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Preface

"This is an essay in nineteenth century more than in 18th century history, if such a distinction need be made: my purpose is more to comprehend the shape women's experience was taking them than to illuminate what it had been."

Nancy Cott, The Bonds of Womanhood, p. 4.

It is understandable that during the 1970's, Nancy Cott wrote about the "shape" of women's experiences. Many women emerged in the seventies to demand equal rights between the sexes by proposing the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment and also to demand legal rights for abortion. Both demands represented great instability in the standing social order, manifested in the requests for political change. In this context, it is important that modern feminists, Nancy Cott included, investigate the growth of the feminist movement. They need to know why women have unified according to their sex.

However, in order to truly understand the basis of today's feminism, it is necessary to illuminate the actual experiences of women, to speculate their position in the community during the first several decades of nineteenth century New England. Their lives and daily activities manifested the transformation of social attitudes that developed during this period, since these attitudes determined the options of women within the post-Revolutionary social order.

Therefore, it is my purpose in this essay to reveal my discoveries of the women who lived in Middletown, Connecticut during 1820 - who they were, what they did, who they lived with,
what kind of property they owned and what institutions they participated in, since these actualities unfold their economic, political and social possibilities and opportunities. I have identified these women statistically and will examine their Middletown experiences in light of the experiences of New England women in general. I hope to also reveal some of these women's personal histories since upon these rest the dynamics of social history.

In order to provide a thorough basis for further research of women's social history, particularly in 19th century Middletown, Connecticut. I will finally describe some of the major problems I found related to my research methods and will briefly suggest further routes for research.
Middletown, Connecticut, 1820 -
Investigations and Discoveries of Its Women and Its Social Order

In 1820, women headed 21% of the city of Middletown's households. The city census for that year listed 414 households of which 84 were headed by women. At first, this may not seem unusual since the Revolutionary War had occurred only forty-five years earlier and aged war widows could account for a number of these women. However, in light of the function of marriage and family within the Connecticut social order during the eighteenth century and in comparison to data collected from the 1790 census list, the 1820 statistics are unusual and exciting.

In 1790, women headed only 11% of Middletown's households. Of 944 households, 103 were headed by women. Initially, it was surprising to find even this many women on the 1790 Census. Until the end of the 18th century, the New England family structure functioned to insure social control. The Puritans believed God had pre-ordained a hierarchy amongst all people and

"The family provided the foundation for the superiority of husband over wife, parents over children...master over servants,”¹

and justified a similar hierarchy in the state level where there existed a superiority of

"ministers and elders over congregation..., rulers over subjects...of state.”²

Anyone who ventured away from their family or did not belong to the church did not fit into this hierarchy and was considered a threat to the community. Because of the strength
of the family, young widows usually re-married into a new family or were taken care of by their own extended families. Their venturing to maintain their own household seems unlikely.

Nonetheless, the occurrence of the Revolutionary War does explain why there were approximately 100 female headed households in 1790. It is well known that Middletown's male population experienced the consequences of the war. Henry Whittemore, in the chapter, "Town and City of Middletown," in *History of Middlesex County, Connecticut*, wrote:

"During 1776, the militia of Connecticut were subjected to five heavy drafts, and in August of that year all standing militia of the state west of the Connecticut River were ordered to march to New York City. Instead of the question, who went from Middletown that year? the proper inquiry would be...who did not go? It is known that the hardships and privations of the militia this year were very great; that many from Middletown suffered severely."

None of this may not at first seem dynamic, but the fact is, there was a 10% increase in the number of women who headed Middletown households between 1790 and 1820. In fact, almost 11% of those who headed their households in 1820, also headed their households in 1790. The existences of these women indicate a breakdown in the patriarchal colonial family structure as well as a change in its social functions. By 1820, women not only headed their households, but they lived in smaller, predominantly female households.

Working with the 1820 Census, which lists the names of household heads and breaks the members of the households down by sex and age, I figured the average household size (male and female) as 5.5 members. The average female household was only 4.0 members - a marked decrease. Further, out of
the 84 households in consideration, nearly half were all-female. Nine of these households were women living alone. All but one of these nine lone women were aged over 45 years. For the most part, the other all-female households consisted of older women either a few living together or a combination of older and younger women living together.

I consider the ages of the family members important because they limit to some extent my speculations about the households being studied. For instance, in a household where an older woman was living with a younger woman, I could speculate that a mother and daughter lived together or an older woman and her maidservant. The groups of older women could be sisters, older mothers and daughters or a group of unrelated women living together. Seventeen of the 43 male and female households listed males only under the age of sixteen. These households most likely consisted of a widow with young male children, a woman and an apprentice of some sort, or possibly, but uncommonly, a mother with an illegitimate child.

Curiously, I figured the ages for the female household heads during 1820. I assumed that none were younger than sixteen years old. Using the census, I definitely figured the ages of 82% of the women. 2.4% were young, between the ages sixteen and twenty-six; 31% were aged between twenty-six and forty-five; 49% were aged over forty-five years. Another 16.6% of the women could be aged anywhere from twenty-six on up since their household listed women of those ages. Lucretia Lee, an unnaturalized citizen was not listed under an age group, but I assume she was over 26 years old.

Interestingly, these women were of varying ages, in-
indicating that it was not a revolutionary idea of the young
to break out of the traditional family structure, but the struc-
ture itself that was deteriorating. This was due primarily
to such factors as the Revolution War and Connecticut's
industrial modernization which as I will examine, influenced
the physical and psychological circumstances of the social
order in Middletown.

Before discussing the forces at work in Connecticut's
nineteenth century society, I must still identify two variables
about the ladies under question- their marriage status and
the amount of property they owned. Determining the marriage
status was no easy task. The census was one of the few reliable
sources I used where I felt certain that the information
concerned the household belonged with Martha Barnes, the widow of
Thomas Barnes and not with Martha Barnes, the widow of Joshua
Barnes. I also trust that the clerk responsible for the
census was not idiosyncratic in his town inventory. With most
other resources, I encountered the possibility that the woman
listed in the vital records was not the same woman listed in
the census. Regardless of these possibilities, identification
attempts were still successful.

After accumulating information from the 1820 Census,
I turned to Middletown's vital records which list the births,
mariages and very sketchily, the deaths that occurred in
Middletown. A good number of the women on the census were not
listed in the vital records. Most likely, they were not
born or married in Middletown. Perhaps they were just passing
through the city, or lived there for a time to later move.
When I did find a name on the vital records that correlated
to the vital records, I tried to match the ages from the census
with the information I could compile from the vital records. Few matched closely. Wills were more helpful in determining marriage statuses. I discovered Mary Alsop was a widow since she mentioned inheriting estate from her late husband. Unfortunately, probate information existed about only twenty-seven women. I finally used such books as Beers' edition of the History of Middlesex County and any primary source material I could readily find written by people who lived in Middletown around the turn of the nineteenth century. With a little bit of imagination founded in fact, I deduced the marriage statuses I needed.

For 26 women (31.6%), there was not enough information to even venture a status. While the census listed some households with who could possibly be husbands of the household heads, I did not find any other sources which verified this. Fortunately, I did identify 14 women (16.7%) to be single; and 44 (52.8%) to be widowed. These marriage statuses can be used as a measure of social change. The fewer women that were married, the greater the amount of social change occurring.

The amount of property a woman owned also serves as a measure of social change. In a society where women had no political representation, these women would own property without being able to control the political ordinances concerning that property. Since they did own property come the 1800's, it can safely be deduced that a massive change in the position of women in Middletown's visible institutions was happening.

I used two sources to collect property information-
the 1820 tax list which gave the names of male and female taxpayers with their amount paid, and the Middletown probate records which listed information about the process of administering the estates of the residents who had filed wills or had estate of any value to be distributed. The average woman household head paid less taxes than the average taxpayer (male and female). 34.5% of the women listed on the census were also listed on the tax list. Their average tax, excluding Abigail Hubbard, the largest taxpayer with a sum of $1373.76, amounted to $52.78. This was very low compared with Middletown's overall average tax of $83.

While women in general seemed to be poorer than men, at least on a tax basis, the probate records revealed that a number of these women owned enough property that either they felt it necessary to write a will designating its future ownership, or the city felt the estate large enough to warrant administration through the court system. While the wills were written mainly by the wealthier Middletown women, they revealed an enormous amount about the women in question. Twenty-seven women who were listed in the 1820 Census were also listed in the probate records. Of these 27, nineteen had wills on file. The wills list all types of property, real and personal. When the women left their property...

Just about half of the women with property information listed in the Probate Records, owned real property. Patty Dickinson owned several lots, and Abigail Hubbard even owned eight lots in Wisconsin. About half of these women also had money supplies in the form of cash, bank savings and stocks in either banks or private enterprises. Almost all owned a collection of moveables—miscellaneous articles such as furniture, clothing, bedding, and family heirlooms. I found only two women, Mary Bohanning and Lucy Whittlesey, to have died insolvent.
of property they owned - the idea that something had occurred—an industrial revolution, a war, an incident, a conflict, an opportunity - that had resulted in an upset in the traditional colonial social system and women were, as Nancy Cott described in *The Bonds of Womanhood*, becoming more aware of being women, entering the work world, considering and choosing not to marry and becoming active inside and outside of the home.

I attribute the change in the family structure and in the female role in the community to the Revolutionary War, the modernization of the Connecticut economy which created a physical and psychological environment in which the traditional family structure—the self-sufficient, male-headed family—no longer functioned efficiently. Conflict occurred and people changed their attitudes and lifestyles. Society changed.

The extended family did not just collapse, forcing 80 women to head their households. A century before, as land resources became so scarce that fathers could no longer supply their male offspring with property enough to support a family, the family structure had to change. Fathers were forced to find other occupations for their sons or sons were forced to migrate to where the resources were. Mary Russell, daughter of the wealthy merchant, Samuel Russell, entered her diary:

"there is however...such a spirit of emmigration in this state that when a young man has attained a little property, he generally disposes of it in order to settle in the backwoods."*

Thomas Atkins also described the situation:
"One has but to attempt to write the history of any New England village to be impressed with the fact that he will find her sons and daughters scattered throughout the West and South, and in almost all cases filling positions of trust and influence in the places of their adoption. Our own town (Middletown) is no exception to this truth."

With all of this occupation-changing and migrating, Middletown's social structure changed. The economy diversified to accommodate the new work force. The once sufficient farmer began to depend on a butcher for his meat and a tailor for his clothing.

The same forces were still working in Middletown in 1820. Economic circumstances were still undermining the social order. Resources were still limited and the Connecticut Valley was undergoing an enormous upheaval in its economic organization. After losing the British market because of the colonial revolt against British governmental control, after the Embargo Act of 1807 and the War of 1812, cities like Middletown—with the added availability of new technology and productive processes, the continued conflict between the patriarchal social order and limited resources, and the newly instilled factors that American independence created (the notion that a country, an institution, a family did not necessarily have to be a controlling variable within society, but rather, the individual, the family and the institution could determine its own activities),—developed manufacturing economy. The change in the Middletown economic structure have to do with women heading their own households in 1820?
First, women were experiencing the same resource limitations as men. For some reason, it seemed more acceptable for young men to migrate from Middletown than for young women. Steven Peretz, in his paper, "A Demographic Profile of Early 19th Century Middletown, Connecticut: A Statistical Analysis," gathered data which revealed a disparity between the male and female population in Middletown within certain age groups from 1800 to 1820. He found that there was a surplus of males in the population prior to age 10, a surplus which decreased as they grew older. Because the sex ratio disparity increased the greatest between the 10-15 and 16-25 age group, Peretz reasoned male emigration to be the cause. This emigration, along with war casualties, definitely resulted in a decrease in the number of males in the community. Consequently, Middletown women emerged as household heads, entered the city's occupational structure.

Thomas Atkins, in his book, History of Middlefield and Long Hill, described the situation, telling the tales of Harriet Miller, whose husband died in 1825:

"Horace Miller left his wife with six children, the eldest not 13, the youngest an infant. The following in regard to this mother is quoted from the pen of one of her daughters: 'My mother was a very energetic woman. She was obliged to manage the farm and attend to all her other duties. I well remember her going 1½ miles to feed and take care of the cattle, when it was so cold and stormy that her clothes were frozen stiff upon her. She was always cheerful and happy, and left no stone unturned to make others happy. She was very active until the last of her life. She was 38 when she passed away, and the summer previous she was spending a few days with her children on Long Island where they had a party of young people, and she danced with one of her grand-children.'"

and Martha Barnes, the widow of Jabez Barnes, a sailor who died at sea, leaving her with eight children. She:

"...was a wonderful woman of the age in which she lived. Left with this family of children,"
a one-story house, a small barn, and eight or ten acres of land, she managed to take care of her children until they became old enough to take care of themselves. She took in weaving and worked early and late, and yet she found time to go to church, and used to walk to meeting two miles and a half, on Sabbath days when she was past middle age. She was an eminently religious woman, of great courage, and of strong common sense."

Atkins then went on to describe how she trailed and rawhided a man who had stolen her bag of "necessary articles:"

"She started on his track over the bridge and came up with him about halfway up the hill. Seeing the mark on the bag, and knowing it was hers, she saluted him, 'You dog, you have stole my pluck! at the same time, she drew the whip over his head and shoulders."

Apparently, some women were definitely competent enough to handle their own households, despite the difficulty.

By 1820, this resulted in the acceptance of women as responsible property holders. They were recognized legally in probate procedures. Importantly, men felt secure in willing property to women. Mary Harris willed her will:

"three daughters Priscilla, Rachel and Emily Harris - two pieces of land that was set me in distribution of the estate of my father, Harris Prout."10

Eventually, it was extremely noticeable in the wills of the female household heads, that they tended to leave property to other women, particularly to single women. This was understandable. As more women became financially independent, they wanted other women in similar circumstances to have it a little bit easier. Mary Butler left her son, John, all the "beds, bedding, furniture, pictures and things in the room now occupied," as well as half of her monies. She left the remainder to her daughter, Maria Butler, on the condition that she must let John live in his room, and take care of him while he remains single.11

The shared plight of women forced to head their households resulted in a female consciousness. Nancy Cott, in
The Bonds of Womanhood, detailed why this consciousness occurred. After the Revolutionary War, women became involved in women's spheres, both within and outside of their homes. Even married women worked in homes where husbands left to work.

It was fascinating to read journals and wills, written by women in Middletown, which revealed a sensitivity and bond between the authoress and other women. Lucy Whittlesey wrote in her will:

"My household furniture I have given to my daughter Hannah the use of it while she lives, excepting our bed to my Daughter Williams and some other little articles which may be mentioned hereafter. If my Estate should ever be cleared from its present embarrasments, it may probably amount to little more than $5000 which I would have divided into five parts — one part to my Daughter Alsop Two parts each to my other daughters — my reasons for this is first that I consider my Daughter Alsop to be abundantly supplied with this world's goods — my Daughter Hannah is a solitary woman I will stand in need of property — my Daughter Williams is a merchant's wife and more likely to be reduced than her sister — my children are all dear to me." 12

Poverty was not the only bond between women. On the high society level, women also experienced a female awareness. Mar Russell wrote in her diary:

"The ladies here had no idea of celebrating it till the morning of the 4th when it was agreed they should meet in the grove and have cold colation with tea and coffee — about 50 Ladies met and considering the very short notice everything was very nice and well managed — after tea 6 toasts were drank and then the Ladies marched in procession down the town — We were very unwilling to part with our friends but my aunt was anxious to get home she never was half so far from home before but was much better satisfied and happier than her family ever expected she would be." 13

Although women in 1820 realized an absence of men in the home and experienced changing attitudes amongst men and themselves about the position of women in the community, their opportunities were limited by the fact that they were women. It cannot be forgotten that men still headed 79% of Middletown's households. In fact, for the widow with children and the young mother, the absence of men from the house meant an even stronger responsibility that the mother
carefully raise and nurture her children to be healthy and moral Americans. These attitudes combined with the economic and psychological factors earlier discussed, worked within the Middletown community to accommodate women in its institutions, while at the same time, women took care of their homes. As a result, job opportunities for women remained in some degree limited to working alongside of their husbands in business, running it while he was away. A number of women ran Dwelling Houses and Taverns, often with their husbands, but after the death of these husbands, they maintained the business. Mehitable Hall ran a boarding house and tried to clear the estate of her late husband, Dr. William Brenton Hall, of its creditors.\textsuperscript{14} The widow Bigelow maintained Bigelow's Tavern after the death of her husband in 1772 until 1818.\textsuperscript{15} In 1786, both she and Mary Alsop donated funds for construction of the Middletown Court House.\textsuperscript{16} Taverns and Dwelling Houses could be run in conjunction with the home, explaining why it was acceptable to work them.

Another institution in which women could readily participate were religious and benevolent organizations. On October 29, 1795, Sally Parsons, one of the women listed on the 1820 census list, was one of eleven founders of the first Baptist Church of Middletown. Six of these founders were women.\textsuperscript{17} Nancy Cott discussed why this type of participation became so prevalent. Women who lived in Middletown during the 18th and 19th centuries were not equal to men, economically or politically. Once they married, they lost their rights to property. However, equality between the sexes was possible within religious organizations. Men and women could both be devout Christians. Religious organizations also provided something that women could participate in outside of the home, where they could develop some type of social identity, that men developed in the work world. For women, religion functioned to help them define themselves within the community. Here was an opportunity for them to voluntarily become active in an institution of
major social value. Religious groups provided women with a community of peers outside the family, without contravening the importance of the family.\textsuperscript{18}

At the same time women became active in the church, they also became active in charitable societies. This too was an acceptable female activity because women it required women to be responsible for the proper maturation of an individual, an indigent. Women were already doing this type of duty within the home with their own children. It was only natural that they be allowed to extend their role further into the community.

Between 1809 and 1818, three charitable societies emerged in Middletown: the Female Charitable Society, "whose special design is to provide for the education of the children of the poor and to furnish clothing to the destitute," the Female Benevolent Society, "for the education of the indigent poor young men for the ministry of the Gospel," and the Middletown Bible School, "whose subject is to communicate religious instruction to those who attend its schools."\textsuperscript{19}

Beers mentioned that the Female Benevolent Society was incorporated "at the last session of the Assembly, when it possessed $1100 in Bank Stock," inferring that these societies were also economic enterprises which provided benefits personal and communal, that answered the needs of the poor and the women who ran them. It was not unusual then that Patty Dickinson left in her will 10 shares of stock of the Bank of the United States to the American Bible Society, and Anna Phillips left $300 to the American Mission Society and $50 each to the American Bible Society, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and the American Home Missionary Society.\textsuperscript{20}

In the thirty years since 1790, the Middletown social structure changed as the population adjusted their lifestyles in order to reduce the conflict between their necessity to earn a living and to maintain their maternal role in the home. The emergence of the un-married woman,
running her own home, manifested the widespread modernization of Middletown's society, where Poor Houses and Government Institutions supplemented the home's function of social control. As the economy diversified and specialized, the extended family lost its importance. This loss, along side the psychological repercussions of a female consciousness, explains why women chose at all to head their households, and why their survival was insured within the Middletown social web.

**Closing Remarks**

The basic problem in researching women in New England colonial and revolutionary society is a lack of immediate resources. Women did not become involved in organizations which kept records of their actions until the turn of the nineteenth century. Even then, these resources only reveal information about those women who had the time and wealth to participate in these organizations. Likewise, any personal diaries, journals and wills were written by the higher class women who had time to write and the need to establish wills. I do not mean to be pessimistic about the future of research in women's social history, but hope to encourage a careful scouring of resources written by men at the time in order to capture any insightful references they might make, revealing a glimpse of the female place in their lives. For instance, by reading Dr. William Brenton Hall's ledger, I developed a sense of relationships between the Doctor and both wealthy and poor women.

I plan to investigate the available Church and Benevolent Society Records in order to access the actual female role in these organizations, and finally, to read the Middlesex Gazette, with the mention of women in particular, kept in mind.
Appendix A - List of female heads of households, Middletown Census, 1820

Manoma Allen
Elizabeth Allison
Mary Alsop
Lucy Anderson
Sarah Arnold
Betsy Bacon
Eleanor Bacon
Lucretia Barnes
Martha Barnes
Bridget Bevint
Mary Bohanning
Sarah Bevins
Sarah Bill
Lucretia W. Brown
Mary Butler
Martha Camp
Jemima Cannon
Susannah Chamberlain
Phebe Clark
Hannah Collings
Janet Cooper
Elizabeth Cotton
Agnes Cotton
Molly Crittenden
Elizabeth Cuttings
Elizabeth Dealing
Patty Dickinson
Elizabeth Doolittle
Lucy Dowd
Sarah Eggleston
Deborah Fairchild
Mary Franer
Elizabeth Gilbert
Hannah Griffin
Lydia Hall
Fanny Hamlin
Lucy Harrington
Mary Harris
Hannah Hills
Abigail Hubbard
Sarah Hull
Sally Jepson
Abigail Jetenson
Catherine Knap
Sarah Lathrop
Martha Laurie

Lucretia Lee
Elizabeth Loomis
Sarah Magill
Mary Mansfield
Susan Miles
Lucy Miller
Mary Mitchell
Margaret Morrip
Elizabeth Nott
Sally Parsons
Ann Phillips
Experience Plum
Polly Porter
Mary Rand
Elizabeth Ranney
Elizabeth Rawson
Nancy Robbins
 Desire Rockwell
Abigail Russell
Esther Sage
Lucy Ann Shaylor
Nancy Spellman
Elizabeth Spencer
Mary Starr
Peggy Starr
Betsy Storrs
Abigail Stow
Mary Stow
Mary Stow
Elizabeth Sumner
Elizabeth Tarbox
Elizabeth Townsend
Roseanna Ward
Mary Welch
Lucy Whittlesey
Esther Williams
Esther Windborne
Jane Wrighs (?)
Appendix B - List of female heads of households, Middletown Census, 1790

* Mary Alsop
  Sarah Babb
  Rhoda Bacon
  Sibbel Bacon
  Hannah Banks
  Mary Banks

* Martha Barnes
  Mary Beaumont
  Elizabeth Bigelow
  Martha Bill
  Hannah Birdsey
  Abigail Birdsey
  Jane Brewer
  Martha Brooks
  Hannah Butler
  Lucy Cinnason

* Phebe Clark
  Sarah Clark
  Mary Coy
  Sarah Crowell
  Esther Cunningham
  Martha Danforth
  Alisha Doolittle
  Hannah Doolittle
  Mrs. Hannah Doolittle
  Phebe Doud
  Abigail Fairchild
  Lydia Fisher
  Mary Fletcher
  Mary Francis
  Mary Frasier
  Rhoda Gilbert
  Abigail Gill
  Sukey Goodwin
  Basheba Goodrich
  Mary Griffin
  Anna Hall
  Mary Hambleton
  Abigail Hamlin
  Sarah Hawkins
  Mary Henshaw
  Lydia Hosmer
  Abigail Hough
  Anna Hubbard
  Jamansy Hubbard
  Martha Johnson
  Mary Johnson
  Mehitable Johnson

+ Mary Barns
+ Margaret Gleason
+ Patience Hamlin
+ Sarah Hensahaw

Hannah Kelly
Sarah Kirby
Letitia Lane
Mary Leverett
Darcus Lovelond
Sarah Markham
Sarah Miles

* Mary Mitchell
  Lois Nichols
  Mary Nott
  Mehitable Parsons
  Christiany Perry
  Thankful Pickett
  Lucas Priella
  Darcy Prout
  Mary Ranney

* Elizabeth Rawson
  Susannah Redfield
  Sarah Richards
  Rachel Robbards
  Elizabeth Robbert
  Ruth Roberts
  Lydia Robinson

* Desiah Rockwell
* Esther Sage
  Martha Savage
  Naomy Savage
  Sarah Savage
  Lucretia Scott
  Rebecca Sheers

Partridge Southmayd

* Elizabeth Spencer
  Anna Starr
  Elizabeth Strong

* Elizabeth Sumner
  Susannah Sumner
  Phebe Treadway
  Rebecca Treat
  Abigail Ward
  Hope Warner
  Lois Warner
  Esther Wetmore
  Hannah Wetmore
  Abigail White
  Elizabeth Whitebread
  Bula Whittlesey
  Lois Wilcox
  Jamima Willis
  Sibbel Woodward
  Ruth Woods
  Hannah Wright

* Female heads of Households on Both 1790 and 1820 Censuses
+ Listed out of alphabetical order
Appendix C - Women listed on the Middletown Census, 1820
living alone

Sarah Arnold (26-45)
Betsy Bacon (26-45)
Martha Barns (over 45)
Catherine Knap (over 45)
Lucretia Lee (unnaturalized citizen)
Mary Mitchell (over 45)
Desire Rockwell (over 45)
Peggy Starr (over 45)
Esther Windborne (over 45)

Ages listed in parenthesis
None listed on the Middletown Tax List, 1820 except for
    Betsy Bacon 17.00
    Peggy Starr (widow) 15.00
Appendix D - Age breakdown of women listed on Middletown Census, 1820

(16-26)
Sally Jepson
Mary Rand

(26-45)
Elizabeth Allison
Lucy Anderson
Betsy Bacon
Lucretia Barnes
Bridgette Bevint
Mary Bohanning
Lucretia Brown
Susannah Chamberlain
Hannah Collings
Janet Cooper
Elizabeth Cotton
Elizabeth Dealing
Elizabeth Gilbert
Panny Hamlin
Abigail Jetenson
Martha Laurie
Susan Miles
Sally Parsons
Experience Plum
Polly Porter
Elizabeth Ranney
Nancy Robbins
Elizabeth Townsend
Roseanna Ward
Mary Welch
Esther Williams

(over 45) cont.
Catherine Knap
Sarah Lathrop
Elizabeth Loomis
Mary Mansfield
Mary Mitchell
Elizabeth Nott
Ann Phillips
Elizabeth Rawson
Desire Rockwell
Esther Sage
Lucy Ann Shaylor
Mary Starr
Peggy Starr
Abigail Stow
Mary Stow
Mary Stow
Elizabeth Sumner
Elizabeth Tarbox
Lucy Whittlesey
Esther Windborne
Jane wrights

either (over 45) or (26-45)
Sarah Bevins
Jemima Cannon
Agnes Cotton
Elizabeth Cuttings
Lucy Dowd
Deborah Fairchild
Sarah Magill
Lucy Miller
Margaret Morrip
Abigail Russell
Nancy Spellman
Elizabeth Spencer
Betsy Storrs

other
Lucretia Lee - unnaturalized citizen

20
Appendix E - Marriage status of female heads of households,
Middletown, 1820

Married - no women definitely identified to be married, 1820

Single
Betsy Bacon (married later?)
Elizabeth Cotton
Patty Dickinson *
Fanny Hamlin *
Sally Jepson *
Elizabeth Loomis
Mary Mitchell
Elizabeth Nott
Lucretia Lee *
Experience Plum
Polly Porter *
Mary Rand * (m. October 5, 1824)
Elizabeth Rawson *
Jane Wright *

Widowed
Mary Alsop *
Lucy Anderson
Lucretia Barnes *
Martha Barnes *
Bridgette Bevint
Mary Bohanning *
Sarah Bill
Lucretia W. Brown*(re-married is)
Mary Butler *
Susannah Chamberlain *
Phebe Clark
Hannah Collings
Janet Cooper *
Sarah Eggleston *
Elizabeth Gilbert*(re-married 1820)
Lydia Hall *
Lucy Harrington *
Mary Harris *
Hannah Hills *
Abigail Hubbard *
Sarah Hull *
Martha Laurie
Sarah Magill *
Mary Mansfield *
Susan Miles
Lucy Miller
Sally Parsons *
Desire Rockwell
Abigail Russell *
Esther Sage *
Lucy Ann Shaylor *
Elizabeth Spencer *
Mary Starr *
Peggy Starr *
Abigail Stow *

Widowed, cont.
Mary Stow *
Elizabeth Sumner *
Elizabeth Tarbox *
Elizabeth Townsend
Roseanna Ward *
Mary Welch
Lucy Whittlesey *
Esther Williams
Esther Windborne *

Unknown (lack of information)
Manoma Allen
Elizabeth Allison
Sarah Arnold
Eleanor Bacon
Sarah Bevins
Martha Camp
Jemima Cannon
Agnes Cotton
Molly Crittenden
Elizabeth Cuttings
Elizabeth Dealing
Elizabeth Doolittle
Lucy Dowd
Deborah Fairchild
Mary Franer
Hannah Griffin
Abigail Jetenson
Catherine Knap
Sarah Lathrop
Margaret Morrip
Ann Phillips
Elizabeth Ranney
Nancy Robbins
Nancy Spellman
Betsy Storrs
Mary Stow

* indicates that marriage status has been verified by some source other than the census and vital records.
Appendix F - Women Listed on Census and Tax Lists, Middletown, 1820

Mary Alsop 136.10
Betsy Bacon 17.00
Lucretia W. Brown 44.00
Elizabeth Cotton 12.00
Agnes Cotton 10.00
Patty Dickinson 364.22
Deborah Fairchild 30.00
Elizabeth Gilbert 37.50
Fanny Hamlin 8.00
Abigail Hubbard 1373.76
Sarah Magill 6.00
Mary Mansfield 38.44
Susan Miles 32.96
Elizabeth Nott 12.00
Sally Parsons 12.00
Elizabeth Ranney 45.60
Elizabeth Ranney 45.60
Elizabeth Rawson 18.90
Esther Sage 24.00
Lucy Ann Shaylor 55.78
Mary Starr 34.00
Peggy Starr 15.00
Betsy Storrs 75.00
Mary Stow 69.70
Mary Stow 4.00
Elizabeth Sumner 53.34
Elizabeth Tarbox 16.00
Lucy Whittlesey 356.82
Esther Williams 48.00
Jane Wrigs 3.00

out of alphabetical order
Martha Barnes 4.00
Appendix G - Women listed on Middletown Census, 1820 and in Probate Index, Middletown Records

Elizabeth Allison
Mary Alsop
Betsy Bacon
Martha Barnes
Mary Bohanning
Mary Butler
Martha Camp
Susannah Chamberlain
Elizabeth Cotton
Patty Dickinson
Sarah Eggleston
Lydia Hall
Fanny Hamlin
Mary Harris
Abigail Hubbard
Sarah Hull
Elizabeth Loomis
Sarah Magill
Sally Parsons
Polly Porter
Elizabeth Rawson
Mary Starr
Abigail Stow
Elizabeth Tarbox
Roseanna Ward
Lucy Whittlesey
Anna Phillips
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16 Ibid., p. 86.

17 Ibid., p. 132.


19 Whittemore, Town and City of Middletown," p. 53.


21 Ibid., vol. 30, p. 381.
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