

Manchester Papers in Economic and Social History

R.C. Nash

Domestic material culture and consumer demand in the British-Atlantic world: colonial South Carolina, 1670-1770

Number 59
September 2007

ISSN 1753-7762 (Print)

ISSN 1753-7770 (Online)

**DOMESTIC MATERIAL CULTURE AND CONSUMER DEMAND IN THE
BRITISH-ATLANTIC WORLD: COLONIAL SOUTH CAROLINA, 1670-1770**¹

Until the 1980s, little research was undertaken on consumerism in Britain and British America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries but since then the subject has generated impressive work on consumer demand and on the production and marketing of consumer goods. For Britain, the major issue at stake is the part played by the growth of the home consumer market in the onset of industrialisation. The most ambitious interpretation holds that a "consumer revolution" erupted in the mid-eighteenth century, a demand-side shift which paralleled and accelerated the revolutionary supply-side changes occurring in the scale of industrial production and technology. The central feature of this supposed revolution was that, for the first time, the "middling sort" and the labouring classes became regular consumers of manufactured consumer goods. New levels of prosperity created by the growth of commerce and industry and reinforced by the higher earnings of the army of women and children who entered manufacturing employment converted the latent desires of middling and lower-class consumers to engage in socially-competitive spending into an effective demand for consumer products.² The concept of a "consumer revolution" has focussed attention on the great significance of the home market to industrialisation but it also had a number of critics. First, while it was agreed that the labouring classes in eighteenth-century England became mass consumers of tobacco, tea and other groceries, many historians doubt either that their real wages and general living standards increased from ca.1750 or that systematic evidence existed to show that they formed the basis of a mass market for consumer manufactures.³ Second, the view that the mid-eighteenth century represented a watershed in the history of consumption was rejected. The origins of a consumer society had deep roots in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when English rural industry was reorganised to produce a much-diversified range of import-substituting textiles and of other manufactures for the expanding home market. If there was a decisive turning-point in the development of the consumer market for manufactures, it lay not in the mid-eighteenth but in the late-seventeenth century, a period when the middling, though not the labouring classes, adopted new consumer items, including tableware, ceramics and furnishings, on a widespread basis.⁴

The concept of a "consumer revolution" influenced studies of the development of consumerism in British America, although it was not linked there to a debate about industrialisation. Rather the focus of study was the late-colonial growth of population and of the incomes generated from staple-export production which together created a mass demand for manufactures. Despite the claims of earlier historians this demand could not be met by self-sufficient household production, which was very limited in extent, nor was it satisfied by indigenous industry, which largely consisted of artisans involved in the handicraft production of low-grade textiles, shoes and furniture.⁵ Instead, colonial consumers preferred

the greater variety and the higher quality of British and European goods and, as a consequence, the booming colonial economy sucked in imports from Britain and Europe, a flow which reached unprecedented proportions from the late 1740s: "This consumer revolution affected the lives of all Americans". The mechanism which drove it were the same as those which underpinned demand in Britain, that is, competitive and emulative spending on products which conferred social status on the purchasers. The post-1750 flood of imports from Britain tied the colonies ever more firmly to the metropolitan economy and swamped America with goods of the same type as those consumed by the middling and gentry classes in Britain. Colonial tastes in textiles, tableware, furnishings, and other consumer goods became thoroughly anglicized, creating an "empire of goods" and a new and remarkable unity in the character of British-American consumer culture.⁶ The notion of an eighteenth-century "consumer revolution" has received a much warmer reception among American than British historians and the argument that a colonial mass market for imported manufactures had come into existence by the Revolutionary era has commanded general acceptance.⁷ Criticisms of the thesis in the colonial context have amounted to qualifications of the argument, and of its periodization, rather than to its outright rejection. Most notably, regional studies, drawing on the evidence of probate inventories and extending their coverage back into the seventeenth century, have demonstrated that the emergence of consumer markets until ca.1720 was a very slow process, although it did provide the essential foundations for the faster development of consumerism in the late-colonial period.

However, the geographical coverage of these regional studies has been uneven. Whilst New England and especially the Chesapeake have generated comprehensive research, the region studied in this paper, South Carolina, has been mentioned only in passing.⁸ Yet we know that South Carolina's economy, based on the plantation production of rice, and later indigo, expanded at a faster rate than any other colonial region in the eighteenth century, and that its white population achieved levels of wealth and an access to imported British commodities which far surpassed those found elsewhere in British North America.⁹ This raises an obvious question, one which provides the main theme of this paper: did South Carolina's rapid economic growth and great wealth lead it to develop a distinctive consumer culture, one which diverged significantly from that found in less wealthy colonies such as the Chesapeake and New England?

Section I discusses current research on New England and the Chesapeake so as to provide a comparative context for the study of consumerism in South Carolina and to survey a number of key issues concerning sources and methodology. Section II uses probate data to explore the distinctive features of South Carolina's consumer culture, concluding that the tempo at which consumerism spread in South Carolina was more rapid than in other regions and that the South Carolina elite came, in the late colonial period, to engage in conspicuous consumption to a degree which was not paralleled in other colonial societies. Section III seeks to explain South Carolina's exceptionalism in terms of its

greater wealth, the high degree of integration of its urban and rural societies, and the role played in consumption by its unique systems for importing and distributing consumer goods. Finally, Section IV shows that while earlier studies have relied on the use of probate inventories to examine patterns of consumption, these sources have to be supplemented by the evidence of trade data and mercantile sources if anything like a full picture of consumer expenditures is to be established.

I

Regional studies of colonial consumption have used probate inventories as their main source and it is useful, before summarising the main conclusions of this research, to investigate the methodology used to analyse the inventories, one which, in the next section, provides the basis for exploring South Carolina's consumer culture. Current research into probate inventories has been directed to two main ends. First, historians have calculated the monetary value of consumer goods recorded in inventories and compared this with the value of the three categories of non-consumer property which comprised the rest of the property listed, namely, producer goods, that is livestock, crops, and tools; slaves and other bonded labour; and business inventories and financial assets.¹⁰ From these sources historians have been able to estimate both the absolute value of household consumer possessions and their relative significance in total personal wealth compared with those resources which were devoted to production, to bonded labour, and to financial investment. Second, within the consumer category, they have recorded the incidence in probate inventories both of "traditional" goods, those which had long been in common usage, and of new "consumerist" goods, such as tea-ware and tableware, those which reflected new forms of personal and social conduct within the household. One way of assessing the relative significance of old and new goods in inventoried estates is simply to count the percentage of households which possessed certain goods. However, a more sophisticated approach is to construct indexes of bundles of goods which reflect different aspects of consumer behaviour and measure the scores achieved by these indexes in samples of inventoried estates. Carr and Walsh in their exhaustive studies of Chesapeake consumption, use two main indexes (which are employed in the next section in analysing consumer behaviour in South Carolina). First, a "modern" index, comprising those essential goods that a modern household would perceive as necessary even for the most rudimentary of domestic lifestyles, such as beds, tables and cooking pots. This index allows us to assess the degree to which households achieved traditional standards of comfort and convenience; that is, standards of consumption regarded in early modern society as conventional for households which existed at levels above mere subsistence. Second, an "amenities" index mainly comprised of new consumer goods such as tea-ware, cutlery, silverware, pictures and secular books.¹¹ This index assesses the rates of diffusion of ownership of goods associated with

new forms of eating and drinking, leisure and social display in the period. It represents the degree to which households participated in the new modes of "polite" behaviour and civilized domesticity which historians have identified as the crucial social underpinnings of the eighteenth-century expansion of consumerism.

The application of these approaches to the Chesapeake and New England has brought household living standards in these regions into a sharp focus. In one crucial respect, of course, both regions enjoyed a high standard of life compared with the mass of the English population. The colonists, after the period of initial settlement, always had enough cultivated land to produce ample food supplies and a high standard of nutrition, so that by ca.1700, American adults were several inches taller than their English counterparts.¹² However, while Americans were well fed compared with the average Briton, the mass of colonists experienced standards of domestic comfort and convenience, at least as represented by their household consumer possessions, which were no better, and for large sections of the population considerably worse, than those prevailing in low-income British households.

The patterns of consumerism which emerged in America reflected the regional character of migration, rates of population growth and household formation. The great majority of migrants to New England were free persons rather than indentured servants and they brought with them some capital and possessions, including consumer goods. They came largely in family groups and this, combined with the region's very low rates of mortality and high rates of fertility, promoted a rapid population growth and the predominance in society of families which were large even by the standards of pre-industrial society. These sizable households had ample supplies of land and labour, agricultural resources which were boosted by the wealth they brought from England or, in the case of later generations, by the substantial property newly-married couples received from their parents. New England households therefore had the means of satisfying their needs for basic consumer goods and, as early as ca.1650, probate inventories record an average of £30 of consumer goods per household, a monetary value similar to that found in inventoried farming households in England and one which, for New England, was not to change substantially over the entire colonial period (Table 1 (A)).¹³ New England families therefore owned a reasonable complement of basic consumer goods, although the high costs of imported manufactures meant that their domestic possessions were scantier than those found in English households with an equivalent value of goods. Thus, about half of all households were seriously deficient in essential consumer possessions as measured by the "modern" index, including furniture and equipment, such as beds, chairs and drinking vessels. Moreover, as late as ca.1720, the great mass of New England households entirely lacked those amenities which historians have associated with more refined forms of domesticity and leisure, such as fine earthenware, tea-or coffee-making equipment, and secular books.¹⁴

The majority of seventeenth-century migrants to the Chesapeake, on the

other hand, were young, penniless male indentured servants who performed several years' unpaid labour growing tobacco for their colonial employers in exchange for the costs of their passage. Once freed, ex-servants possessed few resources, other than an allotment of unimproved land, and as tobacco producers they

TABLE 1. AVERAGE PERSONAL AND CONSUMER GOODS' WEALTH IN WORCESTERSHIRE, ENGLAND, VIRGINIA, MASSACHUSETTS, MARYLAND, RURAL PENNSYLVANIA, SOUTH CAROLINA, C.1670-C.1770

(A)		<u>AVERAGE</u>		<u>AV. VALUE OF</u>		<u>% OF WEALTH IN</u>
		<u>PERSONAL WEALTH</u>		<u>CONSUMER GOODS</u>		<u>CONSUMER GOODS</u>
		Current	Constant	Current	Constant	
		£	£	£	£	
<u>ENGLAND</u>						
S. WORCESTER.	C.1670	£104	£104	£29	£29	28%
S. WORCESTER.	C.1720	£154	£154	£31	£31	20%
<u>COLONIES</u>						
VIRGINIA	C.1670	£140	£140	£26	£26	19%
VIRGINIA	C.1730	£104	£104	£28	£28	27%
VIRGINIA	1774	£412	£310	£33	£25	8%
MASSACHUSETTS	C.1670	£105	£105	£35	£35	33%
MASSACHUSETTS	1774	£190	£143	£40	£30	21%
MARYLAND	C.1670	n.a.		£23	£23	n.a.
MARYLAND	C.1720	n.a.		£27	£27	n.a.
RURAL PENN- SYLVANIA	C.1690	n.a.		£30	£30	n.a.
	C.1730	n.a.		£21	£21	n.a.
(B)						
SOUTH CAROLINA	C.1700	£265	£265	n.a.		n.a.
SOUTH CAROLINA	C.1730	£436	£436	£28	£28	6%
SOUTH CAROLINA	C.1745	£565	£528	£30	£28	5%
SOUTH CAROLINA	1773/74	£1707	£1283	£78	£59	5%

Sources: (A) Carole Shammas, The Pre-Industrial Consumer in England and America (Oxford, 1990), 87, 94-5. (B) For c.1700, Peter M. Coclanis, The Shadow of a Dream: Economic Life and Death in the South Carolina Low Country, 1670-1920 (New York, 1989), 79.

For all other dates see Note on Sources, p.*

Notes: All values in £s sterling. For the conversion of current to constant values, see Shammas, Pre-Industrial Consumer, 303-304. Base years, 1660-74.

struggled to make a living in an industry which suffered from frequent over-production crises in the later seventeenth century. These bleak economic prospects, combined with very high rates of adult mortality and the gender imbalance amongst migrants, meant that many Chesapeake households were

impoverished and a high proportion comprised a single, poor male adult, or a single widow or widower with children. As late as 1680s, the average value of consumer goods held by Chesapeake households was only about £10, one third of the level found in New England. The majority of the population was therefore deprived of many basic household goods such as tables, earthenware, and linen, a starkness in material possessions which compared unfavourably with even the very poorest households in England. The expansion of the native-born element of the population, which inherited some property, including improved land, and which experienced much lower levels of mortality than the migrant population, increased the number of sizable, better-off households; but it was not until ca.1720 that Chesapeake consumption standards caught-up with those current in New England in c.1650 (Table 1(A)). The middling and well-to-do tobacco planters did enjoy a more comfortable existence, but by ca.1720 only a small proportion of them possessed even a modicum of the more refined amenities. Their consumption therefore differed in degree rather than in kind from those of the poorer households. The Chesapeake in the early eighteenth century had a "broadly shared material condition and cultural attitude that was distinctly premodern ... The region's wealthiest men and women had not yet adopted an integrated lifestyle which set them off from that of other groups."¹⁵

From the early eighteenth century there was an overall increase in both the quantity and the diversity of the consumer goods owned by households in the two regions, a process which has been measured with a fair degree of precision using the indexes of consumption specified above. In the Chesapeake, the average "amenities score" per estate increased from 2 amenities (out of 12) in 1700, to about 5 per estate in the early 1770s. In New England, the trend in the ownership of amenities was uncannily similar: the average number held by households was 2 in 1675-1700 and 5 in the years 1760-1774. There were differences between the two regions however in the rate of the diffusion of these goods by social class. In the Chesapeake, the process of dissemination commenced with the richer households from the early eighteenth century and then spread to the generality of households in the 1740s and 1750s; whereas, in rural New England, all wealth groups improved their position at a similar rate from the early eighteenth century, although with a much quicker pace of progress from the 1740s to the 1770s.¹⁶

Colonial Americans, then, achieved new, and some historians have argued, revolutionized, standards of consumerism in the eighteenth century with respect both to the quantity and to the diversity of their consumer possessions. What caused this expansion in consumption? The most important factor encouraging its growth, it goes without saying, was increasing wealth. At any one time there was a close association between the hierarchy of wealth and that of consumption. In the Chesapeake, for example, the richest households, ca.1720, invested several times as much in consumption goods as the poorest ones.¹⁷ One would therefore have expected that the eighteenth-century growth both in colonial wealth and in consumption would be reflected in a steady increase

in the value of consumer possessions recorded in household inventories.¹⁸ In fact, recent research has shown the opposite: the absolute value of household consumer goods rose to c.1700, but then stagnated in the eighteenth century, despite the fact that consumerism was spreading in the colonies at a fast pace (Table 2(A)). For example, in Virginia, the total personal wealth of the planters trebled from 1730 to 1774, mainly because the number and the value of the slaves they owned was increasing. At the same time they increased the quantity and diversity of consumer goods in their possession, yet the value of these possessions remained unchanged.

How can we account for the fact that consumption became more widespread whilst the value of consumer goods held by households stagnated? The answer lies in the long-term changes which occurred in consumer preferences and in the quality and prices of consumer goods. The notable trend in consumer preferences in England and America in the early modern period was the substitution of "traditional" goods which had provided an enduring or even a lifetime's use with less durable products; pottery and glass were substituted for pewter and wooden-ware, lightweight cottons for heavy-duty woollens, and so forth, because consumers came to prefer goods which were finished in more attractive styles or patterns and which were less cumbersome to use or more comfortable to wear. These substitutes were cheaper, often much cheaper, than the goods they replaced. Furthermore, there was a general fall in the prices of consumer goods, both old and new, from the late seventeenth to the late eighteenth century; textiles, for example, including broadcloth, kerseys and standard linen fabrics, fell in price by between 30% and 50%.¹⁹ These factors meant that a stock of goods in ca.1770, containing a significant element of new consumer products, comprised a much-increased quantity of possessions compared with a stock of traditional goods of the same monetary value a century earlier. As Shammas has commented: "A combination of falling prices and substitutions of less permanent goods for more durable ones probably disguises most of the increased accumulation of consumer goods in the eighteenth century."²⁰

But why did the colonists, as their wealth increased, supposedly not spend more on consumer goods, especially given the claims made by historians that had a whole-hearted commitment to new forms of consumerism?²¹ The answer is that they did indeed spend more on consumption, something which again is concealed by the unchanging value of consumer goods held in probate inventories. The probate records give us a snapshot of the stocks of consumer goods held in inventoried estates at any one time but they tell us very little about important changes in household expenditure patterns over time. First, as noted, the new consumerist goods had a limited durability compared with the traditional

TABLE 2. PROPORTIONS OF SOUTH CAROLINA INVENTORIES WITH
NEW COMMODITIES, C. 1730, 1773/1774

	Knives/ Forks	Glass ware	Ceramics	Tea Equip.	Coffee Equip.	Mahogany Furniture	Secular Books	Riding Carriages
<u>(A) C.1730</u>								
SOUTH CARO.	32%	17%	37%	35%	14%	3%	45%	2%
VIRGINIA	16%	9%	3%	3%	1%	?	? ^a	?
ENGLAND	10%	?	57%		15%	?	22	?
LONDON	19%	17%	39%	32%	23%	?	52%	?
 <u>1774</u>								
SOUTH CARO.	47%	26%	52%	52%	22%	38%	53%	31%
VIRGINIA	71%	46%	36%	49%	20%	3%	?	?
MASSACHUSETTS	53%	56%	35%	56%	24%	12%	?	?
MASSACHUSETTS	40%	46%	24%	48%	19%	?	?	?
LOW WEALTH								

^aThe Virginia sample used in this table does not include books; however, we know that the possession of secular books in Maryland and in York County, Virginia, was on an exiguous scale, c.1730; see Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behaviour in the Colonial Chesapeake," in Carson, et al, eds., Consuming Interests, pp.*

(B) C.1730, 1773/74

PROPORTIONS OF SOUTH CAROLINA INVENTORIES WITH NEW COMMODITIES BY WEALTH GROUP^a

	Knives/ Forks	Glass ware	Ceramics	Tea Equip.	Coffee Equip.	Mahogany Furniture	Secular Books	Riding Carriages
<u>C.1730</u>								
UPPER	41%	24%	70%	59%	29%	4%	41%	10%
MIDDLE	43%	18%	44%	50%	15%	2%	57%	0%
LOWER	21%	12%	26%	17%	9%	0%	36%	0%
 <u>1773/1774</u>								
UPPER	68%	41%	90%	80%	35%	72%	77%	74%
MIDDLE	46%	20%	59%	48%	18%	30%	47%	20%
LOWER	24%	14%	19%	26%	14%	12%	32%	6%

Sources: For South Carolina, see Table 1. For Virginia, Massachusetts and London, Shammass, Pre-Industrial Consumer, 182-84; Shammass, "The Domestic Environment", 12. For England, and for London (ownership of books only), Weatherill, Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture, 26, 49.

^aWealth Groups fall within the following range of inventoried personal wealth: LOWER, £1-200; MIDDLE, £201-1,000; UPPER, £1001-.

manufactures they superseded and hence they had to be replaced more frequently. Furthermore, the more often goods were replaced, so the greater the opportunities for new product fashions to be marketed and adopted; that is, household purchasing decisions came to be heavily influenced by short-term fashion considerations as well as by a practical need to replace goods that had worn out or broken. Thus, the annual expenditure required to maintain a stock of goods ca.1770 comprised of semi-durable consumer goods was inevitably higher than the expenditure needed to sustain a stock of the same value in ca.1670, but composed of sturdier, traditional items.²² Furthermore, probate inventories (especially South Carolina ones) significantly under-record two categories of goods which comprised the major categories of consumer expenditures, but which have largely been ignored in modern studies of consumerism in colonial America: that is, textiles and clothing, and consumer perishables, principally groceries, goods imported from Britain and the West Indies. A fuller picture of household spending has to include expenditure on these imports which experienced a substantial per capita increase in the eighteenth century. Given the absence of information on such goods in probate inventories, and the general lack of data on household budgets, such expenditures can only be reconstructed by analyzing trends in the volume and composition of imports of European and Caribbean consumer goods, a task which, for South Carolina, is undertaken in Section IV, below.

Besides the economic factor of wealth, historians have emphasised two other major cultural and social forces as key and competing explanations of changes in consumer behaviour: status competition between social classes leading to emulative spending; and the effects of urbanization. The "emulation thesis" sees consumer innovation as a top-down process. It was initiated by high status, landed elites seeking to differentiate themselves from the lower orders, but whose novelties then achieved a widespread, and, from the elite's point of view, unwelcome circulation as they were progressively imitated down the social scale, thus in turn setting off another cycle of elite differentiation and "lower-order" imitation. Research on the Chesapeake has focused attention on social emulation rather than urbanization as the major cause of the expansion of consumerism in the region. Towns in the Chesapeake did indeed adopt new consumer goods at an earlier stage, and to a greater extent, than the rural areas, yet they had little influence on the countryside. Chesapeake towns, before ca.1750, were few in number and small in size compared with those in New England and the other northern colonies. They sold few goods to farming households and the "display" effects of their higher standards of consumption had little influence on rural consumers, even those within their immediate hinterlands. The pioneers in consumer innovation in the rural areas were found not in the towns but amongst the rural elite. The "tobacco gentry" became, in the early eighteenth century, the first rural social group to adopt new goods, which they imported directly from the merchants in England to whom they consigned their crops. Their consumption habits were then taken up, in the

1740s and 1750s, first by the middling and eventually by the lower class of tobacco planters, groups which obtained their consumer products from the thick clusters of rural stores which sprang up in the Chesapeake in the same decades.²³

In recent years, however, a strong reaction has set in against the emulation thesis.²⁴ Cultural historians have argued that the motivations of consumers cannot be read off from the mere fact of the ownership of possessions as recorded in probate inventories and, furthermore, that consumers had reasons for acquiring goods other than a desire to emulate their betters. Middle-class women, for example, cherished their possessions more for private and sentimental reasons than because they provided an opportunity for social display. Moreover, middle and lower-class consumers, in general, resisted elite fashions when these were seen as extravagant or overblown, remaining loyal to traditional fashions or generating independent styles in clothing and furnishings which were free of elite influences.²⁵ The emphasis on urbanization as a key influence on consumer behaviour has also been developed as a critical response to the "emulation thesis". For England, Weatherill has argued that, for the period 1675-1725, there was no direct link between social status and consumer innovation: indeed, urban craftsmen and merchants adopted new consumer products, such as fine china and tea-ware, with more alacrity than higher status rural farmers or gentry. For British America, Carson has shown that the first colonial users of new types of furniture or tableware invariably turn out to be town dwellers. Towns were quicker to adopt new consumer goods than rural areas for three main reasons. First, consumer goods were obviously more readily available in towns, acting as they did as the chief centres for the marketing and manufactures. Second, townspeople engaged in more frequent and more elaborate social interactions than country dwellers, which stimulated the use of consumer props such as tableware and the participation in social rituals such as tea drinking. Third, towns were more anonymous than rural communities; hence, townspeople were eager to display portfolios of fashionable goods to signal their status to other town dwellers.²⁶ This shaping influence of towns in consumerism is evident in New England, where new consumer goods made their first appearance in Boston in the 1680s, became commonplace in middling Boston households by 1720, but did not bulk large in rural New England inventories until the 1740s or 1750s. The diffusion of consumer goods in rural New England was also dictated by the towns, which acted as the principal centres for importation and distribution. Indeed, the geographical take-up of consumer goods in the countryside closely followed the pattern of the waterway and other transport routes which connected Boston and other coastal towns to communities in the interior.²⁷

To sum up recent research on consumerism in British America. First, a consumer revolution, or something close to it, occurred in America in the eighteenth century: the new consumerism was centred on the adoption of cheap substitutes for traditional goods, whose prices fell substantially over the period; hence there no increase in the absolute value of the stocks of consumer goods held

by colonial households at any one time. However, expenditures on consumer goods rose over time in association with the colonists' growing wealth, both because the new goods required more frequent replacements and because spending increased on imported textiles and groceries, trends in spending for which probate inventories provide an inadequate guide. The mechanisms driving the new consumerism, however, differed markedly between regions. In New England, the towns pioneered new consumer tastes and also acted as the means by which the new goods were diffused in the rural areas. Towns in the Chesapeake, on the other hand, while they adopted new goods with gusto, had a negligible impact on the countryside. Here, the pacesetters in consumer tastes were the wealthy and high status rural gentry, whose new consumer habits were emulated, a generation or later, by their middle and lower-class neighbours. New England and the Chesapeake, then, provide two divergent models of the development of consumerism. The next section shows that colonial South Carolina followed neither model but instead developed a distinctive consumer culture of its own.

II

Research on the material culture of domestic households in the British-American colonies has neglected South Carolina. We know a fair amount about the lifestyle of Charleston's richest inhabitants in the late colonial period, but there are no systematic studies of consumption to parallel those for the Chesapeake and New England.²⁸ This section provides such data, drawn from probate inventories, for the Lowcountry area of South Carolina, the economically-unified plantation region which dominated the colony's economy. Estimates of the total personal and of the consumer wealth of inventoried South Carolina estates in the eighteenth century are presented in Table I(B). These estimates confirm the well-known fact that the average wealth of South Carolinians was much higher than that possessed by the residents of the other mainland colonies, a contrast which is quite obvious by ca.1700 and which became even more marked in the eighteenth century. Thus, while probated estates in South Carolina were worth, on average, twice as much as those in Virginia and Massachusetts in ca.1700, by the time of the Revolution, they held four times as much wealth as those in Virginia, and ten times that found in Massachusetts. However, until the mid-eighteenth century, despite their notably greater resources, South Carolina's inventoried wealth-holders, on average, possessed consumer goods of no greater value than their less affluent neighbours in the other colonies. As they were much richer than their fellow colonists this means that the proportion of their wealth held in consumer goods was extremely low by American or British standards.

Distribution of Resources Between Productive Assets
and Consumer Goods, South Carolina Estates, ca. 1730

Slaves	Producer Goods ^a	Financial Assets ^b	Consumer Goods
48%	33%	13%	6%

^aIncludes livestock, producer durables and perishables, i.e., field crops, stored grain, etc. and business inventories. ^bIncludes cash as well as mortgages, bonds and notes.

The great concentration of South Carolina's wealth in slaves and other productive assets, ca.1730, reflected the investment priorities dictated by the hectic expansion of the Low Country's plantation economy in the early-eighteenth century. South Carolina was an unusual colony in that a substantial proportion of the migrants who founded it came not from Europe but from the other British colonies in America, especially from the West Indies. The latter brought slaves with them and hence, unlike in the Chesapeake, slaves formed an important part of the colony's labour force from its first settlement. To begin with these slaves were employed in conventional rural activities, in livestock farming and in the lumber business, but from 1710 slaves, who now came mainly from Africa, were employed on plantations producing naval stores and especially rice; by the late 1720s, rice production dominated what had become, in two generations, an important regional export economy. The massive investment in improving land, and above all in importing slaves, clearly restricted the resources available for consumption. Thus, from ca.1700 to ca.1730, South Carolina's exports of plantation staples increased tenfold, while imports of slaves increased fourteen-fold; yet imports from Britain, the overwhelming source of consumer goods, increased only fivefold. Export earnings generated by plantation production were spent not on consumer imports but on slaves and other investments in plantations.²⁹

Nevertheless, while the demands of plantation production appear to have restricted South Carolinians' consumption to very modest levels, given their total wealth, consumer behaviour in the region, ca. 1730, differed from that in other colonial regions in a number of important ways. First, historians have identified certain goods such as pottery and glassware and tea- and coffee-drinking equipment as the key components in the transformation of domestic consumer culture in the eighteenth-century American colonies. As Shammas comments: "What really marked the mid-eighteenth century off from previous periods, then, was the diffusion of eating and drinking goods into the ordinary household."³⁰ It is notable that the incidence of these goods in South Carolina was much higher as early as ca.1730 than it was Virginia or indeed in provincial England (Table 2(A)). That South Carolinians made a greater and more precocious use of these goods than colonists in the Chesapeake is confirmed by evidence from a quite different source, the colony's (white) per capita imports of tea, china, and earthenware and glass, which far exceeded

comparable imports into Virginia and Maryland in the same years.

White Population's Per Capita Imports of Tea and of China & of
Glass/Earthenware: Virginia & Maryland and Carolina, 1733-37
(Annual Averages)

	Tea (lbs)	China & Glass/Earthenware (pieces)
Carolina	0.53	9.7
Virginia/Maryland	0.10	1.6

Source: For imports, Customs 3, vols. 33-37, Inspectors'-General, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, National Archives, England. For population, McCusker and Menard, Economy of British America, 136; Coclanis, Shadow of a Dream, 64.

Second, we can further confirm the precocious development of consumerism in South Carolina by organising the inventory data for the colony using the Carr and Walsh and the Weatherill indexes expressing the changing distribution of consumer goods in terms of the percentage of the three indexes (bundles of goods) held in inventoried estates. This reveals that, ca.1730, the number of "modern" items, that is basic and traditional household goods, such as mattresses, tables and cooking pots, recorded in South Carolina and in Chesapeake inventories was equal: each group of households possessed about 6 "modern" items per unit.³¹ However, at the same time, the number of "amenities" per South Carolina estate was 4.5, while in both the Chesapeake and New England it averaged just less than 3 items per unit (Table 3.) South Carolinians had more novel items connected to leisure, to civilized comforts, and to display than their fellow colonists. They were more eager, it appears, to engage in fashionable forms of domestic behaviour than they were to acquire the full range of basic facilities, although the acquisition of the latter was clearly within their economic means.

In fact, a more useful point of comparison between consumerism in South Carolina and elsewhere in the early eighteenth century is not with the other plantation colonies, or indeed with the English provinces, but with London, which was of course the centre of fashionable consumption in the Anglo-American world at this time. Peter Earle notes, for example, "the dual invasion of coffee and tea-making equipment into London homes. This was rare before the 1690s but, as with so many other innovations, what was rare or unknown in the 1680s becomes commonplace in the reign of Queen Anne".³² Remarkably South Carolina was not far behind (Table 2(A)). By ca.1730, the incidence in South Carolina inventories of ceramics, glassware, cutlery, tea- and coffee-equipment, and secular books matched or exceeded that found in London inventories (predominantly those of middle-class traders and tradesmen). Rather surprisingly, then, we find that South Carolinian standards of consumption

were metropolitan rather than provincial. Consumer culture in South Carolina, defined in terms of new "polite" forms of behaviour and of civilized domesticity was, as early as the colony's second generation, in close step with developments

TABLE 3. POSSESSION OF CONSUMER GOODS IN SOUTH CAROLINA ESTATES AS MEASURED BY 3 INDEXES

	Amenities	Weatherill's	Modern	Average % Score	% of Estates
<u>1729-31</u>					
<u>1735</u>					
UPPER	47%	54%	73%	58%	11%
MIDDLE	34%	48%	67%	50%	39%
LOWER	20%	24%	37%	27%	50%
ALL	34%	42%	59%	45%	100%
<u>1773-74</u>					
UPPER	56%	69%	84%	70%	34%
MIDDLE	33%	38%	57	43%	34%
LOWER	19%	21%	31%	24%	32%
ALL	36%	43%	57%	45%	100%

Sources: See Table 1 and text, pp. *.

amongst London's middle classes and some years ahead of those prevailing in the rest of American colonial society.

From the 1730s, however, the rate at which South Carolinian households adopted new commodities slowed down and by the 1770s Virginia residents, for example, had caught-up with, and in some respects had even overtaken, South Carolina's levels of consumption. So, tea and coffee drinking, which scarcely register in the Virginia samples for c.1730, had by the 1770s become as popular there as in South Carolina; while tableware items like cutlery and glassware were more commonly encountered in Virginian (and indeed in New England) than in South Carolinian households (Table 2A). The more detailed index scores tell the same story. The average number of "amenities" and "modern" items per South Carolina household changed very little from c.1730 to the mid-1770s, whereas in the Chesapeake, the scores of both the "modern" and especially the "amenities" index increased substantially; by the early 1770s the Chesapeake scores in these respects very nearly equalled the South Carolinian ones.³³

However, it would be misleading to suggest that South Carolina's consumption patterns evolved very quickly in the first two generations of settlement and then stagnated. There was a major change in consumption in South Carolina in the later colonial period: the average value of consumer goods held by South Carolinian estates grew rapidly, trebling in the forty years from mid-century

to the Revolution, from £28 to £78 per inventory. In Virginia and Massachusetts, in the same period, the value of inventoried consumer goods increased respectively from £28 to £33 and from £27 to £34 per household. (Table 1(B)). The standard pattern observed for other colonies, which is now regarded as the orthodoxy, in which from the early eighteenth century to the Revolution the monetary value of consumer goods in estates stagnated or fell is not found in South Carolina.

We cannot, however, understand South Carolina's divergence from other societies if we focus on the "average" probated estate. We must ask instead whether the precocious use of new consumer goods ca.1730 and the increase, after 1750, in the value of consumer goods held by households occurred amongst all social groups or whether it was stratified by social class and occupation and by urban and rural residence. This requires the disaggregation of our sample of inventoried wealth-holders into more refined categories, ones organised around wealth levels, occupations and place of residence.³⁴

The probate data for South Carolina have therefore been classified into upper, middling, and lower wealth groups, to provide information of the average value of estates in different wealth classes and of the consumer component within them (Table 4). The upper group (those with estates valued at more than £1,000) was dominated by planters producing rice and later indigo for the export sector, who made up about 80% of the class. It also included rich farmers - those using large slave-labour forces to produce livestock and grain for the internal South Carolina rather than for the external market. These planters and farmers owned nearly half all inventoried slaves, c.1730, and 90% of them

TABLE 4. DISTRIBUTION OF INVENTORIED WEALTH AND CONSUMER GOODS
 AMONGST SOUTH CAROLINA ESTATES, C.1730, C.1745, C.1774

	AV. WEALTH	AV. CONSUMER GOODS	CONSUMER GOODS AS % OF WEALTH	% OF TOTAL ESTATES	% OF TOTAL WEALTH
<u>1729-31, 1735</u>					
UPPER	£1,904	£71	4%	11%	48%
MIDDLE	£482	£34	7%	39%	43%
LOWER GROUP	£80	£13	16%	50%	9%
ALL ESTATES	£436	£28	6%	100%	100%
<u>1746-48</u>					
UPPER	£2,291	£78	3%	15%	60%
MIDDLE GROUP	£475	£31	7%	39%	33%
POOR GROUP	£81	£14	17%	46%	7%
ALL ESTATES	£565	£30	5%	100%	100%
<u>1773-74</u>					
UPPER	£4,539	£186	4%	34%	90%
MIDDLE	£443	£32	7%	34%	9%
LOWER	£73	£14	28%	32%	1%
ALL ESTATES	£1,707	£78	5%	100%	100%

Source: See Table 1.

^aWealth Groups fall within the following range of inventoried personal wealth: LOWER, £1-200; MIDDLE, £201-1,000; UPPER, £1001-.

in the early 1770s. The upper group was rounded off by a small number of foreign-trade merchants, by high-ranking professionals, and by rentiers whose chief form of income was money lending. Farmers were the largest category in the middle group (estates valued from £100-£1,000), alongside planters, professionals - including lawyers, public officials, school-masters, and doctors - and rentiers. Farmers were also the largest element in the lowest wealth class (£1-£100), although it should be said that farmers in this category were almost all petty agriculturalists, with few if any slaves and little livestock.³⁵ The other major occupation in the lower group was that of trades of low status, comprising shopkeepers and artisans such as carpenters and tailors. 20% of those in the lowest-wealth group had no identifiable occupation, although it is certain that these were non-agriculturalists, namely, mariners, overseers, labourers, retired males and widows and the unemployed and the indigent.³⁶

What specific patterns of consumption were associated with the various wealth groups and how did wealth differences shape the distinctive features of South Carolina's consumer culture? The hierarchy of wealth and of occupations, and thus of status, it goes without saying, was related to the consumption hierarchy. Around 1730, for example, the upper wealth group held total wealth four to

five times as great as that held by the middling group and consumer goods worth twice as much (Table 4.) However, this made surprisingly little difference to the profile of consumer goods held by the two groups. The upper group owned more new consumer goods than the middling, but the differences were small ones, and with respect to two commodities, cutlery and secular books, the middling households had higher proportions of these goods than the upper ones (Table 2 (B)). Likewise, the upper and middling groups both held quite similar bundles of the basic and of the non-essential goods which comprise the "modern", the "amenities", and the "Weatherill" indexes.³⁷ In qualitative terms, then, both groups owned a similar range of possessions: the rich merely had rather more of them. The two groups, it could be said, shared a common material culture.³⁸ The social line of division in terms of consumption laid not between the elite and everyone else, but rather between the upper and middle groups on the one hand and the lowest wealth category on the other. The latter were too poor to reach the monetary threshold needed to acquire more than a modicum of basic goods, a threshold set, ca.1730, at £25 to £30 per household. However, while the low-wealth households possessed many fewer basic goods and amenities than the middling and upper ones, they nevertheless did share in the fashion for some new commodities and in this respect they easily outdid comparable Virginia households. So, tea or coffee drinking were found in about one in four households of the lowest wealth category in South Carolina in c.1730, while such habits were almost non-existent in any other than the very wealthiest households in the Chesapeake samples of the same period.³⁹

What major changes occurred in the social distribution of consumption in the later colonial period? The consumption patterns of the middling and lower groups experienced no change. By the mid-1770s, the values of consumer goods held by these two groups stood at almost exactly the same level as those of the early 1730s.⁴⁰ Moreover, neither group experienced any improvement in the range of basic goods and amenities in their possession, as measured by the indexes, and neither increased their possession of "new" commodities beyond the precocious levels achieved forty years earlier. This contrasts with low and middle-wealth households in New England and the Chesapeake which improved their consumer standards most rapidly in the period from the 1730s to the Revolution. The upper group of South Carolina households, on the other hand, increased their average total and consumer goods' wealth by more than two and a half fold from ca.1730 to the 1770s and they further extended both the range of amenities in their possession and their ownership of new consumer goods. Moreover, the percentage of all inventoried estates made up by the highest wealth class increased from 11% in 1730 to 34% by the early 1770s, by which time the upper group of estates effectively monopolized inventoried personal wealth, holding 90% of the total (Table 4). This upgrading of wealth levels was caused by South Carolina's very rapid economic growth in the late colonial era. The value of rice exports slumped in the wartime depression of the 1740s, but they boomed from the end of the war until the 1770s, years in which they

were supplemented by indigo exports, which commenced in the 1740s and which thereafter enjoyed a spectacular rate of progress. This surge in exports was based on a growth in the scale and in the intensity of plantation production, as planters reinvested their export earnings in more slaves and required their labour forces to produce both rice and indigo on their reorganised estates. The average numbers of slaves owned on plantations increased by a half from the late 1740s to the early 1770s and, furthermore, the high demand for slaves and their enhanced productivity raised their average value by about 40% in the same period.⁴¹ The late colonial boom in plantation production and exports was therefore accompanied by a further massive increase in the value of slaves and other productive assets, forms of wealth which continued to dominate the planters' portfolios.

Distribution of Resources Between Productive Assets
and Consumer Goods, South Carolina Estates, 1773-1774

<u>ESTATE VALUE</u>	Slaves	Producer Goods ^a	Financial Assets ^b	Consumer Goods
£2001-	59%	19%	18%	4%
£1001-2,000	70%	15%	9%	6%
£201-1,000	55%	19%	2%	7%
£1-200	43%	26%	3%	28%

Source: See Table 1.

^aIncludes livestock, producer durables and perishables, i.e., field crops, stored grain, etc. and business inventories. ^bIncludes cash as well as mortgages, bonds and notes.

Moreover, the growth in the elite's wealth was so rapid that rich households were able to increase their investment both in production and in consumption. In the early 1730s the upper wealth class held an average of £71 of consumer goods per estate; by the early 1770s this had increased to £186 per estate (Table 4).

By the 1770s, indeed, the richer households, especially those with total wealth above £2,000, stand out by their ownership of four types of goods (Table 5). First, wrought silver, which in the early eighteenth century had been held in the form of conventional plate, but which by the 1770s was invariably encountered as tea, coffee, dining and cutlery services and which was owned, at least in households worth more than £2,000, in the quantity of hundreds of ounces.⁴² Second, furniture, including mahogany tables, chairs, desks, chests of drawers, clothes presses, and gaming tables, as well as cheaper furniture, although in lesser quantities, made from walnut, cedar, cypress, hickory, and uncommonly, from maple, sycamore and oak, as well, of course, much basic furniture in pine.⁴³ Third, riding chairs, chariots and chaises, that is, light two and four-wheeled vehicles, some of them manufactured in South Carolina,

but mainly imported from London.⁴⁴ Fourth, they owned masses of household linen and tableware: mounds of sheets, napkins and table cloths; numerous pieces of china and other ceramics, for example matched sets like Wedgwood Queensware and Delftware, for serving tea and meals; and multiple sets of specialised glasses and decanters, for wine and spirits.

From ca.1750, then, the South Carolina elite fashioned for itself a domestic milieu of conspicuous display based on an abundance of high status goods, a milieu different in character from the domestic environment found in the houses of middling or lower wealth-holders, or in Chesapeake estates.⁴⁵ Before 1750, the boundary between the consumption of the rich and of the middling group had not been clearly defined. By the 1770s, the elite had distinguished itself from the lower social groups by the number, quality and value of their possessions. They had constructed portfolios of consumer goods which were regarded, as is discussed below, as the indispensable components not just of

TABLE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CONSUMER GOODS HELD BY FOUR WEALTH GROUPS, 1729-1731,1735 AND 1773/1774 £s^a

<u>ESTATE CATEGORY</u>	APPAREL	BEDS/LINEN	FURNITURE	KITCHEN GOODS	WROUGHT SILVER	RIDING CARRIAGES
<u>A. 2,001-</u>						
Average Value						
1729-31/35	£0	£18	£26	£18	£28	£ 5
1773/74	£5	£55	£67	£42	£70	£26
<u>B. £1001-£2,000</u>						
Average Value						
1729-31/35	£8	£22	£ 9	£ 8	£11	--
1773/74	£2	£23	£16	£11	£11	£7

<u>C. £201-£1,000</u>						
Average Value						
1729-31/35	£2	£13	£5	£7	£6	--
1773/74	£2	£10	£8	£6	£3	£1
<u>D. £1-£200</u>						
Average Value						
1729-31/35	£5	£3	£2	£2	£2	--
1773/74	£4	£4	£2	£2	£3	--

Source: See Table 1.

^a The data excludes various miscellaneous goods which made up about 2% of the value of all consumer possessions. The sample also omits estates in which consumer goods are not valued or are valued as a whole but not specified in detail.

^bNumber of estates in brackets.

"polite" but also of "genteel" society, ones which were beyond the monetary reach of middling wealth-holders, signifying a style of life which was the

distinctive property of upper-class households.

South Carolina consumption patterns, then, were heavily influenced by wealth and social class but they were also affected by urbanization and by occupation. By the early 1770s, rural estates were worth, on average, about 12% more than Charleston ones, yet their holdings of consumer goods were worth about 15% less (Table 6(A)). This distinction between town and country was most obvious at the lower and upper ends of the wealth scale, and much less noticeable in the middle register. In the richest category, for example, the city residents held estates worth, on average, 40% more than their rural equivalents while their holdings of consumer goods were worth 80% more. It appears, then, that Charleston's elite residents demonstrated a lavishness of consumption which exceeded even that of their richest rural counterparts, while the city's poorer households strove to achieve a level of consumption that marked them out from their rural counterparts.

Finally, in addition to place of residence, occupation also had an important influence on consumption. By far the greater part of South Carolina's wealth was held by its agriculturalists: in 1773/1774, planters and farmers comprised 58% of inventoried wealth-holders, yet they held 76% of all personal wealth. In contrast, non-agricultural households made up 42% of estates yet held only 24% of total wealth. However, the non-agriculturalists were greater consumers than the planters and farmers (Table 6(B)). So, those identified with occupations of high status, such as merchants, were much less wealthy on average than their agricultural equivalents, the rice and indigo planters, and yet they possessed the more richly-appointed households. Likewise, those in low status trades were the poorest of the four occupational groups identified and yet these tradesmen owned consumer goods of a disproportionately high value. Of course the distinctions made here between urban and rural inventoried estates, and between those following agricultural and non-agricultural occupations, are overlapping ones. The great majority of the planters and farmers were resident in the rural areas while most of the non-agriculturalists were located in Charleston. Indeed, the categories of "urban" and "rural" were elastic ones in the South Carolina context, the great significance of which for consumption patterns is brought out in the next section.

III

What explains South Carolina's distinctive patterns of consumerism in the colonial period compared with other colonial regions? In particular, how can we account for the precocious standards of consumption achieved in the early eighteenth century, the surge of elite consumerism after ca.1750, and the differences which existed in levels of consumption between urban and rural and between agricultural and non-agricultural households. The obvious answer

TABLE 6. DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONAL & CONSUMER-GOODS WEALTH BETWEEN CHARLESTON & NON-CHARLESTON & BETWEEN AGRICULTURAL AND NON-AGRICULTURAL ESTATES IN SOUTH CAROLINA, 1773-1774

(A) RURAL V URBAN

WEALTH CATEGORIES

	£1-200		£201-1000		£1000-	
	<u>Average Wealth</u>		<u>Average Wealth</u>		<u>Average Wealth</u>	
	Personal	Consumer	Personal	Consumer	Personal	Consumer
Charleston	£42	£20	£423	£35	£5096	£277
Non-Charleston	£78	£12	£406	£34	£3640	£156

(B) OCCUPATIONS

AGRICULTURAL V NON-AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS

<u>ESTATE SIZE</u>	<u>PLANTERS</u>		<u>FARMERS</u>		<u>TRADES OF HIGH STATUS</u>		<u>TRADES OF LOW STATUS</u>	
	<u>Ave. Wealth</u>		<u>Ave. Wealth</u>		<u>Ave. Wealth</u>		<u>Ave. Wealth</u>	
	Personal	Consumer	Personal	Consumer	Personal	Consumer	Personal	Consumer
£1-200	£81	£2	£84	£3	£135	£63	£60	£15
£201-1000	£475	£20	£446	£30	£452	£51	£366	£20
£1001-	£4215	£147	£2094	£64	£5963	£324	---	---
<u>ALL ESTATES</u>	£3416	£120	£509	£23	£1927	£128	£145	£16

Source: See Table 1.

Notes: South Carolina inventories seldom give the residence of the deceased. However, the location of the great majority of estates can be established from the evidence of wills; jury lists; newspaper advertisements of the post-mortem sale of estates; the known residence of estate appraisers, and from other miscellaneous sources. Estates for which no location could be established are excluded from Panel(A). Likewise, those estates for which no occupation could be established are excluded from Panel(B).

to these questions is that South Carolina was very much wealthier than other colonies and that wealth was the decisive influence shaping consumption.⁴⁶ However, the growth of wealth alone cannot explain the distinctive features of South Carolina's consumer culture. First, as noted above, South Carolina consumers in the early eighteenth century, at all wealth levels, had a high propensity to acquire new consumer goods compared with Virginian households.

Second, while the growing wealth created by the booming economic trends of the late colonial era was a precondition for the surge in elite consumption which occurred after 1750, it was not a sufficient condition for that expenditure to occur. In fact, in other colonial societies sharp increases in average wealth in the late colonial period were accompanied by falling levels of consumption. In the upper echelon of Chesapeake and New England inventoried estates the value of consumer possessions reached a peak in c.1720, levelled out until c.1750, and then actually fell in the 20 or 30 years before the Revolution, the opposite of the pattern which prevailed amongst South Carolina's elite.⁴⁷ Third, the wealthiest households were not always the most frenetic consumers. Thus, urban consumers, and those in non-agricultural occupations generally, had lower average wealth than their rural and agricultural counterparts, yet they spent more on consumption.

The key to integrating non-wealth factors into the explanation of the distinctive characteristics of South Carolina's consumerism lies in the recognition that nowhere in colonial north America were the boundaries between the town and the countryside more fluid, nowhere was there such a high degree of integration of the urban and rural economies and societies, as in South Carolina. Thus, many of the richest Charleston households were the homes of planters more or less permanently resident in the city; of merchants and professionals who combined commercial and professional occupations with the ownership of plantations; and of city rentiers who did not own plantations but who held sheaves of mortgages and bonded debts from planters. Conversely, many planters whose principal domicile was on their plantations were resident in Charleston for part of the year, transacting business and politics, or in the pursuit of leisure, entertainment and consumer goods.⁴⁸ Even those South Carolina planters who did not take up a temporary residence in Charleston were urban consumers in the sense that they bought their consumer goods from the city's large-scale and specialised suppliers rather than from rural retailers. Consumption tends to be viewed in terms of the cultural demands and preferences exercised by the consuming groups and of the economic means which they possessed to make those demands effective ones. However, consumption was also critically influenced by the means of supply and in South Carolina nearly all households, not just those of the elite, learned and satisfied their consumer demands in a metropolitan market which had no counterpart in the other plantation colonies.

Indeed, it is notable that the consumerism of South Carolina's highest wealth groups, whether in town or country, bears a much closer comparison with that of the mercantile and gentlemanly elite of the northern mainland cities, than it does with the wealthy planters of the Chesapeake.⁴⁹ In eighteenth-century Philadelphia, for example, one finds in the houses of the richer merchants and gentlemen the same profusion of mahogany furniture, of silver, and of riding carriages as one observes amongst the Carolina planters.⁵⁰ One should not therefore make too much of the differences in levels of consumption in South Carolina between rural and urban or between agricultural and non-agricultural

households. South Carolina's rich households, whether in town or country, adopted a "high-style" consumerism which in other colonial regions was associated with an urban culture and marketing system and which, to seek comparisons further afield, closely resembled the domestic lifestyle of London's bourgeois merchants and tradesmen.⁵¹ The interplay between urban and rural life in elite consumerism is conveyed in the following advertisement in the South Carolina Gazette of May 1773, announcing the sale of the country property of the rich, Huguenot-descended planter Benjamin Guerard, which summed up the gentlemanly ideal:

"A *delightful* RETREAT, Eight miles by land or water from [Charles] Town ... open to several parts of that beautiful River, *Ashley River*, ... *With which will be Sold*, The large Quantity of very genteel furniture ... A very easy and desirable Distance for a Carriage and Four or Six Horses, as a Gentleman may come to his Business in Town in the Morning, and return to his Family in the Evening."

What functions did this carefully cultivated, urban or quasi-urban lifestyle play in buttressing the elite's position at the head of South Carolina society? In general, historians have interpreted the social behaviour and consumption of elites in the colonial Anglo-American world in terms of their pursuit of gentility. The key eighteenth-century development was that the status of gentleman came to be less defined by birth and more by manners and education, that is by acquired rather than by inherited traits.⁵² In America, where anyway birth counted for far less than in England, elite gentlemen emphasised the gulf between themselves and the "meaner sorts" by presenting themselves and their domestic surroundings in styles which were abreast of the highest and latest fashions. Stylish goods thus displaced possessions which reflected the old-fashioned virtues of antiquity and dynastic tradition. Fashion replaced the "patina of age" as the key indicator of the individual's social worth, at least as defined by his possessions.⁵³ However, while the obvious costliness of the elite's clothes and possessions displayed wealth and hence status, these were things which prosperous members of the lower social groups could attempt to imitate or counterfeit. Hence, as a second tactic in fashioning themselves as a socially exclusive caste, the elite sought to create a complex code of genteel, dignified and restrained manners and social rituals, which only they had the necessary education and leisure time to acquire and perfect: "as gentility became more a matter of manner, society placed less emphasis on material display."⁵⁴

The South Carolina inventories provide evidence of the first rather than the second tactic that is testimony of a greater conspicuous consumption rather than of a retreat from material display. The wealthy elite was the only social class in South Carolina to increase its investment in consumer goods from the 1740s. This meant, inevitably, that the material expression of social distinctions between the elite and everyone else came to rest on a greater degree of visible differences in the possessions owned by them and by other

social groups (Tables 4, 5). Rich South Carolina families lavished their main consumer investment on luxury, high status goods like riding carriages, silver tableware and mahogany furniture, thus emphasising the social distance which existed between them and the middling and lower classes. In doing so, these households were clearly driven by a desire to exhibit the latest fashions, generally English, or rather London ones. Riding carriages, for example, became popular amongst London middle-class and urban gentry families from the late seventeenth century, where they played an unrivalled role in "genteel" urban social communication between upper and middle-class families, particularly between their female members. Although rare in South Carolina estates before ca.1750, carriages then came to play a similar role in the province's rural and urban social life. By the 1760s and 1770s, indeed, they were de rigueur in rich households, being found in 85% of estates with personal wealth valued above £2,000, in 60% of estates worth more than £1,000, but in only 20% of estates of the middling category. Carriages became the ultimate status possessions for elite families, acting, alongside silver tableware and fine mahogany furniture, as one of the three "badges of distinction that set apart the very rich from the merely wealthy". Imported carriages were widely advertised in the South Carolina Gazette, invariably with the tag that they were "of the latest London fashion", replete with details of their accoutrements and decoration.⁵⁵ The adoption of the metropolitan vogue for mahogany furniture, on the other hand, occurred much more quickly. Fashionable in England from the 1710s and 1720s, mahogany furniture was found in 3% of all South Carolina estates, ca.1730, a proportion that rose to 24% by the mid-1740s, and to 38% by the mid-1770s.⁵⁶ Additional evidence suggests that South Carolina consumers in the 1760s and 1770s followed London furniture fashions closely, as the taste developed for a more restrained style of mahogany furniture, based on simpler lines and less elaborate carving. However, while mahogany furniture, by the 1770s, is invariably found in estates worth more than £1,000, it is rarely encountered in rural estates below this value.⁵⁷

The South Carolina elite, then, had quasi-urban standards of consumption. However, the closeness of the links between town and country meant that South Carolina consumers of all classes tapped into Charleston's supply and distribution system. The importance of the centralization of the Low Country's marketing system, and the shaping influence it had on consumption, can best be brought out by comparing it with the rural-based marketing structure of the Chesapeake. There, until the 1730s, the generality of planters bought their imported goods not from towns but from stores kept by great planters or by "country" merchants who acted largely as factors for merchants in the British outports. The supply of goods offered by these stores was a limited and intermittent one. The wealthier planters, who consigned tobacco on their own account to London, therefore satisfied their demand for better-quality goods by placing direct orders with their London correspondents. From the 1740s, the distribution system in the Chesapeake was transformed by the appearance

of chains of well-stocked rural stores run by factors for English and Scottish principals and by indigenous rural merchants who imported large cargoes of manufactures on credit from London suppliers. This revolution in distribution has been credited as one of the major causes of the region's proliferating consumerism in the mid-eighteenth century, which brought it up in many respects to South Carolinian standards.⁵⁸

South Carolina had, in contrast, and from its foundation, a highly-centralised and urbanized system of merchandising and distribution. So, in the years from 1670 to 1700, a high proportion of the small number of surviving probate inventories for South Carolina in those years are of merchants, nearly all of them resident in Charleston. However, although one or two of these firms carried large and varied stocks of goods, the majority of them were petty shopkeepers and dealers, and none of the mercantile inventories for the period included any modish consumer goods such as tea, pottery, cutlery and other forms of tableware.⁵⁹ From 1700, the rise of the naval stores and rice industries focused the colony's trade on Charleston to an extraordinary degree. South Carolina planters, unlike the wealthier tobacco producers, did not consign their crops to England on their own account, nor did they sell them to rural stores, in the manner of the poorer tobacco planters; rather they disposed of them in Charleston, from whence they also obtained their consumer goods.⁶⁰ The distribution system for imports was therefore, as in the other plantation colonies, intimately linked to the export trades, but it created an urban not a rural marketing structure.

So, by the years 1733-37, when imports from England averaged £84,000 per year, of which a high proportion (72%) came from London, a large business community of at least 74 merchants and shopkeepers sold dry goods in Charleston.⁶¹ These dealers held quite modest inventories of trade goods, which averaged only about £200-300 per trader, although these stocks, unlike those of the first generation of merchants, now invariably included new items of consumption such as tea-ware, pottery, glassware, cutlery and secular books.⁶² There was also a scattering of retailers in the countryside, but in South Carolina rural dealers never achieved a fraction of the significance they possessed in the Chesapeake, or in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, and, in any case, they were mainly subsidiaries of Charleston firms.⁶³ Charleston's dominance in the distribution of manufactures was underpinned by the compactness of the Low Country's settlement: as late as 1720, over 75% of white settlers lived in a central zone bounded by the Edisto River to the south and by the upper branches of the Cooper River to the north, and hence few households were located more than 20 or 30 miles from Charleston.⁶⁴ The city's firms had numerous rural as well as urban customers and it is clear that Charleston was the overwhelming point of supply for consumer goods throughout the province. Rural clients were supplied by urban merchants on credit, undertaking to repay their debts in cash, or in rice and other goods delivered to Charleston; the absence of such credit arrangements in the Chesapeake seems to have precluded the tobacco

region from generating significant urban-rural consumption links.⁶⁵

The post-1750 surge in consumerism was underpinned by a further elaboration of the Charleston marketing system. In the 1760s, there were about 120 merchants and shopkeepers advertising the sale of imported dry goods in Charleston.⁶⁶ The probate records reveal that merchants now held much larger trading stocks than those which had been common in the 1720s and 1730s, business inventories which averaged £1,500-2,000 per firm, similar in value to those held by Philadelphia merchants or by the larger of the rural Scotch stores trading in the Chesapeake at this time.⁶⁷ There were also many more specialised city dealers in luxury imports than in the 1730s: in wine, in wrought silver and jewellery, in furniture, and in riding carriages. For example, in the 1760s there were 42, and in the early 1770s, over 50 Charleston dealers in wine and spirits, compared with 16 traders in the 1730s.⁶⁸ Finally, the demand for basic linens and cottons prompted the opening of Charleston "warehouses" from the late 1760s, in which a number of separate merchant-retailers sold these and other goods cheaply for cash or on short credits.⁶⁹ By the 1760s, rural settlement had spread considerably outside the central region of the Low Country in both the northward and southward direction, but these areas were supplied by an well-articulated system of roads and above all water-borne distribution which flowed out from Charleston's wharves. For example, James Poyas, whose general Charleston dry goods and groceries business supplied over 60 rural customers in the mid-1760s, distributed his goods by wagon and through the use of 12 different owners of schooners and boats.⁷⁰

IV

The study of South Carolina's distribution system for imported manufactures helps to explain the "urbanized" patterns of consumption observed in probate inventories but it further makes clear that the story of consumption told by the inventories is an incomplete one. First, the inventories tell us very little about the quotidian flows of household incomes and expenditure and about the proportion of income spent on consumer products. The probate records give us a static representation of the kinetic process of consumption. Second, while inventories provide an excellent record of durable items found in the household they tend to omit or under-represent two less durable components which nevertheless represented the principal items of consumer expenditure: that is, they exclude most forms of textiles and clothing as well as foodstuffs which were purchased rather than produced within the household, which in South Carolina were groceries rather than basic food items.⁷¹ The significance of these expenditures cannot be grasped from probate inventories but only from an analysis of the flow of consumer imports into the Charleston market from Britain and the West Indies which supplied by far the greater part of South Carolina's textiles, clothing and groceries.

White per capita consumption of imported English goods in the South Carolina Low Country, in c.1770, has been estimated at £14 per year which, assuming an average household size of 4.22 whites, indicates household expenditures on English imports of £60 per year.⁷² This is the prime cost of these goods in England but by the time they reached the South Carolina consumer their prices had been increased by at least 25%, to accommodate the costs of freights, insurance, mercantile profits and the granting of credit to the customer.⁷³ Analysis of the composition of these imports, suggests that 83% of them can be classified as consumer goods and hence that annual household expenditure on English consumer imports amounted to £62 (£60 x 1.25 x 0.83).

COMPOSITION OF "CAROLINA" IMPORTS FROM ENGLAND, 1771-1774

CONSUMER GOODS

	<u>Textiles</u>			
Linens/ Cottons	Woollens	Silks	Clothing/ Haberdashery	SUB-TOTAL
32%	16%	3%	8%	59%
Food/ Drugs	Domestic ^a Hardware	Silver Plate	Other	SUB-TOTAL
6%	2%	1%	15%	83%

<u>PRODUCER GOODS</u>		<u>GRAND TOTALS</u>	
Metal Goods	Other		Average Value
7%	10%	100%	£395,000

Source: Customs 3, vols. 71-74, Inspectors'-General, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, National Archives, England. Total value in sterling.

Notes: ^aIncludes, glass, earthenware, china and pewter.

There are two customs' categories, wrought metal goods and the catch-all and expanding category of "goods several sorts", which cannot be readily classified as either consumer or producer goods. I have therefore assumed that these goods were divided equally between the two classifications. For a recent discussion of the composition of the English export trades to the North American colonies see, S. D. Smith, "The Market for Manufactures in the Thirteen Continental Colonies, 1698-1776", Economic History Review, 51 (1998), 678-708.

Goods imported from the West Indies c. 1770 amounted to about another £8 per household, virtually all of which can be classified under the heading of consumer foodstuffs.⁷⁴ In other words, annual household expenditure on imported consumer products stood at £70 in c.1770, close to the value of a household's lifetime accumulation of such goods in 1773/1774, namely £78, as estimated from probate inventories. The data for the early 1770s can be compared with expenditures on consumer-goods' imports, ca.1730, of about £23 per Low Country household, indicating that household spending on consumer imports increased three and a half fold over the period.⁷⁵ Part of this spending, however, was on textiles

and other imported manufactured goods for the use of slaves and which therefore counts as producer rather than consumer expenditures. The value of textile imports earmarked for slaves in the early 1770s can be roughly estimated at £30-40,000 per annum that is about 10% of total imports.⁷⁶

The probate inventories and other sources reveal that there was also an indigenous production of consumer goods: "homespun" textile production for household use; a plantation output of other basic goods, such as "negro shoes"; and a Charleston production of luxury goods such as fine wood furniture, silverware, and riding carriages. However, the value of this internal output was minute compared with the value of stocks of imports found in mercantile inventories. Moreover, South Carolina's production of silverware, pottery, paper, textiles, and other consumer goods in the late colonial period ranked at a low level compared with that in the northern colonies, which means that South Carolina was more dependent on imports than other colonial regions.⁷⁷ One suspects, indeed, that the largest indigenous South Carolina contribution to consumer "production" was the making of the several million yards of textiles which were imported every year into clothing.⁷⁸

The major category of imports from Britain was textiles, led by linens and cottons, but amongst which woollens and silks played a prominent part, as well as clothing items and accessories, such as gloves, hats, stockings, and haberdashery; the less sizable imports from the West Indies were composed principally of rum, sugar and other foodstuffs. The goods which have most interested the historians of consumerism, on the other hand, such as furniture, silver, china, glass, earthenware, cutlery and other domestic utensils, made up a much less important component of consumer imports.⁷⁹ There is, then, a great difference between the types of consumer goods which predominate in South Carolina inventories and those which were imported and distributed through the colony's transatlantic trade networks, although nearly all studies of consumerism have privileged consumer durables over textiles, clothes and accessories.⁸⁰ This basic mismatch between the pattern of consumption revealed by probate sources, and what people actually spent their money on, is confirmed by the contents of the business inventories held by Charleston merchants, a number of which are summarized below.

COMPOSITION OF SAMPLE OF MERCANTILE INVENTORIES
HELD BY SOUTH CAROLINA MERCHANTS 1720-1735, 1745-1775

<u>Consumer Goods</u>							
	Textiles	Clothing/ Haberdashery	Bedding	Domestic Hardware	Groceries	Books	Other
1720-1735	52%	6%	1%	2%	22%	*	2%
1745-1775	50%	11%	6%	3%	14%	1	5%
	<u>Producer Goods</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> £s			
	Hardware/ Tools	Other	<u>No.</u>	<u>Average Value</u>			
1720-1735	9%	6%	7	£288			
1745-1775	5%	5%	9	£2,020			

Notes: * = less than 0.5%.

Source:

1720-1735: Inventories for Andrew Dupuy (1723); James Du Poids D'Or (1725); Timothy Bellamy (1726); Francis Holmes Sen. (1726); Albert Muller (1727); Jacob Satur (1729), Joseph Warmingham, (1729).

1745-1775: Inventories for John Laurens (1747); John Dart (1755); Samuel Perroneau (1756); Samuel Winborn, (1762); John Jones, (1764); Samuel Perroneau, (1766); William Ioor (1767?); Thomas Gadsden (1770); Nathaniel Stoll, (1772). The inventories for Gadsden and Ioor provide figures of total stocks held, but not of the individual commodities. They are included as evidence of the total size of mercantile inventories.

Mercantile inventories, in fact, provide a more accurate account of consumption than is derived from the English customs records, both because they include all types of imports and because the more detailed description of goods in inventories allows them to be classified more precisely. The source once again highlights the long-term dominance in distribution of textiles, and of clothing and clothing accessories, and the low value of domestic hardware and utensils. Consumers demanded a huge variety of textiles, the means to turn this raw material into clothing, and an assortment of ready-made clothes and items of personal adornment. Merchants and retailers shaped their stocks to meet these requirements and hence, to take one example, their inventories generally carried a greater value of stocks of buttons than they did of all the new tableware commodities put together. This reflected the standard gentleman's costume of the period, consisting of a long waistcoat and outer coat, with single or double lines of narrowly-spaced buttons running from the collar to the hem.⁸¹ Foodstuffs and groceries form a higher proportion of the mercantile inventories than they do of imports from England, because the inventories include West Indian and Philadelphia goods, as well as imports of food from England.

Of course mercantile inventories of wholesalers and retailers, like probate inventories in general, record stocks of goods not flows of sales and of expenditure. So a particular item might represent only a modest percentage of a merchant's stock of goods, but if its turnover was a rapid one, then its contribution to merchandising and consumer expenditure would be much higher than its proportionate share of the inventory would suggest. A more accurate picture of the flow of expenditure and consumption would therefore be gained from mercantile records of sales to customers. However, for South Carolina, unlike, say, Philadelphia, mercantile accounts are very thin on the ground, scarcer even than surviving collections of mercantile correspondence. Indeed, there is only one extant set of accounts for a Charleston merchant-retailer in the late colonial period, the daybooks of James Poyas for the years 1762-1767. Poyas was a Charleston rice and indigo factor who sold the planters' crops in Charleston on commission, and who retailed to them, and to many other Charleston and country customers, a full range of imported commodities from Britain and from the West Indies and elsewhere.⁸² Poyas's sales for an eighteenth-month period are summarised as follows:

James Poyas's Retail and Wholesale Sales,
March 1764-February 1765, September 1765-February 1766^a

<u>Consumer Goods</u>						
Textiles	Clothing/ Haberdashery	Bedding ^b	Domestic ^c Hardware	Groceries	Books ^d	Other
53%	15%	9%	2%	15%	1%	1%
<u>Producer Goods</u>			<u>Total Value</u>			
	Hardware/Tools	Other	<u>of Poyas's Sales</u>			
	4%	1%	£4,510			

Source: Merchant's Day Book [James Poyas], 1764-1766, (Photo-copy), 34-325, South Carolina Historical Society.

^aThe source is largely illegible for the period March to August 1765.

^bThis is comprised of textiles, mainly woollen blankets, but includes mattresses, ticks and miscellaneous items like gauze for mosquito netting.

^cIncludes all forms of tableware, cutlery, cooking and cleaning utensils, and miscellaneous equipment.

^dIncludes writing materials.

Again, what Poyas's business reveals is the dominance of sales of textiles, of clothing and haberdashery, and of groceries, and the low significance of the turnover of domestic hardware and other consumer goods of the type which predominate in probate inventories. Poyas's customers spent most of their money on textiles and groceries, goods which they bought on a monthly or more frequent basis. Their purchases of domestic hardware and producer goods were much less important and were made only two or three times a year.

In conclusion: the distinctive features of South Carolina's consumerism in the eighteenth century, as revealed by probate inventories, lay in its early adoption of new consumer goods, in the rising tide of consumer expenditures found in wealthier households from mid-century, and in the differential patterns of consumption found in urban and rural households. However, South Carolina households spent a far higher proportion of their incomes on imported textiles, clothing, and groceries than they did on the newfangled commodities or on high status possessions, goods which have been the motifs of recent research into early modern consumer culture. Consumerism, in other words, combined two quite different sorts of expenditure: first, spending on consumer durables, which leaves clear evidence in post-mortem inventories; second, the buying of textiles and clothes, a pattern of spending which is heavily under-represented in the probate records. The first kind of expenditure was an intermittent one. The formation of new households gave rise to a large expenditure on consumer durables of the type that are recorded in probate inventories. Subsequently, however, such purchases made up a small and a noticeably irregular part of household spending.⁸³ Of course, in their efforts to keep abreast of fashion, the richer households in South Carolina renewed or extended the range of their domestic possessions after marriage. However, much of the elite's increased expenditure in this category in the late colonial period was on silver, mahogany furniture, and other luxury goods. The fashion characteristics embodied in these goods formed a large part of their appeal, but so did their longevity in use and their transmission by inheritance, attributes which embodied an important part of their function as objects proclaiming high status.⁸⁴ Indeed, the symbolic value imparted to high status goods by the "patina of age" probably did not lost its significance as quickly as has been claimed, meaning that these goods were replaced at infrequent intervals. The second, and much more important form of expenditure, as has been demonstrated through an analysis of trade and mercantile records, was on textiles, clothing and items of personal adornment. The replacement rate for these goods was higher than for consumer durables, partly because more lightweight textiles came into fashion which had to be replaced more often and partly because consumers were more sensitised to new fashions in clothes than they were in household goods. So, De Vries in his idealized model of changing replacement rates for consumer goods in the eighteenth century, assumes that the rate of replacement for textiles might accelerate from every 10 to every 5 years, that for tableware from every 30 to every 15 years, while that for furniture and silver remained static at 30 years.⁸⁵ As another historian of eighteenth-century consumerism has commented: "metropolitan chic was more highly prized in clothing than in tableware, in tableware than in furniture and in furniture than in kitchenware".⁸⁶ South Carolina households spent about £60 per annum on British imports, the greater part of it on textiles and clothing. Peter Earle's study of well-to-do London families in the period 1675-1725, whose consumption patterns were in many other ways similar to those of South Carolina households, suggests that they spent

roughly the same amount on clothing, i.e., £60 per annum.⁸⁷ Moreover, the mercantile records of one merchant (James Poyas) suggest that South Carolinians shopped far more frequently for textiles and clothing than they did for consumer durables. Indeed, it may well be that South Carolina's upper-class consumers asserted their status through a dual strategy: first, they renewed their claims to high fashion on a season-to-season basis through their clothes, and other personal adornments, upon which they, like everyone else, concentrated their consumer expenditures; second, they used possessions like mahogany furniture, silver tea services and riding carriages to emphasise the time-honoured nature of their families' claims to high social status. The focus of consumption for eighteenth-century South Carolinians, however, was one which remained dominant throughout the early modern period, that is the textiles, clothing, and numerous personal accessories used to adorn their bodies rather than the new consumerist objects designed to adorn their houses.

NOTE ON SOURCES.

Tables 1-6 are based on an analysis of probate inventories for the following periods: for the two years June 1729-May 1731 and for 1735 (156 Inventories); 1746-1748 (154 Inventories); 1773-1774 (263 Inventories).⁸⁸ They represent about 11% of all the extant South Carolina inventories for the period 1730-1774. The first set of years was chosen because the inventories were fairly numerous and in reasonable or good condition and because these years allowed comparisons to be made with data currently available for Chesapeake households. The other sets of data were chosen as representative of the mid- and late-colonial periods. In 1746-48, the South Carolina economy was beginning to recover from the war-induced depression of the early and mid-1740s, whilst in 1773 and 1774, economic conditions were in a largely favourable conjuncture, although overshadowed in 1774 by the impending conflict with Britain. All the inventories for the period until 1748, as far as I have been able to establish, are for the Low Country. A small number of the inventories for 1773/1774 are for the Back Country, although in the end these have been included in the sample.

I have not attempted to assess the degree to which the wealth of the inventoried population was representative of the population at large because the scantiness of tax and demographic data for South Carolina means that we lack the information about the age and family structure of both the inventoried and the wider population which is required for such an exercise. There is no reason to believe that the range of deceased individuals subject to probate inventories was markedly different in 1773-1774 than in earlier years.

It should be noted that 84 of the inventories for 1774 have been printed in Jones's well-known study, a sample used by historians to provide evidence of average inventoried wealth in the South Carolina Low Country in the late colonial period.⁸⁹ However, her sample was taken solely from the Charleston District for 1774, in which households were on average wealthier than in the

other two Low Country districts of Beaufort and Georgetown.⁹⁰ This does not materially affect Jones's methodology, which used a randomly-selected sample of districts covering all the colonial regions, and she took steps to correct for the Charleston District's very heavy concentration of personal wealth when arriving at her final figures of British-American per capita wealth.⁹¹ But it does mean that her data, when used in isolation, give an exaggerated, although it should be said far from wholly distorting picture, of the Low Country's wealth on the eve of the Revolution. Consequently, the figures of average personal wealth presented above, which are drawn from all Low Country districts, are somewhat lower than those given in the sources quoted above and elsewhere. It also means that any comparisons made between Jones's data and those for earlier years, which draw on all South Carolina districts, for example Bentley's comprehensive study, are not strictly comparing like with like.⁹² Finally, all values given in the tables and in the text are in sterling and they are, with the exception of Table 1, current values rather than constant ones.

Notes

¹ I would like to thank my colleagues Steve Rigby and Natalie Zacek for their very helpful comments on an earlier draft of this chapter.

2. Neil McKendrick, "The Consumer Revolution in Eighteenth-Century England", in McKendrick, John Brewer and J.H. Plumb, eds., The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialisation of Eighteenth-Century England (London, 1982); McKendrick, "Home Demand and Economic Growth: A New View of the Role of Women and Children in the Industrial Revolution", in McKendrick, ed., Historical Perspectives: Studies in English Thought and Society in Honour of J. H. Plumb (London, 1974).

3. See Ben Fine and Ellen Leopold, "Consumerism and the Industrial Revolution", Social History, 15 (1990), esp. 172-176; Pat Hudson, The Industrial Revolution (London, 1992), 173-180; Jan De Vries, "Between Purchasing Power and the World of Goods: Understanding the Household Economy in Early Modern Europe", in John Brewer and Roy Porter, eds., Consumption and the World of Goods (London, 1993), 87-98; Carole Shammas, The Pre-Industrial Consumer in England and America (Oxford, 1990), 77-86. For a more optimistic view of mass living standards after 1750, and of the working-class contribution to a mass market for cotton textiles, see, Beverly Lemire, Fashion's Favourite: The Cotton Trade and the Consumer in Britain, 1660-1800 (Oxford, 1991), 46- 54, 97-106.

4. Joan Thirsk, Economic Policy and Projects: The Development of a Consumer Society in Early Modern England (Oxford, 1978); Margaret Spufford, The Great Reclotting of Rural England: Petty Chapmen and their Wares in the Seventeenth Century (London, 1984); Lorna Weatherill, Consumer Behaviour & Material Culture in Britain, 1660-1760 (2nd ed., London, 1996); Peter Earle, The Making of the English Middle-Class: Business, Society and Family Life in London, 1660-1730 (London, 1989).

5. Shammass, "How Self-Sufficient was Early America", Journal of Interdisciplinary History, XIII (1982), 247-272; Shammass, Pre-Industrial Consumer, 57-69; John J. McCusker and Russell R. Menard, The Economy of British America, 1607-1789 (Chapel Hill, 1985), 280-94.
6. T. H. Breen, "An Empire of Goods: The Anglicization of Colonial America, 1690-1776", Journal of British Studies, 25 (1986), 467-499, the quotation is from p. 487; Breen, "`Baubles of Britain': The American and Consumer Revolutions of the Eighteenth Century", Past and Present, 119 (1988), 73-87.
7. See, for example, John-Christophe Agnew, "Coming Up for Air: Consumer Culture in Historical Perspective" in Brewer and Porter, eds., Consumption and the World of Goods, 31-33; Lois Green Carr and Lorena S. Walsh, "The Standard of Living in the Colonial Chesapeake", William and Mary Quarterly, 142-143.
8. For recent research on consumerism in British America and its relative neglect of South Carolina, see, Cary Carson, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, eds., Of Consuming Interests: The Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century (Charlottesville, 1990); Shammass, Pre-Industrial Consumer; Brewer and Porter, eds., Consumption and the World of Goods. There has also been little study of consumerism in the British Caribbean colonies, although see, Nuala Zahedieh, "London and the Colonial Consumer in the late Seventeenth Century", Economic History Review, 48 (1994), 239-61; and for a brief comparative survey of late seventeenth-century Caribbean and mainland consumption standards, see Lois Green Carr, Russell R. Menard, Lorena S. Walsh, Robert Cole's World: Agriculture and Society in Early Maryland (Chapel Hill, 1991), 114-17.
9. See McCusker and Menard, Economy of British America, 168-188; Peter M. Coclanis, The Shadow of a Dream: Economic Life and Death in the South Carolina Low Country, 1670-1920 (New York, 1989), 63-110.
10. Probate inventories, other than those for New England, very seldom include valuations of real property, i.e., land and buildings. The figures of wealth given in this paper therefore refer to personal or moveable wealth.
11. Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behaviour", in Carson, et al., Of Consuming Interests, 69, 133-34. A third index, which is used for comparative purposes in the next section, can be derived from Weatherill's studies of English consumerism which, in essence, combines the Carr/Walsh "modern" and "amenities" indexes, see her Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture, Appendix 1, 201-07.
12. Walsh, "Toward a History of the Standard of Living in British North America", William and Mary Quarterly, 45 (1988), 117-18; Carr and Walsh, "The Standard of Living in the Colonial Chesapeake", William and Mary Quarterly, 45 (1988), 135-36; Sarah McMahon, "A Comfortable Subsistence: The Changing Composition of Diet in Rural New England, 1620-1840", William and Mary Quarterly, 42 (1985), 25-65.
13. McCusker and Menard, Economy of British America, 103-05; Kenneth A. Lockridge, A New England Town: The First Hundred Years (New York, 1970), esp. 65-75; Gloria L. Main, "The Standard of Living in Colonial Massachusetts", Journal of Economic History, XLIII (1983), 101-108; Main, "The Standard of Living in Southern New England, 1640-1773", William and Mary Quarterly, 45 (1988), 124-34; Jackson Turner

Main, "Summary: The Hereafter", *ibid.*, 160-61. Main and Main, "Economic Growth and the Standard of Living in Southern New England", Journal of Economic History, XLVIII (1988), 27-46; Jackson Turner Main, "Standards of Living and the Life Cycle in Colonial Connecticut", Journal of Economic History, XLIII (1983), 159-174.

14. See Table 1(A) and Main and Main, "Living Standards in Colonial New England", 39-45; Jackson Turner Main, Society and Economy in Colonial Connecticut (Princeton, N.J., 1985), esp. 88-114; John Demos, A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony (New York, 1970), 24-58.

15. McCusker and Menard, Economy of British America, 35-40; Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behaviour", 63-65, 71-77, 123-129, the quotation is from p. 64; Carr and Walsh, "The Standard of Living in the Colonial Chesapeake", 135-159, William and Mary Quarterly, 45 (1988), 135-59; Gloria L. Main, Tobacco Colony: Life in Early Maryland, 1650-1720 (Princeton, N.J., 1982), 167-266; James Horn, Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake (Chapel Hill, 1994), esp. 31-48, 293-33.

16. Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behaviour", 65-67, 71-75, 130-31; Main and Main, "Living Standards in Colonial New England", 39-45.

17. Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behaviour", 72-77.

18. For example, in 1980, Carole Shammas, "The Domestic Environment in Early Modern England and America", Journal of Social History, 14 (1980), 18, stated: "Over the three century period [1500-1800] the same wealth groups progressively invested a higher proportion of their wealth in consumer goods".

19. Shammas, Pre-Industrial Consumer, 95-100, 116; Shammas, "The Decline of Textile Prices in England and British America Prior to Industrialization", Economic History Review, 47 (1994), 483-507; Weatherill, Consumer Behaviour & Material Culture, 109-11.

20. Shammas, Pre-Industrial Consumer, 112.

21. See, Billy G. Smith, "Comment", William and Mary Quarterly, 45 (1988), 163-66.

22. De Vries, "Between Purchasing Power and the World of Goods", 100-04; Shammas, Pre-Industrial Consumer, 95-96.

23. Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behaviour", 65-68, 102-09, 116-18, 134, 144-45.

24. For critical discussions see, for example, Grant McCracken, Culture and Consumption: New Approaches to the Symbolic Character of Consumer Goods and Activities (Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1988), 93-96; Amanda Vickery, "Women and the World of Goods: A Lancashire Consumer and her Possessions", in Brewer and Porter, Consumption and the World of Goods, 274-77.

25. Vickery, "Women and the World of Goods", 289-94; Hudson, Industrial Revolution, 177-79; Fine and Leopold, "Consumerism and the Industrial Revolution", 166-73.

26. Weatherill, Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture, esp. 167-89; Carson,

"The Consumer Revolution in Colonial America", 607-121; Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behaviour", 91-102.

27. Main and Main, "Living Standards in Colonial New England", 40-41.

28. For late-colonial Charleston see, George C. Rogers, Jun., Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys (Norman, Oklahoma, 1969); Carl Bridenbaugh, Cities in Revolt: Urban Life in America, 1743-1776 (Oxford, 1970), 336-37.

29. Coclansis, Shadow of a Dream, 74-75; Peter H. Wood, Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 Through the Stono Rebellion (New York, 1974), 28-37, 55-62, 95-124; Wood, "'More Like a Negro Country': Demographic Patterns in Colonial South Carolina, 1700-1740", in Stanley L. Engerman and Eugene D. Genovese, Race and Slavery in the Western Hemisphere: Quantitative Studies (Princeton, N. J., 1975), 72. Slave imports increased fourteen-fold between the decades 1706-1715 and 1726-1735.

30. Shammass, "The Domestic Consumer", 14.

31. For the Chesapeake see Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behaviour", 71-77, figures 1-7, and for South Carolina, see Table 3. To arrive at the number of "modern" items per household, divide by 10.

32. See Table 3; Peter Earle, Making of the English Middle-Class, 294-300, the quotation is from p. 295. Weatherill also shows that the incidence of new goods in London inventories was low until the 1690s and then spread rapidly; see her Consumer Behaviour & Material Culture, 49, 88.

33. See Tables 2A and 3, and Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behaviour", esp. 68-71.

34. Probate inventories, at least for South Carolina, rarely give the occupation of the deceased and even these designations are not always accurate ones; hence the great majority of occupational descriptions are drawn from the internal evidence of the inventories themselves.

35. Note that in 1773/1774, the lower wealth group owned only 1% of all slaves in the sample.

36. Agricultural occupations are easy to spot in the inventories as these invariably listed holdings of crops, of livestock and of farming tools and equipment.

37. Compare the first two lines of the upper panel of Table 3.

38. As Kevin M. Sweeney comments on the American colonies generally in the early eighteenth century: "... the homes of the wealthy were more likely to be distinguished by a greater number of rooms and greater quantities of goods than by the character or quality of the furnishings", see his "High-Style Vernacular: Lifestyles of the Colonial Elite", in Carson, et al., eds., Of Consuming Interests, 4.

39. See Table 1(A) and Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behaviour",

78-90.

40. One would not of course expect much alteration in the average wealth of those in the middle and lower categories as their wealth was defined within strict and unchanging bands; however, it would have been perfectly possible for households possessed of an unchanging average personal wealth to have increased, or indeed, decreased their holdings of consumer goods.

41. Peter C. Mancall, Joshua L. Rosenbloom, and Thomas Weiss, "Slave prices and the South-Carolina Economy, 1722-1809", Journal of Economic History, 61 (2001), esp. 620, 625.

42. At prevailing valuations, the average £70 of wrought silver owned by the richest households was equivalent to about 300 ounces. The growing use of silver tableware followed English fashions, see Earle, The Making of the English Middle Class, 298; Sweeney, "High-Style Venacular", 3-5. In the inventories of rich households one also notes the ubiquitous presence of silver and gold watches and the much less common occurrence, at least in the inventories, of gold and silver jewellery and other items of personal adornment.

43. South Carolina inventories, unlike those in other colonies, invariably record whether furniture, even items like chests or boxes, was made from pine or one of the finer woods. Where a particular wood was not specified I have assumed that the furniture was made of pine; certainly, unclassified furniture wood was much cheaper than other kinds.

44. Judging by advertisements in the South Carolina Gazette for the years 1770-1774, which more commonly feature imported carriages than locally-made ones.

45. For consumer possessions in Chesapeake estates, see Alice Hanson Jones, American Colonial Wealth: Documents and Methods, 3 vols. (New York, 1977), vol. 2; and for a brief comparison between the richest South Carolina and Chesapeake estates, Jones, Wealth of a Nation To Be: The American Colonies on the Eve of the Revolution (New York, 1980), 335-336.

46. See Table 1(B). For an analysis of the growing wealth of colonial South Carolina's plantation society, see Menard, "Slavery, Economic Growth and Revolutionary Ideology in the South Carolina Low Country", in Hoffman, McCusker, Menard and Albert, eds., The Economy of Early America: The Revolutionary Period, 1763-1790 (Charlottesville, 1988), esp. 263-71.

47. See Table 1 (A); Main, "The Standard of Living in Southern New England", 131; Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behaviour", 72-73, figures 2 & 3, 117. The Chesapeake elite did shift their spending preferences towards more luxurious goods in the late colonial period, although they apparently did so while the aggregate value of their consumer goods' holdings declined.

48. Rogers, Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys; Bridenbaugh, Cities in Revolt, 340; R. C. Nash, "The Organization of Trade and Finance in the Atlantic Economy", in Jack P. Greene, Rosemary Brana-Shute, and Randy J. Sparks, Money, Trade and Power: The Evolution of Colonial South Carolina's Plantation Society (Columbia, South Carolina, 2001), 94-97; Menard, "Financing the Lowcountry Export Boom: Capital and Growth in Early South Carolina", William and Mary Quarterly, 51 (1984),

659-76; Menard, "South Carolina Lowcountry", 261-62.

49. For the idea that a common culture embraced the elites of Charleston and of the northern cities, see Bridenbaugh, Cities in Revolt, 346-49.

50. Doerflinger, Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise, 20-26, 129-31, 375-81. Doerflinger's sample of late-colonial Philadelphia merchants were wealthier than the upper group of South Carolina estates but owned roughly the same value of household consumer goods. Amongst a larger sample of merchants for 1789, the richer traders owned riding carriages and silver plate, although not in the same proportions as wealthy South Carolinians in the early 1770s. For the high values of consumer goods held in Boston estates compared with those in rural New England see, Main and Main, "Living Standards in Colonial New England", 38; Gloria Main, "Standard of Living", 130-31.

51. For the northern seaports as the settings for the most developed forms of luxury consumerism in the late colonial period, see Sweeney, "High-Style Vernacular", 24-26. For advanced levels of consumption in a Caribbean city, Port Royal, Jamaica, see, Zahedieh, "London and the Colonial Consumer", 252-56.

52. For a recent discussion, in the English context, of changing conceptions of gentility and of the "middling sort", see Henry French, "Ingenious & Learned Gentlemen' - Social Perceptions and Self-fashioning Among Parish Elites in Essex, 1680-1740", Social History, 25 (2001), 44-66; French, "The Search for the Middle Sort of People in England, 1600-1800", Historical Journal, 43 (2001), 277-293.

53. McCracken, Culture and Consumption, 31-41.

54. Sweeney, "High-Style Vernacular", 8-10; Carson, "The Consumer Revolution in Colonial British America", 520-21; Karin Calvert "The function of fashion in eighteenth-century America", in Carson, et al., eds., Of Consuming Interests, 260-63, 270-75, the quotation is from p. 274; Richard L. Bushman, "American High-Style and Vernacular Cultures", in Greene and J. R. Pole, eds., Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era (Baltimore, Maryland, 1984), esp. 352-367.

55. See Table 2. For the high status, and costs, associated with riding carriages see, Sweeney, "High-Style Vernacular", 37-38, the quotation is from p. 37; Bridenbaugh, Cities in Revolt, 340-42; Earle, Making of the English Middle Class, 301; Susan E. Whyman, Sociability and Power in Late-Stuart England: The Cultural World of the Verneys, 1660-1720 (Oxford, 1999), 87-109. Carriages were also luxuries in England because they were accompanied by dedicated carriage horses and liveried servants. Carriage horses are quite often specified in South Carolina inventories, slave coachmen much less so. For advertisements for imported carriages see, for example, South Carolina Gazette, January 17th, October 31st, November 21st, 1774.

56. Before ca.1750, mahogany furniture was almost all tables; chairs and other forms of furniture did not become widespread until the 1760s and 1770s. For English and colonial styles and production see, Ambrose Heal, The London Furniture Makers (London, 1952); Earle, Making of the English Middle Class, 27-28; E. T. Joy, "The Overseas Trade in Furniture in the Eighteenth Century", Furniture History, 1, (1965); Weatherill, Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture, 32-33; Bushman,

"American High-Style and Vernacular Cultures", 363-67.

57. Except in a fair proportion of Charleston and of non-agricultural households of middling wealth, illustrating the influence of urban residence and of occupations on consumption patterns.

58. See, Carr, "The Metropolis of Maryland: A Comment on Town Development Along the Tobacco Coast", Maryland Historical Magazine, vol. 69 (1974), esp. 139-45; Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behaviour", 105-11; Bushman, "Shopping and Advertising in Colonial America", in Carson, et al., eds., Of Consuming Interests, 236-37; Shammass, Pre-Industrial Consumer, 283-84; Jacob M. Price, "Economic Function and the Growth of American Port Towns in the Eighteenth Century", Perspectives in American History, 8 (1974), 163-73; Price, "Buchanan and Simson, 1758-1763: A Different Kind of Glasgow Firm Trading to the Chesapeake", William & Mary Quarterly, 40 (1983), 3-41. For the greater choice offered by urban over rural stores, see, Carson, "Consumer Revolution in Colonial America", 608-09, esp. n. 193. In the late colonial period the location of Chesapeake stores continued to follow a riverine rather than an urban pattern and the town network never dominated the distribution of goods to rural customers.

59. This refers to the inventories of James Beamer, Margaret Clifford, Wilson Dunston, Richard Fowell, John Harris, Samuel Osborn, Lewis Pedriau, Alexander Pepin, John Van Aersien, John Vansusteren, Nathaniel Williamson, all in Records of the Secretary of the Province [hereafter Records of the Sec.], 1675-1695 and Records of the Sec., 1692-1700, South Carolina Department of Archives and History [hereafter, SCDAH].

60. Nash, "Organization of Trade and Finance", 77-81.

61. Nash, "Organization of Trade and Finance", 83, 86. This includes only dealers who advertised in the South Carolina Gazette in these years: of course many traders seldom advertised, for example Gabriel Manigault, one of the great South Carolina merchants in the period; see, Maurice A. Crouse, "Gabriel Manigault: Charleston Merchant", South Carolina Historical Magazine, 68 (1967), 220.

62. For these mercantile inventories see p. 19, notes to Table.

63. See Nash, "Organization of Trade and Finance", 81-83; Nash, "Urbanization in the Colonial South", 14-15. For the Chesapeake, see above endnote 58. For Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, see Doerflinger, "Farmers and Dry Goods in the Philadelphia Market Area, 1750-1800", in Hoffman, et al., eds., Economy of Early America: The Revolutionary Period, 167-78; Shammass, Pre-Industrial Consumer, 266-85.

64. See Wood, "'More Like a Negro Country'", 134-40.

65. For examples of Charleston merchants with a large rural clientele, supplied on credit, see inventories of Captain Albert Muller, John Cawood, and George Atcheson, Records of the Sec., vol. E, 1726-27, 423-29, 531-34, Records of the Sec., Vol. F, 1727-1729, 358-59, SCDAH; and, for the 1760s, the business accounts of James Poyas, see below, p. *.

66. For the period 1762-67, see Jeanne A. Calhoun, Elizabeth A. Paysinger and

Martha A. Zierdan, "A Survey of Economic Activity in Charleston, 1732-1770" (The Charleston Museum, 1982), 92-96.

67. See below, p. *; Shammass, The Pre-Industrial Consumer, 268-69; Doerflinger, Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise, 129-30.

68. For sources, see above, endnote 21.

69. For advertisements for warehouses, see for example the South Carolina Gazette, August 1st, August 22nd, 1771; June 4th, 1772, Supplement.

70. For Poyas, see below, p. *

71. For an acknowledgement of the importance of textiles and more ephemeral items in household expenditures, see, Weatherill, Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture, 112-36; John Styles, "Manufacturing, Consumption and Design in Eighteenth-Century England", in Brewer and Porter, Consumption and the World of Goods, 538-39; Jan De Vries, "Purchasing Power and the World of Goods", 102-03.

72. For per capita imports see Coclanis, 75-77, 248-49, note 79. I have assumed that household size in 1770 in the Low Country was the same as in the first census of 1790, that is 4.22, see Heads of Families at the First Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1790 (Genealogical Publishing Company Inc., Baltimore, 1978), 9. For the South as a whole, in 1774, Jones, Wealth of a Nation To Be, 37, estimated that there were 4.26 free persons per wealth holder, which is approximately the same as household size, although as she points out, some households had two or more wealth-holders.

73. Shammass, Pre-Industrial Consumer, 74-75, and Price, Capital and Credit in British Overseas Trade: The View from the Chesapeake, 1700-1776 (Camb., Mass., 1980), 149-50, suggest much higher mark-ups than this for retail transactions in the colonies. However, Charleston's market was a highly competitive and efficient one and in the late-colonial period dry goods were sold on credit there in retail transactions at an advance of 9:1 on the English invoice price which, taking into account the difference in currencies, represented an advance of 28.5%. See, for example, advertisements for dry goods in the South Carolina Gazette, January 3rd, 1771; June 14th, 1773; January 17th, March 28th, 1774.

74. For West India imports, see Nash, "Urbanization in the Colonial South", 7.

75. The figures for ca.1730 (1728-32) were estimated on the same basis as those for 1771-74, above.

76. Philip D. Morgan, Slave Counterpoint: Black Culture in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake and Lowcountry (Chapel Hill, 1998), 125-26, estimates that South Carolina slaves received 5 yards of "negro cloth" [plains = cheapest woolens] and a pair of shoes per year. Henry Laurens's allotted his slaves about 10 yards of "negro cloth" per year in the mid-1760s plus shoes; Philip M. Hamer, et al., eds., The Papers of Henry Laurens, vols. 1-12 (Columbia, S. C., 1968-1990), 4:493, 634, 661, 665; 5:3-4, 6, 11, 19, 57, 73, 93, 95, 161. Imports of woolens to provide slaves with 10 yards each would have cost approximately £40,000 per annum at Charleston retail prices in the early 1770s. Slaves acquired other goods, such as pipes, caps, etc., but as generally they had to pay for these, they cannot

have owned them in large quantities.

77. For the limited extent of consumer production in the British-American colonies, see Shammass, Pre-Industrial Consumer, 3-4, 62-69. For the restricted development of South Carolina's manufacturing in 1775, and for its meager imports of textile-making equipment, compared with other colonies, see Lester Cappon Smith, "Market for Manufactures". On craft production in Charleston, see Bridenbaugh, Cities in Revolt, 271-75; Bridenbaugh; Calhoun, et al., "A Survey of Economic Activity". Numerous advertisements in the South Carolina Gazette show that craftsmen, especially those in the luxury trades, sold imported goods as well as their own products.

78. Note the importance of "haberdashery" in the data given below, which mainly consisted of thread and other articles needed to make clothes.

79. For the importance of textiles compared with consumer durables in London's export trade to the West Indies in the late seventeenth century, see Zahedieh, "London and the Colonial Consumer", 250-51.

80. For the great significance of imported goods to British-American consumption as a whole, see Shammass, Pre-Industrial Consumer, 62-69.

81. Sales of buttons by Philadelphia merchants to rural shopkeepers exceeded in value those of eating utensils, see Doerflinger, "Philadelphia Market Area", 178. Bushman, "Shopping and Advertising", 236-38, also notes the prominence of stocks of buttons in shopkeepers' inventories.

82. There are two surviving Daybooks for Poyas's business: Merchant's Day Book [James Poyas], 1761-64, Charleston Museum Archives, Charleston, which is now regarded as too fragile for archival use; the second is, Merchant's Day Book [James Poyas], 1764-1766, South Carolina Historical Society, 34-325, only available in the form of a photo-copy, the copy used here. Poyas imported cargoes of manufactures from a number of major London merchants; he also imported flour and other provisions from Philadelphia, while his West-India goods were bought at auctions in Charleston.

83. For this theme, see especially, Weatherill Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture, 113-33. A study of outgoings on a Maryland tobacco plantation, 1662-1672, shows that expenditure on clothing exceeded that on other imported manufactures by a factor of at least 10:1; although the trustee managing the estate in these years was little concerned to replace consumer durables; see, Carr, et al., Robert Cole's World, 80-86.

84. As Vickery, "Women and the World of Goods", 290, 292, comments on a Lancashire gentry family in the middle decades of the eighteenth century: "it appears that furniture was bought once in a life-time and expected to last for generations" and that "Large or expensive items [of furniture], bought new or inherited, were suggestive of history and lineage".

85. De Vries, "Purchasing Power and the World of Goods", 101-04.

86. Vickery, "Women and the World of Goods", 292.

87. Earle, The Making of the English Middle Class, 283-90.

88. Records of the Sec., vol. F, 1727-1729, vol. G, 1729-1731, vol. H, 1730-31; Inventories, WPA Transcripts, vols. CXII-CXIV (1746-1748); Miscellaneous Records: Inventories, vol. CC, (1732-1736); Inventories, vol. MM, (1746-1748); Inventories, vol. Z (1771-1774); vol & (1772-76); vol. AA (1774-85), SCDAH. Jones, American Colonial Wealth, III, 1473-1619.

89. See previous endnote for Jones's data. For examples of their use, see Menard, "Slavery, Economic Growth, and Revolutionary Ideology", 265-267; Coclanis, Shadow of a Dream, 89-91.

90. As noted by Coclanis, Shadow of a Dream, 90-91. In fact, Jones did not use all the inventories for 1774, even for the Charleston district.

91. See Jones, Wealth of a Nation To Be, 352-362.

92. William G. Bentley, "Wealth Distribution in Colonial South Carolina", (Unpublished PhD. thesis, Georgia State University, 1977).