

THE ‘SCHOOL FOR MODESTY AND HUMILITY’: COLONIAL AMERICAN YOUTH IN LONDON AND THEIR PARENTS, 1755–1775*

JULIE M. FLAVELL
University of Dundee

ABSTRACT. *Despite the growing conflict between Britain and her colonies, a metropolitan education remained a popular choice for the sons of elite colonial Americans in the late colonial period. This article explores the attitudes of the youths themselves, and of their parents, towards their London education during a period when political conflict was engendering a growing sense of separateness. American youths typically underwent a status crisis upon reaching the metropolis. Their insecurities related to the usual pitfalls of genteel London life: the prospect of social isolation and vulgarity, and the opportunities for debauchery. The parents of these colonial youths, however, shared the view of elite British parents of the period that a public education was a necessary social apprenticeship for their children. They regarded personal experience of the metropolis, and familiarity with its social and political systems, as important attributes for elite colonists. Parental views on the advantages of a metropolitan education for their sons were unaffected by the imminent breach with Britain. The status crisis experienced by colonial youths in London was age-related; their visiting parents were acculturated to the metropolitan environment. The article concludes by suggesting that the polarized provincial mentality so long attributed by historians to the colonial presence in London should be replaced by a more integrationist model which reflects the real complexity of the relationship between colonial American elites and their mother country.*

I

In the two decades before American independence, as Britain's political relationship with her North American colonies was drawing to its close, elite colonial parents persisted in the long-standing practice of sending their sons home to finish their educations. Sons of colonial elites went to the metropolis not only to receive formal education or training, but to acquire refinement and advantageous contacts as well. Naturally they met with mixed success; while some prospered, others succumbed to the pitfalls of genteel London life, whether through isolation, vulgarity, or corruption. But whatever their experiences, correspondence between these youths and their parents reveals an unabated determination to attain a gentleman's education which measured up to metropolitan standards.

Education is a significant vehicle for cultural transmission, and adolescents

* I wish to thank Bob Harris and Chris Whatley for comments on earlier versions of this article.

and young adults are the most vulnerable group in the process of transmission of culture from one generation to the next. The presence of the youth of colonial American elites in London is unsurprising, since it is well known that Britain's North American colonies were becoming increasingly Anglicized during the eighteenth century. But in the last two decades of the colonial period the colonies were also engaged in a political conflict with their mother country which prompted them to imagine themselves as a separate people. How far during this period did this tension reflect itself in the responses of elite colonial youths to the metropolitan environment they encountered, and in their parents' advice and solitudes on their behalf? And what can we conclude from this about elite colonial American attitudes towards their place in the Anglo-American world at the eve of American independence?

Historians have long relied upon a core-periphery model to describe the relationship between London and her provinces during the eighteenth century. Within the context of this model, colonial attitudes to the metropolis are often conceptualized in terms of extremes, in which a desire to imitate metropolitan lifestyles is linked with a sense of native inferiority. This inherent conflict in the provincial condition commonly leads to the emergence of a compensatory sense of local pride.¹ Recently T. H. Breen has given this a neo-whig twist by arguing that it was an aggressive English nationalism emerging in the mid-eighteenth century which actively marginalized the colonists and it was this which provoked the emergence of an American identity.² Both of these versions of the predicament of the American colonists as provincials within the British empire conform to a long-standing depiction of colonial residents in London in the late colonial period as increasingly alienated in social, political, and cultural terms from the metropolitan world they encountered.³ But these studies have focused on political activists. A study of colonial youths in London and their parents suggests a more complex response to the metropolis on the part of colonial

¹ See John Clive and Bernard Bailyn, 'England's cultural provinces: Scotland and America', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 11 (1954) pp. 200–13; Richard B. Sher, 'Scottish-American cultural studies, past and present', in Richard B. Sher and Jeffrey R. Smitten, eds., *Scotland and America in the age of Enlightenment* (Edinburgh, 1990); Jack P. Greene, 'Search for identity: an interpretation of the meaning of selected patterns of social response in eighteenth-century America', in Greene, ed., *Imperatives, behaviors and identities: essays in early American cultural history* (Charlottesville, 1992); Jack P. Greene, *The intellectual construction of America: exceptionalism and identity from 1492 to 1800* (Chapel Hill, 1993), pp. 162–99; John M. Murrin, 'A roof without walls: the dilemma of American national identity', in Richard Beeman, Stephen Botein, and Edward C. Carter, III, eds., *Beyond confederation: origins of the constitution and American national identity* (Chapel Hill, 1987).

² T. H. Breen, 'Ideology and nationalism on the eve of the American Revolution: revisions *once more* in need of revising', *Journal of American History*, 84 (1997–8), pp. 13–39.

³ Pauline Maier, *From resistance to revolution: colonial radicals and the development of American opposition to Britain, 1765–1776* (New York, 1974; first published 1972), ch. 8; Michael Kammen, *A rope of sand: the colonial agents, British politics, and the American Revolution* (New York, 1974; first published 1968), pp. 164–9; Paul Langford, 'British correspondence in the colonial press, 1763–1775: a study in Anglo-American misunderstanding before the American Revolution', in Bernard Bailyn and John B. Hench, eds., *The press and the American Revolution* (Worcester, MA, 1980), pp. 311 and ff; see also Paul Langford, 'London and the American Revolution', in John Stevenson, ed., *London in the age of reform* (Oxford, 1977).

elites. They saw themselves as occupying a special role as mediators – cultural, political, and social – in the Anglo-American relationship. Therefore, an encounter with London did not necessarily pose such a simple, bipolar choice of adaptation on them. Despite the growing political conflict between Britain and her colonies after 1765, colonial elites continued to groom their sons to occupy this crucial position in the Anglo-American relationship.

Elite American colonists had always travelled to the mother country for business, politics, education, and pleasure. The volume of commercial business and politics between Britain and her colonies increased after the middle of the century; so did tourism. Throughout the eighteenth century, British tourism both within Britain and to the European continent rose steadily. This was a result of the consumer revolution and improvements in transport and communication.⁴ The same trends caused the emergence of ‘something like organized tourism’ within the colonies after 1763.⁵ Colonial tourism to Britain and the continent also increased. Published travel literature, which was increasingly available to British readers, was also read by the colonists. Elite American colonists were travelling more after the Seven Years War, and they were increasingly travelling to the metropolis.⁶

More colonial students also found their way across the Atlantic between 1755 and 1775. For example, of the fifty-three American colonists who earned a medical degree at Edinburgh University between 1740 and 1780, only six came in the first twenty years. The number of young colonists studying law at the Middle Temple (the most popular of the Inns of Court) beginning in 1681 tripled after the middle of the eighteenth century.⁷ Colonial Americans also came to study medicine in London’s hospitals; boys were sent to school at any of number of London’s academies and boarding schools. Formal education was not the only thing that brought American youth home. Merchant apprenticeships were often completed in a London counting-house, where useful contacts could be made. Both Henry Laurens and John Hancock served such apprenticeships.⁸ Some came for ordination in the Church of England. All of these, of course, would be male; in general, colonial women of any age did not make the Atlantic crossing as often as their husbands, fathers, brothers, or sons.⁹ But as tourism increased, daughters of wealthy colonists more

⁴ Jeremy Black, *The British abroad: the Grand Tour in the eighteenth century* (Stroud, 1992), pp. 3–10.

⁵ Barbara G. Carson, ‘Early American tourists and the commercialization of leisure’, in Cary Carson, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, eds., *Of consuming interests: the style of life in the eighteenth century* (Charlottesville, 1994), p. 374.

⁶ W. L. Sachse, *The colonial American in Britain* (Madison, 1956), pp. 18, 32, 123, 150; Michael Kraus, *The Atlantic civilization: eighteenth-century origins* (Ithaca, 1949), ch. 2.

⁷ See Appendix, p. 27.

⁸ *The papers of Henry Laurens*, ed. George C. Rogers, Jr, et al. (11 vols., Columbia, 1974), VIII, p. xxii; ‘Letters of John Hancock, 1760, 1761’, *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 43 (1909–10), p. 193.

⁹ Mary K. Geiter and W. A. Speck, ‘Anticipating America: American mentality before the Revolution’, in David Englander, ed., *Britain and America: studies in comparative history, 1760–1970* (New Haven, 1997), p. 30.

frequently accompanied their parents to London. Some colonial daughters were sent to English boarding schools.

Colonial youths, making what was for them a sort of Grand Tour in the metropolis, self-consciously recorded their experiences in journals and letters, and these were often preserved by themselves or their correspondents. This was common practice; young British men making their Grand Tours to the continent often did the same.¹⁰ Eighteenth-century British travellers to the continent, whatever their age, regarded their trips as cultural and educational processes. They were supposedly improving themselves by a means which had become fashionable. The improvement at its best consisted of imbibing the superior arts and manners of the country visited. At its least, one broadened one's knowledge of the world in a manner which, it was believed, could not be equalled by means of any formal education.¹¹ For this reason, many British visitors to the continent, of various ages and both sexes, kept private diaries of their trips, or carefully recorded their reactions in correspondence.

II

Of all colonial visitors to the metropolis, the student had most in common with the British tourist on the continent. He regarded his tour as a quest for self-improvement. Whether student or apprentice, he remained a visitor, outwith the mainstream of London life. He tended to be very self-conscious in registering the effects of his new environment on himself. He resorted more often than did other types of colonial visitors to comparisons and general observations. It is no wonder that historians describing the colonial American experience of Britain have relied heavily on student testimony.¹² It is both meaty and well preserved.

The letters and diaries of colonial students have been classed by historians alongside other colonial travel accounts in order to draw comparisons between metropolitan and colonial lifestyles. They have also been used to corroborate the impression that colonial visitors were increasingly struck by the corruption they encountered in the metropolis.¹³ Thus they have been used to gauge the colonial acculturative experience in London. But with respect to acculturation, students deserve to be put in a category of their own. Both their age and their purpose in London made them exceptionally vulnerable to the stresses of cultural adjustment. Parents recognized this, and parental concern is reflected in a long-standing colonial fear that an English education would teach their

¹⁰ See, for example, G. Rodmell, 'An Englishman's impressions of France in 1775', *Durham University Journal*, n.s., 30 (1969), p. 75n. ¹¹ Black, *The British abroad*, pp. 288–9.

¹² In particular, see Sachse, *The colonial American in Britain*. Kraus, *The Atlantic civilization*, also makes use of student material.

¹³ See, for example, Bernard Bailyn, *The ideological origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, MA, 1967), pp. 89–92, and Greene, 'Search for identity', p. 168.

youth a contempt of their birthplaces.¹⁴ The temptation to cultural cringe must have been very great for these youthful newcomers, faced with a frighteningly competitive genteel society in which their status required to be defended.

The challenges this posed to them were quickly registered in their letters home. James Allen, son of Pennsylvania Chief Justice William Allen, was admitted to the Middle Temple in 1759, along with his older brother Andrew.¹⁵ In January 1764, nearing the end of his studies, he wrote to Benjamin Chew, the attorney-general, who was a family friend:

I frequently consider what my Situation will be when I get back to America. I know the people there are apt to be suspicious of a young fellow who has been sometime abroad; & to expect him to return with a great deal of Pride & Contempt of his own Country. I hope I shall be so much on my guard as to be declared innocent of such heavy Charges. Indeed I am of Opinion that England is a much better School for Modesty & Humility than America; the Sight of so many Superiors in Rank and fortune, is apt to lessen us in our own Esteem, who do not see such things in our own Country.¹⁶

Clearly struck by the superior refinement of the metropolis, he nevertheless took care to remain ‘on his guard’ to avoid resorting to the obvious psychic refuge of a contempt for his birthplace. And his defence of his situation – that in fact London schooled a young colonial elite in humility – had a substantial foundation. It was echoed in many letters of young colonists home. John Dickinson came from Delaware in the mid-1750s to study law at the Inns of Court. A few months after arriving in London, he described to his father the demoralizing effects that the superior standards of the metropolis had on American youth. The result, commonly, was a dramatic loss of self-esteem: ‘young fellows from America coming here still aim at the respect & place they had at home, & in imitating those so greatly above them, like the frog in the fable, burst in the attempt’.¹⁷ Both Allen and Dickinson were confronted by sights that no colonial experience could prepare them for: court, bishops, aristocracy, the English institutions which simply did not exist in the colonies.¹⁸ And what better place than London to feel the full enormity of the difference?

Increasingly during the eighteenth century the English aristocracy was metamorphosing into an urban leisured class. By mid-century, many of the English aristocracy and gentry probably spent from six to nine months of the year in ‘town’. Principally, of course, this meant London, where they were seen to live ‘in the utmost extravagance’.¹⁹ A visiting American would not require

¹⁴ Lawrence A. Cremin, *American education: the colonial experience, 1607–1783* (New York, 1970), pp. 475–6.

¹⁵ C. E. A. Bedwell, ‘American Middle Templars’, *American Historical Review* (1920), p. 685.

¹⁶ James Allen to Benjamin Chew, London, 4 Jan. 1764, Chew papers, Historical Society of Pennsylvania (hereafter H.S.P.).

¹⁷ John Dickinson to Samuel Dickinson, 15 Aug. 1754, in H. Trevor Colbourn, ed., ‘A Pennsylvania farmer at the court of King George: John Dickinson’s London letters, 1754–1756’, *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 86 (1962), pp. 277–8.

¹⁸ Greene, *The intellectual construction of America*, pp. 107–9.

¹⁹ John Rule, *Albion’s people: English society, 1714–1815* (London, 1992), pp. 43, 45.

an introduction to exclusive circles to observe the ostentatious living of ‘the Great’, as the century saw the proliferation of public spaces which were accessible to ‘the swelling middle tier of society’. Members of the growing middle ranks lived in a milieu in which gentility was increasingly susceptible of a cultural definition; ‘A person could... become a gentleman, as long as he looked and behaved like one.’ Eighteenth-century English cities – with London leading the way – were arenas for ‘an unappetizing struggle for personal precedence’. In realistic terms, Englishmen of middling rank who lived in London might not feel pressured to aspire to a title or an estate, but they surely would respond to the pressure to acquire the manner of a gentleman – a worrying, intangible quality. Image-building was grounded in dress, manners, and conversational skills.²⁰

Outward display was an important badge of rank in the colonies as well. One’s posture, facial expression, dress, conversation, and, more elusive, one’s ease of bearing – the ability to seem relaxed yet elegant, genteel and yet lively in points of taste and wit – all of these traits were as much sought after in British North America as in Britain itself.²¹ After the middle of the century, in the colonies as well as in Britain, ideal genteel manners moved away from the stiffness of the first half of the century, to be replaced by an air of ‘relaxed self-assurance’.²² True gentility now required not only elegance, but an appearance of being accustomed to elegance. The word ‘ease’ was commonly applied here. Americans kept very much abreast of fashions and polite trends in the metropolis, largely through the colonial press.²³ The curriculum of colonial schools was a testimony to their determination to instil these qualities in their children. Colonial youths arrived in the metropolis with the expectation that they had been groomed for polite society.

Once in London, they were nevertheless faced with significant challenges. They had to adjust to their relatively reduced status; the American gentry were roughly equivalent to the English upper middle class.²⁴ And whatever their ostensible reasons for being in London, they understood that they were also expected to acquire metropolitan polish and contacts. This depended upon falling in with the right crowd.

Colonial students at the Inns of Court found that in this respect they were not ideally situated. James Allen wrote of that place, ‘The greatest Difficulty is getting into a good Set of Company, & I am afraid mine will never be in the Temple, for the young fellows in general appear to be a Set of Coxcombs & the Men of Sense avoid ’em on that Account.’ Of his own countrymen at the

²⁰ Peter Borsay, *The English urban renaissance: culture and society in the provincial town, 1660–1770* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 226–7, 231–2, 237–41.

²¹ Richard L. Bushman, *The refinement of America: persons, houses, cities* (New York, 1992), ch. 3.

²² Kenneth Silverman, *A cultural history of the American Revolution* (New York, 1987; first published 1976), p. 16.

²³ Michael J. Rozbicki, ‘The cultural development of the colonies’, in Jack P. Greene and J. R. Pole, eds., *The Blackwell encyclopedia of the American Revolution* (Oxford, 1991), p. 79.

²⁴ Bushman, *The refinement of America*, p. 70.

Temple, he added, ‘The Behaviour of the People of America is an Imitation of the Citizens in London, whose Character is that of a proud, selfish, unmannerly Set of People.’²⁵ Allen apparently felt that he, at least, had escaped this mistake. John Dickinson also abused the manners of the wealthy inhabitants of the City: ‘You cant conceive how the citizens are despisd at this end of the town, with respect to their politeness. Cit[izen] bears the same signification here as clown does with us, or rather worse, for it means an awk[w]ard imitator of gentility.’²⁶ Dickinson had quickly discerned that the manners which prevailed in the West End – which he described as consisting of ‘ease & freedom of behaviour with [one’s] superiors, complaisance and civility to [one’s] inferiors’, in contrast to the ‘proud manners’ and ‘stiffness’ of the citizens – were the sought-after article.²⁷ Allen, too, dissociated himself socially from the City. But Allen’s comment makes it clear that not every young colonist steered clear of the pernicious effects of City society.

Visiting colonists were perfectly aware of the difference in status between the City and the West End. Where income allowed this influenced choice of residence. For example, planter Ralph Izard and a number of other South Carolinians lived in Berners Street in the West End; New Yorker Stephen Sayre lived on fashionable Oxford Street. South Carolinian Henry Laurens resided in Westminster while in London between October 1771 and 1774. Southern planters, of course, were in many ways dependent on the City merchant. But this did not create an equality of status in their minds. Henry Laurens was supervising the education of his sons in London. He confided to a friend that he had not introduced his children to ‘my trading Friends in that City [London]’ for fear they should acquire ‘loose manners and morals’.²⁸ Young Charles Carroll of Maryland, who arrived at the Inns of Court in 1759, was advised by his father ‘not to accept too many civilities from such men [City merchants]. “It might seem to be pride not to accept now and then their Invitations,” he continued, “but do it so seldom and in such a manner as to not make yourself cheap.”’²⁹ When the two sisters of Andrew and James Allen came to London with their father in 1763, they initially lodged with their merchant contact in Cheapside, David Barclay. Brother Andrew, however, quickly arranged a house for them in ‘a rather more agreeable Part of the Town’, Golden Square in Westminster.³⁰

Despite the challenges, and the competitive, critical atmosphere in which they found themselves, some young colonists became thoroughly integrated. Andrew Allen confessed to his father’s friend that the combination of ‘[t]he Unthinkingness of a young Man, the many new & great Temptations of a London Life & I fear a Disposition not much averse to Pleasure’ had caused

²⁵ James Allen to Benjamin Chew, 12 Dec. 1764 London, Chew papers, H.S.P.

²⁶ John Dickinson to Mary Dickinson, 1 Aug. 1754, in Colbourn, ed., ‘Dickinson’s London letters’, p. 276.

²⁷ Colbourn, ed., ‘Dickinson’s London letters’, p. 269.

²⁸ Henry Laurens to George Appleby, Charlestown, SC, 2 Apr. 1771, in *Papers of Henry Laurens*, ed. Rogers, Jr, et al., VII, p. 469.

²⁹ Cited in Sachse, *Colonial American in Britain*, p. 20.

³⁰ Andrew Allen to Benjamin Chew, 2 July 1763, London, Chew papers, H.S.P.

him to neglect his studies. 'All these, I know, are by no Means sufficient to excuse an Inattention to my Studies, & yet all these Things taken together must have some Effect upon an American Novice.'³¹ Allen's apologies for lack of attention to his studies contain more than a hint of self-satisfaction at having become a 'man of pleasure'.

But not all young colonists were so self-assured. Edward Tilghman was admitted to study at the Middle Temple in June 1772. A Marylander, he was the son of Edward Tilghman, Sr, a wealthy member of the Maryland Assembly.³² Just after reaching the Temple, he wrote to his uncle in an unhappy vein that he hoped to return home next spring. '[T]he Polish certainly may be got by that time', he explained, but 'the great Difficulty will be to make good Acquaintances, I found it a difficult Matter in Philada. tis much more so here.'³³ Tilghman was shy, a serious disadvantage for one of his station. Newcomers at the Middle Temple needed to assert themselves to acquire the 'Polish' and the 'good Acquaintances' which were goals to be placed on a par with learning in acquiring an English education. Tilghman focused instead on his legal studies. In November he confessed to his uncle that he had not made much progress in acquiring 'ease':

As for my vile awkwardness, ... I am endeavouring to throw it off but am sorry to find [it?] on some Occasions too prevalent; decent fashionable Words of common Civility do not come from me as from others, all is too constrained, my very legs and Arms refuse genteel Postures, a dan[cing] master shall chasten them and unless my bad Habits are [bred in the?] Bone they shall be rooted out.³⁴

Dancing masters taught not only dancing but deportment – how to sit, stand, and enter a room.³⁵

While in London Tilghman repeatedly complained of loneliness, and asked to return home.³⁶ His letters finally prompted his father to confide to a friend, 'I am afraid patience will hardly hold out to carry him thro' the Term of 1774; if so he only loses the Advantage of the Parliament of next Winter – But I lose sight of the main Object, the polish, the Something not to be expressed, only to be acquired by mixing with the World & c & c. – I give up.'³⁷ Tilghman took seriously Edward junior's need to acquire the genteel manner that marked a gentleman – 'the main Object' of his trip to London, and the most elusive one. Tilghman's case provides an example of the isolation and loneliness which could be the lot of a colonial student. He did not resort to the characteristic defence of decrying London corruption and the shallowness of its genteel society, but others did.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Bedwell, 'American Middle Templars', p. 687.

³³ Edward Tilghman to Benjamin Chew, 10 July 1772, Chew papers.

³⁴ Edward Tilghman to Benjamin Chew, 3 Nov. 1772, Middle Temple, Chew papers, H.S.P.

³⁵ Bushman, *Refinement of America*, p. 65.

³⁶ Edward Tilghman to Benjamin Chew, London, 24 Nov. 1772, Edward Tilghman to Benjamin Chew, Middle Temple, 21 Sept. 1772, Chew papers, H.S.P.

³⁷ Edward Tilghman Sr to Benjamin Chew, 1 Jan. 1773, Chew papers, H.S.P.

Charles Carroll of Carrollton, who arrived in London in 1759 to study at the Inns of Court, had been meticulously groomed as a member of the mainstream colonial elite. He was schooled by the Jesuits, first in Maryland and then, for several years, in France. When he reached London, his father informed him that all of young Carroll's previous training had been a prelude to study there. Charles Carroll of Annapolis charged his son not only to acquire knowledge of the law, but also to gain useful contacts. He intended his son to have that essential prerequisite of an eighteenth-century American elite, the ability to negotiate his way through the power structures of the metropolis.³⁸

Carroll at first consciously joined in his father's purpose. He warned him that 'it will be more necessary that I shou'd appear in a proper genteel handsome way in my present situation than in France, as you are much more known in one country than in ye other, besides [my] frequenting company will draw on expenses'.³⁹ Nevertheless, a power struggle similar to that carried on by the Tilghmans shortly ensued. Throughout most of his stay in London, young Charles Carroll complained that he was lonely and that it was difficult to meet people. He also became critical of the emptiness of the genteel life he was supposed to emulate.

At the outset, Carroll could not escape from the awkwardness that troubled so many. 'The choice of company is the most difficult, & yet ye most important article', he wrote – adding, 'in which ye Temple appears to be deficient'.⁴⁰ Where to go, then, for company? This problem was not resolved in a hurry. A year later, he was finding polite society as inaccessible as ever, and tiresome to boot: 'the prodigious vacuum that reigns thro' the conversation of genteel company is insupportable to men of a certain stamp'.⁴¹ Carroll was not being controversial here. Other observers had noted that 'the conduct of an Englishman's day in London leaves little time for work'.⁴² Peter Borsay, describing the typical round of polite recreations, speaks of the 'endemic threat' to leisured life 'of becoming intolerably boring'.⁴³ But the threat of boredom was so much greater for a young person who joined polite society in an apprenticeship, as it were, of manners. Lord Chesterfield rather unintentionally illustrated the potential odiousness of the situation in a letter to his son:

Nothing forms a young man so much as being used to keep respectable and superior company, where a constant regard and attention is necessary. It is true, this is at first a disagreeable state of restraint; but it soon grows habitual, and consequently easy; and

³⁸ Charles Carroll of Annapolis to Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 6 Oct. 1759, in Thomas O'Brien Hanley, ed., *The Charles Carroll papers*, microfilm publication from the collection of the Maryland Historical Society (Wilmington, DE, 1971).

³⁹ Charles Carroll to his parents, London 13 Nov. 1759, in Hanley, ed., *Charles Carroll papers*.

⁴⁰ Charles Carroll to his parents, 13 Nov. 1759, in Hanley, ed., *Charles Carroll papers*.

⁴¹ Charles Carroll of Carrollton to Charles Carroll of Annapolis, 16 Sept. 1760, in Hanley, ed., *Charles Carroll papers*.

⁴² François de la Rochefoucauld, *A Frenchman in England in 1784* (London, 1995), p. 19.

⁴³ Borsay, *The English urban renaissance*, p. 142.

you are amply paid for it, by the improvement you make, and the credit it gives you... All this I went through myself, when I was of your age. I have sat hours in company, without being taken the least notice of; but then I took notice of them, and learned, in their company, how to behave myself better in the next, till by degrees I became part of the best companies myself.⁴⁴

There is no evidence that polite society soon became habitual and easy to Carroll. Ten months after his initial confession of distaste, he flatly answered his father's inquiry regarding the state of his social life: 'I am intimate with no one.'

His criticism of London society deepened. Genteel company, he complained, was expensive and a waste of time: 'I never knew an idle man that was good for anything unless to entertain company at a feast.' Like Tilghman, Carroll wanted to return home early.⁴⁵ After several years, he penned his most damning indictment of his London education. The typical student of law at the Inns of Court, he wrote, was 'soon disgusted with the difficulties and dryness of the study; the Law books are thrown aside dissipation succeeds to study, immorality to virtue; one night plunges [him] in ruin, misery, and disease'.⁴⁶ Yet he liked London, pronouncing it more enjoyable than any other place he had studied in. In December 1763, less than a year before returning to Maryland, Carroll was finally able to report that he had acquired a circle of friends.⁴⁷

Criticism, of course, ebbed and flowed as the correspondent sensed success or failure. The London career of Thomas Coombe as seen through his letters to family provides an illustration. Coombe, a Pennsylvanian, had been educated in his native colony and was a promising protégé of Provost William Smith. He arrived in London in late 1768 seeking ordination as priest in the Church of England. Although most colonists travelling to London for ordination kept the expensive stay down to a minimum, Coombe set out while still several years short of twenty-four, the canonical age for priesthood.⁴⁸ He used his prolonged stay to launch a promising career by gaining experience, polish, and connections. In fact, he became something of a celebrity for his preaching, and it is evident that quite early on he began thinking of settling there. Nevertheless, Coombe started out with the typical remarks: London, he reported to his sister, had the salutary effect of curing one of pride and making one feel one's insignificance.⁴⁹ But Coombe's diffidence did not last long. Unlike his young

⁴⁴ *The letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope, 4th earl of Chesterfield*, ed. Bonamy Dobree (6 vols., London, 1932), v, no. 1816, Chesterfield to his son, London, 5 Mar. 1752, p. 1844.

⁴⁵ Charles Carroll to his father, 15–16 July 1761, and Charles Carroll to his father, 30 Feb. 1760, 10 Apr. 1760, 10 June 1761, in Hanley, ed., *Charles Carroll papers*.

⁴⁶ Charles Carroll to his father, London, 7 Jan. 1763, in Hanley, ed., *Charles Carroll papers*.

⁴⁷ Charles Carroll to his parents, 13 Nov. 1759, and Charles Carroll to his father, 8 Dec. 1763, in Hanley, ed., *Charles Carroll papers*.

⁴⁸ Sachse, *Colonial American in Britain*, pp. 70–1, 74, 76.

⁴⁹ Thomas Coombe, Jr to Sally Coombe, London, 28 Jan. 1769, Thomas Coombe papers, H.S.P.

countrymen at the Inns of Court, he had a career to pursue. While waiting for ordination, he was connected to St Botolph's Church in Aldgate. There he was reported 'in great vogue' as a preacher, and he obtained a following in the congregation. Over the next few years, Coombe, from the vantage of London, sought posts in England and America alike. His vocation won him a public reputation, and he became friendly with Oliver Goldsmith and Benjamin West.⁵⁰ Thus, he quickly found himself in the thick of London society. He was not lonely for long; nevertheless, indictments of London life appear in his letters.

Two months after arriving in London, Coombe testified his disdain of its worldliness in defensive tones:

Having made a little Excursion into the wide World, & seen its Folly & vanity, I shall sit down calmly in a snug Parsonage-House, & laugh at the Littleness of Greatness. It is really worth a Person's while to make a voyage to London, were it only to cure him of Pride. Not long since, I had an Opportunity of viewing the noblest Sight that England can afford, the King going in state to Parliament; & having viewed it, I could not help falling into a Train of Reflections on the Vanity of human Grandeur.⁵¹

Just six months later, he wrote to sister Sally: 'I could not have imagined that I should ever have bore so warm a side to this Country, as I find I do.' By October – less than year after taking up residence – Coombe was able to report to his father that the congregation at St Botolph's were attempting to obtain a living for him. 'My return Home', he wrote in the same letter to his father, 'will always be desirable upon your & my dear Mother's account, otherwise I cannot say that I have many Inducements to make me wish for a settlement in Philadelphia. My income there would be but trifling to bring up a Family, & it is probable I might never rise higher than Assistant-Minister.' Dr Franklin was encouraging Coombe in his English career, and predicting that he would not return home for another seven years.⁵²

Over the next few years Coombe continued to officiate at St Botolph's, and to look for posts in England and America. His letters to his father were full of accounts of his successes in making contacts and building a public character.⁵³ Although the St Botolph's post went to another, Coombe by this time was setting his sights higher. Posts in his native Philadelphia, he informed his father, were unlikely to pay well; Maryland would be better. If only Lord Baltimore were in London, Coombe could approach him about a Maryland position. 'You see, my dear Father, I begin to talk like one of the World, & to attend to Consequences.' Coombe then touched upon the theme of metropolitan corruption, but corruption in the form that particularly related to him:

⁵⁰ Carl and Jessica Bridenbaugh, *Rebels and gentlemen: Philadelphia in the age of Franklin* (Westport, CT, 1978; originally published 1942), p. 108.

⁵¹ Thomas Coombe, Jr to Sally Coombe, 28 Jan. 1769, Thomas Coombe papers, H.S.P.

⁵² Thomas Coombe, Jr to Sally Coombe, 19 June 1769, and Thomas Coombe, Jr to his father, 3 Oct. 1769, Thomas Coombe papers, H.S.P.

⁵³ Thomas Coombe, Jr to his father, 6 Dec. 1769, and 3 Jan. 1770, Thomas Coombe papers, H.S.P.

There is hardly a Post of Profit in this Kingdom, however trifling, which is not either sold to the officer, or bestowed upon a Tool of the M—y, but had I any Interest with Men in Power, the most distant Hint from my Father how I might serve him, would be sufficient to make me exert every nerve in his behalf.⁵⁴

Coombe was not preoccupied with the problem of the decadence of genteel living, and its possible effects upon himself. He did not wish so much to mingle with the great as to obtain a post from one of them. He was keen to pursue a career according to the English method, which he was quick to learn; but at the same time he referred with disapproval to the ‘corrupt’ process by which one obtained such posts (though himself never hesitating to participate in it). He also occasionally expressed concern regarding the effect that process might have on himself.

Coombe’s letters are laden with frustration as his efforts to attract a patron continued to get him nowhere. That frustration expressed itself in harsh censure of a metropolis where success apparently had to be won at the price of personal honour. By April 1771, still without a post, Coombe bitterly contrasted the comfort of American clergy with that of their English brethren:

very few of the English clergy are so well off. The Crown Livings, which are the best, are only given to Tools & Sycophants, & given upon Terms unbecoming Honest Men to accept. I am daily more & more satisfied I could make my way good in England by Perseverance; but were my Temptations to reside here much greater than they are, I should not hesitate a Moment about returning to America.⁵⁵

Yet all things come to those who wait. The very next month Coombe discovered a temptation that did, after all, have the power to detain him in England. Lord Rockingham offered to make him his chaplain. Elated, Coombe still inserted his oft-repeated protest that he had no desire to be rich and great: ‘I am convinced that the best way to cure a reasonable Person’s Ambition is to let him live awhile in the Midst of it.’ He added that he had seen no one so unhappy as the great.⁵⁶

Coombe’s fellow Pennsylvanian, Thomas Ruston, had come to London under very similar circumstances several years earlier. Ruston studied medicine at Edinburgh in the early 1760s. By 1765 he was in London, completing his medical training and considering a career. Like Coombe, Ruston was educated and came from a family with sufficient means to promote his career in the metropolis, but not to provide him a life of leisure. Ruston quickly acquired a strong conviction that being wealthy was important. Money, he wrote to his father, seemed the most prized object of any to the people of Britain; and now it seemed so to Ruston as well. Public spirit was almost non-existent, and people frankly spoke of doing things only for gain. Success was not at all based on merit. The most deserving people, in Ruston’s observation, often seemed to barely scrape along in Britain. Here it was common to see ‘a Fool with a Title,

⁵⁴ Thomas Coombe, Jr to his father, 6 Dec. 1769, Thomas Coombe papers, H.S.P.

⁵⁵ Thomas Coombe, Jr to his father, 3 Apr. 1771, Thomas Coombe papers, H.S.P.

⁵⁶ Thomas Coombe, Jr to his father, 1 May 1771, Thomas Coombe papers, H.S.P.

an Knave with a Pension, & an Honest Man with a threadbare Coat'.⁵⁷ These lessons were not lost on the young Pennsylvanian. Soon after reaching London he announced to his father that he was in quest of an heiress. He hoped for no less than £10,000. Ruston's new ambition necessitated taking up residence in London. Rich heiresses were thin on the ground in Philadelphia, although he had heard tell that there were better pickings in the southern colonies. But, he cautioned his father, appearances were important in this trade. No hint of financial difficulties must be allowed to reach his acquaintance – even his father in Philadelphia should take care to be discreet, as word could cross the Atlantic. And he needed to assume a genteel lifestyle. Over the following years, Ruston repeatedly wrote home requesting his father to clear his debts. Unpaid debts, of course, would endanger his project.⁵⁸ Success was delayed, but in the end perseverance won through. In 1772 Ruston married the niece of a governor of the Bank of England.⁵⁹ He happily informed his father that he had given up medicine to work with his father-in-law, who was a stock-broker. Office hours were 11 a.m. to 3 p.m.⁶⁰

Despite the widespread Anglicization of colonial society, and particularly its elites, it is clear that when these young colonists reached London they were confronted with new behaviours, roles, and values to which they had to adjust if they were to thrive. Some, like Edward Tilghman, remained on the margins of London life, waiting to return home. Thomas Ruston, on the other hand, having once appreciated the situation, seems to have taken the London path to success with few inhibitions. All of these young men were initially overwhelmed by the high standards and competitive atmosphere of the metropolis. All worried about its effect on themselves. Where failure seemed imminent, the typical response was a defensive resort to criticism. But in making these criticisms, they were not inspired to say anything which went beyond widely held Anglo-American conventions regarding London's corruption and worldliness. When they ventured to criticize, they only asserted what was already generally accepted; London was worldly, materialistic, full of vicious temptations; fashionable society was empty, dull, wastefully expensive. They did not develop these ideas.

III

These Americans in London were also young men at the start of their public careers, who had something to prove. Could they take up their roles as social elites? Could they make a success of a budding career? These questions confronted them wherever they were; but the problems were posed particularly forcefully in the highly competitive atmosphere of the metropolis. Perhaps,

⁵⁷ Thomas Ruston to his father, 10 Mar. 1764, Thomas Ruston collection, Library of Congress.

⁵⁸ Ruston to his father, 30 Sept. 1764, 4 Feb 1767, 11 Apr. 1767, 4 July 1768, Thomas Ruston collection.

⁵⁹ A. R. Riggs, 'The colonial American medical student at Edinburgh', *University of Edinburgh Journal*, 20 (1961–2), p. 149.

⁶⁰ Ruston to his father, 5 Feb. 1772, Thomas Ruston collection.

then, the acculturative stress experienced by these American youths was age-related, and would not be felt so keenly by their elders.

When John Dickinson described the advantage of a stay in the metropolis, he did so in terms of its effect on a young person. 'It would impossible to enumerate all the benefits to be acquired in London, but it cannot be disputed that more is learnt of mankind here in a month than can be in a year in any other part of the world.' Exposure to London life accelerated maturity: 'London takes off the rawness, the prejudices of youth & ignorance.'⁶¹ London was an antidote to naivety, according to Dickinson. Its lessons could be learnt elsewhere, but not so intensively. Here Dickinson was drawing upon the idea of 'worldly experience' as a part of a young gentleman's education.⁶²

And was this experience peculiar to American youth? Any provincial, wrote Dickinson, would have the same reaction: 'I don't pretend these inconveniences are peculiar to America; if a person is brought up in a country place in England with the same indulgence, he is equally ignorant, equally boorish.'⁶³ Dickinson was describing the status crisis that afflicted colonial students newly arrived at the Inns of Court. But he was obviously seeing other young provincials, not American, going through the same process. James Boswell, in London in his early twenties, compared London to Edinburgh in similar terms: '[A] person of small fortune who has only the common views of life and would just be as well as anybody else, cannot like London', where one finds 'so many people higher than oneself'.⁶⁴ His comparison was corroborated by Virginian Walter Jones. Jones came to Edinburgh as a medical student in 1766, then completed his training in London a few years later. He reported to his brother that although in Edinburgh he associated with English and American 'Gentlemen' students, and lived 'genteely', in London he no longer felt so secure a tenure upon his status: 'A man of middle Station and a Stranger is really in a wilderness', he wrote. The pleasures of London were 'competent' only 'to men of large fortunes or men of no principles'.⁶⁵

Despite the insecurities registered in their children's letters home, elite colonial parents saw important advantages in sending them to the metropolis to complete their educations. It was a social apprenticeship for young men approaching adulthood who expected to assume a public role in life. During the century, a widespread argument in support of public education was that education at a public school was critical for youth who were designed for 'an

⁶¹ John Dickinson to his father, 25 May 1754, in Colbourn, ed., 'Dickinson's London letters', p. 269.

⁶² George C. Brauer, *The education of a gentleman: theories of gentlemanly education in England, 1660-1775* (New York, 1959), ch. 4.

⁶³ John Dickinson to his father, 15 Aug. 1754, in Colbourn, ed., 'Dickinson's London letters', p. 278.

⁶⁴ *Boswell's London journal*, ed. Frederick A. Pottle (London, 1950), 5 Dec. 1762, p. 68. Naturally Boswell excepted persons 'of imagination and feeling' like himself from this conclusion.

⁶⁵ Walter Jones to Thomas Jones, 23 July 1769, Walter Jones to Thomas Jones, Edinburgh, 15 Aug. 1766, Walter Jones to Thomas Jones, Edinburgh, 18 June 1769, Roger Jones family papers (microfilm, Library of Congress), Reels 6, 7.

active participation in the world'; at school, the parochial manners of home could be unlearned, and youthful bashfulness could be overcome.⁶⁶ Henry Laurens subscribed to this view. He advised fellow Carolinian Thomas Smith, whose fourteen-year-old son Benjamin was then studying at Philadelphia, to send the boy to Winchester, Westminster, or Eton in the following year. 'It seldom happens that a private Education qualifies a Man to Shine in Public Life', he wrote; 'Exceptions may be made against this Observation, but they are such as admit of very ready and conclusive Answers.' A youth leaving a school such as Winchester or Eton to go to 'one of the Universities, or to serve a Clerkship, in any part of G. Britain or America' may do so 'with much Advantage in hand'.⁶⁷ Benjamin Franklin suggested in similar terms that his grandson William Temple Franklin should attend Eton. Franklin was perfectly aware of the universal complaints against the schools and universities for 'the Relaxation of all Discipline' and 'the viciousness of the Youth', but he concluded that these were outweighed by the advantages of an education at Eton and Oxford.⁶⁸

If young people seemed particularly sensitive to the status crisis triggered by an encounter with London, their parents were more alert to the proximites to vice which that city afforded their sons. Young Americans had a bad reputation in London. James Allen frankly told Benjamin Chew that 'Americans are particularly remarkable for being wild & Extravagant'. Henry Laurens spoke of 'the general censure which the people here pass upon American youth'.⁶⁹ Virginian William Lee, who resided in London as agent for his family's tobacco interests, had an unpleasant experience with a 'kinsman committed to his charge, a youth of "strong & ungovern'd passions", who had "the full American Idea of extravagance & dissipation... nurtur'd by some unhappy examples & connections in London"'.⁷⁰

Stories of ruin and dissipation are not hard to find. Young Peter De Lancey of New York contracted venereal disease when he was sent to Oxford in early 1762. A family friend, writing of the circumstance, commented, 'I wish our young Folks who go Home for their Studys may not attend the dirty Coffee Houses and idle expensive Vaux Halls & ca: too much to accomplish what they are sent for. Most of them that I see have furnishd their Eyes pretty well, but the poor Brain is as naked as ever.'⁷¹ At Edinburgh, a story was circulating in

⁶⁶ Brauer, *Education of a gentleman*, pp. 218–20.

⁶⁷ Henry Laurens to Thomas Smith, Westminster, 28 Dec. 1771, in *Papers of Henry Laurens*, ed. Rogers, Jr, et al., viii, pp. 133–4.

⁶⁸ Benjamin Franklin to William Franklin, London, 14 July 1773, in *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, ed. Leonard W. Labaree and William B. Willcox (New Haven, 1959–00), xx, pp. 311–12.

⁶⁹ James Allen to Benjamin Chew, London, 12 Dec. 1764, Chew papers, H.S.P.; Henry Laurens to John Paul Grimke, Westminster, 3 Oct. 1772, in *Papers of Henry Laurens*, ed. Rogers, Jr, et al., vii, p. 490.

⁷⁰ Sachse, *Colonial American in Britain*, p. 54.

⁷¹ John Watts to Sir William Baker, New York, 11 Aug. 1764, in *The letterbook of John Watts (1762–1765)*, Collections of the New York Historical Society, 61 (1928), p. 282; see also John Watts to Sir William Baker, New York, 13 May 1763, and John Watts to Sir James Napier, New York, 9 Aug. 1764, in *Letterbook of John Watts*, pp. 142, 278.

1772 of an American student there who ‘arrived suddenly from London’ with a young lady whom he kept concealed, and whom he ‘sometimes says that he is married to, and sometimes not; but the latter is to be feared, as he is of the most fiery and ungovernable temper’. The elopement (if elopement it was) was with a young lady of respectable family.⁷²

Dubious sexual liaisons were not all that young Americans, away from the watchful eyes of parents, could get up to. Henry Laurens had to intervene to prevent a duel with swords in Hyde Park between two young South Carolinians who had been at boarding school near London. ‘It cost me almost one whole Night,’ recalled Laurens, ‘and the Walking 8 or 10 Miles and riding 12 or thereabout, in order to find out the Gentlemen and prevent it, for I never ceased my Pursuit until I got hold of Mr Brailsford and deliver’d him to his Father.’ By the time Laurens found the two, they had met on the field and been persuaded by their seconds to make it up. Laurens took the trouble to report it to the parents concerned back in Carolina, lest they hear ‘some unfavourable Report of it from the Mouth of Fame’.⁷³

American youths did not need to travel to London to become corrupted. They could just as well fall prey to temptation in colonial schools and cities. New Yorker William Livingston, writing in the mid-1750s on the establishment of a college in New York, warned that students must be required to attend divine worship twice daily, in order to be kept from ‘Scenes of Wickedness and Debauchery, which they might otherwise run into, as hereby their Absence from the College will be better detected.’ William Logan chose to educate his sons in England in order to protect them from the influence of Philadelphia’s ‘Ensnaing Youth’. Virginian Arthur Lee described Williamsburg as a ‘sink of idleness and vice’.⁷⁴ Immediately after the American Revolution, when Secretary of War Henry Knox drew up a proposal for militia training camps for America’s youth, he recommended that they be located far from America’s large cities, ‘to avoid the vices of populous places’.⁷⁵

But London was exceptional for the scale of its corruption. It was the most populous city in Europe by the mid-eighteenth century. It was twenty times the size of Philadelphia, the largest city in the American colonies.⁷⁶ It therefore posed a unique challenge because of its size, its expense, and its standards.⁷⁷ London was labelled by European visitors as ‘the wickedest city in the world

⁷² Alvin R. Riggs, ‘The colonial American medical student at Edinburgh’, *University of Edinburgh Journal*, 20 (1961–2), p. 148.

⁷³ Henry Laurens to James Laurens, Westminster, 13 May 1772, in *papers of Henry Laurens*, ed. Rogers, Jr, et al., viii, pp. 306–7.

⁷⁴ William Livingston, *The independent reflector*, ed. Milton M. Klein (Cambridge, MA, 1963), p. 202; Sachse, *Colonial American in Britain*, p. 225n.

⁷⁵ Lawrence Cress, *Citizens in arms: the army and the militia in American society to the War of 1812* (Chapel Hill, 1982), p. 91.

⁷⁶ London was twenty times the size of cities like Norwich, Bristol, Liverpool, and Philadelphia, and ten times the size of Edinburgh. Thomas L. Purvis, *Revolutionary America 1763 to 1800* (New York, 1995), p. 253.

⁷⁷ Christopher R. Friedrichs, *The early modern city, 1450–1750* (London, 1995), p. 20.

because of the largest'.⁷⁸ For some, the anonymity such a vast city afforded could be seen as an advantage. Young Boswell, enumerating its good points, included this: 'the satisfaction of pursuing whatever plan is most agreeable, without being known or looked at, is very great'.⁷⁹ Slaves brought from the West Indies and the American colonies as servants for their masters were notoriously hard to control. The problem became pervasive enough to attract the attention of Sir John Fielding in a publication of 1768.⁸⁰ Both Henry Laurens and Benjamin Franklin, who brought enslaved young manservants with them to London, complained of 'servant trouble'.⁸¹ Franklin, piqued, spoke of London as a place 'where there are so many Occasions of spoiling Servants, if they are ever so good'.⁸² Naturally the new-found freedom of Europe's largest city was appealing to those who, due to age or social status, were habitually subordinate to others. But for colonial parents, London was seen as a place where temptation was too easily encountered.

Henry Laurens had a posture of habitual anxiety with reference to the imperial capital on behalf of the children he escorted there. Three of his sons were in England in the early 1770s for their education. When he first considered sending his son John to England, he wrote: 'I hate the Thoughts of his being in, or so near London, as to be able to go there by Virtue of his own Will.' Of son Henry, he wrote, 'it is my wish that he may know no other Person for some considerable Time to come, but his Tutor and those of the Family in which he lives'. He had recently heard from a fellow South Carolinian, just returned from London, that some of the students at the Islington school he intended for his middle son, Henry jr, had been seen 'rambling the Streets of the City, in half Holy days as he call'd them'. He wrote of this with concern to Richard Clarke, the head of the school. Once in London, Laurens from time to time exerted himself to discourage the sons of his absent Carolina acquaintance from 'strolling about the Streets [of the City] or sauntering in a Coffee House'.⁸³

Such anxieties were the lot of a growing number of parents on both sides of the Atlantic. The eighteenth century had witnessed an ongoing debate on the

⁷⁸ Cited in Rosamond Bayne-Powell, *Travellers in eighteenth-century England* (London 1951), p. 167.

⁷⁹ *Boswell's London journal*, ed. Pottle 5 Dec. 1762, p. 69.

⁸⁰ M. Dorothy George, *London life in the eighteenth century* (London, 1987; first published 1925), p. 140.

⁸¹ Henry Laurens to Gabriel Manigault, Westminster, 20 Mar. 1772, and Henry Laurens to John Lewis Gervais, Westminster, 29 May 1772, in *Papers of Henry Laurens*, ed. Rogers, Jr, et al., viii, pp. 227, 353; Henry Laurens to George Appleby, Westminster, 28 Feb. 1774, in *ibid.*, ix, p. 318.

⁸² Benjamin Franklin to Deborah Franklin, London, 27 June 1760, in *Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, ed. Labaree and Willcox, ix, p. 175.

⁸³ Henry Laurens to Richard Clarke, Charlestown, 25 Aug. 1770; Henry Laurens to Thomas Corbett, Charlestown, 4 Apr. 1771; Henry Laurens to Edmund Head, Charlestown, 4 Apr. 1771; Henry Laurens to Richard Clarke, Charlestown, 6 Apr. 1771, in *Papers of Henry Laurens*, ed. Rogers, Jr, et al., vii, pp. 328, 475, 477–8, 482; Henry Laurens to Alexander Garden, Westminster, 20 Aug. 1772, in *ibid.*, viii, p. 434.

merits of public versus private education. Boarding schools were conceded, even by their advocates, to be places where children were often exposed to vicious companions and a corrupting moral environment.⁸⁴ Exclamations over the undesirable manners and lifestyles which could be acquired at Oxford, Cambridge, or any of the public schools were universal among Anglo-American parents of appropriate rank. But at some point a young gentleman had to be pushed out of the nest, and become worldly-wise. Otherwise how could he ever assume his proper public station in life?⁸⁵ This view had been expressed by Budgell in his *Spectator* No. 313 early in the century. Considering the pros and cons of private versus public education, Budgell granted the point made by so many educational theorists, that a private education was a better way to ensure the virtue of one's children; on the other hand, a public education was necessary if the child was to acquire 'manly assurance, and an early Knowledge in the Ways of the World'.⁸⁶

Thus, we read testimony of the hovering solicitude of colonial parents in their correspondence with their sons studying in London: were their sons too shy, too reticent, too bashful? Or, on the other hand, were they straying into the extravagancies and vices of cosmopolitan society? Worries of this kind had to be endured by any parent, British or American, who wished a promising son to escape the narrow horizons of a home environment and acquire the manners and knowledge essential for public life.⁸⁷ Henry Laurens, expressing his feelings on separating from his sons, identified himself with English rather than colonial parents, remarking that 'such Separation hapens every day between Parents and Children in this land of Universities and Schools'. After listing a number of his acquaintances in Britain who had sent their children to English boarding schools or abroad, he concluded, 'I consider what is the most likely Method to make my children happy in being useful to Society and I pursue that Method, in Spite of all the strong affections and Inclinations of Nature.'⁸⁸ Colonial parents sending their sons home to complete their educations had the same goals as English parents who sent their children away to school or university, and made the same assessments of the risks. The vicious qualities a boy could acquire at Eton, Winchester, or Westminster were acknowledged by parents in Britain and America; but the important role these leading public schools had to play in forming a boy for public life was also appreciated.

Travel was seen by many British and American parents as the culmination of a polite education. Chesterfield's letters to young Stanhope reveal that a son set loose to experience continental life was at least as worrying as a son sent off to public school or university. He provided Stanhope with lengthy advice on

⁸⁴ Brauer, *Education of a gentleman*, pp. 195–8.

⁸⁵ For a discussion of the debate, see John Cannon, *Aristocratic century: the peerage of eighteenth-century England* (Cambridge, 1984), ch. 2.

⁸⁶ *The Spectator*, ed. Donald F. Bond, III (Oxford, 1965), p. 133.

⁸⁷ Cannon, *Aristocratic century*, pp. 36–9, 43.

⁸⁸ Henry Laurens to Alexander Garden, Westminster, 24 May 1772, in *Papers of Henry Laurens*, ed. Rogers, VIII, pp. 326–7.

how to evade the pressure of his English peer group while abroad, styling their amusements as ‘debauchery and profligacy’. ‘I well know the general ill conduct, the indecent behaviour, and the illiberal views of my young countrymen abroad; especially wherever they are in numbers together’, he stated bluntly. If young Americans in London did not at times cut a very impressive figure, Chesterfield could wax lyrical on the contemptible qualities of their English counterparts on the continent.⁸⁹ If colonial parents were worried, since time immemorial, that native sons sent home for their education would acquire a superior attitude towards their place of birth, the same fear beset British parents who sent their children to Europe to acquire polish. Just as London was the cultural core of the British empire, Paris could be said to be the core of a European ‘republic of letters’. Returning English youths had to be admonished not to assume an air of superiority.⁹⁰ All of these parents – from the urbane Lord Chesterfield to the planters and merchants of England and her provinces – shared fears that their sons, removed from parental supervision, would capitulate to the opportunities for vanity, vice, and dissipation to which the young seemed prone. The anxiety reflected in elite colonial parents’ correspondence with their children in London is best understood in the context of this ubiquitous Anglo-American parental anxiety, rather than in the context of particular American attitudes towards the metropolis.

Of the students discussed here, two were visited while in London by parents who left records of their visits. Their testimonies provide an instructive contrast to those of their children. They suggest that for those who were accustomed to assume the dominant role in a patriarchal society, the anxiety associated with travel to the metropolis was focused on the young and subordinate. The status anxiety – the concern to acquire a proper genteel manner – the temptation aroused by the debauched living so visible in the city – and more generally, the prospect of finding oneself alienated from the simpler life of the provinces – none of this is present in the letters of these older colonial visitors in London. They commented upon metropolitan corruption, but unlike their younger countrymen, they did not worry about the effects of it on themselves.

This can be explained partly by their reasons for being in London. Most were there on business. These people were established in their respective walks of life, and when they reached London their business predetermined both this status while there and their acquaintance. They were not constrained to define themselves, as the students at the Inns of Court had been. They did not have to adjust to a new social arena, or prove to anyone (at home or in London) that

⁸⁹ *Letters of Chesterfield*, ed. Dobree, iv, no. 1639, Chesterfield to his son, London, 15 May 1749, pp. 1342–7; no. 1658, Chesterfield to his son, London, 12 Sept. 1749, pp. 1392–1406; no. 1702, Chesterfield to his son, London, 30 Apr. 1750, p. 1533; no. 1708, Chesterfield to his son, London, 5 June 1750, p. 1551.

⁹⁰ Black, *The British abroad*, pp. 297–300; *Letters of Chesterfield*, ed. Dobree, v, no. 1828, Chesterfield to his son, London, 11 May 1752; Sher and Smitten, eds., *Scotland and America in the age of the enlightenment*, p. 4; Gerald Newman, *The rise of English nationalism: a cultural history, 1740–1830* (London, 1987), pp. 42–3.

they could adopt the standards of the London urban gentry or succeed professionally in a more competitive milieu. In one respect, their letters and diaries are more comparable to the travel writings of aristocratic English visitors to the continent, who invariably had introductions to exclusive circles at court wherever they went: their testimonies were often more preoccupied with whom they were seeing than what they were seeing.⁹¹ Anyone travelling on business within the Anglo-American world in the eighteenth century was unlikely to be lonely. Letters of introduction invariably produced a round of acquaintance and invitations. Henry Laurens warned a young associate not to carry too many if he wanted to manage to get down to any business; and one of Laurens's friends travelling from South Carolina to Philadelphia requested that his Carolina friends not even mention his visit to their contacts in Philadelphia, as he wished to avoid the round of socializing that would result.⁹²

The experience of Laurens himself when he arrived in England in 1771, accompanying his three sons, was typical. The day after disembarking at Falmouth, he wrote letters to friends and business associates in Charleston, London, and Bristol, apprising them of his situation; to Felix Warley, who was handling his business while he was away, he remarked: 'You see I am writing rather quickly than deliberately. I am in a Tavern, new Friends coming in upon me, Post Chaise to hire, Children to take Care of, and not a few letters to write to different Places.'⁹³ All of this was before he reached his expectant friends in Bristol and London. Laurens, an established British merchant (as he called himself), a wealthy South Carolinian who still had relatives living in England, would hardly experience the initial isolation which comes through so clearly in the letters of youthful colonial students. If he was a provincial entering the metropolis after a long absence, he was nevertheless a very well-integrated one.

Andrew and James Allen, the young Pennsylvanians at the Inns of Court, were visited by their father William and their sisters Anne and Peggy in early 1763. Although William Allen had come to England to give his daughters a tour, as chief justice of Pennsylvania and an activist in provincial politics he quickly became involved in important political developments relating to the colonies, notably the Stamp Act. The elder Allen had attended the Middle Temple many years earlier; he therefore resumed old acquaintance upon arrival, and, as a member of the Proprietary faction, immediately claimed the acquaintance of the Penns.⁹⁴ A few months after arriving he explained to Benjamin Chew that although he was ostensibly at his leisure in England, 'I am here a very busy creature having in my peregrinations through England

⁹¹ Black, *The British abroad*, pp. 216–17.

⁹² Henry Laurens to John Hopton, Charles Town, 1 July 1771, and Henry Laurens to William Fisher, Charles Town, 24 Aug. 1769, in *Papers of Henry Laurens*, ed. Rogers, Jr, et al., vii, pp. 547, 128.

⁹³ Henry Laurens to Felix Warley, Falmouth, 10 Oct. 1771, in *ibid.*, viii, p. 6.

⁹⁴ William Allen to Benjamin Chew, London, Golden Square, 2 July 1763, in 'William Allen–Benjamin Chew correspondence, 1763–1764', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 90 (1966), p. 204.

besides meeting with half a score of my old acquaintance made so many other new ones at the several publick places that I have been at that I have done nothing but pay and receive visits for these three weeks at which time I came from Bath.' A month later, Allen wrote that he had been invited to join two clubs attended by 'top people here', whose memberships included Edmund Burke, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Garrick, and David Hume.⁹⁵ Allen had taken his daughters on a tour of the fashionable places, including Harrogate, Scarborough, York, Matlock, and Bristol. 'I have in order to satisfie my Girls curiosity taken this tour', explained Allen, writing from Bath. Now he was irked to find that his daughters were resisting leaving England at the appointed time. 'England is a bewitching place to Young Folk', he concluded. Allen himself was not bewitched; but he obligingly took his daughters to the races at York, in order to 'mingle with the men of pleasure' at what he called 'one of the grandest meetings of the Nobility and Gentry in the kingdom'.⁹⁶

His own comments on the *beau monde* which so interested his daughters were few and moderate; after almost a year in the metropolis, he commented in a letter to a friend: 'When I return I have a deal to tell you of the Politeness I might say falseness and corruption of the people here, But you will say that I am grown old and Sour, I am at least I hope so old as not [to] imitate some of them in their ways.'⁹⁷ It was not uncommon for visiting colonists to remark on the corrupt manners of London. Such reactions to the Great City were typical in England as well, and reflected a long-standing division over what constituted good breeding, whether the perfectly executed and elegant manners which one could find in the best London circles, or the slightly less refined but supposedly more genuine civility of the country gentleman.⁹⁸ But whether one saw good breeding as fundamentally a reflection of good nature or of the influence of polite company, the getting of good manners in London was considered to be a youthful preoccupation. William Allen, for example, was perfectly tolerant of his daughters' quest for high society; indeed, he abetted them in their pursuit across the English countryside of the company of the 'men of pleasure'. But he was hardly touched himself by the aspiration to measure up to London standards of gentility which motivated his daughters and sons. This anxiety was particular to the young Americans, who had to guard against the pitfalls described by students Allen and Dickinson, and (in the words of one critical New York parent) 'not turn Pretty Gentlemen as Most of their Countrymen do Before they are Men'.⁹⁹

⁹⁵ William Allen to Benjamin Chew, London, 30 Dec. 1763, and William Allen to Benjamin Chew, London, 27 Jan. 1764, in 'William Allen–Benjamin Chew correspondence', pp. 216, 220, and 221n.

⁹⁶ William Allen to Benjamin Chew, Bath, 7 Oct. 1763, in 'William Allen–Benjamin Chew correspondence', pp. 212, 210.

⁹⁷ William Allen to Benjamin Chew, London, 27 Jan. 1764, in 'William Allen–Benjamin Chew correspondence', p. 221.

⁹⁸ Brauer, *Education of a gentleman*, p. 152.

⁹⁹ Oliver De Lancey to Lady Susannah Warren, New York, 9 Jan. 1764, Gage papers in the East Sussex Record Office, G/Accn. 1201–54. De Lancey had sent his two sons Stephen and Oliver to an English boarding school; Lady Susannah was watching their progress.

The older generation of colonial visitors were thus free of the fears of their youthful counterparts at the prospect of vulgarity and isolation. Did they feel threatened by that other obvious danger of a visit to London, the temptation to debauchery which was everywhere in the ‘wickedest city in the world’? London was notorious throughout Europe for its prostitution.¹⁰⁰ Many visitors, colonial and European alike, remarked on the brazenness of the prostitutes. One can easily find references to the ‘Lewdness’ of London prostitutes in diaries and letters of visiting Americans. But if some Americans registered shock in their letters, any other reaction would be indiscrete on paper. The diary of Samuel Curwen of Massachusetts, for example, is outspoken on the subject. On one occasion Curwen recorded that he had a difficult time extricating himself from the importunities of a prostitute on the Strand. At the time, however, he was accompanied by two friends from Massachusetts who were openly amused, and who in fact urged the prostitute on.¹⁰¹ If some visiting colonists took the London prostitutes in their stride, or even availed themselves of their services, they were unlikely (with the exception of the colourful William Byrd II) to leave any written record. At any event, though colonial fathers sending their sons to this sink of sin feared for their offsprings’ morals and health, there is no evidence that they feared for their own.

IV

London, its society, high living, and vice was perhaps something maturer colonists could handle, even while they joined many Englishmen in deploring its excesses and casting doubt on its future. London was a unique place within the Anglo-American world, not only because of its size but because it was a place which seemed to contemporaries to comprehend the very worst and the very best of changing times. As the epitome of modern living – for better or for worse – its impact on English society and the empire as a whole was immeasurable. Many of its unique features, like anything that could be labelled an improvement, could be variously described as instances of progress, or as instances of the onset of corruption.¹⁰² Elite colonial Americans were perfectly aware of London’s dual image. As conveyers of metropolitan influences to the colonies, and local leaders as well, they could exploit it by variously describing themselves as urbane and Anglicized, or simple and Arcadian.¹⁰³

In the decade leading to independence, when the burgeoning political conflict with Britain was promoting the development of a counter-image of the colonies as embodying piety and virtue, the attitude of elite colonial parents

¹⁰⁰ Bayne-Powell, *Travellers in eighteenth-century England*, pp. 62–3, 167.

¹⁰¹ *The diary of Samuel Curwen*, ed. Andrew Oliver (2 vols., Cambridge, MA, 1972) 1, pp. 48–9.

¹⁰² See George, *London life in the eighteenth century*, pp. 36–7, for contemporary comments on London.

¹⁰³ Ian K. Steele, *The English Atlantic, 1675–1740: an exploration of communication and community* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 268–9.

towards the education of their sons in the metropolis appears to have been untouched. In their worries over corruption, vice, and expense – in their conviction that their children should achieve London standards of gentility and acquire the contacts, manners, and education necessary to assume their proper stations in the world – they had much in common with English parents of similar rank. It was the role of society's elites to know the world well enough to act a public part in it. Therefore, the benefits of a public education outweighed the risks.

American elites had led the way in the process of Anglicization which had occurred in the colonies since early in the century. Their leading position in colonial society was enhanced by their ability to assimilate metropolitan lifestyles. The political conflicts which began after 1763 did not change this. Instead, wealthy colonial parents continued to send their sons to the metropolis to complete their education. Their eagerness to ensure that the rising generation of colonial leaders were able to understand the social and political power structures of the metropolis was unabated throughout the period leading to independence. When colonial youth and their parents corresponded about the acquisition of metropolitan standards of education and personal refinement, the issues which were dividing mother country and colonies became irrelevant. John Dickinson, Edward Tilghman, Thomas Ruston, the Laurenses, William Temple Franklin, and Walter Jones (as well as a large number of other colonial youths who studied in London in the 1760s and 1770s: Benjamin Rush, John Morgan, and Thomas Pinckney, to name just a few) all ultimately embraced the Patriot cause. The Allens, Thomas Coombe, and Andrew De Lancey remained loyal. Yet they had in common their attitudes towards an 'English' education, its hazards, and its undeniable benefits.

Recent scholarship describing the emergence of an assertive English nationalism after mid-century has led Timothy Breen to suggest that colonial elites, responding to this newly perceived exclusiveness, felt demoted within the Anglo-American world to the level of 'second-class beings' who were regarded as inferior to Britons of similar rank.¹⁰⁴ This conforms to a long-standing depiction of the colonial presence in London in the same period as increasingly alienated in social, political, and cultural terms from the metropolitan world they encountered. Paul Langford and Pauline Maier have both depicted the colonial community in London as chiefly confined to the 'dissenters, American businessmen, and radicals who congregated to the capital, who were unrepresentative of Britain in general, and who tended to be highly politicized', notably the circle of dissenters and radical politicians who connected themselves with Wilkes.¹⁰⁵ Michael Kammen, in his study of the colonial agencies,

¹⁰⁴ Breen, 'Ideology and nationalism on the eve of the Revolution', pp. 29–30.

¹⁰⁵ Langford, 'British correspondence in the colonial press', p. 311; see also Langford, 'London and the American Revolution'; Maier, *From resistance to revolution*, ch. 8.

depicted native American agents in London after 1766 as increasingly obsessed with and alienated by the corruption they encountered there, which was seen to constitute a danger to the purity of provincial institutions and lifestyles.¹⁰⁶

But this picture of an awkward and insecure colonial presence in London, increasingly defensive of its status and socially outwith the mainstream, ill conforms with the fact that elite colonial parents of all political persuasions continued unhesitatingly to send their sons 'home' to complete their education. London was the 'School for Modesty and Humility'. Parents were complacent about the status crisis commonly experienced by colonial youths in London. They encouraged their offspring to internalize the norms of genteel London society as far as possible. They seemed to have few qualms regarding the effect this might have on their children's identities. Their advice to their sons demonstrates that they expected that an English education would enhance, not undermine, their understanding of their place in the world. This suggests volumes about what they thought that place was.

Historians have long used a core/periphery model as a framework for conceptualizing relations between the British metropolis and her provinces. Such a model suggests that those living at the peripheries of empire had a bipolar mentality toward its core, incorporating imitation and 'cultural cringe' alongside a compensatory counter-image of provincial life as purer and more virtuous.¹⁰⁷ The influence of this model is evident in previous studies of the colonial presence in London at the eve of American independence. The conflict inherent in the core-periphery mentality seems apt for a period when Britain and her colonies were themselves engaged in a conflict which impelled colonists to choose between the two loyalties. But this polarized mentality, however much it may seem to anticipate events, may obscure the complex relationship colonial elites had with the metropolitan environment during this period. An alternative conceptual framework is the pluralistic theory of acculturation, which admits the possibility of a variety of choices of adaptation. Among other options, an individual may choose to retain a positive attitude towards both the original cultural identity and the identity of the host country. Opting for one need not exclude the other.¹⁰⁸ Rather than causing greater conflict, this 'integrationist' choice of adaptation has been shown to result in the minimal degree of acculturative stress.¹⁰⁹ Such a pluralistic acculturation model enables us to conceptualize colonial elites in London as integrated individuals who felt empowered by their ability to absorb multiple identities. Although this theoretical framework obscures the dimension of conflict in the

¹⁰⁶ Kammen, *A rope of sand*, pp. 164–9.

¹⁰⁷ Ned Landsman, 'The provinces and the empire: Scotland, the American colonies and the development of British provincial identity', in Lawrence Stone, ed., *An imperial state at war: Britain from 1689 to 1815* (London and New York, 1994), p. 263.

¹⁰⁸ J. W. Berry, 'Acculturation as varieties of adaptation', in A. M. Padilla, ed., *Acculturation: theory, models and some new findings* (Boulder, CO, 1980), pp. 9–25.

¹⁰⁹ G. Dona and J. W. Berry, 'Acculturation attitudes and acculturative stress of central American refugees', *International Journal of Psychology*, 29 (1994), pp. 57–70.

Anglo-American relationship, it more accurately reflects the real complexity of the colonial elite acculturative experience in the metropolis.

The upper ranks of colonial American society may truly be said to have had a special relationship with their mother country. For them, as opposed to the generality of colonial society, the metropolis not only set standards from afar; it also permitted them to construct for themselves a special role within the empire as mediators between periphery and centre, as those who experienced the metropolis in personal terms and understood how to negotiate its cultural, financial, social and political systems. Elite status within the colonies thus rested in part not only on their ability to imitate metropolitan standards of gentility, but also on their ability to assimilate metropolitan strategies for gaining success, influence, and power.

Elite colonists – planters, merchants, lawyers, clergymen – and their wives and children were pulled to the metropolis for a variety of reasons, and in increasing numbers, during the eighteenth century. Along with some of them came their enslaved Afro-American servants. Almost every rank of American who was engaged in the ubiquitous merchant marine of the Atlantic British empire could be found in London and other British ports. As well as these, an indeterminate number of Americans of the middling sort made their ways to the imperial capital.¹¹⁰ Native Americans, too, appeared in the streets of London. But there can be no doubt that slaves, colonists of the middling sort, and native Americans were present in numbers much inferior to their proportions in the colonies themselves. The majority of American colonists in London in the two decades prior to independence were certainly the elite and the well born.

First-hand experience of the metropolis was an elite perquisite. Its refinement and its corruption did not necessarily pose a threat to the colonial gentlemen who ventured there. It was for the lower ranks of society to be characterized as naive and vulnerable to its temptations. Elite Americans did worry about the effect of London on subordinates, but not many of those they saw as their personal subordinates ever went there. In a sense, then, London was peculiarly their own; knowing it enhanced their positions within their native provinces. In the right circumstances they might emphasize it as a source of corruption,

¹¹⁰ An insight into the existence of this latter type can be seen in the London career of Benjamin Franklin. Franklin himself made his well-known first trip to the mother country at the age of eighteen, a young printer who was intent upon learning more of the trade in London (a common thing for printers to do – see Steele, *The English Atlantic*, p. 142). Franklin and his friend James Ralph travelled steerage, and arrived in London without a job and practically penniless (Benjamin Franklin, *Autobiography and other writings* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 41–3). Years later Franklin obtained a berth on a merchant ship for Ralph's Philadelphia grandson, Isaac Garrigues, who had apparently come to London in quest of a job (Benjamin Franklin to Deborah Franklin, 4 June 1765, in *Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, ed. Labaree and Willcox, xii, p. 169; Isaac Garrigues to Benjamin Franklin, Jerusalem Coffee House, 31 Jan. 1771, in *ibid.*, xviii, p. 21; Isaac Garrigue to Benjamin Franklin, New Coffee House [1762?], in *ibid.*, x, p. 186). Franklin's Boston niece, Martha Harris Johnson, emerges in his letters in 1768 and 1769, keeping shop in the English countryside (Benjamin Franklin to Jonathan Williams, London, 4 Oct. 1769, in *ibid.*, xvi, p. 212).

rather than a standard of progress; but this commonplace accusation could not characterize their more complex personal and private responses to the place. After the Revolution, American criticism of foreign education became much more vociferous. But though it may have slowed, it could not stop the pilgrimage of elite American students to London.¹¹¹ The Inns of Court remained a popular object for them throughout the century.¹¹² More than forty years after his own student days in London, Benjamin Rush wrote to his son James, who like his father before him was completing his medical studies there. In a period when London was still in financial and cultural terms a metropolis for the struggling new United States, Rush counselled his son in words which could have been written by any colonial parent: ‘That great city is an epitome of the whole world. Nine months spent in it will teach you more by your “eyes and ears” than a life spent in your native country.’¹¹³ Even after independence, London could still be seen as a place for America’s youthful elites to be schooled in a knowledge of the wider world and their place within it.

¹¹¹ Kraus, *The Atlantic civilization*, pp. 269–72.

¹¹² Bedwell, ‘American Middle Templars’; J. G. De Roulhac Hamilton, ‘Southern members of the Inns of Court’, *North Carolina Historical Review*, 10 (1933), pp. 273–86.

¹¹³ B. Rush to James Rush, Philadelphia, 1 May 1810, in *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, II: 1793–1813, ed. L. H. Butterfield (Princeton, 1951), p. 1043.

APPENDIX

The total of American youths in London during 1755–1775 cannot be known, because it includes categories such as merchant apprentices, tourists, and schoolboys. However, the figures for American student numbers at four popular British centres of learning – the Inns of Court, Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh University – corroborate the impression given by surviving correspondence that American student numbers in Britain were at least stable, and probably on the increase, during the period. As stated in the text, prior to 1761 only six Americans had studied at Edinburgh. Between 1681 and 1754, an average of 0.79 American students were admitted to the Middle Temple per annum. Between 1755 and 1775, the annual average increased to 3.1.

Year	American students in Britain*
1755	1
1756	6
1757	8
1758	8
1759	9
1760	5
1761	6
1762	8
1763	6
1764	8
1765	11
1766	3
1767	8
1768	13
1769	16
1770	9
1771	7
1772	10
1773	18
1774	6
1775	9

* The figures are for total numbers matriculating at the Inns of Court, Oxford and Cambridge for that year, or graduating from the University of Edinburgh. Figures for the Middle Temple at the Inns of Court are complete; this was the most popular of the Inns for Americans. Figures for the Inner Temple, Gray's Inn, and Lincoln's Inn are incomplete.

Sources: C. E. A. Bedwell, 'American Middle Templars', *American Historical Review* (1920), pp. 682–8; J. G. De Roulhac Hamilton, 'Southern members of the Inns of Court', *North Carolina Historical Review*, 10 (1933), pp. 273–86; Samuel Lewis, 'List of the American Graduates in medicine in the University of Edinburgh, from 1705 to 1866, with their theses', *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, 42 (1888), pp. 159–65; William Connelly, 'Colonial Americans in Oxford and Cambridge', *American Oxonian*, 29 (1942), pp. 6–17; Thomas L. Purvis, *Revolutionary America, 1763 to 1800* (New York, 1995), p. 195.