

Girls and Boys: Poor Children and the Labor Market in Colonial Massachusetts

Barry Levy

*University of Massachusetts-Amherst*¹

Though they spoke loudly in favor of liberty, Massachusetts leaders seized waifs for house and field work. They felt no contradiction exploiting helpless children. Samuel Adams, the most vocal champion of liberty, wrote to James Warren, "I am much obliged for your care in procuring for me a Boy." Adams planned to work the pre-adolescent hard: "I cannot spare him the time to attend School."² In Hardwick, Massachusetts, Paul Mandell, a local revolutionary hero who served as selectman, militia captain, and delegate to the First and Second Provincial Congress, indentured no less than ten Boston poor children, aged between five and eleven years. He gained 123 years of cheap labor by corralling them until they reached adulthood.³ A brisk trade existed throughout revolutionary Massachusetts in needy children.

The sweat of poor White children substituted to a degree for the increasingly questioned exploitation of Black slave labor. Yet, the Massachusetts labor system had long rested on the backs of working children. Richard Dunn reminds us that, for people without fossil fuel engines or electric machines, labor was a grim issue. From *The Age of Religious Wars* through *Sugar and Slaves*, Dunn describes the ordinariness of brutality in pre-industrial labor systems. Europeans harbored a keen sense of their limited powers of production, a "psychology of limited wealth." In order to support a few sufficiently free and leisured people to create the glories of civilized culture, Europeans believed that most people needed to be forced into underpaid labor. Society had to be blantly hierarchical: many drones at the bottom and a few swells at the top.⁴

Such hierarchies tended to be exaggerated further in America, as Dunn has shown. Englishmen found that they could grow and process sugar for enormous profit in the Caribbean islands. But once they realized that sugar cultivation required intensive labor and that local supplies of labor were meagre, they quickly accepted the enslavement of Africans as policy, creating a rich and unusually vicious West Indian society.⁵ The "psychology of limited wealth" also gave a sharp edge to non-slave labor systems in Anglo-American society. Dunn's "Servants and Slaves: The Recruitment and Employment of Labor," offers a valuable overview of the diverse, usually harsh, ways, including those in New England, that English people solved the problem of labor in America.

Dunn does claim that the family labor system of New England was the most egalitarian of any in the New World. Yet he also shows that family labor

was problematical. It took at least sixteen years for a young family's infants to become fully productive. This meant that at a time when a household needed labor most, the family labor system offered virtually nothing. And it was painful for adult children, too, since Massachusetts families, in order to squeeze as much labor from able children as possible, delayed their adult sons' and daughters' marriages and ownership of land almost endlessly.⁶

Some historians, nonetheless, use Dunn's unsentimental observations about New England to perpetuate a romantic view of the region. By describing its family labor system as the natural exception to a host of artificial labor systems that ranged from indentured servitude to slavery, they virtually place New England on a pedestal. They argue that nature ruled in New England insofar as children worked hard for their fathers naturally, because all family members owned and developed the same property together. Mutual interest prevailed. Any problems that existed in the family labor system are understood within the framework of the bonds and natural tensions of family life. Labor history is reduced to family history.⁷

By discussing orphans, I aim to show that the New England family labor system should not be viewed romantically or naturally. Familial emotions existed, but the New England system was as coercive, as imaginative, as vigorously constructed as any other pre-industrial labor system in America. Its architecture is most visible when focusing on orphans, not on home-grown children. By looking at the corners of the New England house of labor, its real shape and story emerges. This is not to say that the achievement of a relatively egalitarian labor system in New England was an illusion. It was real, but not forged simply as a product of loving and sharing. Indeed, I want to appreciate better the colonists' creativity and sacrifice in the production of a relatively humane labor system. New Englanders paid dearly in effort, pain, and emotional constraint as they imaginatively created a society of relative wealth and equality in a world whose technological and productive limits, as Dunn's work emphasizes, encouraged cruel labor exploitation.

* * *

The story can begin in Dedham, Massachusetts in 1681. There colonists used a complex array of laws and power arrangements to create and sustain a fragile family labor system. At the same time, they elevated poor White children to the major source of labor from the outside.

Local law dictated that all Dedham households tell the selectmen immediately of the arrival of any worker who might stay for two weeks or more. Yet by 1681, many Dedham households hid such workers from the town fathers. Troubled by widespread non-compliance, the selectmen "proposed whether the town would prosecute the order concerning inmates and servants or repeal it — to which the town answered that they will have it prosecuted."⁸ The

selectmen then gave notice that on the eleventh day of the second month in 1681 "the inhabitants as have such servants and inmates to come to them this day, which according diverse persons did, and we have attended them and heard each of their answers and allegations."⁹ As Dedham householders paraded and confessed in front of selectmen, they unwittingly created a census, including Dedham addresses, of inmates from outside the town.

Almost all the outside laborers were poor children. Twenty-two of the 112 households in Dedham, or some twenty percent, reported having 28 inmates; and 24 of the 28 inmates were children, 20 of them White. For example, "Michill Metcalfe informing that he have a boy from Boston he is allowed to keep the said boy provided he clear the town of him within four years unless he have further order." Altogether, among the children, there were ten "boys", eight "girls", two "Negro boys", two "Indian boys", one "lad, and one "English girl"; among the adults and adolescents there were one "man", one "Negro man", and two "maids".

Why did boys and girls, especially White boys and girls, dominate the composition of the inmates from outside of Dedham? Certainly boys and girls were not the most productive workers. Charity played a role. Five years before this census, all of the region was engulfed in King Philip's War, the most destructive Indian war in the history of New England. Dedham had strong real estate ties to Deerfield, Massachusetts, a town harshly attacked. It is reasonable to assume that Indian and White orphans were housed in Dedham. But charity had its limits. The existence of "a boy from Boston" and an "English girl" (the expensive bond accompanying her implied that she was a poor child born in England) suggests that labor needs also counted. Metacom (King Philip) never attacked Boston or London. The selectmen's labor policies thus played a major role in the presence of so many children.

The town clearly allowed the Dedham selectmen to use their authority unreservedly. Although the selectmen allowed most of the 22 householders, not all, to keep his or her servant or servants for at least a year, they told each householder exactly on what terms he or she could keep their laborers. For example, when Doctor Jonathan Avery gave "notice that he have an Negro in his family," the selectmen said he could keep him if Avery "shall give ten pound bond." On the other hand, the selectmen decided that Avery should not long keep a maid. As "for his maid," spoke the selectmen, "he hath liberty to keep her provided he clear the town of her within a year unless he have further order." And so it went. Robert Avery reported that he had "a lad Tho Boilson by Name," but the selectmen "allows it not at present but shall further consider of it and if there be cause he may repair to the select men for their approbation." Josiah Fisher had two boys: one the selectmen let him keep for only four years, the other he was allowed to keep indefinitely with a five pound bond. On what criteria were these distinctions made? The selectmen did not say; they did not have to.¹⁰

The townspeople entrusted the selectmen with such power over labor recruitment with good reason. They understood that their family labor system needed to be carefully controlled and protected, if it were to work at all. Thus, the maintenance of their family labor system, the labor-familial relations in their households, depended upon the vigilance and coercion of their selectmen in regards to all such matters. A keystone of this family labor system was the law that single persons, unless they had sufficient wealth to establish their own households with servants, could not live alone. Instead, they by law had to live as subordinates in households approved by the selectmen. Some historians believe that the stated motive for this law was the only motive underlying its existence. The Puritans feared corruption arising from a conviction, it is argued, that "sin and iniquity..are the companions and consequences of a solitary life."¹¹ Single people living alone or in groups might cause problems, to be sure. Nonetheless, it is obvious that the main point of this law was to prevent adult sons and daughters from seeking the best wage and independence, and thereby abandoning their fathers' household by setting up for themselves. Regulating young adults was a fixation of Dedham's selectmen in the late seventeenth century. Each year a day was set aside to place town-born young adults in proper households.¹² Without this law and its vigorous enforcement, the family labor system in Massachusetts would have crumbled quickly, just as slave labor systems would have collapsed without laws that prevented adult slaves from leaving without permission.

Massachusetts suffered from labor shortages well into the eighteenth century. Laborers' wages were so high that town and colony made repeated attempts to regulate them.¹³ In such an environment, without coercive regulation, many young men and women might easily have established themselves as high-wage cottagers in their hometowns or elsewhere. While avoiding years of grating subordination to their thrifty and overbearing fathers, they could have achieved marriage and dignity independently. And if a few did so leave and flourish, the sons and daughters still at home, appreciating the alternative, could have renegotiated their relations with the patriarch. To maintain adult children and order at home, Puritan fathers would have had to grow kinder, gentler, and richer. They would have had to offer their children bribes comparable to the rewards of early independence.¹⁴ In order to prevent such a devastating blow to their family labor system, Massachusetts citizens gave selectmen the power to crush bachelors' independence with gusto and finality.¹⁵

Additionally, the selectmen exercised the power to prevent child labor from accumulating in inefficient and lackadaisical households, particularly when diligent households needed labor. Selectmen had the power to take poorer households' own small children and assign them to another household. Any household that did not pay full taxes to the town could be so invaded and

reduced. In 1680, when word got out that "there is some inconveniency and disorder in the family of Johyn MacCintosh," the selectmen "deputed Ensign Fuller and Sergt Wight to go to his house and take particular notice of the state of his family..." They then told Mackintosh that he had about a month to put out one of his sons as a servant in a richer family. When the poor man failed to comply, they assigned his son "to service with... Tim Dwight." They gave Mackintosh two weeks to find an alternate master or to accept the selectmen's choice.¹⁶

Watertown's selectmen compelled the bulk movement of children from poor to rich households. In 1727 they posted a notice telling poor families to put out their children to "such religious families where both body and soul may be taken good care of." They threatened sanctions for disobedience. They also organized a pauper auction. The same notice told "such persons that have a desire to take children or servants, to meet with the above said select men at their meeting on the first Monday of April next at the dwelling house of Mr. Thomas Learned innholder in said town at three of the clock in the afternoon of said day."¹⁷

Though poor and inefficient, Obediah Coolidge refused to surrender his children. The Watertown selectmen ordered Coolidge's "wife and children and household goods be forthwith removed to the dwelling house of the Widow Rachel Goddard of the said town, there to continue under the care of the said widow."¹⁸ Imagine Coolidge returning to his house lot from hoeing his fields, finding his house vacant and stripped of furniture, running from room to room calling his wife's and children's names, realizing what had happened (perhaps a notice was left), screaming aloud or silently. Yet this was not the work of gangsters. A consensus of the Watertown meeting gave the selectmen power to so protect the fledgling family labor system from failures like Coolidge. The townspeople understood that family labor, being based on child labor, was relatively inefficient under the best conditions. Yet, if masters were easy-going and lazy like Coolidge, the family labor system would merely encourage spoiled children and would produce almost nothing.

Most importantly, the selectmen had the power to determine all aspects of the flow of labor from outside the town. One central purpose of such power was to protect the town from having to support too many charity cases with town tax money; home-grown obligation was burden enough. But the selectmen's power was also crucial to the whole family labor system. As a number of historians have pointed out, a major asset and economic power of New England households was the value of their children's labor. Often, in lieu of the exchange of currency, rural families exchanged services and labor, frequently performed by their children. Such rural "credit" was kept in account books usually recording, not money transactions, but labor exchanges. In such towns, much of a household's economic clout consisted of its children's labor.¹⁹ Fami-

lies invested much time and money in raising their children. They did not want families to bypass their children and easily hire outside labor. Such practices would undermine the value of their town-born labor.²⁰ And if outsiders stayed in town and became sick and poor, the town's real inhabitants certainly did not want employers to foist upon them the cost of these laborers' support.

Thus, while the selectmen allowed inhabitants to bring labor into town for extended periods, they insisted that they be notified and that the labor be treated by the host family as an adopted son or daughter. Obligations had to be equal to those of natural children. Host families had to promise with good security to pay for every pence and shilling that the import might cost the town. In 1674, for example, Thomas Clap asked to keep his maid servant; the selectmen answered that "we see no reason to allow her but that he should remove her out of the town." Clap insisted that he needed all his outside laborers, including his imported maid, so he gave security to the town. The price was high. He posted his "saw mill and all my rights and privileges thereunto belonging to the selectmen of Dedham and their successors for ever upon condition that neither Henry Earle nor Elizabeth Lenord shal be any trouble or damage by them or either of them unto this town."²¹

The selectmen assessed the potential damage of each outside laborer and demanded that the host household post an appropriate bond. The selectmen's labor policies made children a comparably affordable form of imported labor. In the "census" of 1681, the selectmen usually demanded just £5 bonds for White New England born girls and boys, £10 for enslaved or foreign children, and £20 bonds for adults. Puberty was a major consideration in setting bonds.²² Adolescents could get pregnant or impregnate; they could thereby create other children that the town would need to support. They were also a real, competitive threat to young town-born labor. Boys and girls could not in the short run impregnate or get pregnant, and they could be exported when they reached adolescence.

Additionally, if a man or woman promised to fully adopt the imported child "as his own," he or she did not have to offer any bond whatsoever. Among the twenty-two families, there were two cases of full adoptions. For example, "Robert Fuller having two grandchildren with him saith that the boy is to be put out to a trade, when he attain to the age of 15 years and the girl is to be with him during the natural life of himself and wife and that he intends to give them that portion which their mother should have had if she had lived, whereupon they are allowed..."²³ Adopting a child by word of mouth was deemed a legal pledge to pay all damages caused by the child; and, therefore, a bond was not needed.

White New England orphans were also cheaper, even if not adopted, because they would most likely leave town to return to their families of origin. Households that promised to dispose of their orphans before they reached

puberty could keep them without charge. Indian and Afro-American children, though pre-pubescent, were usually slaves or life-long servants. They would probably remain in town after adolescence. Thus, they usually cost double in bonds, aside from their market cost.

The prices for such child servants, whatever their ethnic origins and irrespective of selectmen's policies, were much lower than for adults of similar status.²⁴ When the price of bonds was added, obviously only the wealthiest households could afford both to buy and to post bond for adult servants. Therefore such servants were rare. Thanks to the enormous power given by the town to the selectmen to protect Massachusetts' new family labor system, waifs found themselves in the 1680s the number one remedy for family labor shortages in Dedham and most likely in many other towns as well.²⁵

But young, poor children did not continue to occupy top place in Dedham's supplemental labor market. From 1650 to 1769 Dedham imports of long-term labor were generally sparse, averaging about two people or families a year. It should be remembered that the households of Dedham relied for long-term help chiefly on town labor — their own children. After 1710, Dedham people imported outsiders not only for work in their households but also to serve as tenants for rented land. Throughout this period, Dedham households did continue to import boys and girls as labor. However, children eventually became secondary in the supplemental labor market to mature men, women, and families (see Table 1.).

Table 1: Outsiders in Dedham as Reported in Notifications and Warnings Out, 1650-1769

years	children	men	women	families	total
1650-1679		2	1		3
1680-1709	26	6	4		36
1710-1739	1	23	9	20	53
1740-1769	32	30	47	61	170
total	59	61	61	81	262

Source: *Dedham Town Records*

Why the decline in the significance of orphans in the labor market? In the 1680s and 1690s, as Bernard Bailyn has pointed out, Boston merchants developed important markets for New England produce in the West Indies.²⁶ Probably as money spread from this new trade, more families could afford adult servants. Demographic changes must also have played a role. Nonetheless, the chief reason for the partial eclipse of orphan child labor by adult and family labor was the new settlement laws in the colony. In 1693, it became possible for towns to admit more adult workers without demanding prohibi-

tively expensive bonds from their employers. The 1693 law stated that a person could become an inhabitant of a town if he or she lived there for three months without being "warned out" by the selectmen. If the stranger was warned out during that period, the town would not be liable to support him or her. In effect, the town could allow outside workers to stay in town for at least three months without incurring financial liability for them.²⁷ The General Court in 1700 extended to one year the period between entrance into town and qualification as an inhabitant.²⁸

Before 1693, the time qualification for becoming an inhabitant was ambiguous and thus selectmen had immediately to demand security from employers of outside labor. With the "warning-out" system, the selectmen did not have to demand that every employer or landlord immediately post bond for every human import, especially short-term help.

These settlement laws hardly signified the beginnings of a free labor market, however. The 1700 law explicitly stated that once a stranger was warned out, he or she could be sent from the town at any time by a warrant or treated as a vagabond.²⁹ Thus, while some people who came to Dedham stayed despite being warned out, others left or were thrown out. In 1718 Dedham folk still believed that warning a person to leave town meant he or she must leave.³⁰ They passed a town ordinance that stated that any master who kept a person who had been warned out had to pay £1 sterling per month, and the same applied to landlords in regard to tenants.³¹ After 1718 in Dedham, a landlord or household could keep a tenant or laborer for about ten months, the time it took the selectmen to warn a person out. An alternative was to post security for the outsiders.

Many people who came to Dedham were not warned out. Children continued to be privileged in this regard: they were warned out less than other types of strangers (see Table 2). At the same time, thanks to the new settlement laws, farmers could take in laborers and tenants with the knowledge that they had months between notification and warning out. Many clearly took advantage of this period of grace. Moreover, by the 1760s in Dedham, some strangers, though warned out, continued to live in the town. Among 26 fami-

Table 2: Patterns of Warning Out among different kinds of Immigrants in Dedham, 1700-1769

Town's Action	Children	Men	Women	Families
warned out	14	40	42	60 ³³
not warned	22	16	16	21
percent warned	39%	71%	72%	74%
total	36	56	58	81

Source: *Dedham Town Records; Massachusetts Tax Valuation List of 1771*

lies that came to Dedham between 1760 and 1769 who were warned out by the town, at least 9, about a third, continued to live in Dedham, as shown by their presence in the 1771 tax evaluation.³² Poor children could not do the work that adults could. Thus, once it was possible to retain adult workers for useful periods without extra charges, stranger children declined as a percentage of the out of town labor force in Dedham.

The relative decline of poor children in the supplemental labor market occurred despite the continued availability of poor orphans. The number of children who lost a father or mother or both before the age of twenty-one years remained surprisingly high throughout the colonial period. Thus, poor children were always obtainable, though most remained in their hometowns, as evidenced by their marriages there.

So far I have reconstituted 2,309 households formed by marriage between 1630 and 1799 in thirteen Massachusetts towns. Currently the sample of towns and families is biased by selection of many places where dangerous occupations swelled the ranks of orphans. As a consequence, four of the thirteen towns studied, and about half of all the families, came from fishing towns or seaports where the loss of adult men to sea accidents and diseases related to their trades were common. In these towns, 46 percent of all children who survived to the age of fourteen years lost at least one parent by death by the time they reached twenty-one years of age. Nonetheless, six of the thirteen towns studied were eastern farming and artisan towns that included a large share of the Massachusetts population. In these towns, 43 percent of all surviving children lost at least one parent. Only two towns in central Massachusetts — Shrewsbury and Oxford — had a relatively small percentage of half and full orphans: just 33 percent of all children surviving to the age of fourteen years. Among all the children studied, 44 percent experienced before the age of 21 years the loss of at least one parent to death. Among those who survived to 14 years of age, 4 percent (479) lost both parents, 11 percent (1315) lost their mothers, and 29 percent (3,414) lost their fathers.

A majority of the children in the sample were born after 1740, but parental loss was not an isolated phenomenon of the middle or end of the eighteenth century. The earliest period of Massachusetts family history was unusually stable. Less than 35 percent of the children born before 1660 lost at least one parent. Among the children born between 1660 and 1679, in contrast, over 47 percent lost a parent before these children reached twenty-one years. The percentage of such children remained above 40 until after 1800. The exception is the period between 1760 and 1779, when only 37.4 percent of the surviving children born in this period lost a parent, despite the American Revolution. This relatively low figure suggests that war-related deaths was not the main factor in orphaning children. Clearly, it is a mistake to view colonial Massachusetts families as typically stable. With the exception of the

settlement period and the years from 1760 to 1779, Massachusetts children were often traumatized by their parents' premature deaths.

Indeed, the supply of orphans suggests that needy children might have often flooded the supplemental labor market. Yet orphaned children usually stayed in their home towns. Only a minority were involved in the inter-town child labor market. In order to study their movement in society, 2454 orphans and half-orphans, along with a control group of 396 non-orphans, were entered into a computer file.

Children had an array of experiences after a parent died. Aggregate statistics can only outline them primitively. Mortality rates among orphaned children were not much greater than those among "normal children."³⁴ Many an orphan saw a surviving parent remarry: 60 percent among those whose mother died. Widows remarried less often. Only some 19 percent of the widows who stayed in the home parish remarried. Some 40 percent of the widows never remarried and died in their children's home parish. Another 41 percent of the widows probably moved to other places, neither dying nor remarrying in their children's home parish.

Table 3: Thirteen Towns Ranked by Percentage of Orphans, 1640-1800

Towns	% of Children Orphaned	% Lost both parents	Lost a Father	Lost a Mother	Type of Town
Deerfield	54%	6%	68%	27%	frontier
Gloucester	49%	7%	70%	23%	fishing
Salem	46%	10%	60%	30%	seaport
Malden	46%	8%	69%	24%	eastern
Marblehead	46%	11%	69%	24%	fishing, seaport
Newton	46%	11%	57%	32%	eastern
Marlborough	43%	11%	59%	30%	east/central
Beverly	43%	8%	70%	22%	fishing/farm
Rowley	42%	10%	59%	28%	eastern
Haverhill	42%	10%	71%	19%	eastern/north
Shewsbury	37%	12%	55%	32%	central
Topsfield	30%	12%	55%	32%	eastern/north
Oxford	29%	6%	69%	34%	central
total	11,832				
	children				

Source: *Vital Records of Deerfield, Massachusetts, to the Year 1550* (Boston, 1920); *Vital Records of Marblehead, Massachusetts to the End of the Year 1849* (Salem, 1903-1908); *Vital Records of Marlborough, Massachusetts to the End of the Year 1849* (Worcester, 1908); *Vital Records of Beverly, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849* (Topsfield,

1906-7); *Vital Records of Haverhill, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849* (Topsfield, 1910-11); *Births, Marriages, and Deaths in the Town of Malden, Massachusetts, 1649-1850* (Cambridge, 1903); *Vital Records of Newton, Massachusetts, to the Year 1850* (Boston, 1905); *Vital Records of Oxford, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849* (Worcester, 1905); *Vital Records of Rowley, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849* (Salem, 1928-31); *Vital Records of Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849* (Worcester, 1904); *Vital Records of Salem, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849* (Salem, 1916-1925); *Vital Records of Topsfield, Massachusetts* (Topsfield, 1903-1916); *Vital Records of Gloucester, Massachusetts, to the End of the Year 1849* (Salem, 1923).

Note: All of these volumes alphabetize and thereby make family reconstitution much easier than the use of original church records. I included men who died, married, and had children in the records. This method underestimates the number of orphans and half-orphans, for it focuses on the stable part of the population, and the number of children who lost both a father and mother in childhood. For example, a man married and died in a town and left an orphan, but the orphan's mother, the widow, moved to another town following her husband's death and then died herself soon after. The orphan is still a minor, and now has unluckily lost both parents. Many widows did move. Yet, my method fails to catch this woman's death and includes this orphan erroneously as a half-orphan, a fatherless child.

Another way to gauge the social and economic placement of orphans is by their first marriages. The town records allow the historian to detect at what age children married, and whether or not they married within their home parishes. Orphans and half-orphans experienced only slightly more geographic mobility in childhood and youth than non-orphans. Among non-orphans, 65 percent married in their hometowns. Among those who lost mothers, 64 percent married within their hometowns. Geographic mobility rose somewhat among those who lost fathers: 54 percent married in their hometowns. Among children who lost both parents, 46 percent married in their hometowns.

Differences of age at first marriage emerged among those who did marry in their hometowns, and confirm the expectation that the presence of a living father delayed the marriage of his children. Children who lost their fathers and could thereby acquire inheritances at twenty-one or eighteen gained the means to marry and establish an independent household faster than children with long-living parents. Among those who did marry in their hometowns, 63 percent of the fatherless married before the age of 25 years, compared to 47 percent of those with two living parents. Only 8 percent of the fatherless children married at the age of 35 or older compared to 13.5 percent of non-orphans.

Despite some interesting differences of marriage age and geographic mobility, what is most striking are the similarities among the lives of orphans, half-orphans, and non-orphans in Massachusetts. Thanks to the coercive poli-

cies of the General Court, towns, and their selectmen, the value of child labor was kept high. Towns were protected from young people moving too quickly into independence, strange labor from outside of towns was prevented from devaluing hometown child labor, and hometown child labor was prohibited from accumulating in the households of inefficient and undemanding adults. Thanks to such policies, whatever the inner trauma from the loss of parents, orphaned, and half-orphaned children kept their labor value, they tended to stay in their home villages, and thereby they became integrated as adults into seventeenth-and eighteenth-century Massachusetts society. Ironically, historians have been able to sustain a fond delusion that Massachusetts was a bastion of natural patriarchal stability because the people of colonial Massachusetts were so seasoned in facing and handling instability and familial tension. Rather, they grew expert in using legal coercions to create "mutual advantages" that handled and obscured the impact of significant household failure and discontinuity.

As noted, although most orphans stayed in their hometowns, many were also part of an intertown supplemental labor market. Most moved through informal networks involving kin and friends.³⁵ The study of such informal transactions would be difficult, though worthwhile. Luckily, the records of the Boston Overseers of the Poor provide many accessible formal transactions that reveal much about the Massachusetts orphan and homeless child market in the second half of the eighteenth century.³⁶

The Boston Overseers put out for service some 1134 poor children between 1734 and 1806. Inasmuch as Boston was declining economically during this period, the Overseers often needed to look outside the town for host families. They found a large market for poor children. Poor orphans were widely popular. The Overseers were able to place outside of Boston some 838 children or some 74 percent of all the homeless Boston children.

What kind of families took these alien orphans and homeless children? Paul Mandell, who took ten orphans, was exceptional. Among the 1134 children placed out, 908 or some eighty percent of the host families took only one Boston child. In total some 940 colonial families participated in the program. These families were dispersed among some 220 towns, chiefly in Massachusetts but also in Maine, New Hampshire, and Connecticut.

In order to study the kind of New England families that took in needy children for many years (the average term of service was for over ten years), I decided to reconstruct genealogically and economically a large sample of host families. So far I have completed reconstitution of 124 families in ten Massachusetts towns, and have just begun collection of pertinent economic data.

Informed by Lawrence Towner's impressions, I expected the host families to be economically advantaged, well-established people who had fewer children than normal. After establishing themselves in their hometowns, I

thought they might take orphans with charity and convenience in mind, when their own children were beginning to leave. There were indeed cases like this. However, the great majority of host families were middling but modest. Most surprisingly, they were young. Most households hosted orphans just as their own marriages were starting out.

Among the 124 orphans, 94 or some 75 percent arrived into host families that were within 14 years from the date of marriage. A clear majority, 79 orphans or some 63 percent arrived into host families that were only nine years or less from marriage. Virtually all of these families had plenty of children of their own. Less than 5 percent of the orphans lived with childless couples. In fact, 72 percent of the orphans lived in families with four or more surviving children of their own.

In a typical case, a Boston orphan arrived into a family which had some toddlers and more on the way. By the time the Boston orphan's time was up, the host family's many children would not be leaving but, instead, would be approaching their most productive years of labor (see Table: 4).

Table 4: Years from Marriage When the Orphan Arrived: 124 Boston Child Apprentices and their Host Families, 1730-1805

Poor Child Arrived:	Number of Orphans	Percent of Orphans	Accumulative Percent
Before Marriage	3	2%	2%
At Marriage to 4 years	46	37%	39%
5 years to 9 years	30	24%	63%
10 years to 14 years	15	12%	75%
15 years to 19 years	10	8%	83%
20 years or more	20	17%	100%
Total	124	100%	

Source: *Vital Records of West Bridgewater, Massachusetts, to the Year 1850* (Boston, 1911); *Vital Records of East Bridgewater, Massachusetts to the Year 1850* (Boston, 1916); *Vital Records of Bridgewater, Massachusetts, to the Year 1850* (Boston, 1916); *Vital Records of Marblehead, Massachusetts to the End of the Year 1849* (Worcester, 1908); *Vital Records of Hardwick, Massachusetts to the Year 1850* (Boston, 1917); *Vital Records of Roxbury, Massachusetts to the End of the Year 1849* (Salem, 1925); Lawrence W. Towner, "The Indentures of Boston's Poor Apprentices, 1734-1805," *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Volume 43: Transactions: 1956-1963* (Boston, 1966), pp. 417-68.

Typical were the situations of the Boston poor children in Bridgewater, Massachusetts. Eighteen Bridgewater families hosted nineteen Boston poor children (ten girls, average age ten years, and nine boys, average age seven years). Five boys worked as farmers, one as a blacksmith, and three as weavers. Five girls learned housewifery and five spun. Domestic textile production was common in Bridgewater. The girls typically served for eight years; the boys for fourteen years.

The orphans arrived into young families in Bridgewater. The Boston girls arrived on average just four and one half years after the marriages of their hosts; the boys just four years after. The host families eventually had an average of six surviving children per couple.

Jonathan and Susanna Bass were the only Bridgewater couple to take on more than one Boston orphan. In early October, 1741, Jonathan Bass was in Boston signing for two: William Negars, a seven-year-old poor boy offering fourteen years service, and Elizabeth Matthews, a three-year-old pauper girl offering fifteen years service. Bass acted with some urgency. He was betrothed; just a month later, on November 11, 1741, he married Susanna Byram. The orphans must have been displayed at their wedding dinner. William Negars was to work as a weaver and Elizabeth Matthews as a house servant. The Basses eventually had three children of their own who survived.

Orphans for newlyweds was a typical practice in Bridgewater. In 1759, Susanna Perraway, a six-year-old Boston orphan girl, was taken in for twelve years of service by Robert and Abigail Hayward in Bridgewater. Perraway was to be a domestic servant. She was nearly a wedding gift orphan; the Haywards had been married for only two years. When Abigail got pregnant with their first child, she perhaps decided she needed long-term assistance. The Haywards had five surviving children eventually, four of them girls. By 1771, the Haywards amassed modest wealth. They had real estate worth £11 annually and a small part of a mill.³⁷ Perraway left service in 1771 but stayed in Bridgewater, where she married Paul Smith on April 6, 1775.

Farnel Chamberlane arrived in Bridgewater in 1750 at the tender age of four years. He was to serve the stricken household of Daniel and Susannah Alger for a full seventeen years as a farm laborer. Daniel Alger had married Susannah Forbes of Easton two years earlier (December 1, 1749), but the couple had already lost two children at birth. The first was born dead on July 24, 1749 and the second, recognizable as a daughter, lived a day in the middle of June 1750. In September, just three months after this second death, Farnel Chamberlane arrived. The Boston poor child, Farnel, was perhaps a replacement for the children that Susanna seemed unable to produce. But additionally, and more importantly, the Alger family anticipated the need for labor and thought it wise to be charitable, while getting a child-laborer who had already survived four years.

If the four-year-old sensed his importance, he would also find that he could be replaced. Just as he walked in the door, Susannah Alger was pregnant with her first surviving child, Daniel, who arrived nine months later. Daniel was followed by Susannah in 1753, Israel in 1755, Kezia in 1757, Benjamin in 1760, the twins — Chloe and Sylvia — in late 1761, and so on. By the time his contract was completed, Farnal Chamberlane was surrounded by ten surviving children, all legitimate heirs.³⁸ There is no evidence that Farnal stayed in Bridgewater.

Nineteen Boston orphans entered Marblehead, a fishing and commercial seaport. Like those in Bridgewater, the hosts tended to be young. It is interesting that Marblehead took many Boston orphans, for the town's mariners and fishermen died prematurely and left many orphans themselves. The town had a hardy appetite for boy labor. Seventeen of the nineteen orphans who entered Marblehead from Boston were male, and among these seventeen, eight were apprenticed as mariners, the largest occupational group. Many Marblehead host families had mariner patriarchs. The seamen's early deaths and movements made for instability. Among the towns studied so far, the eighteen Marblehead host families had the fewest number of their own surviving children, under four on an average. Nonetheless, these host families again tended to be young: only eight years from marriage on average when they took a Boston boy or girl.

Michael Wormsted, the only Marbleheader to take two Boston orphans, married Mary Bull in December, 1752. By the time Michael went to Boston in 1758 to enroll the two Fessenden brothers — Joseph, age five, and Parker, age seven — he already had three children of his own; the oldest, Sarah, was five. Wormsted, a ship's captain, signed the Fessendens to become mariners for fourteen and sixteen year stints respectively. Wormsted was thirty-one-years-old. In a sense, the Fessenden brothers relived the trauma of their orphaning. The older orphan, Joseph, left service in April 1774. The younger brother, Parker, had almost two more years to serve, when in November, 1774, Micheal Wormstead died at age forty-five, the not untypical fate of a sea captain.

Not all the young boys who came from Boston to Marblehead were trained as mariners. In late 1754, Joseph Stricker, a maker of sails, married Hannah Griffin. Four years later his sickly young wife died at the age of twenty-five. The childless widower traveled to Boston in 1760 and enrolled William Shirley, a nine-year-old poor boy, as a twelve-year servant to learn and practice the art of sailmaking. Joseph Stricker remarried Joanna Burchstead at Lynn in 1762. Eventually Stricker and Joanna produced two children of their own. William Shirley left service in 1772, and about a year later he married Abigail Vickery. He eventually fathered three children of his own in Marblehead and died in Marblehead in 1807 at the age of fifty-six, a sail-maker. The Boston poor boy had lived forty-seven years in his new hometown.³⁹

Hardwick, Massachusetts was the only place that fit expectations, since it was a place characterized by wealthy elite orphan hosts who seemed to replace their own children's labor with that of Boston orphans. Town hosts included Daniel Billings, a merchant who took a child; Joseph Blake, an owner of a forge, sawmill and father of Harvard graduates, who took two children; Luke Brown, a lawyer and Harvard graduate, who took one child; Daniel Oliver, son of Lieutenant-Governor Andrew Oliver, who took a child; Timothy Ruggles, Jr. owner of two houses in town and three tanhouses, who took two children; Paul Mandell, discussed earlier, the possessor of ten orphans; and Jonathan Warner, Revolutionary leader, who took three Boston orphans.

Some twenty-six Boston orphans accumulated among the elite in the rural town of Hardwick. The girls were all to be specialists in housewifery and the boys virtually all farmworkers. On average, the children arrived some fifteen years after his or her host families was formed. This was by far the largest average span of years between marriage and the arrival of an orphan among all the towns studied.⁴⁰ In regard to the age and wealth of the hosts, Hardwick was exceptional at the high end. As seen, most host families were far younger and far poorer.

The typical youth of host families is not surprising. As mentioned, the Massachusetts family labor system had a glaring weakness in that it took from fourteen to sixteen years to raise a child to become a productive worker. At the outset of marriage young colonial Massachusetts couples were in an unenviable situation. Usually coming from large families with limited capital, the newlyweds frequently had little capital themselves. A new bride would then spend the next twelve to twenty years in various stages of pregnancy and recovery from childbirth and nursing. Meanwhile infants and toddlers would be swarming underfoot, making daily existence more complicated and exhausting. The family labor system demanded devoted female sacrifice. Otherwise, a couple could never have a labor force.

Although less burdened than his wife, a man had the difficult challenge of increasing his household's wealth with only his own labor and that of his overworked wife. Inasmuch as the family lacked working children, the family could only pay labor debts in the distant future.

It was just such hard-pressed households, not those more established and comfortable with many adult children, that often found it both an act of charity and an advantage to take what they could afford, a free five-year-old boy or girl from the Overseers of Boston. A couple might not get much work from such a child immediately, but the orphan was getting bigger and stronger every year, just as the couple's own energy was waning. When the orphan's time was just about up, the couple's own blooming children were becoming productive.

The arrival of an orphan or two early in marriage also had psychological advantages. Beginning a Christian marriage with a real act of charity should not be dismissed. Additionally, the orphan provided the young couple with a rehearsal for any couple's most demanding task, the transformation of their own children into a productive household labor force. The economy of Massachusetts relied chiefly, not on charity children, but on couples' own children as laborers who worked primarily in the family. For colonial New Englanders it was no simple matter to find the correct blend of loving endearments, threats, rewards, and corporal punishment to get children to work efficiently. But the economy and survival depended upon it. Thus, an orphan early in marriage allowed a couple a full-dress rehearsal for managing its own children's labor. And if the poor child was emotionally or physically scarred, the wounds would become invisible to the couple as soon as the child departed.

Taking on orphans early in marriage probably also eased the youngster's arrival and departure with minimal financial and emotional trauma. The child came at a time when his or her work was truly needed. He or she would often be the most able and valuable child in the family. Such a situation could give a needed boost in self-esteem to a child traumatized by the death or desertion of parents and diminished by poverty. Nor would leaving be a great shock. The orphan was slowly removed from his or her central place as the eldest and ablest child. After a few years, the host's own children arrived and began maturing. They would displace the servant's labor. The family would then have enough labor to let the orphan go painlessly when of age to leave. Additionally, the outside world would look more inviting to the matured orphan than the now well-populated work environment of the host family and their sinewy, legitimized progeny.

I have not yet traced enough wills to assess gifts to these poor children from their host families. I would be surprised to find anything but modest tokens. Most orphans left houses with many legitimate children. The host families needed their resources to repay the work of their own many children. To confirm this hunch, most poor children not only left their host families but also their host towns. Among the 124 servants whose host families have been studied, only twenty-five (20 percent) left a record in their host towns. Since the records used were the same, it is worth pointing out that this was well below the normal 65 percent of non-orphans that married within their hometowns and even well below the 46 percent of full orphans, but town children, who married within their hometowns.

Although more study needs to be done, the system of taking in orphans emerges as unsentimental, often abusive, exploitative. Yet, it was far more a success than a failure for both the orphans and their host families. Even famous patriots existed on both sides of the poor orphan divide. Rufus Putnam, George Washington's major military engineer, was orphaned in central Massa-

chusetts at the age of seven years, lived with his maternal grandfather for two years and then, in 1747, went to live with his stepfather, Captain John Sadler. Putnam later complained bitterly that Sadler exploited him by not paying any attention to his education. His maternal grandfather made sure that he "was kept at school as much as children usually were at that day, and could read pretty well in the Bible." While living with his stepfather, however, he observed that he "never saw the inside of a school house, except about three weeks." His stepfather punished Putnam's efforts at self-education: "I was made a ridicule of, and otherwise abused for my attention to books, and attempting to write and learn arithmetic." In 1754 Putnam was a bound apprentice to Daniel Mathews of Brookfield, a millwright. According to Putnam, "by him my education was as much neglected, as by Capt. Sadler, except that he did not deny me the use of a light for study in the winter evenings." Despite his duress, he learned to work hard at a trade which he made good use of by enlisting in the provincial corps of the British army during the Seven Years War. In his memoirs, Putnam blamed his grammatical inelegance on his former masters. Yet, he had enough self-esteem, talent, and education to become a military general.⁴¹

Some successful Boston orphans included the father of Paul Revere and the famous newspaper editor and founder of the American Antiquarian Society, Isaiah Thomas. In 1756, at the age of eight, Thomas, a poor orphan, was put out in Boston for thirteen years to Zachariah Fowle to be an apprentice printer. Yet Thomas was not only a client of the system, he was also a provider. In July, 1771, Thomas in turn took Anthony Haswell, a fifteen-year-old Boston poor child, to be an apprentice printer for six years. Here was a heart-warming chain of charity perhaps, but certainly one based solidly on mutual advantage. When Thomas took Haswell, he was not yet a famous editor. He was just setting up his business and family. He needed cheap labor and had no children of his own. He was only two years out of service himself.⁴²

Thomas's act fit the general pattern. Taking Haswell was not only an act of charity; it was also the best labor a young man could get. Insofar as the placement of orphans in Massachusetts was a success, it was because the system united charity and real self-interest, as illustrated by the youthful nature of the host families.

But clearly the creation of mutual advantage between orphan and host family was neither an accident nor simply natural. Massachusetts authorities reinforced both the family system of labor and the supplementary labor market in orphans self-consciously and with ample application of coercion both inside and especially outside the household. Family labor worked because the household and town were surrounded by legal barbed wire. Particularly through the early eighteenth century, when labor shortages existed, the General Court and towns legally prevented single persons from setting up on their own and

thereby undermining their fathers' authority. This was crucial. Legal coercion, not familial love or the labor market, was the key to patriarchs' retention of their adult childrens' labor and thereby the survival of the family labor pattern. Second, the General Court and towns assured that the labor value of children and of orphans would remain relatively high by creating settlement and warning out policies that prevented the full development of a free labor market.

Indeed, local and provincial Massachusetts authorities did an excellent job not only of keeping labor out of towns but also of keeping labor out of the colony. As David Galenson has found, and as Richard Dunn has highlighted, among 20,657 emigrating British servants in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, only 234 or a paltry one percent were bound for New England.⁴³ And at that time New England had established trade relations with the West Indies and was enjoying a vibrant economy. Nor did Yankee hospitality improve. As Bernard Bailyn discovered, among some 9364 British people who moved to America between 1773 and 1776, New England attracted a grand total of 77 people, less than one-half of one percent. The New England economy was then highly articulated, though weak. Market forces, if left to themselves, would have certainly done better than to recruit only 77 immigrants.⁴⁴

The creation and maintenance of family labor required a difficult balancing act. If town labor was in shortfall, youth could become independent too early. If town labor dropped precipitously in price, households would need discount their main strength, their youth labor. By assuring that the price of labor would be neither prohibitively low nor high, Massachusetts authorities created a demand for the labor of all children. This demand for young labor, sweetened with a dose of Christian charity, was the backbone of the disposition of poor, homeless children in colonial Massachusetts. In brief, the creation of these mutual advantages was an imaginative and signal, if alas temporary, victory over the brutal forces of a free labor market.

Notes

1. The author thanks the Charles Warren Center at Harvard University and the American Council of Learned Societies for financially supporting the research upon which this article is based.
2. Samuel Adams to James Warren, Boston, April 13, 1772, *Warren-Adams Letters, vol. 1: 1743-1777, Publications of the Massachusetts Historical Society* (Boston, 1917), pp. 10-11.
3. Lawrence W. Towner, "The Indentures of Boston's Poor Apprentices, 1734-1805," *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts: Volume 43: Transactions: 1956-1963* (Boston, 1966), pp. 417-68; Lucius A. Paige, *History of Hardwick, Massachusetts* (Boston, 1883), *passim*.
4. Richard S. Dunn, *The Age of Religious Wars, 1579-1715* (New York, 1979)
5. Such is the theme of Dunn's classic, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713* Chapel Hill, 1972).
6. Richard S. Dunn, *The Age of Religious Wars, 1559-1715* (New York, 1979); Richard S. Dunn, "Servants and Slaves: The Recruitment and Employment of Labor," in Jack P. Greene and J.R. Pole, eds., *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era* (Baltimore, 1984), pp. 184-188. Some of Dunn's observations about New England family labor are based upon the scholarship of Philip Greven, Jr..
7. Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, "Martha Ballard and Her Girls: Women's Work in Eighteenth-Century Maine," in Stephen Innes, ed., *Work and Labor in Early America* (Chapel Hill, 1988), pp. 70-105; Daniel Vickers, *Farmers and Fishermen: Two Centuries of Work in Essex County, Massachusetts 1630-1850* (Chapel Hill, 1994), *passim*..
8. Don Gleason Hill, editor, *The Early Records of the Town of Dedham, Mass., 1672-1706* (Dedham, Ma, 1899), pp. 118. [hereafter cited as Dedham Records].
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 120-22.
10. *Ibid.*
11. Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England* (New York, Harper and Row, paperback edition, 1966), pp. 145-46.
12. See for example: "Tenth day, 7 month, 1677, the selectmen this day to settle the young persons in such families in the town as is the most suitable for their good. Eleaz Metcalfe desire to sojourn at Micall Metcalfes which was allowed to long as he demean himself orderly. Jonathan Freeman desire liberty to sojourn in the house of Jonathan Fuller wich is allowed so long as he demean himself orderly. James Vales desire to sojourn at Robert Fuller's house: John Fular desire to sojourn at Rob Fullar house. Amos Fisher desire to sojourn at his father's house, Nath Ware desire to sojourn at the house of Joshua Fisher. Rob Ailinge desire to sojourn in the house of Thomas Fisher. These are allowed so long as they demean themselves orderly." Dedham Records, p. 53.
13. Richard Morris, *Government and Labor in Early America* (New York, 1965), pp. 44-79.
14. For a group of contemporary fathers who operated in just this way, see Barry Levy, "'Tender Plants': Quaker Farmers and Children in the Delaware Valley, 1681-1735," in Katz, Murrin, and Greenberg, eds., *Colonial America: Essays in Politics and Social Development* (New York, 1993), pp. 152-79.
15. Consider Dunn's reexamination of the the seventeenth-century Abbot family of Andover. Joseph Abbot worked for his father for 13 years after reaching the age of twenty-one. He worked for the promise of a future inheritance on stoney land, which he had to share with at least five siblings. For young men like Abbot, a bachelor, cottage work and high wages would have been a delightful alternative to thirteen years of celibacy and work for a stern and miserly patriarch. Dunn, "Servants and Slaves," pp. 185.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 106.
17. *Watertown Records, Volume 2* (Watertown, Ma., 1900), 340.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 342-43.
19. Christopher Clark, *The Roots of Rural Capitalism: Western Massachusetts, 1750-1860* (Ithaca, New York, 1990).
20. The selectmen's authority also made it harder for the town's children to work in other towns and thus had the added benefit to the family labor system of keeping children in

town.

21. Hill, ed., *The Early Records of the Town of Dedham, Mass., 1672-1706* (Dedham, Mass., 1899), pp. 120, 126.

22. For example, "Edward Richards informing that he have a man servant an apprentice it is agreed that he shall give twenty pound bond..." *Ibid.*, pp. 120-122.

23. *Ibid.*, pp. 122-24.

24. The Boston newspapers show that slaveholders often gave away extra Afro-American slave children gratis. But they had to be under six years of age.

25. There were a lot of such children in Salem as well. See Carol F. Karlsen, *The Devil in the Shape of a Woman: Witchcraft in Colonial New England* (New York, 1989), pp. 227-228.

26. Bernard Bailyn, *The New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1955).

27. *Massachusetts Acts and Resolves*, 1692-3, p. 68.

28. *Massachusetts Acts and Resolves*, 1700-1, pp. 451-53.

29. *Ibid.*

30. The major study on New England warning out is quite dated and is in need of replacement, Josiah Henry Benton, *Warning out in New England* (Boston, 1911). Benton argues that everyone knew that the demand that people actually leave by warrant was never taken seriously by the overwhelming majority.

31. Julius Tuttle, ed., *Early Records of Dedham, Massachusetts 1706-1736. Volume 6* (Dedham, Ma., 1936), 177.

32. Bettye Hobbs Pruitt, ed., *The Massachusetts Tax Valuation List of 1771* (Boston, 1978). I looked at only families because they would most likely appear in the tax lists, if they stayed in town.

33. Sources detailed in Table 3.

34. Between the ages of 35 years, 5.5% of the non-orphans died, 6% of those who lost a father, 8% of those who lost a mother, 5.4% of those who lost both parents before twenty-

one.

35. For example, Samuel Adams got his "boy" from the connections of James Warren.

36. Lawrence W. Towner, "The Indentures of Boston's Poor Apprentices, 1734-1805," *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts: Volume 43: Transactions: 1956-1963* (Boston, 1966), pp. 417-68.

37. Puritt, *Massachusetts Tax Valuation of 1771*.

38. *Vital Records of West Bridgewater, Massachusetts, to the Year 1850* (Boston, 1911); *Vital Records of East Bridgewater, Massachusetts to the Year 1850* (Boston, 1917); *Vital Records of Bridgewater, Massachusetts, to the Year 1850* (Boston, 1916).

39. Towner, "The Indentures of Boston's Poor Apprentices."

40. *Ibid.*; Thomas W. Baldwin, ed., *Vital Records of Hardwick, Massachusetts to the Year 1850* (Boston, 1917); Lucius A. Paige, *History of Hardwick, Massachusetts* (Boston, 1883), *passim*. The habit of orphan taking seemed to spread among elite women in Hardwick. For example, Paul Mandell's wife was Susannah Ruggles, daughter of the grand-living Tory Timothy Ruggles, an orphan host. One of Squire Mandell's neighbors was Jonathan Warner, a Revolutionary general. Warner in 1766 had married Hannah Mandell, the eldest daughter of the great orphanholder Paul Mandell. Jonathan and Hannah Warner would take in three Boston orphans.

41. Rufus Putnam, *The Memoirs of Rufus Putnam* (New York, 1903), pp. 9-11.

42. His relationship with Fowle was turbulent. He ran away in 1766 and returned, but renegotiated his service contract with Fowle. Fowle later helped finance Thomas.

43. Dunn, "Servants and Slaves," p. 183; David W. Galenson, *White Servitude in Colonial America: An Economic Analysis* (Cambridge, 1981).

44. Bernard Bailyn, *Voyagers to the West: A Passage in the Peopling of America on the Eve of the Revolution* (New York, 1988), pp. 209-211.