V. POPULATION OF COUNTIES AND THEIR SUBDIVISIONS.

COUNTY AREAS MADE COMPARABLE—POPULATION OF MINOR CIVIL DIVISIONS—NAMES OF TOWNS NOT RETURNED SEPARATELY AT THE FIRST CENSUS—POPULATION OF CITIES.

POPULATION OF COUNTIES.

In 1790 there were 292 counties in the area enumerated; in 1800 there were 784 counties in the same area. Of the 292 counties enumerated in 1790, however, few were even approximately the same in area as the counties bearing the same name a century later. In order, therefore, to determine what changes have occurred in county population, it is necessary first to ascertain, as accurately as possible, the 1900 areas comparable with those which existed under the same county names in 1790.¹

The population in 1900 of the counties included in the area enumerated in 1790 is presented in Table 105 (page 201), in comparison with the returns for 1790. As this adjustment has been made in connection with the classification of population by color, sex, and age, some reference to the more important facts indicated will be found in the section dealing with that classification.

The statement has frequently been made that many of the counties in the area enumerated in 1790 have decreased in population during the nineteenth century. The following analysis of county areas in the several states enumerated in 1790, according to the amount of increase or decrease, is based upon the comparable areas presented in Table 105:

---

1 The changes in most cases have been in the direction of organizing new counties from the area existing under the county name in 1790; in Maine, for example, 5 counties only had been erected in 1790, as compared with 16 in 1800. Wherever a 1790 county line passed through a town having over 500 inhabitants in 1800, estimated parts of such population were assigned to the counties on each side of the line.

For determining the changes in county areas which have occurred during the century, three general sources of information are available: (1) The statistics of the several states; (2) maps made in 1790, or sufficiently near that year to show with reasonable accuracy the counties as they were at the time; and (3) gazetteers, yearbooks, and state histories and manuals. Beginning with the Ninth Census (1870) the Federal census reports upon population have recorded the changes made in the area of counties during the decade preceding the publication of the report. This material was useful to supplement similarly detailed information for the period from 1790 to 1850, when the latter could be secured.

The statistics of the several states must be accepted as the most reliable source of information for this analysis. In cases where natural boundaries, such as rivers, bays, mountain ridges, etc., are specified as county limits, these can be readily located upon recent maps, and hence the county boundaries as they existed in 1790 can easily be determined. Such natural features bounded in whole or in part the counties of Maryland and Kentucky at the close of the eighteenth century. For these states, therefore, little evidence was required in addition to that derived from state statutes. In most instances, however, the statutes in defining county lines refer to landmarks which have long since vanished, such as "a stick and stones," or "three trees," or to the property of persons long since deceased, which can not now be easily identified. Determination of the exact location of such landmarks would have required much detailed research, involving great expense, and was obviously impracticable. Hence, in such cases it has been necessary to rely upon maps of the 1790 period and upon the secondary sources of information above mentioned.

Maps for 1790, or for years close to that date, are available for most of the states enumerated in 1790. But the best maps of the period are to some extent incorrect both in boundaries and in areas; few of them indicate the boundaries of counties, and even these sometimes proved useless on account of inaccuracy. For the states of Virginia and Georgia no maps containing the county lines could be found, and it is probable that none are in existence. It is curious that Virginia, in which the oldest settlements and the largest population existed at the First Census, should be one of the states for which such important information is entirely lacking.

Gazetteers, yearbooks, and state histories and manuals proved useful as guides and as a secondary source of information, and data thus secured were freely used as a basis for constructing county lines where more direct evidence was lacking or could not be secured without great expenditure of clerical labor. A few of the state manuals contain carefully compiled data recording all changes in the areas of counties; for example, the manual of the state of Massachusetts specifies the date of transfer of all towns or parts of towns from one county to another. But in general, publications of this character contain merely a list of the counties, with the date of formation and the county or counties from which formed. Such information proved helpful, however, because it facilitated the work of combining the 1790 counties, or parts of counties, which were formed from any county enumerated in 1790. It was also useful in verifying the boundaries shown in maps and in making clear some of the lines specified in the statutes.

For the purpose of procedure adopted, it is obvious that absolute accuracy has not been secured in the attempt to obtain comparable areas at the first and last censuses. But for the desired purpose—that of establishing a reasonable basis of comparison—the county lines, as shown in the accompanying maps and utilized in the tables, are without question sufficiently accurate.
MASSACHUSETTS, CONNECTICUT, AND RHODE ISLAND—CHANGES IN COUNTY LINES: 1790 AND 1900.

[Red lines indicate 1790 boundaries.]
NEW YORK—CHANGES IN COUNTY LINES: 1790 AND 1900.

[Red lines indicate 1790 boundaries.]
NEW JERSEY—CHANGES IN COUNTY LINES: 1790 AND 1900.

[Red lines indicate 1790 boundaries.]
PENNSYLVANIA—CHANGES IN COUNTY LINES: 1790 AND 1900.

[Red lines indicate 1790 boundaries.]
MARYLAND AND DELAWARE—CHANGES IN COUNTY LINES: 1760 AND 1900.

[Red lines indicate 1760 boundaries.]
NORTH CAROLINA AND SOUTH CAROLINA—CHANGES IN COUNTY LINES: 1790 AND 1900.

[Red lines indicate 1790 boundaries.]
GEORGIA CHANGES IN COUNTY LINES: 1790 AND 1900.

[Red lines indicate 1790 boundaries.]
KENTUCKY AND TENNESSEE—CHANGES IN COUNTY LINES: 1790 AND 1900.

[Red lines indicate 1790 boundaries.]
Upon this basis, which is obviously the only correct method of analysis, decreases are shown for only 1 county in New England (Nantucket Island), 1 in Maryland, and 8 in Virginia. In other words, of the county areas enumerated in 1790 only about 3 per cent showed a decrease during the century which has elapsed since the First Census. On the other hand, approximately three-fourths of the entire number have increased much more than 100 per cent, and about one-third showed a population increase of over 500 per cent.

One hundred and forty-eight counties in the area enumerated in 1790 reported a maximum population at some year since 1850 but prior to 1900, without having undergone any change of area sufficient to explain the lower figure. The following table shows that in the aggregate the maximum population of these counties exceeded their population in 1900 by 244,793, or 7.8 per cent. This fact is shown graphically in the map on the next page.

### Table 15.—Number of Counties in Area Enumerated in 1790 Reaching Maximum Population Prior to 1900, With the Population in 1900, and the Aggregate Maximum Population of Such Counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State or Territory</th>
<th>Number of counties</th>
<th>Population in 1800</th>
<th>Aggregate maximum population</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1890</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>564,728</td>
<td>627,906</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>216,562</td>
<td>244,193</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44,430</td>
<td>52,191</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>253,600</td>
<td>266,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35,593</td>
<td>44,643</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24,353</td>
<td>25,681</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle states</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,467,648</td>
<td>1,671,300</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>558,832</td>
<td>1,022,615</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>141,592</td>
<td>286,570</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36,762</td>
<td>39,874</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern states</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,119,694</td>
<td>1,187,688</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90,159</td>
<td>144,482</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>339,716</td>
<td>385,470</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32,703</td>
<td>36,874</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>145,861</td>
<td>153,374</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>168,134</td>
<td>170,825</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>166,944</td>
<td>186,064</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>196,098</td>
<td>216,205</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>176,465</td>
<td>186,604</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preponderance of maximum population at the Tenth Census was probably due to the fact that the agricultural prosperity of the original area of the United States reached its highest point about 1880; after that date the competition of the West in agricultural products became rapidly greater, thus increasing the problems of the eastern farmer, and offering added inducements for removal to more favored sections or for migration to cities.

The following table presents a classification of counties by specified sizes at intervals of practically half a century:

### Table 16.—Counties in the United States Grouped According to Size as Measured by Population, With Number and Proportion of Population in Each Group: 1790, 1850, and 1900.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limits of Population</th>
<th>1790 Population</th>
<th>1850 Population</th>
<th>1900 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All counties</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>3,038,125</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2,000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>326,705</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 to 5,000</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>776,720</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1,013,881</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 25,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>457,590</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 to 50,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>133,574</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 to 100,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>500,681</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and over</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97,748</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Limited to areas having organized county government. Not including the District of Columbia, cities independent of county organization, Indian reservations, the districts of Alaska, or the islands of Hawaii.
COUNTIES IN AREA ENUMERATED IN 1790, WHICH HAD LESS POPULATION IN 1900 THAN AT SOME PREVIOUS CENSUS SINCE 1860 WITHOUT CORRESPONDING CHANGE IN AREA.
The population conditions prevailing in the United States in 1790—when the two groups of counties having between 5,000 and 20,000 inhabitants included more than half of the population and two-thirds of the counties—had changed materially by 1850, and by 1900 the class which preponderated in 1790 had become comparatively insignificant. On the other hand, the group which preponderated in 1900—that having a population of 50,000 or over, which included 219 counties and two-fifths of the population—in 1790 included but 5 counties and less than 10 percent of the population.

In 1800 the area enumerated in 1790 contained 784 counties. A comparison of the population of these counties from decade to decade shows in many instances apparent decrease in inhabitants, but in a large proportion of these cases such decrease is the result of changes in county areas—the tendency, as population grew denser, being to subdivide large counties.

**POPULATION OF MINOR CIVIL DIVISIONS.**

Local organization within counties in 1790 has already been described briefly in Chapter II, in connection with the subjects of boundaries and area of the United States in 1790. Minor civil divisions (subdivisions of the counties) were returned separately at the census of 1790 for the New England states and for a portion of the Middle states, but not for any Southern state. This makes the county the smallest unit available for comparison when the entire Republic is considered.

In 1790, in all settled portions of New England, the boundaries of the towns were specified in the charters, and were well defined. It was therefore natural to expect that the enumerators and marshals would make their returns by towns. All returns were by towns, except for New London county, Conn. The summary of the marshal for Connecticut, however, did not give the population of minor civil divisions in any county.

In the Middle states, except in the more thickly settled sections, the boundaries of the minor civil divisions were less clearly defined than in New England, and more unstable. The county was the important subdivision, and doubtless many of the enumerators, in the absence of definite instructions, considered a return of the minor subdivisions of small consequence even where practicable.

All the enumerators for New York showed the population of the townships under the counties. In the Census report, however, the population of Ontario county—which included all the western portion of the state—is not shown by townships.

The 1790 schedules for New Jersey are not in existence. The marshal for New Jersey included in his summary the names of the townships in the 13 counties which composed the state, but reported the population of individual townships for only 5 counties, or scarcely more than one-third of the total number. If the enumerators in the remaining 8 counties—which were not confined to any one section of the state—were required to ascertain the population by townships, they probably succeeded in doing so with little or no difficulty. Hence the responsibility for inconsistent returns must have rested with the marshal.

Of the 21 counties in Pennsylvania in 1790, only 9 of the older settled counties were returned by townships or minor civil divisions. For 5 other counties the returns were partly by minor civil divisions and partly grouped under such phrases as "remainder of county" or "eastern (or western) portion of county." For the remaining 7 counties, which were practically unsettled, and might be termed frontier counties, the population was given for the county only, with the comment "not returned by townships."

The returns for Delaware and for all the Southern states were presented by counties only. In the South the roads were poor, even in the more thickly settled districts, and at a distance from the coast they degenerated into trails or ceased entirely, so that the geographers of that period found it difficult to construct maps which would present the physical formation with accuracy; it was not to be expected that an enumeration made under such difficulties could present accurately the population by divisions smaller than counties, even where such divisions existed. In the returns for Virginia and South Carolina the population of the most important places was appended; the returns for the District of Kentucky gave separately the population of 5 towns. Villages existed within the counties, and the boundaries of the larger villages were probably well defined. But inasmuch as they were subject to change by the local authorities at pleasure, it is probable that little importance attached to them as separate units. This is indicated by the fact that in 1790 many villages had two names, as Waltham, or Westham, in Honrico county, Va.; and also by the fact that in many cases the same village is designated by different names on different maps published about that time.

Attempts to ascertain from outside sources the names of townships and of villages or other settlements which existed in 1790 but were not reported at the First Census, made it evident that complete lists of minor civil divisions are not available for any of the Southern states. For Virginia it was possible to compile from a contemporary history a reasonably accurate list of settlements which were in existence in 1790; but the lack of such lists for other states, and the difficulty in securing information upon this subject, justify the inclusion in this publication of the following lists of minor civil divisions, which were compiled, after considerable inquiry and research, from the principal gazetteers, maps, etc., of the period, and from lists of post offices as they existed in 1796. After having been prepared with care, these lists were submitted to officials of state historical societies in Pennsylvania.
A CENTURY OF POPULATION GROWTH.

Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, respectively. Thus they have received the consideration and revision of the most competent authorities in the states considered.

No definite information exists as to the exact legal status of the 436 communities or settlements in the Southern states which possessed sufficient importance to appear in the records of the states, thus justifying inclusion below. Some of them doubtless had a municipal form of government, however small their population; others may have been townships in the geographic sense, possibly without population; still others may have been settlements without any township formation below the county.

PENNSYLVANIA.

[Those counties for which minor civil divisions are not given in the census returns, or are given in part only.]


DELAWARE.


County not specified: Cantwell's Bridge.

MARYLAND.

 Allegany county: Cumberland. Old Town.


Baltimore county: Gothic. hooked. Reisterstown.

### Maryland—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Cities/Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
A CENTURY OF POPULATION GROWTH.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Anson county: Anson C. H.
Beaufort county: Beaufort.
Bladen county: Bladen.
Brunswick county: Brunswick.
Carteret county: Carteret.
Caswell county: Caswell.
Chatham county: Chatham.
Cumberland county: Cumberland.
Dare county: Dare.
Duplin county: Duplin.
Edgecombe county: Edgecombe.
Franklin county: Franklin.
Granville county: Granville.
Hertford county: Hertford.
Hoke county: Hoke.
Horry county: Horry.
Iredell county: Iredell.
Johnston county: Johnston.
Lincoln county: Lincoln.
Martin county: Martin.
Mecklenburg county: Mecklenburg.
Montgomery county: Montgomery.
Nash county: Nash.
New Hanover county: New Hanover.
Onslow county: Onslow.
Orange county: Orange.
Pamlico county: Pamlico.
Pender county: Pender.
Perquimans county: Perquimans.
Pitt county: Pitt.
Randolph county: Randolph.
Rutherford county: Rutherford.
Sampson county: Sampson.
Shelby county: Shelby.
Stokes county: Stokes.
Surry county: Surry.
Wayne county: Wayne.
Gaston county: Gaston.
Greene county: Greene.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Abbeville county: Abbeville.
Beaufort district: Beaufort.
Berkley county: Berkeley.
Bourbon county: Bourbon.
Brevard county: Brevard.
Burlington county: Burlington.
Butler county: Butler.
Camden district: Camden.
Camden county: Camden.
Charleston district: Charleston.
Cherokee district: Cherokee.
Charleston court house: Charleston.
Chester county: Chester.
Chesapeake: Chesapeake.
Chesterfield county: Chesterfield.
Clarendon county: Clarendon.
Clayton district: Clayton.
Clayton county: Clayton.
Clemson: Clemson.
Columbus county: Columbus.
Columbia: Columbia.
Cowpens station: Cowpens.
Cowpens was established in 1783 as Cowpens; later known as Patriot. Brevard.
Crawford: Crawford.
Cumberland: Cumberland.
Cumberland court house: Cumberland.
Cumberland county: Cumberland.
Darlington: Darlington.
Dawson: Dawson.
Decatur county: Decatur.
Denton: Denton.
Dover: Dover.
Dorning: Dorning.
Dorse: Dorse.
Dover county: Dover.
Dover court house: Dover.
Dover house: Dover house.
Dover was established in 1783 as Dover.
Dover court house: Dover court house.
Dover house: Dover house.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
Dover: Dover.
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KENTUCKY—continued.

Madison county:  
Booneborough.  
Milford.  
Richmond.  
Mason county:  
Charlestown.  
Limestone.  
Lower Blue Licks.  
May’s Lick.  
Washington.  
Mercer county:  
Boiling Spring.  
Danville.  

Mercer county—Continued.  
Harrods-town.  
Warwick.  
Nelson county:  
Bairdstown.  
Beallborough.  
Hardinsburg.  
Hartford Station.  
Woodford county:  
Frankfort.  
Georgetown.  
Leestown.  
Peterburg.  

TENNESSEE.

Davidson county:  
Nashville.  
Greene county:  
Greeneville.  
Hawkins county:  
Rogersville.  
Knox county:  
Knoxville.  
Tennessee county:  
Clarkeville.

1 Now Maysville.  
2 Later Oldtown; now Harrodsburg.  
3 Now Bardstown.  
4 Now Hartford.  
5 Originally called McClelland’s Station; later Lebanon. Present name dates from 1790.  
6 Originally Tanner’s Station.

For the northern portion of the country, it is possible to present accurately the total and average population of minor civil divisions at the First and Twelfth censuses. This is done in the next tabular statement.  

A threefold increase in the number of minor civil divisions enumerated in 1900, as compared with the number enumerated in 1790, has been attended by practically a threefold increase in the population of such divisions. The average population of minor civil divisions in New England has increased more than threefold, while that of the Middle states has more than doubled. The proportionate change thus favorable to New England is explained by the fact that the population of the states in that group is much denser than elsewhere in the United States, and as the geographic area is small, and was practically all settled in 1790, the increase in the average population of minor civil divisions represents principally the effect of a moderate increase of population within a limited geographic area. In the Middle states the existence of much larger areas, portions of which were entirely unsettled in 1790, has resulted in a much smaller increase in the average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>1790</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>Per cent increase, 1790 to 1900, in number of minor civil divisions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of minor civil divisions.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Average per minor civil division.</td>
<td>Number of minor civil divisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>2,096,203</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>5,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>1,066,206</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>95,643</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>141,099</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>85,848</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>378,556</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69,852</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>297,655</td>
<td>5,641</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle states</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>1,017,087</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>3,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>184,329</td>
<td>2,009</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>423,611</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>2,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59,066</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The list of 436 minor civil divisions in the Southern states approximates, so far as it is possible at the present time to secure such information, to the actual number of towns or settlements included within the counties composing the states in question. Utilizing the figures for the Southern states thus obtained, the following results appear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE OR TERRITORY</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>1790</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>Per cent increase, 1790 to 1900, in number of minor civil divisions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of minor civil divisions.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Average per minor civil division.</td>
<td>Number of minor civil divisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern states</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1,903,532</td>
<td>4,365</td>
<td>2,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland and District of Columbia</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>319,728</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia and West Virginia</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>747,610</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>265,065</td>
<td>4,099</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>296,073</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>1,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>83,943</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>1,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72,617</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>1,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35,681</td>
<td>3,245</td>
<td>1,457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accepting the number of minor civil divisions shown for 1790 as substantially accurate, between 1790 and 1900 the number increased approximately thirtenefold. This, if it represents actual increase, results not merely from the subdivision of existing minor civil divisions, but principally from the establishment of new communities. In 1790 much of the territory included in the Southern states was a wilderness. Kentucky did not reach the dignity of statehood until two years after the census had been taken; Tennessee, then known as the Southwest Territory, was still farther from admission to the Union.

It is probable, however, that the list of minor civil divisions in the South, while fairly accurate so far as the larger settlements are concerned, is very incomplete for the smaller villages, and especially for townships and other rural subdivisions.

It will be observed that the change in average population indicated for the Southern states—a decrease from 4,365 in 1790 to 2,254 in 1900—differs widely from the change shown by the actual figures for the New England and Middle states. In the Southern states the center of activity in 1790 was the plantation, while the economic changes during the century have been continually away from the plantation and toward communities. But if the number of minor civil divisions shown for 1790 is too small, the average population for that year is correspondingly too large.

**POPULATION OF CITIES.**

In 1790 there were but 5 cities having a population of 8,000 inhabitants or more—Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Charleston. In 1900 the number of cities included within the area enumerated in 1790 and having a population of 8,000 or more was 286, an increase of more than fiftyfold. Indeed, so great has been the increase of communities of this size that Rhode Island—smallest of all the states—had more cities of 8,000 inhabitants or over in 1900 than were found in the entire Republic in 1790.

The limit of size above established for 1790 admits so many communities in 1900 that it seems best to consider this subject from a different point of view. The following table presents the population of the 47 cities in the area enumerated in 1790 which had in 1900 a population of 50,000 or more, in comparison with the population of the same places at the First Census, so far as the earlier figures are obtainable. Of these 47 cities, 39 were located in the New England and Middle states and 8 in the Southern states. The population in 1790 of 32 of these cities can be presented approximately; 5 did not exist even as independent townships in 1790, but were formed later from parts of other townships and subsequently became cities; 9 appear not to have had any population at the date of the First Census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City:</th>
<th>Population of 50,000 or over in 1900 in area covered by enumeration of 1790, by states.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POPULATION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CITY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>2,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>3,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>2,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>1,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>2,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>16,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>6,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>15,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>15,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New London</td>
<td>4,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>4,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>3,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>1,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>108,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>1,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>78,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoboken</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabethtown</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>2,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>78,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>16,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>100,326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Not returned separately. 2 Part of Chesterfield, total population 1,144. 3 Part of Charleston, total population 1,444. 4 Original city area only. 5 Formed in 1872 of parts from Fairfield and Stafford. 6 More's Gazetteer. 7 Estimated. 8 Town and precincts. 9 St. Phillips and St. Michael parishes.

It must not be overlooked, in studying tables of this character, that the results are seldom entirely comparable. In nearly all of the 47 cities included in the above table the area has changed materially since 1790, and tends to change from decade to decade, as increasing population requires an extension of municipal boundaries to meet industrial and residential requirements.

Of the 5 cities having the largest population at the First Census—Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Charleston—Charleston, the fourth
city in population in 1790, alone of the 5 has failed to maintain its importance as a center of population. The other 4 cities remained leaders in population a century later, with only two rivals—both located outside of the area enumerated in 1790. Chicago, a remote wilderness in 1790 and for nearly half a century afterwards, in 1900 exceeded in population Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore; while St. Louis, in 1790 a small frontier settlement not even within the boundaries of the United States, at the last census slightly exceeded in population Boston and Baltimore.

Although the total population of the United States increased rapidly from 1790 to 1900, the increase of the 4 early leaders in urban population—New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore—was relatively even more rapid. In 1790 their combined population was less than 100,000, forming but 2.4 per cent of the population of the Republic; in 1900 it was 5,800,748—nearly 58 times as great as in 1790—and formed 7.5 per cent of the national population, or more than three times the proportion for 1790.

The population reported under the names of these 4 cities, at the beginning and at the end of the century, can not be regarded as strictly comparable, because the limits of each have expanded so that they now include large areas which in 1790 were independent and unconnected. While principally open country at that time, these areas nevertheless supported a population which, if it had been included as urban population at the First Census, would have altered materially the totals reported in 1790. Elsewhere in these pages (see Table 21, page 84) will be found the population in 1900, classified as white and colored, for the cities of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore, computed for the areas of these cities as they existed in 1790.