{70}\) For the refugee situation in Ipswich, see Vannah, “Crotchets of Division,” 842-846.

\(^{71}\) For Hunt, see Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:306, 315, 318, 411-414. For Jewett, see Vannah,
“Crotchets of Division,” 700-701.

\(^{72}\) This does not include men who had numerous problems within each category, just those men with a
negative factor in more than one of the main areas: socio-economic status, crime, debt, or no town
connection.
a town underling as a servant, had also been in trouble with the law. These men represented perhaps the easiest decisions the militia committee made when filling their draft quotas.

Table 3-2
Ipswich Soldiers’ Negative Factors, 1650-1676

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage$^{74}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio/Economic Status</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Town Connection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Problem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Factors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ipswich Committee of Militia used the war and impressment to continue their long running campaign to rid the town of undesirables. While they surely did not wish for all the men they sent off to die, impressment would get them out of town for a while, and possibly for good, especially if the soldiers found themselves a better home during their wartime travels. And if they did not come back from the fighting, Ipswich would be little worse, perhaps a little better, than before they left. Ridding the town of these


$^{74}$ Percentage of total men with factor (n=88).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
miscreants was also an important step in fighting the sin and disorder that many believed had caused the war in the first place.\textsuperscript{75}

What of those men without a negative factor who left Ipswich to fight? Sixteen men from town have no known strike against them, yet they fought alongside those that did. All of the men were socially either in the local elite or upper middle ranking.\textsuperscript{76} Why they were chosen or if they were impressed is unclear. While the vast majority of those who fought in the war did so after being impressed for service, there were some men in every company and town who volunteered for service. There are two factors in Ipswich that suggest a number of these sixteen men did just that. First, most, eleven out of the sixteen (69 percent) served in the early days of the war and they served with their own militia lieutenant, Samuel Appleton.\textsuperscript{77} It is not hard to imagine a number of men, of the same or similar social circle in town, coming forward in the early days of the war to join their lieutenant in an adventure. These men had not heard the stories of Lathrop's ambush or the tales of death from the frontier. Another possible factor in their decision to volunteer was their place in those upper families. Six of the men to join Appleton (55 percent) were not their families' first sons. They had less to lose and longer to wait for

\textsuperscript{75} For more information of the war as a punishment, see Increase Mather, "An Earnest Exhortation: To the Inhabitants of New England," in \textit{So Dreadful a Judgment: Puritan Responses to King Philip's War 1676-1677}, ed. Richard Slotkin and James K. Folsom (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1978); Increase Mather, \textit{Early History of New England; Being a Relation of Hostile Passages between the Indians and European Voyagers and First Settlers: And a Full Narrative of Hostilities, to the Close of the War with the Pequots, in the Year 1637; Also a Detailed Account of the Origin of the War with King Philip}, ed. Samuel Gardner Drake (Albany, N. Y.: J. Munsell, 1864); Increase Mather, "A Brief History of the War with the Indians in New-England," in \textit{So Dreadful a Judgment}.

\textsuperscript{76} For the names, see Appendix 2. For their status, see Vannah, "Crotchets of Division," 1022-1139.

\textsuperscript{77} For their service with Appleton (many were later transferred to other commands or garrisons), see Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 142-158.
their inheritance.\textsuperscript{78} This was especially true in Ipswich, where many second and younger sons were not guaranteed commonage in the closed town.

Many of the men from the upper ranks in town served in garrisons near the end of the war, when the heavy impressment load and increased draft evasion caused a severe shortage of troops, necessitating even the better sort to be sent, although to a somewhat safer duty. While it is impossible to know if these men of the town's better families volunteered or were reluctantly impressed by their militia committee, it is known that they constituted a small percentage, only 19 percent, of the town's soldiers. The rest, a clear majority, were those with at least one negative mark against them.

How did Ipswich's soldiers fare during the war? The town's death toll was considerable, but not as great as some towns'. Ipswich lost nine men killed in action, most with Lathrop at the Bloody Brook ambush.\textsuperscript{79} Five men were listed as wounded in action, a very low number which is probably underreported.\textsuperscript{80} Undoubtedly, many more men were wounded in the course of the war; those listed as such were often those who had injuries that plagued them the rest of their lives. Yet, most of the men who marched off to war returned to Ipswich. One wonders how they fit in town after their harrowing service. Yet, the town's militia committee had seen to it that the town met its impressment quotas. The service of the men from Ipswich, in all theaters and campaigns


\textsuperscript{79} The killed were Freegrace Norton, Samuel Taylor, Samuel Crumpton, Thomas Manning, Thomas Mentor, Samuel Stevens, Jacob Wainwright, Samuel Whitteridge, and John Line, a native American servant.

\textsuperscript{80} They were Jonathan Denison, Robert Dutch, George Stimson, George Timson, and Thomas Dow.
of the war, was invaluable to the war effort of the colonies. The question remains, however, if Ipswich's impressment pattern was typical of other Essex County towns.
Marblehead

The area of Marblehead was settled as early as 1629. Situated on a peninsula jutting out from the Massachusetts shore, Marblehead's history was closely intertwined with that of Salem, the much larger and more powerful town to the east. The area of Marblehead was small, "not much bigger than a large farm," and its rocky coastline and hillsides afforded little in the way of good farming land. The harbor was, however, deep and well protected. At first, Marblehead, or Marble Harbor, was an area within the town boundaries of Salem. As early as 1631, the area's economic potential was foreshadowed by the establishment of a fishery station. Fishing and shipping dominated the economy of Marblehead throughout the colonial period. Merchants from Boston and Salem, backed by London fish merchants, outfitted fishing voyages from the little town from its earliest days. In May 1635, the Massachusetts General Court ordered that there should be a plantation at Marblehead and it should have a measure of independence from Salem; "the inhabitants now there shall have liberty to plant and imp've such ground as they stand in neede of . . . the inhabitants of Salem shall part with such ground . . . being payed for their labor and costs." The very next year, a ship of 120 tons, the third ship built in the entire colony, was launched at Marblehead; it was the first of many vessels built there.

---


82 Heyrman, *Commerce and Culture*, 209.

In January 1637, Salem’s selectmen, who oversaw Marblehead, ordered that “for the better furthering of the fishing trading” no one in Marblehead could be granted more land than that given by the town to fishermen; the town’s future was to be tied strictly to fishing, not agriculture. More fishermen could be accommodated in town if the lots were kept small; the town had no need to lay out farm land, since the economy was to be supported by fishing. By 1638, small plots of land, most two acres or less--enough for a house and drying station for fish--had been assigned to twenty-two families. Christine Heyrman argues that two social groups co-existed in Marblehead during the colonial period: the men who managed the fishery and the fishermen who did the work. The large number of fishermen in town made the population ethnically diverse, predominantly male, and mobile and seasonal in nature. Crime was a constant problem within this group. There was also endless in- and out-migration. Drastic differences between the power and position of the two groups in town were evident. While the fishermen greatly outnumbered their employers, they had much less power in town affairs. Both groups continued to grow through the seventeenth century as the town blossomed. In 1648, Marblehead was granted its independence from Salem and the town was incorporated by the General Court the following year. Shortly thereafter, the townspeople chose selectmen to oversee the town’s business, although the town remained tightly linked to its former parent because of the powerful position of Salem merchants in Marblehead’s economy.

84 Roads, History of Marblehead, 12. See also Vickers, Farmers and Fishermen, 95-97.
85 This policy seems to have succeeded; over 55 percent of Essex County’s fishermen came from Marblehead. See Vickers, Farmers and Fishermen, 100.
86 Roads, History of Marblehead, 13.
87 Heyrman, Commerce and Culture, 211.
88 Vickers, Farmers and Fishermen, 139.
As Heyrman argues in her book *Commerce and Culture*, Marblehead’s unstable population made the town unique in Puritan New England.\(^8\)\(^9\) There was little structure in the town. The first church, often the first institution gathered in a new Massachusetts town, was not established until 1684, more than fifty years after the town’s settlement. Heyrman wondered, “whether Marblehead held more village atheists than any other New England town?” and concluded, “if the majority of inhabitants were not actually hostile to religion, they were indifferent to Congregationalist orthodoxy.”\(^9\)\(^0\) Nor was there any great respect for the institution of town government among the majority of the population. The highly diverse population was not the “ideal material” for a Puritan community.\(^9\)\(^1\) Most inhabitants had little to do with local government and when they did, it was usually in opposition to it. The turnover of selectmen in Marblehead was almost constant, symbolizing a distinct lack of public support. In addition, the town’s population took the selectmen to court three times during the 1660s over local tax disputes. With scant regard for local government and religious institutions, the militia establishment in town fared little better.

Marblehead’s militia band was a part of Salem’s militia until after the separation of the two towns in 1648, but, Marblehead’s militia troubles began even before that date. Heyrman cites troubles in establishing a town militia as one of the factors that convinced

---

\(^8\) Heyrman, *Commerce and Culture*, 207-273.

\(^9\) Heyrman, *Commerce and Culture*, 223.

\(^9\) Heyrman, *Commerce and Culture*, 221. The same point is made by Vickers, *Farmers and Fishermen*, 92-93. The following portrait of Marblehead’s town government comes from Heyrman, pgs. 219-221.
the General Court to leave Marblehead under Salem's care for so long.\textsuperscript{92} In 1644, the General Court ordered Marblehead to fortify the harbor, an order that was not followed.\textsuperscript{93} At the same time, the Court ruled that "In consideration of the great default and neglect of the inhabitants of Marblehead in not exercising themselves in Martiall discipline—it is ordered that the inhabitants of Marblehead shall make choyce of some one who shall exercise the rest, that they may not be to seeke when special occations call for their assistance."\textsuperscript{94} Since the first officers from the town were not confirmed until the 1660s, it is unlikely these orders were carried out either. While Heyrman contends that Marblehead’s militia continued to be trained and overseen by Salem’s military leaders for a number of years, it is more likely, especially when taken with evidence below, that the community simply did not have a militia structure in the early days.\textsuperscript{95} This argument is strengthened by the fact that not a single Marblehead resident is listed in the town records with a military title until 1672, well after its militia company was finally established by direct order of the General Court.\textsuperscript{96}

In 1666, during a crisis with the Dutch, the General Court once again instructed the people of Marblehead to erect some fortification in their harbor.\textsuperscript{97} In addition, the court for a second time ordered that a militia company for the town be organized to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{92} Heyrman, \textit{Commerce and Culture}, 224.
\item \textsuperscript{93} Roads, \textit{History of Marblehead}, 16.
\item \textsuperscript{94} Quoted in Roads, \textit{History of Marblehead}, 16.
\item \textsuperscript{95} Heyrman, \textit{Commerce and Culture}, 224.
\item \textsuperscript{96} There are a few men titled "captain," however they are mariners, not militia leaders. See Bowden, "Marblehead Town Records," 266.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
ensure that the fishermen might be drilled and disciplined in military tactics.\textsuperscript{98} This order would have been unnecessary had the town followed a similar order in 1644. The General Court placed Major William Hathorne, a powerful merchant and political figure from Salem, in command of the new company and chose Samuel Ward of Marblehead as his sergeant. Hathorne, a magistrate of the Court of Assistants, was widely disliked in town as a powerful outsider and politically conservative figure in Marblehead’s rough political landscape.\textsuperscript{99} This time, the town evidently took heed of the legislature’s orders; the fort was completed in 1667 and later that year the town elected Samuel Ward as the first lieutenant of its own militia company.\textsuperscript{100}

While it is not known for certain the status of Major Hathorne in the Marblehead militia after Ward’s election and confirmation as lieutenant, the continued presence of Hathorne in the town in an official capacity is evident in the Essex Quarterly Court records.\textsuperscript{101} It seems probable that Hathorne retained his special position in Marblehead and its militia as overseer to ensure the obedience of the town to the law.\textsuperscript{102} Only one other record of the Marblehead militia exists, a record from November 2, 1675 listing soldiers impressed for active duty. It was signed by “Richard Norman, Ensign.”\textsuperscript{103} Norman had appeared in the town records as early as 1672 as “Ensign Norman,” but no

\textsuperscript{98} Roads, \textit{History of Marblehead}, 23.


\textsuperscript{100} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 3:435.


\textsuperscript{102} Heyrman also thinks so, see Heyrman, \textit{Commerce and Culture}, 224.

\textsuperscript{103} “Ensign Richard Norman to the General Court, 2 November 1675,” in volume 68, document 38 in Joseph B. Felt, compiler and ed. in \textit{Massachusetts Archives Collection} (aka “Felt Collection”), \textit{Massachusetts State Archives} (Boston: 1629-1799).
other evidence of his appointment survives; this is not surprising, taking into account that the General Court was appointing officers after 1668 and did not always publish notices of the commissions. It is likely, therefore, that Major Hathorne, Lieutenant Ward, and Ensign Norman made up the town’s committee of militia. No other officers for the town are listed in the records and Marblehead had no magistrates (other than Hathorne) or even a deputy to the General Court. There is little reason to believe, and no evidence to suggest, that the command structure of the town changed from 1667 to the start of King Philip’s War in 1675.

The two Marblehead men on the town’s militia committee were prominent members of the town’s elite. While Heyrman argues that the “so-called” elite in Marblehead were not generally up to the standards of other towns and did not enjoy much traditional influence and power, Richard Norman and Samuel Ward seem to have been the exception. Neither was ever in trouble with the law, as were so many of Marblehead’s elite. Ensign Norman had been a resident since 1648 and by 1658 was a selectman. His name is almost constantly listed in the town records. In 1670 and

104 For his listing as an ensign, see Bowden, “Marblehead Town Records,” 266. Ward and Norman, along with John Legg, were listed as a part of Marblehead militia committee after the war (exact date unknown) on an impressment order. The document is “Committee of Militia from Marblehead to the General Court, 1677?,” volume 69, document 50 in Felt, “Massachusetts Archives Collection.”

105 Marblehead did not send a deputy to the General Court until 1684. See Heyrman, Commerce and Culture, 224.

106 Although neither of them were in the original groups of the town’s settlers, (See Bowden, “Marblehead Town Records.”) this was not nearly as important in Marblehead with its high level of migration. For the prestige of local leaders, see Heyrman, Commerce and Culture, 220-222.

107 For information on Marblehead’s elite and lawlessness, see Heyrman, Commerce and Culture, 220-221.

1671 he was again a selectman.\textsuperscript{109} Samuel Ward arrived in Marblehead much later (he does not appear on the 1644 list of householders); the first record of him in town is in 1660 when he was made a “Packer and Gager” for the town.\textsuperscript{110} He quickly climbed the social ladder. By 1662, he was a selectman and in 1665 he was again chosen for that post, holding the position of town constable as well.\textsuperscript{111} He continued his rise in the town hierarchy, being appointed in 1666 as the town’s first militia sergeant by the General Court. The next year he was chosen the company’s lieutenant.\textsuperscript{112} In 1672 and 1674, he once again served as a selectman.\textsuperscript{113} It is quite clear that despite the dismal record of most of Marblehead’s local leaders, the General Court had picked two of the town’s ablest men to lead the militia and the militia committee (along with Major Hathorne). Despite the fact that local government in Marblehead was scorned and its actions ignored by a large segment of the population, especially the transient fishermen, in 1675-1676 even those men had to pay attention to the power of the local institutions. Many of them were about to be sent off to war by the town’s committee of militia.

Marblehead listed a total of twenty-seven men compensated by the colony for some type of service during the war.\textsuperscript{114} Of those men, twenty-one (78 percent) served with a known active-duty company or companies. The seven men with unknown service might have been compensated for any number of reasons, including active service which

\textsuperscript{109} Bowden, “Marblehead Town Records,” 246, 251.

\textsuperscript{110} Bowden, “Marblehead Town Records,” 234.

\textsuperscript{111} Bowden, “Marblehead Town Records,” 237-238.

\textsuperscript{112} His appointment as lieutenant, not captain, also signifies that the town had less than a full strength company of sixty-four men.

\textsuperscript{113} Bowden, “Marblehead Town Records,” 262, 273.

\textsuperscript{114} See Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.).
has simply not been recorded. Of the seven men with unidentified service, none of them are mentioned in any town or county documents before the war. Only one of them have a last name which is represented in the 1674 householder list of the town; a John Harris appears on the list, a possible relative of Griffin Harris. The seven men of unknown service in Marblehead are a complete mystery; what their service was, who they were, and why they were in Marblehead is all unknown. It is most likely they were transient fishermen, recruited for some task while in town during the war.

Unfortunately, little more is known about most of the twenty men from Marblehead who served in an active duty company. From the muster rolls, it appears that the town militia committee in Marblehead was called upon twice to send men to fight during the war. The first group of five recruits left to fight under the command of Captain Lathrop in August 1675. Marblehead's largest contribution to the war effort came with the call-up for the Narragansett campaign in November 1675; as many as twelve men from town fought under Captain Gardner. Three other men served on

115 The seven men were Thomas Beaues, Edward Cheeke, John Cleves, Walter Emmet, Griffin Harris, Richard Pearse, and Gregory Sowder.

116 Roads, History of Marblehead, 26-27.

117 The men were William Dew, Samuel Hudson, John Merrett, Mark Pittman, and Thomas Rose. See Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 133-141.

active duty during the conflict; Enoch Lawrence served with Paige’s troop early in the war and Rowland Ravensbee and Thomas Stamford served under Captain Brocklebank in the early months of 1676.\textsuperscript{119}

Of the five men recruited into Captain Lathrop’s command from Marblehead in the early days of the war, three had solid connections to the town. John Merrett (or Marriatt) was the son of Nichols Merrett, one of the original settlers in the town in 1636, and a prominent figure in town politics.\textsuperscript{120} Nicholas had been a selectman numerous times and held various other offices in town. His son John, who was thirty-two years old and married at the time of the war, had already been the town constable and a deputy marshal of Salem.\textsuperscript{121} In 1674, John was listed as a householder and allowed one cow on the town common.\textsuperscript{122} Mark Pittman had roots in Marblehead back to 1648, when he appeared on the list of town householders as deserving commonage for two cows.\textsuperscript{123} Pittman was considerably older than most soldiers; he was born around 1625, and was about fifty at the time of the war.\textsuperscript{124} He was married to Mary Shapligh and they had at least one child.\textsuperscript{125} On the 1674 commons list, Pittman was listed as having space for


\textsuperscript{120} Roads, \textit{History of Marblehead}.

\textsuperscript{121} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 5:421, 5:437; Bowden, “Marblehead Town Records,” 276.

\textsuperscript{122} Bowden, “Marblehead Town Records,” 282.

\textsuperscript{123} Roads, \textit{History of Marblehead}, 18-19.


\textsuperscript{125} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 2:442. He was probably related by marriage to David Shapligh, a Gardner soldier.
three cows. Thomas Rose appears for the first time in the town records on the 1674 commons listing where his space for two cows is acknowledged. In post-war court records, he is named as a shoreman or mariner, a step above a fishermen and one with a more definite link to the town. While it seems he was just starting out in Marblehead, he appeared to be doing well based on his middling position on the householder list.

It is curious that these three men were called to serve. Not only did they have connections to the town, two of them, Merrett and Pittman, were quite well placed in the town’s society. Merrett was the son of a powerful man in town, as powerful as any political figure could be in Marblehead’s anti-establishment climate. John was himself on the road to power in the town, serving as a constable. Pittman was not involved much in town government, but he was a stable, long time resident. In one of the many controversies over the role of selectmen in town, Pittman sided with Lieutenant Ward and Ensign Norman when signing a 1673 petition. Pittman and Merrett were old for soldiers; Merrett was thirty-two and Pittman was fifty, one of the three oldest soldiers recruited in all of Essex County. Both were married and Pittman had children. It is


127 Bowden, “Marblehead Town Records,” 279.

128 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 7:154. Vickers argues that those men who worked in the fishing trades on shore or owned land in town were generally the more “settled and sober householders.” See Vickers, Farmers and Fishermen, 95.

129 It is conceivable that Mark Pittman had a son of the same name who was the actual soldier. That would explain “his” service. However, no record of a son exists in any form and it must be presumed that it was the original Mark Pittman who served. This is simply one of many cases where the social portrait of a soldier does not fit with the overall recruitment pattern.

130 George Francis Dow, Topsfield Deaths from 1638 to 1800: Compiled from Town, Church, and County Court Records (Salem, Mass.: Salem Press, 1897), 5:278-280.

131 Two of the 357 soldiers with known birth dates were 50 years old, including Mark Pittman, and one was 51. The average age of enlisted men (26.6 years) in Essex County is based on this study’s count of enlisted soldiers in a known company, which totals 357 soldiers, with birth data known for 195 of them (55
hard to understand why these men, along with Thomas Rose, a man just starting out in town, were chosen for service. Perhaps their sense of civic duty was strong and they volunteered to go; this could especially be the case with John Merrett, who possibly saw military service as a way to solidify his rise to political prominence and escape his father’s shadow. The fact that they served early in the war, before the public realized how dangerous military service was, also points to the possibility these men might have volunteered.

It is easier to understand the militia committee’s other choices. The last two soldiers listed as serving with Lathrop have little or no recorded connection to the town other than their names on the pay lists. Samuel Hudson does not appear on any listing of townspeople from Marblehead before the war. He was married before the war, but the details of this and of his birth date are unknown. The one incident that places him in town before the war is a court record from June 1670. It is perhaps this incident, where Samuel Hudson was sentenced to be whipped or fined “for not assisting the constable, discouraging others, and using provolking speeches,” that brought him to the attention of the committee. While it may seem unlikely that a crime five years before would carry much weight with the committee in crime-ridden Marblehead, the details of the incident

---

percent). The median and modal age is 25 years. For details, see Appendix 1. Age data come from a variety of sources, including town histories and vital, town, church, and court records. For Marblehead these include Roads, History of Marblehead; Bowden, “Marblehead Town Records;” Chapman, ed., Vital Records of Marblehead; Dow, ed., Essex Probate Recs; Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs.


133 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 4:267. The crime was considered serious enough that the men were to “lie in prison” until they paid their fines.
prove otherwise.\textsuperscript{134} Not only had Hudson’s behavior been extreme in its disregard for proper authority, in the form of Constable William Beale, two of Beale’s friends, Major Hawthorne and Ensign Norman, who witnessed the act and testified to Hudson’s guilt were members of the militia committee.

The last Lathrop soldier, William Dew, had a very tenuous connection to Marblehead. Dew was born in 1653 and raised in Salem (later Beverly) by Edward Bishop, who in 1662, was given custody of Dew as an apprentice for seven years.\textsuperscript{135} William Dew would have completed his apprenticeship around 1670, freeing him to make his own way in life. He had “worked” as a soldier before; his probate record lists pay “for ye County servise under Captain Page of Boston” as an asset in addition to the pay from his time with Lathrop.\textsuperscript{136} The only other asset in the record is merchantable fish; Dew was probably a drifter who had spent some time in Marblehead as a fisherman. It is likely that this is how he was known to the militia committee. It is also quite possible, especially since he had already served in the military, that he volunteered for service when he heard Lathrop needed men. It was one way a man with few prospects could make a little money.\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{134} For a discussion of the details of this case, see Heyrman, \textit{Commerce and Culture}, 220-221. For a general discussion of crime in the city, see Heyrman, \textit{Commerce and Culture}, 218-221; Vickers, \textit{Farmers and Fishermen}, 96-97.

\textsuperscript{135} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 3:117. For information on Edward Bishop, see Perley, \textit{History of Salem}, 2:179-182.

\textsuperscript{136} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Probate Recs.}, 3:35.

While the recruitment pattern for the five men who served with Lathrop is somewhat obscure, the same cannot be said of the record of those men who were impressed later that year for service under Captain Gardner. Of the twelve men from town listed as impressed for service with Gardner, only two (16 percent) have any meaningful connection to the town in the surviving records, Henry Codner and Thomas Russell. Codner and Russell were familiar last names in Marblehead on pre-war householder records, although Henry and Thomas do not appear themselves. Codner was a servant to Jeremiah Gatchell, a member of one of the town’s original families. A few court records also place Codner and Russell in Marblehead in the 1670s. There is little question that the two were living in or very near Marblehead in 1675.

The other ten men (83 percent of the total) pressed for the Narragansett campaign are a different story. Not a single man has a known connection to the town before the war—they simply do not exist in any town, county, or colony records before appearing on the impressment lists in 1675. There is no doubt that when it came to pressing men for the dangerous Narragansett campaign, the committee of militia in Marblehead decided to scour the streets for transients rather than send a majority of their own permanent, long-term citizens. The town was bursting with a transitory population of

---

138 One other soldier has a single record which places him in town. In 1660, Thomas Weymouth appears in the Marblehead town records only once, in 1660 in connection with a land dispute which was never settled. There is no evidence he owned land in town. There is no other record of him in town and he is treated here as one of the men with no connection to Marblehead. See Bowden, “Marblehead Town Records,” 233.

139 A Josiah Codner and Henry and Roger Russell appear on either the 1648 or 1674 householders lists. There is no guarantee that these men were related. See Roads, History of Marblehead, 18-19, 26-27.


142 For a social portrait of these men, see Vickers, Farmers and Fishermen, 129-141.
maritime laborers.\textsuperscript{143} They came from all over the Atlantic world, most notably from England and Newfoundland. Even the Marblehead elites, who were dependent on the labor of these men, complained of “the concourse of many strangers” in town.\textsuperscript{144} They came and went constantly, as Daniel Vickers points out in his book \textit{Farmers and Fishermen}, they often “worked for a season or two, took up a page in a merchant’s book, and then vanished without making any further imprint on the colony.”\textsuperscript{145} They were relatively poor, socially unstable, and, according to many Puritan leaders, not very bright. William Hubbard described the men as “a dull and heavy-moulded sort of People, that had not either Skill or Courage to kill any thing but Fish.”\textsuperscript{146} These were the men the militia committee did not mind losing and who they sent to fight the war, much as Elizabethan deputy lords lieutenant had done in the past.\textsuperscript{147}

One question that emerges is why the majority of men pressed for the earlier campaign under Lathrop had town connections while the later soldiers did not. There are a number of possible reasons for this. First, Marblehead had suffered a tragedy with its first group of soldiers under Lathrop; four out of the five men sent (80 percent) were

\textsuperscript{143} Heyrman estimates the population of Marblehead in 1680 (five years after the war) at six hundred, a large population for the small land area of the town. See Heyrman, \textit{Commerce and Culture}, 213.

\textsuperscript{144} Quoted in Vickers, \textit{Farmers and Fishermen}, 132.

\textsuperscript{145} Vickers, \textit{Farmers and Fishermen}, 132.


\textsuperscript{147} While some militia committees might have also considered keeping men of the better sort in town for home defense, this is unlikely in Marblehead. The town’s position as a peninsula on the coast seems to have made it relatively unworried about Indian attack. The town even deemed garrison houses “needless.” See “Military Committee’s Report, March 29, 1676 with Particulars of Garrisons in Essex County Towns,” \textit{Historical Collection of the Essex Institute} XLI, no. 4 (1905): 355-356.
killed either at Hatfield or Bloody Brook.\textsuperscript{148} Hathorne, Ward, and Norman on the militia committee presumably did not want to lose any more of the town’s permanent citizens. The possibility that they might was strong; the General Court had warned the towns of the dangerous nature of the upcoming Narragansett campaign in its impressment order, reminding towns to send “men of strength courage and activity.”\textsuperscript{149} Who better to send than a large number of the transient fishermen who prowled the streets of Marblehead every day? There is some evidence from the post-war period that that is exactly who these men were; Leonard Belinger and David Shapligh are listed as fishermen after the war.\textsuperscript{150} The men were strong and fit, and their loss would be of little burden to the town. William Dew, the former apprentice with few ties to Marblehead who had been killed at Bloody Brook, created no burden for the town; his probate inventory was taken, his debts settled, and that was that.\textsuperscript{151} From the militia committee’s standpoint, transient fisherman were the perfect soldiers.\textsuperscript{152}

If that was the case, why didn’t the militia committee press such men for all of the spots in Gardner’s company; why the two men with a town connection? Surely there was no shortage of eligible transient fishermen in town. Why were Henry Codner and


\textsuperscript{149} Leach, \textit{Flintlock and Tomahawk}, 119.


\textsuperscript{151} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Probate Recs.}, 3:35.

\textsuperscript{152} Military men might have differed in their opinion. Like professional military leaders in Elizabethan England in the 1500s, some New England officers complained of the quality of impressed soldiers early in the war, especially in comparison to volunteers later in the war; those men who fought for bounties and profit. See Benjamin Church, Thomas Church, and Samuel Gardner Drake, \textit{The History of Philip’s War, Commonly Called the Great Indian War, of 1675 and 1676}, reprint of 1716 Boston, 2nd ed. (Exeter, N.H.: J. & B. Williams, 1829), 41-45.
Thomas Russell singled out as Marblehead residents for impressment? Both of the men had been in trouble with the law. That in itself was not special in Marblehead, but both cases had special circumstances. In 1669, Henry Codner was sentenced to be whipped or fined for abusing William Beale and his wife with reproachful speeches. William Beale was the same friend of Ensign Norman and Major Hathorne who was the victim of the incident with Samuel Hudson. The Beale family had several enemies in town; it appears they also had strong allies in the form of Norman and Hathorne. In addition, Codner had been earlier accused of burglary (the charges were later dropped), had lost a case for debt in 1670, and was known to owe the estate of Mr. Croad of Newfoundland, a well known fishing merchant, a whopping thirty-three pounds. It seems this was enough to land Codner, a servant, debtor, and troublemaker, in Gardner’s company that November.

Thomas Russell had also experienced serious trouble with the law. In 1673, he was twice sued for debt and lost both times, prompting the constable to attach some of his property. He had made no friends among the town’s elite when he signed a petition in 1674, protesting the actions of the town selectmen; a petition directly opposed to the views of Samuel Ward and Richard Norman of the militia committee. Russell’s largest problem occurred in November 1675, right before the committee of militia met to impress Gardner’s men. Thomas Russell and his wife Mary were convicted by the Essex

---

153 Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 4:160-162. Beale was also fined, for “breaking Henry Codner’s head” while the two scuffled.


156 Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 5:278-279.
Quarterly Court of abandoning Mary’s child (by her first husband) in the care of Jonathan Simmons of Pacasset in New Plymouth.\footnote{Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 5:370.} While traveling, the Russells employed Simmons to care for the child, promising to pay its upkeep.\footnote{The sex of the child is not mentioned in the court case, thus “it.”} They neither paid nor picked up the child, in effect abandoning it in Simmons’ care for two years. Simmons finally traveled to Salem to seek redress, claiming he had lost everything in the present war and could no longer care for the child. While the court did not find either Russell guilty of a crime (they ordered that Simmons be compensated out of the estate of Mary’s first husband), the incident must have sent shock waves through the community. Happening at precisely the moment the militia committee needed to press men for a dangerous expedition, Thomas Russell soon found himself marching off to fight in the Great Swamp.

Further proof that the committee of militia preferred to press men not connected to town is the fact that the other three men who served, Rowland Ravensbee and Thomas Stamford in Brocklebank’s command, along with Enoch Lawrence in Paige’s troop, were non-householders with no known connection to Marblehead in the pre-war records.\footnote{It is unusual that Lawrence, a trooper, is missing from the records. Troopers were usually culled from the counties’ better families, yet no records of him exist other than his enlistment records. It is possible that the property requirements for troopers, while not officially relaxed during the war, were relaxed informally. This notion deserves further study, which unfortunately is beyond the scope of this study. For information on the legal basis of the troops, see Chapter 1.} After losing four of their own to the enemy in their very first impressment group, the militia committee was not in any hurry to send more of the town’s permanent inhabitants to war. They instead chose transients from among the huge population of temporary maritime laborers in town or, in a few cases, troublemakers. Ironically, none of the men
pressed into service after the first group, those men who had been decimated at the Bloody Brook, were listed as being killed or wounded in battle.\textsuperscript{160} It did not really matter very much to the town in any case; most of its sons stayed home, thanks to the local committee of militia.

\textsuperscript{160} Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}.  
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CHAPTER FOUR

ESSEX COUNTY’S SUBORDINATE TOWNS AT WAR: RECRUITMENT IN ROWLEY

As satellite communities of larger commercial and trading towns, subordinate towns fed their larger neighbors, either with trade goods or food. Richard Archer argues that these towns, most of which devoted themselves to commercial agriculture, had generally higher levels of affluence and an even distribution of that wealth at the same time.¹ Several Essex County towns fall into this category, including Beverly, Gloucester, and Rowley.² Beverly and Gloucester, by the 1670s, had become typical agricultural subordinates to their larger neighbors, Salem and Ipswich.³ While not a typical


² Archer, Fissures in the Rock, 134-151. Archer’s labels are based, in large part, on the percentage and distribution of wealth in the towns throughout New England. He labels several Essex County communities as subordinate towns, including Beverly, Gloucester, Marblehead, and Wenham. This study, based on a closer reading of the Essex County records, adds Rowley to that list (Archer labels it agricultural, even though it does not fit his standard for such a town) based on its function as a textile center. It also changes Marblehead (which Archer concedes does not fit into his subordinate category well) to a secondary center and Wenham to the isolated town category. For his list, see Archer, Fissures in the Rock, 164-166.

³ For information on Beverly, see Beverly Town Records, 1665-1709, (Beverly, Mass.: Published by the Town, 1895); Early Records of the Town of Beverly, (Beverly, Mass.: Allen Print, 1905); Edwin Martin Stone, History of Beverly, Civil and Ecclesiastical: From Its Settlement in 1630 to 1842 (Boston: J. Munroe, 1843); C. H. Webber and Winfield S. Nevins, Old Naumkeag: An Historical Sketch of the City of Salem, and the Towns of Marblehead, Peabody, Beverly, Danvers, Wenham, Manchester, Topsfield, and Middleton (Salem, Mass.: A.A. Smith and Lee & Shepard, 1877); Alice Gertrude Lapham, Old Planters of Beverly in Massachusetts and the Thousand Acre Grant (Cambridge, Mass.: Printed at the Riverside Press for the Beverly Historical Society and the Conant Family Association, 1930); William P. Upham, ed., Records of the First Church in Beverly, Massachusetts, 1667-1772. (Salem, Mass.: Essex Institute, 1905); First Church of Beverly Massachusetts, The Register of Baptisms of the First Church in Beverly, 1667-1710 (Boston: Research Publication Company, 1903); Vital Records of Beverly, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849, ed. Topsfield Historical Society, Mass., 2 vols., Vital Records of the Towns of Massachusetts
subordinate center, which acted as a food production hinterland for a larger town, Rowley did feed its neighbors, with cloth and blankets. The citizens of Rowley busied themselves with textile production (along with subsistence agriculture); their textiles clothed Essex County’s towns.

The town of Rowley was situated between the towns of Ipswich and Newbury in the middle of Essex County. The original leader of the settlement was the Rev. Ezekiel Rogers from Yorkshire, England. He and his flock of around twenty families arrived in Massachusetts near the end of the Great Migration in October 1638. Arriving too late in the season to establish a town and having some matters of land ownership to settle, Rogers and his group stayed in Salem for the winter and finally settled Rowley after negotiations between the surrounding towns of Newbury and Ipswich and the General


4 There are a number of town histories of Rowley, although none is considered authoritative. The two most complete are: Thomas Gage, *The History of Rowley Anciently Including Bradford, Boxford, and Georgetown from the Year 1639 to the Present Time* (Boston: Feminand Andrews, 1840); Amos Everett Jewett, Emily Mabel Adams Jewett, and Jewett Family of America, *Rowley, Massachusetts, “Mr. Ezechi Rogers Plantation,” 1639-1850* (Rowley, Mass.: Jewett Family of America, 1946). In addition, there are a number of important genealogies about Rowley families, by far the most useful for studying the town as a whole is George B. Blodgette and Amos Everett Jewett, *Early Settlers of Rowley, Massachusetts: a Genealogical Record of the Families Who Settled in Rowley before 1700, with Several Generations of Their Descendants* (Rowley, Mass.: Amos Everett Jewett, 1933). There is one modern academic study of colonial Rowley, Patricia O’Malley, “Rowley, Massachusetts, 1639-1730: Dissent, Division, and Delimination in a Colonial Town” (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 1975) and one modern popular study Jos. N. Dummer, *Rowley, 1640-1936: A History of the Town of Rowley, Massachusetts Compiled from the Register of Deeds and Probate Records of Essex County* (Rowley, Mass.: The Jewel Mill, 1989). In addition, Chapter 2 “Those Drowsy Corners of the North” in David Grayson Allen, *In English Ways: The Movement of Societies and the Transferal of English Local Laws and Custom to Massachusetts Bay in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Norton, 1982), 19-54 is an important social history of the town.
Court were concluded in early spring of 1639. By that time, Rogers’ group had grown to around sixty families.\(^5\) The original grant to the town included some land along the Atlantic shore and a small corridor between the towns of Newbury and Ipswich to access the ocean. The town was established within the corridor about two miles inland, along a small stream eventually named Town Creek. The large size of the eventual land grant from the General Court was assured by the political skill of Rev. Rogers, who doggedly lobbied for as much land as possible.

Quickly, the townspeople went about the task of laying out the town by assigning house lots. The town layout included three major streets (see Map 4-1) where most of the earliest settlers would live. Forty-four of the original sixty families of 1639 stayed to become the original settlers of Rowley, the rest migrating elsewhere or back to England. Between 1641 and 1660, an additional thirty-six families joined the town, making a total of around eighty families in town by the 1660s.\(^6\) These families were tied by a number of bonds, most especially, as Patricia O’Malley has argued, by their Puritanism, their roots in Yorkshire back in England, and their common skills in the textile trade.\(^7\)

The Rev. Rogers was a powerful political influence in the early years of the town and an authoritative presence as a spiritual leader in the lives of the great majority of the town’s earliest settlers. Of the fifty-four men who were in town with Rogers in 1639, forty-one were full members of Roger’s church, while twenty-six out of the forty-three latecomers arriving by 1660 also joined the church. More than two-thirds of the early

\(^5\) Jewett, Jewett, and Jewett Family of America, Mr. Ezechi Rogers Plantation, 11.


\(^7\) O’Malley, “Rowley,” 22-35.
inhabitants enjoyed the privileges and responsibilities of full church membership.⁸ Even those in town who were not church members attended meeting and were highly influenced by the “Puritan Way” in Rowley. Yet, as in so many Massachusetts towns, just before the war, a religious controversy struck Rowley that divided the town into two camps.⁹

Rowley’s church had supported two ministers from its founding, one as pastor and the other a teaching minister. Ezekial Rogers, the town’s founder, was the church’s pastor, and Samuel Philips came to town as the teacher in 1651. When Rogers died in 1661, Philips was not made the town’s pastor. Instead, the town brought in Samuel Shepard, who was ordained in 1665. His premature death in 1668 opened a void in the church, which was finally filled in 1673 when Samuel’s older brother, Jeremiah Shepard, was called by the town for a year-long trial. In February 1674, a vote was taken in town to extend the pastor’s trial to another year and Shepard stayed on, but trouble was already brewing. A small minority had spoken out against the new preacher at the vote (Shepard’s qualifications and the cost of keeping two ministers concerned some) and dissention grew as time went on. The town soon divided among pro-Shepard and anti-Shepard camps and things got worse in late 1674 as the Rev. Samuel Philips, Rowley’s teaching minister, entered the fray against Shepard. Rowley was consumed by this controversy, which continued to divide the town through November 1675, when a council of five elders from surrounding towns convened to settle the question. Rev. Phillips, the

⁸ Jewett, Jewett, and Jewett Family of America, Mr. Ezechi Rogers Plantation, 23. See also O’Malley, “Rowley,” 23-27.

⁹ For a complete account of this controversy, see O’Malley, “Rowley,” 49-83, from which the following account is taken. See also David Thomas Konig, Law and Society in Puritan Massachusetts: Essex County, 1629-1692 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 101-105.
teacher, was commended for his actions in behalf of the “church’s peace,” while the congregation was both “praised and chastised” for their part in the affair. Rev. Sheppard was dismissed from the church after his current one-year term was over (unless the entire church voted to call him again) and encouraged to move on. Still smarting, Shepard stayed in town for three more years even after his dismissal, his presence in Rowley a constant reminder of the town’s division.

The second common bond among the inhabitants of Rowley was their northern English background, which was quite different from the majority of Puritan settlers in Massachusetts Bay, who usually came from East Anglia in southern England. Rowley was the only town in the colony to draw a large number of citizens from the northern English counties of Yorkshire and Lincolnshire. Numerous historians have argued that this caused great differences in many aspects of Rowley’s settlement and existence, including governance, town layout, and occupational patterns. David Grayson Allen, in his book *In English Ways* argues that Rowley was unique in a number of ways based on its Yorkshire background. The wealth distribution of Rowley was skewed compared with other Massachusetts towns, with a high concentration of wealth in the upper decile of the population, much reminiscent of the manor style economy of Yorkshire. “In such a sharply defined society, the frequent, if incomplete, reevaluations of inhabitants’ taxable wealth listed in the town records may have reflected,” Allen argues, “among other things,

---

10 O’Malley, “Rowley,” 77-78.
a Yorkshire consciousness of social place." In addition to his calculations of unequal wealth based on Rowley probate inventories, Allen points out that the land allotments made by the town were also less equal than other Massachusetts towns. “In Rowley between 1639 and about 1642, when all of the early granting took place, only 2 percent of the total of 95 grants exceeded 100 acres . . . . The top 10 percent in Rowley controlled 44.5 percent of the land in 1642, whereas only 31 percent was held by the same proportion of the population of Watertown.” Later allotments of pastureland, calculated in “gates,” confirm that this trend of inequality continued into the 1670s. Social and economic status was even conferred by the street placement of the house lot given by the town. Rowley, like the manor towns of Yorkshire, England, was economically stratified to a much greater degree than most Massachusetts towns.

Paradoxically, the political situation in Rowley was exceedingly democratic. Their Yorkshire background gave Rowley’s inhabitants specific ideas about who should govern their town and how. Rowley men imported a political system where “Open field agricultural societies [had] required almost all village inhabitants to take on large and small responsibilities.” This led to a town with widespread office holding, where “not only were local inhabitants constantly involved in executing duties as officers, but they

---

also took an active part in formulating local regulations."¹⁸ Even men at the low end of the economic scale of Rowley frequently served as officeholders.¹⁹ The town as a whole made all major decisions in frequent town meetings, leaving the selectmen to simply carry out the town’s wishes. This was very different from the majority of Massachusetts towns, settled by East Anglicans, where the selectmen quickly took over not only the executive role in town government, but also the formulation of policy.²⁰ In Rowley, the town leaders were caretakers who followed the town meeting’s instructions rather than policymakers in their own right. At times, this must have been very frustrating to the men who felt they should lead the town. While this wide base of political participation and leadership seems at odds with the stratified economy of Rowley, Allen argues the inconsistency was consistent with the Yorkshire background of a majority of the settlers, where the same paradoxical situation existed.²¹

The last important bond of the families of Rowley was their common skill in the textile trades, a trait shared by many from the Yorkshire region. While most towns in Massachusetts Bay were pursuing subsistence agriculture in their earliest days of settlement, such was not the case in Rowley. From the very beginning, the town’s economy was based on raising sheep and producing cloth. This was the most distinctive feature to most visitors of the town, as Edward Johnson pointed out,

¹⁸ Allen, In English Ways, 38.
¹⁹ Allen, In English Ways, 40-41.
²⁰ Allen, In English Ways, 42-43.
²¹ Allen, In English Ways, 38-54.
These people being very industrious every way... and were the first people that set up the making of cloth in the Western world: for which they built a fulling mill, and caused their little ones to be very diligent in spinning cotton wool, many of them having been clothiers in England...

The reliance on textiles rather than planting is also seen in the relative size of planting land given by the town compared to common pastureland allotted. Allen argues that land divisions in Rowley “showed characteristically modest holdings, particularly in comparison with those of a community like Watertown [Massachusetts, a town based on traditional agriculture]... [Because] entirely different economic and social habits and customs were operating in these two communities.” In addition, Allen points out that investment or speculation in land was very low, “unlike the case in other communities” that were more economically tied to farming. Rowley was a town intent on textile production. Well into the 1670s, Rowley continued in this tradition, devoting itself to the manufacture of cloth, as seen in the description of Samuel Maverick:

The Inhabitants are most Yorkshiremen very laborious people and drive a pretty trade, making Cloth and Ruggs of Cotton Woll, and also Sheepe wooll with which in a few years the county will abound not only to supply themselves but also to

---


send abroad. This Towne aboundeth with Corne, and Cattle, and a great number of sheep.\textsuperscript{26}

Most Rowley homes contained a spinning wheel and a number had their own looms.\textsuperscript{27} While it is certain that all of the inhabitants also practiced traditional farming to sustain themselves, there is little question that Rowley was a growing textile center by the time of King Philip's War in 1675. This reinforced Rowley's differences from the more traditional towns of Essex County.

Rowley's militia company was established when the town was settled in 1639. The town's first militia leader was Sebastian Bingham, who remained the commanding officer of the town's trainband until he moved back to England in 1650.\textsuperscript{28} It was Bingham who commanded a number of Rowley militiamen when they, along with some troops from Ipswich and Newbury, were ordered to apprehend Passaconaway, the "Great Sachem" of all the tribes of the Merrimack River Valley and bring him to appear before the General Court in September 1642.\textsuperscript{29} The men did not find the sachem, but instead took his wife and sons to Boston, for which they were paid one shilling per day and a

\textsuperscript{26} Quoted in O'Malley, "Rowley," 32.

\textsuperscript{27} O'Malley, "Rowley," 33.

\textsuperscript{28} Bingham was titled as captain in the town records, but there is good evidence that this title came from his militia service in England. As late as 1661, Rowley's militia company was too small (under 64 men) to support a captain and instead was commanded by a lieutenant. It was not until 1673 that Rowley had enough soldiers in its company to name a man (Samuel Brocklebank) as captain. See O'Malley, "Rowley," 30, 46; Nathaniel Bradstreet Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England. Printed by Order of the Legislature}, 5 vols. in 6, (Boston: W. White, 1853), 2:305; Gage, \textit{History of Rowley}, 179.

pound of gunpowder.\textsuperscript{30} When Rowley militia units next deployed, in 1653, Captain Bingham had returned to England. It is not known who was in command when a number of men from town once again joined militiamen from Ipswich and Newbury to scout for a large party of Indians believed in the area; they never found the natives and went home.\textsuperscript{31} In June of 1661 the town and militia company of Rowley, with the approval of the General Court, choose Samuel Brocklebank as their lieutenant and John Brocklebank, his brother, as their ensign.\textsuperscript{32} John Brocklebank died in late 1665 and was replaced as ensign by Mr. Philip Nelson by October 1667.\textsuperscript{33}

In the early 1670s, a militia controversy between the towns of Rowley and Topsfield had to be resolved by the General Court.\textsuperscript{34} By the late 1660s and early 1670s, a small village outside the original town center of Rowley had developed near the line with the town of Topsfield. Rowley Village, as this small community was known, was closely connected to Topsfield, the inhabitants attending church, paying church rates, and training with the militia there.\textsuperscript{35} In 1671, spurred by a now unknown incident, a number of villagers, led by Abraham Reddington, petitioned the General Court to sever the ties between Rowley Village and Topsfield. Other villagers petitioned to stay connected with Topsfield, claiming a great hardship if they would be forced to trek many miles into


\textsuperscript{31} Jewett, Jewett, and Jewett Family of America, \textit{Mr. Ezechi Rogers Plantation}, 228.


\textsuperscript{34} See Chapter 6 on Topsfield for a complete description of this episode.

\textsuperscript{35} Gage, \textit{History of Rowley}, 360-361.
Rowley for church service or militia training. The matter appeared settled in May 1672 when the General Court in Boston ordered that the Rowley Villagers train and pay militia duties in Topsfield. But, the matter remained before the courts until 1674, when the General Court finally ordered the men to train either at Rowley or Topsfield "as shall best suit their inclinations." The villagers complied and during King Philip's War a few served on behalf of Topsfield. Other families, who probably resided in Rowley Village by 1675, had sons impressed by Rowley during the war.

In 1673, the General Court confirmed the militia officers of the Rowley foot company as Mr. Samuel Brocklebank, captain; Philip Nelson, lieutenant; and John Johnson, ensign. The appointment of a captain for the first time indicates that Rowley's company was now at full strength of at least sixty-four men. It is likely that these three men also made up the town's committee of militia, although, as per law, a magistrate or the town's deputy to the General Court might have also sat on that committee.

---


38 The Curtis family, who had three sons fight during the war, fought under Topsfield's command. See Chapter 6 on Topsfield.

39 Most notably, the Tiler family resided in Rowley Village by the late 1670s (possibly earlier) and a Samuel Tiler or Tyler was impressed for Appleton's company from Rowley. See Gage, *History of Rowley*, 182.


41 Codified in the 1672 edition of the General Laws and Liberties of the Massachusetts Colony. See William Henry Whitmore, *Colonial Laws of Massachusetts, Reprinted from the Edition of 1660, with the Supplements to 1672: Containing Also, the Body of Liberties of 1641* (Boston: Published by order of the City Council of Boston, 1889), 110.
had no magistrate living in town.\textsuperscript{42} Rowley’s deputies to the General Court in Boston for the first year of the war, 1675, were Richard Swan and Maximilian Jewett.\textsuperscript{43} In 1676, Maximilian Jewett alone represented Rowley on the Court.\textsuperscript{44} It is probable that Jewett sat on the militia committee for town instead of Ensign Johnson, especially since Jewett was more powerful in town than Johnson. It is also possible that all four men served on the committee. Since no records exist from the committee, it is not know for certain.

The war came early to Rowley. Through the war, Rowley had twenty-eight men credited with some type of wartime service.\textsuperscript{45} Of the men, the details of service of twenty-six (93 percent) are known.\textsuperscript{46} In August 1675, the committee of militia summoned nine men to join Captain Lathrop’s company in its campaign in the Connecticut River Valley.\textsuperscript{47} Lathrop’s company, nicknamed “The Flower of Essex” for the supposed quality of its recruits, received a cross section of the town’s sons. Out of the nine Rowley men sent to fight with Lathrop, a frightfully large number, seven (77 percent) were killed; two in a skirmish at Hatfield on August 25, and five at the Bloody


\textsuperscript{44} Shurtleff, ed., \textit{Mass. Bay Gov. Recs.}, 5:77.


\textsuperscript{46} Only two men out of the total twenty-eight had unknown service. Jeremiah Jewett and Thomas Lambert were paid by the colony, but no service with a militia company or garrison could be found. See Bodge, \textit{Soldiers} (3rd ed.).

\textsuperscript{47} See Table 4-1 for the names of the men in Lathrop’s company.
Brook ambush on September 18. The town was still reeling from the loss when the call came from the General Court for more recruits, this time for Major Appleton’s company.

The members of the militia committee, Brocklebank, Nelson, and Jewett (and/or Johnson) must have had a very difficult time calling up more men to fight so soon after the town’s tragic loss of Lathrop’s soldiers. In all, ten men from Rowley were impressed to fight under Appleton’s command at the Fort Fight in December. Captain Brocklebank’s report on the committee’s renewed conscription efforts read:

To the Honoured Governor and Council,

This may certifie that we have impress’d twelve men according to our warrant, and have given them charge to fit themselves well with warm clothing, and we hope they will and doe endeavour to fixe themselves as well as they can; only some of them are men that are but lately come to town, and want arms, the which to provide for them we must prese other men’s arms, which is very grievous, (except they can be provided for upon the county’s account, which would be very acceptable if it could be.)

The names of the men are: John Hobkinson, John Lighton, John Stickney, Caleb Jackson, Joseph Jewett, William Brown, Thomas Palmer, Samuel Tiller, John Jackson, Joseph Bixbie, Steven Mighill, Simon Gawin

Dated Rowley, 29th of November, 1675


49 See Table 4-1 for Appleton’s men from Rowley.

50 “Samuel Brocklebank to Governor and General Court, 29 November 1675,” volume 68, document 68 Joseph B. Felt, compiler and ed. in Massachusetts Archives Collection (aka “Felt Collection”), Massachusetts State Archives (Boston: 1629-1799). Also quoted in Gage, History of Rowley, 181-182.
While enlightening, this report poses certain inconsistencies with the official records. Brocklebank reports twelve men sent to Appleton’s company from Rowley, but only ten were credited with service under Appleton by the colony. One of the men listed as serving with Appleton was not credited with that service; John Hobkinson (Hobson). Both he and John Jackson, who did serve with Appleton, later served in Brocklebank’s own company, as seen below. It is possible the committee pressed more men than necessary and the extra men saw service with Brocklebank at the next call-up. In addition, another man listed, Steven Mighill was never credited with service by the colony. It is probable that he hired a substitute; Joshua Boynton from Rowley, while not appearing on Brocklebank’s report, was credited with service under both Appleton and later Brocklebank himself. Another soldier listed in the report, Joseph Jewett, was living in Ipswich, even though his family was from Rowley, and his service was credited there.

In addition to the personnel matters, Brocklebank’s letter points out that the town provided warm clothing for the men during the harsh winter campaign (surely not much

---

51 The reason for the discrepancy is not known. Perhaps the quota was changed or a few men served who we simply have no record of at this time. See Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.*)*, 154-158.


53 Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.*)*.


55 The record of Joseph Jewett is perplexing. He lived in the section of Rowley called Rowley Village, which was also closely associated with the towns of Ipswich and Topsfield. Jewett is frequently mentioned in Ipswich records and is credited with his war service under Ipswich. His mention by Brocklebank is problematic. It is possible that he was recruited by Rowley and then released to serve with the men from Ipswich. In this study, he is credited with service under Ipswich, since that is where he is placed in the official records. See Chapter 3, Appendix 2, and Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.*)*, 157, 165. See also Frederic Clarke. Jewett, *History and Genealogy of the Jewetts of America: A Record of Edward Jewett, of Bradford, West Riding of Yorkshire, England, and of His Two Emigrant Sons, Deacon Maximilian and Joseph Jewett, Settlers of Rowley, Massachusetts, in 1639 . . . 2 vols.* (New York: Grafton Press, 1908).
of a hardship for a textile center) and that some of the men were in want of weapons, which were much harder to come by. But, unlike the case in frontier towns, the townsmen with arms in relatively safe, interior-positioned Rowley were willing to part with them, as long as they were compensated by the colony for their sacrifice. As the soldiers marched away in early December, many families in town must have worried that they would never see their loved ones again. Luckily, the town’s men who fought under Appleton were spared, none were killed and only one, Simon Gowen (Gawin), was wounded during the campaign.56

Almost as soon as the men had marched off to the Narragansett country, Captain Brocklebank was informed he would be in command of a company needed to relieve the army after the Fort Fight. While most of Brocklebank’s command seems to have come from other Essex County towns and even Boston, four men from Rowley found themselves marching off with their old militia commander in January 1676.57 This number includes two men Brocklebank reported as impressed for service with Appleton, John Hobkinson (Hobson), who didn’t serve with Appleton, and John Jackson, who did. In addition, Brocklebank commanded the probable substitute Joshua Boynton, who had also just returned from his service with Appleton. These men came back to town unharmed as well, all except Captain Brocklebank who was killed in the April 21, 1676, battle at Sudbury.58 In addition to the men serving with Brocklebank, Samuel Smith from Rowley served with a Captain Manning on a similar mission at about the same time. It is
possible that he volunteered for the duty or was recruited by another town; it seems unlikely that the General Court would issue an impressment quota of one soldier to the town. The last two Rowley men who served with a recognized unit were Samuel Cooper and Thomas Lambert, who served as troopers in Captain Whipple's troop from February 1676 to later that summer. Daniel Wicomb served as a quartermaster during the war and was compensated for that service.

In looking at the characteristics of the men impressed by Rowley's Committee of Militia, there appears to be relatively few differences between the recruits taken for the different companies. Thus the recruits sent to Lathrop and those sent to Appleton or Brocklebank were generally similar in their economic and social makeup. Rowley had a total of twenty-eight men compensated for service during the war: twenty-five in fighting units, a quartermaster, and two men with unknown service (who were most probably compensated for other contributions, perhaps of supplies, during the war). The Rowley

---

59 For examples of men being recruited by towns when traveling, see Douglas Edward Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk: New England in King Philip's War*, reprint of 1958 Macmillian ed. (East Orleans, Mass.: Parnassus Imprints, 1992), 185. Smaller towns were sometimes issued quotas of one man, but Rowley does not fit into that category. See Chapter 6.


61 Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.*)*, 137.

62 This number includes Captain Brocklebank and Corporal Palmer, who were compensated for their service. Brocklebank and Palmer will not be included in much of the analysis below because they were not recruited, but appointed to their positions. They are both statistical outliers of the enlisted men. Both were considerably older than the enlisted men and were married. They both served their town extensively: Brocklebank as a selectman (1651-1652, 1661-1664, 1670-1672), grand juryman, clerk of the market, deputy marshal, and judge of small claims; Palmer had been a selectman (1670), pinder, overseer, marshal, constable, and served numerous years on the Jury of Trials. In addition, both men were officers or non-commissioned officers in the pre-war militia company of Rowley (Brocklebank, as has been discussed, the town's captain, while Palmer was the company's sergeant.) None of the enlisted men served in any town offices. See Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs*; Benjamin F. Arrington, "Town of Rowley," in *Municipal History of Essex County in Massachusetts*, ed. Benjamin F. Arrington (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., 1922); Blodgette, "Rowley Town Records;" Gage, *History of Rowley*: Jewett,
men recruited for fighting units during the war averaged 25.8 years of age, which is slightly below the average age of 26.6 years for all Essex recruits. While overall the soldiers Rowley sent to fight were younger men than most towns sent, their youth is indicative of the population of the entire town, which, as Allen and O’Malley point out, was younger in general than other Massachusetts towns. The average age for Rowley men in Lathrop’s company was 22.8 years, while Appleton’s company average was 28.8 years and Brocklebank’s company average was 20.6 years old. After the town’s horrendous loss of younger sons at Bloody Brook, the militia committee selected older and more experienced men to send on Appleton’s dangerous winter campaign in December 1675.

Most of the men in the fighting units were unmarried at the time of their service. Out of the twenty-five men in fighting units, only four (16 percent) were married.

---

63 The average age of enlisted men (26.6 years) in Essex County is based on this study’s count of enlisted soldiers in a known company, which totals 357 soldiers, with birth data known for 195 of them (55 percent). The median and modal age is twenty-five years old. For details, see Appendix 1. The Rowley known sample is 20 out of the 24 soldiers of active units (83 percent) with known birth dates. The overall average for Rowley is of the enlisted men (excludes Captain Brocklebank (forty-seven years old) and Corporal John Palmer (fifty-three years old)). If they are added into the equation, the average age for men sent by Rowley becomes 28.2 years. Birth data for Rowley comes from numerous sources, especially Vital Records of Rowley, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849, 2 vols. (Salem, Mass.: The Essex Institute, 1928); Blodgette and Jewett, Early Settlers of Rowley; Jewett, Jewett, and Jewett Family of America, Mr. Ezechi Rogers Plantation.

64 Allen, In English Ways, 37-38; O’Malley, “Rowley,” 44.

65 Excludes outliers Captain Brocklebank and Corporal John Palmer.

66 The married men were Captain Samuel Brocklebank, Corporal John Palmer, John Harriman, and Thomas Lever. John Jackson was widowed. Marriage records are from Vital Records of Rowley, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849; Blodgette and Jewett, Early Settlers of Rowley; Blake Smith, Jackson, Nicholas Jackson of Rowley, Massachusetts and His Descendants 1635-1976 with Allied Lines. (Belchertown, Mass.: Blake S. Jackson, 1977); Jewett, Jewett, and Jewett Family of America, Mr. Ezechi Rogers Plantation; Lois Ware Thurston, “The English Ancestry of Leonard Harriman of Rowley, Massachusetts
However, if just the twenty-three enlisted men are examined, only two of them (9 percent) were married at the time of their service.67 One of the men, John Jackson, who served with both Appleton and Brocklebank, was a widower.68 Only one of the two married enlisted men had children.69 In Lathrop’s company, only two of the men were married, Corporal John Palmer and John Harriman, who had married in 1674 and did not yet have any children; the rest of the men were single.70 After the horrendous losses at Bloody Brook, Rowley’s Committee of Militia made sure that it sent only single men into harm’s way. None of the ten soldiers sent to fight with Appleton and none of Brocklebank’s men, except the captain himself, was married. Trooper Thomas Lever of Whipple’s troop was married, but this was usual for the slightly older and more affluent members of the colony’s cavalry arm; he was also the only enlisted man with children before the war.71 The militia committee made a priority of recruiting unmarried and childless men for active duty, especially after the surprise attack at Bloody Brook proved

---

67 John Harriman and Thomas Lever.

68 Jackson, Nicholas Jackson of Rowley.

69 Trooper Thomas Lever, see Blodgette and Jewett, Early Settlers of Rowley, 228.


71 For information on troops and troopers, see Chapter 1. For Lever’s children, see Blodgette and Jewett, Early Settlers of Rowley, 228.
how deadly the war could be. For the committee, keeping families intact was a top priority, as they were the bedrock of New England society.\textsuperscript{72}

Since most of the men sent to fight were not married and thus still living with their birth families, an examination of those families offers clues into the militia committee’s impressment decisions.\textsuperscript{73} The economic and social position of one’s family was crucial to the eventual standing any man would acquire in his hometown. Each family was placed in one of four categories, elite, leading, middling, or subordinate.\textsuperscript{74}

While economic, social, and political factors were used to determine a family’s category, in Rowley, the town’s widespread political participation and office holding meant that less weight was given to the political variable than was the case in other Essex towns in this study. A number of different sources exist for determining the relative place of families in Rowley around the time of King Philip’s War. The probate record of each family’s patriarch was examined in order to give a clearer picture of each family’s


\textsuperscript{74} See the Introduction, pg. 30 note 79, for a discussion of the categories and their determining factors.
economic status. Five of the soldiers had fathers who died before the war began.\textsuperscript{75} Numerous others lost their fathers soon after the war and their probate totals and inventories were used to help determine the family’s economic situation.

In addition to the probate records, three very useful resources for determining the relative economic ranking of the families of Rowley exist. The first is a record of the original land grants (house lots) made by the town in the 1640s.\textsuperscript{76} The house lots size was remarkably uniform in Rowley. When the land was laid out around 1643, there were fifty-nine original house lots; they ranged from six acres to one-and-a-half acres in size. The eight largest lots in size were assigned to major contributors to the town founding and were situated in the center of town between the meetinghouse and training field. Twenty-two families who were minor contributors each got two-acre lots, while the majority of inhabitants, twenty-eight families who did not contribute to the founding of the town, received one-and-a-half acre lots. These smaller lots were situated on the outer ends town. The size of the lots and their placement in town are one part of the evidence chain that establishes the hierarchy of social and economic standing in Rowley at the time of the war.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{75} Fathers William Hobkinson (Hobson), William Stickney, Francis Lambert, Thomas Palmer Sr., Peter Cooper, Hugh Smith, and Edward Sawyer all died before the war began. In addition, the fathers of the two men compensated by the colony with no known active service, Joseph Jewett and Thomas Lambert, died before the war. See George Francis Dow, ed., \textit{The Probate Records of Essex County, Massachusetts}, 3 vols. (Salem, Mass.: Essex Institute, 1916).

\textsuperscript{76} See Gage, \textit{History of Rowley}, 123-134 for the house lot sizes and locations.

\textsuperscript{77} See O’Malley, “Rowley,” 36 for the breakdown of lots.
The second and most important source on Rowley families is a tax list from 1662. While the list predates the war by more than ten years, it offers a clear picture of the economic situation in town for all of the families who had settled in Rowley to that point. Since there was relatively little movement into and out of Rowley after the town-founding period of the 1640s to 1650s, the list contains all but three of the families eventually paid for service during the war. The tax list measures the relative positions of the families in the economic and social hierarchy in town. The tax rate was based on total property and, as David Grayson Allen points out, Rowley’s unique situation of being a textile center meant that total property, not just land holdings, were crucial to status in town. Unlike traditional farming towns, Rowley families had more of their wealth tied up in moveable property (rather than land), making the tax list the most important measure of economic status in town. Rowley’s stability and isolation over the years makes the tax list of 1662, while not a perfect mirror of the 1675 town, an invaluable resource for understanding the town at the time of the war.

The stability of the town’s economic situation between the time of the tax list of 1662 and the 1670s is confirmed by the third and last source of information, a listing of “gates” or rights to common land in 1678, just three years after the conclusion of the war. The gate system was a direct import from the Yorkshire region in England that had been

---


79 Of active soldiers, only the families of Symon Gowen and Samuel Tyler, two newcomers to town in the 1670s, are not on the list. Strangely, the tax list does not contain a listing for Jeremiah Jewett, the son of original settler and leading citizen Joseph Jewett. For the tax list, see Stickney, “Ancient Tax List of Rowley.” For information on the quiet nature of Rowley’s in-migration, see O’Malley, “Rowley,” 44-45.

home to most of the inhabitants. In addition to planting land, the town assigned a number of “gates” which limited the number of animals a family could put on common pastureland (the gates were not physical gates, just the town’s label for the amount of access a family had to common pastureland). In any agricultural town, the amount of land assigned was important; in a textile center such as Rowley, the pastureland the town assigned to its citizens was crucial. Rowley assigned each household a number of gates based on the economic and social status of its citizens (which was also reflective of their original house lot assignment). Thus, many of Rowley’s citizens were given one-and-a-half gates, which entitled them to a certain amount of pasture, planting, and marshland. The amount of land given rose in greater than geographical proportion to house lot size. Thus those families given two-acre house lots received four-and-a-half gates, while those with three-acre house lots got thirteen gates, and so on.

Over the years, some gates were bought and sold, given as gifts, or inherited, but the land holdings remained relatively stable over the years. The town meeting kept tight control on the town’s land. A survey of the record by Patricia O’Malley lists the number of gates many families held in 1678, three years after the war. The number of gates held by each family gives us a good clue to the social and economic position of the various families in town just a few years after the war and also shows the stability of that status over time when the gates are compared with the 1662 tax list status findings (see Table 4-1). The families on the top of the tax list hierarchy are generally high on the

81 Allen, In English Ways, 33.
82 Allen, In English Ways, 36-38.
gates hierarchy list sixteen years later in 1678, while those lower on the tax list remained near the bottom of the gates list. Thus, in addition to being a good measure of the town’s social and economic makeup in 1678, the gates list confirms the relative stability of the town’s social structure and validates the tax list of 1662 as a reliable source of family place even at the time of the war.

Just which Rowley families were required to send their sons to fight? On the economic and social scale, the militia committee of Rowley sent a very representative group of its sons to fight King Philip’s War. There are young men from all parts of town and all types of families. The majority of soldiers impressed came from middling families (twenty-one out of the twenty-five active soldiers (84 percent)), by far the largest category of families in town. Only two soldiers (8 percent) came from a leading family, while another two men (or 8 percent) came from subordinate families (See Table 4-1). It is clear that Rowley’s militia committee, despite the town’s high stratification of wealth, was not basing its recruitment decision on economic or social status. Rowley was not sending only its lower class citizens to war; it was sending a cross section of the town. This seems strange, given the high level of wealth stratification in the town, yet it mirrors the paradox of widespread political power in Rowley. This is even more striking when looking solely at the 1662 tax list (See Table 4-1 and Appendix 3). If the list is broken down into quartiles, the equality of the militia committee’s impressment is even clearer. From the top quartile of families, five sons (19 percent) were impressed, while the second quartile had four (16 percent), the third had three (12 percent), and the bottom had two (8 percent).

84 For Rowley’s wealth distribution, see Allen, In English Ways, 23-25.
85 Allen, In English Ways, 38-54, at 49.
86 Captain Brocklebank is not included in this analysis because he was not recruited, but appointed by the General Court.
Table 4-1
Town Rankings of Rowley Militiamen Based on
Tax Rates, House Lot Size and Location, and Gates, 1643-1678

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAX RANK</th>
<th>CAT.</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>SOLDIER'S NAME</th>
<th>FATHER'S NAME</th>
<th>HOUSE LOT &amp; STREET</th>
<th>TOWN STATUS</th>
<th>GATES 1678</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Pearson, Joseph</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>Latecomer</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (tie)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Brocklebank</td>
<td>Hobson, John</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Latecomer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Stickney, Andrew</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>Wethersfield</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Lambert, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Holme</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (tie)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Brocklebank</td>
<td>Brocklebank,</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>2 Bradford</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (tie)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Palmer, John</td>
<td>1½ Bradford</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Bayly, Thomas</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1½ back street</td>
<td>Latecomer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>Palmer, Thomas</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1½ Bradford</td>
<td>Latecomer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Whipple</td>
<td>Cooper, Samuel</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>1½ Bradford</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Appleton, Brocklebank</td>
<td>Jackson, John</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1½ Bradford</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Appleton, Brocklebank</td>
<td>Boynton, Joshua</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1½ Bradford</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Whipple</td>
<td>Lever, Thomas</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1½ Bradford</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>Jackson, Caleb</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>1½ Holme</td>
<td>Latecomer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Kilborn, Jacob</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>1½ Bradford</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Harriman, John</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>1½ Bradford (bought)</td>
<td>Latecomer</td>
<td>5 ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 (tie)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Scales, Matthew</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1½ Wethersfield</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 (tie)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Holmes, Richard</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1 back street</td>
<td>Latecomer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 (tie)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Quartermaster</td>
<td>Wicomb, Daniel</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1½ Bradford</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>2 (Son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>Smith, Samuel</td>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>1½ Bradford</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Brocklebank</td>
<td>Wood, John</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Bradford (bought)</td>
<td>Latecomer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>Brown, William</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Latecomer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87 Andrew served with Lathrop; John served with Appleton.

88 Francis Lambert, Thomas’s father, died in 1647 and Thomas was adopted and raised by his uncle, Thomas Barker. Blodgette and Jewett, *Early Settlers of Rowley*, 220-21.

89 Gates are Daniel Wicomb’s, not his father’s, and may be less than his family had as a whole, taking division into account.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Rate</th>
<th>CAT.</th>
<th>Father’s Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>House Lot</th>
<th>Soldier’s Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Sawyer, Ezekiel</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>1½ back street</td>
<td>Latecomer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>Leyton, John</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1½ Holme</td>
<td>Latecomer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>Burkby, Joseph</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1½ Unknown</td>
<td>Latecomer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not on Tax List:**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S | Appleton | Gowen, Symon | Unknown |
| L | Unknown | Jewett, Jeremiah | Joseph |
| S | Appleton | Tyler, Samuel | Moses |

**TAX RATE** is the rank of the family based on the 1662 Rowley tax rate. **CAT.** is the family’s economic/social category based on the criteria in this study. L=leading family, M=middling family, and S=subordinate family. **SOLDIER'S NAME** sometimes contains two names when two different sons of the same family served. **FATHER'S NAME** gives the family patriarch’s name. **COMPANY** is the military unit the soldier served with. When two companies are listed, either multiple sons served in different companies (Jackson and Stickney) or one son served in two different companies (Joshua Boynton). **HOUSE LOT** records the original grant size of the family’s house lot in acres and then gives the location in town by the street name if known. **TOWN STATUS** is a measure of when the family arrived in Rowley, either as one of the original settling families, as latecomers arriving generally between the late 1640s and 1670 and those new to town who arrived from 1670 to 1675. **GATES 1678** refers to the amount of common land available to each family for pasturing their animals; the original number of gates was based on the family’s social and economic status in town and about equal to the size of the original house lot given (usually 1 ½ gates). The number changed over time through additional grants or purchase.

quarter of town’s families filled nine positions (35 percent). The third quartile of families in town sent five sons (19 percent) to active duty, while the lowest quarter of families had seven sons recruited (27 percent). Thus 54 percent of Rowley’s recruits came from the

---

90 Stickney, “Ancient Tax List of Rowley.”

91 Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.).

92 Gage, History of Rowley, 123-34.


95 While two active soldiers, Symon Gowen and Samuel Tyler, were newcomers to town and they and/or their families were not included on the 1662 tax list, there is little doubt, based on other measures, that they would have been in the lowest quartile in 1675. Thus they are included here in that quartile.
top half of the social hierarchy, while 46 percent came from the lower half. The equality of the militia committee’s recruitment pattern, when based on family economic and social status as seen in the 1662 tax list, is quite remarkable. Representatives of all types of families were sent, from Joseph Pearson, son of John Pearson the owner of the town’s fulling mill and third in town wealth in 1662, to Joseph Burkby, whose father Thomas was seventy-sixth out of eighty-five on the 1662 list.96

An examination of the economic and social status of Rowley recruitment by company makes the picture even clearer. Rowley men were chosen for three main company impressments: Lathrop’s company in August 1675, Appleton’s company in December 1675, and in January 1676 for Brocklebank’s company. Men also served with Whipple’s troop and Manning’s company, but not in any great number. The breakdown of the recruitment by economic and social status for each company follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Soldiers in Top Half</th>
<th>Soldiers in 1st Quartile</th>
<th>Soldiers in 2nd Quartile</th>
<th>Soldiers in 3rd Quartile</th>
<th>Soldiers in 4th Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>14 (54%)</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
<td>9 (35%)</td>
<td>12 (46%)</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (55%)</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (40%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocklebank</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>2 (66%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (66%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Whipple’s company (2 soldiers) and Manning’s company (1 soldier)

96 For Pearson, see Jewett, Jewett, and Jewett Family of America, Mr. Ezechl Rogers Plantation.

97 There were a total of twenty-four men, but twenty-six positions, as Joshua Boynton and John Jackson served twice; both served once for Appleton and once under Brocklebank.
Once again the equality of recruitment is evident, but, when looking at the data by company, it appears slightly less so. Appleton’s company was evenly split, with half of its men coming from the top of the town’s social scale and the other half from the lower halves of the town’s pecking order. Lathrop’s company had 44 percent of its recruits from the top half of the town’s hierarchy and 55 percent from the lower half. The equality of both groups almost mirrors the town’s overall numbers. But, Captain Brocklebank seems to have chosen the men for his command slightly differently, as three-fourths of his men were from the top half of Rowley’s social standings, while only one man came from the bottom half.\footnote{This difference is striking; it is possible that Brocklebank wanted men closer to his social status serving under him, or perhaps he and the militia committee chose men well known to him. The differences evident once the numbers are broken down by companies, as opposed to the overall numbers, are probably due to the influence of Whipple’s men. As troopers, Whipple’s men were predictably upper middling men and their inclusion skews the overall numbers slightly more toward equality than is the case when looking at the companies in detail. While the picture is still of overall equality in recruitment, the company data might put in doubt Hubbard’s description of the Lathrop’s men as the “Flower of Essex.”}

While the overall equality of Rowley’s recruitment is inescapable, it is worth noting that a number of the original leading families in town did not send any sons to

\footnote{The small number of men from Rowley in Brocklebank’s company may well have skewed this finding.}
fight in the war.\textsuperscript{99} None of the young men of the original town families, those that received original house lot grants of more than two acres were pressed for war.\textsuperscript{100} This fact is brought home even more clearly when the town’s recruitments are plotted on a map of the town. Rowley’s town layout was based along three main streets and centered on the meeting house and training field (see Map 4-1). Families were assigned house lots sized according to their contribution to the settlement of the town and their socio-economic status. The positions of the house lots in town were also based on status. As Allen points out, “Most wealth in terms of land grants was concentrated on Wethersfield Street and on the nearby highway to Newbury. These house lots were larger than other Rowley grants . . . . Most inhabitants on Bradford Street had holdings of about a half to two-thirds of the median while those along Holme Street and nearby were equal to it.”\textsuperscript{101} The town elite were originally centered on the land between the meetinghouse and the training field, off Wethersfield Street. Only one active soldier, John Hobkinson (Hobson), son of William, lived in this prestigious section of town (see Map 4-1).\textsuperscript{102} Most of the families of soldiers were situated along Bradford Street or Holme Street,

\textsuperscript{99} Jeremiah Jewett, son of Joseph Jewett, of one of the leading families in town, was compensated during the war, but no active service can be traced to him. Joseph Jewett, Jeremiah’s brother, was impressed for service in Ipswich, where he lived. For Joseph’s service, see Chapter 3 on Ipswich and Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 164-165. No Jewetts were pressed to serve by Rowley’s Committee of Militia. See Jewett, Genealogy of the Jewetts.

\textsuperscript{100} The families were the Mighills, Reyners, Careltons, Barkers, Bellinghams, Bringhams, Rogers, and Nelsons. See O’Malley, “Rowley,” 36. From Brocklebank’s report to the General Court, it is known that Steven Mighill was pressed into service in November 1675, but apparently he paid a substitute to go in his place, as he did not serve.

\textsuperscript{101} Allen, In English Ways, 31-32.

\textsuperscript{102} William Hobson, John’s father, bought the land in 1652 from Sebastian Bringham, who went back to England. Gage, History of Rowley. Thomas Lambert, one of the two men with unknown service in Rowley, was adopted by his uncle Thomas Barker and possibly raised in this section in Barker’s house.
Rowley House Lots by Family, with Soldiers' Families Noted, 1650-1676

Source: Jewett, "Mr. Ezechiel Rogers Plantation," endpaper.
while a number were on a back street, which did not even have a name. If the recruitment pattern was fairly equally divided in town, the question remains why so few of the original leading families had sons sent to war.

While the map view (Map 4-1) is a graphic representation of the original social hierarchy in town, it is based on the original land allocations through 1650. When placed in context using the 1662 tax list, it becomes apparent that the original town leaders were no longer necessarily the town’s wealthiest citizens. Unlike the stable period from 1662 to 1675, Rowley had experienced some changes in its social hierarchy from its original settling to 1662. O’Malley makes this case in her study, arguing that the loss of the forceful leadership of Rev. Rogers and the death and re-migration of a number of the original families changed the social scene in Rowley.\textsuperscript{103} Despite their less powerful economic standing in town by 1662, most of these originally powerful families still avoided having their sons sent off to war. But, it was not only the leading citizens among the original settlers who avoided having sons recruited.

When examining the soldiers from Rowley, it becomes clear that the militia committee preferred to impress sons of non-original families in town. The history of family settlement, when each family came to town and was given land, is set out in Thomas Gage’s \textit{The History of Rowley}.\textsuperscript{104} Out of the sixty families in town to receive original grants, forty-four still remained in town by 1675.\textsuperscript{105} Of those original families,

\textsuperscript{103} O’Malley, “Rowley,” 40-48.
\textsuperscript{104} Gage, \textit{History of Rowley}, 122-135. See also O’Malley, “Rowley,” 187-193 for an analysis of this data.
\textsuperscript{105} O’Malley, “Rowley”.
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only ten (23 percent) had sons impressed during King Philip’s War.\textsuperscript{106} Of the sixteen families who came to Rowley later, between 1645 and 1669, seven (43 percent) had their sons impressed for war service.\textsuperscript{107} In addition, two soldiers were impressed from families new to Rowley, arriving between 1670 and 1675, as Brocklebank noted in his report to the General Court.\textsuperscript{108} O’Malley argues that around forty-four of the original settling families stayed in Rowley and were still in town by 1675, as opposed to only around twenty-five late-coming families that can be identified in town by the time of the war.\textsuperscript{109} As the large majority of families in town, the original families should have contributed a majority of the soldiers to the companies, but this was not the case. This makes the discrepancy between impressment of the two groups even greater. It is obvious that the militia committee preferred to send sons of late coming or new families to town, sparing the original families to a large degree. It is also possible that the original families were requiring newer families in town to demonstrate their loyalty to the town by providing sons for service. In either case, it seems the strong common bond of homeland in Yorkshire between the original settlers was still in place and was an important incentive when the militia committee, composed entirely of original townsmen, picked its recruits.

If just the twenty-three active-duty, enlisted militiamen men are examined in detail, the strength of the Yorkshire bond is even clearer:

\textsuperscript{106} This figure does not include Captain Brocklebank, who was an original founder, because he was appointed not recruited. For a list of each soldier and his category, see Table 4-1.


\textsuperscript{108} See note 50 above.

\textsuperscript{109} In O’Malley, “Rowley,” 187-193 the author groups the inhabitants into “permanent settlers” (in this study “original”), “returned to England,” “moved elsewhere in New England,” and “later settlers” (in this study “late comers” and “new to town”).
Table 4-3
Town Origins of Enlisted Soldier's Families, Rowley 1643-1676

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Town Origin</th>
<th>Number of Men</th>
<th>Percentage of Soldiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original (Pre 1644)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latecomer (1644-1669)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New to Town (1670-1675)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If soldiers from families that were town latecomers and those new to town soldiers are combined, 61 percent of the men sent to fight from Rowley were from non-original families, despite the fact that original families outnumbered later coming families in town by nineteen families. An examination of the soldiers by company is equally illuminating:

Table 4-4
Family Origin of Rowley Enlisted Soldiers by Company, 1643-1675

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Original Family (Pre-1644)</th>
<th>Late Comer Family (1645-1669)</th>
<th>New to Town Family (1670-1675)</th>
<th>Late Comer and New Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>6 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocklebank</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Manning's company, Whipple's troop, and Unknown Men

---

110 This table deals with enlisted men (Captain Brocklebank and Corporal Palmer are not recorded), not positions, thus the two men who served twice (Joshua Boynton and John Johnson) are only counted once here. If the two troopers from Whipple's troop are taken out of the equation (because they were in a different category and were, perhaps, not impressed like the others) the numbers are even more striking. Original settler soldiers would be seven (32 percent), latecomers thirteen (59 percent) and new to town soldiers two (still 8 percent). Without the troopers, the overall numbers would have original families contributing 32 percent of soldiers while latecomers and new to town soldiers would represent 68 percent of all active duty militiamen.

111 This table deals with positions and thus the two men (Joshua Boynton and John Johnson) who served twice are counted twice.
It is apparent from these numbers that the militia committee, (made up of original settlers and Yorkshire natives: Brocklebank, Nelson, and Johnson and/or Jewett), was limiting the number of men from the town’s original families it placed in danger, even though original families made up the majority of families in town. This is especially true in the three main combat units, Lathrop, Appleton, and Brocklebank, which had between 50 percent and 75 percent of their soldiers drawn from non-original families in town. The first call-up of troops (for Lathrop’s company) saw the committee impress a whooping 75 percent of the enlisted men from late coming families to town. Appleton’s company, recruited for the dangerous winter mission against the Narragansett, had 60 percent of its enlisted men from later coming families, with 20 percent of its militiamen made up of men so new to town that Brocklebank mentioned it in his report, saying of them “only some of them are men that are but lately come to town, and want arms.”

This is especially telling, recalling that the warrant for the November 1675 quota warned committees that the campaign would be dangerous and asked them to take care in the men they impressed. This was apparently taken by the Rowley militia committee as a clear warning to impress only those it could afford to lose. Brocklebank’s company had the largest percentage of original townsmen, but its small size is easily non-representative and the captain, who was in charge of recruiting, might simply have chosen men well known to him to serve under his command. That the committee was less willing to lose the sons of its long established original families, even if they outnumbered newer families

112 Quoted in Gage, History of Rowley, 181-182.

in town, is quite evident from the recruitment record. The Yorkshire bond was still strong.

In addition to the militia committee’s singling out men from late arriving families, their selections within those families show a concern for the stability of the families while the son was away on campaign or if he was lost during the war. The birth order for seventeen out of the twenty-three enlisted men (74 percent) is known.\textsuperscript{114} Out of the seventeen known men, five were first sons (29 percent), four were second sons (23 percent), five were their families’ third son (29 percent), and three men (18 percent) were their families’ fourth son. This is striking in a town like Rowley, where its relatively young population made the number of younger sons relatively low.\textsuperscript{115} The vast majority of those pressed into service (71 percent) were not the eldest son in the family, but a younger son. This point is even more salient when looking at only the three main combat groups recruited by the committee. In the companies of Lathrop, Appleton, and Brocklebank, out of the sixteen known birth orders (73 percent known of the total), only three men (19 percent) were first sons. It is quite clear that Brocklebank, Nelson, and Jewett (and/or Johnson) made an effort to avoid impressing a family’s crucial first son. While primogeniture was not practiced in New England, first sons were favored in order to assure the continuation of the family status. They were often given land sooner and


\textsuperscript{115}Allen, \textit{In English Ways}, 37.
married sooner and better than their younger brothers.\textsuperscript{116} In addition, they were often tasked in their father’s will with taking care of their mother (or their father’s subsequent wife).\textsuperscript{117} First sons were crucial to the continuation of the family and the records show that the militia committee was very reluctant to impress them.

Two families in town had multiple family members impressed. The Stickneys contributed their fourth son Andrew to Lathrop’s command (where amazingly he survived the Bloody Brook ambush) and then saw their third son John march off with Appleton.\textsuperscript{118} The two arms of the Jackson family, headed by brothers William and Nicholas, each had a son pressed for service. The William Jackson family sent second son John to war twice, once with Appleton and again with Broklebank. However, the Jacksons’ eldest son Samuel was not sent.\textsuperscript{119} John’s cousin, Caleb, third son of the Nicholas Jackson family, joined his cousin in the campaign with Appleton while his eldest brother stayed home.\textsuperscript{120} Even in those families who had multiple sons impressed, or perhaps most of all in those families, the militia committee worked hard not to select a first son.


\textsuperscript{117} Wilson, \textit{Heart of a Man}, 102-103.

\textsuperscript{118} Stickney, \textit{Stickney Family}.

\textsuperscript{119} Jackson, \textit{Nicholas Jackson of Rowley}, 1, 35.

\textsuperscript{120} Jackson, \textit{Nicholas Jackson of Rowley}, 1.
Of the five first sons that served, one had special circumstances surrounding his service that might explain his impressment by the committee. At thirty-five years of age, Samuel Smith, the first son of Hugh Smith, was the oldest of the enlisted men from Rowley to serve. His father had died almost twenty years before the war in 1656, when Samuel was sixteen. It is quite possible that his father’s early death put Samuel in a hard economic position, a possibility strengthened by his relatively low position on the 1662 tax list (fifty-eighth out of eighty-five) and the fact that he did not marry until after the war at the age of thirty-seven. It is possible that Samuel volunteered for service in the hope of bettering his economic position or that he was impressed by the committee with their understanding he no longer had the special circumstance of being a first son in the traditional sense. From this example and all the others, there remains little doubt that family background played a major role in the impressment choices of the Rowley Committee of Militia.

As notable as the findings on family are, there were other factors the committee took into consideration while making its conscription decisions. The religious controversy that swirled in Rowley in the 1670s deeply affected all aspects of town life and seems to have played a part in the militia committee’s decisions on impressment.

121 Blodgette and Jewett, *Early Settlers of Rowley*, 344.


123 For tax list, see Appendix 3 from Stickney, “Ancient Tax List of Rowley.” For the marriage, see *Vital Records of Rowley, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849.*

124 There is no record that his mother Mary was still alive in 1675 or if she had died. There is also no record of any siblings. Blodgette and Jewett, *Early Settlers of Rowley*, 344. For information on volunteering to better one’s social position, see Frank Tallett, *War and Society in Early Modern Europe, 1495-1715*, ed. Jeremy Black, *War in Context* (London: Routledge, 1992), 97-104.
during King Philip’s War. The conflict over the minister in town divided the people of Rowley into two camps: the majority who were against the appointment of Rev. Shepard to the permanent position of town minister and a vocal minority that supported Shepard. By examining the petitions and court documentation surrounding the case, the faction each family in town supported was determined for fourteen of the twenty-three enlisted men (61 percent). Ten of the men are from families that do not appear on any documents concerning the controversy; some were non-church members without a say in the matter, while others had an opinion that was simply not recorded. The records also reveal the various positions of the members of the town’s committee of militia. Samuel Brocklebank and Philip Nelson, the two highest ranking members of the committee, were in the pro-Shepard faction. The third member of the committee, whether it was Ensign John Johnson or Deputy Maximillian Jewett, was in the majority anti-Shepard camp.

Looking at the available information on the men impressed, it is obvious that Brocklebank and Nelson used their majority vote in the committee to great advantage.

It is probable that Brocklebank and Nelson were using their seats on the militia committee to take some measure of revenge for their failed attempt to place Rev. Shepard on Rowley’s pulpit permanently. O’Malley points out that the two men were among Shepard’s staunchest supporters. As it became clear by the fall of 1675 that their bid

---

125 A militiaman was counted in one camp or the other based on either his or a prominent member of his family’s (usually his father’s) signature on either a petition or mention in a court case. These names fluctuated over time, but a general sense of each family’s stand can be found by looking at the records. For the petitions, see Gage, History of Rowley, 74-77; Jewett, Jewett, and Jewett Family of America, Mr. Ezechi Rogers Plantation; O’Malley, “Rowley,” 243-252. For the court documents, see Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 6:325-328. In her dissertation, Patricia O’Malley focuses on the controversy and its effects on the town, see O’Malley, “Rowley,” 61-111.

would fail and their reputation as town leaders was damaged, the need to lash out at their political foes would have been very strong. Rowley’s unique political situation based on its Yorkshire background, of widespread political participation and weak town leaders probably exacerbated the situation.\textsuperscript{127} Brocklebank and Nelson had less power than leaders of other Massachusetts towns to rebuke their detractors, yet colony law and the power of the General Court assured their control of the militia committee. At the very time they wanted to re-assert their power in town, an act that would be difficult in the everyday governance of Rowley, they were put in a position to impress men for the war.

Of the fourteen men enlisted with known connections to a faction in the church dispute, only two (14 percent) were from families who supported Rev. Shepard’s bid to become the town minister.\textsuperscript{128} Twelve men (86 percent of the total known men) who had publicly come out against the minister or were members of families that had done so wound up marching off to war.\textsuperscript{129} While it is true that a majority in town were against Rev. Shepard, the numbers in that faction did not amount to as large a percentage as was seen in the companies sent off to war.\textsuperscript{130} In addition, a number of the ten enlisted men whose attitudes about the controversy are unknown were probably anti-Shepard in their beliefs, as that was the position of a majority of people in town. Their inclusion would

\textsuperscript{127} Allen, \textit{In English Ways}, 18-20.

\textsuperscript{128} John Wood of Brocklebank’s company and Richard Holmes of Lathrop’s command.

\textsuperscript{129} In Appleton’s company: Joseph Burkby, Caleb Jackson, and John Leyton. John Jackson and Joshua Boynton were from Anti-Shepard families and served with both Appleton and Brocklebank. In Lathrop’s company: Thomas Bayly, Jacob Kilborn, Joseph Pearson, Ezekiel Sawyer, and Matthew Scales. Thomas Lever in Whipple’s troop was also in the anti-Shepard camp.

\textsuperscript{130} While she never gives actual numbers of the families in each camp, Patricia O’Malley implies that the town was split two-thirds against Shepard and one-third for him. These percentages fluctuated over time. See O’Malley, “Rowley,” 61-78.
make the percentage of anti-Shepard men impressed even higher.\textsuperscript{131} It seems probable that Brocklebank and Nelson, perhaps over the objection of the third member of the committee (the anti-Shepard Jewett or Johnson), were exacting a form of revenge on their political enemies by impressing their sons for war; a revenge that was hard to come by in the regular course of Rowley’s Yorkshire-inspired governance, but one that was facilitated by the colony’s militia law.

Another piece of Rowley’s recruitment puzzle is the role crime played in the committee of militia’s choices. Debt, a factor in some towns’ recruitment decisions, seems to have played little or no factor in Rowley.\textsuperscript{132} O’Malley argues that in the early days of the town, the example set by town founder Rev. Rogers precluded criminal matters: “The impact of this dominance on the moral tone of the town can be seen in the volumes of printed records of the colony . . . . No Rowley name appeared in its records between 1640 and 1660 in connection with any criminal matters.”\textsuperscript{133} But, after Rogers’ death, criminal activity increased slightly in town.\textsuperscript{134} Despite this rise in crime, Rowley was relatively peaceful, especially when compared to other Essex County towns such as

\textsuperscript{131} The documentary record of the minority of families who were pro-Shepard is actually better than the records of the majority who were against him, many of whom were part of a silent majority. The members of the pro-Shepard faction were very vocal in their support and signed petitions and brought court suits frequently. See O’Malley, “Rowley,” 61-78.

\textsuperscript{132} Only two men had any problems with debt, but, it was long before the war. John Jackson was sued twice for debt in 1662, more than thirteen years before the war. See Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 2:386-7, 2:410-412. Corporal John Palmer was sued for debt in 1670, but he was acquitted of the charge. See Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 4:236. It is highly unlikely that any of these cases had an impact on the militia committee in 1675.

\textsuperscript{133} O’Malley, “Rowley,” 53.

\textsuperscript{134} O’Malley, “Rowley,” 53-58.
Salem or Marblehead. Within its tranquil environment, there is little doubt the town took notice when criminal activity did occur. There is also no doubt that, as town leaders, the members of the militia committee were well aware of any transgressions.

Out of the twenty-three enlisted men from Rowley, five (22 percent) had criminal records. All the men had committed their crimes in recent years; none were more than four years out of the militia committee’s memory. In November 1671, Ezekiel Sawyer, a soldier impressed into Lathrop’s company, was fined for several misdemeanors committed while he and his friend Thomas Spofford were on the night watch in Rowley. They ran a rope across Rowley’s main street, causing a rider the next morning to be thrown from his horse. They also ran a cart into the river and placed another cart outside a family’s door to trap them inside their home. The boys confessed and offered an apology to the quarterly court. While the series of pranks sounds harmless, the fact that they endangered the horse rider’s life and disrespected the office of town watch made the crimes serious in the eyes of the local magistrates. The court wrote: “[you were] to watch for the good & safety of the Town to prevent disorder,

135 Edwin Powers, Crime and Punishment in Early Massachusetts, 1620-1692: A Documentary History (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), 400-416, cites only 257 total criminal cases in all of Essex County over the 1671-1674 period (an average of 85 a year in the county) and shows that the Court of Assistants, which dealt with the most serious capital crimes, saw on average only 8 cases a year from the whole colony. When this is broken down into the individual towns in Essex County and adjusted for the size of those towns, it becomes quite clear that a small community like Rowley saw very few criminal cases and it is also apparent that those cases must have been widely known about and discussed in town. Many historians have commented on the relatively small number of criminal offenses in colonial New England. See Zechariah Chaffe, Jr., “Colonial Courts and the Common Law,” in Essays in the History of Early American Law, ed. David H. Flaherty (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1969); Kermit L. Hall, The Magic Mirror: Law in American History (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 30-31; George Lee Haskins, Law and Authority in Early Massachusetts: a Study in Tradition and Design (New York: Macmillan, 1960); Peter Charles Hoffer, Law and People in Colonial America (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992); Konig, Law and Society; Edgar J. McManus, Law and Liberty in Early New England: Criminal Justice and Due Process, 1620-1692 (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993).

136 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 4:441-442.
whereas [you] carried it as if some enemy had broken into town to block the way & lay stumbling blocks & doe mischief."\textsuperscript{137}

The young men were sentenced to be whipped or pay a fine by the court and to appear before the church to ask forgiveness as well. Thomas Spofford appeared before the church in Rowley the next Sunday, acknowledged his wrongdoing, and asked forgiveness. When Ezekiel Sawyer rose, he gave a very different speech. According to the church records, Sawyer “instead of acknowledging his disorderly carriage did charge the church with partiality in letting pass greater matters without calling for repentance from them.”\textsuperscript{138} Sawyer’s speech shocked the congregation and he was ordered to “consider his sin and the offense he had given the church by his speech and carriage at this time.”\textsuperscript{139} Two weeks later, Sawyer appeared and “his proud and contemptuous spirit was subdued and he made open confession and contrition for his evil carriages.”\textsuperscript{140} There can be no doubt that his actions and especially his defiance of authority labeled him a troublemaker in town, a label known to the militia committee. It is not hard to see why he was picked to serve on the first company called up in Rowley during the war, while his repentant partner in crime was not.

\textsuperscript{137} Quoted in Jewett, Jewett, and Jewett Family of America, \textit{Mr. Ezechi Rogers Plantation}, 127.
\textsuperscript{138} Quoted in Jewett, Jewett, and Jewett Family of America, \textit{Mr. Ezechi Rogers Plantation}, 127.
\textsuperscript{139} Quoted in Jewett, Jewett, and Jewett Family of America, \textit{Mr. Ezechi Rogers Plantation}, 127.
\textsuperscript{140} Quoted in Jewett, Jewett, and Jewett Family of America, \textit{Mr. Ezechi Rogers Plantation}, 127.
Two enlisted men impressed by the committee had criminal convictions for fornication, the most common crime prosecuted in the Essex Quarterly Court.\textsuperscript{141} Leonard Harriman, one of only two married enlisted men, was convicted of fornication in October 1674, a scant ten months before he was impressed into Lathrop’s command.\textsuperscript{142} He went on to marry the woman, but the damage to his reputation in town was already done. It is probably not a coincidence that he was the only married enlisted man pressed into one of the three combat companies. Samuel Smith, the sole soldier from Rowley to serve with Captain Manning’s company, was convicted of fornication in 1673 with Hannah Button. He was sentenced to pay a fine or be whipped.\textsuperscript{143} Whether Smith’s infraction played a part in his service is less clear, as he possibly volunteered for service or was impressed while out of town.\textsuperscript{144}

The widower John Jackson also had some trouble with the law. In April 1675, just four months before he was pressed first into Appleton’s company for the Narragansett campaign, Jackson was fined for his strange behavior in Rowley. The lengthy court action summoned over ten witnesses to recount Jackson’s “crime.”\textsuperscript{145} Jackson was seen by John Pickard “to have a strange motion upon his spirit and . . . he wrought as if he would destroy himself . . . the reason of which frame he told me he could

\textsuperscript{141} Forty-eight cases of fornication were tried in Essex County between 1671 and 1674, which made up 18.7 percent of the total 257 prosecutions in the county during those years. Powers, \textit{Crime and Punishment}, 405.

\textsuperscript{142} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 5:408.

\textsuperscript{143} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 5:233.

\textsuperscript{144} See note 126 above.

\textsuperscript{145} The following account is taken from Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 6:27-29.
not tell me . . . it appears he hath not the use of his reason as other men."\textsuperscript{146} Many testified that Jackson's latest bout of "distemper" had begun at the death of his wife. Jackson's parents testified that this sort of behavior had happened to Jackson before, about fourteen or fifteen years since, their son was taken with an illness in his head and was struck with such a melancholy that it was thought he was dead, and he spent one summer in this condition, acting as if bereaved of his understanding. Further that he had never fully recovered . . . Also that he had not the capacity to work at his calling.\textsuperscript{147}

Perhaps it was the fact that Jackson could not function in civil society that caused the militia committee to impress him into Appleton's company. He seems to have made an adequate soldier; otherwise he probably would not have also joined Brocklebank during his campaign. Perhaps the militia committee thought Jackson would function better away from town and the constant visual reminders of his wife's death, which seem to have thrust him back into his illness. The reason the militia committee chose to place such a disturbed young man in combat is forever lost, but the fact that the committee had a disturbed man pressed into service fits their pattern of recruiting difficult men.

The fifth instance of a man with a criminal record the committee sent to war is a very unusual case. John Layton was prosecuted in November 1675 for "running away after being impressed for the service against the Indians and alleging that another man was sent to serve in his room, who was accepted by him who had the pressed

\textsuperscript{146} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 6:27-28.

\textsuperscript{147} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 6:29.
command.\textsuperscript{148} After hearing the evidence, the court ordered Layton be cleared of the penalty for running from the press. It also ordered that he pay court costs for the prosecution because "he ought to have brought his discharge under the officer’s hand" when the matter was first brought forward.\textsuperscript{149} It seems clear that Layton was pressed by the militia committee to serve with Lathrop’s command in August and hired a substitute in his place.\textsuperscript{150} By not informing the committee of his substitution, Layton ended up in court on a charge of avoiding the press. While he had avoided serving with Lathrop (and probably dying at the Bloody Brook), Layton was pressed once again just a few weeks after his trial, this time to serve with Appleton at the Fort Fight.\textsuperscript{151} It is possible that the committee of militia, which was probably embarrassed by the incident, took its own method of revenge by pressing him a second time.

Interestingly, one man who had run seriously afoul of the law and was singled out by the militia committee for impressment never served. Steven Mighill was named in Brocklebank’s report to the General Court as an impressed man in November 1675, but he avoided service, probably by hiring a substitute. The only member of a leading original family to be pressed, he had a well-known criminal record. The married Mighill, on several occasions, had harassed and propositioned Margaret Tophet, a servant in town through the early 1670s. In 1674, she was finally forced to present him to the court,

\textsuperscript{148} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 6:89.

\textsuperscript{149} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 6:89.

\textsuperscript{150} An examination of all the evidence does not give any clues to who in Lathrop’s command was Layton’s hired replacement.

\textsuperscript{151} Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 155, 413.
which was the only means of stopping his lewd behavior.\textsuperscript{152} His scandalous actions would have been cause of great concern in town; it seems that the militia committee took his actions into account when it choose to impress him for Appleton's company. His call up came despite the facts that he was married and the son of one of the original leading families in town. Even though he never served during the war, Mighill's case is proof that a criminal past or inappropriate behavior was one way a man could find himself atop the committee's list, no matter what other factors weighted in his favor to avoid the press.

It is plain that a man's criminal past could harm his chances with the militia committee. Two men out of nine (22 percent) from Rowley that went to Lathrop's company had criminal problems, while three men (33 percent) who were pressed for Appleton's harsh campaign were so tarnished.\textsuperscript{153} These are surprising numbers when the lack of crime in Rowley is taken into account. Almost all of the men in town with a recent criminal record, from fornication to mental illness, found themselves prime candidates for the press masters in Rowley.

The town survived the war, but at a great cost in the lives of its young men. Seven men, all soldiers of Lathrop's company, were killed, making the town's enlisted casualty rate 30 percent. Yet, despite these frightful losses early in the war, the town of Rowley continued to do its part and sent more of its young men off to fight. The committee of militia in town, Captain Brocklebank, Lieutenant Nelson, and either Ensign Johnson or Deputy Jewett, drew up list after list of young men to send into harm's way.

\textsuperscript{152} Konig, \textit{Law and Society}, 122.

\textsuperscript{153} The Appleton figures include the original press of Steven Mighill even though he did not serve. Without him the rate is 22 percent.
Their choices tell us much about their town’s values. Most of the men sent to fight were young and unmarried. There is little doubt that Rowley’s Committee of Militia took family background into consideration when making its impressment choices in 1675 and 1676. The committee chose men from all strata of the economic and social spectrum for service. However, no sons of the town original elite were picked for service, and a majority of men, especially in the three fighting companies, were from families that had missed the town’s founding.\footnote{This summary does not include the impressment of Steven Mighill, since he did not serve.} The members of the militia committee were also very reluctant to impress first sons into dangerous service. The town’s 1670s religious controversy also played a part in the committee’s deliberations, with the committee dominated by pro-Shepard forces recruiting large numbers of the sons of their foes in the anti-Shepard camp into militia service. Lastly, criminal or abnormal behavior was a definite factor in the militia committee’s work. While few men in Rowley had trouble with the law, almost all of those who did found themselves marching off to war. Local control of militia impressment, like local control of the congregational church, meant that a community’s values, in this case Rowley’s values, were mirrored in those it sent out of town to fight.

While there are generally few differences between the men recruited from one company and mission to the other, a few illuminating trends do emerge. The factors the militia committee regarded as negative (criminal record, being in the anti-Shepard faction, or not being one from one of the town’s original families) were examined and broken down by company (See Table 4-5). There seems to be little difference between the companies in impressing men with marks against them. The company with the...
highest percentage of marked men is Appleton’s company, with 90 percent. This is not surprising, given the warning local committees of militia were given by the General Court about the mission’s dangerous nature. It is also telling that Appleton’s command, with its high percentage of marked men, was recruited during the town’s period of mourning the loss of men at Bloody Brook. The realization that many of the recruits might not come back home, while always in the back of the committee’s mind,

Table 4-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Positions with a Negative factor</th>
<th>Total Negatives Marks</th>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Anti-Shepard</th>
<th>Non-Original Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall 25 Positions</td>
<td>21 (84%)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>13 (52%)</td>
<td>15 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop 8 Positions</td>
<td>7 (88%)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 (29%)</td>
<td>5 (71%)</td>
<td>5 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton 10 Positions</td>
<td>9 (90%)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>6 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocklebank 4 Positions</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other* 3 Positions</td>
<td>2 (66%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Manning’s company and Whipple’s troop.

was forcefully brought home by the high cost of the ambush and it seems that the committee made doubly sure that it was not sending its upstanding sons to fight that December.

155 The chart is based on enlisted positions and thus the two soldiers that served in two different companies (Joshua Boynton and John Jackson) are counted twice each.

156 Number is the total number of negative marks against all men (including multiple marks against any men) in each impressment group. For example, John Layton was both a member of the anti-Shepard faction and had a criminal record, so his record contributed two marks to this measure.
Yet, Lathrop’s company, the so-called “Flower of Essex,” had almost the same number of marked men as Appleton’s later company. It seems that if the militia committee in Rowley was choosing men with negative factors against them from the very beginning of the war. In fact, the men from Rowley sent to Lathrop’s command contained the highest percentages of all three negative factors (crime, anti-Shepard, non-original family) of any impressment group sent from the town. If the total number of negative marks is examined, the men sent to Lathrop and Appleton had the same number, even thought two fewer enlisted men served with Lathrop. The group with the lowest number of negative marks is the group “Other,” which includes the man from Manning’s command and the two troopers with Whipple’s troop. It is expected that troopers, who were by law of an upper middling status, would have few negative marks.

In the end, it is very apparent that the Rowley Committee of Militia was consistent throughout the war in its recruitment efforts. There was no great difference between companies. From the very beginning, the committee impressed mostly men who had a negative mark against them and the committee decided what those marks were. The men who went to war were those the local militia committee determined it could most afford to lose, if that was what God intended.
CHAPTER FIVE
THE “NEW ENGLAND TOWN” AT WAR: ANDOVER

Most resembling the stereotypical New England town of the seventeenth century, Richard Archer’s “agricultural towns” shared many characteristics.¹ These small, but growing, villages often started with a nucleated town layout: the homes and meetinghouse in the town center surrounded by common fields and pastures. The original families were proprietors, a status that entitled them to future land divisions. Because of their “dependence on the acquisition of land,” Archer argues, “people of the agricultural towns married somewhat later than their counterparts elsewhere in New England; needing farm workers, they had larger families than typical; and . . . they lived longer lives than most New Englanders.”² In the early years of settlement, these towns were based on subsistence agriculture. As time passed, their citizens moved beyond mere subsistence farming, but they were connected to the market on a local, rather than a regional, scale. This resulted in an equal distribution of wealth in the towns.³ Economic equality resulted in less social strife. While certainly not utopias, as some historians have

¹ For his discussion of agricultural towns, see Richard Archer, Fissures in the Rock: New England in the Seventeenth Century (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 2001), 134-151, at 147. Archer lists two Essex County towns as agricultural, Andover and Rowley; however, Rowley is much closer to his description of a subordinate town and is considered one in this study. See Chapter 4.

² Archer, Fissures in the Rock, 147.

³ Archer, Fissures in the Rock, 147.
suggested, these towns were often more harmonious than larger towns.\textsuperscript{4} The quintessential “New England Town” in Essex County during the seventeenth century was Andover.

Situated on the Merrimack and Shawshin rivers, the town of Andover sits northeast of Salem and was, in the seventeenth century, on the frontier of the county. While Andover’s location—a long day’s walk or a half-day’s ride from Salem—made it somewhat isolated in the early days of settlement, its potential for growth into a market-oriented town was ensured by its position on the Merrimack River. With great potential and plenty of land for farming, Andover became a desirable location for settlement soon after the establishment of Massachusetts Bay. Settlers started to arrive in the early 1640s. Andover was incorporated by the General Court on May 6, 1646, and was named after Andover, England, the home of many of its first settlers.\textsuperscript{5} The earliest settlers of the town, led by Simon Bradstreet, an intimate of Governor John Winthrop, and John Osgood, quickly established a prosperous, if somewhat isolated, settlement. By 1660, the English traveler John Josselyn noted that Andover was a thriving town with a large


amount of land under cultivation and livestock in the fields. However, at the time of King Philip’s War, Andover was still a small agricultural town.

As ordered by the governor and the General Court, Andover established a militia to protect itself from enemies soon after its founding. Andover had close ties to the military hierarchy of Massachusetts Bay and Essex County; both the first major general of the colony, Thomas Dudley, and the sergeant major of the Essex County regiment, Daniel Dennison of Ipswich, had relatives in Andover. The first official mention of the Andover militia is a notice in the papers of the General Court from 1658. The communication from the militia company at Andover records the results of an election for the town’s militia commander. The notice stated that the outgoing commander, Sergeant John Stevens, was “willing and desirous to be dismissed” from his office and the “inhabitants of Andover have made choice of John Osgood to be their Sergeant and chief commander” in his place. With fewer than sixty-four men of militia age, Andover’s militia unit was too small to warrant a captain of its own and was commanded by a sergeant instead. The county quarterly court approved Osgood’s commission as

---


7 Dudley and Dennison were appointed to their posts in the 1644 militia organization that established the four counties of Massachusetts Bay Colony and their respective county militias. Thus Major General Dudley was in charge of all the militia of Massachusetts Bay in 1644 and Sergeant Major Dennison was the commander in chief of the Essex County militia. See Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover, 167.

8 Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover, 167.

Andover's sergeant and commander in June 1658. Eight years later, the Andover militia mustered once again to elect new officers, with the results sent to the quarterly court for approval. By 1666, the town and company had apparently grown in size. The company re-elected Osgood as commanding officer, but he was now appointed as a lieutenant in recognition of the increased size of Andover's company. Subordinate officers were elected for the first time; Thomas Chandler was named ensign and Henry Ingalls became the company's sergeant. As the three highest-ranking members of the military in the town, they also made up the town's committee of militia, since the town had no resident magistrate. The town's representative to the General Court in Boston, by law the only other source for possible militia committee members, was Captain Thomas Savage; as a non-resident of Andover it is highly unlikely he served on the town's militia committee. These officers, Osgood, Chandler, and Ingalls, remained in power throughout King Philip's War.

As a frontier settlement, Andover was vulnerable to Indian attack, thus the town was on guard from the opening of hostilities in June 1675. By October, with the news of Indian attacks spreading, there was a growing sense of panic in the frontier towns of Essex County. Major Dennison, the sergeant major of the county, wrote to the council in

---

10 George Francis Dow, ed., Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts, 8 vols. (Salem, Mass.: Essex Institute, 1911-1918), 2:101.

11 This was quite common, see Jack Sheldon Radabaugh, "The Military System of Colonial Massachusetts, 1690-1740" (Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 1965), 10.


13 The makeup of the militia committee was codified in the 1672 edition of the General Laws and Liberties of the Massachusetts Colony. See William Henry Whitmore, Colonial Laws of Massachusetts, Reprinted from the Edition of 1660, with the Supplements to 1672: Containing Also, the Body of Liberties of 1641 (Boston: Published by order of the City Council of Boston, 1889), 110. For Andover's lack of a resident magistrate, see Abbot, History of Andover; Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover.
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Boston that he planned to advance on two isolated towns to offer some assistance and calm the inhabitants, "...our posts at Topsfield & Andover being affrighted with the sight, as they say, of Indians... It is hardly imaginable the panic fears that is upon our upland plantations and scattered places... The almighty and merciful God pity and help us." The Indians did not attack Andover in 1675, but sons of the town did play an important role in the conflict that first year.

According to the muster lists in Bodge's *Soldiers in King Philip's War* and town histories, sixteen men from Andover were paid for service by the colony during the war. The first call to arms came to Andover in November 1675. The town was required to provide men to fight in the upcoming expedition against the Narragansett Indians in Rhode Island. The Andover men were to muster on Dedham Plain on December 10, where Captain Joseph Gardner was to take command of them and men from other Essex towns. Lieutenant Osgood reported, when he returned the recruit's names to the General Court in Boston, "They are most of them now well fixed with armes and ammunition & cloathing. Edward Whittington wants a better musquete which wee know not well how to supply, except we take from another man which these times seems harde; we are now sending to Salem for sum... shoes and cloth for a coate for one or two." Osgood was


17 See Chapter 2 for a narrative of Gardner's company's exploits.

18 "John Osgood, to The General Court, 29 November 1675," volume 68, document 68a Joseph B. Felt, compiler and ed., in *Massachusetts Archives Collection* (aka "Felt Collection"), *Massachusetts State Archives* (Boston: 1629-1799). Also quoted in Bailey, *Historical Sketches of Andover*, 170. The towns had been warned in the impressment warrant to see to the special needs of the men for the winter campaign, especially warm clothing. For details of this, see Douglas Edward Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk: New..."
well aware of the economic situation of these men; he had, of course, commanded them in Andover’s regular militia company for years. His report offers an important glimpse into the preparations each town made to send its sons off to war. The lieutenant’s concern for his soldiers is apparent in his work to outfit the men properly for the harsh winter campaign, supplying extra clothing and shoes for those men not able to provide for themselves.\(^{19}\) Osgood’s report also relates a valuable lesson about the dual nature of a frontier town’s concerns during the war. While Osgood greatly regretted sending one of his men to war with an inadequate musket, in the end, he refused to impress a better weapon for Whittington from a family in town; that would have meant one less weapon available to defend the town in the case of an attack.

Andover’s Committee of Militia, made up of Lieutenant Osgood, Ensign Chandler, and Sergeant Ingalls, set to work impressing the allotted number of soldiers in mid-November 1675. The committee, no doubt, kept the advice of the commissioners of the United Colonies in mind and endeavoured to recruit only those “of strength, corrage, and activity” for such a dangerous offensive mission in the worsening winter weather.\(^{20}\) The town constables in charge of issuing the warrants of impressments were Steven Osgood and Nathaniel Dane, neither of whom had relatives among those they were to impress.\(^{21}\) While most nineteen-century histories claim that Andover’s allotment for Gardner’s company was twelve soldiers, only eleven men have been identified by name

---

\(^{19}\) It was not uncommon for towns to adopt special town rates or taxes to provide supplies for men sent from the towns to fight. See Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk*, 104, 110.


and collaborated by the pay lists of the colony as having served. Of the eleven men impressed for Gardner’s company in Andover, the birth dates of eight were found. All eight belonged to the second generation of Massachusetts Bay settlers; their ages range from 20 to 31 years, with an average age of 24 years old. This makes the average soldier of Andover slightly younger than the overall average of 26.6 years old for Essex County men serving in the war. All of the men recruited by Andover’s Committee of Militia were single at the time of the war. None had fathered children. It is evident that the United Commissioners’ warnings about the dangerous nature of the upcoming campaign compelled the militia committee to recruit unmarried men.

Most of these young men probably still lived in their fathers’ houses and worked their fathers’ fields. As Philip Greven points out in his book *Four Generations: Population, Land, and Family in Colonial Andover, Massachusetts*, it was not unusual for sons of the second generation to marry relatively late, the average age at marriage for second-generation males in Andover was 26.7 years. Sons needed their father’s permission and, more importantly, access or title to their land, before they could marry.

---

22 Bailey, *Historical Sketches of Andover*; Fuess, *Andover* both claim a John Faulkner was recruited to serve with Gardner from Andover, but the name does not appear in the pay lists in Bodge, *Soldiers* (3rd ed.) and is thus not included in this analysis.


24 For data on the soldiers’ ages, see Appendix 1.

25 See *Vital Records of Andover* for marriage information on the men of Andover. Five men married by 1685, another three were married by 1689, two were killed later in the war, and Edward Whittington had no marriage on record. It is unlikely he did not marry, although possible. See Lisa Wilson, *Ye Heart of a Man: The Domestic Life of Men in Colonial New England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999) for the role of marriage in early New England.

Greven argues that because of the scarcity of farm labor and an early recognition of the scarcity of land within Andover’s boundaries, fathers kept close control of their sons by limiting their access to land, and thus their ability to marry and support a family at an early age.27

This view, slightly altered, is shared by Daniel Vickers in his book Farmers and Fishermen: Two Centuries of Work in Essex County, Massachusetts, 1630-1830.28 Vickers agrees with Greven that most young men in their twenties continued to work family lands, but not on specific instructions from their fathers. Sons and fathers reached an important informal understanding when the son turned twenty-one and reached social and political, but not yet full economic, independence.29 Sons and fathers agreed upon which part of the father’s estate would eventually transfer to the son and the son started working that section independently, while still assisting his father in some ways. Vickers argues that fathers and sons were interdependent—sons needing access to land and fathers needing their son’s labor in the tight labor market that was seventeenth-century Massachusetts. While most of the militiamen’s occupations are not listed in the surviving records, it is certain that almost all of the men worked in agriculture, most probably for their fathers, as Greven and Vickers suggest. Only two men have listed occupations. Edward Whittington was listed as a weaver (without a loom or mill), and Ebenezer Baker sometimes worked as a carpenter in addition to working for his father on the family


28 Daniel Vickers, Farmers and Fishermen: Two Centuries of Work in Essex County, Massachusetts, 1630-1850 (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1994).

29 For his discussion of this crucial father and son relationship, see Vickers, Farmers and Fishermen, 31-83, 64-77.
It is highly unlikely that the promise of payment for service in King Philip’s War acted as the main catalyst for men to break away from their father’s control. War pay was relatively low and land bounties for enlisted men were not common enough to allow second-generation sons to establish themselves without their father’s help.

If they were not yet the heads of their own families, what kind of families did the Andover soldiers belong to as children of first-generation Andover settlers? Information from many sources allowed family portraits of varying degrees of detail to be constructed for the Andover men in Gardner’s company, detailing each family’s economic and social status. Probate records for the men and their fathers, tax lists, family histories, and town land records facilitated the determination of the standing of each family in town in relation to each other. The 1679 minister’s tax rate is perhaps the best indicator available to determine the relative economic and social standing of the families in town. Even though the earliest surviving tax list comes three years after the conclusion of the war, it still offers many important clues. While it is possible that a family’s circumstances changed dramatically during the intervening years (1676-1679), any such drastic change in a family’s situation would be mentioned in the numerous family or town histories.

Studying the father’s tax rate for each family provides a rough ranking of citizens in town, offering a glimpse of the social strata of Andover during the war years. Using

30 For Barker, see Greven, *Four Generations*, 87. For Whittington, see Bailey, *Historical Sketches of Andover*, 119. It is almost certain that Whittington either made his living working as a farm laborer, itinerant weaver, or most probably, both.

31 The pay during King Philip’s War was fairly low, see Chapter 2. This makes the circumstances of impressed enlisted men in King Philip’s War very different from the situation reported in Fred Anderson, *A People’s Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years’ War* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1984), where the author argues that eighteenth-century colonial American soldiers were induced to volunteer in order to gain independence from their fathers sooner than they could otherwise.

32 For the tax lists, see Abbot, “‘Transformations,’” 242-248.
the 1679 rate when a father is no longer listed, either having moved away or died, is still possible; the ranking of the militiaman or another family member is used to determine family status. However, this is problematic. The division of a father’s estate between a number of his children can have the effect, if relying on any one son’s (or other family member’s) rate, of under-representing a family’s status. In these cases, it is best to rely on another measure to corroborate that family’s true status. The 1679 tax roll includes most of the militiamen’s fathers and also lists several of the men separately, usually those who had married in the intervening years (1676-1679) and started their own independent families (See Table 5-1).

In addition to the tax list, land allotment records for Andover are available, especially for the 1662 final allotment, which finished the town’s land division (See Table 5-1). Andover granted families title to “house lots” in town based on the economic and social status of the families. The town then used those allotments to determine the size of the total amount of farmland a family would receive. The formula used by Andover allotted twenty acres of farming upland for every acre of house land granted. Additional land grants of meadow or marsh were often given for pasture. Thus, a family given an average house lot of five acres received, at a minimum, one hundred and five acres from the town by the time of the final division in 1662. There are several instances of a family being allotted considerably more land than the formula would suggest, for example, Richard Barker’s ten acre house lot entitled him to two

---


hundred and ten acres, yet he amassed over three hundred acres from the town in total. After 1662, land was available in Andover only for those who could purchase it from the original (pre-1662) settlers. Those “latecomers” to Andover generally had lower social standing in town than the original town families, although this was not always the case.

The measurement of house-lot size is an important indicator of a family’s economic position in the town. It offers a way to rank families, even though many families were awarded the same size lots. The house-lot rankings are inferior to the 1679 minister’s rate rankings, however, because of their timing; much happened to change the fortunes of various families between the final disbursement of land in 1662 and the beginning of King Philip’s War in 1675. During this period, the families who moved to town late—five out of the eleven men with Gardner—did not receive a town land disbursement and instead purchased land. It is difficult to gauge those families’ position in the town hierarchy by land data alone. In addition, the additional acreage given by the town outside the formula tends to diminish the usefulness of rankings based on land, which are less concrete than the tax lists. However, when used in conjunction with the other information available, house-lot data are important elements in creating a social and economic ranking of the families in Andover.

36 Greven, Four Generations, 85.
37 While an argument has been made that most New England towns were strictly divided between proprietors (those citizens eligible for town land divisions) and simple inhabitants (or newcomers), in John Frederick Martin, Profits in the Wilderness: Entrepreneurship and the Founding of New England Towns in the Seventeenth Century (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 186-216, that does not seem to be strictly the case in Essex County, especially during the first decades of settlement. See Vickers, Farmers and Fishermen, 21, especially note 11.
38 Greven, Four Generations, 46.
By 1675, there were roughly forty to fifty families, with all of their differing branches, living in Andover. All of the economic and social data above allowed a categorization of the families of Andover into one of four categories: elite, leading, middling, or subordinate. Of the eleven men impressed for Gardner’s company, only two were members of leading town families (18 percent), seven were from middling families (64 percent), and two were from a subordinate families (18 percent). There was a wide range of families in the middling category, from upper middling to almost subordinate. The classification of only two of the soldiers as subordinate is reinforced by Lieutenant Osgood’s report of “one or two men” needing town assistance to ready themselves for the campaign. No enlisted man from Andover was classified as coming from an elite family. The only Gardner militiamen classified as from leading families in Andover were Ebenezer Barker and Nathan Stevens.

Ebenezer Barker was the third of six sons of Richard and Johanna Barker. Richard Barker was one of the most prominent men in town; he was considered the first inhabitant of Andover and a town leader, having served as both a town surveyor and a selectman in 1674. Richard’s 1679 minister’s rate ranks him as the forth-highest placed inhabitant in Andover, hailing from the prosperous northern end of town. His house lot in town was 10 acres, which tied for fifth place in size in town and actually meant that the

39 The 1679 tax lists name forty-six different family names, while various family histories discuss a few families of the same name (Parker for instance) which had two distinct branches in town. Given this information, an estimate of forty to fifty distinct families (or households) existing in 1675 Andover is assumed. See Abbot, History of Andover; Abbot, “Transformations;” Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover; Greven, Four Generations.

40 See the Introduction, pg. 30 note 79, for a discussion of the classification system.

41 See Vital Records of Andover.

42 Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover, 7-8, 138.

43 For minister’s rate, see Abbot, “Transformations,” 242-248.
family controlled, by the town’s formula, at least 210 acres of land, although Greven proves Barker owned at least 300 acres by the 1670s.\textsuperscript{44} (For the details on all of these men, see Table 5-1).

Nathan Stevens, the first English child born in Andover, was the son of John Stevens.\textsuperscript{45} Nathan’s father John died in 1662 with a house lot of 12 acres (total acreage at least 252 acres), the fourth largest in Andover at the time.\textsuperscript{46} John Stevens’ will and inventory of 1662 place his estate at £463-4-0, a considerable sum that included land, house, barns, livestock and a host of household goods and tools.\textsuperscript{47} Nathan, who was eighteen years old at his father’s death, inherited a portion of his father’s lands, which by 1679 placed him tenth out of thirty-nine men in the more prosperous northern section of town and nineteenth in town overall, at the high end of the middling range. His extended family was firmly placed among the leading families of Andover, once the effects of the division of property at the father’s death are taken into consideration. His mother, Widow Stevens, placed tenth in the town, even after Nathan’s portion had been granted to him.\textsuperscript{48} If you combined the two rates of mother and son in the 1679 tax roll, the Stevens family was ranked as high as the fifth or sixth family in town.\textsuperscript{49} Wealth alone did not confer status in town, political power was a part of the equation. Yet, the lack of

\textsuperscript{44} For house lot sizes, see Greven, \textit{Four Generations}, 46, 85.

\textsuperscript{45} Fuess, \textit{Andover}, 68.


\textsuperscript{47} See the inventory in Bailey, \textit{Historical Sketches of Andover}, 24.


\textsuperscript{49} Abbot, “Transformations,” 242-248.
### Table 5-1

**Ranking of Enlisted Men Serving with Gardner from Andover, 1675 by Town Socio-Economic Rank and Land Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Ct.</th>
<th>Father or Son</th>
<th>N/S Rank</th>
<th>1679 Tax Rank</th>
<th>House Lot Size</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Overall Land Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N-4</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>5th*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marston</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N-5</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbot</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11th*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>8th/32nd</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S-6</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10th*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N-32</td>
<td>10th/53rd</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frye</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S-9</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>6th*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovejoy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S-33</td>
<td>50th</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7th*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N-33</td>
<td>70th</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S-40</td>
<td>74th</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittington</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S-41</td>
<td>75th</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Family Name* is the family name of the militiaman; *Ct. (Category)* is the family status as classified in this study, *L*=leading, *M*=middling, *S*=subordinate; *Father or Son* indicates if the tax record is the families' (father's, mother's, or brother's) or son's (the militiaman), including in the case of Preston his brother, who was in similar circumstances; *N/S Rank* is the rank order of the family (or the son in the case of no father) in their town section, north or south, based on the 1679 minister's rate; *1679 Tax Rank* is the rank order of the father (or other family members if the father is not available) in the town overall by the minister's rate; the rank includes all of the families of Andover (there were around forty-six family names present in town and numerous branches of many of the families were present), not just those who sent sons to fight. The 1679 tax is the closest measure in time to the war that is available to determine the relative status of the men's families. The father's tax rate is used, where available (see column Father or Son) to determine the family's rank. In cases where the father was not known or listed in the tax list, the son's tax rate (or other family member's) is used. This data and the rankings established from it must be viewed with great suspicion because of the real possibility that the son's tax rate was based on the divided property of the father at the time of the father's death; this would significantly under-represent the wealth of...

---

50 Town rank of eighth is based on his older brother Edward the nominal "leader" of the family; Samuel's rank alone is thirty-second.

51 Town rank of tenth is based on his mother's (Widow Stevens) ranking; Nathan's rank alone is fifty-third in town. If the two were combined, the family ranking would be close to fifth or sixth in town.
the family as a whole. In these cases, it may be best to rely on the land data, if available, to give a truer picture of the family's wealth and status. House Lot Size is the size of the house lot allotted by the town by 1662. Total Acres is the minimum amount of land the family had based on the house lot size and the formula developed in Andover (twenty acres of upland allotted for each house lot acre). It does not measure extra or extraordinary land allocations to certain families. Some families were given more land based on circumstance; Overall Land Rank is inclusive town rank based on house lot (acreage) size and the formula employed by Andover for future land allocations. It does not take into account extra land allocations to certain families, which is why the rankings may not coincide with the actual acreage numbers. This ranking includes all the families of Andover, not just soldier's families. A * denotes a tie for town rank based on the formula acreage. The majority of families in town received four or five acre house lots.

apparent political power of the family (John Stevens is not listed as ever holding any town office) is offset by the early death of the patriarch; if John Sevens had lived, it is quite probable he would have taken his place in the town's governance along with his peers, the Os good and Chandlers.

By the 1670s, Andover was divided into two sections, north and south. In her dissertation, Transformations: The Reconstruction of Social Hierarchy in Early Colonial Andover, Massachusetts, Elinor Abbot makes a strong case that Andover was split into these two sections from its inception. The split, between the northern, prosperous end of town and the southern, subordinate end of town, was based, argues Abbot, upon the different groups or "Companies" that settled the town. This offers an additional tool for understanding Andover's social and economic strata. These regions divided even the town's tax lists, and the town ranks of families were based first upon their regional tax ranks. As such, the north/south divide of Andover offers a useful framework to take a closer look at the enlisted men and their families. The prominent Barker and Stevens

52 Abbot, "Transformations,. 75-84.
families were inhabitants of the northern section of town, as were a number of upper-middling families who sent militiamen to fight with Gardner.

John Marston, the militiaman, was born in Salem the son of John Marston and his wife Alice. While the family was relatively new to Andover, not having any land allotted to them by the final division of 1662, the 1679 tax lists place the elder John Marston as sixth in the town, just behind Richard Barker and Thomas Chandler. While the Marstons had the economic status to be a leading family, their lack of long-term ties to Andover and the total lack of any political power enjoyed by the family places them in the middling group.

The last man from the northern, more prosperous, section of town to serve was John Parker. The Steven Parker family, which included militiaman John, was relatively new to Andover in the 1670s and seems out of place among the established families of the north of town. Steven had not been in Andover before 1662 and did not acquire any land from the town’s allotment process directly. However, Parker settled in the northern section of town, presumably with the aid and assistance of his kinsmen Joseph and Nathan Parker, two early inhabitants of Andover. Joseph Parker, a tanner in town, was fifth in land holdings by 1662 and his connections must have been a great help to Steven in getting started in town. By the time the 1679 minister’s rate was assessed, Steven was no longer listed in Andover. But John, the militiaman, was ranked thirty-third out of thirty-seven men in the north tax list and seventy out of a total of eighty-six.

---


men in town overall. John Parker and his immediate family fit in the lower spectrum of the middling category, despite their association with the affluent northern section of town.

The other middling men of Andover’s contingent in Gardner’s company all lived in the southern section of town. Joseph Abbot was the third son (fourth child) of George and Hannah Abbot. Hannah Abbot was the sister of Thomas Chandler, the ensign of the Andover militia and a member of the militia committee. The family lived in one of Andover’s garrison houses. George Abbot was one of the founders of Andover and was granted a four-acre house lot in 1662, giving him at least eighty acres of land from the town divisions, about the town average. This land, and other land he purchased and was allotted above the regular formula, placed his family near the very top of the social strata in the southern part of town. He was ranked second in the southern minister’s tax

---

56 Whether Steven (the father) moved or died in the intervening years is unknown, although there is no known probate record for him, see George Francis Dow, ed., *The Probate Records of Essex County, Massachusetts*, 3 vols. (Salem, Mass.: Essex Institute, 1916). For John’s rankings, see Abbot, “Transformations,” 242-248.

57 One could argue, based on the numbers alone, that John Parker belongs in the subordinate family category, however, his connection with a prominent family in town and the fact that Andover was so homogeneous and lacking a sizeable lower element places him instead at the lower rung of the middling category.


60 Greven, *Four Generations*, 46.

61 It is probable that George Abbot controlled much more than the eighty acres his house lot would convey upon him, based on his tax assessment in 1679. It is almost certain he either bought or was given additional lands between 1662 and 1679, which raised him to the status he enjoyed in 1679. For a study of using tax lists and probate inventories together, see Kevin M. Sweeney, “Using Tax Lists to Detect Biases in Probate Inventories,” in *Early American Probate Inventories*, ed. Peter Benes (Boston: Boston University Press, 1987).
list of 1679, and seventh overall in town rank. This would almost place him in leading
citizen status, but his family was large (which divided his wealth) and there is no record
of his taking a leadership role of any kind in the town.

John Ballard, third son William and Grace Ballard also came from the southern
section of town. William had originally live in Newbury and moved to Andover around
1644. According to Bailey, William “was a considerable land owner in town, though
not so much in public office as some of the first settlers.” He is listed as having had a 5
acre house lot (at least 105 acres) from the town and was ranked sixth out of forty-seven
men in the 1679 south minister’s rate list, eleventh in town overall. Williams’ 1689
will and inventory of property was valued £206-18-0 placing his family squarely in the
middling cluster.

Another middling soldier was James Frye, the son of John and Ann Fry, who
arrived in Massachusetts Bay in 1638 from England and had originally settled in
Newbury. John Frye, a wheelwright, moved to Andover around 1645 and was a

---

63 See Abbot, History of Andover; Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover; Fuess, Andover.
64 Melvin Gilbert Dodge, Ballard Genealogy: The Descendants of Israel Ballard and Alice Fuller (Utica,
N. Y.: Kirkland Press, 1942); Charles Frederic Farlow and Charles Henry Pope, Ballard Genealogy:
William Ballard (1603-1639) of Lynn, Massachusetts and William Ballard (1617-1689) of Andover,
Massachusetts and Their Descendants (Boston: C.H. Pope, 1911); Sidney Perley, “Ballard Genealogy,”
Essex Antiquarian 6, no. 1 (1902): 35-36.
65 Dodge, Ballard Genealogy, 2.
66 Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover, 102.
68 Dodge, Ballard Genealogy, 3-4; Farlow and Pope, Ballard Genealogy, 64-65.
69 James Savage, O. P. Dexter, and John Farmer, A Genealogical Dictionary of the First Settlers of New
England: Showing Three Generations of Those Who Came before May, 1692, on the Basis of Farmer’s
member of the Andover church and a freeman by 1669. By 1662, the family of eight was allotted an eight-acre house lot, which tied for the sixth largest in Andover and equaled at least 168 acres of land and grew larger, to at least 200 acres. The Frye family is ranked fourteenth in town overall and ninth in the southern section of town, based on the 1679 minister’s rate of father John.

The militiaman John Lovejoy was the son of John Lovejoy and his wife Mary. The elder John Lovejoy had emigrated to New England as an indentured servant, but by 1662 had been granted a house lot of seven acres, giving him control of at least 147 acres and tying him for seventh in landholding in Andover. John served as constable in 1669. While his land holdings were impressive, especially for a former indentured servant, Lovejoy’s 1679 minister’s rate ranking is less so; he was ranked thirty-third in the southern section of town and at fifty on the whole. While there may be many reasons for this seeming contradiction, possibly he gave some of his property away to his children early (although there are no records of this), his rankings and position place him and his family in the middling group.

Samuel Philips, another middling-status soldier for Gardner’s company, is in some respects a mystery. While no evidence of a Samuel Philips was found in any of the

---


71 Greven, *Four Generations,* 46, 92-93.


73 Bailey, *Historical Sketches of Andover,* 75.

74 Greven, *Four Generations,* 46, 92-95.

75 Bailey, *Historical Sketches of Andover,* 137.

sources consulted, a Phelps family does appear in Andover’s 1679 tax listings.\textsuperscript{77}

According to Bailey, Samuel and Edward Phelps were weavers and were in town by February 1678 when Edward took the freeman’s oath.\textsuperscript{78} The fact Edward took the oath while his brother did not suggests that Edward was the older of the two and perhaps the guardian of Samuel. They probably arrived in Andover shortly before the war from a town outside Essex County.\textsuperscript{79} It seems likely that Samuel Phelps is the militiaman impressed by the committee to serve in Gardner’s company and his name was misreported as Philips. Both Edward and Samuel appeared on the 1679 tax list. Edward was at the third position on the south end ranking and eighth in town inclusive.\textsuperscript{80} Samuel Phelps/Philips was assessed four shillings and eleven pence, placing him at rank twenty-four in the southern section of town and thirty-second in town overall at that date.\textsuperscript{81}

While this record indicates that Samuel Phelps/Philips sits squarely in the middling group, his close ties to Edward could place him under the care, especially during the war years, of the eighth-highest ranked family in town.

John Preston was also a relative newcomer to Andover when he was recruited for service in Gardner’s company. His father Roger Preston had arrived from England in 1635 and first settled in Ipswich with his wife Martha, where John was born.\textsuperscript{82} The

\textsuperscript{77} Abbot, “Transformations,” 242-248.

\textsuperscript{78} Bailey, \textit{Historical Sketches of Andover}, 107, 118.

\textsuperscript{79} No record of a Samuel Philips was found in any of the vital records for any of the towns of Essex County, thus it is highly likely he was born outside the county.

\textsuperscript{80} Abbot, “Transformations,” 247.

\textsuperscript{81} Abbot, “Transformations,” 424-248.

\textsuperscript{82} Charles Henry Preston, \textit{Descendants of Roger Preston of Ipswich and Salem Village} (Salem, Mass.: Essex Institute, 1931), 1.
family moved to Salem in 1660, where Roger was a husbandman and the keeper of an ordinary until he died in 1666 while visiting the town of Lynn.\textsuperscript{83} It is not known when John moved to Andover. Obviously he does not appear on the town's list of land grantees and he also does not appear in the tax list for 1679. This is curious, since John Preston was in town in 1678 and took the freeman's oath.\textsuperscript{84} His brother Samuel does appear and has a rank of fortieth in the southern section of town and seventy-fourth in town overall.\textsuperscript{85} It is quite possible that his brother John was in a similar economic position in the town in 1675. John was granted twenty acres of land in 1677.\textsuperscript{86} While the anecdotal evidence of his family in Salem would seem to point to a middling existence for the brothers, John's history in Andover after the war, (the fact he was not permanently attached to Andover per the tax list) places him in the subordinate family category. He is most likely one of the men who needed the town's help in procuring a coat and shoes for the winter campaign.

The last man impressed for Gardner's company from Andover was Edward Whittington, the soldier whose poor musket caused Lieutenant Osgood such concern. Whittington's family's information is lost to us. No family record for Whittington could be found in Essex County towns or in the standard Massachusetts Bay genealogical sources.\textsuperscript{87} He was a relative newcomer to town and does not show up at all on the 1662

\textsuperscript{83} Preston, Descendants of Roger Preston, 2-5.

\textsuperscript{84} Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover, 107.


\textsuperscript{86} Preston, Descendants of Roger Preston, 22.

\textsuperscript{87} Vital Records of Weymouth, Massachusetts, to the Year 1850, 2 vols. (Boston: New England Historic Genealogical Society at the charge of the Eddy Town-Record Fund, 1910); Frederic William Bailey, Early
land division listings.\textsuperscript{88} There is evidence that he was a craftsman just starting his trade, for in 1673 the town of Andover gave permission for Edward Whittington and Walter Wright, weavers, to set up a fulling mill in town, a task they never accomplished.\textsuperscript{89} It is very likely that Edward worked in Andover as an itinerant weaver or a farm laborer. He did take the freeman’s oath in Andover in February 1678.\textsuperscript{90} Edward is listed near the bottom of the tax list of 1679; he is forty-first in the southern section of town and seventy-fifth in town overall.\textsuperscript{91} There were only eight men in town paying less than Whittington and most seem to have been very young sons (probably near twenty-one, the age of majority) of established families in town.\textsuperscript{92} His low ranking on the tax list, the fact he did not have a proper musket and could not afford one, and his lack of family ties to the town place him in the subordinate category. The probability that he continued to move around the colony and did not settle down is evident in the fact there is no marriage record for him in any Massachusetts Bay record.\textsuperscript{93} Edward Whittington is almost assuredly the other man who the town outfitted with clothes before the campaign; it seems quite obvious he was unable to equip himself.


\textsuperscript{88} Greven, \textit{Four Generations}, 46.

\textsuperscript{89} Bailey, \textit{Historical Sketches of Andover}, 119.

\textsuperscript{90} Bailey, \textit{Historical Sketches of Andover}, 107.

\textsuperscript{91} Abbot, “Transformations,” 247-248.

\textsuperscript{92} Abbot, “Transformations,” 248.

\textsuperscript{93} For a discussion about the importance of marriage in seventeenth-century New England, the pressure placed on men to marry, and the oddity of an unmarried man during this period, see Wilson, \textit{Heart of a Man}, 37-98, 158.
When examining the Andover Committee of Militia’s choices for service with Captain Gardner in the dangerous offensive winter campaign of 1675, a number of characteristics about their families are evident. There is a cross section of the community; the committee did not simply pick sons of the poorer families in town. While no members of the contingent were of elite families, in reality only one family qualified as elite. John Osgood, the town’s militia commander, was needed at home. However, it is curious that none of his sons, two of whom would have been of militia age, were sent to fight in the war.94 This fact, however, might be consigned to coincidence until one looks at the family rankings more closely.

When studying the top ten families of the town, based on the 1679 minister’s rate list, a number of curious elements appear (See Table 5-2). Andover's social and economic rankings list only six families in the whole town that were of leading status.95 While two men of the eleven sent to Gardner (18 percent of the total men) were from leading families, most of the principal families in town did not send sons to fight with Gardner, families such as the Poors, the Chandlers, and the Ingalls. Of the top ten families listed on the tax lists in 1679, six families sent sons to fight. However, out of the wealthiest five families in town, only one had a son impressed, Ebenezer Barker. The top five families in town also included the three families directly represented on the committee of militia. Significantly, not one of the sons of these families, the Osgoods, Chandlers, or Ingalls, was pressed to serve. The Poor family, the second-highest ranked family in town, also did not send a son to war. Although not represented on the militia

94 For Osgood’s sons, see Abbot, History of Andover, 19.

95 The families were the Osgoods, Poors, Ingalls, Barkers, Chandlers, and Stevens.
Table 5-2
The Top Ten Families in Andover and their Sons during King Philip's War, 1675-1676

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town Rank</th>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Town Position</th>
<th>Son(s)</th>
<th>Served</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Osgood</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Member-Committee of Militia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Osgood Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Member-Committee of Militia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Osgood Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ingalls</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Member-Committee of Militia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Osgood Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Barker/Stevens Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Member-Committee of Militia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Family Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Marston</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Osgood Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Abbot</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Southern Family Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Phelps/Philps</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Southern Family Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Southern Family Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Barker/Stevens Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Shading represents those who had sons of militia age who DID NOT serve during the war. There are a total of around forty-six family names present in Andover by 1679. **Town Rank** is the family's rank based on the 1679 minister's tax list of all families in town; **Family Name** is based on the patriarch (The eighth family—Phelps/Phelps—almost certainly included the soldier Samuel Philips); **Town Position** indicated which pole of town, North or South the family lived in; **Son(s)** is an indication that the family had a son of militia age during the war years (1675-1676); **Served** is an indicator of a son of that family serving in the war; **Notes** indicates positions of power held in Andover (members of the Committee of Militia) and membership in allied family groups.

---

committee directly, the Poors were linked to the Osgood family through marriage.\textsuperscript{97} Thus, these four leading families, all linked by marriage ties and all with militia age sons, sent none to fight during the war.\textsuperscript{98} The only other family in the top five in town, the Barkers, were not linked to the Osgood group, but instead were linked by marriage to the Stevens family. Both these families had sons impressed for service.\textsuperscript{99} The other family tied to the Osgood group, the Marstons, did have a son who went to war. Lieutenant Osgood, the undisputed leader of the town, appears to be the leading presence on the militia committee as well. It is obvious that the Osgood group of leading northern families, who held the power to impress the young men of the town through their control of the militia committee, were willing to send the sons of their equals out to fight, while they protected their own.

In the southern end of town, another group of important families had formed, based on marriage bonds, much like the northern Osgood group. These families, who came from the less affluent side of town and held less political power, soon found their sons heading off to the wilderness to fight the Narragansett Indians. The group included the Chandlers, the Abbots, the Ballards, and the Phelps/Philips.\textsuperscript{100} This group of families, including both leading and upper-middling households, was linked by a series of marital, economic, and social bonds. Except for the Chandlers, whose patriarch Thomas sat directly on the militia committee, each family in this group had a son impressed to fight.

As only one member of three (and not the leading member) of the militia committee,

\textsuperscript{97} Abbot, "Transformations," 125.

\textsuperscript{98} For genealogical information of the families, see Abbot, History of Andover.

\textsuperscript{99} For information on the formation of the Osgood group and its members, see Abbot, "Transformations," 122-125.

\textsuperscript{100} For the formation of the southern group and its members, see Abbot, "Transformations," 126-128.
Chandler obviously did not have enough power to protect his neighbors as Osgood had done for his circle. Chandler was able to keep his own sons out of harm’s way, but he was not able to extend the safety net to others in his group. Family connections, especially those surrounding the leading families in town and those connected with the militia committee, played a large part in impressment in Andover.

While the families at the very top of the power structure in Andover, especially those in the Osgood group, protected their sons from service, it is also apparent that the militia committee did not simply send sons of the poorest and least powerful families away to fight. Of the eleven men sent by the Andover Committee of Militia, six (60 percent) came from the top ten families in town, an impressive contribution. Only two men (18 percent) sent to fight with Gardner were from the subordinate families in town. The majority of Andover’s men, in terms of economic position, resembled the Elizabethan idea of a trainband made up of the best middling sort much more than they did a unit from one of Elizabeth’s overseas expeditions culled from the untrained and lowly general militia. Yet some of the men from Andover were on the lower spectrum of the town’s economic scale. While it was not the deciding factor in the committee’s decisions, socio-economic status did play a part.

Were there other factors in deciding who should fight for Andover? A careful study of the county quarterly court records turns up little. No member of the Andover contingent of Gardner’s company could be said to have a criminal record. This makes them quite different from many of their fellow soldiers from Essex County.101 While two men had served as witnesses in court, none of the Andover men ended up in court for

101 For overall numbers for the county, see Table C-5 in the Conclusion.
criminal acts before the war.\textsuperscript{102} The low crime rate in town prevented the militia committee from filling its militia quotas by simply turning out the jail.\textsuperscript{103} However, a few of the men were mentioned in court records in regards to debts they owed. None of the men were serious or litigated debtors. Three, however, fell into the category of non-litigated, but known, debtors. Both John Marston and John Preston owed money to a wealthy merchant, John Croad, highlighted in his extensive 1671 probate inventory.\textsuperscript{104} In addition, Marston owed twenty shillings to the estate of Joseph Grafton Jr. of Salem in 1671.\textsuperscript{105} In a similar case, a lawsuit between George Corwin and Dr. Jonathan Gifford of Salem listed a debt owed to the doctor by Andover’s John Parker.\textsuperscript{106} The debt recorded in these instances was normal, the private operating debt that many young men in the midst of beginning their own independent lives incurred. However, it was known in town that these men had been singled out for their indebtedness by the court. While being sued for payment of debt would almost assuredly tarnish a man’s reputation in his town, it is less clear if the non-litigated debt present in Andover would be a factor in the militia

\textsuperscript{102} Edward Whittington was deposed in a case in March 1669 and Samuel Philips was a witness in the Boston Court in November 1673. Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}


\textsuperscript{104} Marston owed Croad £2-18-1 while John Preston owed him £3-10-6. See Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 4:401-403.

\textsuperscript{105} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Probate Recs.}, 2:227.

\textsuperscript{106} Parker owed Gifford £1-4-0, see Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 4:436-437.
committee's impressments decision in November 1675. In the case of Marston, that seems unlikely to be the case, his high family ranking (fifth in town) easily makes him the equal of most of the men sent. However, the inclusion of Preston and Parker, whose families were relatively new to Andover (post 1662) and who also ranked very low in the town pecking order, seems to make a strong case for the militia committee having filled the gaps in the contingent with, if not undesirables (of which there were very few in homogeneous Andover), at least with some of the less important citizens of town.

Overall, however, it does not appear that criminal behavior or excessive indebtedness was a large factor in the militia committee's impressments decision in November 1675.

The question remains, why did Andover's militia committee impress so many young men from its leading and middling families to fight in what would surely be a harsh and dangerous campaign? There are several possible answers to this question. There is a good chance that at least a small number of the young men of Andover volunteered to go; the lure of the glorious battlefield has been a strong motivator throughout history. Even though many towns were having difficulty recruiting men as early as November 1675, the Gardner call-up was Andover's first occasion to send troops to fight. Despite the news of ambushes such as Bloody Brook, it is quite possible that

107 This data and argument offers a slight corrective to earlier arguments made about debt in Kyle F. Zelner, "Massachusetts' Two Militias: A Social History of the 1st Essex Expeditionary Company in King Philip's War, 1675-1676" (M.A. thesis, Wayne State University, 1993) in which all debt was combined and considered as a factor for impressment. New information in Vickers, Farmers and Fishermen has altered the understanding of debt and the amount and type of debt which might constitute a large enough sum to cause community leaders concern.

108 See Table 5-1 for information on the two; Parker's family was ranked at seventieth in town in 1679 and Preston does not appear on the tax list at all. Neither family had had land distributed to it by the town in the final division of 1662.

109 For information of resistance to recruitment and impressed men fleeing service, see Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, 94-95, 184-185; Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 143; Jenny Hale Pulsipher, "The Overture of This
a few sons of Andover’s finer families volunteered to fight that November.\footnote{For particulars on volunteers and impressments, see George M. Bodge, \textit{Soldiers in King Philip’s War} (Boston: Printed for the Author, 1891), 45-47, 55-57, 62-63, 201; Leach, \textit{Flintlock and Tomahawk}, 103-106; George H. Martin, “Glimpses of Colonial Life in Lynn in the Indian War Days,” \textit{The Register of the Lynn Historical Society} 17 (1913): 98-122.} While the prominence of impressment over volunteerism is well established for the war, there is no doubt that a certain number of men did volunteer for war service. The Marstons were linked by marriage ties to the powerful Osgood group, but they sent a son to fight. John Marston seems a likely volunteer. He is the only son of an Osgood-related family to serve in Gardner’s company and would seem to be safe from the militia committee’s press through his connections. His slight debt problems were more than offset by his family’s prominence. Unless he volunteered, it is a mystery why the well-connected young man wound up under Gardner’s command. A few other leading and middling sons in town might have followed his lead; it would not take many volunteers to sway such a small sample of militiamen (eleven total) into such an uncharacteristically leading/middling family oriented group of recruits. The lure of battlefield glory was probably strong for those young men in a farming town such as Andover, where fathers controlled their sons’ labor and limiting their entry into families of their own by manipulating access to farming land.\footnote{See Greven, \textit{Four Generations}, 72-99.}

This explanation of the high number of leading and upper middling families supplying Andover’s militiamen is strengthened by an examination of which sons went to fight. Information on the birth order is known for nine of the eleven soldiers in Gardner’s Andover contingent (see Table 5-3). While six of the leading families in town had sons

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Name & Birth Order \\
\hline
John Marston & 1 \\
Thomas Osgood & 2 \\
Robert Osgood & 3 \\
Edward Marston & 4 \\
William Osgood & 5 \\
Peter Osgood & 6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Birth Order of Soldiers in Gardner's Contingent}
\end{table}

recruited for service, either from volunteerism or impressments, none of those families (with the possible exception of John Marston’s family, whose birth order is unknown) were asked to sacrifice their oldest son to the war effort. The militia committee seems to have been very careful picking (or allowing men to volunteer) from the ranks of first sons in town. Only two of the nine soldiers with known birth orders were first sons; both of those men, John Lovejoy and John Parker, were from families far down the town’s social hierarchy. They were also younger (Lovejoy was the youngest soldier at twenty, Parker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth Order</th>
<th>Age at War</th>
<th>Family Status</th>
<th>Town Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ebenezer Baker</td>
<td>3rd Son</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Marston</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Abbot</td>
<td>3rd Son</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Philips</td>
<td>Younger Brother</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8th/32nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ballard</td>
<td>3rd Son</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Stevens</td>
<td>2nd Son</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Frye</td>
<td>2nd Son</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lovejoy</td>
<td>1st Son</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Parker</td>
<td>1st Son</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Preston</td>
<td>5th Son</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>74th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Whittington</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>75th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-3
Birth Order Status for Andover Men in Gardner’s Company, 1675

*Name is the militiaman; Birth Order is the order at birth based on probate or other records; Age at War is based on birth data in family histories, vital records, and court records; Family Status is based on the classification in this study, L=leading, M=middling, S=subordinate; Town Rank is the rank order of the family in the town overall by minister’s rate of 1679.*

112 Town rank is eighth is based on his brother Edward, his rank alone is thirty-second.
was twenty-two) than the other soldiers (average age twenty-four) and might have been the only sons of militia age available for impressment from those particular families. Thus, while Andover was sending members of its best families to war, it was not sending, for the most part, the all-important first sons of the leading families, upon whom great expectations had been placed.

The birth-order data also strengthen the case for volunteerism. It is logical that sons not first in line to inherit or be given pre-probate title to some of their father’s land (a necessary step in their starting their own families) would seek some escape, albeit a temporary one, from their father’s control. While the system of primogeniture was not practiced in New England, second and third sons did know they would be far behind their oldest brother in gaining control of any land, and thus tied to their fathers longer; some might have sought escape for a short time because of that fact. Historians Daniel Scott Smith and John J. Waters have shown that first sons in seventeenth-century Massachusetts married earlier and received more financial support than their younger brothers, who were then held at home longer than first sons. This supports the idea that some younger sons who marched off to fight with Gardner probably volunteered to go, in order to escape their controlling families for a time. The soldiers’ ages, all over twenty-one (except John Lovejoy) also gave them the necessary political freedom to

---

113 If this had occurred, it would be similar to the pattern in England, where primogeniture inheritance saw first sons inherit the entirety of their father’s estate, forcing later sons to join the army or become clergymen. While the later sons of Andover knew they would get some land from their fathers, they also knew it would be a long time coming and not the choicest plot. See Vickers, Farmers and Fishermen, 19.

volunteer without their fathers’ permission.\textsuperscript{115} It cannot be argued, at this point in the war (November 1675) that these possible volunteers expected military service to gain them the means necessary to escape their father’s control for long. Military pay was not sufficient for permanent escape and the land bounty for military service was not yet established.\textsuperscript{116} However, the glory accrued and the ability to escape their fathers’ control, if even for a short time, may have been enough incentive to garner a few volunteers for the Andover contingent of Gardner’s company.

Another factor to consider when looking at the militia committee’s choices is the ratio of men from long-established families in town versus those who were relative newcomers. Five out of the eleven men sent to fight were from families that were not a part of one of the town’s original settlement groups. In his book \textit{Profits in the Wilderness}, John Frederick Martin argues that non-proprietors, families that did not have a share in land divisions, were in a subordinate position in most New England towns.\textsuperscript{117} While some have challenged that argument, it is impossible to discount it as a possible factor in the committee’s decision making.\textsuperscript{118} Of the five men sent from Andover, two from the upper ranks were also relative newcomers to town: John Marston and Samuel

\textsuperscript{115} Vickers, \textit{Farmers and Fishermen}, 67-68.

\textsuperscript{116} For low pay, see Chapter 2. In Massachusetts, a few military professionals and officers of the Pequot War in the 1630s had been given land grants for their service, but the practice was not widespread among enlisted men. The first mass incident of a land grant to common men was made to the soldiers of the Narragansett campaign of December 1675, when the men (including these Andover soldiers) who had assembled on Dedham plain were promised by the Massachusetts Bay Council that they should have a gratuity of land in addition to their wages if “...they played the man, took the Fort, and Drove the Enemy out of the Narragansett Country ....” However, this land grant was not an incentive to the men before the announcement and could not have had any impact on the recruitment of these forces. See Leach, \textit{Flintlock and Tomahawk}, 124; Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 180.

\textsuperscript{117} See Martin, \textit{Profits in the Wilderness}, 149-253.

\textsuperscript{118} Vickers, \textit{Farmers and Fishermen}, 21.
Philips/ Phelps. If the committee was giving some sort of preference to its established townsmen, this might offer a reason why these two highly ranked men were impressed. Three other impressed men came from new families in town that were closer to the bottom of the town rankings: Parker, Preston, and Whittington. While a privilege for longevity in town might help explain some of the impressments, it also leaves many unanswered questions.

One of the most plausible explanations for the large number of men from leading and middling families pressed into service is simply that Andover was a peaceful and homogeneous town in 1675. There were few men in town with criminal or substantial debt problems. Almost every family in town fit the leading or middling category. As Archer points out in his classification framework, one of the hallmarks of an agricultural town was a small population with "the tendency toward equal distribution of wealth" and while "there was social and economic stratification, . . . these towns . . ." were some of " . . . the most equitable of all New England towns." Unlike Marblehead with its population of transient mariners or a large town like Ipswich with its large number of subordinate families, Andover was simply less stratified. Vickers points out there simply were not large numbers of unattached farm laborers roaming around the agricultural sections of Essex County in the seventeenth century. There were relatively few men like Edward Whittington in a farming town like Andover, men who were newcomers to town without a town family connection and who found themselves in a subordinate position. It is also probable that many of the newer families in town were younger than

\[^{119}\text{Archer, }\text{Fissures in the Rock, 147.}\]

\[^{120}\text{For a discussion of the place of unattached farm laborers in Essex County and comparisons to the situation in England, see Vickers, }\text{Farmers and Fishermen, 52-64.}\]
the established families in Andover and did not have sons of the correct military age for such a campaign. Thus, more of Andover’s soldiers than would seem reasonable, indeed the majority of men recruited, were from leading and middling families. The reason more militiamen were not taken from the lower elements of Andover society was simply that there were not a large number of men in town who belonged to that category.

Amazingly, all of the Andover men who served with Gardner during the campaign returned to town. Ebenezer Barker and Joseph Abbot were wounded during the Fort Fight on December 19, 1675. One other soldier from Andover was active at this time. While there is no record of the town recruiting for any other company, a Roger Marks (or Robert Mackey) from Andover was listed as having been wounded while serving with Major Appleton during the Narragansett campaign. However, in her comprehensive history of early Andover, Sarah Bailey casts doubts on whether this soldier was truly from Andover. The only record found relating a Roger Marks to Andover was a death record of a Sarah Marks in 1690, which stated that her husband was one Roger Marks. There is no Roger Marks or Robert Mackey on the town tax or land listings. He remains a mystery.

121 This supposition comes from a general familiarity with the town records and the town histories, see Vital Records of Andover; Abbot, History of Andover; Abbot, “Transformations;” Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover; Greven, Four Generations.


125 See Vital Records of Andover.

About the time the men of Gardner’s company were returning home, three
Andover men found themselves serving with Captain Samuel Brocklebank of Rowley.
Brocklebank had been active in recruiting for the Narragansett campaign and raised a
company to continue to press the Narragansett enemy after the Fort Fight. There is no
record of the General Court’s quota for Andover, as there was for Gardner’s Company,
but three Andover men were recruited to serve with Brocklebank. One of the men,
Nathan Stevens, had been with Gardner on the Narragansett campaign; it is probable he
volunteered to stay with the army. While he had already received a portion of his father’s
estate (he was eighteen when his father died in 1662), there is no marriage record for him
until 1692. Even though he was thirty-one years old at the time of the war, it is likely
he was still living at home and caring for his mother and younger siblings in 1675. It
is possible that Nathan enjoyed the life of a soldier over that of mother’s helper. The
other two soldiers recruited for Brocklebank’s Company were Zechariah Ayers and
Joseph Parker.

Zechariah Ayers was a newcomer to Andover. He was born in Haverhill on
October 24, 1650 to farmer John Ayers and his wife Mary. Undoubtedly, Zechariah
arrived too late to partake of the town’s divisions of land. He settled in the less
prominent southern section of town and by 1679 was listed at thirty-eighth place in the

---

127 See Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk*, 137-142.


129 The fact she was, as “Widow Stevens,” still listed as the family’s leader in the 1679 tax list suggests she
had not remarried and still had minor children at home. Otherwise, her other sons, if they were of age,
would have taken their portions and Nathan would be listed as the family head. See Abbot,


southern section and sixty-fourth out of eighty-six in town overall.\textsuperscript{132} He married only after the war, in 1678.\textsuperscript{133} While this qualifies him for the middling category, it places him in the decidedly lower spectrum of that scale.

Joseph Parker belonged to the prominent Parker family in Andover and was a kinsman to the Gardner militiaman John Parker. The Parkers were the only family that contributed more than one man to fight from town, but John and Joseph came from different branches of the family. Militiaman Joseph Parker's father Joseph was an original settler in town; the elder Joseph was a tanner and married to a Mary Parker. They were, according to Bailey, "citizens of much consideration."\textsuperscript{134} Joseph the militiaman's birth date is unknown. The Parkers were important citizens in the northern section of town, owning a tannery, along with the town's gristmill and considerable land.\textsuperscript{135} According to land records, the Parker family received the fifth-largest division of land from the town, with a house lot of ten acres and its minimal corresponding land of two hundred acres.\textsuperscript{136} Joseph the elder died in 1678 "at a great age and infirm" and his estate was valued at over £546.\textsuperscript{137} His first son Joseph inherited the largest portion of that, including the gristmill.\textsuperscript{138} Accordingly, Joseph was ranked at fifteenth place in the north end of town and twenty-second in town overall, even after the division of his

\textsuperscript{132} His 1679 rate was £0-3-10, see Abbot, "Transformations," 242-248.
\textsuperscript{133} Savage, Dexter, and Farmer, \textit{Genealogical Dictionary of New England}.
\textsuperscript{134} Bailey, \textit{Historical Sketches of Andover}, 102.
\textsuperscript{135} Bailey, \textit{Historical Sketches of Andover}, 102-103.
\textsuperscript{136} Greven, \textit{Four Generations}, 46.
\textsuperscript{137} Bailey, \textit{Historical Sketches of Andover}, 102-103.
\textsuperscript{138} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Probate Recs.}, 3:278-281.
father's property between four sons and three daughters. After the war, Joseph married Elizabeth Bridges in October 1680 and was beginning a family when he took ill. In his own will of 1684, as a carpenter and innkeeper, Joseph's place in society comes into even clearer detail. By 1684, his estate was worth £402; the mill alone valued at £100. He left his entire estate to his wife "till my only child Joseph shall come to the age of twenty-one years." While there is little doubt that the Parkers were important members of Andover society, their lack of political power in town placed them in the middling group, not among the leading families in town.

Neither Joseph Parker, Zechariah Ayers, or Nathan Stevens had had any trouble with the law, nor did any of the three men have a problem with debt. Ayers witnessed in court once, in April 1674. Yet all three served in the war. None of the men was protected by an alliance to the Osgood group on the militia committee. Parker was from the decidedly upper-middling category, but he was not protected by political connections. Once again, the Andover militia committee placed townsmen in good standing in harm's way, while they continued to protect their own. The three men were all back in Andover after about five weeks and were the last men from the town to have to leave for their militia service during the war.

---

140 Vital Records of Andover.
141 Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover, 103.
142 Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover, 103.
143 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:301.
144 Even though Captain Brocklebank's company was sent out again in a few weeks to garrison the town of Marlborough, the Andover men did not accompany him as they had been released from service, as is seen
On February 10, 1676 enemy warriors attacked the frontier town of Lancaster, an attack that became famous because of the abduction of Mary Rowlandson. Fear spread throughout the countryside and Andover’s place on the frontier looked even more dangerous than in the past. Reports of Indian movement along the Merrimack River sent Andover into a panic and Lieutenant Osgood wrote the Council in Boston. The town had just been ordered to send ten men to Woburn for its defense and Osgood was worried. On February 16, he requested “if it may stand with you honors wisdom & favour to release our men that are to goe forth, as wee being an outside town & in greate danger in our apprehension as any and may stand in as great need as any other town of help, this makes us bould to request this favour att your hands.” His request was granted; Andover sent no more of its men out of town to fulfill their militia roles for the duration of the war. In addition, the town began to prepare for a direct assault. More garrison houses were built; a committee from the Council in Boston reported back in March that “We met at Andover, where we found twelve substantial Garrisons well fitted’ which wee hope through God’s blessing may bee sufficient to secure them from any sudden surprisal of the enemy.” On March 18 two Indian scouts had been sighted looking over below. For the details of Brocklebank’s service, see Chapter 2. See also Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 206-217.


146 Quoted in Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover, 171.

147 By April 1676, a number of frontier towns, including Andover, were exempted by law from further impressments and the men from those towns serving in the army at the time were sent home to help with home defense. See Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 5:358., Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, 186.

148 Quoted in Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover, 172.
the town and Lieutenant Osgood sent to Ipswich for relief. Major Denison, the county militia commander, led sixty men to the town, but the Indians had slipped away.

Andover was finally attacked on April 8, 1676. That morning, an Indian war party was spotted and alarms rang throughout town as the citizens fled to the garrison houses. Two of George Abbot's sons were at work in the fields and did not make it to the safety of their family's garrison house. Joseph Abbot, the wounded veteran of Gardner's company, made a brave fight, killing an Indian before he was killed. He had survived the harsh winter Fort Fight only to be killed within sight of his boyhood home; he was the only Andover soldier slain in the war. The Indians took his younger brother Timothy, a boy of thirteen, captive. The house of Edmond Falkner was also attacked and the Indians killed and maimed a large number of his farm animals.149 Lieutenant Osgood, in his April 1676 report to the Council in Boston, wrote of the town's fear and utter sadness at these events. Osgood was very concerned for the future of the town:

We have had some forces to help us but the enemy cannot be found when we go after them; and we find that we are not able to go to work about Improving our lands but are liable to bee cut off nor are we able to raise [illegible] men at our charge to defend ourselves. We fear greatly that we shall not be able to live in the town to Improve our lands to raise a subsistence without some force be kept above us upon the river of Merrimack and to Concord river, which being speedily and well defended with a competent quantity of soldiers all the Towns within might be in sum reasonable safety to follow their Employs to raise com and persur their cattle . . . for now we are so distressed to think that our men are libel

to be shot whenever we stir from our houses and our children taken by the cruel enemy, it do so distress us that we know not what to do; if some defense be not made by the forces above us we must remove off if we can tell where, before we have lost all lives and cattle and horses to the enemy; we are completely able to fend ourselves in our garrison houses if we have warning to rest in, but otherwise out of our house we are in continual danger.  

Andover was in a bad way. Corn was in such short supply that those who had it to sell insisted on hard currency rather than credit for payment, an impossible situation for many truly hungry families in need. Many families were ready to quit the town and the General Court abated the town’s county rate for the year. Further steps to defend the town were taken and more garrison houses were erected. Most important, a contingent of forty soldiers was sent to assist the local militia in protecting Andover. Military patrols were established and farming parties toiled in the fields under the watchful eyes of armed guards.

Two other Andover men were listed on the pay lists of Massachusetts Bay during the war. Their service is unknown; their names do not appear on any muster lists in Bodge's *Soldiers in King Philip’s War* or elsewhere. It is highly unlikely either actually served as soldiers during the war. Both men were much older than the other men paid by the colony and were established town leaders. The first man is Stephen Johnson, thirty-

---

150 Quoted in Bailey, *Historical Sketches of Andover*, 175.

151 Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk*, 188.

152 Fuess, *Andover*, 72.
five years old and married.\footnote{Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 2:288, 3:5.} He also had at least three children at the time of the war.\footnote{Abbot, \textit{History of Andover}, 35.} Johnson was a town leader and very active in town affairs, having been a town constable in 1672 and on the grand jury and a town surveyor in 1673, and a selectman for the last year of the war in 1676.\footnote{Bailey, \textit{Historical Sketches of Andover}, 138.} He had been granted a house lot of four acres in 1662 and thus controlled at least eighty acres in town as of that date.\footnote{Greven, \textit{Four Generations}, 46.} Most importantly, he was listed as a carpenter and in 1671 had been granted a license by the town to operate the first saw mill in Andover, where he cut lumber and made thousands of wood shingles every year.\footnote{Bailey, \textit{Historical Sketches of Andover}, 574.} The payment Johnson received from the colony is most likely a reimbursement for lumber used to build the many fortifications in town during the war.

The last of the men compensated by the colony for service from Andover was John Osgood, the town's leading citizen and the lieutenant of its militia company. He is the only man in Andover to enjoy elite status. Osgood's central role in Andover is already evident. He was the son of the elder John Osgood, one of its founders. Born in England in 1630, John Jr. traveled to America with his father and mother Sarah in 1638, where they first settled in Ipswich.\footnote{Eben. Putnam, \textit{Genealogy of the Descendants of John, Christopher, and William Osgood} (Salem, Mass.: Salem Press, 1894), 1-2.} Moving quickly to Newbury, the family ended up in Andover in 1645. The first town meeting was held in the Osgood home. The elder John Osgood was one of the first ten members of the Andover church and the town's first representative to the General Court. He died in 1651, half way through his first term as a
deputy. John Osgood Jr., as the eldest son, inherited his father’s house and lands, while his brothers and sisters were given money as their inheritance. This will kept the Osgood’s lands and power base in Andover intact.

John Osgood quickly replaced his father in the town’s hierarchy. John settled in the northern section of town and had a house lot of 20 acres (he eventually controlled over 610 acres in town), second only to the absentee Simon Bradstreet, who lived in Boston and would become the colony’s governor in 1679. Osgood had been married to Mary Clements in 1653 and they had three children. He was still at the top of Andover’s political and economic structure in 1679, when he was the first ranked individual in the entire town, paying a minister’s rate of £0-17-9, over three shillings above his closest competitor. Although he listed his occupation as tanner, he was the largest farmer in Andover. He also, from 1659 on, ran an ordinary in town. In 1672, he had a spot of trouble with the law and was fined for “giving some Indians cider at his house” by the Essex Quarterly Court. This incident did little to damage his power in Andover.

---

159 It was unusual for a New England father to not divide his estate among his sons, but John Osgood Sr. must have felt the need to keep his sizeable holdings, and the family’s prominent role in Andover, secure. The other sons and daughters were given £25 pounds each in cash at their eighteenth birthdays. For the will and an inventory, see Bailey, Historical Sketches of Andover, 17-22.


161 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs.


164 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:121.
John Osgood had a long history of public service to his town. In 1658, Osgood took the freeman’s oath and started his career as a town leader. By 1659, not only was he serving on the grand jury, but also he was, as we have seen, the sergeant and commander of the town’s militia. He was named lieutenant in 1666 and served as a town selectman from 1670 to 1673 and again in 1676. In 1674, the quarterly court made him one of three commissioners to hear and judge small causes in Andover, in effect making him a small claims judge.

Osgood’s status as the leader of Andover cannot be questioned.

Osgood never left the town during the war; his compensation was earned while dealing with the crisis at home. Perhaps the compensation he received was for his work on the committee of militia, although the other two members of the committee, Thomas Chandler and Henry Ingalls, did not receive any pay from Massachusetts Bay. Osgood’s pay may have been a reimbursement for supplies he procured for his soldiers before they marched off to fight in Gardner’s company. As commander of a town on Essex County’s frontier, Osgood was forced to deal with a number of emergencies that crept up during the war, the most important being to ensure the town’s defenses and hold the frontier to shield interior towns from Indian attack. It is possible that he was paid for

---

165 Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 2:111.

166 For grand jury, see Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 2:168. For militia, see Bailey, *Historical Sketches of Andover*, 168.


169 Bodge, *Soldiers* (3rd ed.).

170 There is ample precedence for this type of payment. See the example of such a payment to the constable of Hatfield in the case of Captain Lathrop’s company in August 1675 in Bodge, *Soldiers* (3rd ed.), 139.
war service while commanding the town, although no other men on regular town militia
duty (sentry, garrison, drill, etc.) was thus compensated. Since the details of his
compensation are missing, we will never know exactly what he was paid for, but it is well
known how important his service to Andover was.

The next few months in Andover were nervous but relatively quiet until the war in
southern New England ended with King Philip’s death in the fall of 1676. In October
1676, the town rejoiced as the captive Timothy Abbot was returned to his family by an
Indian women who took pity on his mother. While conflict continued to rage in
Maine, and some Andover men were impressed to fight there in 1677, the town had
survived King Philip’s War.

Andover’s impressment record during the war is dominated by family status and
family connections of political and military power. While the economic and social status
of men was not a dominant factor in all impressments, five men from town were of
sufficiently low rank to make their position in the town’s hierarchy a possible motive for
their recruitment. Yet many sons from well-off families served as well, or some of them
did. It is quite clear that the town’s militia committee, made up of Osgood, Chandler, and
Ingalls, protected their own militia-age sons from the press. It also seems clear that
Lieutenant Osgood protected at least some sons of allied families, especially the Poor
family, who were linked to the Osgoods by marriage. Ensign Chandler does not seem to
have had the same clout on the committee. Chandler saw most of the sons of his group of
allied families go off to war, although he was able to protect his own sons. Among those
soldiers from leading families, it is curious that no first sons served during the war; they
seem to have been protected by the committee as well. Some of the men may have

171 Fuess, Andover, 71.
volunteered to go, lured by the glory of battle. This certainly seems plausible in the cases of John Marston and Nathan Stevens.

The fact that over a third of the men impressed were from families relatively new to town also points to a bias on the part of the committee. Few criminals were pressed into service from Andover because there simply were none to send. A few of the men pressed had slight, non-litigating debt problems which may have gained the attention of the committee members. The most plausible reason for the social and economic makeup of Andover’s pressed militiamen is simply the town’s homogeneous nature. Andover was in many ways the model seventeenth-century New England town, harmonious and without great economic or social divisions. The reason Andover did not send mostly “rabble” to fight the war, as so many other towns did, was that it did not have much “rabble” to send.
CHAPTER SIX

THE ISOLATED TOWNS OF ESSEX COUNTY AT WAR:
TOPSFIELD, MANCHESTER, AND WENHAM

The last type of Essex County community, small isolated towns, present serious obstacles to any historian examining them. One question is whether the tiny towns were truly independent political units or simply districts within larger communities? In addition, the populations of these towns was often so small that they nearly defy quantitative investigation—if a town’s population of soldiers was under five men, how can that possibly offer substantive conclusions? Perhaps it cannot, especially compared to the study of recruits from larger towns. Yet the details of small town militias are important to any understanding of the nature of military service and recruitment in the entire society. The lessons they teach are in many ways larger than the communities themselves.

These isolated hamlets offer a rare glimpse into the early years of the militia system in a town; their small size and relatively late settlement allow a glimpse at the formation of the institution of a town militia. In many ways, despite their interior (and relatively safe) position in the county, the small Essex towns are like frontier villages in this regard. In addition, their weaknesses meant that they often relied on larger, more powerful communities for assistance. The insular, closed New England town has become such a pervasive stereotype in colonial history that the relationships between towns has
been neglected by many historians. The interaction between towns and the conflict it
often brought is an important part of the colonial New England story.¹ While some
historians have studied the political dynamics between towns by examining large towns
that split into two separate communities, inter-town militia relationships offer yet another
excellent vantage point from which to scrutinize those important relationships.² During
war, healthy relationships between towns were crucial, yet as the history of King Philip’s
War in Essex County shows, even war could not stop friction between neighboring towns
or within the small towns themselves.

Incorporated after the majority of towns in Essex County, Topsfield, Wenham,
and Manchester were isolated villages, away from the hustle and bustle of Essex life.
None of the towns, though mainly agricultural communities, began as nuclear, open field
communities on the model of Andover. Richard Archer categorizes these communities as
places where those “too poor or too late to acquire property in well-established towns”
went to establish a family.³ While none of the three towns were strictly tied to a larger
town economically, as were subordinate towns like Rowley, they were connected to
neighboring towns by militia ties. The villages were too small to field a full company of
militia on their own, which forced them to make certain adjustments in military life.

¹ There has been some work done in this regard. For an interesting example of this type of study for Essex
County, see Harold Arthur Pinkham, “The Transplantation and Transformation of the English Shire in
America: Essex County, Massachusetts, 1630-1768” (Ph.D. diss., University of New Hampshire, 1980).

² The perfect example of the contentious relations between towns splitting into multiple communities in
Essex County is Salem, which saw parts of its territory become Beverly, Wenham, and Marblehead. For
details, see Sidney Perley, The History of Salem, Massachusetts, 3 vols. (Salem, Mass.: S. Perley, 1924).

³ Richard Archer, Fissures in the Rock: New England in the Seventeenth Century (Hanover, N.H.: 
isolated/frontier town, ignoring small Manchester altogether and placing Wenham among subordinate
towns. Based on a close reading of the Essex County records, Wenham is, in reality, an isolated
community. For Archer’s lists, see Archer, Fissures in the Rock, 164-166.
When the three towns were called upon in 1675-1676 to furnish men to fight in the war, their responses were in many ways dictated by their military and social situations. Manchester, which was tied to the militia of nearby Beverly, allowed Beverly’s militia leaders to play a significant role in selecting which Manchester men served, but not without some conflict. Topsfield’s militia committee did choose its own soldiers, in the end sending a number of men from districts on the outskirts of town, areas which had given them much trouble in the past. The experiences of Topsfield and Manchester point out the conflict inherent when two towns or sections of towns were forced to work together to field a single militia company. Topsfield’s difficulty with Rowley Village and Manchester’s troubled relationship with Beverly attest to that fact. The conflict seen between the towns and their neighbors is reminiscent of the later troubles between Salem Town and Salem Village which contributed to the conflict that culminated in the Salem witch craze in the 1692.\(^4\) Conflict did not come from inter-town relationships alone. Wenham was so small that it is hard to know whether it had a militia committee at all, or if its sergeant simply selected the men to serve; in that regard it mirrors the frontier towns of western Massachusetts that could not raise enough men to defend themselves. The small size and relatively weak position of the trainband caused trouble within the town and in the militia company even before the war started. The experiences of these small and isolated towns offer a unique glimpse of the workings of the militia system in the backcountry of Essex County, but they do more than that. They convey as much about conflicts inherent in Massachusetts society in the late seventeenth century as they do about the colony’s military situation.

The town of Topsfield, located in the middle of Essex County, was founded on land originally a part of Salem and Ipswich. The English settlers who began to move there in the late 1630s originally called the settlement New Meadows. As early as 1639, the General Court allowed settlers from Salem and Ipswich to set up a village in the area, on the north side of the Ipswich River. On October 18, 1648 the General Court renamed the settlement Topsfield, after a small parish in Essexshire, England. Exactly two years later, the village was incorporated as a town per the request of two powerful inhabitants, Zacheus Gould and William Howard. The vast meadowland in the town made it a perfect spot for a mix of farming and raising livestock. While small compared to its immediate neighbors Salem or Ipswich, Topsfield showed signs of steady growth and by

---

5 There are few histories of Topsfield. The most important and best known is George Francis Dow, Alice Goldsmith Waters Dow, and Ruth H. Allen, *History of Topsfield, Massachusetts* (Topsfield, Mass.: Topsfield Historical Society, 1940). In addition, there is some useful information in C. H. Webber and Winfield S. Nevins, *Old Naumkeag: An Historical Sketch of the City of Salem, and the Towns of Marblehead, Peabody, Beverly, Danvers, Wenham, Manchester, Topsfield, and Middleton* (Salem, Mass.: A.A. Smith and Lee & Shepard, 1877). There are no modern historical treatments of the town. In large part due to the extraordinary efforts of genealogist and historian George Francis Dow, there are a large number of published primary records for the town, the most important of which include: *Vital Records of Topsfield, Massachusetts to the End of the Year 1849*, (Topsfield, Mass.: Topsfield Historical Society, 1903); George Francis Dow, *Town Records of Topsfield, Massachusetts, 1639-1778*, 2 vols. (Topsfield, Mass.: Topsfield Historical Society, 1917); George Francis Dow, ed., *Baptismal Records of the Church in Topsfield, Massachusetts 1727-1779* (Salem, Mass.: Salem Press, 1895); George Francis Dow, *Topsfield Deaths from 1638 to 1800: Compiled from Town, Church, and County Court Records* (Salem, Mass.: Salem Press, 1897). In addition, the active Topsfield Historical Society, founded by Dow, infrequently published a journal of history and genealogy of the town and area called *The Historical Collections of the Topsfield Historical Society* starting in 1895. A number of important family histories and genealogies were included in this journal and at other places. A sampling of the town’s genealogies includes: Gay Esty Bangs, “Isaac Esty of Topsfield and Some of His Descendants,” *Historical Collection of the Topsfield Historical Society* 5 (1899): 105-117; Walter Davis, Jr., “The Wildes Family of Essex County, Massachusetts,” *Historical Collections of Topsfield Historical Society* XI (1906): 17-35; George Mooar, *The Cummings Memorial: A Genealogical History of the Descendants of Isaac Cummings, an Early Settler of Topsfield, Massachusetts*, reprint of 1903 B.F. Cummings ed. (New York: New England Historic Genealogical Society, 1993).
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the late 1660s had a population of around thirty-five to forty families. Topsfield was more prosperous than its small neighbors, Manchester and Wenham, which both grew slowly and had only around twenty-five families at the time of the King Philip’s War. Unfortunately for historians, the early town meeting records of Topsfield were lost in a fire at the town clerk’s house in 1658; the earliest surviving continuous record comes from the town book started in 1675, which does contain some earlier records.

Despite the loss of the early town records, the remaining town records, combined with county and colony records, offer a surprisingly complete record of the militia in Topsfield from 1666 on. In June 1666, the General Court confirmed and approved that “the inhabitants of Topsfield and the villages adjoining thereunto, having by order of Major Danyell Denison, met together in a military way and choose officers of a foot company of train soldiers.” This order confirms that Topsfield and its neighboring village, known as Rowley Village, were following an order by Major General Denison to pool their men into a single militia unit. This provision had been placed in the law so smaller towns and villages could combine their forces into a functional unit when the

---

7 These figures are taken from Topsfield Historical Society, “County Rate Made the 18th of November 1668 for Topsfield,” *Historical Collections of Topsfield Historical Society* 3 (1895): 51. See Appendix 4. The list has forty-four names, but a number of them belong to the same families.

8 See the sections below for Wenham and Manchester.

9 For information on the state of the records, see Topsfield Historical Society, *Town Records of Topsfield Massachusetts 1659-1739*, vii.


towns were too small to field their own company of at least sixty-four men.12 The order also confirmed the officers chosen by this combined company: "John Reddington as sergeant-in-chief to command the company, Joseph Bigsby, sr. sergeant, Abraham Reddington, sr., clerk and Edmund Towne, John Cummings, and William Smith, corporals."13 The highest officer listed is a sergeant, meaning that the company, even including men from the outlying village, was still under full strength. In 1667, less than a year later, John Gould was chosen and confirmed as ensign (and new commander) of the company, followed a year later by Francis Peabody's appointment above Gould as the new company commander with the rank of lieutenant.14 Little did Lieutenant Peabody know he was about to enter into a long and drawn out controversy over the nature of his militia company.

In the early 1670s, a militia controversy between Rowley Village and Topsfield had to be resolved by the General Court. Rowley Village was a small hamlet outside the original town center of Rowley that developed near the Topsfield town line in the 1660s. Rowley Village was closely connected to Topsfield, the inhabitants attending religious meetings and militia training there.15 In 1671, a number of village inhabitants, led by Abraham Reddington, a former clerk of the band, petitioned the General Court to sever

12 This was passed by the General Court in May 1652, Shurtleff, ed., Mass. Bay Gov. Recs., 4: pt:1:86 and codified in the 1672 edition of the General Laws and Liberties of the Massachusetts Colony. See William Henry Whitmore, Colonial Laws of Massachusetts, Reprinted from the Edition of 1660, with the Supplements to 1672: Containing Also, the Body of Liberties of 1641 (Boston: Published by order of the City Council of Boston, 1889).


the ties between Rowley Village and Topsfield. Others asked the Court to allow them to stay connected with Topsfield, claiming great hardship if they were forced to travel several miles into Rowley to conduct civic functions. In June 1671, charges were brought against Sergeant Joseph Bigsby and Abraham Reddington of Rowley Village for refusing to attend training in Topsfield and they were fined by the Essex County Quarterly Court. The “rest of the company which did exempt itself from training” were to be fined by the clerk of the band in Topsfield “as his duty entailed.”

In November 1671, the controversy continued when the town of Topsfield petitioned the quarterly court, stating that the actions of the villagers (not paying their church rate yet still attending services) were hurting the town of Topsfield. In addition, the fact that the villagers were staying away from militia training was seen as a hardship, “the withdrawling of them from the village . . . . Military discipline and exercise can not be well attended and promoted by reason of the paucity of our trained soldiers listed in Topsfield very few; too few to make our exercise to have any thing of soldier-like luster and beauty in it.” Topsfield asked the court to enjoin the villages to return to the fold, at least temporarily. By March 1672, the quarterly court rendered its verdict and it “ordered that at the next training day at Topsfield, the soldiers of the Village shall attend there and declare whether for the future they will train there or not. And as the major part of the said Village soldiers shall determine by vote, it shall be binding during the court’s pleasure.” However, the quarterly court was not the last voice heard on the subject.

---

16 Gage, History of Rowley, 360-363.
17 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 4:397.
The matter seemed finally settled in May 1672 when the Essex Quarterly Court reversed its own call for a vote on the matter and issued the following directive by order of the superior General Court in Boston:

[Quarterly] Court being informed that the General Court has allowed the uniting of Rowley Village with Topsfield in one military Company, appointing their officers as their own desire, they revolke their former order of March last, and declare that the said Villagers ought to continue in the military company with Topsfield and to attend all military service and exercise under the established officers of that company until they be released or otherwise disposed of by the General Court’s order.20

Yet, in October 1674, the General Court issued another ruling, this time their final word on the long-standing case. They allowed the men of Rowley Village to serve either at Topsfield or Rowley, “as shall best suite with their inclinations and occasions.”21 Most villagers complied and a few found themselves fighting for Topsfield during King Philip’s War.22 Some of the families of Rowley Village sent sons to fight for Rowley in 1675-1676.23 Despite this compromise, the exact nature of Rowley Village was in limbo for some time, as both Topsfield and Rowley held power over the villagers’ lives. This state of affairs continued until Rowley Village was incorporated as the town of Boxford

20 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:37.


22 The Curtis family, who had two sons fight during the war, served from Topsfield.

23 Most notably, the Tiler family resided in Rowley Village by the late 1670s (possibly earlier) and a Samuel Tiler or Tyler was impressed for Appleton’s Company from Rowley. See Chapter 4. See also Gage, History of Rowley, 182.
in 1685 and allowed its own militia company.\textsuperscript{24} The pattern of conflict between small towns over militia affairs was seen time and again in the colonial period.

Topsfield’s Committee of Militia in the years before and during King Philip’s War consisted of the top three militia officers in town, as Topsfield did not have a magistrate living in town and did not send a representative to the General Court during the period.\textsuperscript{25} Thus, the committee was made up of Lieutenant Francis Peabody, Ensign John Gould, and John Reddington, the town’s most senior sergeant.\textsuperscript{26} When the war broke out in the summer of 1675, Topsfield’s interior position in the county offered it a relative sense of security. Yet, the war did come to town. Topsfield’s first son was sent to fight in August 1675, when Thomas Hobbs served in Captain Thomas Lathrop’s ill-fated company.\textsuperscript{27} Hobbs was listed among those killed at the Bloody Brook on September 18, 1675.\textsuperscript{28}

Even before the news of the death of its citizen reached town, the successes of the Indian enemy in the early days of the war caused a shift in Topsfield’s mood from one of ease to worry and anxiety. The town meeting on September 8, 1675 ordered the building of a fortification,


\textsuperscript{26} Dow, Dow, and Allen, \textit{History of Topsfield}, 125-126.

\textsuperscript{27} Dow incorrectly identifies this soldier as Thomas Towne, see Dow, Dow, and Allen, \textit{History of Topsfield}, 141. The official records name a Thomas Hobbs as serving with Lathrop, see George Madison Bodge, \textit{Soldiers in King Philip’s War}, reprint of 1906 3rd ed. (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1967), 133-141, at 136, 138.

\textsuperscript{28} Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 136.
wee have agreed to mak a stone wall aboute the meeting house for fort... the wall is to be three foot brod in the bottom and five foot hie... or six as shall be thote most Conveniant with a watch hous at the south est Corner in this wall ten feet squarethis is to be done by the towne... This wall is to be ten feet from the meeting house side and end... and the watch hows Corner is to be fore foot from the hous end.29

As late as 1706, this fortification was still standing and was known in town as the “old meeting house fort.”30 Despite their new fortification, the citizens of Topsfield were still greatly distressed and apprehensive about a possible Indian attack. By October, with the news of Indian attacks spreading, there was a growing sense of panic in all of the towns of Essex County. Major Dennison, the Sergeant Major of the county, wrote to the council in Boston that he planned to advance on two isolated towns to offer some assistance and calm the inhabitants, “our posts at Topsfield & Andover being affrighted with the sight, as they say, of Indians... It is hardly imaginable the panick fears that is upon our upland plantations and scattered places... The almighty and merciful God pity and help us.”31

In November 1675, the call went out to the towns to ready recruits for a major offensive against the Narragansett Indians.32 Topsfield sent a total of five men, the

---

29 Dow, Topsfield Town Records, 17-18.
30 Dow, Dow, and Allen, History of Topsfield, 141.
32 Isaac Cummings, Jr., a sometime resident of Topsfield, served in Appleton’s Company during this campaign, however, he did so as a recruit of Ipswich, in which section he is treated. See Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 164—167. See also Albert Oren. Cummins, Cummings Genealogy: Isaac Cummings, 1601-1677
largest group of men impressed from the town at any one time. On November 30, 1675 John How, the clerk of the Topsfield militia, made a report to the major general reporting the men assigned to fill Topsfield’s quota: “Willyom Peabody, Zachos Perkins, Robert Andros, Jack Burton, Zacviah Curtis . . . are phrased according to your Henered order and fixed with arms and Ammunition: only Zacviah Curtis he is praised and was warned to come to the Clerks to Show his arms but he hath not Com but we here he hath hired Himself to go for Mr. Browne of Salem.”

Zachariah Curtis did not serve for Topsfield in the campaign, but instead had already hired himself out as a substitute to serve for a “Mr. Browne of Salem”; Topsfield sent his older brother Zacheus to serve in his stead. Of the five men who left Topsfield to serve under Captain Gardner, four survived the campaign. Robert Andrews was killed December 19, 1675 while storming the Narragansett fort.

John Wild/Wildes of Topsfield served with two different companies during the war, starting in the fall of 1675 under Captain Poole in the garrison at Quabaog. Wild

---


35 Dow, Dow, and Allen, History of Topsfield, 142.


went on to serve under Captain Turner when Poole’s company was transferred to Turner in the spring of 1676. At the time of the transfer, John Wild attained the rank of corporal. He saw extensive service and was paid over sixteen pounds for his lengthy time in uniform. It is not known if he was impressed for service under Poole or if he volunteered; but, a small town such as Topsfield might easily have been issued a warrant for only one man. It seems probable, based on his elevation to corporal and his very lengthy term of service, that Wild either enjoyed or excelled at soldiering or both.

By 1676, the war was striking closer to home as attacks increased and the frontier drew ever closer to Essex County. The military command of the colony proposed that the eastern towns fortify their frontier by building a fence or wall from the Charles River north to the Merrimack River. Each town was to plan a section of the wall and send delegates to Cambridge in March to discuss the plan. Almost every town involved disapproved of the unfeasible plan. In March 1676, the Topsfield selectmen and the militia committee met together to send their reply to the General Court. Citing the great expense of such a wall, the Topsfield commission replied they had:

concaiv some other waye for Sacuerity may be less Charg . . . for the careing of our Husbendry we concaive that it will be most Safe for us to be ordered to go in Companies to our work that soe we may have Some to watch whan the other work: ther for we Humbely desire the Honored Court or Counsell to apint and

John’s brother Jonathan also served during the war, but no official record of his service can be found. See Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.).


39 Davis, “Ancestry of Dudley Wildes,” 625. This was an excessive amount, most soldiers were paid between two and three pounds for their service. See Chapter 2.

40 Dow, Dow, and Allen, History of Topsfield, 143.
impower Sum met persons that so may Se that the Severall in Habitants may So be disposed of and we now being ordered into foure Garisons and so be com foure compenis we doe conceive that if Some man or men in Eatch Garison be opinted to order that Company to witch thay belong, it may be most Convanent.41

The town divided itself into four companies, based on four garrison houses to establish a watch over the agricultural work which had to continue, Indian threat or not.

The records also report that three men from Topsfield were reimbursed by the colony for unknown military “service.”42 It is not known whether James Stanley and Isaac and Joseph Estey served in an active unit or simply offered other assistance to the war effort. It is possible they were compensated for service in one of the town’s own garrison companies, perhaps as a leader of a garrison house company established by the town’s watch plan. All together, if the substitute Zachariah Curtis is included, eleven men from Topsfield were paid for war service; only seven of which, it is assumed, were impressed by Topsfield’s militia committee.43

Looking at the seven men impressed by the committee, a few patterns are discernable. The birth dates of six of the seven men (83 percent) impressed are known.44

41 “Town of Topsfield to General Court, 22 March 1676,” volume 68, document 172 in Felt, “Massachusetts Archives Collection.”


43 This number assumes John Wild was impressed. The discrepancy comes about from the unknown records of the Esteys and James Stanley and the fact that Zachariah Curtis hired himself out as a substitute before he could be impressed.

44 Birth dates came from myriad sources: town birth records, church records, court records, probate records, and town histories. For Topsfield, the most important are: Vital Records of Topsfield; Dow, Topsfield Town Records; Dow, ed., Topsfield Church Records; Dow, Dow, and Allen, History of Topsfield; Ipswich Historical Society, “Probate Records Relating to Topsfield.” Topsfield family histories are also an excellent source of birth records. For a sampling, see Walter Goodwin Davis, “Perkins Family of Topsfield,” in Massachusetts and Maine Families in the Ancestry of Walter Goodwin Davis (1883-1966), ed. Walter Goodwin Davis (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1996); Davis, “The Wildes Family of
The impressed men of Topsfield were older than the county average. Their ages, which ranged from 26 to 32 at the time of the war, averaged 28.5 years; while the average for all enlisted men from Essex County that served was 26.6 years old. It seems that the militia committee was choosing older men on purpose. Interestingly, two of the men with unknown, possibly home service, Joseph and Isaac Estey, were considerably younger, aged 17 and 18 respectfully. Despite their above average age, all of the men originally impressed by the committee were unmarried. In fact, the only married man who served, out of all eleven men, was Zacheus Curtis, who served in his brother’s place in Gardner’s company. He had married in December 1673. It is evident that in order to protect the town’s economic, religious, and social fabric, Topsfield’s militia committee made the lack of a spouse and family a very high priority in its impressment decisions.

As unmarried men, the soldiers still had close ties to their birth families; most probably still lived at home. A close look at the socio-economic situation in Topsfield offers some interesting data about the families. In addition to the normal probate data on each family and the listing of the various government posts the family patriarchs held, a

---


45 For details on soldier’s ages, see Appendix 1.


47 Vital Records of Topsfield. Topsfield did have the highest age at time of marriage of all the Essex County towns. The average age at time of marriage for Topsfield men, according to Archer, Fissures in the Rock, 167, was 27.2 years. The next closest Essex County town was Andover at 26.9. Both Andover and Topsfield were relatively small towns. Larger commercial towns, such as Salem, had a much lower mean age at marriage for men, in the case of Salem 23.9 years.

listing of the land allotments made in 1668 and a tax list from the same year survives to help establish the town’s socio-economic and political hierarchy (see Appendix 4).49

Looking at the seven men impressed into active companies by the committee, three men came from leading families (43 percent), two came from the middling group (29 percent) and two (29 percent) have insufficient records to make a categorization (see Table 6-1).50

Not a single man impressed came from a demonstrated subordinate family, although the two men without sufficient records, Thomas Hobbs and Isaac Burton, may well have fallen into that category. Of the men with unknown service, two (brothers) were from a middling family, while one was from a subordinate family.

The predominance of soldiers from Topsfield’s leading and upper middling families is even more pronounced when looking at the 1668 tax list and land allotment records (see Table 6-1 and Appendix 4).51 While taken seven years before the war, the two lists offer a clear image of the socio-economic hierarchy in Topsfield during the war; the amount of change in the social-hierarchy in most interior towns during this period of the seventeenth century was very low.52 A few soldiers (or their families) do not appear

---

49 Topsfield Historical Society, *Town Records of Topsfield Massachusetts 1659-1739*, 56-57; Topsfield Historical Society, "County Rate 1668."

50 See the Introduction, pg. 30 note 79, for a description of the categories and their criteria.

51 Topsfield Historical Society, *Town Records of Topsfield Massachusetts 1659-1739*, 56-57; Topsfield Historical Society, "County Rate 1668."

### Table 6-1
Socio-Economic and Political Hierarchy of Topsfield Soldiers' Families, 1668-1675

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1668 Tax Rank</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Soldier</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>1668 Land Allotment</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>William Peabody</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>30 Acres</td>
<td>Lieutenant Comm. of Militia Selectmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Zacheus Perkins</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>30 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Poole &amp; Turner</td>
<td>John Wild Jr.</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Thomas Hobbs Jr.,</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Isaac Burton</td>
<td>William Nickols</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Isaac Jr. &amp; Joseph Estey</td>
<td>Isaac Sr.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>James Stanley</td>
<td>Mathu</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>10 Acres</td>
<td>Mortgaged Farm in 1675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not on Tax List:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Zacheus Curtis Jr.</td>
<td>Zacheus Sr.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not in Town 1668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Zachariah Curtis</td>
<td>Zacheus Ss.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not in Town 1668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1668 Tax Rank** is the families' overall rank in Topsfield. **Category** is the families' socio-economic ranking as used in this study, L=leading family, M=middling family, and S=subordinate family. **1668 Land Allotment** was the size of lot the town provided for the family.

---

53 Topsfield Historical Society, “County Rate Made the 18th of November 1668 for Topsfield,” *Historical Collections of Topsfield Historical Society* 3 (1895): 51.

54 See the Introduction, pg. 30 note 79, for the categories.
on the 1668 tax list; the Curtis brothers were not Topsfield inhabitants in 1668, living in Rowley Village.\textsuperscript{55} Robert Andrews’s father, Robert Andrews Sr., died in 1668 and no one from the upper middling family was included on the 1668 tax list, perhaps the settlement of the estate was still pending.\textsuperscript{56}

A close look at the tax and land records shows that out of only seven men impressed, five (71 percent) were in the top quartile of the town’s hierarchy.\textsuperscript{57} If the Andrews family is included in this quartile, based on the father’s high probate total of £685 in 1668, six out of the seven men (86 percent) would come from the top 25 percent of town families. Based on the tax list data alone, which excludes the Curtis brothers, none of the impressed men came from the bottom three-quarters of the town’s hierarchy. If the Curtis family, which sent both impressed Zacheus Jr. and the non-impressed substitute Zachariah is included into the hierarchy (based on Zacheus Sr. 1682 probate inventory of £134), they would place in one of the bottom two quartiles of the town hierarchy. Thus, Topsfield’s Committee of Militia impressed men from either the highest strata or a relatively low middling or possibly subordinate strata—there were none from the middle. The three men with unknown service, the Esteys and James Stanley do come from the middle of the 1668 tax list; however, by 1675 Mathu Stanley, James’s father,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{55} Davis, “Curtis Family of Boxford and Topsfield,” 334.
\item \textsuperscript{57} This includes Isaac (Jack) Burton, who had been adopted by William Nickols, who placed eleventh on the town tax list and had twenty acres of land assigned in 1668. See Dow, Dow, and Allen, \textit{History of Topsfield}, 49.
\end{itemize}
was in severe economic trouble and forced to mortgage his entire farm, placing him in a subordinate position.58

The reasons for this pattern are not clear. The reliance on sons of the elite families is similar to the pattern found in Andover, a town with a similar economic and settlement position in the colony.59 However, that is where the similarity ends. Unlike Andover, where the militia committee members at least protected their own families from service, the committee in Topsfield sent its own to fight. Francis Peabody, the lieutenant in town and the highest-ranking member of the committee, sent his own son William to fight under Gardner. John Gould, the town company’s ensign and a militia committee member, sent a number of sons of allied families off to war, including John Wild and William Peabody who were related by marriage and the Curtis brothers, whose family had long been associated economically with the Goulds.60 The third committee member, John Reddington, was also related by marriage to William Perkins, as well as John Wild Jr., yet he helped send them off to war.61 It is very difficult to understand why.

It is possible that a number of the young men who fought did so of their own accord. Topsfield’s position as the town with the highest age of marriage for Essex County males belies the fact that these young men were tied to their father’s families longer than their contemporaries in other towns.62 The possibility is strong that a number

58 Dow, Dow, and Allen, *History of Topsfield*, 44.

59 See Chapter 5.


61 Dow, Dow, and Allen, *History of Topsfield*, 43.

62 For the links between fathers and sons, see Philip J. Greven, *Four Generations: Population, Land, and Family in Colonial Andover, Massachusetts* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1970), 72-99; Daniel...
of these sons of leading families volunteered for service to escape, even if temporarily, their families. The same possibility exists for the soldiers of Andover.\textsuperscript{63} On top of the excitement and adventure of campaigning, military service might have been enticing as an escape for monetary reasons. Although the system of enlistment bounties and land grants to ordinary soldiers was not yet regularly established, there was a slight monetary incentive to volunteer; even the small amount of cash earned independent of one’s father would be a leg up in becoming independent.\textsuperscript{64} There is also the idea of service to one’s community, often a strong urge during a crisis.

A factor that strengthens the argument that a number of these leading sons might have volunteered is their birth order.\textsuperscript{65} Most of the Topsfield men recruited for active service with an infantry company were not their families’ first sons, especially in the leading families (see Table 6-2). The two sons of leading families recruited, William Peabody and Zacheus Perkins, were their families' third and fourth sons, respectively. Robert Andrews, who also fought with Gardner, was the second son of his upper

---

\textsuperscript{63} See Chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{64} It is unlikely that this would be the main reason to volunteer, as was the case in the eighteenth century, when such monetary incentives were a major part of enlistment, according to Fred Anderson, \textit{A People’s Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years’ War} (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 26-62; Stephen C. Eames, “Rustic Warriors: Warfare and the Provincial Soldier on the Northern Frontier, 1689-1748” (Ph.D. diss., University of New Hampshire, 1989), 271-322. Most soldiers’ pay during King Philip’s War was simply too low, see Chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{65} Birth order data comes from a variety of sources, including vital, court, church, and probate records, as well as genealogies.
Table 6-2
Birth Order of Topsfield Soldiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soldier</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Birth-Order</th>
<th>Social Category &amp; Rank</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Age During War</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hobbs Lathrop</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>M-8</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Andrews Gardner</td>
<td>2nd Son</td>
<td>M-None</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Burton Gardner</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>M—11</td>
<td>William Nichols</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacheus Curtis Jr. Gardner</td>
<td>1st Son</td>
<td>M-None</td>
<td>Zacheus Sr.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Peabody Gardner</td>
<td>3rd Son</td>
<td>L-1</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacheus Perkins Gardner</td>
<td>4th Son</td>
<td>L-4</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wild Jr. Gardner</td>
<td>1st Son</td>
<td>M-7</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unknown Service:

| Zachariah Curtis Unknown-Substitute | 3rd Son | M-None | Zacheus Sr. | 24 |
| Isaac Estey Jr. Unknown            | 1st Son | M-15   | Isaac Sr.   | 18 |
| Joseph Estey Unknown                | 2nd Son | M-15   | Isaac Sr.   | 17 |
| James Stanley Unknown               | Unknown | S-23   | Mathu       | Unknown |

**Social Category and Rank** combines the families’ socio-economic ranking as used in this study, L=leading family, M=middling family, and S=subordinate family and the town rank based on the 1668 tax list.

middling family. The fact that these two men were not their families’ first sons meant that they had even longer to wait for independence from their family. Historians have shown that first sons in seventeenth-century Massachusetts married earlier and received more financial support than their younger brothers, who were then held at home longer than first sons. As non-first sons, they would be far behind their oldest brother in gaining control of any land and thus tied to their fathers longer; some might have sought

---

escape for a short time because of that fact. As younger sons of the most dominant men in town, men who had to retain their property to retain their high status, these young men had more of a reason to believe they would be waiting a long time for their own independence. Some of the sons from Topsfield’s leading families, especially William Peabody and Zacheus Perkins, probably volunteered to fight in order to escape their controlling families for a time, even though their connections to the militia committee would have protected them from impressment. All of the men who fought with active units were well over the age of twenty-one, the minimum age for such a decision. The ideal that many of these sons of leading families volunteered for service is the most plausible explanation for their recruitment, despite the relatively low numbers of volunteers from Massachusetts during King Philip’s War.

There are complications to this theory. The town’s very first soldier, John Hobbs of Lathrop’s Company, was killed in action. This must have brought the dangers of the war home to Topsfield’s citizens (including any potential volunteers for later campaigns) in a very real way. Second, as stated above, military pay was relatively low and the system of land bonuses for military service not yet established, making the financial reward for service relatively small. However, the men from the leading families had high

67 See Chapter 5.
hopes of eventual financial independence at their father's death. They needed temporary independence more than a financial incentive. Not that the pay was insubstantial for all of the men; for one Topsfield soldier, military pay was quite a large financial incentive.

John Wild Jr. was the first son of his family and at thirty-two years old had already been granted the use, but not the title, of some land by his father before the war.70 However, it was not enough to become independent and marry. Wild served with Captain Poole and stayed in the army when Poole's command was transferred to Captain Turner in 1676. By the time he mustered out in spring 1676, Wild had accumulated almost £16 in pay for his lengthy service.71 In addition, his political status grew when he was promoted to corporal during the war. It is almost certain he volunteered to remain in service at the time the company was transferred to Captain Turner; otherwise his length of service would have allowed him release from duty. But the war was very good to Wild; he increased his chance for earlier independence by his time in the army. He had been so successful in the military that in 1677, after King Philip's War was officially over, he volunteered to serve again, this time in Maine with Captain Benjamin Sweet. His second campaign was not as lucky for Wild; he was killed at Black Point in June 1677. Despite the preponderance of impressment during the war, the contention that a small number of leading sons of Topsfield probably volunteered for service, either from a sense of community duty, a calling for the glory of the battlefield, some financial reward (however small), or simply to get away from their small town and controlling families for a time, is compelling.


While it is probable that a number of men, mostly from leading families, volunteered for service, most men from town were impressed by the militia committee. What motivated these decisions? It is clear that the committee did not simply choose men from the lower socio-economic strata in town. Most of the men came from leading or middling families. One exception to this might be the case of Isaac Burton of Gardner’s company. Little is known of the background of the twenty-seven year old Burton. He lived with the William Nickols family, who treated him as their “adopted son.” While Nickols was the eleventh person in rank on the 1668 tax list, the socio-economic status of the adopted Burton is less certain; he does not appear on the 1668 rate himself, being too young. Perhaps even more important than his questionable status in the town’s hierarchy is the question of where Isaac Burton lived in town.

William Nickols and his family, including Burton, belonged to a small group of settlers on the fringes of Topsfield society. These settlers, who lived on the far edge of Topsfield, considered themselves citizens of Salem and disliked their enforced connection to Topsfield. After the war, Isaac Burton, who was given a portion of William Nickols' farm as his “adopted” son, continued to live in this outlying section of

---

72 One exception to this, among the three men with unknown service, is James Stanley, whose father Mathu Stanly was forced to mortgage his house and farm in 1675, placing the family into the subordinate category. See Dow, Dow, and Allen, *History of Topsfield*, 44. However, since the particulars of his contribution to the war effort are unknown, as is also the case with the Estey brothers, who fit into the middling category based on the 1668 tax list, the three men are not included in this analysis.

73 He was listed as “Jack Burton” in the initial recruitment report. See “John How to Major General Dennison, 30 November 1675,” volume 68 document 70 in Felt, “Massachusetts Archives Collection.”

74 Dow, Dow, and Allen, *History of Topsfield*, 49.

75 Topsfield Historical Society, “County Rate 1668.”

In addition, William Hobbs, the father of soldier Thomas Hobbs, also lived in this community of outsiders. While the Hobbs and Nickols/Burton families joined the Topsfield church, there is no doubt that they and the other families in their fringe settlement were seen as outsiders; outsiders who caused Topsfield conflict and expense with constant court cases over which town, Salem or Topsfield, controlled the area. In addition to the men who lived in the outlying sections of Salem, a number of soldiers came from the outlying sections of Topsfield associated with Rowley, known as Rowley Village. The Curtis brothers and Robert Andrews all came from this area of Topsfield. The early 1670s militia controversy over the village made it a controversial and problematic area for the town of Topsfield. Thus, five out of the eight men in known combat units (63 percent) were from the periphery of Topsfield and not from the main section of town. The status of outsider or outlier had a direct bearing on the militia committee’s impressment decisions once war came.

The militia committee in Topsfield also took criminal behavior into consideration in its recruitment decisions. A number of men had problems with the law in the years preceding the war. The low crime rates in the colony and the small number of men from each town accused each year of a crime made those men stand out in the eyes of their townsmen, especially those in power. This was especially true at the time of the war,

---

77 Dow, Dow, and Allen, History of Topsfield, 48-49.
78 Dow, Dow, and Allen, History of Topsfield, 48-49.
79 Andrews, History of the Andrews Family; Davis, “Curtis Family of Boxford and Topsfield.” For the militia controversy, see above and Chapter 4 on Rowley.
80 Eight men includes Zachariah Curtis, the substitute and the seven men from known units.
81 Crime was relatively rare in colonial New England, especially when compared to the same period in England. See Archer, Fissures in the Rock, 109; Edgar J. McManus, Law and Liberty in Early New
when the colony’s ministers and lay leaders were preaching that the sin and disorder which began to rise with the second generation of Puritan New England were responsible for God’s punishment in the form of the war. The General Court was so concerned about further sin that they issued new laws and revived the office of tithingman to enforce them in order to bring some order back to the society. What better way to set things right with God than to further punish troublemakers by sending them off to fight the very war their transgressions had prompted?

Topsfield’s first soldier, the outsider Thomas Hobbs of Lathrop’s command, had been fined in September 1668 for excessive drinking and had debt problems, including

---


84 Edgar McManus, an historian of crime in New England, argues that once the accused had been tried and punished, there was no stigma from the offense remaining and “the books were considered closed on the offense. The offender could then start over with almost a clean slate.” McManus, *Law and Liberty in Early New England*, 185. While this may have been the case in the pre-war period, the above average number of impressed men with criminal pasts seems to belie that argument. McManus himself states that this forgive and forget mentality was strongest “during the early years [founding period] when social cohesion was vitally important,” 183.
not paying the town rate for the minister’s house in the late 1660s and early 1670s. In April 1672, Robert Andrews (along with his brother Thomas and others) was fined for breach of the peace and “swearing upon a common frame.” While not a serious crime, it might have made all the difference to a militia committee trying to decide whom to send off to war in November 1675.

Of the five men recruited for Gardner’s company, two (40 percent) had criminal records. In reality, three men had criminal records, Robert Andrews and both the Curtis brothers, Zachariah and Zacheus. Despite the fact he did not serve when called by Topsfield, on account of his employment as a substitute, Zachariah Curtis was initially impressed by the committee most probably based on the fact that he and his family were known troublemakers. In June 1672, Zacheus Curtis Sr., his sons Zacheus Jr. and Zachariah, along with Abraham Reddington Jr. and John Everitt, were “complained of for smoking tobacco in the meeting house at Topsfield in the time when most people were met on a Lord’s Day to the great offense of the assembly.” All five men were presented in court and admonished for their behavior. It was quite a scandal in tiny Topsfield. John Everitt, a crippled man in town, sincerely apologized to the court for his actions. Abraham Reddington Jr., another of the convicted troublemakers, did not march off to war a few years later; one wonders if his relative, John Reddington of the committee of

---

87 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:63-64.
88 Massachusetts had banned smoking around crops and buildings, see McManus, Law and Liberty in Early New England, 51-53; Powers, Crime and Punishment. That the offense took place in the meeting house and during a Lord’s Day made the matter very serious indeed. See Powers, Crime and Punishment, 170-172.
89 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:63-64.
militia, saved him that fate? However, both the Curtis brothers found themselves called for service. It seems probable that the committee, having called the disorderly younger Zachariah for service, turned to his troublemaking older brother Zacheus when Zachariah was not available.

Zacheus's difficulties had not begun with the meetinghouse incident; he had a long and troublesome criminal record. He would probably have been the committee's first choice for service if not for the fact he was married. Zacheus Jr. had started getting in trouble early. In May 1663, at seventeen years of age, he was presented for falsely publishing an intention of marriage of a couple in town, against their will and without their knowledge. He was sentenced to stand in the church door and wear a sign on his hat reading "For setting up a false purpose of marriage." In March 1664, he was in more serious trouble. He was sentenced to be whipped and pay a fine for abusing Mary Hadley. Her statement reads:

when I was goone by Thomas bucrs hous where Zacheus Curtious was and he followed me and overtook me and he had a rood and he whipt me with that and then he let me goe and puled another rod and he ouer tock me agayne and whipt me with the 2 rod with my feet under his arms and and my head on the ground and then he let me goe and gathered two rods and ouertwoke me and made me pull of my cloths and whipt me with both them rods the thurd time and then he let me gooe agayne and got another rod and wypt me with that rod . . . and then he bid me goe and dress my selfe but . . . he would a had me to a gone in to a swamp

---


and I would not: and when I told him that I would tell my aunt he said he would whip me fewer times as much.\textsuperscript{92}

A secondary note explains that Curtis was being presented for whipping and abusing several children.\textsuperscript{93} This physical abuse (and possible attempted rape) was shocking to the tiny town. It was not Curtis's last bout of trouble, however.

In 1672, there was the smoking in the meetinghouse incident and in 1675, Zacheus Curtis was sought as a witness in the fire that destroyed the Saugus ironworks.\textsuperscript{94} While he was not directly implicated, he was friendly with some men that were. This recent incident might have reminded the authorities of his criminal past. When the militia committee tried and failed to fill its quota with his younger brother Zachariah in November 1675, the absence was easy to rectify by impressing his more troublesome older brother, despite the fact he was married at the time.\textsuperscript{95} Clearly, the militia committee felt that if it had to send men off to war, better to send some of the more difficult citizens in town.

By looking at the background of the soldiers from Topsfield, an image of recruitment emerges (see Table 6-3). Conscription in Topsfield seems to follow the long held belief of many historians about the workings of colonial recruitment, with volunteers stepping forward with the issuance of a recruitment warrant and the remainder of the

\textsuperscript{92} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 3:138.

\textsuperscript{93} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 3:138.

\textsuperscript{94} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 6:5. See also E. N. Hartley, \textit{Ironworks on the Saugus} (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1957).

\textsuperscript{95} He was, in fact, the only married man Topsfield sent to fight during the entire war.
Table 6-3
Impressment Factors in Topsfield, 1675-1676

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soldier</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Factors in Impressment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hobbs</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Town Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Record (September 1668)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Andrews</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Town Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Record (April 1672)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Burton</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Town Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questionable Economic Status (&quot;Adopted&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacheus Curtis Jr.</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Town Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serious Criminal Record (1663, 1664, 1672)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Peabody</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Probable Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacheus Perkins</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Probable Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wild Jr.</td>
<td>Poole, Turner</td>
<td>Possible Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachariah Curtis</td>
<td>Unknown-Substitute</td>
<td>Town Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Record (1672)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

unfilled slots being filled in with town undesirables by impressment.\textsuperscript{96} One need only to look at the mixture of militiamen: sons of the elite with connections on the militia committee (men who were very unlikely to have been impressed against their will) and a collection of town outsiders and troublemakers to see a pattern (see Table 6-3). This model, especially the relatively high number of volunteers, is not the norm for King Philip’s War; yet there are few other possible explanations for the pattern of Topsfield’s recruitment. Francis Peabody, John Gould, and Abraham Reddington, Topsfield’s Committee of Militia, thus fulfilled their town’s quotas in a way that would become the standard practice in the early eighteenth-century’s imperial wars; they and their town were ahead of their time.

\textsuperscript{96} This pattern is well established for the imperial wars of the eighteenth century, but is disputed here for the seventeenth century. For recruitment in the eighteenth century, see Anderson, \textit{A People’s Army}, 26-62; Eames, “Rustic Warriors,” 271-322, at 320-322.
Manchester

Manchester was the smallest town in Essex County at the time of King Philip’s War. It was located on the seacoast between Ipswich, Gloucester, Wenham, and Beverly. Unlike its neighboring towns, Manchester’s rugged shoreline of cliffs and boulders offers no safe harbor for ships. The area, originally known as Jeffery’s Creek, was first settled in the late 1630s. By 1640, a total of around seventeen families “jointly and humbly” petitioned the General Court in Boston to grant them permission to establish a village. In 1645, the families petitioned the legislature again, this time to change the name of the settlement to Manchester. The General Court never formally incorporated the town during the seventeenth century.

Manchester remained small. The number of families in town at any one time is unknown, but town records reveal less than twenty family names that appear with any frequency. In his history of the town, D.F. Lamson cites fifty-two different individuals named in the town records (representing forty-six distinct family names) up to 1676, however, many appear to have quickly come and gone without staying. In 1686, the

---

97 Manchester has been virtually ignored by historians of colonial Massachusetts. The only dedicated history of the town is D. F. Lamson, History of the Town of Manchester, Essex County, Massachusetts, 1645-1895 (Manchester, Mass.: Published by the Town, 1895). The same history (word for word in some cases) with some additional information was printed as a part of the history of the county as D. F. Lamson, "Town of Manchester," in Municipal History of Essex County in Massachusetts, ed. Benjamin F. Arrington (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., 1922). Very small and sketchy historical treatments of the town are made in Perley, History of Salem; Webber and Nevins, Old Naumkeag. In addition, there are two printed volumes of town and vital records, Vital Records of Manchester, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849, (Salem, Mass.: Essex Institute, 1903); Town Records of Manchester, from the Earliest Grants of Land, 1636... (Salem, Mass.: Salem Press, 1889).

98 Lamson, History of Manchester, 22-23.

99 Town Records of Manchester.

100 Lamson, "Town of Manchester," 137.
town rate for the “use and support of his majesties government in new england” showed only thirty-one families residing in town, a full ten years after the conclusion of the war and over forty-five years after the town’s founding.\footnote{Lamson, \textit{History of Manchester}, 52.} The town records are mostly a record of land grants, typical in size and type of land (marsh, pasture, and planting) for a small agricultural community in Massachusetts at the time. The town leadership positions circulated among the same men (under 10 in number) from about 1660 to 1680.\footnote{Town Records of Manchester, 8-17.}

The history of the militia in Manchester is very unclear. There is not a single reference to a militia unit of any kind in the town records.\footnote{Town Records of Manchester.} Nor is there any mention of a military unit based in town up to 1676 in any of the town histories.\footnote{Lamson, "Town of Manchester;" Lamson, \textit{History of Manchester}; Webber and Nevins, \textit{Old Naumkeag}.} In the militia reorganization of Massachusetts undertaken after King Philip’s War in 1680, Manchester was missing from the 2nd (North) Essex Regiment, indicating that the town had no militia organization of its own.\footnote{Robert K. Wright, “Massachusetts Militia Roots: A Bibliographic Study,” (Washington: Departments of the Army and the Air Force, Historical Branch, Office of Public Affairs, National Guard Bureau, 1986), 11.} Nor are there any definite clues to any militia officers in town. The town records do mention an inhabitant who is listed as “Srgt Wolfe” in 1636, but no other mention of him (or any other officer) is made.\footnote{Town Records of Manchester, 4.} It seems that Manchester, as a small and insignificant town, had no organized militia unit or militia committee at the time of King Philip’s War.
Yet, five men from Manchester served as militiamen during the war. John Allen, John Bennett, and Joshua Carter served with Captain Lathrop during his ill-fated campaign in the fall of 1675. Samuel Pickworth was a corporal under Captain Gardner during the Narragansett campaign of 1675. And finally, John Knight was recruited for service in November of 1675. Knight’s recruitment offers important clues into the operation of the militia recruitment in Manchester during the war. In March 1676, a case came before the quarterly court of Essex County based on a militia problem in Manchester the previous fall. The court convicted Samuel Leach of Manchester for “abusive speeches, affronting and not obeying authority, when impressed for the county’s service” and ordered him to be whipped or pay a hefty five-pound fine.

The documentary evidence of this case offers the only remaining evidence of militia recruitment in Manchester during the war. On November 3, 1675, a warrant was sent to John Elithrop, the constable of Manchester, from the lieutenant of Beverly’s town militia, William Dixsy. The warrant ordered Elithrop to impress one soldier for service and bring him to Beverly to join that town’s company on an appointed day. It is apparent from these documents that Manchester’s men were under the control of the Beverly militia. After Beverly received a summons for men, it allotted a portion of its quota to Manchester. When the recruitment patterns for both towns are compared, the case for


108 Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.)*, 164-167. Lamson had this wrong; he credits Pickworth under Lathrop and even asserts that Pickworth died at the Bloody Brook. See Lamson, *History of Manchester*, 55.

109 Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 6:132-134. Lamson also had this wrong; he does not credit Knight with service. See Lamson, *History of Manchester*, 55.


this is even stronger. Not a single soldier from Manchester served in a company that did not also include men from Beverly’s militia; the quotas for Beverly became Manchester’s quotas and the men from both towns served side by side.\textsuperscript{112}

However, the relationship between the two towns and their militias is even more complex. Rarely in the history of the Massachusetts militia have so many different warrants been issued to impress one man. The first of four warrants was dated September 18, 1675 and reads: “To the constable of Manchester you ar required in his maiestys name to impress one able man of yor towne for the servis of the Contry complete in armes & to be at an owers warning by order of ye Comander Leftenant William Dixsy [of Beverly’s militia] & John Knite I will not except of.”\textsuperscript{113} This warrant was too late to be the instrument that impressed the men for Lathrop’s command from Manchester and was too early for the impressment of Samuel Pickworth for the Narragansett campaign. It appears likely that no one was ever impressed based on this warrant, which prompted the militia committee of Beverly to issue a second warrant on October 10, 1675. This warrant to Elithrop was more precise in its requirements and included a threat to the Manchester’s constable “faill not upon ye peril by order of the melette [militia] of Beverly.”\textsuperscript{114} It appears from the record that Constable Elithrop tried to impress Samuel Leach of Manchester for militia service. According to Elithrop’s later testimony, Leach “answered he thought he should not go, saying ‘You may go yourself if you will’ and presently Rose up and bending his fist threatened to strike me [Elithrop] and struck my

\textsuperscript{112} Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}.

\textsuperscript{113} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 6:133.

\textsuperscript{114} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 6:132.
pipe out of my mouth. He [Leach] lifted up his foot and threatened to kick him
[Elithrop], calling him rogue and said he would turn him out of his house, etc."

Despite his violent refusal to serve, it seems that Leach did eventually report to the
muster at Beverly; however, the twisted tale does not end there.

Manchester’s quota of Beverly’s militia, which was supposed to have been filled
by the impressment of Samuel Leach, was still unfilled in January 1676. In early
January, two additional militia warrants were sent to Constable Elithrop in Manchester.
The warrant of January 11, 1676 stated: “To the constabell of manchister you ar
Requiered in his magesteys name to bring up your imprsed man by to morrow ten of the
clock to beveley: to attend furder order all complet according to law with eight days
prosion by order of the millishia Left William Dickse.” The second warrant, issued
the very next day, was even more precise, naming the soldier to be impressed (John
Knight) and adjusting the time of his muster, armed and equipped, to eight in the morning
on January 14, 1676 at Beverly. William Dixsy, the militia commander of Beverly,
was leaving nothing to chance, giving constable Elithrop very explicit instructions and
making him deliver John Knight in person to the muster. But why was this necessary?
Samuel Leach had been Manchester’s contribution to the Beverly militia. Yet this was
not the case; Leach had been released from service by the “militia of Beverly,” after
being impressed by Elithrop in the fall of 1675 and had never served. How he was

115 While this appears to have happened in the fall of 1675 when Elithrop tried to impress Leach, it did not
come to light until much later (January 21, 1676) in testimony given about an associated case. See Dow,


117 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 6:133.

118 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 6:133.
able to convince Dixsy to release him without fulfilling his service is unknown. What makes it even more strange is the fact that Dixsy allowed Leach to leave and later accepted for service John Knight; this despite the fact that the very first warrant, back in September 1675, had said that Knight was not acceptable.\textsuperscript{119} In the end, John Knight served under Captain Poole in the garrison forces of western Massachusetts.\textsuperscript{120}

While it seems that William Dixsy of the Beverly militia was controlling the militia situation in Manchester, this state of affairs did not sit well with the selectmen of Manchester. They entered the fray by signing out a warrant, once again to be served by poor constable Elithrop, to compel Samuel Leach to care for John Knight’s wife, who was now at home without a husband. They also severely criticized the methods of the Beverly militia. The Manchester selectmen, Thomas Bishop, John West, and Samuel Freed, laid out their concerns in a petition to Magistrate and Major General Daniel Denison:

To the Court, Respecting a woman and her child that is left in a very poore Condition her husband being prest for the service of the country whereas another was prest that was in every Respect more fitt as we conceive namely Samuel Leech who was sett fre by the malitia of bevarly which was contrary to order as we conceive we do intreat your worship that you would be pleased to direct us what to doe in such a case the inhabitants of our village doe manifest as there inability so there unwillingness to contribute to her present nessessity and the Reason they aledg is that Samuell leech was prest before and did not goe and

\textsuperscript{119} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 6:133.

\textsuperscript{120} Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 258-259.
therefore was a delinquent... we conceive that the malitia of beverlay had no power to give any warrant to pres another man therefore we hope that your worship will Judge that either the malitia of beverlay or Samuel leech should maintain this woman in her husbands absence.

The selectmen were bolstered when Major General Denison answered: “if there were any irregularitie in sending away that soldier [John Knight] and releasing Leech, yet being sent & now in ye countries service, the selectman must take care that his family does not suffer in his absence & they have power to press Leach or any other to carry on his occasions & if any refuse upon notice given order shall be taken with them.”

When Constable Elithrop tried to serve this latest warrant, an order to assist Goodwife Knight, the uncooperative Leach once again failed to follow the selectmen’s orders. Elithrop testified that: “In a scoffing manner Leech had said that he would take no notice of the warrant for it was more than the Selectmen or the Major General or the Governor himself or the King could do and he said he would get some copies of the warrant to set up in other towns to publish what fools they were. Also that Leach did nothing for Goodwife Knits [Knight] though she was in a suffering condition for want of wood and other necessaries.” This incident of disrespect for authority had prompted the entire 1676 court case and caused the quarterly court to issue its ruling against Leach. He was convicted and ordered to be whipped or pay a fine of £5.

---

121 Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 6:133.
122 Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 6:133.
Like it, was so upsetting to the government that in May 1676, the General Court passed a new law, stating that men neglecting to appear would be fined £4 and "if their neglects or refusal shall be accompanied with refractions, reflection, or contempt upon authority, such persons shall be punished by death or some other grievous punishment." In addition to Leach’s fine, the court allowed Constable Elithrop costs, the least they could do for such a faithful and often abused public servant. Mary Knight and her family got little relief, however, and the quarterly court ordered as late as June 1676 that both the militia committee in Beverly and the selectmen of Manchester “forthwith take care that they may be relieved and not suffer” because the family was still “in great need.”

The case offers us some important insights into the militia in Manchester, the relationship between the militia in a small town and a larger neighboring town, and a glimpse of how a town too small to have its own militia went about selecting men for service. First, the small number of men impressed from the town, five total for the entire war, is easy to understand in light of the fact that Manchester was so small that it did not even have a militia unit of its own. It is simply not known, for the records are silent, what the peacetime relationship between the two militias was. While it is not certain, it would seem probable that the men from Manchester trained with the Beverly militia prior to the war. Until 1668, Beverly was a part of Salem and not a distinct entity of its own, so it is very possible that the men from Beverly and Manchester trained with the Salem militia in the early days of settlement. However, the relationship between the men of Manchester and Beverly’s militia is made clear in the court case and shows a strong link during King Philip’s War. If the same relationship existed before the war, the total


absence of militia officers in Manchester and the lack of any mention of the militia in the
town records are easier to understand.

Another question the court case alludes to, but does not answer completely, is
who was choosing the men of Manchester to serve when called. Normally, the town’s
committee of militia would make the determination of which men from town to impress.
However, it seems very clear that Manchester did not have a single militia officer (or
non-commissioned officer), let alone a militia committee. From the records in the
Samuel Leech case, it seems probable that the constable of Manchester chose which men
to impress once the warrant arrived from Beverly’s militia commander. The case for this
is strong, since each of the four impressment warrants was addressed to him.\(^ {127}\) In
addition, in the first warrant, issued in September 1675, Lieutenant Dixsy of Beverly
actually names a man, John Knight, who will not be acceptable as an impressed soldier,
which seems to imply the choice was up to Manchester’s constable, with guidance from
Beverly’s militia establishment. This notice also makes it clear that the men in the two
towns knew each other well and supports the argument that men from the two towns
trained together before the war. Early in the war, Beverly’s militia was commanded by
Captain Thomas Lathrop, who recruited five men from Beverly and three from
Manchester for his own ill-fated campaign in August 1675.\(^ {128}\) There are no surviving
warrants from this impressment, but, if they followed the same pattern as occurred later

\(^{127}\) Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 6:132-134.

\(^{128}\) For Lathrop’s role in the Beverly militia, see Edwin Martin Stone, *History of Beverly, Civil and
Ecclesiastical: From Its Settlement in 1630 to 1842* (Boston: J. Munroe, 1843), 25-29, 168-169. For the
number of men from each town, see Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.)*, 133-141.
in the war, Constable Elithrop in Manchester probably choose the three Manchester men who served with Lathrop.

Compared to the men in several other towns, very little is known about most of the Manchester soldiers. Two of the three men who served with Captain Lathrop, John Allen and Joshua Carter, were absent from the records except for their names on the original muster sheets.\(^{129}\) It is probable that John Allen was the son of William Allen of Manchester, one of the first eight settlers in the area in the late 1630s.\(^{130}\) William had come from Salem, was a member of the Salem church, and served in various posts in the town.\(^{131}\) His 1678 will and probate inventory makes no mention of a son named John; but since John Allen died at the Bloody Brook years before, there is no reason it would. The probate inventory totals £180 and is consistent with the belongings of a middling farmer of the period.\(^{132}\) It seems quite probable that the John Allen of Lathrop’s command was the son of this man. Of Joshua Carter, there are no records whatsoever.

A little more is known about the family of the third man sent to fight under Lathrop, John Bennett. His father was Henry Bennett, who was born in England in 1629 and had come to Massachusetts in 1650.\(^{133}\) He settled in Ipswich and married Lydia Perkins there in late 1650; they had five sons from 1651 to 1667, of which John was the


\(^{130}\) Lamson, *History of Manchester*, 20.

\(^{131}\) *Town Records of Manchester*, 3-17.


\(^{133}\) John M. Bradbury, *The Bennet Family of Ipswich, Massachusetts* (Boston: D. Clapp and Son, 1875), 5-6.
second.  His farm of two hundred acres was in the extreme southeast section of Ipswich, very close to the town boundary of Manchester.  He also held considerable land on a number of islands off the coast. There is no evidence Henry Bennett was ever a freeman or a church member in Ipswich.  He died sometime after 1679.  John, Henry and Lydia’s second son, was born in 1655, which would make him twenty years old at the time of the war.  There is no record of John being married. It is likely he worked on his father’s farm; Henry Bennett kept direct control of all of his land until 1682, when he gave his eldest son Jacob fifteen acres of land.  It is unlikely as second son and at only twenty years old, John would have been granted any land or had any independence from his family by 1675.

John Bennett did run into some trouble in July 1675. He was fined by magistrate Major William Hawthorne of Salem for affronting the constable while he was gathering the minister’s rate.  The disrespect of authority was taken seriously in Massachusetts Bay and probably made a great impact on the man responsible for choosing soldiers from Manchester, himself a constable, John Elithrop. The record is silent as to whether John Bennett had affronted Elithrop or a different constable (perhaps in Salem or Beverly), but the fact remains that less than a month after he had committed this crime, a constable sent

---

134 Bradbury, Bennet Family, 5-6.
135 Bradbury, Bennet Family, 5.
136 Bradbury, Bennet Family, 6-7.
137 Bradbury, Bennet Family, 7.
138 Bradbury, Bennet Family, 7.
139 Bradbury, Bennet Family, 7.
140 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 6:60.
him off to war. He and the other two young men from Manchester paid the ultimate price, for all three were killed in the horrific carnage at Bloody Brook in September 1675.

Only one man from Manchester was involved in the next major campaign of the war; Samuel Pickworth fought in the Narragansett campaign under Captain Joseph Gardner.\textsuperscript{141} The case of Samuel Pickworth is problematic. First, Pickworth had strong ties to both Salem and Manchester, making it difficult to determine where he was recruited. Bodge lists him as a resident of Salem.\textsuperscript{142} Documentation that his wife and children were living in Manchester during and after the war points to Samuel’s residence being in Manchester.\textsuperscript{143} It is most likely that he lived in Manchester for years (there are numerous instances of the Pickworth family in Manchester’s town records) and simply had strong ties to Salem.\textsuperscript{144}

Pickworth served as a corporal in Gardner’s company from December 1675 to February 1676.\textsuperscript{145} There is very little evidence in the primary or secondary literature about the recruitment or appointment of non-commissioned officers. While there are several cases of sergeants being appointed or confirmed by the quarterly courts, there are

\textsuperscript{141} While it may seem strange that the town only contributed one man to the campaign, from the records of the Leech/Knight impressment, it is known that Manchester had been asked to submit a single man for service. Manchester’s small size and subordinate militia relationship to Beverly makes the impressment of a single soldier reasonable.

\textsuperscript{142} Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 167.

\textsuperscript{143} \textit{Town Records of Manchester}, 17.

\textsuperscript{144} This would explain why his marriage and his children’s birth records are recorded in Salem. See \textit{Vital Records of Salem, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849}, 6 vols. (Salem, Mass.: Essex Institute, 1916).

\textsuperscript{145} Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 164-167.
few mentions of corporals. It is simply not known how these men were treated in regard to recruitment. Most were non-commissioned officers in their town militias before serving in the same capacity (sometimes at reduced or heightened rank) in a company called to fight in the war, although this does not seem to be the case with Pickworth. Non-commissioned officers could have found themselves serving in assembled active-duty companies in several ways: some volunteered, others were asked by officers to serve, some were appointed, and a few might have been impressed. Even though we do not know if he was picked, asked, or volunteered for service, Samuel Pickworth of Manchester went off to fight in December 1675.

Samuel Pickworth’s precise birth date is not known, but was probably close to 1640, making him around thirty-five at the time of the war. His father, John, was a long time resident of Manchester, appearing in the town records as early as 1637. The elder Pickworth was active in town affairs, serving as commissioner of the minister’s rate, timber overseer, and selectman. John Pickworth and his wife lived on a number of acres in Manchester and farmed them with their family of four. John Pickworth died in 1663 and his will and probate inventory detailed holdings of a middling farmer, a

146 For examples of sergeants being appointed or confirmed in Essex County, see Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 2:101,332, 3:290, 336, 337, 375.

147 No militia records for Manchester exist. Pickworth may have been a non-commissioned officer in Beverly, but there are no records of this. See Early Records of the Town of Beverly, (Beverly, Mass.: Allen Print, 1905); Beverly Town Records, 1665-1709, (Beverly, Mass.: Published by the Town, 1895).

148 Based on his brother’s and sisters’ baptism dates and the family genealogy. See Perley, History of Salem, 1:402.

149 Town Records of Manchester, 5.


151 For numerous land grants, see Town Records of Manchester.
dwelling sitting on twenty-five acres of land, a few additional parcels around town, a
share of the town’s sawmill, and a normal assortment of household goods totaling an
estate of 168 pounds. Samuel, as the second eldest son, was made co-executor of the
will and was given two small parcels of land and his father’s share of the sawmill. In
addition he was to act on his mother’s behalf, overseeing her part of the estate; the eldest
son John Jr. apparently being too busy running the main family farm. At the time of
his father’s death, Samuel was not yet married, but, as he had been given a small parcel
of land by the town in 1661, it is not known whether he still lived at home at the time of
his father’s death. Samuel was placed on a special jury of inquest in Lynn in 1666,
showing his tendency to range widely around Essex County in his affairs.

Samuel married Sara Marston on September 3, 1667 in Salem. The next
summer they had their first daughter, Sara, then a son Samuel Jr. in 1673, and another
daughter, Hanna, in May 1675. Samuel Sr. was a member of the First Church in Salem
and had his son Samuel Jr. baptized there in 1672. When he marched off to war in
December 1675, his family anxiously awaited his return, but it waited in vain. Samuel

---

155 *Town Records of Manchester*, 10. It is hard to know Samuel Pickworth’s status in the town and his
family because of the lack of his age in the records. He did have married sisters, but it is not known if his
er elder brother John Jr. was married or not. See Dow, ed., *Essex Probate Recs.*, 1:428-429.
156 Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 3.
157 *Vital Records of Salem*.
158 *Vital Records of Salem*.
159 Richard D. Pierce, ed., *The Records of the First Church in Salem Massachusetts 1629-1736* (Salem,
Mass.: Essex Institute, 1974).
was killed on December 16, 1675 with two others while leading a scouting party before the Fort Fight.\footnote{160} An inventory of his estate, sworn to in probate court by Sara Pickworth, offers a detailed view of Samuel’s economic status. The inventory includes a house and land worth £55, household goods, swine, lumber, carpenter’s tools, and “several years time in a youth.”\footnote{161} From this account of his possessions, it becomes clear that while he owned a small farm, Pickworth’s primary occupation was as a carpenter. The inventory total is only £83 once the possessions are valued against the debts.

His inventory places Pickworth in the subordinate category in socio-economic status and offers a clear example of the economic hardship faced by second sons of lower middling families once the first generation patriarch died. His elder brother got the majority of the family's land and the dwelling house, which forced Samuel to pursue another income source in town. Pickworth’s situation offers both clues and questions about his status as a non-commissioned officer. It is possible that he was impressed as a regular soldier by Manchester because of his secondary status in town and later promoted to corporal, even without holding a rank in the peacetime militia.\footnote{162} Being around ten to fifteen years older than the majority of the militiamen and having experience overseeing an apprentice may have given him the credentials to become a corporal under Gardner. However, the fact that Pickworth joined Gardner’s company in the midst of the impressment controversy between Beverly and Manchester is probably a clue he was not

\footnote{160} For an account of this incident, see Hubbard, \textit{History of the Indian Wars}, 141. See also Bodge, \textit{Soldiers (3rd ed.)}, 167.

\footnote{161} The youth was probably an apprentice carpenter in the middle of a contract period. Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Probate Recs.}, 67-68.

\footnote{162} While it seems unlikely that a married man with three infant children would have been impressed, Manchester’s small size could have made it difficult to find other candidates. The impressment option still appears unlikely, however.
impressed. The impressment system between Beverly and Manchester had broken down and was not fixed again until January 1676, by which time Pickworth had already served and died.\textsuperscript{163} It is possible that he volunteered for service, needing additional income, and was eventually promoted for the above reasons. It is also possible that in his business and social connections to Salem, Pickworth knew Captain Joseph Gardner, who may have asked him to join the campaign as a corporal. The truth about Pickworth's recruitment will probably never be known.

The last soldier to be chosen for militia duty was John Knight, who served with Captain Poole after the long drawn-out impressment saga in town was resolved. Constable Elithrop, working under the direction of Lieutenant Dixsy of Beverly, selected him for service. There are no records of John Knight before the war in any of the standard sources. He simply appeared in 1675 during the impressment controversy. No record exists of a Knight family in Manchester before 1675.\textsuperscript{164} John Knight settled in town after the war and married the widow of Abraham Whitheare.\textsuperscript{165} However, the only mention of him prior to his service appears in the first warrant sent to Constable Elithrop from Beverly in September 1675, in which Lieutenant Dixsy calls for a man with the following caveat “John Knight I will not except of.”\textsuperscript{166} What had Knight done to cause such a negative image of himself? There is no record of wrongdoing in the county or

\textsuperscript{163} Beverly issued its first warrant in the controversy in September 1675 and did not have it filled until January 1676 with the impressment of John Knight. It seems highly unlikely another warrant for impressment would have been filled (in December 1675, for Gardner's command) in the midst of the controversy over the earlier warrant. See Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 6:132-134.

\textsuperscript{164} \textit{Vital Records of Manchester; Town Records of Manchester; Lamson, History of Manchester.}

\textsuperscript{165} Perley, \textit{History of Salem}, 1:427.

\textsuperscript{166} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 6:133.
colony court records.\textsuperscript{167} Perhaps Knight was a drifter who had made a bad impression in Beverly when passing through and was not wanted back. Perhaps he had been sent to Beverly in the earlier press (for Lathrop's command?) in August and was deemed, for some reason, unsuitable. Lieutenant Dixsy finally accepted him as a soldier in January 1676, after the long drawn-out Leech impressment affair, in fact he was mentioned by name in the final warrant.\textsuperscript{168} In the post-war period, John Knight seems to have become just another middling farmer in Manchester; it is a mystery why he evoked such a strong response during the war.

As a group, the impressed men of Manchester are very unremarkable. Little is known about them, as is the case with the town in general. It is not even certain if Samuel Pickworth was impressed or if he joined Captain Gardner in some other way. It seems likely that John Bennett's offense of confronting a constable in July 1675, perhaps even the man who eventually impressed him, led to his service. However, the reasons the other men were chosen are much harder to understand. There is so little information available that further analysis is simply not possible. Yet, the lack of data on the soldiers does not mean that Manchester's story is not important.

The impressment system of Manchester was unique, made so by the lack of a committee of militia in town. The small town relied on a combination of outside advice from the Beverly militia commander, Lieutenant Dixsy (who was issuing the warrants), and the decisions of one man in Manchester, Constable Elithrop, to make its impressment decisions. However, as has been demonstrated, this system did not work smoothly. The


\textsuperscript{168} Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 133.
two powers involved, Lieutenant Dixsy and Constable Elithrop, clashed repeatedly over impressment, and the selectmen of Manchester even entered the fray to support their constable. The Leech/Knight impressment controversy shows a system in disorder. The General Court had established town committees of militia to exert local control over impressment, giving those who best knew the men of any town the power to pick which men served as soldiers. Local control of impressment was not assured in Manchester, which lead to a system of chaotic and unreliable recruitment and conflict within the town and among neighboring towns. It is this situation which makes the examination of a small town such as Manchester as vital to the history of Massachusetts’ militia and the colony itself as any large town.
Wenham

Wenham, like many towns in Essex County, began with the settlement of Salem in 1628. It did not take long for the settlers at Salem to discover Wenham Lake, which had also been a favorite area for the local Indians to fish. Located between Salem and Ipswich along the road linking the two towns, the area was known for its plush meadows. Wenham became an outlying township of Salem and a number of men from the town were given large grants of land in the area as early as 1637. At about the same time, the famous Reverend Hugh Peter gave a sermon at Wenham, then called Enon, praising the area’s suitability for farmland. The wide meadows and abundant rivers and streams flowing from Wenham Lake made the place a perfect site for an agricultural community. To further increase its own settlement and population, Salem offered five and ten acre house lots around the lake to about twenty families in order to establish a town center for the settlement in 1639.

The founding of Wenham was made official by the General Court in 1643 when it incorporated the town and named it after Great Wenham and Little Wenham back in England, former home of many of the community’s settlers. Unlike many other towns

169 There are very few historical treatments of Wenham. The classic history of the town, Myron O. Allen, *History of Wenham Civil and Ecclesiastical from Its Settlement in 1639 to 1860*, reprint of 1860 ed. (Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1975) is sparse in its coverage but does have some interesting observations. The more complete Adeline. Cole, ed., *Notes on Wenham History 1643-1943* (Salem, Mass.: Wenham Historical Association, 1943) is a standard if unexceptional account of the town’s history. There is also a published volume of the town’s records, *Wenham Town Records*, 4 vols. (Wenham, Mass.: Wenham Historical Society, 1927) in addition to the standard collection of vital records for the town *Vital Records of Wenham, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849*, (Salem, Mass.: Essex Institute, 1904).

170 These first grantees included Joseph Batchelder and Austin Killam, who later had sons fight for the town in King Philip’s War.


settled in the county, there was no organized town leader or group responsible for the beginnings of the settlement. The settlers, now with four thousand acres of land to manage, began the process of building a community.\textsuperscript{173} The town gathered its church in 1642 and had a meetinghouse well underway by the time it made John Fiske, a former assistant to Reverend Hugh Peter, its pastor in 1644. The church, like the town, was very small, having only nineteen members in 1645.\textsuperscript{174} Despite its promise, Wenham stagnated for the next ten years. Fiske, who had hoped to develop an important settlement in Wenham, became frustrated with the town’s lack of growth. In 1654, he received a letter inviting him to move to the new plantation at Chelmsford. After visiting the new town with a number of men from town, Fiske decided to leave Wenham. In 1655, Fiske and seven families moved to Chelmsford, leaving a gaping whole in the small and struggling community.

The town had taken a mighty blow with the removal of the minister and seven families. The church in town was saved by the intervention of Charles Gott, a prominent Salem inhabitant who had recently moved to Wenham. Gott was quickly appointed as a selectman and set about getting the town a new minister. He convinced Antipas Newman to move to Wenham and Newman remained the pastor until 1672. He became prominent in town affairs and a large landowner. Despite the infusion of new blood, Wenham


\textsuperscript{174} Cole, ed., \textit{Wenham History}, 23.
remained small and continued to struggle, having only two hundred inhabitants as late as 1662.

The town’s interior position in the county, between its larger neighbors of Ipswich and Salem, meant it was spared from direct threat of Indian attack. There are few surviving records that discuss the town’s early militia. While it is known that the town, as required by law, had a training field and the men trained occasionally, no list of town officers exists.\textsuperscript{175} The first mention of the militia is a reference in the town records to a Sergeant White in November 1670, who was apparently the town’s militia sergeant.\textsuperscript{176} This proves, not surprisingly, the town’s militia company was fewer than sixty-four men, and thus too small to have its own commissioned officer.\textsuperscript{177}

The next mention of the militia in the official records comes from the Essex County Quarterly Court in May 1674 when Charles Gott, the clerk of the militia band in Wenham, swore out a case against Walter Fairfield for abuse. The Court issued a warrant “in case of Refusall to paye to Distraine the Goods of walter fairfield to the value of five shillings Being his fine for not appeanc on the last training daye as also five shillings of Henry Haget for like Defect & Rec. it into your hands for the use of the Companye, signed by Thomas Fiske, sergeant.”\textsuperscript{178} According to the testimony of the town’s new militia commander Sergeant Thomas Fiske, Sr., and Charles Gott, the case stemmed from the absence of Walter Fairfield and Henry Haget on a training day. When Gott went to

\textsuperscript{175} Cole, ed., \textit{Wenham History}, 33.

\textsuperscript{176} \textit{Wenham Town Records}, 33.


\textsuperscript{178} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 5:309-310.
Fairfield’s house to collect the militia fine, Fairfield replied he would not pay. Gott returned to Fairfield’s house a week later and once again read the warrant. Saying he “cared nothing for Captain Tom [Sergeant Thomas Fiske, apparently known as captain even though his rank was officially sergeant], with many filthy speeches,” Fairfield again refused to pay. When Gott attempted to seize two pewter vessels in place of payment, Fairfield wrested them away.

The next day, Gott and Thomas Fiske Jr., the sergeant’s son, returned to Fairfield’s house and tried to obtain corn in lieu of the fine. This time, Fairfield first threatened them and then assaulted Gott, who related that Fairfield “shooved me with violans several times & tooke A greate Club in his hand and vowed if I came theare he woulde knock me down.” Further struggle ensued. Fairfield testified that he had offered Gott several boards in place of the fine, but Gott would not consider them. Most of the witnesses told a version consistent with Gott’s account. Fairfield, apparently a man of great temper, had numerous other court cases pending at the same time, all of which he lost. He later appears to have moved to Ipswich. In the end, the Court ordered Fairfield to pay five shillings fine to the company and twenty shillings to the county.

---

179 A May 1672 law established that the clerks were to collect fines, and if they did not, they could be fined themselves. See Whitmore, Colonial Laws of Massachusetts, 203. If the men could not afford to pay the fines, they would be subject to “military punishment” such as “Riding the Wooden Horse, or By Bilboes, or lying Neck and Heels, or acknowledgement at the head of the company” See Whitmore, Colonial Laws of Massachusetts, 204.


181 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:308-310.

182 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:310.

183 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:373.
The incident offers a rare glimpse into the workings of a small town militia. Fairfield asserted that he though Gott was joking the first time he demanded the fine, a misunderstanding born out of the fact that Gott was new to his post. Sergeant Fiske had appointed Gott to the office of clerk of the band only after the company’s choice, by vote, had refused to serve in the highly disliked position. This case highlights why the General Court passed fines for men (forty shillings) who refused to serve as clerk. In addition, the case indicates that Fairfield and Haget, the other men fined for non-appearance, were confused by the company’s procedure about rainy training days. The company had agreed that if the weather were bad on the morning of training, the training day would automatically be postponed, in order to save the men from traveling all the way to the training field. This was a simple yet important agreement, since the men could not fire their weapons if they were wet. Yet, this also caused confusion; several men testified that they thought training would be postponed on the training day in question because of threatening weather. The case also demonstrates the high level of frustration and bad feeling within the town’s militia company. Sergeant Fiske seems to have been out of favor, at least with some of his men. Fairfield’s divisive comments

184 Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:309.


187 See the testimony of William Fiske, John Abbe, and John Waldren in Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs., 5:310.
about "Captain Tom" harbor sarcasm and disdain.\(^{188}\) The fact that five men testified against Fiske and Gott in court sends a signal that all was not well in the Wenham militia.\(^{189}\) In less than a year, King Philip's War would break out and the troubled militia would be tested for the first time in over thirty-five years.

The lack of militia records for Wenham makes identifying its militia committee difficult. There is no doubt that Sergeant Thomas Fiske was a member as the town's militia commander. However, as the only officer in town, and a non-commissioned officer at that, Fiske's counterparts are harder to know. The law establishing committees of militia stated that any magistrate living in town, or, in the absence of a magistrate, a deputy to the General Court could join with the highest ranking militia officers in town (or any combination of the men) to constitute a three man town militia committee.\(^{190}\) There was no magistrate living in Wenham at the time.\(^{191}\) The town did not send a deputy to the General Court in Boston during the period of 1674-1677.\(^{192}\) Thus, it is not known if Wenham even had a committee of militia or if Sergeant Fiske simply elected men to serve. His name alone appears on the report dated November 30, 1675 to the General Court about the recruits for the Narragansett campaign.\(^{193}\) It is also possible that

\(^{188}\) Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 5:309.

\(^{189}\) See the testimony of John Fiske, John Gilbert, John Waldren, Nathaniell Browne, and Tameson Waldren in Dow, ed., *Essex Quarterly Court Recs.*, 5:310.


\(^{191}\) Wenham Town Records.


\(^{193}\) "Serg. Thomas Fiske to the General Court, 30 November 1675," volume 68, document 69b in Felt, "Massachusetts Archives Collection."
the town selectmen helped make the decision. The records are simply too meager to know for certain.

Wenham sent a total of nine soldiers to fight during King Philip’s War. This was the second smallest number of soldiers impressed from any town in Essex County (Manchester with five men sent the fewest soldiers), which befit Wenham’s relatively small population. Two men, Thomas Kimball and his cousin Caleb Kimball served with Captain Lathrop during his ill-fated campaign. Caleb was killed at the Bloody Brook on September 18, 1675, but his cousin Thomas was one of the lucky few who survived. The town impressed seven men for service in the Narragansett campaign: Mark Batchelder, Richard Hutton, Samuel Moulton, Philip Welch, and Thomas Kimball (the Lathrop veteran) served under Captain Gardner. Thomas Abbe and Thomas Killom were credited with service under Major Appleton. The seven men are treated as one impressment group, since they were pressed for the same campaign. Out of the group,

---

194 See Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.*)*. In the town histories, several soldiers from Wenham that served in the war are listed: see Allen, *History of Wenham*, 38 and Cole, ed., *Wenham History*, 33. Allen undercounts Wenham soldiers, listing only the five impressed into Gardner’s company (Mark Batchelder, Richard Hutton, Thomas Kimball, Samuel Moulton, and Philip Welch). Cole lists the same five and then lists three men who volunteered (Thomas Abbe, Caleb Kimball, and John Dodge). There is no source for Cole’s assertion that these men volunteered. One man, John Dodge, was not a resident of Wenham in 1675, but had moved to Beverly and is not treated in this section. See Dodge, “Dodge Genealogy,” in *Essex County Manuscript Genealogies, Philips Library, Peabody Essex Museum* (Salem, Mass.); Joseph Thompson. Dodge, *Genealogy of the Dodge Family of Essex County, Mass, 1629-1894*. (Madison, Wis.: Democrat Printing Co., 1894).


197 “Serg. Thomas Fiske to the General Court, 30 November 1675,” volume 68, document 69b in Felt, “Massachusetts Archives Collection.”
Thomas Abbe was wounded at the Fort Fight, while his comrade Mark Batchelder was killed.  

Later in the war, Henry Kimball, brother to Caleb and cousin to Thomas, served with Captain Benjamin Sweet's company from February to June 1676, while Thomas Kimball, already a veteran of two campaigns, went out again with Captain Brocklebank from January through March 1676. Both soldiers returned home to Wenham unscathed. It is possible that these last two men were volunteers, since it was uncommon, although not unheard of, for the General Court to issue any town a quota for just one man. The likelihood of volunteerism is even stronger in the case of Thomas Kimball, who served in three different companies. It seems unlikely that Wenham's militia committee would impress one man multiple times when other young men in town had not served. One possible explanation for his service in multiple companies is that Kimball, one of the few survivors of the surprise attack at Bloody Brook, felt soldiering suited him. However, it is also possible that the committee picked him multiple times because it had little choice. With such a small population to draw from, the committee of militia in Wenham was likely hard pressed to find suitable young men to draft into service. This is also a possible explanation as to why so many members of the extended Kimball family were sent.

All of the men who served in the war from Wenham did so as enlisted men. 

The ages of seven of the nine men (78 percent) are known; their ages ranged from 17 to


199 For Sweet, see Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.)*, 342-347. For Brocklebank, see Chapter 2 above and Bodge, *Soldiers (3rd ed.)*, 206-217.

40 at the time of the war.\textsuperscript{201} The average age of the men was 25 years old, which is close to the average of 26.6 years old for enlisted men in Essex County.\textsuperscript{202} Only one of the men was married, the drifter Philip Welch.\textsuperscript{203} Of the men who were full-time inhabitants of Wenham, none were married, not even Mark Batchelder at 40 years old.\textsuperscript{204} It is obvious that the militia committee placed a high premium on the fact that these inhabitants had no dependents that the town would be forced to care for if the militiaman was killed.\textsuperscript{205} The town was also keeping its existing families intact. This was especially crucial in small and struggling Wenham, which did not have a large population to begin with. The militia committee worked hard to protect heads of households in town, at the expense of its young, single men.

In addition to choosing young unmarried men, the committee took care not to pick men who were vital to the survival of their birth families. None of the men, with the possible exception of three for which no records exist, were their birth family’s first son


\textsuperscript{202} See Appendix 1.

\textsuperscript{203} Welch had ties to several Essex County towns, especially to Topsfield and Ipswich. For more on Welch, see below.

\textsuperscript{204} This was unusually old not to be married and that might have played a part in Batchelor’s recruitment. It is also possible he volunteered: he did have a strong history of town service. See Perley, “Batchelder Genealogy;” Pierce, \textit{Batchelder, Batcheller Genealogy}.

(see Table 6-4). The birth order for six of the nine men (67 percent) is known: three of the six were second sons, two were their family’s third son, and one soldier was the fourth

designed to carry on the family name and ensure the family’s place in the town hierarchy. It seems that the Wenham militia committee was attempting to avoid undue hardship on the community and its families by drafting the least significant men in town; men who, if lost, would be missed, but whose absence would not bring ruin to the town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY NAME</th>
<th>SOLDIER(S)’S NAME</th>
<th>FATHER’S NAME</th>
<th>SON’S BIRTH ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbe</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batchelder</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>2nd Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutton</td>
<td>Richard Jr.</td>
<td>Richard Sr.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killom</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>2nd Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimball</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>3rd Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimball</td>
<td>Caleb Henry Jr.</td>
<td>Henry Sr.</td>
<td>3rd Son 4th Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>James Sr.</td>
<td>2nd Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It is possible that either Thomas Killom or Richard Hutton, the two men without a known birth order record, was a first son. In Richard Hutton’s case, it is quite possible, since his father’s name was Richard and it was common to name first sons after the father. See Daniel Scott Smith, “Child-Naming Practices, Kinship Ties, and Change in Family Attitudes in Hingham, Massachusetts, 1641 to 1880,” Journal of Social History 18, no. 4 (1985): 541-566. For information on sons and fathers in New England, see Greven, Four Generations; Smith, “Parental Power;” Vickers, Farmers and Fishermen.
or to any one family. The real possibility of losses during the fighting was strengthened after the town lost one of its own, Caleb Kimball, early in the war at Bloody Brook.

Wenham’s Committee of Militia did take advantage of one troubling man to spare the rest of the town’s families the heartache of losing a valued member of the town. The committee impressed Philip Welch into Gardner’s company, even though it appears he was not a resident of the town. It is possible that Welch was impressed while in town on business or that he and his family were in town for a short time; his wife had lived in Wenham. Most of the records about Welch come from Topsfield and Ipswich, towns where he had strong roots. He was well known in the county from the time of his arrival. Welch and another boy had been brought to Massachusetts Bay in May 1654 from Ireland. Welch, aged eleven, and William Dalton, aged nine, “were stolen in Ireland by some English soldiers in ye night out of theyr beds & brought to Mr. Dills ship, where there were diverse others of their country men, weeping and crying because they were stolen from their friends.” They were transported to Boston and their indenture (nine years for Welch, eleven for Dalton) was sold to Mr. Samuel Symonds, a very prominent citizen of Ipswich. In 1661, Symonds brought a suit against Dalton for refusing to work and both young men petitioned the General Court to end their contract. They argued,

---

208 Only his inclusion on the impressment report of Sergeant Fiske places him in the Wenham impressment group, not among the Topsfield or Ipswich men.

209 Impressing men while they were in town on business was a common occurrence during the war. It did not always sit well with colonial authorities. See Douglas Edward Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk; New England in King Philip’s War*, reprint of 1958 Macmillian ed. (East Orleans, Mass.: Parnassus Imprints, 1992), 184-185.


"We were brought out of our country contrary to our own wills & minds and sold here . . . notwithstanding we have indebted to do him [Symonds] ye best service wee could these seven Complete years . . . Now 7 years being so much as ye practice in old England . . . & wee being both above 21 years in age, we hope this honored Court and Jury will seriously consider our Condition." The General Court sided with Symonds and the two men served him until 1663, as per the original indenture agreement.

No further mention of Welch appears until after he was free of Symonds in 1663 or 1665. He married Hannah Haggett of Wenham in February 1667. In November 1668 and November 1670, the couple appears in the court records concerning a land sale in Topsfield. It would appear that the couple and their five children, born between 1668 and 1675, were living in Topsfield at the time of the war; but, it was the Wenham militia committee that impressed Philip Welch for the Narragansett campaign. To make matters even more confusing, a Philip Welch, possibly the same man, also appears on different lists as coming to Gardner’s company from Lynn or Beverly. The most probable explanation is that Welch and his family were drifters, moving from town to town. There is little doubt that as an poor unskilled indentured servant with a large family, Welch was in the subordinate category. His status and the assumption that the family moved from place to place is strengthened by a 1676 court case.

213 There is some disagreement over the length of his contract. See Welch, Philip Welch of Ipswich, 10-11.
214 Welch, Philip Welch of Ipswich, 11.
215 Welch, Philip Welch of Ipswich, 11.
216 Welch, Philip Welch of Ipswich, 16.
217 Bodge, Soldiers (3rd ed.), 167; Welch, Philip Welch of Ipswich, 11.
Almost as soon as Welch got back from his war service in early 1676, he moved his family from Topsfield to Marblehead. The selectmen of Marblehead petitioned the Essex County Quarterly Court that:

Whereas the laws of this common wealth ordereth that every towne shall provide for its own poore: Philip welch of Topsfield being reputed A very poore man & of late com with his family into our towne of Marble Head without Leave obtained from either towne or Selectmen, also, being according To our towne order warned either to depart or give bond for ye townes securitie hee refusing to doe either, wee doubte not but this honnoured court will give releeffe against this unjust intrusion.\textsuperscript{218}

The Court allowed Marblehead to disallow Welch and his family as inhabitants worthy of town support. Welch was still in Marblehead in 1677, but he had moved back to Topsfield by 1679.\textsuperscript{219} There is little doubt that he and his family were seen as a nuisance and a potential drain on town coffers wherever they went. It is not surprising that Wenham’s militia committee jumped at the chance to send Welch to war in place of one of its own. Not only would no family in town be harmed if he didn’t come back, if that happened, Welch’s widow and children would be cared for by Topsfield, not by the meager resources of Wenham.

Wenham, being so small, did not have many choices of its own young men to send to war. A 1659 tax list of the town (see Table 6-5), the closest to the war years available, shows only twenty-seven individual men in town, who represent around

\textsuperscript{218} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 6:192.

twenty-three households.  While the list was made over fifteen years before the war, it offers us important clues into the social and economic hierarchy in town. In reality, there were probably fewer families in town by 1675, as Wenham experienced high levels of out-migration. Myron Allen argues that the 1675 colony assessment for Wenham was considerably less, in proportion, to its assessment twenty years before, and the town was in such financial hardship because of the "feeble and drooping condition of the place" that the colony discharged Wenham from paying the Harvard University subscription in early 1675. Although the downturn in Wenham’s fortunes, the 1659 list does lay out the social and economic hierarchy of the town, which, when compared with probate records, show little variation between 1659 and 1675.

Looking closely at the tax list and other socio-economic data, it becomes apparent that Wenham's militia committee impressed sons from families all along the town’s economic scale; it probably didn’t have a choice if it wanted to impress un-married non-first sons (see Table 6-5 and Table 6-6). Thomas Kimball, the three-time soldier, was the son of one of the town’s most important citizens. His cousins, Henry and Caleb Kimball, came from one of the town’s lower middling families. Yet all three went to war for Wenham. There was a slight preference on the part of the committee to enlist the sons of families on the lower end of the socio-economic scale. This preference is apparent when

---

220 The list is printed in Allen, *History of Wenham*, 33.


222 The position on the tax list and the later relative wealth of certain individuals, based on their probate inventories, even twenty or thirty years later, shows little movement. Richard Kimball, the highest placed individual on the tax list, retains his high position and in his 1676 probate inventory, shows assets of £986, the highest recorded in town. His brother Henry Kimball, who was near the bottom of the 1659 list, has a 1676 probate inventory of £100. There are additional examples which confirm this stability. See Dow, ed., *Essex Probate Recs.*, 3:72-75.
Table 6-5
Wenham Tax List with Soldiers’ Families Highlighted, 1659

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Soldier's Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Richard Kimball</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>John Fisk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mr. Gott</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>in corn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>James Moulton Sr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>John Dodge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>third in corn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thomas Fisk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Richard Coy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Phineas Fisk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>John Gooland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Richard Hutton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>in corn</td>
<td>Richard Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Austin Kilham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>in corn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Value £1-18-0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Soldier's Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>John Abby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>in corn</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mark Batchelder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Richard Goldsmith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>William Gore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Henry Haggett</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>John Kilham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>John Powling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>in corn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Alexander Moxey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Daniel Kilham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>John Batchelder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Robert Gowen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Henry Kimball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>half in corn</td>
<td>Caleb, Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>James Moulton Jr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Abner Ordway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Edward Waldron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Thomas White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examining the 1659 tax list. Only three of the men impressed (37 percent) came from families who paid above the average tax assessment (£1-18-0), while five men (63

---

percent) came from families that paid below the average.\textsuperscript{224} There seems to be a distinct preference on the militia committee to single out men from the less affluent families.

In addition to the tax data, the categorization system used in this study also points out a preference for impressing sons of middling to lower status families. This is instructive because it takes the political power of those families, especially the family patriarchs, into account (see Table 6-6). Wenham’s small size meant that a large number of the fathers of militiamen had served in town governance, however, only a few had the

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Soldier’s Families and Town Rank in Wenham, 1659-1675\textsuperscript{225}}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Tax Rank in 1659} & \textbf{Category} & \textbf{Family Name} & \textbf{Soldier(s)’s Name} & \textbf{Father’s Name} \\
\hline
1 & L & Kimball & Thomas & Richard \\
\hline
2 (tie) & M & Moulton & Samuel & James Sr. \\
\hline
9 (tie) & M & Hutton & Richard Jr. & Richard Sr. \\
\hline
\textbf{Town Average-£1-18-0} & & & & \\
\hline
12 (tie) & M & Abbe & Thomas & John \\
\hline
12 (tie) & L & Batchelder & Mark & Joseph \\
\hline
\text{*his rank}\textsuperscript{226} & 20 & M & Kilom & Thomas & Daniel \\
\hline
21 (tie) & M & Kimball & Henry Jr. Caleb & Henry Sr. \\
\hline
Not on List & S & Welch & Philip & Unknown \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textit{TAX RANK IN 1659} is the family’s rank; \textit{CATEGORY} reports the findings of the categorization system used in this work, \textit{L} = leading family, \textit{M} = middling family, and \textit{S} = subordinate family.

A mixture of political power and economic clout to be called leading citizens. Only two men who served from Wenham came from leading families. In addition to being in the

\textsuperscript{224} These percentages do not include the non-resident Philip Welch.

\textsuperscript{225} Allen, \textit{History of Wenham}, 33. Philip Welch was not on the 1659 tax list, as he was not an inhabitant.

\textsuperscript{226} Mark Batchelder’s father Joseph died in 1647. Mark’s ranking are his own, not his family’s as a whole. Before the split of family assets at the father’s death, the Batchelder family would have been at the top of the town hierarchy. See Perley, “Batchelder Genealogy;” Pierce, \textit{Batchelder, Batcheller Genealogy}. 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
number one position in the town’s tax list in 1659, Richard Kimball, militiaman Thomas’
father, was very active in town government, holding numerous town offices, including
being a town selectman eleven times from 1657 to 1674.\(^{227}\) Richard Kimball was even a
member of the highly prestigious Artillery Company in Boston, as was Sergeant Thomas
Fiske.\(^{228}\) Mark Batchelder, despite his relative middle position on the tax list, was the son
of a founder of the town, who had also been Wenham’s first deputy to the General Court
in Boston.\(^{229}\) Mark had served on the jury of trials, as town constable, and as selectman
at least three times from 1668 to 1673.\(^{230}\) The Batchelder’s were also active members of
the Wenham church, the only family of a soldier to leave a record in the church of any
consequence.\(^{231}\) The rest of the Wenham families, middling all, had fathers who served
the town, but none had power in town on the scale of Kimball and Batchelder.

In the end, only two of the soldiers (25 percent) came from leading families, while
six (75 percent) came from middling families (see Table 6-6).\(^{232}\) While Philip Welch
did not appear on the list, it is apparent from all of the evidence that he was from the
subordinate category. Despite the declining position of the town, there does not seem to

\(^{227}\) Wenham Town Records; Morrison and Sharples, Kimball Family.

\(^{228}\) Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly CourtRees., 4:286. For information about the company, see Louise Breen,
Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprises among the Puritan Elite in Massachusetts, 1630-1692
of the Massachusetts Now Called the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts, 1637-
1888 (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1895).

\(^{229}\) The fact that his prominent father died before the war and had his property split among his remaining
family is the reason for Mark Batchelder’s lower than expected showing on the tax list. See Wenham Town
Records; Perley, “Batchelder Genealogy;” Pierce, Batchelder, Batcheller Genealogy.

\(^{230}\) Wenham Town Records; Perley, “Batchelder Genealogy;” Pierce, Batchelder, Batcheller Genealogy.

\(^{231}\) Pierce, ed., First Church in Salem.

\(^{232}\) See the Introduction, pg. 30 note 79, for the classification system, which uses a mixture of economic,
social, and political factors. These figures do not include the non-resident Philip Welch.
have been any native Wenham families that belonged to the subordinate category in the 1670s. Yet, three of the middling sons were on the lower end of the middling spectrum, Thomas Killom, and Henry and Caleb Kimball. Socio-economic status did play a part in Wenham's decisions, but the committee was far more concerned with pressing men without families of their own (and who were not the first sons of their birth families) than they were with drafting the sons of the town's lower-middling sort only.233

None of the native Wenham men pressed into military service had a criminal record. In the ten years before the war, only one serious crime of a physical nature occurred in Wenham.234 The perpetrator of that act, and the only man with a criminal record drafted, was the drifter Philip Welch. In November 1668, Welch (this time listed as an inhabitant of Ipswich) was fined for breach of the peace in Wenham, "striking John Abbe, Jr. with his fist, blows upon his face with much violence."235 This incident, along with his socio-economic position was another reason Welch was known as a troublemaker throughout the county. There is little question why Wenham's committee impressed Welch.

While Wenham experienced few crimes in the ten years before the war, none of them were of a serious nature.236 However, two incidents involving the fathers of three

---

233 Not counting the non-resident Philip Welch.

234 This was confirmed by examining all court records pertaining to Wenham for the years 1665-1676 in Dow, ed., Essex Quarterly Court Recs.


soldiers might have made an impact on the militia committee. In November 1668, Thomas Fiske, the town’s sergeant and militia committee member, sued James Moulton, (the father of soldier Samuel Moulton) in November 1668 for an undisclosed reason.\textsuperscript{237} The quarterly court threw the case out and Moulton was allowed costs by Fiske when the case was “not prosecuted.” Also in 1668, Richard Hutton and Daniel Killom (the fathers of militiamen Richard Jr. and Thomas) were accused of disturbing the assembly during the Lord’s Day.\textsuperscript{238} Hutton and Killom spoke out of turn at a church meeting after service and would not be quiet, eventually threatening the constable. One of the main witnesses against them was Thomas Fiske. Is it possible that Fiske impressed the sons of these men in order to finally take some measure of revenge for personal wrongdoing against him or disturbances in his town? While it cannot be known for certain, it does seem a possibility, if a chilling one. Being the sons of perceived (by Fiske or the committee) troublemakers in town might just have been enough to send young men off to war in small, isolated Wenham.

When faced with quotas from the General Court for soldiers, Wenham’s committee looked at the available men in town very carefully. The easiest choice for the committee must have been sending drifter and troublemaker Philip Welch. After that, it became more difficult. There were no serious native troublemakers in town to ship off. It is possible that the committee practiced corruption by blood and sent the sons of citizens perceived as difficult. The committee did send three native citizens at the lower end of the town’s economic scale to war, but it also sent at least one son of a leading

\textsuperscript{237} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 4:73.

\textsuperscript{238} Dow, ed., \textit{Essex Quarterly Court Recs.}, 4:97.
family. In the end, Wenham's committee chose men from all parts of the socio-economic spectrum who were unmarried non-first sons; those men who could most be sacrificed if the war went badly.

**Small Town Militias: An Appraisal**

Despite their small populations and the related quantitative concerns, small isolated towns and their trainbands offer an important glimpse into the militia system and Massachusetts society in general. In general, their small populations meant that militia committees in the small towns had fewer choices of men to send to fight, in many cases making for an interesting mix of soldiers. Yet, while the type of men recruited by the towns is important, the real lessons these tiny communities offer are about the workings of interdependent militias. The village militias were weaker than their larger brethren in more established towns. This caused a number of problems. Often the small-town militias were placed in subordinate positions to larger units in neighboring towns. This situation often bred conflict, as was the case with the Manchester-Beverly relationship. Discord also arose when town militias were forced to incorporate citizens from outlying districts within their borders, such as happened in Topsfield with the families from Rowley Village. Sometimes, the weakness of the institution in the smaller towns resulted in weaker officers and contempt for their authority, as was the case in Wenham. The same disrespect for small town militia officers is seen in the example of Samuel Leach in Manchester. Thus, an examination of small town militias offers an excellent vantage point to understand inter-town conflicts, which were representative of the increasing declension of New England society as a whole as the seventeenth century dragged on.
CONCLUSION

THE MYTH OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY OBLIGATION IN
SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEW ENGLAND:
THE MILITIAMEN OF KING PHILIP'S WAR

The militia and militiamen of seventeenth-century wartime New England have been misunderstood far too long. The universal military obligation enacted by the colonists early in the seventeenth century obscured later generations' views of the institution and the men who served it. The widespread perception, held by generalists and specialists alike, that the seventeenth-century militia consisted of all men from sixteen to sixty, and that it represented society as a whole, even in times of conflict, can no longer stand. By uncovering how the seventeenth-century impressment system worked, who colonial soldiers were, and where they came from within their communities, this study lays to rest the old myths about "archetypal" citizen-soldiers and the earliest colonial armies mirroring their society, myths long ago discredited for later periods and conflicts. In addition to revealing the true nature of the colonial military past, this investigation illuminates the values of the leaders and society that sent the men off to war.

Thus, the study of the military past not only offers a vantage point to understand conflict and the immense role it played in colonial America, it allows important insights into colonial society at large, made even more important by the seriousness with which its participants treated the topic. In war, everyone participated in some fashion. Unlike
an obscure religious controversy in the local church or a rivalry between various families in a town vying for power, war and the enormous consequences it brought assured that everyone in society was involved in its conduct. As Richard Kohn so aptly pointed out over twenty years ago, “Over the course of American history, few experiences have been more widely shared than military service.”¹ If anything allows a clear insight into the values a community held dear, it is the actions of that society in wartime, when its very future was at stake.

Well over a thousand men served in active-duty militia companies in King Philip’s War from July 1675 to September 1676; 357 served from Essex County, Massachusetts alone. The men were chosen out of their towns by a uniquely New England military command structure, the town committee of militia. Locally controlled militia committees, consisting of both military and civilian leaders, were developed by Massachusetts Bay in 1652. By the time the war began in 1675, they had become a dominant presence in the colony’s military chain of command, second only in their power and scope of responsibilities to the colonial government of governor, council, and General Court. The committees were as important to the smooth operation of a town’s militia as were selectmen to the town government; the two institutions were perfect examples of the “persistent localism” that was so much a part of colonial New England’s political and social makeup.² Thus, even after the loss of locally elected militia officers


in the 1660s, a community-based joint civilian-military committee assured that the locality had a significant role to play in the institution of the militia. This was especially important during wartime, when the militia committees took over most of the functions of town government. Even in times of war and crisis, community control was maintained, an important safeguard against military abuses by the general government. The most important power of the militia committees, not the colonial government in Boston or the county major general, was the authority to choose citizens who would be sent to war. For individuals, their families, and their towns, the town committees of militia held the power of life and death in their hands.

The local nature of recruitment precluded the existence of a “typical” early colonial soldier. Each town militia committee had different criteria for choosing soldiers, and the soldiers from those towns were in certain ways different from each other. Andover sent a number of its better sort to fight, while Rowley chose town outsiders, and Ipswich persons of the lower strata. Thus, while the “persistent localism” of Massachusetts Bay’s militia impressment system disallowed the establishment of an “archetypal” colonial militiaman, it did create numerous broad categories or types of recruits. And among these broad types, certain common characteristics did exist. Most enlisted men who were impressed to fight King Philip’s War in an active company or troop were in their mid-twenties when the war began, unmarried, and had at least one negative factor that had landed them on the militia committee’s list.

One soldier who represents these common characteristics was Robert Dutch Jr. of Ipswich. Robert Jr. was born on June 24, 1647 to Robert Sr. and Mary Dutch of
Gloucester. In 1639, the soldier’s father, Robert Sr., came to America at the age of sixteen with his father and mother, Osman and Grace Dutch, from Bridgport, England. Osman, the family’s original immigrant, settled his family in Gloucester, where he lived on the eastern side of the town’s harbor. He was a fisherman and sometimes boat captain. Although he was a selectman in 1650, Osman never rose above the lower to lower-middling social rank; when he died in 1684, his entire estate was valued at only £83, forcing his widow to sell the family’s land to survive. With such poor prospects in Gloucester, it is no wonder Osman’s eldest son, Robert Sr., moved to the neighboring town of Ipswich to try to make his fortune, especially once he had a family to support.

Robert Sr. had married an Ipswich girl, Mary Kimball, sometime before 1646 and the couple had had two children, John in 1646 and Robert Jr. in June 1647. It is probable that Robert Sr. called on the Kimballs, his in-laws, to help with the 1648 move to Ipswich; by the 1650s, the family was ensconced on Story Street in the town. In the highly stratified population of Ipswich, Robert Sr. and his family were in the lower middle of the town’s social and economic spectrum. He made his living on the sea, first as a mate and later a captain of small ships in the Massachusetts coastal trade. Robert Sr. had some trouble in Ipswich; he was fined for “reproachful speeches” in 1653 and for striking a man in 1656. His wife Mary incurred the wrath of the Ipswich elders in 1666 for wearing a silk scarf above her station, although the charges were dropped when

---

Robert proved his estate to be at least one hundred pounds. Robert Jr., the eventual soldier, probably worked alongside his father on certain voyages, and at other times worked as a farm laborer while staying at his grandfather’s house. He was cited in 1662 for taking a cow out of a neighbor’s yard, but his grandfather vouched for him in court.

When the call came for soldiers for Appleton’s command, Robert Dutch Jr., aged twenty-seven, unmarried, and from a lower-middle-class family with a few troubles in town, found himself pressed by the local constable under the warrant of the town’s committee of militia. He served with Captain Lathrop and soon found himself fighting in the Connecticut River Valley in the fall of 1675. Dutch was present at the ambush at Bloody Brook on September 18. His story is told in Hubbard’s contemporary history,

As Captain Mosley came upon the Indians in the [next] morning, he found them stripping the Slain, amongst whom was one Robert Dutch of Ipswich, having been sorely wounded by a Bullet that razed to his Skull and then mauled by the Indian Hatchets, was left for dead by the Savages, and stript by them of all but his Skin; yet when Captain Mosley came near, he almost miraculously, as one raised from the Dead, came toward the English, to their no small Amazement; by who being received and cloathed, he was carried off to the next Garrison, and is living and in perfect Health at this Day.⁴

Dutch was paid £4-16-10 for his service under Lathrop and Appleton and released from service. He married in 1677, had three children, and moved to Rhode Island before dying between 1705 and 1708. While his exploits were remarkable, the fact that he was chosen

for service was not. As far as is possible in the locally-controlled system in Massachusetts Bay, he was a "typical soldier" in almost every regard: his age, marital and family status, and the fact he was not one of Ipswich's upstanding citizens, at least not in the eyes of the militia committee. There were hundreds more like him, each with his own story and each chosen to fight by local authorities by their own standards.

The Essex County committees of militia in all the towns paid attention to a number of criteria when making impressment decisions. While each committee was locally controlled and had a slightly different set of criteria or factors they weighed before issuing impressment warrants, some commonality exists among all of them. On average, the committees chose young men in their twenties to fight the war, the mean age being 26.6 years. The vast majority of the men who fought as enlisted men, 76 percent, were either in their twenties or thirties (see Table C-1). Understandably, the average ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Soldiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Based on age data for 195 (55 percent) of the 357 enlisted men in active companies. Data came from a variety of sources, including court, probate, church, town, and vital records; town histories; and genealogies. See Appendix 1.
of non-commissioned officers and officers were quite different. The officers commissioned out of Essex County to lead wartime companies were 46 years old on average, with an age range from 65 to 30 years old. Non-commissioner officers were younger, but on average older than enlisted men; the average age was 30 with an age range of 52 to 19 years old.

The men chosen to fight as enlisted soldiers were also predominately unmarried. Of the 357 men, only 77 (22 percent) were married. Some towns enlisted more married men than others, especially in the larger towns where perhaps the militia committees did not know the details of each man's life (see Table C-2). All three towns that impressed more than their share of the married men, Ipswich, Lynn, and Salem, were large commercial and market towns. The towns that impressed the fewest married men (Andover, Gloucester, Newbury, Rowley, Topsfield, and Wenham) were mostly subordinate or isolated towns. A few towns deserve special consideration. Andover, the one true agricultural town in the study, did not send a single married man to war, the only town with such a record. Heads of households were simply too important in the small farming community to endanger in war. The same reason might have been at work on Newbury's militia committee, which sent the smallest percentage of married men to fight in comparison to its total soldier population. Marblehead, a commercial town like Salem,

---

7 Based on twelve officers: ensign (or cornet) and above. See Appendix 1.

8 Based on twelve non-commissioned officers: corporals and sergeants. See Appendix 1.

9 Marriage data comes from a variety of sources, most often vital, probate, church records and genealogies, but also court and town records.
Table C-2
Marriage Status of Enlisted Soldiers, King Philip’s War, 1675-1676 by Town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Number of Married Men</th>
<th>% of Total Men Married</th>
<th>Number of Men in Service</th>
<th>% of Total Men in Service for County</th>
<th>Difference % married &amp; % in service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andover</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marblehead</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>+11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sent, unlike Salem, a very small percentage of married men to fight. Marblehead was a special case; after its tremendous loss of townsmen in Lathrop’s command, the town chose almost all of its soldiers from among its large population of transient fishermen, men with no permanent connection, certainly not wives, to the town.

An analysis of married men among the different Essex companies, thus recruited at different phases of the war, shows a number of interesting patterns (see Table C-3). As the war went on and the need for men grew, more married men were impressed as a percentage of the combat forces. For example, married men made up only 11 percent of Appleton’s company recruited in the fall of 1675, yet they made up 22 percent of Brocklebank’s force, recruited in January 1676. As the war continued and casualties grew, the colony’s military leadership was less able to protect married men if they...
Table C-3
Marriage Status of Enlisted Soldiers, King Philip’s War, 1675-1676 by Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company or Unit</th>
<th>Dates of Service</th>
<th>Number of Married Men/Total Men</th>
<th>% Married of Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>Aug. '75-Jan. '76</td>
<td>11 / 96</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Aug. '75-Sept. '75</td>
<td>11 / 68</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Nov. '75-Feb. '76</td>
<td>23 / 108</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocklebank</td>
<td>Jan. '76-Apr. '76</td>
<td>7 / 31</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>Jan. '76-Aug. '76</td>
<td>6 / 9</td>
<td>66%(^{10})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrisons*</td>
<td>War- 1675-1676</td>
<td>5 / 39</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troopers</td>
<td>War- 1675-1676</td>
<td>15 / 33</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) This large percentage (66%) is misleading. The small number of Essex County men in Manning’s company, which was made up of men from various counties, is unrepresentative of the company as a whole. The small sample size makes this figure questionable as a true measure of married men in the company.

wanted to fulfill enlistment quotas. However, married men made up only 12 percent of garrison troops; apparently the militia committees wanted to limit their number among troops expected to be on station a long time, which would increase the strain on the families at home. Cavalry troopers, whose members came from the more affluent segment of colonial society (and were usually older), contained a larger percentage of married men, almost half their number; this was not a hardship, however, since most troops did not stay away from home as long as infantry companies, because they were engaged in local scouting.

If the committees of militia impressed relatively few married men, they drafted even fewer fathers. Of the 357 enlisted soldiers from Essex County, only 48 (13 percent) were fathers at the time they were impressed (see Table C-4). Two towns, agricultural Andover, which had not even pressed married men, and subordinate Gloucester, sent no...
men with children to the front lines. A number of towns, all smaller communities, sent only a single father to fight: isolated Wenham, Topsfield, and Manchester; and market and commercial Newbury and Marblehead, with its special circumstances. Even Rowley, which sent three married men, sent a smaller percentage of fathers compared to their percentage of total men sent. Only the relatively larger towns of Beverly, Ipswich, Lynn, and Salem sent more than their share of fathers to serve. Once again, the smaller, more settled towns such as Andover and Gloucester fiercely protected their household patriarchs, while the larger towns sent more of them to fight.11 The protection of husbands and fathers by the committees of militia demonstrates the pivotal role these

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Number of Fathers</th>
<th>% of Total Fathers</th>
<th>Number of Men in Service</th>
<th>% of Total Men in Service for County</th>
<th>Difference % Fathers &amp; % in Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andover</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>+9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marblehead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall      | 48                | 13%                | 357                      | 100%                                 |                                   |

11 Unlike the patterns for married men, an analysis of fathers sent to the assorted companies at different stages of the war shows no discernable pattern. Relatively large numbers of fathers did serve in Gardner’s Company and as troopers.
men played in their families. Husbands and fathers were “prince and teacher, pastor and judge” in their homes. They were also crucial to the economic stability of the family, without their labor, most families would not survive. Militia committees, anxious to preserve the stability and economic well being of Bay Colony families during the calamity of King Philip’s War, went to great lengths to protect husbands and fathers from the press, and to limit their length of service if they were called. In a related concern for family stability, many militia committees tried to limit the number of eldest-sons they impressed, because of their key role in the long-term continuation of families.

Massachusetts Bay committees of militia, in addition to their attempts to limit the disruption impressment caused families, tried to limit hardship on the soldiers’ town when selecting men to fight, in case the men failed to return. While the military law of the colony seemed to imply a universal military obligation for males between sixteen and sixty years of age, that obligation was anything but universal when war came to New England in 1675. Despite the long-standing myth of a representative military in the earliest colonial period, this examination proves that the seventeenth-century American soldier was not representative of society at large; in fact, he was often one of society’s insignificant members—the community troublemaker, society’s outcast, or the town’s deadwood. In his call for a social history of the American soldier, Richard Kohn expected this, calling the notion that American fighting men were “a cross section of the American population” one of the nation’s strongest and most enduring myths. Yet,

---


John Shy, in his influential 1963 article on colonial militias, claimed that only in the eighteenth century did the New England soldier become one of society’s “lower sort.” The information and arguments presented here proves this incorrect; over seventy percent of the soldiers impressed into Massachusetts Bay’s army during King Philip’s War were pressed by their local committees of militia because of a problem in their past or their position in the town’s order. It was not, as Shy argued, the volunteer forces of the eighteenth century that made New England’s colonial soldiers less representative of society as a whole; it was a choice made by the military-civilian leadership when faced with total war in the seventeenth century.

Once again, as they had when forming the militia structure and the committees of militia, the Massachusetts leadership reverted to Elizabethan militia practice by sending expendables on dangerous missions, keeping the better sort at home for local defense. In 1675 and 1676, the committees chose 261 enlisted men (73 percent) with a black mark against them in their town (see Table C-5). Every single town chose a majority of its soldiers from men with a negative factor; the lowest percentage in any town of these men in active forces was 60 percent. Tiny Manchester, with a very small recruitment base and a dysfunctional militia system, sent only troubled men to fight; all five men sent had negative marks against them. Another small town, Wenham, also had a very large percentage of soldiers with black marks on their records (89 percent) for the same reason.

---

14 John Shy, “A New Look at the Colonial Militia,” in A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for American Independence (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). The work of Fred Anderson also contradicts Shy’s assessment, at least for the soldiers of the Seven Years War. Anderson argued that the soldiers were simply temporarily poor (waiting for their inheritance) and enlisted to make money. To Anderson, the eighteenth century colonial enlisted man was not of the “lower sort” at all. See Fred Anderson, A People’s Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years’ War (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 26-62.
Ipswich, the largest town in the county and one that had a history of trying to rid itself of troublemakers, also sent a large proportion of difficult men, 81 percent.

Table C-5
Negative Factors of Enlisted Soldiers during King Philip’s War, by Town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Total # of Men</th>
<th>Total with Negative Factor</th>
<th>Low Socio-Econ. Status</th>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Town Connection</th>
<th>Town Problem</th>
<th>Debt</th>
<th>Multiple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andover</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marblehead</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsfield</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenham</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the soldiers of Essex County overall, low socio-economic status was the single most important reason men were sent off to war, with 42 percent of the men sent in that category. This seems especially true for impressment in the larger towns of Ipswich and Salem, where the militia committees probably relied on socio-economic status.
because the town's large populations precluded committee members from knowing the intimate details of all their citizens. Next in preference came men with a criminal problem; 19 percent of the county's soldiers had been punished for committing a criminal act in their past, from assault and trespass to making "reproachful speeches." Men without a strong connection to the town that impressed them made up 17 percent of the force. In a number of towns, such as Rowley and Andover, the militia committees made an effort to protect sons of the town's original families from war service, sending instead sons of families that had joined the town after the founding period. This argues for the continuation of the strong bond between original core families in the settlements. In some towns, the town connection variable was difficult to document, since lack of documentation was often the only proof of the factor.

Those who had had trouble in town, either themselves or their families, made up 14 percent of the total. This category includes such factors as being on the losing side of a town religious controversy, having the wrong family connections, or being in a dispute with the town fathers over some issue. In many of these cases, the town's elite used the impressment power as a tool to rid their town of "undesirable" elements, a campaign which had gone on for years in some towns, such as Ipswich. The power of the militia committee, like the power of the selectmen or the church elders, could make life difficult for those who did not conform. Debt, a normal part of life in colonial New England, accounted for the smallest number of men sent, only 3 percent of the men had debt problems large and public enough to make them the possible target of their militia committee. Sixty-four men pressed (18 percent) had multiple negative factors. These men, often of low economic status, also got in trouble with the law or had few
connections with the town. Overall, the vast majority of the soldiers sent off to fight King Philip's War were not the "flower" of their towns, but the "rabble."

The specific negative factors each town focused on were different, fitting with the local control and decision-making of the committee of militia system. Some town committees saw crime as a high priority in choosing soldiers, while others wanted to send men with few connections to the town (see Table C-6). By sheer numbers of men, eight of the twelve towns in the county show low economic status as at least one of the most

### Table C-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>First Negative</th>
<th>Second Negative</th>
<th>Third Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andover</td>
<td>Socio-Econ. Status*</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town Problems*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town Connection*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Socio-Econ. Status*</td>
<td>Town Connection</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>Socio-Econ. Status</td>
<td>Town Connection</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>Socio-Econ. Status</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Town Connection*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debt*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Socio-Econ. Status</td>
<td>Town Problems</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Town Connection</td>
<td>Socio-Econ. Status</td>
<td>Crime*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Town Problems*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marblehead</td>
<td>Town Connection</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury</td>
<td>Socio-Econ. Status</td>
<td>Town Problems</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowley</td>
<td>Town Connection</td>
<td>Town Problems</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>Socio-Econ. Status</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Town Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsfield</td>
<td>Town Connection</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Socio-Econ. Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenham</td>
<td>Socio-Econ. Status*</td>
<td>Town Problems</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town Conn.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Socio-Econ. Status</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Town Connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates tie between numbers of factors
important factors in impressment decisions. Yet this can be misleading, especially in the small towns, where many men suffered from low status, but other factors, like crime or town problems, was the real reason for their call-up. The committees of militia in Andover, Manchester, Marblehead, Rowley, and Topsfield chose men primarily for their lack of a connection to the town. These committees were safeguarding their town's stability by sending men who were insignificant to the town's survival. The second most important negative factor for five towns was either crime or the man's negative experience in town, most often being a part of a town or church dispute. A man's problematic history with town leaders was a considerable factor in almost every one of the smaller, closely-knit communities, such as Andover, Lynn, Manchester, Newbury, Rowley, and Wenham. Crime was the second factor in the two largest towns, Ipswich and Salem, as well as smaller Marblehead and Topsfield.

Many towns pressed individuals with multiple strikes against them. A sizeable percentage, more than the norm, of the married men (35 percent) and fathers (39 percent) pressed for service had multiple negatives, perhaps explaining their inclusion in the ranks despite an obvious reluctance on the part of the militia committees to press such men. The two largest towns, Ipswich and Salem, pressed large numbers of men with several negative factors. So too did several smaller towns, including close-knit Rowley (48 percent) and Topsfield, where over 71 percent of their soldiers had multiple negatives. Andover, Gloucester, and Manchester all had sizeable percentages of men with several black marks on their records. These data are crucial to understanding the genuinely local nature of impressment administered by the committee of militia system. Each town's

---

Some small towns, especially Gloucester and Wenham, pressed a relatively large percentage of men with multiple negatives; however, in actual numbers of men pressed, this was insignificant. See Table C-5.
committee, much like the locally-based deputy lords lieutenant under Elizabeth I and James I in England, decided what was best for the community. When they instituted their militia system, and especially when they created the militia committees in the 1650s, Massachusetts Bay’s leaders had wanted to preserve local control of impressment; they wanted to avoid impressment by officials with no grounding in the community like the lords lieutenant under Charles I. The system they established fulfilled their wishes during King Philip’s War in 1675-1676.

An analysis of the soldiers by the company they were pressed into, and thus at what stage of the war they entered service, shows a similar pattern for all the major Essex County companies (see Table C-7). Of the eight companies formed with a sizeable Essex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Dates of Service</th>
<th>Number of Men from Essex Co.</th>
<th>Number with Negative Factor</th>
<th>% with Negative factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paige’s Troop</td>
<td>July ’75-Aug.’75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop’s Company</td>
<td>Aug.’75-Spt.’75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton’s Company</td>
<td>Aug.’75-Jan.’76</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner’s Company</td>
<td>Nov.’75-Feb.’76</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole’s Company</td>
<td>Nov.’75-Apr.’75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocklebank’s Company</td>
<td>Jan.’76-Apr.’76</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning’s Company</td>
<td>Jan.’76-Aug.’76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whipple’s Troop</td>
<td>Mrch.’76-Sept.’76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrisons*</td>
<td>War- 1675-1676</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troopers</td>
<td>War- 1675-1676</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Units</td>
<td>War- 1675-1676</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Garrisons includes Poole’s Company of garrison troops.
County contingent, all but one were made up of at least 50 percent of men with negative factors contributing to their impressment.\textsuperscript{16} In the four major Essex County companies, commanded by Lathrop, Appleton, Gardner, and Brocklebank, the lowest percentage of recruits of the "lower sort" in any unit was 61 percent. The infantry company with the highest number of men with a damaging factor was Captain Appleton’s company, which was recruited predominately out of Ipswich, a town with a high percentage of troubled recruits. Gardner’s company, with many men from Salem, had a similarly high percentage.

An even larger percentage of the men who served in at least two separate units, 75 percent, (See Table C-7) had negative factors, which was possibly the reason they were impressed by the committees numerous times (or perhaps having such bad reputations and prospects at home, some volunteered for service). The differences between the major companies, however, points to only a modest impact on recruitment based on the stage of the war or the mission of the unit.\textsuperscript{17} The facts do put to rest a famous quotation of contemporary historian William Hubbard, that Captain Lathrop’s men were “the very

\textsuperscript{16} The one company that did not, Manning’s Company, had a relatively small number of Essex County men compared to the other units, skewing its result.

\textsuperscript{17} However, there is a discernable pattern. Of the four major Essex companies, Lathrop’s, recruited early in the war, had one of the lowest negative rates (66 percent). While half of Appleton’s troops were recruited at the same time as Lathrop’s command, the other half were recruited in November 1675 for the Narragansett campaign along with Gardner’s company (it is impossible, based on the data available, to separate Appleton’s men by when they were recruited). It may not be a coincidence that Appleton (78 percent) and Gardner’s companies (75 percent), both (in part for Appleton) recruited for the dangerous Fort Fight, had the highest percentages of the “rabble.” The idea of differing recruitment patterns based on mission was posited in Kyle F. Zelner, “Massachusetts’ Two Militias: A Social History of the 1st Essex Expeditionary Company in King Philip’s War, 1675-1676” (M.A. thesis, Wayne State University, 1993); Kyle F. Zelner, “Essex County’s Two Militias: The Social Composition of Offensive and Defensive Units During King Philip’s War, 1675-1676,” \textit{New England Quarterly} 72, no. 4 (1999): 577-593. While the premise is not without merit, the evidence of town-based recruitment presented here makes the mission theory of recruitment weaker than before.
Lathrop’s men, like their fellow seventeenth-century New England soldiers, consisted more of the “rabble” than the “flower.”

The belief that the legally-instituted universal military obligation shaped the early colonial militia has obscured the institution and its members for many years. The soldiers of King Philip’s War were not the soldiers of American myth; they did not accurately mirror the sixteen-to-sixty male population of New England, despite the universal military obligation of the colony. Fighting in the first and last war of mass participation in New England’s colonial era, they did not volunteer and fight out of the patriotic goodness of their hearts. While a small number did step forward on their own, the majority were pressed into service by their towns’ committee of militia, most often with grudging acquiescence, sometimes with outright defiance. They were similar to the English offensive soldiers of Elizabeth’s period before them, men with questionable pasts or not much of a future, picked in most instances because they did not represent the best of their society.

And like their Elizabethan ancestors of the general militia that stormed the shores of France or fought in Ireland, they often made dreadful soldiers. Where Barnaby Rich and other Elizabethan military commanders loudly complained of the quality and fighting skills of recruits pressed out of taverns and jails for Elizabeth’s adventures, a similar assessment of New England’s pressed men was implied in Captain Benjamin Church’s

---

18 Hubbard, *History of the Indian Wars*, 113. It is quite probable that Hubbard’s statement was more a tribute to fallen soldiers than a serious sociological analysis, although many subsequent historians and genealogists have taken the statement as proof of the quality of Lathrop’s men.
stories about pressed men in the early days of King Philip's War. The sheer number of ambushes and bungled operations, such as the ambush at Bloody Brook, the unorganized rush to the Fort Fight, or the disastrous Sudbury Fight, proves the point all too well. The war was going so badly that the colony changed to a new system in the spring of 1676. Only when the colonists turned to Indian guides and all-volunteer companies of soldiers, like those of Captain Church or Captain Mosley, was the war finally won.

Reliance on the volunteer "professional soldier," men enticed and emboldened by enlistment bounties and rewards of western lands for exemplarily service, was the wave of the future.

The myth of the "archetypal" seventeenth-century New England citizen-soldier recruited through a universal military obligation is just that, a myth. Like his Elizabethan ancestors before him, and his descendants of the eighteenth century (and later), the early colonial soldier did not mirror his society, no matter how new or homogeneous that society was. He was pressed most often because he was one of his communities' insignificant members: frequently an outcast, sometimes a criminal. His impressment, by the local elites on the militia committee, conveys as much about the values of colonial

---


communities as it does about the soldiers themselves. Committees of militia wanted to save their towns and families from adversity as much as possible during the difficult war years, so they largely selected men who would not gravely endanger the strength of the town or families if they did not return. Large numbers of middling, law-abiding men who conformed to town standards never marched off to war. This should not be surprising. As Richard Kohn argued over twenty years ago, "different military forces in our history . . . rarely, if ever, comprised a representative cross-section of the American population." Having the hard evidence necessary, we now know for certain, at least for seventeenth-century New England, that he was correct.

\[\text{22 Kohn, "Social History of the American Soldier," 563.}\]
APPENDIX 1

ESSEX COUNTY ACTIVE-DUTY SOLDIERS' AGE
DURING KING PHILIP'S WAR, 1675-1676

_active duty enlisted men, 1675-1676_

Total Number of Enlisted Men: 357
Number with Known Age: 195 (55% of total men)
Average Age: 26.6 years old
Modal Age: 25 years old
Median Age: 25 Years old

By comparison, Fred Anderson's study of eighteenth century soldiers of the Seven Years War, *A People's Army*, reports an average of 26.3 years old for enlisted volunteers during the war, with a median age of 23 and a modal age of 18.¹ These numbers are very close to the soldiers considered in this study. In his section on the soldiers of New England who fought during the American Revolution, Charles Neimeyer reports that 72 percent of the men were in their teens and twenties, an almost identical finding to the men of King Philip's War examined here.²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>100.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Deviation in percentage totals from 100.0 are a function of rounding.


## Breakdown of Men by Age During the War

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age During War (1675-1676)</th>
<th>Number of Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Active Duty Officers, 1675-1676

Total Number of Officers: 12
Number with Known Age: 10 (83% of total officers)

Average Age: 46.2 years old
Modal Age: 30 years old
Median Age: 48 Years old

Breakdown of Officers by Age During the War

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age During War (1675-1676)</th>
<th>Number of Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparison, Harold Selesky’s examination of the officers of Connecticut during the Seven Years War, in his book *War and Society in Colonial Connecticut*, reports the field officers (those above the rank of captain) averaged forty-two years of age, while captains on average were thirty-nine on average. While the averages are similar to those for King Philip’s War described here, Selesky mentions few officers over fifty years old.³

Active Duty Non-Commissioned Officers, 1675-1676

Total Number of Non-Commissioned Officers: 12
Number with Known Age: 8 (67% of total)

Average Age: 29.9 years old
Modal Age: None
Median Age: 23 Years old

Breakdown of Non-Commissioned Officers by Age During the War

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age During War (1675-1676)</th>
<th>Number of Non-Commissioned Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately, none of the studies of eighteenth century soldiers make a separate study of non-commissioned officers’ ages, so no comparison is available.
APPENDIX 2

ESSEX MILITIAMEN AND TOWN NEGATIVE FACTORS IN IMPRESSMENT

**Andover**

Unit(s): Appleton's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Markes</td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Brocklebank's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayers</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Gardner's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbet</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Town Problem-Family Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Town Problem-Family Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>Ebenezer</td>
<td>Town Problem-Family Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fry</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovejoy</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marston</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Town Connection-Latecomer to Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status, Town Connection-Latecomer to Town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

363
Philips  Samuel  Town Problem-Family Connection, Town Connection-Latecomer to Town

Preston  John  Low Economic Status, Town Connection-Latecomer to Town

Whittington  Edward  Low Economic Status, Town Connection-Latecomer to Town

**Unit(s):** Gardner's Company, Brocklebank's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Beverly**

**Unit(s):** Appleton's Company, Whipple's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rayment</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Corwin's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Corwin's Troop, Whipple's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Town Problem-Trouble with Selectmen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Gardner's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Crime, Town Connection-Transient-Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Negative Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blashfield</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Town Connection-Transient-Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conant</td>
<td>Lott</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fferrymann</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Town Connection-Transient-Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussband</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Lathrop's Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balch</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorndike</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trask</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Poole's Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mosse</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Savage's Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Whipple's Troop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hascall</td>
<td>Marke</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Gloucester**

**Unit(s): Appleton’s Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellery</td>
<td>Issac</td>
<td>Town Connection-Latecomer to Town, Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Brocklebank’s Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stainwood</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Brocklebank’s Company, Lancaster Garrison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stainwood</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Crime, Town Connection-Latecomer to Town, Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Gardner’s Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Vinesont</td>
<td>Town Connection-Latecomer to Town, Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haraden</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Town Connection-Latecomer to Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serjant</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somes</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Negative Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duday</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Town Connection-Latecomer to Town, Low Economic Status-Servant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Mosley's Company, Poole's Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Poole's Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bray</td>
<td>Nathaniel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitch</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Town Connection-Latecomer to Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hascall</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stainwood</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Syll's Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ipswich**

**Unit(s): Appleton's Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bidford</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briar</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burley</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>No Town Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnam</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Given Name</td>
<td>Town Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td>Issac</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deane</td>
<td>Philemon</td>
<td>No Town Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennison</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>Nathaniel</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faussee</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitz</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgskin</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowlton</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowlton</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovel</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurvey</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarsh</td>
<td>Zaccheus</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>Freegrace</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipin</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Israh</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimson</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story</td>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Negative Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling, Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timson</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayte</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Nathaniel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle, Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachaerias</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Appleton's Company, Brocklebank's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peirce</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Appleton's Company, Brocklebank's Company, Syll's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Appleton's Company, Gardner's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dow</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emons</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewett</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Town Problem-Family Sues Town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Appleton's Company, Poole's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pengry</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Negative Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparks</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle, Crime, Town Problem-Sues Town Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasmore</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neland</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle, Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingois</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainwright</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle, Crime, Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fellows
Joseph
Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle

Unit(s): Brocklebank's Company, Marlborough Garrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Brookfield/Quabaug Garrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>Issac</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Chelmsford Garrison, Quabaug Garrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alhort</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Gardner's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gourdine</td>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Hadley Garrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chub</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling, Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Henchman's Company, Brocklebank's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groe</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unit(s): Lathrop's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bray</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crumpton</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>No Town Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emons</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower, Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pengry</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>No Town Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainwright</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitteridge</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Lathrop's Company, Appleton's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle, Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringe</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddler</td>
<td>Abiel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Lathrop's Company, Whipple's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Marlborough Garrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle, Crime, Debt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mosley's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paige's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safford</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle, Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paige's Troop, Appleton's Company, Brocklebank's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling, Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paige's Troop, Henchman's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle, Town Problem-Family Sues Town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paige's Troop, Manning's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wardall</td>
<td>Elihu</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unit(s): Paige's Troop, Whipple's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fellows</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gidings</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Poole's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling, Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Prentice's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Quabaug Garrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philips</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Wheeler's Company, Groton Garrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Whipple's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Browne</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit(s): Willard's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellows</td>
<td>Issac</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Crime, Low Economic Status-Town Rank: Underling, * Native American Servant,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lynn

Unit(s): Brocklebank's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrell</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Corwin's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Gardner's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bassett</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Town Problem-Anti-Hathorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Town Problem-Anti-Hathorne, Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Town Problem-Selectmen Dispute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farington</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartt</td>
<td>Isaack</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huchin</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Town Problem—Slandered Town Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huchin</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Debt, Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunkens</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Negative Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linsey</td>
<td>Eliazer</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looke</td>
<td>Jonthan</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rods</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarbox</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Town Problem-Selectman Dispute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welman</td>
<td>Iseck</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Gardner's Company, Brocklebank's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Debt, Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Gardner's Company, Poole's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graves</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Henchman's Company, Brocklebank's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireson</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Lathrop's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ally</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Crime, Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrar</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnell</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinton</td>
<td>Blaze</td>
<td>Town Problem-Implicated in Ironworks Fire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wyman  Stephen  Low Economic Status-Few Records

**Unit(s): Manning's Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirtland</td>
<td>Nathaniel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Poole's Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burrell</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Crime, Town Problem-Anti-Hathorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisk</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>Elisha</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Prentice's Troop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Turner's Company, Poole's Company, Hadley Garrison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coates</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Whipple's Troop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>Thadeus</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellow</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Negative Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witt</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manchester**

Unit(s): Gardner's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pikworth</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Lathrop's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>No Town Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>No Town Connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Poole's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Town Problems, Low Economic Status, Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Town Connection-No Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marblehead**

Unit(s): Brocklebank's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ravensbee</td>
<td>Rowland</td>
<td>No Town Connection-Transient Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>No Town Connection-Transient Fisherman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unit(s): Gardner's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belinger</td>
<td>Lenerd</td>
<td>No Town Connection-Transient Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>No Town Connection-Transient Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>No Town Connection-Transient Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codner</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Crime, Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>No Town Connection-Transient Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>No Town Connection-Transient Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fferker</td>
<td>Auguster</td>
<td>No Town Connection-Transient Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>No Town Connection-Transient Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severy</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>No Town Connection-Transient Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapligh</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>No Town Connection-Transient Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Town Connection-Limited: Transient Fisherman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Lathrop's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dew</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Town Connection-Limited: Transient Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrett</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittman</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Paige's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Enoch</td>
<td>No Town Connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Newbury**

**Unit(s):** Appleton’s Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brabrooke</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breyer</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Cornelius</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilsiey</td>
<td>Issac</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennison</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyer</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordway</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poore</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poore</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawlins</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Town Problem-Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyer</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheepard</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somersby</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standley</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unit(s): Appleton's Company, Brocklebank's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Appleton's Company, Brockfield Garrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Appleton's Company, Marlborough Garrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Henchman's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Browne</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Lancaster Garrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sparkes</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Lathrop's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Zekeriah</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbs</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plummer</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unit(s): Lathrop's Company, Appleton's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodwell</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>Caleb</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolf</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toppan</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Paige's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noyce</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Prentice's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilcott</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Turner's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rowley

### Unit(s): Appleton's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Town Connection-Latecomer to Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkby</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side, Town Connection-Latecomer to Town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gowen Symon Town Connection-Latecomer to Town, Low Economic Status-Few Records

Jackson Caleb Crime, Town Problem-Religious Controversy- Losing Side, Town Connection-Latecomer to Town,

Leyton John Crime, Town Problem-Religious Controversy- Losing Side, Town Connection-Latecomer to Town,

Palmer Thomas None

Stickney John None

Tyler Samuel Town Connection-Latecomer to Town, Low Economic Status-Few Records

Unit(s): Appleton's Company, Brocklebank's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boynton</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Brocklebank's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hobson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Town Connection-Latecomer to Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Crime, Debt, Town Problem-Religious Controversy- Losing Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Town Connection-Latecomer to Town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Lathrop-Quartermaster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wicomb</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unit(s): Lathrop's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayly</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side, Latecomer to Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriman</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Crime, Town Connection-Latecomer to Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Town Connection-Latecomer to Town, Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilbom</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side, Latecomer to Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyer</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>Crime, Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side, Town Connection-Latecomer to Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stickney</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Manning's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit(s): Whipple's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Town Problem-Religious Controversy-Losing Side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Salem**

**Unit(s):** Appleton's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Billerica Garrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Brocklebank's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheever</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pease</td>
<td>Nathaniel</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pease</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Corwin's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Issac</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Gardner's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Debt, Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boden</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradell</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status - Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffingtog</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butteler</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Low Economic Status - Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dees</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Low Economic Status - Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Town Connection - Outsider: Salem Village, Town Problem - Anti-Salem Militia Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frail</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Low Economic Status - Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status - Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hind</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollis</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Crime, Low Economic Status, Servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooper</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Low Economic Status - Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houlton</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Town Connection - Outsider: Salem Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefford</td>
<td>Ffrances</td>
<td>Low Economic Status - Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Town Connection - Outsider: Salem Village, Town Problem - Anti-Salem Militia Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Town Connection - Outsider: Salem Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magery</td>
<td>Larance</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polott</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescote</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Negative Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>Isack</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumeall</td>
<td>Clement</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td>Marck</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switchell</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tossier</td>
<td>Lenard</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trask</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Hasey's Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Lancaster Garrison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyat</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Crime, Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s): Lathrop's Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>Crime, Town Problem--Implicated in Ironworks Fire and Civil Suits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullock</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyser</td>
<td>Eleazer</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambard</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozzier</td>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>Crime, Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropes</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Debt, Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Crime, Town Problem-Quaker Wife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Lathrop's Company, Gardner's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Town Connection-Outsider: Salem Village, Town Problem-Anti-Salem Militia Petition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Manning's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckett</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Mosley's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deares</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainwright</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit(s):** Poole's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pudenter</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Crime, Low Economic Status, Town Problem-Troublesome Wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacie</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit(s): Savage's Company, Brocklebank's Company, Lancaster Garrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Springfield Garrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilsbury</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Turner's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Low Economic Status-Few Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibly</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Whipple's Troop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenny</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Crime, Town Connection-Outsider: Salem Village, Town Problem- Anti-Salem Militia Petition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Topsfield

Unit(s): Gardner's Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Crime, Town Connection-Outsider: Rowley Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>Issac</td>
<td>Town Connection-Outsider: Salem, Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Zacheus</td>
<td>Town Connection-Outsider: Salem, Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>Zachers</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit(s):</strong> Lathrop's Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative Factor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbs</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Crime, Town Coinnection- Outsider: Salem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Unit(s):</strong> Poole's Company, Turner's Company, Sweet's Company</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative Factor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wenham**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Unit(s):</strong> Appleton's Company</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative Factor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abey</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killom</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Town Problem-Family Connection, Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Unit(s):</strong> Gardner's Company</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative Factor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batchelder</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutten</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Town Problem-Family Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Town Problem-Family Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Town Connection-Limited, Crime, Low Family Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Unit(s):</strong> Lathrop's Company</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative Factor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemball</td>
<td>Caleb</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Negative Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemball</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Negative Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemball</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Low Economic Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit(s): Lathrop's Company, Gardner's Company, Brocklebank's Company

Unit(s): Sweet's Company
APPENDIX 3
ROWLEY'S 1662 TAX LIST RANKED BY FAMILY, WITH SOLDIERS' FAMILIES HIGHLIGHTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Company of Soldier in Family</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Pence</th>
<th>Total Pence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gage Corp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rogers Mrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jewett Deacon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dreser John</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pichard John</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tenny Thomas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (tie)</td>
<td>Dickinson Uxor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (tie)</td>
<td>Brocklebank Hobson Uxor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Appleton, Lathrop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Swan Rih:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Northen Ezekiel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Langhorne Richard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nelson Mr.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Elsworth Jeremiah</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (tie)</td>
<td>Brocklebank</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (tie)</td>
<td>Lathrop Palmer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Heseltine Robert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nelson Thomas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 (tie)</td>
<td>Barker James</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 (tie)</td>
<td>Spofford John</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2ND QUARTER

**8 Enlisted Soldiers (7 Men-1 served twice)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Company of Soldier in Family</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Pence</th>
<th>Total Pence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Bayley</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 (tie)</td>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 (tie)</td>
<td>Redington</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Whipple</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ace</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>Good.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 (tie)</td>
<td>Appleton, Brocklebank* (same son)</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mighill</td>
<td>Uxor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 (tie)</td>
<td>Appleton, Brocklebank* (same son)</td>
<td>Boynton</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Burbanks</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE (132 PENCE (d))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Company of Soldier in Family</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Pence</th>
<th>Total Pence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Whipple</td>
<td>Leaver</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazen</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumin</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Brocklebank</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Langley</td>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bixsby</td>
<td>Josaph</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEDIAN (111 PENCE (d))**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Company of Soldier in Family</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Pence</th>
<th>Total Pence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Kingsbury</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 (tie)</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Killborne</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 (tie)</td>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Harriman</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 (tie)</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Riely</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 (tie)</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Seales</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 (tie)</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 (tie)</td>
<td>Quartermaster</td>
<td>Wickem</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Remington</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Worster</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Jewett</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Uxor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 (tie)</td>
<td>Boyes</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 (tie)</td>
<td>Mighill</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Hadley</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Company of Soldier in Family</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Pence</th>
<th>Total Pence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62 (tie)</td>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 (tie)</td>
<td>Brocklebank</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>Browne</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Sawyer</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Company of Soldier in Family</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Pounds</td>
<td>Shillings</td>
<td>Pence</td>
<td>Total Pence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stiles</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trumble</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plats</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>Lighton</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wickem</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rayner</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 (tie)</td>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>Burkly</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mighill</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stickney</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plats</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hindin</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peison</td>
<td>Uxor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>Starling</td>
<td>Good:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lumin</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewett</td>
<td>Neh.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perley</td>
<td>Good:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Pence Statistics:** Average: 132.2824; Median: 111; Mode: 240; Standard Deviation: 70.41317

## APPENDIX 4
TOPSFIELD'S 1668 TAX LIST RANKED BY FAMILY, WITH SOLDIERS' FAMILIES HIGHLIGHTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Company of Soldier in Family</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Pence</th>
<th>Total Pence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Comm. of Militia, 1675-76 Selectman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>264</td>
<td>Ensign Comm. of Militia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gould</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>Sergeant in Chief Comm. of Militia. 1675-76 Selectman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reddington</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1675-76 Selectman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Borman</td>
<td>Daniell</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1675-76 Selectman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Towne</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Poole, Turner</td>
<td>Wilds</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Hobes</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>Mr. William</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>How</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Nickols</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>&quot;Adopted&quot; Issac Burton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Towne</td>
<td>William &amp; Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Company of Soldier in Family</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Pounds</td>
<td>Shillings</td>
<td>Pence</td>
<td>Total Pence</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td>Issac Jr.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Morall</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unknown (2 sons)</td>
<td>Estey</td>
<td>Issac</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (tie)</td>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (tie)</td>
<td>Hovey</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cuttler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2ND QUARTER

No Enlisted Soldiers, 2 Unknown

### AVERAGE (103 PENCE (D))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Company of Soldier in Family</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Pence</th>
<th>Total Pence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Browning</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1675-76 Selectman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEDIAN (94 PENCE (D))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Company of Soldier in Family</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Pence</th>
<th>Total Pence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Mathu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Towne</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td>Issac Sr.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1675-76 Selectman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Avery</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 (tie)</td>
<td>Carell</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 (tie)</td>
<td>Donell</td>
<td>Mickall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Prichat</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Company of Soldier in Family</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Pounds</td>
<td>Shillings</td>
<td>Pence</td>
<td>Total Pence</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Howlett</td>
<td>Ensign</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Corporal William</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Avery</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>Watters</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nickols</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boudon</td>
<td>Mickall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hucker</td>
<td>Mathu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morles</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waklin</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4TH QUARTER**

**No Enlisted Soldiers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Company of Soldier in Family</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Pence</th>
<th>Total Pence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Howlett</td>
<td>Ensign</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Corporal William</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Avery</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>Watters</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nickols</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boudon</td>
<td>Mickall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hucker</td>
<td>Mathu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morles</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waklin</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not on Tax List: 2 Enlisted Soldiers, 1 Unknown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Company of Soldier in Family</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Pence</th>
<th>Total Pence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Zachariah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Topsfield Historical Society. "County Rate Made the 18th of November 1668 for Topsfield." *Historical Collections of Topsfield Historical Society* 3 (1895): 51.
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