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General Artemas Ward was a relatively uncelebrated figure during his lifetime. A judge, militia officer, prosperous landowner, and sometime provincial politician, Ward reached the apex of his public career when, in April 1775, the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts appointed him to command the Massachusetts forces then gathering at Cambridge to fight the British. George Washington arrived in July to take command of the newly formed Continental Army, displacing and quickly overshadowing Ward, who retired in 1777. The sickly and rather portly Ward continued in public service as a judge and Massachusetts representative in the First and Second Congresses, all the while nursing a quiet but intense dislike for Washington. His death on October 27, 1800, passed virtually unnoticed. The end

The author would like to thank William Crawford, Yonatan Eyal, Holly Izard, James Leamon, Laurel Ulrich, and the members of Professor Ulrich’s Spring 2001 Early American Social History Seminar for their valuable input into this article.


REBECCA GOETZ is a doctoral candidate in history at Harvard University.  
Copyright © 2005 by American Antiquarian Society
of Ward’s natural life, however, marked the commencement of a vigorous afterlife for his historical reputation, driven by the intense interest of his many descendants in the memory of their ancestor.

Ward’s grandson Andrew Henshaw Ward stimulated familial interest when his genealogical research in the 1820s led him to publish a history of the family’s hometown of Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, in 1847, followed by a genealogy of the family in 1851. In 1847 the Ward family brought another of Andrew’s ideas to fruition by constructing a monument in the Shrewsbury cemetery to General Ward. Andrew organized efforts among the members of his own generation to preserve General Ward’s memory, and he in effect served as the role model for later Wards. In the 1890s, Andrew’s grandniece Elizabeth, resident and guardian of the Ward family homestead, where the general lived out his days, published another history of Shrewsbury. This history also focused on the family’s role in the region and contained sections dedicated particularly to the general. The roles of genealogist and historian influenced still another Ward, this time a man who styled himself Artemas Ward of the Seventh Generation, one of the general’s great-grandsons. This Artemas commissioned a biography of General Ward (1921) and an updated genealogy of the family (1925). In addition to these literary contributions, Artemas erected further constructions of mortar and stone to the memory of his ancestor, as well as numerous plaques and paintings scattered throughout Massachusetts. Artemas, who acquired the title to the Ward homestead late in his life, bequeathed the home and a substantial endowment to Harvard University, from which funds were taken in the 1930s to raise a statue of the general in Washington, D.C. From Andrew Henshaw Ward to the Artemas Ward of a century later, the family engaged in a self-conscious and nearly continuous effort to immortalize the memory of its beloved ancestor, often using variations of the same techniques to do so: biographies, local histories, genealogies, and monuments.

1. Since there are many different Wards sharing the same name, I will refer to General Artemas Ward (1727–1800) as ‘the general’ or ‘General Ward’ and refer to his descendants by their first names to avoid confusion.
Historians have acknowledged the importance of memory—how the collective American public conceives its past, remembers it, and in turn imbues it with meaning. Included in the problem of memory is the long and mythic role of the Revolution in the American mind. Indeed, many investigations of the Revolution and its heroes pertain to their use in forming national group identities—that of mechanics’ associations, early political parties, and even a nascent sense of American-ness. As Michael Kammen puts it, 'we have highly selective memories of what we have been taught about the past ... the past may be mobilized to serve partisan purposes ... [and] history is an essential ingredient in defining national, group, and personal identity.' Yet General Artemas Ward was not an essential figure in the creation of national identity in the early Republic, nor after his death were his purportedly puritanical values marshaled to lend credence to the ideas of a political party.

Instead, remembering General Ward played a vital role in the formation of his family's identity, its conception of its place in America's past, and in the personal identities of many Ward descendants. To these ends, manifested in several varieties of public commemoration and remembrance, succeeding generations of Wards remembered the general's place in the family and in the community. The example of the Wards and their admiration for their military ancestor demonstrates that in addition to using Revolutionary-era figures to form national identities, it was also possible to use participants such as General Ward to build a sense


of family identity that was strong and lasting. In many ways, employing the general’s memory to create a feeling of family was far more important than using him to formulate a sense of national identity. The Wards are remarkable for their tenacious devotion to General Ward. They created and used the memory of their own private hero of the Revolution to form and maintain a family identity and individual personal identities.

In late December 1852, Andrew Henshaw Ward made the six-hour coach trip back to his home in Boston from his brother Thomas’s house in Shrewsbury, Massachusetts. During the ride he struck up a conversation with a fellow traveller, who told him his name was Perkins. Wrote Andrew later to his brother: ‘... I told him, upon hearing [his name] who he was! That is I told him he was a descendent of the Roxbury Perkins—he said yes but how did you know that? I replied ... that I could tell him much about his ancestors—he became wide awake and said he should see me again about them—he left me with much surprize. I really thought he conjectured I was familiar with “spiritual knocking” and had just been consulting them. ... ’5 Not every nineteenth-century traveller could recite the family trees of the people he met on his journeys, but Andrew Henshaw Ward was a special case. A lawyer and customs agent by profession, but a dedicated genealogist and amateur historian by devotion, Andrew spent his life first learning about his own family and then branching out into other families in his search for ancestors. Although he plainly did not begin his investigations with the preservation of the memory of General Artemas Ward in mind, as he worked he came to recognize that the Wards were not only among the most prominent families in Shrewsbury, but that among the Wards themselves, General Artemas was the most central figure.

5. Andrew Henshaw Ward to Thomas Walter Ward II, January 3, 1852, Ward Family Papers, American Antiquarian Society. Unless otherwise noted, all letters cited in this paper are from the American Antiquarian Society.
General Artemas Ward

Andrew did not, however, acquire his information through séances, as the perplexed Mr. Perkins might have believed. Andrew wrote his genealogies and his *History of the Town of Shrewsbury, Massachusetts* after sorting through the dusty and disorganized piles of town and family records. As his friend William Trask wrote of him: 'We are desirous of knowing something of the lives of those who reclaimed the territory of the various sections of our land from the wilderness. . . . The deficiencies of ingredients of this character our local histories . . . may have been the occasion that induced Mr. Ward to devote his leisure hours principally to genealogical researches.' While Andrew's work in local history can be situated within a larger pattern of town historians writing in Massachusetts, more than a general curiosity about New England's ancestry motivated him. Andrew's letters, published writings, and even his project to build a cemetery memorial dedicated primarily to the memory of General Artemas Ward betray more than a benign fascination with his ancestry. All of Andrew's projects involve General Ward in one way or another, whether as the centerpiece of the cemetery monument or tangentially connected with Andrew's books. Andrew's work made him the custodian of his family's memory, and through that, a builder of Ward family identity. By glorifying the general and the family's history, Andrew also built up his own identity and ego.

Born in 1784, Andrew Henshaw Ward was sixteen when Artemas died. Shortly thereafter, Andrew, as his grandfather had done earlier, matriculated at Harvard. There he would first take an undergraduate degree and then study law. Andrew followed Massachusetts politics assiduously and peppered his letters home to his father with such references, often to the neglect of his studies. Andrew was not destined for politics, however. At the completion of his studies, he left Boston and returned to his hometown of Shrewsbury, where he opened a struggling law office and in his

7. Some of these early letters are devoted almost exclusively to state level politics. See for example, Andrew Henshaw Ward to Thomas Walter Ward I, June 11, 1806.
spare time served as town clerk. While he held that position between 1821 and 1828, he took it upon himself to revise and update the town's vital records, often going door to door to examine family records to make sure he got the information right.

Andrew's fascination with local history was a relatively common one in the early nineteenth century. A paroxysm of interest in the colonial past resulted in a barrage of local histories. And Andrew's interest in history might have been encouraged by the efforts of Americans to remember the Revolution and create a revolutionary past replete with heroes, both the common and the godlike. In 1808, for example, just as Andrew finished reading law in Boston, the bones of approximately eleven thousand American Revolution prisoners of war, who had died on British prison ships near New York City and whose bodies were cast overboard to rot on the beach, were formally reinterred after a massive procession. The discovery of heroes of every stripe from the Revolution, including the now-famous Boston example of George Robert Twelves Hewes, who in the 1830s revealed himself to an adoring public as the last surviving member of the Boston Tea Party, excited general interest in the American past. The common soldier of the Revolution, largely forgotten, at that point, burst onto the public scene abruptly after the 1818 passage of the first comprehensive Pension Act. The images of the suffering common soldier, argues John Resch, became so idealized after about 1810 that revolutionary veterans in virtually all small New England towns became symbols of American virtue. In this atmosphere of remembered and reconstructed heroics, Andrew Henshaw Ward nursed his love of history. It would not take him long to make the connections between these publicly worshipped heroes and the one in his own ancestral line.

In 1829 Andrew’s law practice failed. He moved his family to Boston, where he was appointed a United States customs officer, probably through the Democratic party, of which he was an active and enthusiastic member. His heart, however, remained in Shrewsbury, and the residents of the town seemed to miss his presence as well. In 1830 the town invited him to take part in its Fourth of July observances. Andrew, uncertain that he would be able to make the trip, wrote his father and begged him to make a toast on his behalf, should he not arrive in time to do so himself: ‘As it is quite uncertain whether I can leave here I avail myself of this opportunity to send you (if you will not think it officious for me so to do) a sentimental or toast for you to give that day, if present at the table and which I have no doubt will be well received—here it is—— “The American Family—Too numerous to live without divisions—too patriotic not to yield a ready acquiescence in the will of the majority.”’11 While toasts, feasts, and oratory dominated many Fourth of July celebrations,12 this particular toast reveals much about Andrew’s character. His use of the term ‘Family’ to describe Americans connoted a sense of unity that rejected the political divisiveness of the times. But it also acknowledged the power of the concept of family in Andrew’s outlook on life. On the Fourth of July the American family celebrated a sense of shared purpose and destiny, but he might have just as easily been describing these two qualities in his own family. The Wards, too, lived with a common sense of identity that Andrew had only just begun to explore during his time reconstructing the vital records of his town. His sense of family and his sense of shared heritage, so evident in this toast that described a much larger group, affected his genealogical and historical researches as well.

The evidence suggests Andrew began his family research in earnest by the early 1830s, although not necessarily with the intention of preserving records. His family connections were already significant enough to be of interest to him, as evidenced by the time he spent in Boston and the efforts he made to maintain his connection to Shrewsbury. His dedication to the Democratic party and his active involvement in its affairs further suggest a sense of responsibility towards his community and the nation as a whole.

of writing a history or constructing a genealogy. General Ward’s son Nahum died during the Revolution, and his last surviving brother, Andrew’s father, Thomas Walter Ward, was interested in acquiring any pension money that might be available from the federal government. For information regarding Nahum’s term of service, he turned to Andrew, who lost no time in tracking down the information: ‘I have made several calls at the State House without effect (untill today) to enable me to answer your letter respecting the mili[tary] services of Nahum Ward. I now learn, that it appears of record there, that he served as Captain in Col. Wilsons Reg. Massachusetts from Jan. 1 1776 to March 6 1780—on which last namd day he died—his services are made up at $12 per month. This is all I can learn here . . . if there is any thing further that I can do in aid of ascertaining facts and having justice done, I will readily lend a hand. . . .’

For Andrew, these investigations were a way of ensuring that ‘justice’ was done; they took on a moral character as well. The discovery and respect for one’s ancestors had a moral quality that stimulated Andrew’s interests.

By the early 1840s, Andrew had moved beyond the search for ancestral justice and was deeply involved in the discovery of all his ancestors. By 1841 he was plainly gathering material and questioning his siblings and his mother about his findings. ‘I copied from the Boston records a few days since the following—“Rev’d Thomas Prince of Boston and Deborah Denny of Great Britain, now at Lester are published for marriage—Sept. 12. 1719”—Leicester is often spelled in that way on the old records.’ Andrew’s mother Elizabeth was a Denny, but apparently Andrew had not realized that branch of the family had arrived so recently from England: ‘She [Deborah Denny] had just arrived in this country and was then at her brother Daniel Denny’s on Denny Hill—she was daughter of Thomas & [woman’s name illegible] Denny of Coombs, Suffolk Co. in England—perhaps this is no news to you

---

Mother but it was to me until recently. . . . 14 This information, apparently verified as correct by Elizabeth Denny Ward, appeared in the family history portion of Andrew’s *History of the Town of Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, from Its Settlement in 1717 to 1829*, which appeared in 1847.

Indeed, the year 1847 was a deeply important one for Andrew. He not only published the book, but also oversaw the completion of a monument to his ancestors in the Shrewsbury cemetery and joined the new Boston-based group of history aficionados, the New England Historic Genealogical Society. Between his work at the Customs House, coordinating the family’s efforts to build the cemetery monument, and working on his book, he found little time to do anything else. In one moment of frustration he wrote his brother Thomas: ‘I was glad to learn the monument was about completed—I have officially had more than usual to do and my book which I must not neglect a minute, when I have time to spare, occupies me night and day; I am nearly through with it—at least I can see through. . . .’ 15 The effort of family remembrance intruded even on his sleep.

Andrew put a great deal of labor into writing the book. Although it began as a solo effort, he soon enlisted the aid and support of his parents and siblings to solicit information. He begged his brother Walter to send him old family papers: ‘I want to make perfect as I can what relates more immediately to our own ancestors . . . it is therefore that I feel anxious to take a peep at those older deeds and some other old papers you have—I shall find dates, names, places, &c. in them (when to many they would seem to contain nothing that I want) that would be useful in my enquiry and of which, if we live a few years longer you shall have a chance to see the result—’. 16 Throughout the 1840s, a bemused messenger named Temple carried baskets of Ward family records

15. Andrew Henshaw Ward to Thomas Walter Ward II, July 1, 1847.
back and forth between Shrewsbury and Boston, with Andrew frequently weighing in on his progress. 'I already have [looked at
the papers] and you will then find some things to amuse you—it is
not worth while to stand still and look on the present generation;
we do not know the generations that are to come, I feel anxious
therefore to know about them, that are past, who they were,
where they lived, what they did, when they died and at what
age. . .' Andrew's anxiety drove him to learn as much about the
past as he could, and for him that process involved a keen exam-
ination of whatever records he could put his hands on, including
the Shrewsbury Congregational Church records, and also put-
ting names and dates to the residents of Shrewsbury since English
settlers had arrived there. And there was never enough informa-
tion. Andrew enlisted his mother to help encourage his brothers,
many of them living some distance from Shrewsbury, to find and
send relevant documents to him in Boston. 'If Brothers Henry
and Walter [Thomas Walter Ward II] will collect & put together
such old letters, books, wills, memoranda of any kind as they may
chance to meet with here and there in different places about the
house relating to olden times of the family, I shall be happy to
look them over, with a view of drawing from them, as materials,
some account of the individuals therein referred to. . .' In trac-
ing the family's history, the assistance of his siblings and his
mother were indispensable. Andrew was more the coordinator of
a massive group effort to trace the family's ancestry than a lonely
scholar shut up with his books.

Public reactions to the publication of the town history in 1847
were satisfyingly positive; Andrew reported to his sister Sarah
that 'my book is out and sells here very quickly—price $2.00.'
The organization of the book followed the formula of countless
other town histories by opening with an ink drawing of a major
local figure, in this instance, General Artemas Ward, and from

18. Andrew Henshaw Ward to Elizabeth Denny Ward, October 5, 1841, Artemas
Ward Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.
19. Andrew Henshaw Ward to Sarah Henshaw Ward Putnam, October 21, 1847.
there plunging into the details of land deeds and the history of the Congregational Church (which Andrew dubs ‘An Ecclesiastical History’), quoting frequently and extensively from various town records and family papers in the process. He lifted an entire section of his book from Levi Lincoln’s *History of Worcester* in order to describe the impact of Shays’ Rebellion on Shrewsbury and the surrounding countryside. But over half of the volume’s 508 pages are occupied by an extensive genealogical registry of all the families of Shrewsbury, describing origins and occupations and dates of birth and death. Andrew clearly believed this was the most important part of his book. Writing in the introduction, he asked his readers: ‘Who has not a desire to know something of the people of a town, as well as its location, its ponds, hills and natural advantages? Who they were, and who their ancestors, that were here before us, and have long since departed? Who they were, that laid the foundations, religious, political, and social, on which we are raising superstructures? Who they were, that commenced, under great privations and dangers, what we are now enjoying in abundance and without molestation? Is there not a spirit in man that yearns ... [to know from] whence he came, with whom he was connected in the tenderest ties of family relation, when he died, and whom he left to uphold his name? Perhaps his ancestor!’ Andrew’s own drive to know and understand the answers to these questions led him to investigate the history of every family he could identify in Shrewsbury, and to imbue that knowledge with a sense of ancestral obligation. In Andrew’s mind, his ancestors and the town’s ancestors had guaranteed the lives and cultures of their descendants and therefore deserved the recognition genealogy afforded them. And among these ancestors, none was more important to both the Ward family and the town than General Artemas Ward. What is most fascinating about the book, then, is the general’s representation in Andrew’s hands.

20. Andrew Henshaw Ward, *History of the Town of Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, from Its Settlement in 1717 to 1849, with other Matters Relating Thereto not Before Published, including an Extensive Family Register* (Boston: Samuel G. Drake, 1847).
The frontispiece of the book is a pen-and-ink drawing of General Ward smiling benignly upon his posterity (fig. 1). By placing the picture there, Andrew immediately made the point that although General Ward had died, he was clearly the town’s premier resident. The book recounts the general’s early service as town clerk and holder of various other town offices, including tax assessor, a frequent representative to the Massachusetts General Court, and later, moderator of the town meeting.22 These offices were cited as indications of the importance and prestige of the Wards as a family, but they also demonstrate General Ward’s commitment to his own small community. In addition to the portrait of General Artemas Ward, he is the subject of a biographical appendix. Somewhat ruefully, Andrew noted that ‘[b]iographical notices by descendants of the ancestors are not uncommon, and perhaps pardonable and justified by the public, inasmuch as they are supposed to be in possession . . . of documentary papers illustrative of the character and services of him, of whom they speak.’23 The ‘documentary papers’ Andrew mentioned here are undoubtedly the Ward papers that his brother sent to him in Boston. The biography consists mostly of those official papers that were then in possession of the Ward family to illustrate General Ward’s role in the Seven Years’ War and the American Revolution, concluding with the lengthy epitaph on the new cemetery monument.24 In writing the biographical sketch of the general, Andrew made his purpose perfectly clear, especially when he wrote glowingly of the general’s role in the Revolutionary War: ‘Many interesting particulars of that wonderful event are lost beyond recovery; of these that remain, many never found their way to the public; they, too, in little time, unless preserved by the aid of the press, will pass into the receptacle of things lost upon earth. To gather them up and thus preserve them must not be neglected.”25 In other words, the

25. Ward, History of the Town of Shrewsbury, 495.
knowledge of the general's heroic deeds should not be lost to future generations, and that is why Andrew wrote his book to praise Shrewsbury's ancestors in general, and his ancestor in particular. General Ward's appearances in the book come in two forms: the purely historical, derived from his letters, orderly books, diaries,
and other official papers; and Andrew's memories, in which he testified to the grandfather's deeds through family oral tradition and his own reminiscences. To that end, Andrew could quote long passages from the general's papers and also insert his own memories of the general without seeing a significant difference in the qualities of the two sources. This is especially true in the case of the Battle of Bunker Hill. General Ward commanded the army on that 'heroic' day that later critics denounced as a tactical disaster. Andrew wrote, 'Some things connected with that event [Bunker Hill] I well remember to have heard my grandfather, General Ward, then commanding at Cambridge, relate, in conversation with his neighbors, in the latter part of his life.' On the basis of these conversations, Andrew endeavored to defend his grandfather and justify his actions. The *History of the Town of Shrewsbury* then becomes a curious intermingling of hard historical documents and the memory of serious conversations Andrew heard as a boy between the grandfather he revered and his neighbors. Such memories are undoubtedly powerful, and as Andrew committed them to paper he not only ensured their immortality but also placed the general on a Ward ancestral pedestal, where he remained for successive generations.

The act of writing about Shrewsbury families spurred Andrew's interest in his own family, and so the complete Ward genealogy project was born. Andrew shared his passion to know his ancestors with his family, and he fully expected that they would help him. He enlisted the support of his sister Sarah, then staying with distant relatives in Connecticut. 'I wish you could obtain for me the names of Aunt Tracys children and whom and when they were married,' he wrote to her. '[T]heir childrens names when born, married, died etc—when births cannot be learnt, the ages at death are more desirable... ' On other occasions he sent 'Brother Walter' to look for information. Andrew wrote to ask about one distant relative: 'Benjamin Ward left one child, a daughter—I never heard her name but was told sometime since

that she was about to be married to the Minister of Phillipston—will you learn her name, and if married inform me her name and that of her husband and when they were married?

Even General Ward contributed to the effort, albeit from beyond the grave. In our Grandfather’s [General Ward’s] record book of his doings as a Magistrate one as I remember of having seen when I had it here, records of marriages—I did not then contemplate doing what I now am, so did not copy them—I now desire them very much—if you send me the book by Temple I will copy them and return it—or if more agreeable to you, if you have time to copy them and send them to me, it will do equally as well—but I do not wish to trouble you to copy them without it is properly convenient.

Andrew wrote to his brother on the subject of his genealogy: ‘I am as much confined as ever—I have been bringing up a large family—several thousands in it—it will take me a little time yet, before I get them all settled in the world—after I have done that for them, I hope to go abroad more than I have of late, and then you will see me at Shrews. [Shrewsbury].’ Andrew might have been ‘bringing up’ his large family, but he certainly did not do it without the help of other family members, who also must have had a certain amount of interest in genealogy and in remembering General Ward.

The genealogy begins with the same image of the family patriarch, General Artemas Ward, as in the town history. While most of the Ward ancestors received only a paragraph or so of attention, General Ward got three pages. After recounting his service in the Seven Years’ War, Andrew noted that he was ‘[f]earless in speech and resolute in manner, he boldly denounced such Parliamentary measures as encroached on the rights of the Colonies, and which the Governors, if they did not recommend, at least sought to enforce in offensive language and by arbitrary means.’

27. Andrew Henshaw Ward to Thomas Walter Ward II, April 5, 1850.
28. Andrew Henshaw Ward to Thomas Walter Ward II, April 15, 1848.
This eloquent defense of his character put General Ward at the head of the family, an example for all his scions in virtue and in deed. As the Ward family spread beyond Shrewsbury into Connecticut and Ohio, the genealogy brought it together and united it under the general, who served as its role model.

Both of Andrew's books were published under the aegis of the New England Historic Genealogical Society (NEHGS). Andrew was one of its founding members, joining as soon as the Massachusetts State Legislature had approved its formation in 1845. This society, like many other historical associations that sprang up in the wake of the Revolution, was founded by well-to-do Boston men, who 'wanted a place to discuss New England history, American traditions, and their own family histories.' To that end, a library was established to collect public documents from Massachusetts towns and even census data as it was released by the federal government. Although it would be anachronistic to say that Andrew began his commemorative projects because of his membership in the society (his interest and research had begun as much as twenty years earlier), the NEHGS did provide an outlet for an increasingly popular impulse in American society: people were celebrating their pasts in an unprecedented fashion. As one anonymous commentator in the society's publication, the New England Historic and Genealogical Register, noted, 'The mental and physical qualities [of our ancestors] are handed down . . . generic seeds of those virtues, and that nobility of soul in the parents of ancestors.' In other words, the positive qualities of one's ancestors could be passed down, generation to generation, making it important to identify virtues in ancestors and describe them for posterity. Andrew's identification with this mission explains his obsession not only with knowing his ancestors but with understanding their personalities as well. In Andrew's hands General

32. Untitled article by an unspecified author in the *New England Historic Genealogical Register* 16 (1862): 119–20. Most articles were anonymous and untitled in the early issues of the Register.
Ward then became the ultimate Ward, the one whose virtues Andrew so lovingly described in his books as morals that all successful Wards should emulate.

Andrew’s last and perhaps greatest contribution to family identity through the memorialization of General Ward came in the form of his commitment to the construction of a monument to deceased Wards in the Shrewsbury cemetery. Although the NEHGS advertised only an interest in gathering information about cemetery memorials, the Ward family actually built one, completed in 1847. The same cooperative spirit that manifested itself in Andrew’s book projects infused the erection of the monument at the Ward family plot in Shrewsbury. Planning for it had begun at least by early 1846, and by June of that same year the building project involved members of the Ward clan from Connecticut to Ohio. When it was finally completed in 1847, it had cost the family eight hundred dollars—a sizable sum—but in the form of its construction it allowed space for many family members to be immortalized in stone. Reminiscent of a Greek temple without columns, the monument resembles a small mausoleum with a square roof, about eight feet high (fig. 2). The outside edge of each stone was available for engraving on the north, south, and west sides. Andrew took advantage of this space to memorialize two of his own deceased children by asking his brother to arrange for their names and vital dates to be engraved on the monument when convenient.

The east side of the monument greeted the rising sun with a long-winded memorial tribute to General Artemas Ward. Although it is too weathered to be read easily any longer, Andrew,

---

34. The first mention of the monument in the family letters is Andrew Henshaw Ward to Thomas Walter Ward II, April 27, 1846, although from this correspondence it is evident that the subject had been discussed in person at a much earlier date. In June, Andrew listed for Thomas all the family members interested in contributing; Andrew Henshaw Ward to Thomas Walter Ward II, June 30, 1846.
35. See receipts in the Ward Family Cemetery Records, American Antiquarian Society. Undated correspondence in this box also charts the logistical difficulties of first getting the siblings to agree on a design and then retaining reliable contractors to do the work.
who composed the inscription, recorded it in his genealogy: 'Major Genl Artemas Ward of the Revolution—H. U. [Harvard University] 1748—1762 a Justice & 1776 Chief Justice C C Pleas [Court of Common Pleas] for the County of Worcester—1758 a Major in the Expedition against Canada—1759 appointed Colo—1766 his commission as Colo revoked for his inflexible opposition to arbitrary power, whereupon he informed the Royal Governor, that he had been twice honored—1768 chosen one of the Executive Council and by the same Royal Governor, and for the same reason, negated and deprived of a seal by that Board—1775 appointed to the command of the American Army—1779
appointed a Member of the Continental Congress and under the Federal Government repeatedly elected a Member—17[illegible numbers] appointed Judge of Probate for the Co of Worcester—16 years a Representative in the Legislature and 1786 Speaker of the House of Reps—Firmness of mind and integrity of purpose were characteristic of his whole life, to that he was never swayed by the applause or censure of man, but ever acted under a deep sense of duty to his Country & accountability to his God—long will his memory be precious among friends of liberty and religion.’37 This inscription listed all of General Ward’s professional accomplishments, setting him firmly in the context of his community. Four bodies were reinterred within the walls of the monument, including General Ward himself.38 The monument memorializes the General while simultaneously representing him as the source of his family’s virtues.

Under Andrew Henshaw Ward’s leadership, the Ward family could now remember General Artemas Ward in history, in genealogy, and in stone. Part of the motivation in pursuing these projects was the commemoration of many Ward ancestors and the town they lived in, but for Andrew the general epitomized what it meant to be both a Ward and a citizen of Shrewsbury. The virtues Andrew assigned to General Ward were inculcated in succeeding generations of Wards, who took up remembrance of General Ward in old and new ways.

The cemetery monument clearly stuck in the imaginations of later Ward descendants. Elizabeth Ward, in her book *Old Times in Shrewsbury, Massachusetts*, devoted a page to a photograph of

38. ‘Receipt for Reburial’ in the Ward Family Cemetery Records, American Antiquarian Society. The receipt does not specify whose bodies were reburied. While it might no longer be customary to construct a memorial in a cemetery, there is some evidence to suggest that burial and symbolic reburial were popular methods of remembrance in the early nineteenth century, just as these rituals have been important in some twentieth-century examples, such as the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington National Cemetery. See Cray, ‘Commemorating the Prison Ship Dead,’ 565–90, and his unpublished conference paper ‘Militarism and the Politics of Sepulture,’ New England Historical Association, Spring 2001 Conference, April 21, 2001.
Indeed, this book, published in 1892, carried on the tradition of Ward family history writing, with its lyrical and romanticized vision of the past. Unlike Andrew Henshaw Ward's town history, Elizabeth's effort relies not on official documents and family papers, but on objects such as chairs and swords and family stories passed from generation to generation to tell the story of Shrewsbury and of the Wards. Like many female antiquarians of the late nineteenth century, Elizabeth focused on 'ancient' objects in order to formulate a version of the distant past that amplified the virtues and roles of ancestors whose participation in the Revolution had contributed to the formation of the nation. Elizabeth did not have the benefit of knowing General Ward, as Andrew had, and with temporal distance came a much more romanticized version of events. She wrote most eloquently on the first page of her book: 'There are moments in history which shine out brightly through the centuries, and to us, who are looking back into the dimness of the past to catch every ray of light that can show us more of the lives of those who came before us, they are full of the most intense interest.'

Elizabeth recounts one story in which General Ward's young son, Thomas Walter Ward I, accompanied by another youthful companion, allegedly arrived in Cambridge in the midst of the Bunker Hill battle to visit his father. The general's stern disapproval 'settled the matter ... and so these sons of soldiers, who were brought up to obey, turned their backs on the camp . . . and set their faces homeward.' This charming anecdote, substantiated only by 'tradition' is one of many in a chapter about Shrewsbury during the American Revolution—a chapter populated almost exclusively by General Artemas Ward. She noted his patriotism and sense of duty, for it was from his 'humble dwelling'
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in Shrewsbury that Artemas Ward went forth 'to take an active and prominent part in the political affairs of our country. . . .' 43 To a certain extent Elizabeth continued the earlier family habit of emphasizing General Ward's local origins: although he was involved in the political affairs of 'our country,' Shrewsbury and his Massachusetts commission were the context for discussion of his responsibilities during the Revolution. It should be noted, however, that she devoted almost as many pages to discussing General Ward's involvement in Shays' Rebellion as to the war itself.

Elizabeth had a compelling reason for spending so much time describing General Artemas Ward. During the late nineteenth century, knowledge of the general and his reputation waned. Although the years after the 1876 centennial celebration were marked with increasingly common tributes to colonial lifestyles and figures associated with the Revolution, Boston clergyman and noted travel writer Edward Everett Hale remarked in 1881: 'Today, if you should ask ten Boston men "Who was Artemas Ward?" nine would say he was an amusing showman.' 44 The Reverend Mr. Hale seemed dismayed that most Bostonians associated the name 'Artemas Ward' not with the first commander of the Massachusetts troops during the Revolution, a name understandably imbued with historical significance, but with a noted post-Civil War comedian. In light of this universal ignorance and the family's traditional glowing remembrance of the general, Elizabeth would not have let a negative impression of him take hold, as it threatened to do in the 1880s. The Reverend George Allen, a minister in Shrewsbury in the 1820s and 1830s, wrote in his posthumously published Reminiscences that 'he [General Artemas Ward] had no command of language—was hesitating in his speech' and that General Ward's famous address to the rebels during Shays' Rebellion was 'purely fictitious. Indeed, the General.
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was incapable of such an effort.' Moreover, General Ward 'often expressed himself in an uncouth manner, both in speaking and in writing.' These Reminiscences, published in Worcester in 1883, undoubtedly started the rumor that Elizabeth Ward noted in her book: 'There has arisen a story in late years . . . that [General Ward] replied to the challenge of the bayonets [during Shays’ Rebellion] with a profane curse.'

Such a charge was intolerable, and Elizabeth Ward refuted it with tales of her ancestor’s bravery during an incident in which Shaysites gathered in Worcester in an attempt to close the Court of Common Pleas, of which General Ward was judge: ‘Though Artemas Ward of Shrewsbury had been much in public life, he was a man usually of slow and hesitating speech, had rarely taken part in debates and had never been accounted an orator. As soon as he had looked his audience in the face there seems to have come over him some inspiration, and with great fluency, fervor, and eloquence he forthwith proceeded to reason with the people, whose grievances he did not deny, upon their mistaken method of relief . . . only by tradition has any word of what he said survived . . . but more than anything he did say, or could say—more than anything the greatest orators could have said—was the dauntless courage and dignity of his conduct as a magistrate, of which to find historical parallel you would have to make a far research.’ It is unlikely that Allen knew any better than Elizabeth Ward what Artemas Ward’s actual conduct had been—he was not yet born at the time of the rebellion and was only eight years old when the general died. And there is evidence to suggest that he could have made up the more sensational details he related about General Ward’s cursing. Allen left Shrewsbury Congregational Church under a cloud of unspecified suspicions in 1840, but even earlier he had crossed legal swords with another member of the Ward clan, Henry Dana, who sued him for
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slander. Allen, then, had reason to cast malicious aspersions on General Artemas Ward's reputation. Elizabeth Ward felt a threat to the virtue of her ancestor in an age that revered the colonial past to surprising extremes. Despite the nature of his departure, Allen was a locally known figure, whose negative opinions of the general were likely to carry weight. Certainly one of Elizabeth's motives in writing her history was to rescue General Ward, whose home she lived in, from the danger of local slander. To that end, Elizabeth also educated her two nieces, Florence and Clara Ward, in the history of the house and its objects, and their significance to the history of General Ward. When Elizabeth wrote her history, it was in the context of a Ward tradition begun by Andrew Henshaw Ward. Although she emphasized different aspects of General Ward's life—his home and his possessions—she also dedicated herself to the preservation of a family identity by caring for these tangible items as well as for the general's reputation. Unmarried and without children, she became custodian of Ward family memory and identity.

Elizabeth's nieces, Florence and Clara, remained in the house after their aunt's death; careful curators of its contents, they gave tours to travellers passing through the town. In 1905 the general's great-grandson Artemas acquired the title to the house and built a smaller residence behind it to shelter the two elderly sisters.

This Artemas, by styling himself as 'Artemas Ward of the Seventh Generation,' proclaimed his relationship not only to the general but also to the 'pioneer' family that arrived in Massachusetts Bay in the 1630s. For this Artemas, the further back he could trace his roots, the better. Rather than do the work of investigating his family's history himself, he hired a researcher, Charles Martyn, to do it for him. Martyn remarked of Artemas that 'from his boyhood onward Mr. Ward had felt a strong impulse to rectify these conditions [neglect of his ancestors], and an earnest desire that the family should "find itself"—that the honors and distinctions
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earned by its members should be the common possession of all instead of being known to only a few.’ With his money, he set about doing what he termed a ‘restoration’ of General Artemas Ward, but which in actuality constituted a reinvention of what the general symbolized.

In 1918 Artemas erected the General Artemas Ward Memorial Entrance to the Shrewsbury Cemetery, using the tombstones that once stood over the graves of the general and his wife. Artemas had discovered them languishing in the barn of the Ward homestead, where they had been placed after the erection of the cemetery monument in 1847. Shortly thereafter, Artemas placed portraits of the general in the Old State House and the New State House in Boston and in the Worcester County Courthouse. He purchased and installed memorial tablets for the Shrewsbury Congregational Church and the New England Historic Genealogical Society (of which, like Andrew Henshaw Ward, he was an enthusiastic member). Lamenting the lack of visibility of the Wards’ earliest ancestors, Artemas restored the Marlborough graves of William and Elizabeth Ward, the first Wards in Massachusetts, and erected a monument to them there. Then in 1924 he dedicated the Artemas Ward Annex of the Shrewsbury Public Library, to which he donated his collection of colonial memorabilia. Shortly afterward a new elementary school built in Shrewsbury was named after the general. Artemas purchased the homestead specifically for Florence and Clara to operate as a historic house museum.

A few interesting patterns can be seen in the course of Artemas’s contributions to family memory. Most fascinating of all is his insistence on using old materials to construct something with a new meaning, a tendency that historian Karal Marling notes was a feature of the colonial revival movement: ‘Old buildings made new again in the late nineteenth century commemorated the deeds of America’s ancestors.’ Artemas commemorated his ancestors by
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having the discarded headstones of General Ward and his wife
imbedded in granite at the entrance to the Mountainview Ceme-
tery and by restoring the tombstones of his great-grandparents
William and Sarah Ward. These were recarved, set in concrete to
prevent further deterioration, and a plaque was attached honor-
ing them as the ‘Great-Grandparents of the First Commander of
the American Revolution.’ Artemas used the old identities of
long-dead colonial figures to create new identities, ones that were
appropriate to his own cultural goals. As a businessman who had
made his fortune in advertising,52 he combined his wealth with
his ancestry to form his own personal identity. While Artemas
wished that his family’s history ‘should be the common posses-
sion of all,’ the result of his commemoration was to make General
Ward his own private possession.

Artemas used the same media his predecessors had employed:
history, genealogy, and monuments in stone—but with a new
twist. He commissioned a comprehensive biography—one that
was supposed to be historically accurate in all points—and also
commissioned a new, updated genealogy of the family. Earlier
‘biographicals,’ as Andrew and Elizabeth called them, were
clearly inadequate; to emphasize his own importance and success,
Artemas had to produce his own version. The biography that he
commissioned makes for the first time the argument that General
Artemas Ward was the ‘First Commander-in-Chief of the Ameri-
can Revolution.’ Earlier Wards had not made that distinction,
and with good reason. Andrew Henshaw Ward wrote that Gen-
eral Ward’s commission was from Massachusetts and gave him
authority to command only its troops. Elizabeth Ward reiterated
that point by noting that Ward’s commission from the Massachu-
setts Provincial Congress ‘did not authorize him to command the
forces raised in other Colonies, of which large numbers were
daily arriving in Cambridge.’53 By most accounts Ward had only
nominal control over troops arriving from other colonies—those
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from Pennsylvania, Virginia, New York, and New Hampshire. To call him the ‘First Commander,’ then, is something of a misnomer. Yet by naming him the first, Artemas attached a new prominence and importance to General Ward’s military service, one that sought to move him out from behind the enormous shadow of George Washington and pave the way for national recognition as a first-rate hero of the Revolution. In place of the Shrewsbury gentleman who became the commander of Massachusetts forces, Artemas’s reinvention of the general made him a player of national importance, one who might even be said to have been a Founding Father of sorts. Artemas’s form of reinvention was consistent with the ‘colonial revival,’ a general cultural force dominating popular historical memory in the early twentieth century in which the attainments of revolutionary and colonial ancestors were praised as the forerunners of modern achievements.

The new Ward biography also sought to establish a reputation of military genius for the general. Martyn, who had gathered all the general’s papers, dedicated several chapters to the first months of the Revolutionary War in which Ward was portrayed as a military mover and shaker in a way that previous biographical writing about him had not done. One chapter, tellingly titled ‘Criticisms of Ward as Commander-in-Chief,’ lists and reflects every instance in which a historian could be construed as impugning the general’s reputation. Martyn singles out George Bancroft, accusing him of having ‘sacrificed historical accuracy to the zest of portraying a special viewpoint and nullified the value of his great historical labors by incorrectness of statement or quotation—but that fact has not saved Ward’s reputation from being cruelly wounded.’ To prove this point, Martyn cites Bancroft as ‘promulgat[ing] the theory that Ward was incompetent as commander-in-chief.’ A quick examination of the passage in question, however, reveals that Bancroft barely mentioned Ward,

except to observe in passing that he had been ‘wise’ to resist relieving the besieged American forces on Bunker Hill. In fact, he had not even wanted to attempt to seize the hill in the first place. In this case it is plain that Martyn stretched the meaning of Bancroft’s brief interpretation of General Ward’s tactical abilities to the breaking point. But he had a reason for doing so. By ravaging the opinion of a well-known historian, Martyn furthered Artemas’s goal of making the general a nationally respectable figure with whom the family and Artemas could personally identify. The updated genealogy, too, strove to include more members of the Ward pantheon.

After his death, Artemas Ward of the Seventh Generation left a sizable bequest to Harvard University. It included five million dollars and title to the Ward family homestead, with a stipulation that the money be used to maintain the homestead as a national memorial museum. Some of the funds were to be used to further the reputation of General Ward, which Harvard chose to accomplish by building a statue of the general in Washington, D.C. Leaving the money to Harvard was a clever choice, for it involved the nation’s most prestigious university in a commemoration project to heighten General Ward’s national profile and that of the family.

Florence Ward was still a recognized expert on the house and its contents related to Artemas, and she contributed her expertise to the commemorative project. After the statue had been commissioned to the well-known Chicago sculptor Leonard Crunelle, the treasurer of Harvard University wrote to Florence instructing her to help Crunelle with any questions he might have about General Ward’s appearance and his belongings: ‘On his [Crunelle’s] way back from Chicago he plans to stop at the Homestead. I told him I should like to have him look at General Ward’s military sash and at anything else that you could point out
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as definitely identified with the General. Mr. Crunelle may want to have the sash and possibly some other things shipped to his studio in Chicago for use in making the model. I told him to make a list of anything he wanted and send it to me. I will then give you instructions about shipment.\textsuperscript{58}

The purpose of the statue in Washington, as was noted at its unveiling by Charles Warren, was to give the ‘gift of a monument of a national hero to the people of the United States from their oldest University.’\textsuperscript{59} Indeed, Harvard went through a great deal of effort to carry out Artemas’s wishes about the matter. In July 1931, university officials instructed Crunelle to produce ‘the Artemas Ward Memorial consisting of a bronze portrait statue on a granite pedestal with allegorical reliefs (to be erected in Washington D.C. by authority of Act of Congress approved 21 May 1928).’\textsuperscript{60} Crunelle was quite well known, having produced a statue of Abraham Lincoln as a soldier in the Black Hawk War for Springfield, Illinois, and another of Sacagawea and her son for the grounds of the North Dakota capitol. A feisty artist and a perfectionist, Crunelle seems to have been determined to make trouble for his Harvard employers. Most embarrassing for Harvard officials was the arrival of a decapitated plaster cast of the general at the bronze foundry where it was to be cast. (Crunelle apparently disliked the shape of the general’s nose.\textsuperscript{61}) The contract specified a cost of $49,000 for the figure, which was to be completed and dedicated in the spring of 1936. However, the dedication did not take place until 1938 (fig. 3).

The statue was cast in bronze and mounted on a pedestal that
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Fig. 3. General Artemas Ward by Leonard Crunelle, 1936. The bronze statue commissioned by Artemas Ward of the Seventh Generation before its installation in Washington, D.C. Courtesy of Harvard University Archives.
made the general stand more than nineteen feet tall. He wears a cloak, modeled on the one currently on display at the Artemas Ward House, which Florence Ward swore was the 'military' cloak that had belonged to the general. At his feet is a small cannon, a testament to his military abilities. Most of all, this bronze
General Ward is tall, thin, and majestic-looking, with a definite air of command that undoubtedly projects out over a specially designed Washington traffic circle. This is curious, considering that most sources describe General Ward as round and dumpy. The bronze version is thus a polar opposite. Yet a short, fat General Ward would not do if the goal was to create an icon, suitable by Artemas Ward of the Seventh Generation's standards, to represent both the family and his own posterity. To be acceptable in the family pantheon, General Ward had to look the part of a hero. The inscription\(^62\) reinforces Artemas's construction of the general:

\begin{center}
ARTEMAS WARD
1727–1800
SON OF MASSACHUSETTS
GRADUATE OF HARVARD COLLEGE
JUDGE AND LEGISLATOR
DELEGATE IN 1780–1781
TO THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS
SOLDIER OF THREE WARS
FIRST COMMANDER
OF THE PATRIOT FORCES
\end{center}

General Ward became, in effect, the invented 'First Commander of the Continental Army.' By placing the statue in Washington, the Wards had made him a national figure and raised themselves to national prominence (fig. 4). Artemas of the Seventh Generation, although he used the same media—history, biography, genealogy, and statuary—as his predecessors, was not content, as Andrew had been, merely to record his ancestor's deeds. Nor was he content, as Elizabeth had been, simply to write about and preserve objects that had belonged to the general. His General Ward–related projects were bigger, better, and more visible than anything that had preceded them. Artemas, it appears, dedicated himself to making his great-grandfather more famous

\(^62\) From a blueprint approved by Henry Shattuck, treasurer of Harvard University, Papers of the Artemas Ward Statue in Washington, D.C.
so that Artemas himself, and to a lesser extent, his family, might also be more famous.

Few families now can look back over two centuries and identify hometowns, famous figures, and other pieces of family lore. The Wards are remarkable—for not only did one family member, in this case, Andrew Henshaw Ward—begin such a trend, but later descendants picked up where he left off, putting their own unique stamps on how they remembered their ancestors. The glue that held all of these efforts together was the American Revolution and one ancestor's participation in it. At the center of all these books and monuments is this one man, General Ward, who lived on in his descendants' imaginations as a virtuous and worthy person. By exalting their connection to him, they bound themselves together as a family, establishing an identity that stemmed from their blood relationship with a revolutionary figure. Andrew built an identity as a capable genealogist, Elizabeth became an expert on Shrewsbury and the Ward homestead's artifacts, and Artemas played off the name he shared with the general to emphasize his wealth and personal success. In this case, the importance of one revolutionary figure's memory could be used not just for the building of national identity, but for the much more mundane—but equally important function—of binding a family together across space and across time.