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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not a former indentured servant or apprentice of Essex County, Massachusetts, was capable of social mobility in the seventeenth century.

This is not a quantitative, statistical study. It is a sampling. The actual extent of social mobility, the number of factors which might have made it possible, or prevented it, and the application of conclusions concerning Essex County society to the remainder of society in the Massachusetts Bay Colony are all subjects for some future study but are not dealt with here.

For purposes of investigation, the names of fifty apprentices and servants were chosen from primary sources for Essex County. Those names were then traced through several printed primary sources for the colony and the county. Information was sought with regard to occupation, land ownership, office holding, marriage and family, church membership, and freemanship. For fifteen of the names chosen there was no record at all beyond the fact that they had once been servants or apprentices in Essex County. Those names were then eliminated. For the remaining thirty-five, brief biographical sketches were composed incorporating the bulk of the evidence gleaned from primary sources.

The results of this study indicate that the stratification of Essex County society did not present the former indentured servant or apprentice with insurmountable obstacles to integration within that society and that there was some degree of natural flexibility in the class structure. The former servant or apprentice enjoyed a limited degree of social mobility.

The results of this study are highly tentative. Further investigation is warranted on the subject.
SOCIAL MOBILITY IN PURITAN MASSACHUSETTS
CHAPTER I
SERVITUDE IN ESSEX COUNTY

It was widely believed by Englishmen of the seventeenth century that every man had a place in society, a place to which he was born and in which he ought to remain. By "consenting" to that arrangement Englishmen fulfilled their obligation to uphold the moral and social order of things. The stratification of seventeenth-century English society was a reflection of the medieval concept of perfect order in society. Every man was classified according to his station in life. He had to be a member of one of several classes: the nobility, the gentry, the merchant class, or the yeomanry, for example. He was also very likely to remain in that station in life. There was, however, some flexibility in the class structure.

One factor which contributed more than any other to the flexibility of the English class structure was land ownership. Land was relatively scarce and was a symbol of status more important probably than any other form of wealth. The yeoman, for instance, who could accumulate a respectable land holding could improve his standing in the community by increasing the importance of his role in the agricultural or rural economy. Land thus had a social significance far greater than it has today.

There were many factors—economic, social, religious, and political—which influenced the course of English colonization in the seventeenth century. But the desire on the part of the average Englishman to acquire
land, and thus to achieve economic and social security was the most conspicuous. As Charles M. Andrews has written:

The small feudal landowner and tenant farmer were alike discontented in England: one with the depreciating value of his landed estate and the dwindling returns from his tenancies; the other with the insufficiency of his acres for cultivation. Both were confronted with the changing conditions which were accompanying the breaking up of the medieval system of landholding, and the fall in the value of silver which was leading to the rise of prices. Decreasing profits from the soil, stationary or falling rents, the difficulty of finding laborers and the unreliability and transient character of those that were obtained, the growth of luxury and the cost of living, the demand for better and more varied food, houses, equipage, and display—all these conditions tended to make the lower classes necessitous and the upper classes covetous and greedy.

Imagination, a spirit of adventure, a proclivity to seek refuge from political oppression and from overcrowded cities and towns, a desire to make a profit, and religious zeal were also important factors which influenced English colonization in the seventeenth century. The religious motive, however, was of paramount importance in the creation and establishment of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, which came into being full grown as a religious enterprise during the early 1630's.

The expedition [George L. Haskins writes] was unprecedented in the history of English colonization. Neither the founding of Virginia nor that of the Pilgrim colony at Plymouth afforded a parallel. The men who carried out the Massachusetts enterprise were neither adventurers nor victims of persecution: they were persons of wealth and ability, brought together by the ties of marriage and friendship and by a sense of common purpose. They were energetic, resourceful, and intelligent; most of them were well educated, many of them university graduates. Above all, they were dedicated to the progressive, even radical, cause of Puritanism, which not only motivated the colonial undertaking but had profound consequences upon the structure and form of the colonial government which they were to establish.

The secondary motive of the Puritans who established the colony at
Massachusetts Bay was unquestionably that of procuring readily available, cheap land. That was, in fact, the primary objective of most of those who came to the colony in the migration of the 1630's. It would seem, in view of subsequent events, that the loftier objective of creating a state dedicated to Sion's Saviour was one that was shared only among the small, but powerful, Puritan minority.

Puritanism was the most distinctive, distinguishing characteristic of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. For the most part it represented a way of life expressive of the middle-class state of mind. It afforded a solution to the host of complex problems which the immigrants had brought with them from the homeland, and held out the hope of disentangling the difficulties of society at large.

It was the particular independence of Puritanism as an institution, and of the Puritan leaders as individuals, which made it possible for the company to retain its charter and transfer it to New England, contrary to custom. That same independence enabled Massachusetts to follow a course of virtual self-determination throughout most of the seventeenth century. "Massachusetts," writes Charles M. Andrews, "was never a colony in the ordinary sense of the word; it was a Puritan commonwealth. In the seventeenth century it never fitted naturally into the way the English commercial and colonial scheme was working out, partly because it produced no staple that England wanted and therefore was of little economic value to the mother country, and partly because it resisted by every means in its power inclusion within the bounds of the expanding island kingdom and conformity to the rules which that kingdom laid down governing its relations with its colonies overseas."

Economically, the Massachusetts Bay Colony was less independent of the mother country than it was religiously. The colony had to rely very
heavily upon England for its supply of finished goods and manufactured articles. The economy of the colony was largely given over to farming, and most of the colonists became small farmers, although fishing, naval stores, fur trading, and iron smelting were also important industries.

Politically, the Massachusetts Bay Colony was an experiment in theocracy. "It has been argued that Massachusetts Bay was not a theocracy," writes Louis Wright, "because ecclesiastics were not technically the rulers, but the influence of the clergy upon the magistrates was such that the effect was the same." Whether or not the government of Massachusetts was technically a theocracy, however, it was an oligarchy. Church membership was requisite for being made a freeman of the commonwealth, and only freemen could vote and participate in the government of the colony. The freemen, or voting citizens, were never a majority in the colony, or in any town. Thus the government of Massachusetts was controlled by a Puritan minority throughout most of the seventeenth century, who, according to James Truslow Adams, "...wished, first, to found and develop a particular type of community, best expressed by the term Bible-Commonwealth, in which the political and religious elements, ...should be but two aspects of the same method of so regulating the lives of individuals as to bring them into harmony with the expressed will of God, as interpreted by the self-appointed rulers."

It was not lust for power that governed the principles of a Puritan political administration. To the contrary, Puritanism was demanding in its self-imposed code of sacrifice. The colony's Puritan leaders asked no more of their followers than they were themselves ready to sacrifice. The Puritans were men with a purpose, who believed that Massachusetts had a purpose in being: "A due form of government in Massachusetts was to be an
object-lesson for the resolution of the religious dissension of an erring world." 16 If that purpose were to be realized, civil government had to assume the duties and responsibilities of a civil supremacy. 17

Socially, the great migration to Massachusetts Bay represented a migration of ideas and ideals as well as of men. Therefore it is not at all surprising that the class system should survive the migration to New England and persist, though with diminishing influence, throughout the seventeenth century. "Most of the colonists," writes Bernard Bailyn, "had known only life on the land, either as gentlemen, independent farmers, tenants, or laborers; consequently, both the magistrates and the majority of the population brought with them the attitudes and desires of rural Englishmen. To them land meant not so much wealth as security and stability, tradition and status. Shaken out of their familiar ways by economic and political disturbances, caught up in varying degrees by the cause of religious reform, most of the 20,000 Englishmen who migrated to America in the 1630's sought to recreate the village and farm life they had known. They accepted and probably welcomed the medieval social teaching of orthodox Puritanism if only for its inspiring support of the idea of the close-knit community that existed for the good of all its members and in which each man was his brother's keeper." 18 While the Puritans wanted to revise the church and perhaps reorder the state to make it an instrument of God's will, they were not social revolutionaries. From the very beginning, the importance of class distinctions was continually emphasized by both the magistrates and the clergy of Massachusetts and justified on the basis of religious ideals. 19

The man who was chiefly responsible for interpreting Puritan dogma and formulating Puritan policy was John Winthrop, the first governor of the colony. In his essay, "A Modell of Christian Charity," which he wrote
during his voyage to New England in 1629, it may readily be seen that the greatest of all the Massachusetts magistrates firmly believed in the validity and sanctity of social distinctions: "God Almighty in his most holy and wise providence, hath so disposed of the Condition of mankind, as in all times some must be rich, some poor, some highe and eminent in power and dignitie; others meane and in subjection." 20

And so it was in Massachusetts, for there, perhaps more than in any other seventeenth-century English colony, order was to be observed and respected.

Five distinct social classes emerged out of the settlement of the Massachusetts Bay Colony: (1) an upper class made up of wealthy, educated men with good family backgrounds and influential friends, and which drew most of its members from the English gentry and merchant classes (2) a middle class made up of artisans, tradesmen, shopkeepers, proprietors, and independent farmers, and which constituted the backbone of the social and economic structure of the colony (3) a small lower class, which was made up of free but poor common and unskilled laborers (4) a servant class made up of indentured servants and apprentices who lived in a state of voluntary and temporary bondage (5) a slave class, which was made up of Negroes, Indians, and very occasionally a white criminal, who either by reason of race or crime were normally considered undesirables, and who were held in a state of permanent bondage. 21

It is with the fourth of these classes, the servant class, that this study is concerned. Many of the individuals who emigrated to Massachusetts during the early seventeenth century were servants. 22 For the most part they were men and women who could not pay the cost of their own transportation and who therefore agreed to bind themselves out for a number of years as servants in return for their passage. A large number of children emigrated in the same manner, only as apprentices. All were legally bound
to their masters under the terms of contracts, commonly known as indentures or covenants. 23

In England, hired laborers—the equivalent of indentured servants—and even most apprentices would ordinarily live out their lives as laborers or as artisans, without expectation of moving up the social scale beyond their fathers' stations in life. In the New World, however, the land to man ratio was the reverse of that in England—land was abundant and men were scarce. A great labor demand and an inadequate supply of laborers made it necessary to import laborers and to bind them under the specific terms of a contract in order to guarantee their services for a period of time. The institution of indentured servitude consequently proved to be an institution of mutual accommodation, which not only made it possible for many to emigrate who might otherwise have been unable to, but also made it possible to maintain an adequate, contractually bound, labor force in the colony.

That labor force was made up for the most part of white indentured and apprenticed servants. Negroes were rarely imported in Massachusetts during the seventeenth century, and never to the same extent that they were in some of the other colonies. 24 Imported convict laborers were regarded unfavorably in Puritan Massachusetts and appear to have been brought to New England only on a very limited scale. 25 One authority has stated the situation as follows: "Convicts were, of course, anathema to all who had the general social good in mind..." 26 In Massachusetts the welfare of society in general was more important than anything else. For the same reason—the general social good—heathen Negroes and Indians, as well as "uncivilized" Irishmen and certain other whites, were utilized only on a restricted basis throughout the Puritan community. In fact, it has been estimated that no more than two hundred Negro, Indian, and criminal slaves were living in all of New England in 1676. 27
The white indentured servant and the white apprentice were only a little better off than Negro and Indian slaves. While their status as servants was only temporary—a fact of obvious and overwhelming significance—they were nevertheless men who constituted the lowest order of white society. It was the stigma of just such a classification that the servant or apprentice had to overcome, after he had completed his period of servitude, before he could be integrated into the community in which he lived.

While the servant or apprentice remained under indenture he had very little to look forward to except the day when his period of servitude would come to an end. Within the Puritan society, bound laborers were allowed very little freedom of movement or self-expression. The lot of the bound laborer was anything but pleasant in any of the colonies, however, and the conditions of servitude were really no more arduous in seventeenth-century Massachusetts than they were in any other colony. Because of a serious scarcity of laborers there, in fact, servants were often inclined to take advantage of their masters. 28

In Massachusetts, the servant owed his master respect, faithfulness, and obedience. The society in which the servant lived expected as much of him, and the law demanded as much. Just as the law enforced the service of the servant, however, it also protected him against misuse by his master, insuring him that the terms of his indenture would always be very strictly observed. 29

The institution of indentured servitude, as it evolved out of the varied circumstances of colonial immigration and settlement, developed along lines which were original and quite distinct from English common law. "Important as the English heritage was in determining the patterns of life and thought in Massachusetts Bay, the conditions of settlement
had an equally significant influence upon the life of the colony." In English law, the only persons bound under contract to labor for a period of years were apprentices, who were bound for instruction in a trade, and perhaps some farm laborers, who were obliged by the Elizabethan poor law to hire themselves out by the year. In the colonies, apprenticeship was merely a highly specialized and favored form of bound labor.

The distinction that is sometimes made between the apprentice and the pure villein or bond servant of England does not suffice to distinguish an apprentice from an indentured servant of seventeenth-century Massachusetts. The apprentice and the indentured servant were both servants in the broadest sense of the word, and the articles of the indenture were basically the same in each case; however, the indenture of the apprentice almost always stipulated that he must receive training in some trade. A servant whose indenture did not state that he was to receive an education in some trade was, of course, no more than a common indentured servant. Then too, most apprentices were young, often only seven or eight years of age, whose indentures were to remain in force until they reached twenty-one, the age of their legal majority. Indentured servants, on the other hand, were normally adults who bound themselves out as laborers for a period of time, usually for anywhere from four to fourteen years, with seven years being the average.

A majority of the apprentices who were imported during the first half of the seventeenth century were sent from England to Massachusetts by the English county courts, which were very anxious to relieve England of its vast quantity of destitute, derelict, degenerate public charges. As the apprenticeship system had developed in the Bay Colony by 1650 it served a similar purpose with respect to educating public charges of local origin, but also served as a system by which ordinary, respectable young
men could receive training in the trades. Consequently one would expect that apprenticeship was a ladder up the social scale rather than a barrier to be overcome.

The institution of indentured servitude, exclusive of the apprentice system, however, was neither designed nor intended to produce skilled laborers in number. It was intended merely to meet the immediate common labor needs of the colony. As a result, there was seldom a sufficient number of men employed in the trades, even after 1645 when the colonists of Massachusetts apparently came to rely more and more upon a native labor supply, and the problem of labor supply remained rather serious throughout most of the seventeenth century.

The question arises as to what became of these indentured servants and apprentices after their period of servitude was completed. Were they assimilated into the society in which they lived, or were they stigmatized as second-class citizens? Was there a marked difference between the two once freedom was obtained? Did any of them achieve any degree of fortune or fame? One author states that: "In all the colonies there were those brought as servants, even as convicts, who rose to wealth through industry and frugality, two virtues on which a new land pays high premium. Some founded families that attained to honor and influence." It is the purpose of this study to determine whether or not that statement is at all accurate with respect to one county, Essex County, in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. More specifically, it is the purpose of this study to determine whether or not a former indentured servant or apprentice of Essex County was capable of social mobility in the seventeenth century.

The Puritans of Essex County had as their immediate objective the establishment of a permanent, stable society. Colonial society was of its very nature unstable, however, in view of the character of the constantly
expanding colonial frontier. As the tide of immigration increased between 1630 and 1645, the original towns and villages of Essex County were filled to capacity. Natural population increases after 1645, as well as a steady, though ever diminishing immigration, required the creation of new outposts along the colonial frontier if the immigrant's desire for cheap land was to be realized. There was, as a result, a gradual though steady shift in the population away from the established settlements throughout the first half of the seventeenth century, as the history of the growth and development of towns in Essex County indicates.

Salem, founded in 1630, was the political, economic, social, and religious center of Essex County throughout the seventeenth century. It rapidly became so over-crowded, however, that it had to be subdivided several times after 1635, and a number of new towns were created: Marblehead, in 1635; Wenham, in 1643; Manchester, in 1645; Topsfield, in 1648; and Beverly, in 1668. The creation of other new towns after 1630 indicates a gradual shift in the population away from Salem, for the most part in a northern and western direction: Ipswich, in 1634; Newbury, in 1635; Lynn, in 1637; Rowley, in 1639; Haverhill, in 1641; Gloucester, in 1642; and Andover, in 1646. The towns of Salisbury and Amesbury, which were part of Norfolk County until 1680 when that county was abolished and those towns assimilated by Essex County, also undoubtedly absorbed some of the population overflow from the Salem area.

Economically, the residents of Essex County were primarily dependent upon agriculture for their livelihood. Fishing was also a very important industry, however, particularly in the coastal towns of Lynn, Marblehead, Salem, Beverly, Manchester, Gloucester, and Newbury. Shipbuilding, the naval stores industry, and mercantile trade developed in the coastal towns and villages and fur trading was an important industry in the hinterland.
Iron smelting attracted considerable outside capital and laborers, particularly in the area around Lynn.

The Massachusetts Bay Colony's political affairs were administered from Boston throughout most of the seventeenth century. Essex County's political affairs were, in turn, administered from Ipswich and Salem, both of which served as county seats. In each town of Essex County a group of Selectmen, elected by the freemen of the town, was responsible for conducting town affairs. They made all decisions regarding the general welfare, such as the setting off of common lands, and they appropriated all of the funds necessary to institute civic improvements. They also handled all problems of local concern, such as the settlement of boundary disputes between property owners, which did not involve judicial action. As a rule, the Selectmen were pillars of the local church, and represented the civil aspect of Puritanism in the codes and ordinances which they enacted. The authority of the Selectmen was for all practical purposes absolute, since they represented the Puritan ethic in a civil supremacy.

The county's Quarterly Court generally met in either Ipswich or Salem. Before the court convened, a call was sent out for veniremen from among the freemen of the county. A grand jury was then impanelled, the purpose of which was to deliver indictments in all civil or criminal cases which had come before the constables of the several towns since the last meeting of the court. When the court convened, a jury of trials was selected from among the veniremen of the county. The cases on the docket were then heard and disposed of promptly. Appeals from the Quarterly Court were heard in the Court of Assistants, which normally sat in Boston.

Socially, Essex County was typical of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. There were no extraordinary forces at work there which would distinguish its society from that of Massachusetts in general. In Essex County
religious life, the First Congregational Church of Salem was second perhaps only to the church in Boston as the Bay Colony's stronghold of orthodox Puritanism.

If the former indentured servant or apprentice of seventeenth-century Massachusetts was at all capable of social mobility, the records of Essex County should reveal as much. The number of printed, primary sources that are available for Essex County is, in fact, the principal reason that that county was chosen for this study. The Puritan's seemingly natural desire for recording his deeds is enhanced by the devotion of the Essex Institute, in Salem, to reproducing those vital records. Were it not for those very important records, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to make a study such as this.

It should be kept in mind that this is not a quantitative, statistical study. It is a sampling. The actual extent of social mobility, the number of factors which might have made it possible, or prevented it, and the application of any conclusions concerning Essex County society to the remainder of society in the Massachusetts Bay Colony are all subjects for some future study but are not dealt with here.

The positive determination of social mobility rests upon the careful consideration of a number of factors. Among those factors are: whether or not an ex-servant or an ex-apprentice could find employment, acquire property, marry, support a family, become a member of the church, become a freeman entitled to vote, hold political or elected office, or in fact distinguish himself in any manner at all. For purposes of investigation, the names of fifty indentured servants and apprentices were chosen from primary sources for Essex County. Those names were then traced through several printed primary sources for the colony and county: The Probate Records of Essex County, The Records of the Governor and Company of the
Massachusetts Bay in New England, The Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, and The Essex Institute Historical Collections. For fifteen of the names chosen there was no record at all beyond the fact that they had once been servants or apprentices in Essex County. For the remaining thirty-five, brief biographical sketches were composed incorporating the bulk of all the evidence gleaned from the primary sources.

In compiling the data and composing the sketches, one problem was paramount—positive identification of succeeding references to the servant or apprentice originally chosen. Because no completely satisfactory solution could be found, the sketches and the conclusions based on them must be used with extreme caution. Christian names used generation after generation, surnames often represented by more than one family, variations in the spelling of surnames, temporal and geographical changes, and incomplete "descriptions" in the records all made positive identification difficult if not impossible. These obstacles can be summarized briefly by stating very simply that the body of evidence accumulated is often at very best fragmentary. In each case the biographer had to exercise his judgment without any sure sense of being absolutely right. Consequently, the biographical sketches can be no more accurate than the judgment of the biographer.
NOTES

5. Ibid., 56.
6. Ibid., 57-77.
8. Haskins, Law and Authority, 12.
10. Ferry Miller, Orthodoxy in Massachusetts (Boston, 1959), 149.
13. Ibid.
16. Miller, Orthodoxy, 149.
17. Ibid., 212.


22. Abbot E. Smith, Colonists in Bondage (Chapel Hill, 1947), 337; Haskins, Law and Authority, 98.


24. Ibid., 182.

25. Ibid., 326.


29. Ibid., 66-73.

30. Haskins, Law and Authority, 106.


35. Samuel E. Morison, Builders of the Bay Colony (Cambridge, 1930), 168.

36. Eggleston, Transit of Civilization, 300.
CHAPTER II

THE SERVANTS

1. John Adams [ca. 1653]

John Adams, an English boy, was a servant of John Gifford, an undertaker of the Lynn or Hammersmith Iron Works at Lynn, in Essex County. He was the son of one George Adams. He lived in Gifford's house as a servant, and in 1653, valued at £8 for the four years of service he still owed, he was put out as an apprentice or a servant to a smith.

What became of John Adams after 1653 is uncertain. There were at least two other John Adamses living in Essex County during the same period, and they seem to be the ones most frequently mentioned in the records for the county. One was the son of a William Adams. He was probably one of the leading jurists of the county, and he was probably the same John Adams mentioned in several property suits. There also appears to have been a John Adams living in Newbury in 1656. Later records indicate that after 1680 there was a John Adams living in Salem with his wife Sarah and several children, but there is no apparent connection there with the former servant. Nor does there seem to be any connection between the former servant and any of the Adamses of Ipswich, including the family of William Adams, whose descendants bearing the name John were quite numerous.

John Adams, the former servant, may have been one of the two or three John Adamses admitted as a freeman by the General Court in 1666 or 1668, some eight to ten years after attaining his freedom.
2. Edmund Ashby [ca. 1665] 2

On September 18, 1665, Edmund Ashby signed an indenture binding himself for four years as an apprentice to Samuel Graves, a feltmaker, of Ipswich. He apparently kept to his contract and served his full time, although he did argue with his master and threaten to run away or lie in jail rather than serve him. When his time was up, Ashby sued Graves for £15 that he had given the feltmaker when he first came with him, the apprentice having been promised the £15 when he completed all of his time. With the aid of two attorneys Ashby won the suit. He then sued Graves for non-performance of indenture, but lost that suit. In 1670 the judgment granted to the apprentice at Salem was executed and he received his £15.

Edmund Ashby probably moved to Salem in 1671 in search of a job. The records of that town indicate that on September 25 of that year Edmund and Benjamin Ashby were received as inhabitants of the town. In all probability, Ashby had relatives in Salem. The Reverend John Higginson’s letter of 1670 condemning drunkenness in Salem mentioned an Ashby who was at the time keeping an ordinary in the town.

After he completed his apprenticeship Edmund Ashby became a seaman. In 1671 Samuel Graves complained against Joshua Ray who had served as one of Ashby’s attorneys in the latter’s suit against his master. During the course of that case it was mentioned by one of the deponents that Edmund Ashby was at sea for a time. His desire to follow a seaman’s trade would explain Ashby’s taking up residence in Salem.

In 1679 Ashby sued one Timothy Clarke for false imprisonment, and won the suit. Clarke, who was commander of the ship Sea Venture, had Ashby arrested in Boston on May 23, 1678, for refusing to pay 27s. from a dead man’s wages for the doctor of the Indeavour. Ashby had received
the man's wages but refused to pay the bill. After he was arrested, Ashby paid 50s. bail but was not released. He also tendered the prison-keeper one load of wood, which he refused. A young seaman deposed that while Ashby was incarcerated it was a great hindrance to the improvement of his vessel.

After 1679 it is not too clear what became of Edmund Ashby. The Salem town records indicate that he contributed to the county rate between 1680 and 1682, but he may have left Salem during that time to take up residence in nearby Beverly. The Beverly First Church records indicate that early in 1682 Edmund Ashby was admitted into full communion with the church. Sometime between 1680 and 1682 Ashby apparently married, and in 1682 his son, James, was baptized in the Beverly First Church. In 1685 another son, Ebenezer, was baptized, as were two daughters, Martha and Mary, in 1687. Then in 1690 another daughter, Ellinor, was baptized. In 1697 the wife of Edmund Ashby, Ellinor (also Ellen), was admitted into full communion with the church. In 1702 another daughter, Elizabeth, was baptized.

The Ashby house in Beverly was occupied by an Edmund Ashby in 1723, but in 1751 it was occupied by a Charles Shattuck. That is a good indication that by 1751 Edmund Ashby's descendants had moved elsewhere, and that by that time the main branch of the Ashby family was perhaps even extinct. A good deal of genealogical information is available concerning the Ashby's of Beverly. While there is no positive evidence linking Edmund Ashby, the feltmaker's apprentice who became a seaman, with the Ashby dynasty of Beverly, neither is there any evidence which seems to preclude such a fact.

3. Jeremiah Boutman [ca. 1651]

In 1651 Jeremiah (also Jeremy) Boutman, sometime a resident of
Suffolk, England, with the consent of his uncle and guardian, Robert Newman, signed an indenture binding him as an apprentice to one Matthew Nixson of Salem for seven years. Jeremiah was to be trained in the fishing trade and in the same service at sea that Nixson was engaged in. Boutman was also to receive £3.13s. at the beginning of his time, and £1 when his time was completed.

Jeremiah Boutman apparently married a Hester Lambert in 1659. On July 2, 1660, they had a daughter, Mary; on November 4, 1662, they had a son, Jeremy; and on September 11, 1665, another son, Matthew, was born to them.

In November, 1661, Sarah Lambert, the daughter of Richard Lambert of Salem, was committed to Jeremiah Boutman. She was probably the sister of Hester Lambert. Boutman was to keep her for a year, and was to have £5 for her keep. In 1662 he received £5.10s.6d. from the town officials for keeping her, and in 1663 he was made an additional allowance for her.

According to the Salem Commoners' Records, Abraham Purchase of Salem claimed his house and Jeremiah Boutman's cottage-right in 1661 and again in 1702. Such claims were made in order to determine the town rate and each individual's share of it. That is very probably an indication that Boutman had ceased to claim his cottage-right as early as 1661.

In 1667, Boutman's wife served as a witness in a court case. In 1668 Jeremiah Boutman was involved in a legal action himself. That case concerned the ownership of some cloth goods that Boutman and some others had acquired at Cape Cod. Since no one made a claim for them, Boutman and the others were allowed to retain the goods until the court took some further action in the matter.

The Salem town records for 1669 indicate that Jeremiah Boutman had bought the house of Henry Harwood, deceased, some time earlier. He was
still indebted £15 for the house in 1669, and was instructed by the Selectmen of the town to keep the widow Elizabeth Harwood for two years until September 20, 1670, in order to relieve himself of the debt. He was to be allowed any extraordinary charges which the widow might incur. In 1670, however, Boutman lost the house as a result of an action brought in by Richard Fender [also Flinder]. Fender charged that Boutman was withholding a house and lands which by order of the court had been given to Jane Fender, the plaintiff's wife. The house in which Boutman lived was attached by court order. A deed was produced during the course of the action which identified Jeremiah Boutman as a Salem fisherman. The deed clearly stated that the house and one acre of land should be his in return for a valuable sum paid for the use of the widow Harwood. It would appear that Boutman was unable to meet his debts, and consequently lost both the house and the land.

In an inventory of the estate of William Powell of Salem, taken in 1670, Jeremiah Boutman was mentioned as a debtor to the estate in the sum of 7s. In 1671 Boutman consented to an audit of the estate of the late Henry Harwood. Apparently he ceased to occupy the Harwood house after that audit was taken.

The Salem town records indicate that Boutman received a grant of land upon which to build a house, in 1673. The grant provided for a plot of land near that of a man named Buckly, if there was space available, or for a plot anywhere in that area toward the sea. The eighteen rods of land which he eventually received was located near the Buckly property, and was guaranteed in the grant to be for the use of his heirs as well as for his own use.

In 1674, Jeremiah Boutman was apparently still engaged in some sort of maritime activity. He may, in fact, have done quite well as a seaman.
At least he was able to pay a wage of £15.5s.2d. to a man who had made a
voyage with him in 1674. In 1676, according to the Salem town records,
Boutman was given an abatement of 8s, toward either the county or the town
rate.

In 1677 Jeremiah Boutman was appointed executor of the estate of an
Ann Pickton of Beverly. If it was the same Jeremiah Boutman, he must have
moved to nearby Beverly early in 1677. He must also have had five sons
by that time: Jeremiah, Matthew, John, Joseph, and Benjamin. Either he or
his son Jeremiah, who would have been twenty-nine, was admitted to Beverly
First Church in 1691, and was listed later among the brethren of the church.
A good deal of genealogical information is available concerning the Boutman
family of Beverly.

Daniel Button [ca. 1672] 4

Daniel Button was apparently the son of Matthias and Teagle Button
of Haverhill. He was born on April 10, 1654. Button was an apprentice to
John Dresser, Sr., of Rowley, before 1672. When Dresser died in 1672
he mentioned his apprentice in his will, leaving him a pair of pincers, a
pair of nippers, two paring knives, and four awls. The remainder of the
boy's time, according to Dresser's will, was to be spent with John Dresser,
Jr., who was asked by his father to fulfill his indenture to Button for the
perfecting of his apprentice's trade.

Very little is known of the exact conditions of Button's indenture,
or of Button himself, but he was probably impressed into a Newbury infantry
company on August 5, 1675, and participated in King Philip's War. If this
was the same Daniel Button, and there appears to have been no one else by
that name living in Essex County during that same period, then he was one
of some seventy men killed at the battle of Bloody Brook on the 18th of
September, 1675.
Since Daniel Button died intestate, administration of his estate was granted to a John Bartlett, Sr., of Newbury. The estate was to be ordered according to the administrator's mind. In 1677, when the estate was settled, Button apparently had five brothers and sisters and two half-sisters still living. Button's brother-in-law, James Kingsbury, who was probably a resident of Newbury, received a cow. The remainder of Daniel Button's estate was divided among the rest of his brothers and sisters, the children of Matthias and Teagle Button.

5. James Chichester [ca. 1658]

James Chichester was apparently baptized in the Salem church in 1651. In 1658, William Chichester abandoned his wife Mary, leaving her with several small children and without any means of support. It was not known whether he intended to return. Mary Chichester's father, David Corwithie, placed her son James as an apprentice to Francis Scerry of Salem. The boy was about ten years of age at the time. According to young James's contract he was to be sent to school until he learned how to write a legible hand, was to be given one ewe lamb to keep, was to receive £10 in corn or cattle at the end of his time, and was to receive a suit for the Lord's Day and a suit for working days.

What became of James Chichester after 1658 is not known. There is no evidence of his ever having completed his apprenticeship or of his ever having assumed a role of any importance in the affairs of his community.

6. Nathaniel Clark [ca. 1673]

Nathaniel Clark had been placed with John Trask of Salem sometime before 1673 with intent to bind him as an apprentice until he reached age twenty-one, but his father died before the indentures were completed. Then, in 1673, the court ordered that Clark live with John Trask after the manner of an apprentice. Clark was to be taught the trade of a cooper,
and was to be taught to read, write, and count.

Exactly what became of Nathaniel Clark after he had served out his apprenticeship is not at all certain. There were apparently several men named Nathaniel Clark living in Essex County during the same period that the former apprentice lived there. One was an ensign of a Rowley infantry company in 1685; one was a resident of Byfield, in 1727; there were perhaps two Nathaniel Clarks living in Newbury after 1681; and yet another was an inhabitant of Beverly between 1715 and 1751. There was apparently no connection between any of these men, or between any one of them and the former apprentice.

7. Christopher Codner [ca. 1671] 7

Christopher Codner, Sr., of Marblehead, died in 1660, leaving his wife Mary with a five year old daughter, Mary, and a three year old son, Christopher. According to his father's will, Christopher Codner, Jr., was to receive £60 when he reached age twenty-one or was married. His mother was to give some security for his inheritance if she remarried. Mary Codner apparently married Elias White of Marblehead, a mariner, sometime around 1661 or 1662, at which time the Codner house was conveyed over to a John Devorix and Christopher Lattamore, both of Marblehead, mariners, in trust, for the benefit of the late Codner's children. She then married a Richard Downing in 1664 or 1665. Christopher Codner was not given security by his mother when she married Richard Downing and the court ordered that the house in possession of Joshua Codner, a tailor, of Marblehead, being part of the estate, be given to young Codner and his sister for security of payment of their portions when they came of age. Richard and Mary Downing agreed to bring both Mary and Christopher Codner up free.

On October 9, 1671, Christopher Codner of Marblehead, the son of
Christopher Codner, Sr., signed an indenture binding himself as an apprentice to Joseph Emons of Marblehead, a cordiner, for four years. His contract stipulated that he was to be taught the trade of a shoemaker and that he was not to be taken out of the country.

In 1675, Codner's mother, Mary Downing, and his mother's husband, Richard Downing, appealed to the court to have their son sent home to them. Goodwife Downing testified that she had not known of the indenture and that if she had she would not have consented to it. Richard Downing was said to have refused to let Emons take the boy, but Emons had taken him anyway. When Codner's mother called on Emons he allegedly spoke very badly to her and threatened to break her neck. The court ruled that if the boy's mother and father desired to take their son back home with them they would have to pay Emons for whatever diet the boy had had while he had been with Emons.

Christopher Codner served as a witness in a case in which a Mister Downing was defendant, in 1675, and made oath to a bond in the Salem court. In 1679 Codner himself was the defendant in a legal action. Thomas Tayner brought the action against Codner for pulling down the plaintiff's fence in Marblehead. Major William Hawthorne ruled in Tayner's favor, but Codner appealed the case on legal grounds and won his appeal.

Mary Codner, Christopher's sister, received her portion of her late father's estate, £20, in 1679. Christopher's portion was not available, however, and he and his mother went into the house which made up part of the estate to sell or dispose of it or its contents to raise the £60 that was said to be due him. Apparently, either the £60 which was provided for him in his father's will was to be divided between Christopher and his sister, with Christopher receiving two-thirds, or someone was simply taking advantage of the boy and depriving him of about £20 of his legacy.
The evidence indicates that the boy, either through oversight or design, was probably cheated.

The house and land which Christopher Codner, Sr., had owned in Marblehead was probably conveyed to him on July 10, 1656, by one Henry Pease. In 1679, when Christopher Codner, Jr., came of age, he took possession of the house and property according to court order. He was apparently engaged in the fishing trade at that time. A few years later, in 1685, he sold his part of the property to one John Roads, Sr., for £20.15s.

8. John Corlis [ca. 1672] 8

John Corlis was a servant to Joseph Davis for a year some time before 1673. He testified in a case involving Davis in 1669. Corlis was twenty-one years old at that time. In 1672, George Corlis, apparently a Haverhill resident, brought suit against Davis, who was also probably a Haverhill man, in an effort to force Davis to pay him £12 and two days work with a team. Davis was to have paid same for the services of Corlis's son, John, who had been indentured to Davis as a servant for twelve months. The case was nonsuited.

In 1673 George Corlis brought suit against the administrators of Joseph Davis's estate for the debt which Davis owed him for the services of his son John while he was Davis's servant. He won the verdict.

Almost nothing is known of John Corlis's activities after 1673. He probably married a Mary Wilford of Haverhill, however, before 1690. John Corlis apparently died before 1702. In 1702, Mary Corlis, his widow, married William Whittaker of Haverhill, bringing him several Corlis stepchildren under eighteen years of age.

9. Richard Coy [ca. 1645] 9

Richard Coy was brought to New England, from old England, as a
servant without an indenture, around 1645, by a Mr. Whittingham.
Whittingham then apparently sold his interests in Coy to one William
Hubbard, Sr., of Ipswich, whom Richard Coy was to serve for ten years
according to his agreement with Whittingham. William Hubbard's claim to
Coy's services was maintained by the court in 1645, at which time Hubbard
brought suit against Coy because of Coy's reluctance to serve him. Hubbard
found Coy difficult to handle in all probability. In 1649 Richard Coy was
presented at court for excessive drinking, vain mirth, and singing with
frequent oaths, but he was subsequently discharged. In that same year Coy
brought suit against one Edward Bishop on the charge that Bishop had
slandered him.

In 1651, in a case involving William Hubbard, Richard Coy and his
wife testified. Coy's wife was a Haffield, and after the death of Richard
Haffield of Ipswich, in 1652, his children chose Richard Coy to be their
guardian. He received £60 due the children, in lands, house, cattle, and
other goods, and acquitted the mother of the children, Martha Haffield.
Ruth Haffield, who was a daughter of Martha Haffield, was presented in
court in 1653 for excess in apparel, but Richard Coy affirmed that Ruth's
mother was worth at least £200 and she was discharged. In a later action
in 1653 Richard Coy's wife was also involved with the law. Her husband
answered her presentment and was discharged.

In 1655 Richard Coy brought a suit against William Hubbard, Sr.,
apparently to obtain redress of wrongs done him by his master. At that
time it was sworn that Coy had served only eight and one-half years of
his obligated time, and that Hubbard had agreed to pay Coy if he would
work on. Matthew Coy, the brother of Richard Coy, testified that Coy's
mother had wanted Richard to serve only Whittingham or come back home.
It was also sworn that when Coy had been sent away it had been with poor, insufficient clothing.

Richard Coy had made good his obligation to William Hubbard by 1658. In that year he was apparently licensed to keep an ordinary and draw wine and strong waters in Wenham. His license was renewed in 1659, and again in 1660.

In 1659 Richard Coy was seated on the jury of trials at Salem, and later that same year was summoned once more as a trial juror. He was also chosen, in 1659, to assist in taking a census of those living in Wenham in order that the rate for the minister might be determined. He was also to see to the allotment of a parcel of land to Mister Newman, the minister, to see that Mister Newman got his due, and to act with the Selectmen in levying and collecting a rate for a new meeting house. Richard Coy himself contributed £2.10s. toward the minister's rate, and a sum of 10s. for the new meeting house.

In 1660 Richard Coy served as an attorney in a legal action. He lost the case, which was appealed to the next Court of Assistants. John Leigh and Joseph Armitage were bound for Coy's appearance. During the course of the case it was mentioned that Coy had had something to do with the local schoolhouse, or the establishment of it.

The following year, 1661, Coy was involved in a property suit in which Walter Fairfield brought legal action against Richard Hutten. It was deposed that the house then in the possession of Richard Coy as well as the land it was on was formerly John Fairfield's, whose son was the plaintiff in the case. Coy, age thirty-five, deposed that the land was owned by Samuel Smith, who sold it to the deceased John Fairfield, and that it was part of the farm given by the town of Salem to Smith in Wenham. He also testified that Hutten opposed giving Walter Fairfield the
property unless he could recover it by law.

Richard Coy was a witness in a case involving a Wenham man, in 1661, who was presented on a complaint of his entertaining too many people in his house contrary to law. That year he was also seated once more on the jury of trials at Ipswich court. His name was also returned later for service on the jury of trials.

Between 1662 and 1664 Richard Coy was mentioned in connection with no less than five separate, minor cases. The most interesting of these cases concerned a thirteen year old apprentice, Hope Tyler, who had left his master's service without his master's consent and had found refuge in Coy's home.

In 1664, Walter and John Fairfield, heirs of John Fairfield, brought suit against Richard Coy for withholding possession of a house and lands which had been their father's. Coy won the suit after producing a lease which stated that he was entitled to keep the house and farm for eight years, until July 21, 1666, at which time the heirs of John Fairfield were to take possession of both the house and lands. According to the lease, Coy had to pay 60s. rent the first year and £5 each year after that, half in wheat and half in Indian corn. He was also to be allowed the cost of whatever fences or buildings he put up on the land. Richard Hutten also testified that Walter Fairfield had rented one-third of the farm from Coy some time earlier for £10.

The following year, 1665, Walter Fairfield was fined upon Richard Coy's complaint, for his and his wife's abuse of Coy's wife and children. Coy and his wife Martha had several small children under eight years of age at that time, as well as a son Richard who was about fifteen and a daughter Martha who was about fourteen. Coy, his wife, and his son all
testified that Fairfield had threatened to beat Goodwife Coy and that he
had abused the children.

Francis Wainwright sued Richard Coy, in 1665, for a debt. Wainwright
won the suit, and the court ordered the attachment of oats, wheat, and corn
belonging to Coy. Coy's barn was subsequently attached too. Wainwright sued
Edmund Batter and Walter Fairfield in 1666, because part of Richard Coy's
wheat, oats, and Indian corn had been delivered to Batter, and because Coy
had sold his barn to Walter Fairfield who delivered £6 for it to the man
who had attached it. The plaintiff won the suit.

Richard Coy contributed a horse, in 1666, to a fund for a friend of
his who had to put up security for his wife's appearance at the Court of
Assistants so that she would not have to go to prison. Coy was also named
in connection with a petition of Rachael Clinton who had been deprived of
a legacy of £30 for thirteen years, first by her brother Richard Coy and
then by her husband Thomas White. Exactly what her relationship was to
Richard Coy is not at all clear, but she must have been his sister-in-law.

In 1667, in answer to a petition of the residents of Quabaug, Coy and
several other men were appointed by the court to serve on a commission with
the power to admit residents, grant lands, and also order all prudential
affairs of the place in all matters. Coy and the other commissioners
were to continue in their authority until Quabaug was so well settled that
it might be created a township, according to law.

The widow Martha Haffield of Ipswich died in 1668. An inventory of
her estate was taken by Richard Coy and Thomas White. Coy's wife, Martha
Haffield Coy, was mentioned as an heir in her mother's estate. Richard Coy
was also mentioned in a minor case in 1669.

Nothing is known of Richard Coy's activities after 1669, but his
grandson was probably living in Beverly as early as 1723. He was more
than likely a very prominent man in Beverly, perhaps even a Proprietor. He drowned, somewhere in Virginia, in 1737.

10. Stephen Dow [ca. 1650]

Thomas Davis of Haverhill brought suit against Benjamin Swett, in 1657, for taking away his apprentice Stephen Dow. The court held that the boy should be returned to Davis. According to Stephen Dow's covenant, Davis was to teach the boy to read, write, and to perform the trade of a stonemason according to his capacity and the employment of the place in which he lived. During the course of the case it was deposed that Dow was often sickly and that he was treated well by Davis. It was also said that the boy's father, Thomas Dow, had left the boy with Davis about eight and one-half years before, and that Stephen was to remain with Davis until he was eighteen years old, but that the boy's father had since wanted his son back because he could not afford the terms. Swett was supposedly an agent acting in behalf of the boy's mother, Phebe Dow, who wanted her son back. Thomas Dow had died a short time before the case was brought into the court.

According to his father's will, Stephen Dow was to receive £10 when he reached twenty-one, or £5 at age twenty-one and £5 at age twenty-two. That was not a large legacy by any means, but it was as large a legacy as Thomas Dow could afford to leave his son. The Dows were a poor family. When Stephen first went to serve Thomas Davis, in fact, he could not eat his master's food for a long time, because he was not used to eating meat, milk, and beer, and he did not know that it was good. All he ever had to eat at home was a bread and water porridge, and water.

Early in 1661, Stephen Dow testified in a minor case. Later that same year, however, Stephen and his wife Ann were presented by the grand jury for fornication prior to their marriage, which they confessed. It was
The court decreed that they be whipped not to exceed ten lashes or else pay a fine of 20s. They chose to pay the fine, and Bartholomew Heath engaged to pay it for them.

In 1665 Stephen Dow's land was attached in Haverhill as a result of an action brought in against him by Robert Swan, the assignee of the boy's father, or Swan's assignee Stephen Kent.

Stephen Dow was apparently admitted as a freeman in 1668 or 1669. In 1672, as a result of a suit brought against William Neafe by Richard Dole, Neafe's land, and £6.10s., in the hands of Stephen Dow, were attached.

In 1673 Phebe Bow Eaton, Stephen Dow's mother, died in Haverhill. Administration of her estate was granted to her son Stephen. That same year Dow and Bartholomew Heath were appointed administrators of the estate of Joseph Heath of Haverhill. In 1676 Dow was mentioned in the will of his brother Thomas Dow of Haverhill. He was to share in his late brother's estate with his brother's wife, and was to receive approximately one-half of his brother's lands.

Stephen Dow was seated on the grand jury at Salisbury in 1679. In 1681 he assisted in taking an inventory of the estate of Jane Williams. That same year Stephen Dow testified in a case to the effect that he had rented some property in Haverhill from a James Davis, Sr. He was named the following year, 1682, as a debtor to the estate of one George Carr of Salisbury in the sum of 1s.5d.

When his brother John died, Stephen Dow petitioned for administration of some estate in lands which were his father's and then his elder brother John's. Since John's only son Joseph had died a child, Stephen Dow was apparently the next in line to inherit the land. His son and attorney, Samuel Dow, presented the petition before the court. According to Norfolk
County records, the property of Stephen Dow of Haverhill was located near that of a George Corlis.

In 1701 Stephen Dow circulated a petition in Haverhill requesting that some measures be taken to get back six children who had been carried off by the Indians. Dow's daughter Martha, who was married to Josiah Gage, was apparently living in Haverhill at that time. She was reportedly slain in the Dustin massacre, according to the Haverhill records, but probably was not according to other authority. What became of Stephen Dow after 1701 is not known.

11. Matthew Edwards [ca. 1649]

Matthew Edwards was apparently the son of Frances Hawes of Salem, who died in 1645. It was specified in her will that her husband put her son out to some honest man, to be brought up in learning.

When John Fairfield of Wenham died in 1646, his cousin Matthew Edwards was mentioned in his will. Matthew was to receive twenty acres of upland lying within Fairfield's farm that he had received from Salem, and also a two acre meadow which was to be laid out most indifferently by Fairfield's supervisors. Edwards was to receive the property when he was twenty-one years old. Edwards may also have received a legacy of £9,12s.10d. from his uncle's estate. Robert Hawes, Matthew's step-father, was one of the supervisors of Fairfield's estate.

Matthew Edwards, the servant of Peter Palfry of Salem, requested in 1649 to be allowed to bind himself to another master in order that he might learn a trade. He maintained that he was not Palfry's servant and that his master and dame to whom he had first been bound were dead. The court refused his plea and declared that he was Palfry's indentured servant, and was to continue in Palfry's service according to the terms of indenture.
In 1658, Matthew Edwards, age twenty-five, testified in a legal suit concerning ownership of a colt. He also testified in a case concerning a house occupied by one Richard Coy, in 1661, stating that it had formerly been John Fairfield's house. He was chosen by Benjamin Fairfield, in 1663, to be his guardian. The boy had originally chosen Peter Palfry, but Palfry died in 1663 so the boy chose Edwards and the court confirmed his choice.

Matthew Edwards was apparently admitted as a freeman in 1669. In 1673 he was one of several men chosen to assist in running a boundary between Salem and Reading. In 1674 Edwards testified in a legal action involving Walter Fairfield that he had been asked by Fairfield to go to Wenham to show some men the bounds of a parcel of land that was in controversy. The land had formerly belonged to his uncle John Fairfield. He was forty-two years of age at the time of the dispute. He was also summoned to appear as a witness in an action in 1678. He was living in Reading, apparently, at that time. In that case he mentioned that thirty-six or perhaps thirty-seven years before he had gone to Wenham to live, and that he had lived there for six years.

By 1678 Edwards was probably one of the better known residents of the town of Reading. He was one of several men appointed in that year to lay out a cart-way between Reading and Salem, and he later assisted in that task.

Matthew Edwards testified in another case involving his cousin Walter Fairfield in 1679. He mentioned at that time that he had lived with his uncle John Fairfield, Walter's father, in Wenham thirty-eight years earlier, and that he and Peter Palfry had helped divide his uncle's land. It is not known what became of Matthew Edwards after 1679.


In 1647 John Legate, in behalf of his kinsman Samuel Fog, brought
suit against William Fullar of Hampton for not teaching his apprentice, Fog, the trade of a locksmith. Samuel Fog had four years longer as an apprentice. The court ordered that the remainder of his time be spent with one Isaac Cosen of Rowley, an expert smith. Fog was also allowed 32s. costs. William Fullar, who was also constable of the town of Hampton, presented his apprentice to the court and was relieved of him. In March, 1648, Fog went with Cosen.

Fog testified in a case involving Isaac Cosen, in 1648, that he had delivered a summons. He then apparently served out his apprenticeship with Cosen and returned home to Hampton, because nothing more seems to have been heard of him until he was seated on the jury of trials at Hampton in 1653. Fog’s name was signed to a petition circulated by some Newbury residents, in 1654, which was sent to the General Court in behalf of a Salisbury man. He certified later that he had signed the petition unadvisedly.

Samuel Fog was made a freeman at a court held in Hampton in October of 1654. The next mention of Fog was several years later, in 1662, at which time he made several presentments at the Hampton court as constable of that town. That same year he returned the names of several men from Hampton for duty on the jury of trials, acting once more as constable. In October of 1662 Samuel Fog was seated on the jury of trials at Hampton court. He was also seated on the jury of trials at Hampton in the year 1664.

Samuel Fog probably had a brother Ralph in New England, as well as relatives in England. He may, in fact, have been the cousin of one Lydia Bankes of New England and London, who was a rather influential woman in New England society. In 1673 Samuel Fog may have been one of the Selectmen of Hampton. He was last mentioned, in 1676, as having brought suit against one John Smith of Hampton, for an act of cruelty to a swine.
In 1656 John Coggswell assigned his indentured servant, Thomas Fowler, over to his uncle, Phillip Fowler. Thomas had been bound to Coggswell in London for seven years, and had been brought to New England. Phillip Fowler was a resident of the town of Salisbury. Between 1657 and 1662 Thomas Fowler was mentioned in a number of minor cases. In 1669 Fowler was involved in a suit brought in against Edward Cottell by John Godfry. During the course of the case it was mentioned that Fowler owned a house. Fowler was thirty-three years old at the time of the case.

Between 1671 and 1673 Fowler was a witness in three more suits involving John Godfry. In 1674 Thomas Fowler, a resident of Amesbury, was presented in court himself, for illegally killing a hog. He was admonished, and ordered to pay if the owner of the hog appeared. That same year he testified in a case involving a Boston man and a Newbury woman.

Thomas Fowler, about forty years of age, testified in a legal action against his former master and transporter John Coggswell, Jr., of Ipswich, in 1676. He testified that he had been forced to live with John Coggswell, Sr., for seven years, but that he had paid a sum of £16 and redeemed part of his time. William Coggswell testified that Fowler had been paid for originally by his father.

Thomas Fowler assisted, in 1667, in taking an inventory of a Robert Quinby's estate. Quinby was an Amesbury resident. The following year, Thomas Fowler was mentioned as a debtor in the sum of £1,10s. to the estate of John Woodham of Ipswich. Fowler was seated on the jury of trials at Salisbury court in 1678.

The Norfolk County records of 1678 mentioned Thomas Fowler, stating that he was an Amesbury planter, receiving three acres of salt marsh from a Salisbury man in return for some boards. In 1679, in the settlement of
the estate of William Bradbury of Salisbury, Thomas Fowler was named as being due £2.10s. from the estate for the services of his daughter. The same year Thomas Fowler brought an action against a John Weed, in behalf of the town of Amesbury, for withholding several portions of common land laid out to the inhabitants of Amesbury, which had formerly been a part of Salisbury. Fowler was the owner of a township. Fowler also witnessed a transfer of property, in 1679, between Richard Dole of Newbury and one Ephraim Brown of Salisbury. Nothing is known of Thomas Fowler's activities after 1679.

14. William Harper [ca. 1641]

In 1641 George Carr of Salisbury brought suit against his indentured servant, William Harper, for default of service. The court ruled in favor of the plaintiff, and decreed that Harper had to pay 10s. for the loss of time to his master. Harper was also to be restrained from following the ferry as his vocation. Harper's indenture was drawn up according to the custom of old England.

What became of William Harper after 1641 is unknown. There is very little evidence at hand relating to his activities, and that evidence is far from conclusive. A William Harper was mentioned as being involved in an action against one Thomas Dexter, Sr., in 1641, but there is no apparent link between the plaintiff in that case and George Carr's servant. William Harper was also mentioned again in 1642 as the plaintiff in an action against a Walter Knight, but again there was no apparent connection with William Harper the servant.

15. Baldwin House [ca. 1658]

George Gardner of Salem assigned the time of his indentured servant, Baldwin House, to John Southwick in 1658. The court permitted the action. George Gardner was a prominent member of a very well established Essex
County family. Nothing is known of Baldwin House's activities, however, after 1658.

16. Matthew Jellet [ca. 1641] 16

It was apparently claimed by George Williams of Salem, in 1641, that his apprentice Matthew Jellet owed him two more years of service, but one Francis Perry testified that Jellet's apprenticeship was only for a period of seven years and was to end in March. The court freed young Jellet. The boy agreed to serve his master six months longer, and the court allowed it. What became of Matthew Jellet after 1641 is unknown.

17. Caleb Johnson [ca. 1651] 17

When John Osgood of Andover died in 1651 he willed his indentured servant, Caleb Johnson, a cow calf which was to be given to him three years before his time was out. Osgood also provided that his servant was to be kept at the expense of his executors, his wife Sarah and his son John, Jr., until his time was completed.

Caleb Johnson apparently died shortly after his period of service was completed, in 1656. He was then a resident of Andover. Since Caleb Johnson died intestate, the administration of his estate was granted to a Henry Ingalls. An inventory of the estate was brought in at £20.8s.

18. John King [ca. 1650] 18

William King of Salem died intestate in 1650. His third son, John, a lad of thirteen, was assigned to his brother William King, Jr., to serve him for seven years as his apprentice. John King was to receive £10 from his father's estate and £16 more when he completed his time with his brother. In 1651 William King, Jr., assigned his interests in his brother over to their mother, Dorothy King.

There were apparently several John Kings living in Essex County at the same time that John King the apprentice was living there. One appears
to have been a servant who had been kidnapped in Ireland, transported to New England, and sold there. Another was living there as early as 1638. Yet another John King lived in Northampton during the 1670's and 1680's. There was apparently no connection between any of these men, or between any one of them and John King the apprentice.

John King apparently married an Elizabeth Goldthwaite in September of 1660. They subsequently had several children. That same year, 1660, John King testified in a legal action involving one Roger Hascoll of Salem. John King was probably a cooper, and in 1663 may have purchased ten acres of land from one Eleazer Giles of Salem for £8. He was involved in a minor law suit in 1665. In 1668, King apparently contributed to the town rate. The following year, 1669, he was chosen to serve on the jury of trials at the Salem court.

The Salem Selectmen ordered in 1669 that a horse bridge be built, and John King was chosen as overseer of the project. John King was named in 1670 as being due £2.6s.6d. from the estate of John Croade of Salem. In 1675 King assisted in appraising the estate of Elias Whitty of Salem. In 1678 King applied to the town for a license to operate an ordinary. His request evoked a storm of protest in Salem. Many citizens, including the Reverend John Higginson, objected to the opening of another ordinary.

John King was given a warning to appear in court to take the oath of allegiance in 1678. The following year, 1679, he assisted in appraising the estate of Jacob Preston of Salem. In 1680 John King was presented in court for selling strong waters contrary to law. He confessed and was fined. That same year, and the next year as well, King was mentioned in the Salem town records as an overseer of highways.

Thomas Goldthwaite of Salem died in 1682 or 1683. In his will he left ten acres of land to his son-in-law John King. King sold one lot to
one Caleb Buffum of Salem, but he retained another that he had been willed by his father-in-law. He owned that lot, valued at £15, as late as 1700. In 1683 John King was mentioned as receiving 19s. compensation for work done repairing the highways. He was chosen the following year, 1684, as a surveyor of fences by the Salem Selectmen. That same year King received compensation for seven days work on the highway in the sum of 1ls. He later contributed to the Salem town rate on several occasions.

In 1702 John King claimed a house and a cottage-right that had been Thomas Goldthwaite's. He made a similar claim after 1713. John King and his son John, Jr., were both apparently proprietors of the Salem common lands in 1713.

William King, John King the elder's brother, died in 1684. His wife Katharine died in 1718. In the settlement of her own and her husband's estate it was mentioned that John King, her brother-in-law, was deceased, and that his heirs were to inherit one-fourth of the estate of William King. Additional genealogical information is available concerning John King's descendants.

19. Samuel King [ca. 1650]

When William King, Sr., of Salem died in 1650 his second son, Samuel, age eighteen, was assigned to his brother William King, Jr., to serve him for three years as his apprentice. Samuel was to receive £12 at the end of his time, as well as £10 from his late father's estate.

Very little is known of Samuel King's activities after 1650. He may have been admitted at the court as a freeman from Weymouth around 1681, but that is not certain. When his brother William died, in 1684, Samuel King was designated to receive one-fourth of his brother's estate. Samuel was living at Southhold, Long Island, New York, at the time that his brother's estate was finally settled. He was a cooper. Samuel did not retain his
interests in his brother's estate, but conveyed his rights to his youngest son Samuel who was a Southhold mariner.

20. Thomas Lyon [ca. 1659]  

In 1659 Thomas Lyon, the son of John Lyon, sometime of Marblehead, was bound over to Francis Collins of Salem, a carpenter, as his indentured servant, by order of the court.

What became of Thomas Lyon after 1659 is unknown. A Thomas Lyon was mentioned in connection with several cases of theft and was ordered fined and whipped during the same period, but there is no evidence to indicate that that Thomas Lyon and the servant were one and the same man. Thomas Lyon was also mentioned in connection with a case involving one Christopher Codner, and a property case involving the estate of Jacob Newell of Roxbury in 1680, but there was no apparent relationship between the Thomas Lyon of those cases and the former servant.

21. William Lyon [ca. 1654]  

William Lyon, the son of John Lyon, sometime of Marblehead, signed an indenture in 1654 binding himself as an apprentice to Edmund Farrington, a Lynn fellmonger, for eleven years. The court ruled that he was only to serve for eight years from May 1, 1655. The court also ruled that he was to be taught the trade of a fellmonger.

Very little is known of William Lyon's activities after 1655. He may have testified in a Marblehead case in 1663, however, and may also have been made a freeman in 1666. In 1676 a William Lyon of Rowley was married to Martha Casse of Hampton, but there is no evidence connecting that William Lyon with the former apprentice. Other references offer no specific information relating to the former apprentice.

22. William Norman [ca. 1665]  

William Beale of Marblehead brought suit against his indentured
servant, William Norman, for breach of covenant, in 1665. Beale, who was the deputy marshal of Hampton, had Norman arrested and imprisoned him at Ipswich. William Norman acknowledged judgment to his master for running away from him, and was ordered to be whipped no more than ten lashes and returned to his master. A short time thereafter, Norman, who was valued at £20, was conveyed by William Beale to Captain Thomas Savage at the Salem court. Norman himself agreed to the transfer, and the court allowed it.

What became of William Norman after 1665 is unknown. Little evidence is available relating to Norman's later activities. He may have appeared before the Salisbury court in 1663 on charges that he had sworn a false oath in some previous case, but that is not at all certain. He may also have served as a witness in a minor case sometime in 1674, but that is not certain either.


Jeremiah (also Jeremy) Northend was born in Rowley, England, in 1624. He came to New England in 1638, at the age of twelve, with the Reverend Ezekiel Rogers. In New England he was to serve as the indentured servant of William Bellingham, the brother of the Deputy Governor of Massachusetts, Richard Bellingham.

When William Bellingham died in 1650 he mentioned his servant in his will. Northend was left £4, and was assigned to the Reverend Rogers for the rest of the time that he owed Bellingham. Jeremiah was also given two suits of clothing by Bellingham.

After nine years in the service of Bellingham and Rogers, Jeremiah returned to England. His father was the Lord of Weighton Parva, which was located near Rowley in England. Jeremiah subsequently became the Lord of Weighton Parva, himself. He apparently married twice and had three sons, John, Robert, and Ralph. He died in April, 1702, at the age of seventy-
eight, and was buried in Rowley, England, near his home.

Jeremiah Northend was mentioned in connection with the estate of one Thomas Nelson as having paid the estate 12s. between 1645 and 1647. He was also mentioned by his cousin Ezekiel Northend in relation to the estate of William Bellingham, in 1662. It was from Ezekiel Northend, a descendant of John Northend of Hunsley, England, that the later Northends of the area were descended.

24. Robert Powell [ca. 1653]

Robert Powell signed an indenture, on April 20, 1653, binding himself as a servant to John Coggswell, Jr., of Ipswich, a yeoman. According to his indenture, Powell was to serve Coggswell for six years. Coggswell was in England at the time of the transaction. Samuel Thompson, acting as Coggswell's agent, wrote to Robert Powell's father that Coggswell was willing to pay young Powell's passage, provide him with food and drink, provide him with proper clothing, and give him £10 when he had completed his period of servitude. Coggswell also promised not to sell the boy to anyone else.

Very little is known of what became of Robert Powell after he had completed his period of servitude, but he may have been involved in two minor cases in 1659. He may also have been admonished later in 1673 for not frequenting public worship on the Lord's Days. The following year, 1674, he may have forfeited a bond when he failed to appear in court upon order, and may have been discharged of his bond as surety for John Williams with whom he had been involved in an earlier legal action.

In 1676, in a suit brought in against William Coggswell by John Coggswell, Sr., Robert Powell was mentioned as having been paid for by William's father, John Coggswell, Jr. It was said that John Coggswell, Jr., had paid £14 for Powell. Powell himself testified that he had been bound
to John Coggswell, Jr., in London, for six years and then brought to New England. He also testified that he had lived with William Coggswell for a time after John Coggswell's death, before redeeming the remainder of his time by paying William Coggswell £15. Robert Powell also testified that he had not received the £10 he was to have received after his time was up. Powell was forty years of age at the time of this particular case. Nothing is known of Robert Powell's activities after 1676.

25. Jacob Preston [ca. 1671] 25

Jacob Preston, the son of Roger Preston and his wife Martha, was born in Ipswich in 1658. When his father died in 1666, his mother married Nicholas Holt of Andover. She then moved to Andover with her sons Jacob, John, Samuel, and Levi, but without her son Thomas. Nicholas Holt died in 1703.

On May 20, 1671, Jacob Preston was placed with one Thomas Chandler of Merrimac, to serve him as his apprentice. Then Jacob was sold to one William Curtis of Salem. Curtis was a blacksmith. Preston refused to remain with Curtis.

In 1676 William Curtis complained against Preston for leaving his service. The court ruled that Preston would have to serve out his time, according to indenture, and that he would have to serve three months more for loss of time to his master. Curtis was to keep Preston in the trade of a blacksmith. Thomas Preston was to bear Jacob's costs in court. It was testified by Curtis that Preston had served only eleven months after coming from Thomas Chandler, and that he owed him three and one-half years service. Curtis also testified that he had let Preston go to his brother in a time of sickness but that Preston had gone to his step-father who was in Andover and had since refused to return.

The dispute between Curtis and Preston was still before the court
two years later, in 1678. The case was still before a mediator in 1679, in fact, when Preston was apparently cast away at sea. Preston was engaged in the fishing trade at the time of his death. Administration of his real and personal estate was assigned to his brother John. Jacob’s estate was valued at £5,16s.6d., but was debtor for almost as much.

26. Samuel Sallows [ca. 1666] 26

When Michael Sallows of Salem died in 1666 his son Samuel was named to share in his father’s estate with his brothers, Thomas, Robert, and John, and his brother-in-law Edward Wilson.

Samuel Sallows apparently signed an indenture, shortly after his father’s death, binding himself to George Emory of Salem as his servant. There is, however, no record of such an indenture. In 1651 Sallows was freed from his master Emory when it was testified in court that Sallows was twenty-one years of age.

What became of Samuel Sallows after 1651 is not known. There is a total lack of information concerning his activities after that date.

27. George Stimson [ca. 1653] 27

George Stimson was apparently the indentured servant of a Theodore Atkinson in 1653. He was probably sold by Atkinson to John Coggswell, Jr., in London, around that time, and brought to Ipswich in New England by his master Coggswell. When he arrived in New England, Stimson was probably assigned to William Coggswell, because his master had since died. He was then assigned to Theodore Atkinson in Boston, who probably sold him to one Daniel Epps.

In 1664, Daniel Epps paid charges for his servant George Stimson that were demanded by the court, apparently as the result of an earlier action. That same year Daniel Epps complained against his servant Stimson, whom he accused of breaking into his house, threatening his children and servants,
stealing, and killing two hogs belonging to Epps. Stimson was found guilty by the court, and ordered to pay treble damages for theft, to be severely whipped, and to serve his master a fortnight longer for loss of time. He was then incarcerated, but his master paid a £60 bond for Stimson's release, and guaranteed his appearance at the next session of the court.

George Stimson, age twenty-seven, may have been involved in a minor case later in 1668 as a witness. He may also have been ordered by the court to pay the constable of Ipswich 12s. in 1671 for living out of family government. In 1676, in a suit brought against William Coggswell, by John Coggswell, Sr., testimony was given that George Stimson had come from England with John Coggswell, Jr., as his servant, and that Theodore Atkinson had written to Coggswell asking that Stimson be sent to him. Stimson testified that he went to Atkinson, but knew nothing of the terms under which he went. Sometime before 1664, Stimson apparently went with Daniel Epps. That same year, 1676, Stimson testified, as did his wife, in another minor case involving one of John Coggswell's servants, William Thomson.

In 1678 George Stimson was mentioned in a case involving John Coggswell. In 1679, concerning a rate made for the salary of the elders, George Stimson apparently made no contribution. He was also mentioned as a debtor to the estate of William Symonds of Ipswich in the sum of £1,15s., in 1680. Just what became of George Stimson after 1680 is unknown.

28. William Thomson [ca. 1653]

Samuel Thomson, a doctor of physic of Taunton, England, signed an indenture in 1653 binding his son William as an apprentice to John Coggswell, Jr., of Ipswich, Massachusetts. In return for £19 Coggswell consented to transport William Thomson to New England and to keep him in clothing and diet, with such clothing as he already had, until November 1, 1656. John
Coggswell was then to receive £2 more to keep the boy two years longer, until he was ten years old, and from that time on was to keep the boy free of charge until he was twenty-one years of age. Coggswell, a yeoman, was to bring the boy up in the fear of God, and was to teach the boy the trade of husbandry. Thomson was also to be kept both in diet and clothing, was to be taught how to read and write, was to be trained in obedience, and was to be well cared for generally. If the boy died before November 1, 1658, Coggswell or his heirs were to return any surplus money to Samuel Thomson, allowing only £1 a year for the boy's keep while he was alive.

In 1661, William Thomson may have testified in a case concerning one John Cooke's misdemeanors at the meeting house. In 1668 he testified in two cases in which William Coggswell was involved, and an earlier, sworn deposition made by him was read in a third case. When John Coggswell, Sr., brought suit against William Coggswell in 1675 and 1676 it was mentioned that John Coggswell, Jr., had provided £19 to be paid to John Coggswell, Sr., for the charge of William Thomson. It was also mentioned in that long, drawn-out litigation, that in 1671 William Thomson witnessed a bond which was given by Samuel Coggswell of Ipswich to his uncle William. In a case in 1676 involving John and William Coggswell, William Thomson said that he had lived with John Coggswell, Sr., a few years earlier. Thomson was twenty-seven years old in 1676. That same year, John Coggswell's maid, Hannah Downing, was presented in court for using vile language against William Thomson.

William Thomson was involved in a case in 1678 and 1679 concerning the illegal removal of some trees from the property of a Benjamin Marshall in Ipswich. During the course of the case, and reviews, it was mentioned that William Thomson owned some property in the area, and that he had a
servant named Henry Swett. Several of the Coggswells testified in various phases of that particular case.

William Thomson apparently contributed 8s. id. toward a rate for the salaries of the elders in 1679. He was also apparently bound as a surety in two minor cases the following year. Nothing is known of the activities of William Thomson after 1680.

29. Hope Tyler [ca. 1660] 29

Thomas Chandler of Andover brought suit against Job Tyler, in 1662, for taking away his apprentice and detaining him out of his master's service. It was testified during the course of the case that Hope Tyler, the son of Job Tyler, had been bound to Chandler four years earlier as his apprentice, and that according to the terms of his indenture Hope Tyler was to serve Chandler for nine and one-half years. Chandler was to teach Tyler how to read the Bible, to keep books, and to instruct him in the trade of a smith. He was also to provide Tyler with food, drink, washing, lodging, and clothing. It was also testified that Hope's brother Moses Tyler and another man stole the indenture belonging to Chandler and burned it. Moses Tyler was said to have sworn that Chandler should not have his brother, despite whatever might be done or said. The court ruled in Chandler's favor and decreed that the boy had to be returned to his master. Search warrants were sent out to the constables of Wenham and Ipswich to locate the boy. Hope was then thirteen. It was suspected that the youth was being entertained by one Richard Coy.

Almost nothing is known of Hope Tyler's activities after 1662. He may have been made a freeman in 1673, but that is not certain. He may also have signed a petition, in behalf of his wife and daughter, in 1692, which was sent to the General Court in Boston. The petition concerned the distress of the residents of Salem during the witchcraft delusion.

30. Thomas Varnay [ca. 1650] 30
Thomas Varney, the son of William Varney, being formerly bound to one William Bartholomew of Ipswich for fourteen years, was assigned to a Henry Bartholomew of Salem in 1650. Between 1650 and 1652 Varney was apparently sold to John Hardy of Salem, who in 1652 willed his interests in Varney to his son-in-law Roger Hascoll. Varney was to serve as Hascoll's apprentice. If Varney's parents wanted to buy the rest of their son's time they were to be allowed to do so for £7.

By 1659 Varney had probably returned to Ipswich, where in that year, at the age of twenty or twenty-one, he was chosen to measure some fences belonging to William Coggswell. In 1662 Thomas Varney was presented before the court for misdemeanors and fined. That same year he was involved in a legal action for mowing grass in a meadow after having been warned to get out of it. He also deposed in a minor case in 1663 concerning the ownership of a colt. In 1663 Thomas Varney was sued by Robert Cross for mowing grass in his meadow. Some wheat and hay belonging to Varney were attached, but he subsequently won the case. He was also involved in a case with Cross in 1666, but Cross did not prosecute so Varney was paid court costs.

In 1666 Thomas Varney was the deputy marshal of Ipswich. In 1668 he signed a petition in defense of the character of some of his neighbors who were accused of speaking out against the government.

Thomas Varney may have been the son of Bridget Varney of Gloucester and in 1672 may have inherited seven sheep and an indefinite sum of money from her estate. In 1673, Thomas Varney's name was listed among those who were entitled to vote in Ipswich. In 1675 Varney apparently assisted in appraising the estate of Samuel Coggswell of Ipswich. The next year, 1676, both Thomas Varney and his wife testified in a suit brought against William Coggswell by John Coggswell.

In 1678 Thomas Varney testified in a minor case concerning a boundary
dispute between John and Samuel Coggswell which had taken place some five or six years before. He also testified in a number of other minor cases between 1679 and 1682, including one in which he had to apologize for his wife's part in attempting to have a new meeting house erected contrary to the advice and prohibition of the Council. Nothing is known of Thomas Varney's activities after 1682.

31. William Warrener [ca. 1663] 31

William Warrener brought suit against Cornelius Waldo in 1663 for not performing the covenant of his indenture. Cornelius Waldo, it was testified, had asked Warrener, just prior to the time when Warrener was to complete his period of servitude, to serve him three months longer for time ill-spent. William answered his master's request by running away. Waldo would not allow Warrener to have counsel. It was also testified that Mr. Waldo had put his servant out to other masters. A Richard Brabrook told the court that Waldo had sold Warrener to him, and that Warrener's clothes were in a poor state.

Warrener agreed to serve Waldo three months longer, and released his master from one suit of clothing which was provided for in the indenture. Waldo promised one suit, a new hat, a pair of shoes, and two shirts. New indentures were drawn up on May 20, 1657, for three months service.

Very little is known of William Warrener's activities after 1657, when he completed his service, but he may have been ordered either to pay a fine or be whipped, in 1662, for stiffly denying his misdemeanors when he was presented in court. He may have testified that same year in a legal suit brought against Robert Cross by John Marshall. Warrener and some other men had removed some grass from the Marshall property under Cross's direction.

In 1663 Warrener was sued by Cornelius Waldo for shooting a horse that belonged to Waldo, but the case was eventually withdrawn. He also testified
in a minor case involving Robert Cross the same year. Cross brought suit against Warrener and several others that same year for mowing grass on his property. Two hogs belonging to Warrener were attached, but he was subsequently found not guilty. In 1664 Warrener acknowledged judgment to Sergeant Jeremiah Belcher in a legal action. He was a witness in a case of some minor significance again in 1667. What became of Warrener after 1667 is unknown.

32. Ezekiel Wathen [ca. 1644] 32

Ezekiel Wathen was committed to Thomas Abree in 1644 to serve him as his apprentice until he reached twenty years of age, unless his master died before Wathen reached twenty. Wathen was about eight and one-half years old at the time that the indentures were drawn up. In 1647 the court ordered that Abree, a Salem resident, was to have one-fourth of a house that had belonged to the widow Margery Wathen, Ezekiel's mother, and one-fourth of one year's rent from the same for the use of the boy.

In 1656 Ezekiel Wathen was discharged as Thomas Abree's apprentice, being twenty years old. What became of Ezekiel Wathen after 1656 is not too clear, but he was probably designated as the administrator of Thomas Wathen's estate in 1658. In 1661 he may have been a creditor to the estate of Henry Cooke of Salem in the sum of £2.10s. He may also have been sued for slander in 1669, and acquitted.

By 1671 Wathen was apparently a resident of Amesbury, and in that year petitioned as one of the Amesbury militia against innovations that were being made in militia training. He was also a property owner in Amesbury, and a laborer there, in 1685. Nothing is known of the activities of Ezekiel Wathen after 1685.

33. Richard Welch [ca. 1656] 33

Richard Welch was indentured to a Michael Smith on February 1, 1656,
to serve him for six years as his apprentice. Welch was to be taught the
trade of navigation.

What became of Richard Welch after 1656 is unknown. There is no
record at all of his ever having completed his apprenticeship, or of his
ever having achieved any degree of importance in the affairs of the area
in which he lived after he had completed his training.

34. Benjamin Wise [ca. 1638] 34

When Humphrey Wise of Ipswich died, intestate, a Samuel Greenfield
married his widow and took possession of the lands and goods of the late
Humphrey Wise, without legal order. Wise left five children, including a
son Benjamin, besides some who were married and had already received their
portions of the estate. Greenfield was bonded to bring the boys up until
they were twenty-one, and the girls until they were eighteen. In 1638,
Benjamin, the eldest son of Humphrey Wise, was placed with Abraham Perkins
of Hampton to serve him as his apprentice for seven years. The next year,
1639, Benjamin Wise was with Perkins.

What became of Benjamin Wise after 1639 is not known, but it is known
that he owned property in Ipswich in 1649. In that year his step-father
sold some property, but not that belonging to Benjamin Wise, to an Edward
Colcord of Hampton.

35. Samuel Wood [ca. 1668] 35

Samuel Wood was mentioned in the will of his master Richard Longhorne
of Rowley in 1668. Longhorne left £10 to his indentured servant. If the
boy's father, Obadiah Wood, was willing to let his son serve out his time
with Longhorne's brother, John Johnson, another £10 was to be given to the
boy. If Samuel died before he had completed his service, then the £20 was
to go to the children of Richard Longhorne. A debt of £10 which Wood was
to receive was still on the books of Longhorne's estate as late as 1674.
Exactly what became of Samuel Wood after he had served out his

time is not at all clear. There were apparently several Samuel Woods
living in Essex County during the same period that the former servant
was living there. It is impossible to distinguish clearly between all
of them. One was a resident of Amesbury as early as 1678; one was
apparently living in Ipswich as early as 1676, and may have taken the
oath of fidelity there in 1678; one was the master of a vessel in 1699;
one was thirty years old in 1669; and one was a resident of Rowley
between 1666 and 1688.
NOTES
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   Additional genealogical information is to be found in the following:
   E.Q.C., VI, 295; VII, 160.
   E.I.H.C., II, 46, 261; V, 38; VII, 176, 177, 179, 182, 221, 223, 225, 232, 26h, 265, 268, 269; XXXVI, 222-223; XXXIX, 66; L, 36h-365; LIV, 72; LXXVII, lh4, 51, 5h, 59-60, 61.

19. Samuel King
   E.Q.C., I, 206.
   E.C.P.R., I, 117-118.
   R.G.C., V, 540.
   E.I.H.C., XVI, lh8-lh9.

20. Thomas Lyon [also Lion]
   E.Q.C., II, 122, 167; III, 19, 263; V, 6h, 122; VI, 19.
   R.G.C., V, 301.

21. William Lyon [also Lion]
   R.G.C., IV[II], 582; V, 175, 511.
   E.I.H.C., XXII, 3.
22. William Norman
   E.Q.C., III, 101, 263, 265, 296; V, 430.

23. Jeremiah Northend [also Northende, Northen, Northin]
   E.Q.C., II, 20, 361, 397.
   E.C.P.R., I, 120.

24. Robert Powell

25. Jacob Preston [also Presson, Prasson]
   E.Q.C., VI, 193-194; VII, 73, 315, 415-416.
   E.C.P.R., III, 311-312.
   E.I.H.C., III, 63; LXI, 425-427.

26. Samuel Sallows [also Sallowes, Sallos, Salloes]
   E.Q.C., I, 105, 246.
   E.C.P.R., I, 59.
   E.I.H.C., I, 6; II, 67.

27. George Stimson [also Stimpson]
   E.Q.C., III, 136, 143-144; IV, 15, 425; VI, 152, 156-159, 208, 237, 418; VIII, 51, 311.
   E.C.P.R., III, 304.

28. William Thomson [also Thomsson, Thompson, Tomson, Tompson]
   E.Q.C., I, 325-326; III, 137; IV, 47, 49, 68; VI, 70, 152, 158, 208, 237, 416; VII, 170, 202-204, 259; VIII, 1, 8, 311.

29. Hope Tyler [also Tiler]
   E.Q.C., II, 403-405.
   R.G.C., IV[II], 587.
   E.I.H.C., I, 58.

30. Thomas Varney [also Varne, Verney]
31. William Varrener [also Warener, Warner, Wariner, Woriner]
   E.Q.C., II, 38h, h34, h35; III, 22, 28, 65, 86, 88, 218, 398.

32. Ezekiel Wathen [also Wathen]
   E.Q.C., I, 72, 132, h28; II, h23; IV, 129, h28.
   E.C.P.R., I, 39, 263, 38h.
   E.I.H.C., I, 51; L, 326, 327; LXVII, 191, 192.

33. Richard Welch [also Welsh, Walsh, Walch, Welche]
   E.Q.C., II, 163.

34. Benjamin Wise [also Wiss, Wisse]
   E.Q.C., II, 378.
   E.C.P.R., I, 11.
   E.I.H.C., XIII, 9h; L, 227.

35. Samuel Wood [also Woods]
   E.C.P.R., II, h7-h8, 150; III, 59-60.
   E.I.H.C., IV, 31; XXI, 79, 101; XXII, 213; LIX, 91; LXII, 125-126.
CHAPTER III

CONCLUSIONS

Any conclusions based upon research into the lives of only fifty former servants and apprentices, and upon the biographical material available for only thirty-five, must be considered highly tentative. Those conclusions are not necessarily invalid, however, and in some instances are quite suggestive.

Of some interest, for example, is the lack of data itself. New Englanders as a whole, and the Puritans in particular, were dedicated and reliable record keepers. Massachusetts, in fact, has more seventeenth-century records in print than any other colony. Essex County, in turn, has more records in print than any other county in Massachusetts. The lack of data relating to former servants and apprentices not only suggests that the manuscript records will have to be examined, of which more shall be said later, but also suggests the lowly character of the average indentured servant and apprentice. Significant in this regard is the fact that most of the data available concerning servants and apprentices is drawn from the court records. About the only time that the servant or apprentice seems to have received recognition was when he ran afoul of the law.

A recent study of the Massachusetts Deputies, 1634-1678, provides a rather interesting contrast. That study, based upon the same kind of records, often the very same records, as is this one, reveals significant information concerning the origin, emigration, land ownership, church
membership, freemanship, local offices held, marriages, and family of 255 Deputies. 1 The Massachusetts Deputies represented a middling class of people. The apprentice and the servant, on the other hand, represented the lowest class in white Massachusetts society. The obvious distinction between the two classes is clearly demonstrated in the amount of data available concerning the men of each class. Because the men who became Deputies were under less economic and social restraint, because they had more opportunities, and because they probably started higher up the scale, they were able to accomplish far more than the average indentured servant. They did not achieve more, however, because they were Deputies; rather, they were Deputies because they achieved more, and for that reason the records reveal more about them. Had the average servant become a landowner, married, held local office, been admitted to church membership and freemanship, the records would probably indicate that fact. It seems fair to assume, in the lack of that evidence, that the average servant did not do those things.

Yet, the data which are at hand reveal several rather significant facts. The basic question which this study was designed to answer has, in fact, been answered: the former servant or apprentice of seventeenth-century Essex County was capable of social mobility to some extent. The various criteria of social acceptance were available to some, both servants and apprentices. They could and did marry, could and did become property owners, could and did become taxpayers, church members, freemen, and local officials. In short, all servants were not retained in a reservoir of unskilled workers, and all apprentices did not find themselves confined to the trade for which they had been trained.

Generally speaking, the former apprentice seems to have been more readily assimilated into the community in which he lived than the former
indentured servant. But then the apprentice was theoretically being prepared throughout the course of his apprenticeship to assume a position in the community. In a land in which many artisans, tradesmen, and even shopkeepers had a tendency to get absorbed in the land and become farmers, artisans were in constant demand. The apprenticeship system was by and large designed to satisfy that demand. But the apprentice was not restricted to his trade. Some became farmers, others became seamen.

The indentured servant, on the other hand, was nothing more than a common laborer, and he was expected to remain in that category. In fact, the most that former servants might generally look forward to was employment as hired, non-skilled laborers. The opportunity did exist, however, for them to improve their positions. In some cases they inherited land and were able to begin new lives for themselves as farmers after they had completed their periods of servitude. In other cases former servants worked as hired laborers for a time and were able to purchase small parcels of land with their earnings. Still others turned to the sea, either as fishermen or as seamen, in search of their livelihoods or fortunes.

The conclusion is inescapable that although the colony was small, and although it was located on a frontier, significant class distinctions were immediately apparent and were perpetuated, even though individuals might rise or fall. Among those who could rise were some apprentices and servants. It is extremely doubtful that this picture would change even if the rest of the available printed sources, and the manuscript sources as well, were searched.

Statistically speaking, the data at hand are unimpressive, but the exceptions are important. Of the fifty subjects whose lives were searched, no data at all were available for fifteen beyond the fact that they had once been servants or apprentices in Essex County. Of the thirty-five
remaining cases, twelve demonstrate at least some degree of social mobility on the part of the subject; thirteen yield results which are inconclusive; and ten demonstrate little or nothing. This is not to say, however, that one-third of the former servant class was capable of some degree of social mobility while two-thirds were not. Such an assumption, based upon such fragmentary and inconclusive evidence, would be misleading at best. 2

Of the thirty-five subjects for whom biographical sketches have been presented here, twelve achieved some measure of success and left records of that success. Collectively, they owned land, paid taxes, supported churches, became freemen, served on juries, held local offices, married, and left estates. While statistically unconvincing, it may be suggestive of the difference between apprentices and indentured servants that of these twelve success stories, based upon the records of nineteen apprentices and sixteen indentured servants, eight concerned apprentices while only four concerned servants. Apprenticeship, of course, had a built-in ladder. The apprentice was supposed to succeed, to become an artisan or tradesman, and to set up for himself.

Twelve successes, however, do not tell the whole story. With regard to the question of landed property, for example, ten of the fifty came to own some land, and fourteen came to own a house or some other kind of property or estate. The following table, though fragmentary because of the nature of the sources, gives a rather comprehensive picture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Apprentices</th>
<th>Servants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned Land</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned/Rented House</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Property/Estate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Taxes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Apprentices</td>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported Church/Clergy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Membership:*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became a Freeman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held Local Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed Jury Duty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had Children</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For purposes of tabulation, church membership was based in a few cases upon Freemanship.

Finally, the case of Jeremiah Northend suggests something of the flexibility of the system of indentured servitude. Northend was a young man of some apparent means and influence and yet was indentured as a servant to a prominent New Englander. Undoubtedly, the sole purpose in his being indentured was to give him an opportunity to visit and work in the New World, and to train him and raise him in a godly community. This particular case very clearly demonstrates that indentured servitude was not simply a solution to the problem of labor supply, but was an acceptable educational institution. This case, perhaps more than any other, enables one to view the institution in its proper perspective. For better or for worse, it was part and parcel of the New England Way.

The tentative conclusions of this study having been stated, it now remains only to point out what further research would have to be conducted in order to make this study definitive for Essex County. There are several printed works not available to me which might possibly bring more data to bear on the problem. One printed source which should certainly be examined is the multi-volume New England Historical and Genealogical Register, now
in its one hundred and fourteenth year of publication. A preliminary survey indicates that it is not as useful as might be hoped; however, no study of the subject would be quite complete without an exhaustive investigation of the Register. Another source which might also prove to be of some value is Savage's Genealogical Dictionary, in three volumes. There are also many fugitive genealogical studies available in the Boston Public Library and in the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester. These would probably reveal further data on some of the fifty apprentices and servants.

A number of printed source records should also be examined. Some old town records are to be found in the Essex Institute Historical Collections, but many town and church records for Essex County, as well as for the rest of the colony, are in print but are not available in the library of the College of William and Mary. Those records, concerning town meetings, land grants, marriages, births, baptisms, deaths, and so forth, are available, at least in part, for many Essex County towns: Haverhill, Ipswich, Manchester, Salem, Topsfield, Wenham, Rowley, Lynn, Beverly, and Gloucester.

The manuscript records available in Essex County, particularly at the Essex Historical Institute in Salem and in the County Court House in the same city, should be searched as should the manuscript town records and church records for the county during this period. In addition to new sources, and to more exhaustive use of those to which I have had access, there were, of course, more servants and apprentices than I used. To identify them, and to run their names through all the records, would be to take a much wider sweep and to give a much better statistical base for my conclusions.

Would the results warrant the time involved in intensifying the
search or making the list of servants and apprentices more extensive? These questions could only be answered by doing it. An educated guess based on several months' work in the sources is that the results would not warrant the search. We know now essentially what we have to know about the question for seventeenth-century Essex County. Despite the ideal of order, of rank and place in society which the Englishman brought with him from old Essex to new, the possibility existed for a man to rise above his station, even from the lowest class in the white community.
NOTES


2. Among those cases indicating at least some degree of social mobility are those of:

**Apprentices**
- Edmund Ashby [case 2]
- Jeremiah Boutman [case 3]
- Christopher Codner [case 7]
- Stephen Dow [case 10]
- Samuel Fog [case 12]
- John King [case 18]
- William Thomson [case 28]
- Thomas Varney [case 30]

**Servants**
- Richard Coy [case 9]
- Matthew Edwards [case 11]
- Thomas Fowler [case 13]
- Jeremiah Northend [case 23]
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

The Essex Institute Historical Collections. Vols. I-XCV. Salem: 1859-

The New England Historical and Genealogical Register. Vol. XXXVIII. Boston: 1847-


Secondary Works:


VITA

Richard Albert Rutyna

Born in San Diego, California, April 10, 1937. Graduated from Norfolk Catholic High School, Norfolk, Virginia, June 1955. Received A.B. degree, with honors, from the College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division, Norfolk, Virginia, June 1959.

In September 1959, the author received a $1500 Fellowship from the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg which enabled him to enter the college as a graduate student in the Department of History. He completed his residence in June 1960.

Since September 1960 the author has taught high school in the Norfolk City Public Schools and Evening College at the Norfolk College of William and Mary. He is presently under contract as an Instructor at the Norfolk College of William and Mary.