DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 081 SO 006 296

AUTHOR Kuritz, Hyman
TITLE From 'Order' to 'Economy': Education and Order in Eighteenth-Century America.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Colonial History (United States); Cultural Factors; *Educational Change; *Educational Development; *Educational History; Social Behavior; Social Change

ABSTRACT

Some of the premises and problems basic to an assessment of the role that education played in the creation of social order in eighteenth century America are outlined. The author describes the educational process by which a labor force was created and shaped in Colonial America. The transition from the conceptions of order geared to seventeenth century ideas of station, status, and rank to ideas of free movement and mobility associated with a free labor force is discussed together with the transformation of societies with their own particular structures, values, and culture from pietistic communities to liberal American communities. (Author/SHM)

by Hyman Kuritz
State Univ. of N.Y.
Albany

FROM 'ORDER' TO 'ECONOMY'

EDUCATION AND ORDER IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY AMERICA

In this paper I am confining myself to a modest effort to outline some of the basic premises and problems that need to be examined in any assessment of the role that education played in the creation of social order in eighteenth century America.

A major aspect of such an effort is to understand the educational process by which a labor force was created and shaped in colonial America. This involves the transition from the conceptions of order geared to notions of station, status, and rank that permeated early (17th century) American society although never in the form that obtained in England to notions of free movement and mobility associated with a "free" labor force. It involves also the transformation of societies with their own particular structures, values, and culture (Quakers and Moravians as examples) from pietistic communities to liberal American communities.

A system of order which enabled different groups to live and function under their own established leadership and within the framework of their particular orthodox doctrines gave each group relative freedom to develop its own unique political, economic, and social structure. This was true of all groups in the 17th century whether Puritan, Quaker, or Anglican (Church of England). The church in each case had its central place in the society and each person in theory his station and his status. The Quakers, for example, despite their emphasis on the "inner light" and disdain for formal church establishment, maintained essentially the same system of ordered relationships as the Puritans or the Anglican church. Their established leadership had gone through similar training,

shared similar views, and occupied similar positions in the social structure. What held their communities together in lieu of the Church was the intricate network of meetings which through a system of rewards and restraints held most Quakers closely to official doctrine.

It was more difficult to maintain discipline in the New World where the necessities of living imposed different pressures, where meetings could not be held with the same frequency and rigor, and where people, not under the same surveillance and control by their leaders as in England, sometimes gave vent to strange enthusiasms. This explains why a devout Quaker like George Keith, closely associated with careful orthodox theologians like himself in England, experienced unnerving encounters in New Jersey and elsewhere, moved away from the main body to Christian Quakerism, a more orthodox group, and finally embraced the Church of England. His path foreshadowed the road many others followed later when they too felt the strange winds of other enthusiasms that characterized the long series of revivals of the 18th century.[1]

Another factor that explains the difference under colonial conditions was the narrow range of social status and rank among immigrant groups--the dominance of the middling sort who came here--so that the correspondence between status and hierarchy that gave traditional structures their stability in England did not exist here. This probably made possible more rapid economic growth which very early placed strains on pietistic community-integrated societies. We don't know very much about social structure in colonial society but what we do know suggests that there was probably considerably more mobility in the 17th century which slowed down by the second decade of the 18th century with the emergence of and consolidation of power by colonial elites based on land, slaves, and trade.[2] One of my tasks in dealing with education and order is to analyze the

process by which these elites increasingly geared to the requirements of a mercantilist society exerted greater pressures on pietistic communities and on the laboring poor to force them to accommodate to the necessities as interpreted by these elites. For the non-English groups that came here, especially after 1710, and for the laboring poor, a system of sanctions and rewards was evolving--a hierarchy of values--to which they had to conform to prove their fitness to become part of English-America. These values in turn grew out of the social structure that was coming to fruition by mide-18th century and which were most conducive to economic growth and development.

Any analysis of the process by which a labor force was trained and disciplined to meet the requirements of 18th century mercantile society must look at both slave labor and the laboring poor as integral elements of a unified system. The attitudes elitist leaders developed toward both groups grew out of similar needs. The transformation of a paternalistic society which placed all orders and ranks from king to slave in a hierarchy of family government to the more impersonal liberal democratic society of the 19th century is the starting point for understanding the place of both free and slave labor in the economy. At first a mercantilist social order looked upon education for the poor as a threat to the society because by raising aspirations of the laboring portions of the population the poor would no longer be satisfied with their "natural" role and thereby might upset the necessary balance between merchants and labor or (in terms of education between learning and labor), and thus distort the balance of trade in ways unfavorable to the nation. This was the basis of Bernard Mandeville's argument in his Essay on Charity and Charity Schools (1723):

...it is manifest that in a free nation, where slaves are not allowed

> of, the surest wealth consists in a multitude of laborious poor; for besides that they are the never-failing nursery of fleets and armies without them there could be no enjoyment, and no product of any country could be valuable. To make the Society happy, and people easy under the meanest circumstances, it is requisite that great numbers of them should be ignorant, as well as poor. Knowledge both enlarges and multiplies our desires, and the fewer things a man wishes for, the more easily his necessities may be supplied.
>
> The welfare and felicity, therefore, of every state and kingdom requires that the knowledge of the working poor should be confined within the verge of their occupations and never extended (as to things visible) beyond their own calling. The more a shepherd, a ploughman, or any other peasant knows of the world, and the things that are foreign to his work or employment, the less fit will he be to go through the fatigue and hardships of it with cheerfulness and content.[3]

Tudor England had not been averse to slavery and the efforts during that period to control labor and to keep it within proper bounds included slavery as a legitimate form of servitude. It is true that the English law of 1547 that allowed the enslavement of vagrants under certain conditions was repealed three years later, but this had probably more to do with its excessive expense in a situation where cheap "free" labor was readily available than humanitarian grounds. Apprenticeships and indentures became the more acceptable form for the education and control of labor which imposed some forms of servitude but emphasized also the mutual responsibilities of master and servant.[4] At the same time it gave the apprentice a certain amount of mobility and self-discipline

which was more appropriate for economic growth in a society where labor was, in general, readily available.

More liberal attitudes toward educating the poor gradually emerged because the necessity for elementary forms of literacy to insure competency in the performance of various tasks had become essential to the economy and to the running of the society.[5] A more sophisticated economy and a growing division of labor called for incentives in terms of higher wages, better conditions, and expanded opportunities if workers were to be encouraged to produce more. The particular kinds of skills wanted exemplified in the demand for 'hands' and a hierarchy of skills to be meshed into the necessities of the industrial process called increasingly for education functionally adapted to these requirements. One can see here the beginnings of an important problem that needs further investigation; that is the differences that emerge between employers who look to education to perform certain functional roles important to their interests as against workers whose aspirations may follow a different path. It is the opening chapter in the long and persistent controversy about the modes, content, and objectives of vocational education.

Another factor that induced more liberal attitudes towards the laboring poor was the phenomena of turbulence and disorders an important feature of eighteenth century life. Unrest among the lower orders made it clear that the inculcation of correct values and modes of behavior had become necessary for labor discipline.[6] The charity schools of the 18th century, whether under the leadership of the Church of England or Dissenting groups, operated on the basis of Mandeville's premises even though they disagreed with his conclusions.

Charity school education derived its psychology from Locke whose central point was that education "is a discipline of the mind and body, dependent upon the formation of good habits. By habitual response to carefully selected stimuli the evil hereditary and environmental influences which surrounded the poor from birth would be modified and though they remained hewers of wood and drawers of water, they would be conditioned to perform these duties as good Christians and faithful servants." It met the criticism of creating unnatural dispositions among the laboring poor by carefully tailoring education to stated goals. The SPCK, for example, emphasized that children in the charity schools were to be bred to the meanest services. Many sermons urged eliminating writing and doing accounts in the curriculum. Others stated that "the children would not be educated in such a manner as to put them on a level with the children of parents who had the humanity and virtue to preserve them and the industry to support them."[7] The sermons and writings of Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London, who played a key role in freeing the Church of England from the taint of opposing the Hanoverian restoration, and a staunch supporter of charity schools, expressed similar sentiments:

> But if Charity Schools should grow by degrees into a more polite sort of Education; if the Boys should be taught fine Writing, and the Girls fine Working, and both of them fine Singing; in which Cases also the Masters and Mistresses would hardly refrain from teaching the Children to <u>value</u> themselves upon these Attainments; all this, I own, would have a natural Tendency to set them above the meaner and more laborious Stations and Offices of Life. And therefore all these Things should be carefully kept out of our Charity-Schools; and tho' they are laudable Attainments in them-

selves, and some of the Children may have particular Genius's for them, yet it is far better that they be taught them elsewhere, or not taught them at all; than that these Refinements should be introduc'd into Charity-Schools; which doubtless will stand most clear of Objections, and best answer the End of their Institution; when they pretend to no more than to prepare Children to be good Christians and good Servants.[8]

The necessities for such a program arose in the first place because systematic attention to the needs of the poor have become socially necessary. Growing out of the decay of medieval institutions it was linked to secularization and the emergence of modern society. Poverty was now associated with people dislocated by urbanization and the need for new and different skills. The laboring poor of the colonial era were those who did not readily find a place in apprenticeship arrangements or in the growing crafts and trades.[9] It could also mean as in Massachusetts, for example, people who had sc little property that they could be charged with disorderly living, or living outside of family organization; i.e., living contrary to accepted social mores.[10]

Turning to apprenticeships one can see the same underlying patterns at work. In order to lay the basis for the requisite labor discipline and to maintain the required order and stability in the labor process, each apprentice had to be attached to his master and to his position in such a way so as to provide incentives and restraints to insure the acquisition of skills and correct modes of behavior. The widely quoted London sermon of John Waugh on the Duty of Apprentices and other Servants (1713) illustrates the process. Apprentices, he said, owed obedience first to God and then to their masters. "This is

evident from the Reason of the Thing: for the very Nature of the Covenant between them is Obedience on the one Hand; and Wages and Maintenance, or that Skill and Art, which their Masters profess on the other Hand." Waugh warned his audience of about 1400 charity school graduates that God expected them to accept the stipulations of their contract even if their Masters proved to be "unreasonable." "But you are certainly bound to obey in all things that relate to your Imployment," he continued, "and are expressly Covenanted between your Masters and you: You have engaged to do so, and have a valuable Consideration for it, viz. the Trade and Business you are to be taught: and therefore you do not perform the Conditions upon which you are admitted to Apprenticeship, unless you obey in all things that are particularly express'd in your Agreement; and likewise in all others, which by the Custom of the Place you live in, you are presumed to have agreed to; tho' it should happen that some of them are unreasonable, provided they be not eminently so. Your Compliance in such a Case, how mean and servile soever the Business is, about which you are imployed, is no disparagement to you; 'tis unjust and dishonourable in your Masters and Mistresses to require such things at your Hands, but it will be your Prudence and Praise to do them."[11]

The North American colonies as in all the institutions they developed sought to recreate what they had known in Europe, but the necessity to recruit labor and the growing commercialization that accompanied economic growth damaged the quasi-familial and corporate structures that were characteristic of the early indentures. As long as the poor were firmly attached to a family, to a master, and to a church; as long as the apprentice was the quasi-son of the master and the latter

had filial as well as strictly a commercial bond with his apprentice, the apprentice tended to be a reflex of the world to which he was attached. When the growing commercialization of the relationship severed the filial and familial bond and reduced the connection to simply an economic one, it released the apprentice to live more of a life of his own. His position in society became more of a function of his economic activity and less an expression of the Protestant idealized community. By changing his world of experience and throwing him more on his own it may have also laid the basis for a different set of common experiences that led to a new consciousness of self. For the poor it may have been part of the transformation from a laboring poor to consciousness of class.[12]

Just as the charity schools adapted themselves to the social structure so too did apprenticeships. In the first part of the 18th century, perhaps the first half (looking at Pennsylvania especially), indentured servants entered into many of the trades. But patterns emerged early which indicate that entries were becoming restricted on both ends of the scale. Indentures in America were modelled on the Elizabethan Statute of Artificers of 1562 and the Poor Law of 1601. These laws carefully channeled the poor--especially those on parish relief rolls--away from the craft and artisan skills to rural labor, and unskilled work. In the colonies in similar fashion this policy was followed. That meant that the poor--orphans, parish poor, children of widows, etc., had little opportunity of getting into such crafts as cordwainers, tailors, mariners, carpenters, coopers, etc. Boys were frequently sent into the country as farm laborers and girls into housewifery, i.e. maids. Apprenticeships tended to become shorter towards the end of the century but for the poor they tended to be much longer--

sometimes for ten to twenty years. At the upper end of the scale, apprenticeships to merchants, physicians, and lawyers were restricted to the more affluent by the simple device of charging sizable fees.

It is very difficult to get systematic evidence about the poor because the majority of indentures preserved seem to be mainly for the middle groups who went into the more established trades and which held out the promise of eventual self-employment and setting up business for yourself. The growing commercial and impersonal nature of the indentures in the latter half of the century can be seen by the way in which the specific obligations of the master are now spelled out. This was not characteristic of the earlier indentures. In Philadelphia, as an example, which took for granted the full range of responsibilities of both parties to the contract about one-third of the indentures between 1745/46 and 1771/73 contained no provisions for education although other contractual obligations were carefully stipulated.[13] By the middle of the century this gap began to be filled by the proliferation of evening schools offering to teach a variety of skills and run as a business. In the long run this schooling process could only have contributed to social stratification. In general, it seems fair to conclude that in the 17th century, indentures had been mainly a system whose aim was to take care of the poor--it was a problem of order--but by the 18th century they had been transformed into a system to create an available labor pool for the economy. In Boston, for example, indentures helped to supply the labor needs of the city and surrounding towns. It was a convenient source of servants. The problems of poverty in Boston had risen sharply after 1690. The Anglo-French wars, loss of men at sea, and two disastrous fires in 1702 and 1711 had so dislocated the economy that it

alarmed Boston's leaders. These events meant more bastard children and free Negroes to take care of. The result was the enactment by the Massachusetts General Court in 1692 of a law giving selectmen or overseers of the poor where they existed the right to dispose of the poor children. Males were to serve out their apprenticeships until age twenty-one and females to eighteen or until married. The law was strengthened in 1702. Under these laws a person wishing a servant simply got his selectman to certify the desired person to the overseer. This became so common that by 1740 overseers had their own indentures printed to bind over children. Similar practices occurred elsewhere.[14]

In respect to Negro slavery the same processes were at work. In the 17th century the slave was considered part of the family as was the white servant although the place of the slave was always a step or two lower in the scale. Both religion and law legitimized slavery although English law and tradition presented difficulties in separating the slave as person from the slave as property.[15] While essentially the slave was an "extension of his master's personality,"[16] Christian doctrine recognized him as a human being before God and entitled to baptism and conversion although this fact could not alter his status as a slave. This point of view was reiterated repeatedly by the Church of England and was expressed by all Protestant denominations. Only with the Quakers does one find very early expressions of dissent and even calls for the emancipation of the slave.[17]

Probably the most extensive effort to instruct the Negro was made by the Church of England under the aegis of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.[18] Set up in 1701, for a century it engaged in efforts through its missionary and catechist program to bring Negro

slaves into the Christian fold. A corollary effort was made by the Bray Associates founded by Thomas Bray in 1723 who had also been a principal leader in launching the SPG. These efforts contributed little to the education of blacks mainly due to the massive resistance put up by slaveowners in all the colonies.[19] From another point of view, however, they are significant in the way they reveal prevalent attitudes towards laboring people both free and slave.

The debate over instruction turned around the meaning of religious instruction for the slave. To the Church this instruction as well as instruction for the laboring poor was guided by its central purpose of maintaining the organic unity of society where rank, deference, and authority each had its place in a Christian order. It rested on the frank assumption that an upper class could not function properly without a labor base of the "meaner" sort. It accepted the argument that slavery was necessary to the development of the colonial economy and sought to reassure the slaveowner that the conversion of his slave to Christianity would not only not change his status as a slave but in the long run would make him more efficient and docile. Its Augustan notions were also clearly shown in the assertion that charity and philanthropy must be given in proportion to one's private accumulation and gain. Therefore a nation like England whose profits in part came out of the exploitation of slave labor and particularly those who profited most directly should be most eager to support the conversion of the slave. This was tied in with the universal evangelical belief that all Christians must strive unceasingly to bring as many human souls to grace as possible. The entire debate over the instruction of the slave is strikingly similar to the polemics around Mandeville's point that educating the laboring poor was both unnecessary and dangerous.

The first major effort to convince slaveowners to instruct their slaves was made by Bishop William Fleetwood (1656-1723) in his sermon of 1711. Virtually asserting that the Negro was equal to the white man in his intellectual and moral capacities, Fleetwood attempted to meet the principal objections to the conversion of the slave. He drew an analogy between the slaves in the colonies and "hired Servants" in England and argued that "good Wages and good Usage" usually induced greater efforts by servants. He reiterated the official doctrine that conversion left one's slave status unchanged but then added with complete candor that should the possibility arise that conversion brought freedom, laws would have to be passed to prevent this because the necessities of trade to England were paramount. "I would not have any one's Zeal for Religion (much less my own)," Fleetwood said, "so far outrun their Judgment in these matters, as to cause them to forget that we are a People who live and maintain ourselves by Trade; and that if Trade be lost, or overmuch discouraged, we are a ruined Nation."[20]

In an effort to get the campaign for the religious instruction of slaves off dead center and to develop a more systematic program of instruction, Bishop Edmund Gibson issued his Two Letters in 1727.[21] His questionnaire of 1724, to determine the scale of the program, had revealed the desultory and aimless character of the efforts heretofore exerted.[22] Determined to change this, Bishop Gibson urged that full time catechists be employed who could work out systematically the best methods of instruction. He also urged that certain slaves be selected to be taught English and the basic principles of religion so that they in turn could serve as tutors to others. Conversion, he reassured slaveowners, would reinforce the status of the slave and would help to

reconcile them to their lot. "And so far is Christianity from discharging Men from the Duties of the Station and Condition in which it found them, that it lays them under stronger Obligations to perform these Duties with the greatest Diligence and Fidelity not only from the Fear of Men, but from a Sense of Duty to God and the Belief and Expectation of a future Account." Gospel stresses this point especially for servants, and Gibson added perceptively, "the restraint of Conscience" is much more effective than the "Restraint of Fear."[23] Gibson reveals here the basic insight of how education can be used to bind depressed people more tightly into a social and economic system.

As the century progressed the divergencies imposed by the contrasting requirements of a plantation society and a nascent capitalist economy made themselves more manifest. If changing requirements forced more liberal attitudes toward the laboring poor, more liberal features in respect to education, legal rights, etc., the problem of coping with a rapidly expanding slave labor force produced tendencies in the opposite direction. But in both cases the limits of these tendencies were defined by the social and economic character of labor in the economy. In the case of a laboring poor, new rights to education were contained by the limits imposed by the nexus of capital-labor relationships, by the levels of skill and freedom necessary to "economic progress." In the case of the slave, this nexus tended increasingly to restrict rights to education, mobility, manumission, etc.[24] Avenues to instruction, formerly open, were closed, and severe laws were passed forbidding anyone to teach slaves to read or write. Freedom to associate, to worship, and to have books were progressively taken away.[25] It is probable that as the Southern economy became more dependent upon the slave as the most important

ingredient of the labor force, racism and the degradation of the slave as a species of property became more pronounced.

Social attitudes toward unrest in the 18th century are also intertwined with the changes occurring in both the slave and free labor force. The perception that the change from the quasi-communal type communities of the 17th century to the more socially stratified and commercial societies of the 18th represented a "declension" from order to disorder, was linked to the belief that the greatest danger to social stability emanated from the "lower orders." It is possible, and it is a problem that calls for further investigation, that a certain declension in fact was felt by both the laboring poor and the slave; that they experienced a certain loss of place in a society moving away from the nexus of "family" relationships to the more impersonal commercial milieu of the 18th century. Perhaps this loss of place is related in some way to periodic manifestations of unrest and rebelliousness in both groups. Church of England leaders, habituated as they were to Gothic notions of order, displayed increasing sensitivity to the loosening of the traditional bonds and introduced a new urgency in calling for religious instruction of both the laboring poor and of the Negro slave. At the same time even doubts about slavery began to appear in the Annual Sermons[26] of the SPG in response to the rising pressures from the liberal conscience. All of this was summed up concisely by Isaac Maddox in his sermon of February 15, 1734 when he called for greater efforts to instruct all classes and for firmer ties between religion and empire.[27]

> From the Want of a due Sense of Religion, and from a Neglect of the true Worship of God, Maddox warned, Men not only grow less just and benefecent to each other, less dutiful and

> obedient to their lawful Superiors, less fearful of an Oath, and are more easily induced to take a false one; but in the Event, this must certainly dissolve the Bonds of Union among Mankind, and destroy the very Being of Society. From the sad State of Irreligion and Immorality, Men easily sink into an ignorant and savage Barbarity, when they have learned to despise Human Laws, which to such Men is an easy Lesson, and own the Authority of no common Superior to influence and awe them; when there are no mutual ties, no common Principles to hold them together, they must necessarily break in pieces, and by unavoidable Interferings in Interest, or Pleasure, become mutual Enemies.

Fear of disaffection by the lower classes increased especially on the part of Negro slaves whose numbers markedly increased in the first half of the 18th century both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of the white population.[28] The slaves were considered peculiarly susceptible to the blandishments of enthusiasts and disturbers of the peace because they lacked the power of reason and moral rectitude. But the laboring poor were equally regarded as deficient in intellect and morality and were considered only a step or two above the slave. The ideology of an emergent liberalism was defined in part by the way it perceived these dependent classes and by the changing requirements of the economy which ultimately determined the contours of this liberalism. The further elucidation of this point must await further research.

FOOTNOTES

1. Edgar Legare Pennington, ed., "The Journal of the Reverand George Keith, 1702-1704," in the Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XX (December 1951), 343-487. Hereafter cited as HMPEC.

2. There is a growing literature that is building up to the point where it has become an accepted generalization. See James T. Lemon and Gary B. Nash, "The Distribution of Wealth in Eighteenth Century America: A Century of Change in Chester County, Pennsylvania 1693-1802," Journal of Social History, 2 (Fall 1968), 1-24, James A. Henrietta, "Economic Development and Social Structure in Colonial Boston," William and Mary Quarterly, XXII, 3d ser. (January 1965), 75-92; Kenneth Lockridge, "Land, Population, and the Evaluation of New England Society, 1630-1790, Past and Present, No. 39 (April 1968), 62-80. Gary B. Nash, Quakers and Politics. Pennsylvania, 1681-1726 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), pp. 55-57.

3. Cited in Thomas Woody, Quaker Education in the Colony and State of New Jersey (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1923), p. 233, from "Charity and Charity Schools" in Essays on Charity and Charity Schools (1723).

4. Winthrop D. Jordan, White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812 (Penguin Books; Baltimore, Maryland, 1969 [1968]), pp. 51-52; J. H. Plumb's, "Slavery, Race, and the Poor," New York Review of Books, 12 (March 13, 1969), p. 4.

5. Colonial conditions started this process almost from the beginning. See Sigmund Diamond, "Values as an Obstacle to Economic Growth: The American Colonies," The Journal of Economic History, 28 (December 1967), 561-575.

6. For an interesting example of early protests by "servants," see Lawrence William Towner, "A Good Master Well Served: A Social History of Servitude in Massachusetts, 1620-1750," (Ph.D., Northwestern University, 1955); also his article, "A Fondness for Freedom: Servant Protest in Puritan Society," William and Mary Quarterly, XIX, 3d ser. (April 1962), 201-219.

7. M. G. Jones, The Charity School Movement. A Study of Eighteenth Century Puritanism in Action (Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, 1964 [1938]), p. 88.

8. [Edmund Gibson], Directions Given By Edmund Lord Bishop of London To the Masters and Mistresses of the Charity Schools Within the Bills of Mortality, and the Diocese of London. Assembled for that Purpose in the Chapter House of St. Paul's November the 14th, 1724 (London: printed by S. Buckley [1727]), p. 5.

9. Hyman Kuritz, "Education and the Poor in 18th Century America," Educational Forum, 35 (March 1971), 367-374.

10. Towner, A Good Master, p. 75.

11. (London: Printed for G. Strahan and J. Downing, 1713), pp. 14-15.

12. For an interesting application of this argument to the English experience see Asa Briggs, "The Language of 'Class,'" in Essays in Labour History, ed. by Asa Briggs and John Saville (London: St. Martin's Press, 1960).

13. Ian M. G. Quimby, "Apprenticeship in Colonial Philadelphia," (M.A., University of Delaware, 1963), pp. 3-4, 17, 38-39, 69-70.

14. Towner, A Good Master, pp. 86-87, 89; Carl Bridenbaugh, Cities in the Wilderness, The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1625-1742 (New York: Knopf, 1964), p. 233; James H. Cassedy, Demography in Early America: Beginnings of the Statistical Method 1600-1800 (Cambridge: Harvard, 1969), pp. 108-109.

15. See English judicial precedents in Marcus Wilson Jernegan, Laboring and Dependent Classes in Colonial America, 1607-1783 (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1931), p. 26, note 10, p. 216.

16. The quote is from David Brian Davis, "The Comparative Approach to American History: Slavery," in Laura Foner and Eugene D. Genovese, eds. Slavery in the New World (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969), pp. 62-63.

17. See for example, George Keith, "An Exhortation and Caution to Friends Concerning Buying or Keeping of Negroes," (New York, William Bradford, (693); also "The First Printed Protest Against Slavery in America," Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, 13 (1889), pp. 265-270.

18. The most complete description of the SPG's educational role in the colonies is John Calam, Parsons and Pedagogues: The S.P.G. Adventure in American Education (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1971).

19. Herbert S. Klein, Anglicanism, Catholicism and the Negro Slave," in Ann J. Lane, ed., The Debate Over Slavery. Stanley Elkins and His Critics (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1971), pp. 137-190; appeared originally in Comparative Studies in Society and History, 8 (April 1966), 295-327.

20. The text is in Frank J. Klingberg, Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York (Philadelphia: The Church Historical Society, 1940), pp. 203-204. Several thousand copies of the sermon were distributed in the

North American colonies and the British West Indies. Frank J. Klingberg, "The Expansion of the Anglican Church in the Eighteenth Century," HMPEC, 16 (September 1947), pp. 296-297; David Humphreys, An Historical Account of the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts . . . to the Year 1728 (London: Printed by Joseph Downing, 1730), pp. 248-249.

21. Two Letters of the Lord Bishop of London: The First, to the Masters and Mistresses of Families in the English Plantations Abroad . . . (London, 1729).

22. Denzil Clifton, "Anglicanism and Negro Slavery in Colonial America," HMPEC, 39 (March 1970), p. 68.

23. Gibson, op. cit., pp. 22-23; see also Humphreys, An Historical Account pp. 254-255, 231-275 passim. Gibson's call for systematic instruction had been anticipated by Bishop Philip Bissie in his sermon of February 21, 1717. See A Sermon . . . (London, 1718), pp. 14-15. At least 10,000 copies of Gibson's sermon were distirbuted throughout the continental colonies and the West Indies. Humphreys, An Historical Account, pp. 248-249.

24. David Brian Davis attributes restriction on manumission in North America less on slavery than on "social attitudes toward social integration." This seems highly dubious to me. See Davis, op. cit., p. 65.

25. Stanley M. Elkins, "Slavery in Capitalist and Non-Capitalist Cultures," in Laura Foner and Eugene D. Genovese, Slavery in the New World (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969), pp. 13-14.

26. Thomas Newton, A Sermon . . . February 17, 1769 (London, 1769), p. 27. The most complete statement on gradual emancipation was made by Beilby

Porteus, Bishop of Chester. See A Sermon . . . February 21, 1783 (London, 1783), pp. 8-12; see also J. Harry Bennett, Jr., "The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel's Plantations and the Emancipation Crisis," in Samuel McCulloch, ed., British Humanitarianism: Essays Honoring Frank J. Klingberg (Philadelphia: The Church Historical Society, 1952), pp. 19-20.

27. (London, 1734), p. 23.

28. The proportion of Negroes to the total population in the North American population reached its peak between 1730-1765. See Winthrop Jordan, op. cit., p. 198; see also Carl Bridenbaugh, op. cit., pp. 88, 200-201, 409.