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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the court proceedings involving orphans and illegitimate children in Rowan County, North Carolina. The evidence drawn from public documents suggests that apprentices in Rowan County became economically and socially viable units of society. Admittedly, Rowan County should not be viewed as a microcosm of apprenticeships in North Carolina. A synthesis of apprenticeships in a typical North Carolina county would require more study.

Rowan County inherited its attitudes and actions concerning orphans and illegitimate children from England. Colonists adapted English statutes concerning apprentices and modified them to satisfy the needs of a growing frontier society. Among the southern colonies, Virginia took the lead in providing for unfortunate children. The close geographic proximity between Virginia and North Carolina and the migration of settlers influenced North Carolina's statutes concerning apprenticeships.

In North Carolina, county courts supervised apprenticeships and made contracts legally binding between the youth and his master. This written record, designed originally to protect the rights of both parties, became a valuable tool for historians who otherwise would be unable to identify apprentices and masters. By identifying apprentices and masters, historians can trace their lives through court records and public documents, determine the impact of apprenticeships on society, and society's acceptance or rejection of apprentices. Unfortunately, public documents rarely recorded the names of women. This leaves their roles subject to speculation.

Historians surmise the characteristics of colonial North Carolina by analyzing public records left behind by area residents. Also, historians have the unique responsibility of making the inarticulate talk. The availability of early Rowan County court records lends itself to a study in which the inarticulate speak. A detailed study of apprenticeships in Rowan County provides an insight into the role that society expected apprentices to fulfill.
INTRODUCTION

The nature of the colonial economy demanded that every member contribute to society. Individual success ensured the survival of the community. Hard work and the opportunities found in an expanding economy fostered individual success. Richard B. Morris believed that a majority of settlers respected dignity of hard labor. Colonists resented idleness and punished it by imposing fines, committing vagrants to the workhouse, and sentencing the unemployed to public whippings. Morris also believed that respect for hard work gave the working class a greater spirit of independence. It is feasible that the working class wanted to instill this spirit of independence in other citizens, ensuring that everyone contributed to the community's success. Destitute orphans and illegitimate children burdened society unless they compensated the community by becoming productive and contributing members. By apprenticing such unfortunate children, local governments sought relief from maintenance responsibilities. Furthermore, the children learned a trade and a livelihood while the community gained a skilled craftsman.

This study describes the institutional background and development of apprenticeships in England, Virginia, and North Carolina. In addition, it offers a limited case study of apprenticeship in eighteenth century Rowan County, North Carolina, focusing

---

primarily on the terms of the apprenticeships, the types of people who became masters, and the lives of the apprentices themselves. This study also tests the hypothesis that apprenticeship was a viable institution for maintaining poor children while at the same time offering them the opportunity to become productive adults.

Established in 1753, the settlement of Rowan County was unusual in comparison to the settlement patterns of other North Carolina counties. Located in the northwest section of the North Carolina backcountry, Rowan County was part of a giant geographic crescent which began in the Delaware Valley and ended in North Carolina. Nicknamed the "Road to the Yadkin River," this fertile crescent was actually a well-watered plain of savannah grassland which contained no important geographic differences between the northern and the southern extremities. The "Road to the Yadkin River" ran from Philadelphia through the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, into North Carolina and ending in Rowan County. It provided an ideal avenue to relatively cheap, fertile land for those who wished to escape rapidly rising land prices in Pennsylvania, the depletion of soil on Maryland's Eastern Shore, and an increasing population. Because the central por-

---


tions of Virginia, Maryland, and North Carolina were sparsely inhabited as late as 1740, settlers who entered these colonies through the fertile belt would be free of competitive immigration from the East for several years. 4

In 1758, a traveller from Maryland commented upon reaching the middle of North Carolina that "there were no poor laws nor paupers." 5 Rowan County did not experience serious vagrancy problems associated with aimless wandering of the poor. The original settlers were middle-class farmers who produced foodstuffs instead of tobacco. 6 Many eastern North Carolina farmers grew tobacco and relied upon the fluctuations of the tobacco market for purchasing power. Tobacco is a cash crop sometimes grown even to the virtual exclusion of foodstuffs and grain in the expectation that the monetary income derived from selling

4 Ramsey, Carolina Cradle, p. 200. Another reason for migration was the death of the patriarch of the family head. Immigration to America first became heavy from 1717 to 1730, and numerous men who settled in Pennsylvania, Delaware or Maryland during that period died in the 1730s and 1740s. Usually, patriarchs were unable or unwilling to leave land acquired in the colonies, and their sons lacked the capital necessary to move and to buy lands further inland. As a result, sons were forced to postpone their travels until after their father died and his estate was dispersed. Only then would sons have inherited enough wealth to start a life of their own, and many men chose to begin a new life in a new place. See Ramsey, Carolina Cradle, pp. 200-201.


6 Ramsey, Carolina Cradle, p. 151, and James S. Brawley, Rowan County...A Brief History, (Raleigh: North Carolina Division of Archives and History, 1974), p. 4.
the crop would be higher than the income of the self-sufficient farmer who sold his surplus. While sound in theory, cash agriculture proved unreliable. One poor growing season translated into less money for necessities such as food, and reduced cash crop farmers to poverty. On the other hand, a poor crop for self-sufficient farmers meant there was less surplus to sell, but his family and farm animals still had enough to eat. Because the primary market crop in Rowan County was foodstuffs, not a cash crop, the chance of losing a farm or becoming hopelessly in debt diminished. Eastern North Carolina counties probably purchased food from Rowan County. As a result, fewer poor or homeless persons resided in Rowan County than in other counties where tobacco was the chief crop.

The increasing problem of caring for poor orphans and illegitimate children posed a threat to Rowan County's fragile economic balance. Proceedings involving unfortunate children fill the county court records.7 While fulfilling their duties of recording apprenticeships, court officials unknowingly created a rich source for the study of the inarticulate.

7 Ramsey, Carolina Cradle, p. 183.
During the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries, two general types of white bound labor existed in Great Britain and in the American colonies: apprenticeships and indentured servitude. In many aspects, these two types resembled each other and the public used them interchangeably. Yet, the two systems began for different reasons and achieved dissimilar ends. Apprentices learned a trade in exchange for services rendered; therefore, the apprentice was usually a minor. Servants were more often adults who bound themselves to an employer, either to pay off debts or in exchange for passage to the New World. Records that specified an indentured servant learned a trade were merely a disguised form of apprenticeship.

Another point of difference was that the apprentice's service was not usually transferrable, while the servant's labor became his master's property for the duration of the contract. Thus, a servant's labor could be sold or given away, and if his master died, the servant remained bound to the heirs for the remainder of the indenture. The other major difference between apprenticeships and indentured servitude was the master's obligation to teach his apprentice the rudiments of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Indentured servants did not receive this training and were simply
expected to complete a full day's work. Needless to say, masters sought indentured servants more widely than apprentices because the master bore less responsibility and because the older worker was usually more productive.¹

In England, apprenticeships existed as early as the thirteenth century, beginning as a medieval guild open only to minors. Upon agreement of both parties, Guildhalls bound an apprentice to a local craftsman who provided vocational training in return for the minor's services.² The English Statute of 1275 required the names of apprentices to be recorded and kept in the Chamber of the Guildhall. The Guildhall preserved copies of the contract between the master and the apprentice. The Statute of 1279 (or 1280) limited the number of apprentices a master could have according to his ability to support them, and set the length of the arrangement as seven years. The master and the apprentice arrived at the Guildhall together to register the terms of their agreement within one year of the initial contract date. Other ordinances enacted in 1312 and in 1313 used the phrase "according to the ancient usage." Obviously, apprenticeships were common and existed long before written records. Some guilds recognized the social


benefits of teaching minors a trade and tried to make apprenticeships mandatory.³

With the Statute of Artificers (1562), apprenticeships evolved into a national system of technical training for lower classes.⁴ Parliament, under Elizabeth I, combined previous laws to produce a national system of apprenticeships regulated by uniform rules.⁵ Based on the principle of compulsory labor for able-bodied persons, the Statute of Artificers (1562) stated that indigent children were apprenticed to learn a trade. Minors who refused to serve as apprentices were subject to imprisonment.

By the end of the sixteenth century, apprenticeships consisted of a minimum seven year term which automatically expired on the apprentice's twenty-fourth birthday. Apprentices lived with their master who often acted as a guardian.⁶ There were restrictions placed on who might become an apprentice. Foreign trade merchants, drapers, goldsmiths, ironmongers, embroiderers, and clothiers accepted as apprentices only sons whose parents possessed freehold worth at least forty shillings.⁷

For all of its cumbersome restrictions, the Statute of Arti-

⁵Douglas, American Apprenticeship and Industrial Education, p. 25.
⁶Morris, Government and Labor, p. 376.
⁷Ibid., pp. 364-365. Property restrictions of the Statute of Artificers were never enforced in the American colonies. See Morris, Government and Labor, p. 364.
ficers solved several social problems. Apprenticeships became a preventive remedy for vagrancy, provided minors with a vocational education, and produced skilled workers. There was one disadvantage, however, for common laborers. To prevent agricultural labor from being lured away to the trades, no person below yeoman status could be apprenticed. Therefore, it was difficult for farm laborers to improve themselves.

The Statute of Artificers viewed apprenticeship as a system of relief for the poor and the unfortunate. The English Poor Law of 1601 expanded the concept of relief for indigent children. This law enabled Justices of the Peace and overseers of church parishes to apprentice poor children, orphans, and illegitimate offspring who might otherwise become a burden to the state in the future. Clerks recorded apprenticeships arranged by the courts and the courts prosecuted violators of the agreement. The court assumed responsibility for overseeing the treatment of apprentices. Should masters abuse apprentices or embezzle inheritances, the

---


9Jernegan, Laboring and Dependent Classes, pp. 46-47.

court placed the children with new masters. 11

Treatment of apprentices varied according to the size of the estate left to them by their parents. Legitimate orphans with little or no estate occupied a higher status than illegitimate or poor children and probably received more food and clothing. Illegitimate children could expect nothing more than minimum maintenance from their master. 12 The community, which expected apprentices under the Poor Law to be minimally clothed and fed, reinforced this class structure.

According to the English Poor Law of 1601, the apprenticeships of paupers differed significantly from ordinary trade apprenticeships. The length of term was longer, with males bound to the age of twenty-four and females until twenty-one or marriage. Minors apprenticed under the Poor Law were usually from a lower social class than trade apprentices and, therefore, less likely to be received into the master's household as a member of the family. 13

Unfortunately, under the Poor Law, the mistreatment of children characterized apprenticeships. 14 The English Poor Law became less

Jernegan, Laboring and Dependent Classes, p. 117.


13Morris, Government and Labor, p. 385.

of an apprenticeship system and more of a compulsory guardianship where parish funds partially compensated masters. The system's failure to provide adequate trade education led to the establishment of workhouses and charity schools in the eighteenth century.15

Economic motivation cannot be overlooked as a force for humanitarian practices, for maintaining poor children and orphans became an increasing burden for local parishes.16 It was not unusual for at least one of a child's natural parents to die before the child reached his majority and children who had lost their father were legally defined as orphans whether their mother was alive or not. Often circumstances forced the supervision and education of orphans upon the community which was not always successful in this role.17

Immigrants transferred English poor laws, parish apprenticeships, and trade education to the American colonies and modified them to fulfill the colonies' particular needs.18 Admittedly, the apprenticeship program never completely satisfied colonial demand for trained workers as evidenced by the continual immigration of skilled craftsmen and their relatively prominent position in the community.

The scarcity and the high cost of skilled workers in the co-

16Jernegan, Laboring and Dependent Classes, p. 147.
18Jernegan, Laboring and Dependent Classes, p. 85.
colonies created a market which favored the laborer over the employer. This assured workmen of a higher standard of living and more independence than obtainable in England or in other parts of Europe. It did not take long to acquire the small amount of capital necessary to begin handicraft trades which served local communities. Frequently, workmen preferred setting up shop to husbandry because of the increased opportunities for artisans in the expanding economy of the colonial and Revolutionary periods.

During the seventeenth and the eighteenth century, English immigrants transplanted the apprenticeship system to the various American colonies where it developed along different lines. In the New England colonies, supervision of the poor remained a responsibility of town government. Eventually, counties established workhouses for tramps and for vagabonds while paupers remained under the care of town officials. Southern colonies more nearly duplicated the English parish system than their northern counterparts. Parishes apprenticed poor children, orphans, and illegitimate offspring, allocated aid according to need, and accounted for their actions to the county courts. This apprenticeship system provided skilled craftsmen and benefitted needy children by ensuring them a vocational and sometimes a literary education. The apprenticeship system, as employed by the southern colonies, re-

19 Morris, Government and Labor, pp. 15, 25, 44-45, 49.
presented a transitional step from private to public charity. Among the southern colonies, Virginia took the lead in providing for unfortunate children. The colony was still in its early stages of development when England forced the colony to confront the problem of pauper orphans. In 1619, the city of London sent one hundred homeless children to Virginia to serve as apprentices. Pleased with the results of the apprentices, the Virginia Company petitioned the mayor and aldermen to send another one hundred indigent children to the shores of Virginia in the spring of 1620. The company stressed that the children were at least twelve years old and were apprenticed until the age of twenty-one, or until marriage for females. Upon completion of their contracts, the apprentices worked as tenants on company land.

In March 1643, Virginia passed its first legislation regarding orphans and poor children. Due to increasing negligence in administering orphans' estates, guardians reported annually to the county courts to give an account of their charges' estates. This legislation also required guardians to instruct poor children and orphans in the Christian religion and in the rudiments of learning.

21 Morris, Government and Labor, p. 15.

22 Ibid., p. 385. The first children were apprenticed until age twenty-four. See p. 385n.

In 1656, Virginia passed more detailed legislation concerning orphans. Masters educated and maintained their orphans from the interest earned from their wards' estates. If the interest of an estate yielded an amount too small to maintain and to educate an orphan, the courts bound him as an apprentice until the age of twenty-one to learn a trade. If the courts found a master or a guardian negligent in his duties, then the courts placed the child in another household. Three years later, legislation required sheriffs to summon all guardians to bring in their accounts of orphans' estates. Clerks of the county court registered these accounts. An act of 1705 repeated provisions of earlier legislation, but added a specific instruction obligating masters to educate their apprenticed orphans.24 Apparently, the act made education compulsory for boys only.25

A Statute of 1730 reiterated conditions expressed in previous acts. Virginia gave county courts additional power ensuring that orphans received an adequate education and appointing new guardians or masters if the former did not "take due care of the educating and maintaining of any orphan, according to his degree and circumstances."26 Obviously, justices of many courts failed to enforce the act of 1730 because, in 1740, a severe penalty was imposed


25 Jernegan, Laboring and Dependent Classes, p. 145.

26 Hening, IV, p. 287.
on county court officials who neglected their duty. The fine was five thousand pounds of tobacco with one-half going to the informer and the other half to the county.

The act of 1748 repeated instructions found in previous legislation with an additional clause referring to apprenticed orphans and poor apprentices. Males were apprenticed until their twenty-first birthday and females until eighteen years of age. The masters or mistresses of apprentices were to "find and provide for him or her, diet, clothes [sic], lodgings and accommodations fit and necessary, and shall teach, or cause him or her to be taught to read and write." The act of 1748 was the most comprehensive law enacted in the colonies concerning the education of apprenticed orphans. It also introduced the novel idea of educating girls of this class.

A Statute of 1769 stated that previous laws were insufficient to safeguard parishes "from the great charges frequently arising from children begotten out of lawful matrimony." It provided for the apprenticing of illegitimate children of single free white women and legally, though not socially, raised their status by including a phrase from the act of 1748 which originally applied only to orphans and to poor children. Courts apprenticed ille-

27Jernegan, Laboring and Dependent Classes, p. 145.
28Hening, V, p. 452.
29Jernegan, Laboring and Dependent Classes, p. 145.
30Hening, VIII, pp. 374, 376; Wells, Parish Education, p. 73.
gitimate children born to servant women to the mother's master until the child reached his or her majority. If the master lacked the funds to support an illegitimate child, then the courts bound the child to a new master.\textsuperscript{31}

Illegitimate mulatto children were free or slave depending on the condition of their mother. However, free mulattos were bound out until reaching thirty years of age. This increased to thirty-one by an act of 1705. Until 1753, no specific provisions existed for either apprenticing these illegitimate mulatto children or for providing their education unless the courts applied laws relating to poor children. The act of 1765 reduced the length of apprenticeship of mulattos to age twenty-one for males and eighteen for females. Officials decided the former age was "of unreasonable severity towards such children."\textsuperscript{32}

Virginia legislation enacted laws which referred to special classes of children and apprentices. Orphans with estates occupied a higher status and were maintained and educated according to their position in society. Orphans with minimal estates were bound out; yet, they held a higher rank than children who were apprenticed simply because their parents could not support them. At the bottom of the scale were the illegitimate apprentices and mulattos.\textsuperscript{33}

If one of the parents could not support an illegitimate child,

\textsuperscript{31}Jernegan, \textit{Laboring and Dependent Classes}, p. 152.

\textsuperscript{32}Hening, VIII, pp. 133-134, 376.

\textsuperscript{33}Jernegan, \textit{Laboring and Dependent Classes}, p. 143.
then the parish bound the child out so as not to become a permanent charge of the parish.

Virginia modeled her apprenticeship after the English Poor Laws, but also used this institution to train and to educate children. The Virginian apprenticeship system provided an education for children who would otherwise be unable to attend school.

Another important feature of Virginian apprenticeships was the strength of the parish system. Parish officials, instead of county courts, apprenticed many children.

The close contact between England and Virginia was partly responsible for their similar laws on orphans, poor children, and illegitimate offspring. It is probable that the close geographic proximity between Virginia and North Carolina and the movement of settlers between the two colonies, influenced the latter's statutes concerning apprenticeships. Certainly, North Carolina viewed apprenticeships as an effective method to relieve the public of the financial burden caused by the increasing number of dependent children. However, the legislation concerning apprenticeships

---

34Wells, Parish Education, pp. 72-73.
37Knight, "An Educational Practice," p. 50.
38Ibid., p. 46.
was not as extensive in North Carolina as in Virginia.\(^{40}\)

The North Carolina General Assembly passed the first apprenticeship law in 1715. But colonists had already adapted the principles and customs of English laws to their use.\(^{41}\) The act of 1715 merely legalized a practice already in existence. The law provided for the education of orphans according to their social rank and the prosperity of their estate. The precinct court bound destitute orphans to learn a trade.\(^{42}\) A novel idea introduced by this legislation was to require county court approval of apprenticeships as a prerequisite to becoming a legally binding contract.

A lack of more explicit legislation and the failure to provide closer supervision of guardians and masters led to embezzlement of orphans' estates and negligence of apprentices' wellbeing. In a letter from Governor Gabriel Johnston to the Lords of the Board of Trade, dated December 5, 1735, the governor noted that the 1715 law was "highly unjust and... design[ed] to encourage and protect unjust Guardians who rob their Wards, a practice too

\(^{40}\) Knight, "An Educational Practice," p. 50.


common in this county."^3

A 1755 statute reiterated the act of 1715 and evoked memories of the Virginia law concerning apprentices which was passed in 1748. Similar in ideas and in language, the North Carolina statute required the apprentice's master or mistress to "find and provide for him or her diet, clothes, lodging, and accommodations fit and necessary, and shall teach, or cause him or her to be taught, to read and write...."^4 The 1755 law also instructed courts to bond guardians for good behavior and to require one or more securities to guarantee the responsibility of guardians. If the integrity of guardians or their securities appeared questionable, the courts appointed new guardians or demanded new securities. After their appointment, legal officials expected guardians to attend the next court meeting to submit an inventory of their wards' estates. Thereafter, guardians attended annual county court sessions to exhibit records concerning the management of the orphans' estates. This required the justices of every county to hold an Orphans Court on the first day of the court session for that year. The Statute of 1755 served as a check upon the county courts which previously exercised complete dominance in orphan affairs. The law also legalized the customary practice of churchwardens notifying the county


^4 Knight, "An Educational Practice," p. 48; Records of North Carolina, XXIII, p. 601.
courts of orphans who did not have guardians or masters as well as masters who mistreated their apprentices. 45

The crown repealed the 1755 law because, contrary to the laws of England, it gave county courts unlimited jurisdiction over orphans' estates. The Statute of 1760 reenacted provisions included in the 1755 statute with an added clause apprenticing free-born illegitimate children and mulatto females to the age of twenty-one. This law gave illegitimate and female mulatto apprentices the same rights which the North Carolina Act of 1755 extended to other apprentices. According to the Statute of 1760, masters and mistresses provided adequate diet, clothing, accommodations, and education to their illegitimate and female mulatto apprentices. 46 The absence of male mulattos in this and previous acts leaves their social and economic standing unclear.

The crown also voided the orphan act of 1760 because it, too, allowed the county courts to supervise the disposal of estates. A statute passed in 1762 amended the 1755 and the 1760 acts by limiting the jurisdiction of county courts over estates and by transferring the duty of reporting orphans without guardians or masters from the churchwardens to the grand jury of every county. Justices of the inferior courts of the pleas and quarter sessions


held orphans court annually. Except for scattered vestry acts, the 1762 statute was the final legislation concerning orphans and apprentices in North Carolina before the American Revolution.47

The chief agency for enforcing legislation concerning orphans and apprentices was the county court.48 Properly known as the County Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, the governor appointed approximately twelve justices of the peace to sit on its bench. As a lower, or inferior court, the court's decisions could be appealed to the colony's superior courts. In general, county courts wielded less power than superior courts, but Courts of Pleas and Quarters Sessions had jurisdiction other than in matters pertaining to orphans and apprentices.

The county courts also supervised the building of highways and bridges, and conducted hearings on petty larcenies, assaults, batteries, trespassing, breaches of the peace, and other offenses of a lesser nature.49 The court derived its power from statutes, common law, and custom. Frequently, county courts paid little attention to laws regulating their powers and assumed an indepen-


48During court recessions, the parish vestry temporarily assumed the responsibilities of caring for orphans. Parishes received remuneration from the courts for expenses incurred while providing care for orphans. See Paul M. McCain, The County Court in North Carolina Before 1750, (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1954), p. 79.

dent stance. In fact, many states passed laws simply to confirm the existing practices of county courts.50

County courts exhibited remarkable independence when acting as Orphans Court, and the statutes passed by the General Assembly left many decisions concerning orphans and apprentices to the discretion of court officials. If a man died, his widow usually became the guardian of their children under the age of fourteen. When both parents were deceased, the executor or the administrator of the parents' estate frequently served as guardian to their children under age of fourteen. If orphans were fourteen years or older, they chose their own guardians. The court, however, officially nominated and appointed their choice. Although the courts could appoint a different guardian, it usually respected the orphan's wishes.51 Orphans rarely changed guardians upon reaching the age of fourteen.52

Guardians were required to post a bond to ensure sincerity towards their new charge. The amount of the security required by the courts depended upon the estate value the guardian administered.53 Numerous opportunities existed for financial mismanagement of a ward's estate. Guardians controlled their charge's liquid assets, slaves, plantations, and gristmills. With this

---

50Jernegan, Laboring and Dependent Classes, pp. 157-158.
51McCain, The County Court, pp. 74-75.
53McCain, The County Court, p. 77.
amount of capital, it is no surprise that courts required guardians to post bonds or securities and to submit the ward's account to the court for examination. \textsuperscript{54} Guardians kept an account of the property received in trust, including transactions and disbursements made concerning that property. They sold any perishable part of an estate at a public auction after obtaining a court order. The courts decided which expenses from the orphans' estate were necessary and which investments were profitable. \textsuperscript{55}

The courts expected guardians to use no more from the orphan's estate than was necessary to feed, educate, and clothe the orphan. Guardians were entitled to remuneration for administering their wards' estates. However, if the estate yielded no profit, guardians maintained and educated the youth in return for his services. \textsuperscript{56}

Upon expiration of the guardianship, orphans frequently needed a court order to obtain their estate. If a female orphan married before she reached her majority, the guardian released her estate to her husband.

The courts placed orphans who had little or no estate to supervise, along with poor children and illegitimate offspring, in the custody of a prominent citizen to learn a trade. Masters rarely taught females a trade and their apprenticeship was usually confined to instruction in domestic pursuits. With the exception of mulatto  

\textsuperscript{54}Watson, "Orphanage in Colonial North Carolina," p. 113.  
\textsuperscript{55}McCain, The County Court, pp. 77, 80.  
\textsuperscript{56}Knight, "An Educational Practice in Colonial North Carolina," p. 42.
children who served until age thirty-one, males were apprenticed to the age of twenty-one while females remained apprenticed until they reached age eighteen or married. Indentures usually called for the education (literary and vocational) and maintenance (food, shelter, and clothing) of apprentices according to their rank in society.57 This is in accordance with contemporary English rules supressing extravagance in the dress and the personal appearance of apprentices. For example, apprentices were expected to wear clothes not "exceeding the quality and condition of their Persons or Estate."58

In binding out apprentices, the courts often deferred to the wishes of friends and relatives and, in general, respected any known preferences of the deceased parents. The court usually selected the person who had brought the orphan into the court as the child's master or mistress. This policy led to the choice of masters as people who had already expressed an interest in the child.59 The court also tried to cushion the shock and to ease the transition of children living with a new family by apprenticing siblings to the same master and by placing children of the same age together when possible.60

The process of appointing masters was not always routine.

57McCain, The County Court, pp. 74, 78, 82.
60McCain, The County Court, p. 80.
The courts frequently encountered resistance to apprenticing children. Friends, neighbors, or relatives of the orphans' families kept the children without the required formal indenture, thereby violating the 1715 statute which did not allow children to be bound out except by court order. Widows were also reluctant to relinquish their children to the care of others. "The maternal desire to maintain the family intact evoked many court summonses for women to produce children for apprenticeship." 

Children who were already fourteen before they were bound out had the same privilege of choosing a master that wealthier orphans had in selecting guardians. As with guardians, prospective masters had the right to refuse or to accept this position. Unlike wealthy orphans, poor apprentices bound before age fourteen could not change masters upon reaching that age.

Courts were usually receptive to complaints from orphans and apprentices at any session and did not restrict such matters to the Orphans Court. Upon receiving complaints, the courts investigated the alleged maltreatment. Depending upon the courts' decision, apprentices returned to their master or the courts bound them to a new master. Orphans remained with their masters when the courts determined the master was satisfactorily fulfill-

62 Knight, "An Educational Practice," p. 45.
64 McCain, The County Court, pp. 80, 83.
ing the contract. Courts removed orphans from their masters and re-apprenticed them to learn other trades when the courts determined the master was physically abusing his apprentice, not providing him with proper lodging, food or clothes, not providing an education or illegally reapprenticing the youth to learn a different trade. Court orders did not necessarily guarantee that masters would appear in court as summoned. Inadequate transportation, vagaries of the weather, and disregard for the law hampered the courts' efforts to ensure the well-being of every apprentice.

Masters usually agreed to award the apprentice the customary freedom dues given to indentured servants upon completion of their contracts. In 1715, freedom dues were three barrels of corn and two new suits of clothes valued at five pounds. If the apprentice or the servant was a man, his master could substitute a gun in lieu of one suit of clothes. Under an Act of 1741, freedom dues were three pounds proclamation money and one suit of clothes.

This act also suggested that masters gave freedom dues to any

---

65Knight, "An Educational Practice," pp. 50-51; Morris, Government and Labor, p. 378.


67McCain, The County Court, pp. 80-81; Records of North Carolina, XXIII, p. 63.

68McCain, The County Court, p. 81. The currency prior to 1748 is known as old proclamation money. In 1748, a new currency was issued which became known as simply proclamation. Legally, it was equal to three-fourths the value of sterling. See Charles J. Bullock, "The Paper Currency of North Carolina," Essays on the Monetary History of the United States (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1900), p. 156.
servant who did not accept yearly wages, such as an apprentice.69

Most forms of compensation were not monetary and masters awarded provisions such as a wide variety of animals, tools, and furniture to apprentices upon completion of apprenticeships.70 Occasionally, apprentices resorted to the courts to compel masters to set them free and to pay the required compensation.71

Laws focusing upon freedom dues, apprenticeships, and helpless children represent an ideal which seldom coincided with actual practice. Perhaps the laws were contrary to public sentiment or were not enforced. Also, local practice could become so regular that legislature enacted laws to legalize custom. In either instance, variations within the legal system occurred over a large area and enforcement of these laws varied between counties. A synthesis of apprenticeship in a typical North Carolina county would require more study.72

Unlike laws, the theories which formulated them do not depart from the ideal. The apprenticeship system provided skilled labor and relieved the community of the burden of supporting dependent children.73 Begun in England as a medieval guild for minors, apprenticeships initially served as a vocational school where minors

69Records of North Carolina, XXIII, p. 196.
70McCain, The County Court, p. 81; Morris, Government and Labor, p. 384.
72Jernegan, Laboring and Dependent Classes, p. 157.
73Morris, Government and Labor, p. 364.
learned the fundamentals of a trade. The apprenticeship system expanded into a national system of uniformly enforced laws by the Statute of Artificers in 1562. The English Poor Laws of 1601 enlarged apprenticeships to make them compulsory for certain classes of people. English immigrants transported their customs and tradition to the New World and among them were the beliefs incorporated in the apprenticeship system. Although apprenticeships developed along different lines in the various colonies, apprenticeships in the southern colonies maintained more English characteristics than colonies farther north.

Among the southern colonies, Virginia emerged as leader in political as well as social aspects and her neighbor, North Carolina, followed her example. Although less extensive in North Carolina than in Virginia, apprenticeships remained a vital element in society. Whether in Virginia, or in North Carolina, binding out poor, illegitimate, or orphaned children had a social and an economic function. Designed to relieve the parish and the court of the burden of supporting unfortunate children, apprenticeships also prepared the children to enter society as productive adults. Not only did apprentices learn a trade, they also learned the rudiments of a formal education. In the colonies, apprenticeships were a humanitarian effort to help destitute children become productive members of society.
CHAPTER II
A STUDY OF APPRENTICESHIPS IN ROWAN COUNTY
FROM 1753 TO 1795: A LOCAL INSTITUTION

Whether or not destitute children became a burden to society or productive members depended upon the community's attitudes. If the citizens viewed helpless children as unable to contribute to the welfare of the commonalty, it is unlikely that the populace would have shown an interest in the children's well-being and, thus, would not have expected the children to become productive adults.

Numerous sociologists, psychologists, and researchers predicted the behavior of subordinates based upon the expectations of authority figures. The terms "Pygmalion effect" and "self-fulfilling prophecy" describe the impact of expectation upon people labeled as achievers or, conversely, failures.¹ For example, if a society decided that unfortunate children need not become unfortunate adults if given a chance to become useful citizens, the children were more likely to become productive. On the other hand, if the same society decided not to expend any resources on unfortunate children, they were much more likely to become drains on social sources for the rest of their lives. Communities which took an interest in the well-being of helpless children, and perhaps more importantly, expected them to become productive

adults, were, therefore, rewarded. Instead, a potential underclass became a group of adults with the educational and the vocational training necessary to participate responsibly in the political system and to be economically productive.

Unknowningly, the adult members of Rowan County, North Carolina used the Pygmalion approach in their treatment of helpless children. As required by law, the courts assigned guardians to wealthy orphans and apprenticed poor orphans and illegitimate children to learn a trade. However, Rowan County courts did not give mere cursory attention to the laws but showed genuine concern for helpless children. One of the first books purchased at the expense of Rowan County was Godolphins Orphans Legacy.\(^2\)

Rowan County courts apprenticed helpless children to morally upstanding citizens to learn a trade which became a source of livelihood after the apprenticeship contract ended. Also, apprentices had recourse to the legal system and Rowan courts did not hesitate to summon masters for alleged mistreatment. Because Rowan County expected its helpless youth to become productive citizens and provided a vehicle--apprenticeships--to reach this goal, apprentices there became economically and socially viable as adults.

Rowan County courts apprenticed approximately two hundred and seventy-nine children between 1753 and 1795. Furthermore, the court apprenticed seventeen youths twice, making the total

\(^2\)James Carter purchased this book at the expense of Rowan County on September 22, 1753. Minutes of the Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, Rowan County, North Carolina, 1753-1795, I, p. 23, hereafter cited as RCCR.
number of apprenticeship contracts two hundred and ninety-six. A case by case study of these apprenticeships provides an opportunity to access further this institution as it existed in Rowan County, North Carolina. What was the attitude of Rowan County court officials toward helpless children? Which trades could apprentices expect to learn? Did court officials view apprentices as a means for diversifying the economy? Were male and female orphans and illegitimate children treated differently in regards to apprenticeships? Did apprenticing orphaned and illegitimate children fulfill the goals of the community, namely, to become productive members of society?

The typical apprentice in Rowan County was a legitimate white male bound between the ages of eleven and fifteen to learn a trade making specified wooden items, such as barrels, furniture, or ornamental designs. The average apprentice contract did not include specific instructions regarding freedom dues, formal education or religious training. However, if the courts included these clauses in the apprentice's contract, the master was responsible for teaching the orphan to read and to write, to bring him up in the Protestant faith, and to provide the apprentice with several items in addition to the compensation required by law. Frequently, these items included a cow, a calf, and a spinning wheel for female apprentices and a saddle, a bridle and tools for male apprentices. If money was included, it was usually in the amount of ten pounds.

According to Table I, only one-fourth (seventy-five) apprentices in Rowan County were female. The scarcity of records indi-
icates that many female orphans were probably absorbed into the households of relatives, where they learned the wifely art of houskeeping, instead of learning a more marketable skill. It is no reflection upon Rowan courts that masters did not teach female apprentices such marketable trades. Masters rarely taught female apprentices a craft because their livelihood centered on domestic pursuits such as preparing food, sewing clothes and caring for children. Society accepted women in traditionally male occupations only when helping their husbands or when the untimely death of a spouse left the wife in need of economic support. It is doubtful that courts apprenticed girls in less traditionally feminine occupations. Rowan County courts apprenticed seventy-five females and only one, Catharing Steagle, learned a specific skill--spinning.

Illegitimate children comprised about twelve percent of the apprentices. As indicated by Table I, two hundred and sixty-one apprenticeships contracts, or approximately eighty-eight percent, dealt with legitimate children and the remaining thirty-five contracts, representing approximately twelve percent of the total figure, described illegitimate children. Seventeen of the illegitimate apprentices were male and eighteen were female. Therefore, 


5RCCR, II, n.p., February 8, 1786.
# TABLE I

**FREQUENCY OF LEGITIMATE AND ILLEGITIMATE YOUTHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>PERCENT OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>88.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegitimate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of cases = 296
almost eight percent of all male apprentices were illegitimate as compared to twenty-three percent for females. It is difficult to determine the reasons for a higher incidence of illegitimate females brought to the orphans court. It might be suggested that illegitimate females were less likely to be absorbed into relatives' household and had no alternative but apprenticeship. Charlotte D'Armond was an indentured servant who gave birth to five illegitimate children. However, court records only contain the names of two of her children. On October 18, 1769, Rowan County courts ordered D'Armond to serve her master, John Dunn, three extra years. She served one year for giving birth to a white bastard and two additional years for giving birth to a mulatto. This same court order entrusted Dunn with the care of D'Armond's yet unnamed female mulatto child. In May, 1772, the court ordered D'Armond, now bound to another master, James Kerr, to serve one extra year for each of the two children she had while in his service. Records for May, 1774, show that D'Armond served Manassah Lamb one extra year for giving birth to an illegitimate child. Lamb also accepted one of D'Armond's children, Nancy Robinson, as an apprentice.

Ten years later, on February 5, 1784, the Rowan County court re-apprenticed D'Armond's mulatto, previously bound to John Dunn,

6Ibid., I, p. 194.
to Peter Faust. The child was fifteen years old at the time and had a name—Jeane.  

Margaret Headen gave birth to three illegitimate children. On February 10, 1775, the court apprenticed all of her children to Peter Hendley. On that date, the oldest child was Hannah, age eight, the middle child was John, age six, and the youngest was Bennet, age four.  

Isabella Moore was another mother who produced an illegitimate child. Moore's name commends attention because she was the only female listed in Rowan County's public documents as owning land. It is unknown whether Moore inherited the land or bought it.  

The number of cases involving illegitimate children is small: thirty-two white and three mulatto. Courts discriminated against mulattos by apprenticing them until the age of thirty-one to com-

\[9\text{Ibid.}, \text{II}, \text{n.p.}, \text{February 5, 1784.}\]  

\[10\text{Ibid.}, \text{II}, \text{p. 270.}\]  

\[11\text{Unfortunately, the number of lots Isabella Moore owned is missing. Data on the lives of apprentices and their masters came from a computerized file of information compiled by James P. Whittenburg, History Department, College of William and Mary. The file, which is available at the William and Mary Computer Center, consists of statistical and other types of data on individuals who resided in western North Carolina in the last half of the eighteenth century. As it pertains to Rowan County settlers, this information was taken from the following public records, all located in the North Carolina State Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, North Carolina: Rowan County Tax Lists, 1759, 1778; Rowan County Court Records, 1753-1795; Rowan County Deed Books, 1754-1777, hereafter cited as Computerized file compiled by James P. Whittenburg.}\]
pensate their masters for added inconvenience. The North Carolina General Assembly, and not Rowan County officials, determined this term of service. However, a 1760 statute amended this law which limited a mulatto's service to age twenty-one for males and age eighteen for females. Nine years later, on July 9, 1769, the Rowan County court apprenticed Charlotte D'Armond's mulatto daughter until age thirty-one. On February 5, 1984, the courts reappointed D'Armond's mulatto daughter. The court record did not include the apprentice's age when the contract would expire. Lastly, on July 4, 1778, the courts bound William Chambers to age thirty-one.

Rowan County went to great lengths to assure that other aspects of apprenticing helpless children were completed in full compliance with the law. It is evident that the court refused to comply with a section of the Statute of 1760. The court's decision to ignore the younger age limit for mulatto apprentices was based on many factors. Two possibilities include community pressure and pressure

---

12 Rowan County courts apprenticed a legitimate free Negro named Daniel Mitchell to Maxwell Chambers to master the art of farming. Mitchell received freedom dues upon the expiration of his contract when he reached age twenty-one. RCCR., II, n.p., November 6, 1786.


14 RCCR., I, p. 194.

15 Ibid., II, n.p., February 5, 1784.

16 Ibid., II, p. 308.
within the judicial body itself.

For unknown reasons, Rowan County courts reapprenticed twenty-two youths to another master prior to the expiration date of the original contract. Public records listed sixteen of these apprentices as legitimate and six as illegitimate. Percentage conversions indicate that the courts reapprenticed six percent of legitimate apprentices as compared to seventeen percent of illegitimate apprentices. Therefore, the percentage of reapprenticeships for illegitimate youths is slightly higher than the percentage of reapprenticeships for legitimate youths. Conclusions drawn from this limited sample are highly speculative and theories attempting to explain this quantitative analysis are subject to well-deserved criticism. It is sufficient for the purposes of this study to state the court reapprenticed a slightly higher percentage of illegitimate children. These figures are presented in Table II.

Table III describes the various clauses included in or omitted from apprenticeship contracts and further classifies this information by legitimacy. Table III also tabulates the number of apprenticeship contracts specifically requiring masters to provide a classical education, religious training, freedom dues, and other forms of compensation such as clothes, tools, animals, and money upon the expiration of their contract.

As a group, Rowan courts gave illegitimate apprentices the same opportunities and advantages as those given to legitimate apprentices. Citizens of the community, however, may not have practiced equal social acceptance. Although the total percentage
## TABLE II

**REAPPRENTICESHIPS BY LEGITIMACY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undetermined</th>
<th>Legitimate</th>
<th>Illegitimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reapprenticed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reapprenticed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of cases = 294
of illegitimate apprentices is a small sample, if no forms of dis­
crimination can be found in twelve percent, there is no reason
to assume that a greater degree of prejudice would be found if
the number of illegitimate children was higher. Also, the Rowan
court failed to record freedom dues in over half of the apprentice­
ship contracts and rarely specified the requirements for formal
education or religious instruction. The sparse record of edu­
cational or religious training clauses contradicts Alan D. Watson's
conclusion that "the Rowan court, generally more explicit than
most county courts in its instruction, frequently [emphasis added]
demanded that masters provide apprentices with eighteen months
of education during which study the children should learn to read,
write legible, and cipher to the five common rules.' Moreover,
the Rowan justices directed that the children be raised in the
Protestant Christian Religion.' Watson based his assumptions
on the information contained within the apprenticeship contracts
of five male youths. The author of this thesis concluded that
only eight and one-half percent of the apprenticeship contracts
included a clause regarding a formal education and approximately
two and one-half percent of the apprenticeship contracts included
a clause regarding religious training. See Table III for a tabul-

17 Edgar W. Knight, "An Educational Practice in Colonial North

18 Alan D. Watson, "Orphanage in Colonial North Carolina: Edgecombe
County As A Case Study" North Carolina Historical Review LII
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Legitimate</th>
<th>Illegitimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Educate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Provide Religious Training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Receive Freedom Dues</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Receive Clothes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Receive Tools</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Receive Animals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of cases: 269
Quite often, Rowan County officials included the phrase "to comply with the law" in apprentice contracts to summarize masters' obligations to their apprentices. The absence of specific clauses did not necessarily indicate the court's laxity in supervising apprenticeships or taking care of orphans. Perhaps masters knew their legal responsibilities toward their apprentices and no longer required direct supervision and explicit instruction from the courts. The care of orphans and illegitimate children concerned early Rowan courts who wanted to ensure the success of the institution. Once court officials viewed the apprenticeship system as a success, they no longer felt the need to supervise closely all aspects.

The main purpose of apprenticeships was to teach a trade to an orphaned or an illegitimate youth. As shown by Table IV, court officials failed to record the occupations of twenty-three apprentices and, as mentioned previously, masters did not teach female orphans a marketable skill. Male apprentices labored in twenty-six occupations ranging from blacksmith to maltster. For easier and more readily available reference, the author of this thesis grouped these vocations into eight categories. Blacksmithing and farming remained separate categories. Shoemaking, saddling, tanning, skindressing, curriuring, and cordwaining produced the category of leather goods. Tailors, weavers, hatters, and fullers characterized the fourth category, textile goods. Construction workers, such as stonemasons and millwrights, comprised the fifth category.
### TABLE IV

**OCCUPATION BY LEGITIMACY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Undetermined</th>
<th>Legitimacy</th>
<th>Illegitimacy</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather Goods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Industry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified Wooden Items</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of cases = 297
Included in the sixth category are apprentices who constructed specified wooden items. These trades include cooper, carpenter, joiner, turner, wheelwright, spinning wheel maker, and wagon maker. The eighth category is labeled metal workers and includes silver, tin, and pewter smiths. Miscellaneous occupations, such as potter and brewer, comprise the last category.

The most popular occupation, or at least the one to which the courts assigned more apprentices, made specified wooden items. Rowan courts apprenticed forty-nine youths in some aspect of this area. Some of the items manufactured by the apprentices are evident by their occupation title. Wheelwrights made wheels of various sizes, spinning wheel makers produced spinning wheels, wagon makers constructed wagons and carpenters assumed a more vague role of making wooden items. But some apprentices made wooden items which cannot be determined from the title of the occupation. Coopers manufactured barrels, turners fashioned objects of wood (and sometimes metal or bone) on a lathe, and joiners were craftsmen who did more ornamental work than that of a carpenter.19

The textile industry followed closely behind wooden craft trades in the number of youths apprenticed. Twenty youths dealt with finished products, such as hats and clothes. Of the remaining twenty-eight, the courts apprenticed twenty-seven to become weavers and one was a fuller. Fullers cleanse and thicken the cloth through

a process of beating and washing. Obviously, Rowan County settlers provided a market for finished cloth.

Fourty-four apprentices were involved in the various stages of leather production such as making saddles and shoes. Rowan courts apprenticed one youth to be a cordwainer. Cordwainers specialized in making shoes out of cordovan leather which only the wealthier classes could afford. Fourteen apprentices dealt with the tanning, dressing, and coloring of the leather.

Almost ten percent (twenty-five) of the male apprentices learned the trade of blacksmithing. This moderate number of apprentice blacksmiths is not necessarily evidence that Rowan was a frontier. However, it does indicate that Rowan County increased in population and needed blacksmiths to shoe horses and to fashion andirons, hinges, latches, and tools.

Surprisingly, in a county settled by relatively prosperous farmers, less than seven percent of the apprentices learned farming as a trade. The reasons for this are two-fold. First, the courts apprenticed youths to learn a trade which would make them productive members of society. Perhaps court officials were concerned that children apprenticed to farming might be used as bound labor and would not reap the benefits of the apprentice system. Second,

20Ibid., IV, p. 593.

21Originally, Cordovan leather was produced in Cordova, Spain out of tanned and dressed goat skins. Later, split horse hides were frequently used. Ibid., II, p. 989.

22For the purposes of this thesis, farming will be considered a learned trade, as distinguished from a profession.
the courts apprenticed youths to trades which were in demand. Since farmers settled Rowan County, many young men received instruction in husbandry at home and depended upon farming for a livelihood. 23 Court officials realized that Rowan County needed more skilled labor and craftsmen instead of farmers for continued economic growth.

One and a half percent of the apprentices were involved in construction. Rowan County courts apprenticed Willis Goodwin, Peter Shipton, and John Shipton to become millwrights and Nicholas Patterson to become a stonemason. 24 The small number of apprentices in the construction trade cannot be equated with declining prosperity. Unlike the present, the owner and his family or friends built most dwellings and shops. Only the more complex edifices, such as mills, required the services of a professional.

The court apprenticed four youths to fashion objects out of precious and semi-precious metals. It apprenticed two youths, John Headen and Bennet Headen, to Peter Headley in 1775 to become tinkers and pewters. 25 The Orphans Court apprenticed Isaac Grant to Germon Moore to become a silversmith on January 16, 1768, only fourteen years after the formation of Rowan County. 26 Evidently,


24 RCCR, II, p. 282.

25 Ibid., II, p. 270.

26 Ibid., II, p. 227.
Rowan was already prosperous enough to warrant the apprenticing of a silversmith. Fifteen years later, on May 6, 1783, the court apprenticed John Miller to silversmith Henry Horah.27 The length of time between apprenticeships and the introduction of new names among the masters indicates a slowly, but steadily rising desire for silver objects.

Court records listed two apprentices under the miscellaneous category. John Baker was only ten years old when the courts apprenticed him to John Lorance, Jr. to become a maltster or a brewer of beer and ale.28 The Orphans Court bound Thomas Pasinger to Henry Barroth on May 8, 1777 to become a potter.29 Generally, the image of a potter denotes someone who fashions bowls, storage jars, and eating utensils out of clay. However, sometimes colonists referred to a turner as a potter.30 There is not enough evidence in this apprenticeship contract to make a case for either definition.

Clearly, apprenticeships increased the number of skilled craftsmen. Rowan County courts took advantage of this growing

27 Ibid., II, n.p., May 6, 1783. The Orphans Court reapprenticed John Miller on August 4, 1784 to Foster Joseph to become a blacksmith. See Ibid., II, p. 304.

28 Ibid., II, p. 312. Several months earlier, on May 5, 1778, the courts apprenticed Baker to James Bowers to become a hatter. A note on this contract indicated the courts previously apprenticed Baker to "Michael Anderson, deceased." No records exist which testify to this fact. See Ibid., II, n.p., May 5, 1778.

29 Ibid., II, p. 287.

30 OED, XI, p. 497.
number of craftsmen by apprenticing youths to trades which "would most benefit the child and the community." In the mid- to late eighteenth century, Rowan County was a "middling" frontier county which needed skilled craftsmen to provide economic stability and to attract new settlers. Apprenticeships provided a means by which officials diversified the economy and specialized labor. A diversified economy indicated that settlers selected from a larger variety of consumer goods than if courts apprenticed youths to existing trades only. For example, almost fifty percent of the male apprentices in Edgecombe County became planters. The large number of apprentices in an agrarian occupation seriously curtailed Edgecombe County's ability to produce consumer goods and to attract new settlers. Also, specialization of labor is synonymous with an increasingly complex and prosperous society. Individual craftsmen specialized in one occupation. Thus, craftsmen depended upon consumers for their livelihood. Craftsmen, in turn, became consumers when they purchased articles from other craftsmen. This produced a chain of interlocking economic dependence and a "community of effort" which protected Rowan County from financial stagnation and provided an avenue for capital growth.

Rowan County was also fortunate to have once encompassed the Moravian settlements of Salem and Bethabara. Many Moravian settlers were trained artisans who were well-known for their talented work and unrelenting dedication to their profession. They provided an invaluable source of economic trade which helped to establish craftsmen in Rowan County. Salisbury, Rowan's county seat and administrative center, provided an excellent market place during court sessions for craftsmen to display and to sell their wares.34

According to Barbara Doggett, "probate records indicate that despite their limited means, middling and small planters and craftsmen valued education as did the more affluent members of colonial society."35 North Carolina laws pertaining to the education of apprentices reflect the general level of literacy and the importance placed upon at least the rudiments of learning.36 North Carolina passed a statute in 1755 requiring masters to teach their apprentices to read and to write. An act of 1760 extended this measure to include female and illegitimate apprentices. In this view, apprenticeships are an early form of compulsory education.37 However, Marcus Jernegan questioned the actual number of masters who completed the educational requirements for their

---


35Doggett, "Parish Apprenticeship," p. 68.


apprentices. Jernegan argued that the courts were probably more interested in providing the community with skilled workers than supervising the formal education of apprentices. Also, it is unrealistic to assume that all apprentices eagerly studied academics and reported any shortcomings on their masters' part to the court.38

By law, apprentices in Rowan County learned the rudiments of reading, writing, and arithmetic. How much formal education the youths actually received and how much knowledge they retained is unknown. In the formulative years of Rowan County, court officials frequently specified in the apprentice's contract that he or she receive a predetermined amount of formal education. As the county matured, and perhaps was more able to enforce the law, court officials no longer included specific clauses on educational instruction in apprenticeship contracts. When court officials included specific education instructions, they were not consistent with the amount of education masters provided for their apprentices. Mary Nelson's contract merely indicated that she was educated "according to laws of this Province." Ralph Smith received instruction in reading, writing, and "ciphering as far as the common rule of five."39 Sidney Nydey received two years of a formal education.40

39 RCCR., pp. 44, 83.
40 Ibid., II, p. 212.
Sometimes, apprentices' formal education and religious instruction pursued the same purpose. Some contracts required apprentices to read the Bible. For example, when the courts apprenticed John and Henry Wainwright to James Hughey on April 17, 1755, they were raised in a Christian environment and learned to read the Holy Scriptures. Other requirements for religious instruction were only slightly more specific. For example, Arsbel Laverty was brought up not only in a Christian manner, but instructed in the Protestant faith. Table III indicates that few apprenticeship contracts specified religious instruction. Either court officials tried to separate church and state or they decided that religious teachings were so commonplace that specific instructions were redundant.

Laws pertaining to the care of apprenticed orphans directed masters to provide their apprentices with freedom dues which were customarily given to indentured servants. However, the courts remained the legal instrument which set varying amounts of compen-

---

41Ibid., I, p. 20. There is little evidence that Rowan County settlers were profoundly religious. Despite the Scotch-Irish Presbyterian majority, there is no record of any established churches in early Rowan County except the Moravians. Apparently, the pious quality possessed by colonists, as emphasized by Jethro Rumple's *A History of Rowan County, North Carolina: Containing Sketches of Prominent Men and C. L. Hunter's Sketches of Western North Carolina, Historical and Biographical Illustrations Principally the Revolutionary Period of Mecklenburg, Rowan, Lincoln, and Adjoining Counties, Accompanied with Miscellaneous Information, Much of It Never Before Published* need to be reexamined. Eighteenth century communities possessed the same imperfections as contemporary society. See Ramsey, *Carolina Craddle*, pp. 170, 203.

42RCCR., I, p. 20.
ation. For example, Rowan County courts authorized compensation in terms of livestock, tools, money, and household items.

A suit of clothes was a partial requirement of freedom dues. Several times, Rowan County court officials inserted a phrase in the apprentice's contract specifically requiring masters to furnish their apprentices with the required freedom clothes. Richard Burch received a suit of freedom clothes from his master, Enoch Tuck. James Magaughey gave his apprentice, James Anderson, freedom clothes. John Baltrip received a decent suit of clothes and May Johnson received two suits of clothes.

Money was another partial requirement of freedom dues. Several times Rowan County court officials inserted a phrase in apprentices' contracts requiring masters to give their apprentices a specific amount of money. Sometimes the clause stated the apprentice received an amount of money over that provided by the law. For example, Susannah Hartman received an additional two pounds and Charles [last name unknown] received ten pounds. At other times, the courts did not explicitly say whether money received in addition to freedom dues took the place of the legally required sum. John Donnoly received forty shillings and James Rutlege twenty-five

44 RCCR., I, p. 172.
45 Ibid.
46 Ibid., I, p. 212.
pounds respectively upon the expiration of their apprenticeship.48

Frequently, courts required masters to give their apprentices animals upon completion of their contract. If the courts included such a clause, the master provided the apprentice with a cow and a calf. Other miscellaneous items were included with or in the place of animals, for example, beds, saddles, and domestic tools such as spinning wheels and knitting needles. Sarah Murphy received "above what the Law allows one Cow, Calf, a spinning Wheel and Side Saddle."49 Phillip Slough complied "with the law" in addition to giving his apprentice, Peter Cotton, a loom and gears, new plow, and good irons.50 Rebecca Wilson received a cow, calf, a spinning wheel, and a Bible upon completion of her apprenticeship.51

As mentioned previously, apprentices had recourse to the courts, and guardians were answerable to the courts for the treatment of their charges.52 On January 19, 1759, the court ordered Edward Lawson to appear at the next court with Isaac Johnston, his apprentice, to answer for "his Usage of the Sd. Orphan."53 On May 10, 1769, court records indicated that John Dunn accused Alexander Penny of neglecting his orphan and not complying with

---

49Ibid., II, n.p., May 6, 1783.
50Ibid., II, n.p., May 8, 1789. Apprentice learned the art of weaving.
51Ibid., II, p. 256.
53RCCR., I, p. 63.
the law. Officials ordered Penny to appear in court to answer these charges.\textsuperscript{54}

This court also heard complaints about mistaken identity and a child's eligibility for apprenticeship. On August 9, 1786, Thomas Cooke appeared in court with his apprentice, Agness Rogers. However, Rogers denied she was the person bound by the apprenticeship. Thomas failed to prove that the person he brought to court was the same Agness Rogers who had been apprenticed. The court "Ordered therefore that said Agness be liberated & discharged from Service untill Said Thomas Shall make it appear to this Court that he is intitled to her Service."\textsuperscript{55}

On February 5, 1784, a sheriff summoned Samuel Cooper and his apprentice, a mulatto child of Ruth Freeman, to court. The court decided that "On petition of said Ruth Freeman and it appearing that the Child was born free & not subject to be dealt With as a Poor Orphan of said County, therefore Ordered that said Child be delivered to said Ruth--its Mother, and that Samuel Cooper pay costs."\textsuperscript{56}

Contracts reapprenticing youths frequently list the youths as learning a different trade or receiving different compensation than originally agreed upon. John Baker was the illegitimate son

\textsuperscript{54}Ibid., II, p. 216.

\textsuperscript{55}Ibid., II, p. 377.

\textsuperscript{56}Ibid., I, p. 195.
The Orphans Court apprenticed him to John Baker on August 3, 1784 to learn farming. Baker educated his apprentice, gave him freedom dues and a horse worth twelve pounds, a new saddle, a gun, a mattock, and a hoe. For an unknown reason, John Baker became Absolam Baker's apprentice on February 6, 1789. Absolam Baker continued teaching John Baker husbandry, but the compensation reduced considerably. Baker either respected freedom dues or paid twelve pounds and ten shillings.

The courts apprenticed William Cornelison to Martin Bazinger on November 5, 1782 to become a weaver. Bazinger respected freedom dues and gave Cornelison weaving tools and ten pounds. On August 6, 1787, the courts reapprenticed Cornelison to Jonathan Cox to become a hatter. The second apprenticeship mentioned freedom dues as the only compensation.

On May 6, 1772, Barnabeth Baker became William Barton's apprentice to be trained as a cooper. Baker's compensation was one horse worth six pounds. On November 4, 1772, the courts reap-
prenticed Baker to John Dobbins to become a blacksmith. Baker's compensation for the second apprenticeship was a new pair of belows, a sledge, and a set of hammers.63

Rowan County court officials apprenticed John Smith, son of Michael Smith, to Lewis Lowman on May 8, 1783 to master the art of skindressing. Officials set Smith's compensation at six pounds in addition to freedom dues.64 The court reapprenticed Smith to John Lewis Beard on November 5, 1784 to become a tanner and a currier. The court limited compensation to freedom dues.65

On October 17, 1766, John McCulloh became John Johnson's apprentice to be trained as a tanner. For unknown reasons, the court reapprenticed McCulloh on May 5, 1772, to William Bonner. Bonner complied "with the Former Agreement [concerning compensation] made by his Former Master John Johnson."66

Rowan County officials expected apprentices to become economically and socially viable units of society. These expectations can be viewed in the court's attitudes and actions concerning helpless children. The courts required apprentices to receive a firm foundation in vocational instruction, some primary education, and material and monetary compensation upon the expiration of the contract. This compensation allowed the apprentice to begin his

63Ibid., I, p. 243.
64Ibid., II, n.p., May 8, 1783.
65Ibid., II, n.p., November 5, 1784.
66Ibid., II, p. 233.
career with, at least, a small amount of capital. Although the courts tried to provide the same opportunities and advantages for each apprentice, the times dictated that female apprentices were taught domestic arts and that mulattos served longer apprenticeships. Rowan County courts apprenticed youths to trades which were best suited to areas where towns existed. Salisbury and the Moravian settlements of Salem and Bethabara provided a market place economy. Rather than compete with an established flow of clientele, Rowan County officials apprenticed the majority of orphans to produce leather goods, textiles, and specified wooden items. Unknowingly, Rowan County responded to a supply and demand economy. Many settlers possessed the basic knowledge necessary to produce cloth, shoes, and barrels, but they lacked the refined skill often associated with these items. Apprentices created a supply of these goods which was superior to items produced by the average settler. An increasing number of citizens purchased these goods and demanded more. Rowan County officials complied by apprenticing a greater number of orphans to certain trades without flooding the market.

In the same manner that Rowan County officials tried to improve the economy of the region, they attempted to improve the lives of apprenticed orphans. The courts went to great lengths to charge only prominent and well respected men of the community with the responsibility of providing for apprenticed orphans. Masters met their apprentices' immediate physical needs and provided a stable family background which would serve the apprentices in the future. A study of apprenticeship in Rowan County would be incomplete with-
out an analysis of the men who assumed this awesome task.

Focusing upon the youths' master reveals additional information concerning the institution of apprenticeships in Rowan County. Apprentices lived with their masters in much the same way children live with their parents. Masters were responsible for the moral, religious, educational and trade-oriented aspects of their apprentices' lives and apprentices were responsible to masters for their actions. In this manner, masters served as substitute parents for their apprentices, or in loco parentis.67

Rowan County court records identified and traced the lives of two hundred and forty-nine masters. Public documents listed the appointment of masters to public office or the service of these men in an official capacity. It also recorded the names of persons involved in civil suits and their occupations. Deed records chronicled business activity as it related to land and tax lists provided estimated monetary values of estates.

It is evident that county officials fulfilled the North Carolina statute requiring apprentices to be placed with prominent citizens. Records indicate that Rowan County officials entrusted Adlai Osborn with the care of one apprentice, Archibald Murphy.68 Osborn was "one of the most outstanding men in Rowan County" as

well as a Princeton trained lawyer.\textsuperscript{69} He held a total of thirty-seven offices between 1773 and 1775 in addition to his legal practice. Osborn served as a clerk of court, presided as a justice of the peace, acquired the rank of lieutenant colonel, served as county commissioner, was elected as a delegate to Congress (1782--1784) and to the Convention of 1789, and was honored as a trustee for the University of North Carolina.\textsuperscript{70}

James Carter was another prominent citizen of Rowan County. Carter held thirty-six civic offices and positions between 1753 and 1763 including assemblyman, justice of the peace, county registrar, surveyor, county petit juror, district petit juror, and district grand juror. He was the trustee for the Salisbury town land for nine years.\textsuperscript{71} The courts entrusted Carter with the care of two apprentices, Elizabeth Dixon and James Fletcher, both of whom were apprenticed in March of 1754.\textsuperscript{72}

Two other respected Rowan County residents were Richard Brandon and Matthew Lock. Brandon and Lock held a total of seventy-six civic offices and positions including county petit juror, county grand juror, district petit juror, district grand juror, county


\textsuperscript{70}Computerized file by James P. Whittenburg.

\textsuperscript{71}Powell, William Tryon, II, pp. 634-635; Computerized file by James P. Whittenburg.

\textsuperscript{72}RCCR, I, p. 56.
commissioner, constable, justice of the peace, and roads overseer. Matthew Lock had two apprentices, Margaret and John Campbell, and Richard Brandon had one, Nancy Robinson.

Courts seldom bound apprentices to female masters. Only five women held this position: Elizabeth Steele, Ann Sloan, Rebecca Morrison, Elizabeth Harvey, and Elizabeth Cathey. A contract apprenticing Elizabeth Holland to Rebecca Morrison stated that as long as Morrison remained unmarried, her father, William Morrison, was responsible for the well-being of the apprentice and guaranteed the court that the "Orphan [would] be used as the Law Directs."

Table V tabulates the number of offices held by masters or the appointment of masters as county officials. The author of this thesis included orphaned apprentices and their parents to provide a comparison among the three subject groups and to provide background material for an analysis of their later lives. Public documents recorded two hundred and eighty-five different offices and positions held by masters, fifty by the parents of apprentices, and twenty-one by former apprentices. Table V discloses that the majority of offices held by masters were jury duty for the county and the district courts. During this period of study, forty-four masters served on the Rowan County grand jury, fifty-nine were on the county petit jury, ten masters served on

---

73 Computerized file by James P. Whittenburg.
74 RCCR, II, pp. 11-12.
75 Ibid., II, p. 270.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>County Grand Juror</th>
<th>County Petit Juror</th>
<th>District Grand Juror</th>
<th>District Petit Juror</th>
<th>Roads Overseer</th>
<th>Roads Commissioner</th>
<th>App't. to Road Work</th>
<th>Constable</th>
<th>Sheriff</th>
<th>Deputy Sheriff</th>
<th>Patroller</th>
<th>Militia Officer</th>
<th>Justice of the Peace</th>
<th>County Commissioner of Indian Affairs</th>
<th>Clerk of Court</th>
<th>Surveyor</th>
<th>Assemblyman</th>
<th>Tax Collector</th>
<th>Tax Appraiser</th>
<th>Election Inspector</th>
<th>Member of Revolutionary Convention</th>
<th>Additional Officer</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of cases = 356
the district grand jury, and an additional eighteen men were on the district petit jury for a total of one hundred and thirty-one positions on juries.\textsuperscript{76}

Men responsible for road construction and maintenance comprised another large segment of official duties. Twenty-four men served on the roads jury. Court officials named twenty-two men as road overseers, nineteen men to unspecified road work, and three men as road commissioners.

An indispensable segment of Rowan society were men who kept public order, enforced laws and prosecuted lawbreakers. At least twenty-five masters served as constables, six as militia officers and seven volunteered as patrollers. Rowan County citizens elected two masters as sheriffs, four as deputy-sheriff, and sixteen as justices of the peace.\textsuperscript{77}

Some masters held offices which were either phased out or active for only a certain length of time. In 1768, John McConnell was Rowan County's Commissioner of Indian Affairs and William Moore was a member of the State Revolutionary Convention of 1776.\textsuperscript{78}

\textsuperscript{76}\textit{Ibid.}, I p. 50.

\textsuperscript{77}Computerized file by James P. Whittenburg. Patrollers were equated with constables but their main responsibility was to search for runaway slaves.

\textsuperscript{78}A resolution by the Confederation Congress authorized the Carolinas and Georgia to appoint one commissioner each to coordinate activities with the superintendent of Indian Affairs. Commissioners received five dollars per day for expenses and had access to six thousand dollars to conduct peace treaties. Draper Manuscripts, Tennessee Papers, XX, October 26, 1787, located at the College of William and Mary.
Other public offices held by prominent citizens included county commissioner, clerk of court, surveyor, assemblyman, tax collector, tax appraiser, and election inspector.

Table VI ranks estate values into four categories. Estate values between zero and ninety-nine dollars comprised the low group. The mid-low category listed taxable wealth between one hundred and one hundred and ninety-nine dollars. Estate values of two hundred to four hundred and ninety-nine dollars characterized the mid-high division, and the high ranking category required a minimum of five hundred dollars.

Table VI indicates that few masters occupied the upper echelon income brackets. Table VI also presents a pyramid shaped economic status with the majority of masters (in this study, twenty-four) occupying the lowest economic level and the least number of masters occupying the highest income level. Higher income levels contain correspondingly less numbers of masters. For example, fourteen masters occupied the mid-low economic category, seven qualified as mid-high and only two masters possessed enough wealth to belong to the elite.79

Men responsible for apprentices initiated more legal battles than either the parents of apprentices or the apprentices themselves. As shown by Table VII, masters initiated sixty-eight lawsuits, apprentices, twenty-seven, and parents of apprentices, twenty-eight. Of the masters' sixty-eight lawsuits, only fifteen

79Computerized file by James P. Whittenburg.
### TABLE VI

**ESTATE VALUES**

**OF MASTERS, PARENTS, AND APPRENTICES**

**1754-1778**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High $500 &amp; Up</th>
<th>Mid-High $499-$200</th>
<th>Mid-Low $199-$100</th>
<th>Low $99-0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Masters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Apprentices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of cases = 112
### TABLE VII

NUMBER OF MASTERS, PARENTS, AND APPRENTICES

INVOLVED IN LAWSUITS: 1753-1795

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondent, Debt Suit</th>
<th>Plaintiff, Debt Suit</th>
<th>Respondent, Non-Debt Suit</th>
<th>Plaintiff Non-Debt Suit</th>
<th>Total Non-Debt Suits</th>
<th>Total Debt Suits</th>
<th>Total Suits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Masters</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Parents</strong></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Apprentices</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
involved cases where someone was suing or was being sued for debt. Of those fifteen lawsuits, nine were plaintiffs, or complaintents, and six were respondents. Fifty-three of the total number of lawsuits filed were done so for reasons other than debt suits. Therefore, most of the litigious action concerning masters did not involve bad debts or bankruptcy. This same pattern accurately describes the suits filed by parents of apprentices although the number of suits was smaller—twenty-one nondebt suits and five debts suits, for a total of twenty-six suits.

Rowan officials apprenticed youths to prominent citizens who were financially comfortable although not necessarily wealthy and who held public offices. Several men, most notably James Carter, Adlai Osborn Richard Brandon, and Matthew Lock held numerous public offices recorded in Rowan County court records. The economic wealth and the political influence which these men possessed cannot be underestimated. However, the majority of masters held few public offices or served the county in an official capacity. Yet, the court entrusted these men with the responsibility of orphaned apprentices. One plausible explanation is that Rowan County officials had an unique definition of prominence or at least one which was more characteristic of the era. High moral attributes and involvement in church activities may have elevated some persons to an eminent status. Also, the courts may have apprenticed orphans to extremely skilled craftsmen who simply lacked the financial knowledge necessary for admission to the upper income brackets. It is further possible that court officials became lax and careless
in recording the names of those who held public office.

Research indicates apprentices did not necessarily become wealthy as craftsmen. Nevertheless, they lived more comfortably and probably with a higher degree of job security than unskilled labor. As respected citizens, apprentices became socially mobile and were no longer relegated to a bottom caste.
CONCLUSION

North Carolina's attitudes towards poor orphans and illegitimate children was neither original nor revolutionary. The General Assembly borrowed ideas concerning apprenticeships from neighboring Virginia, and Virginia modeled its legislation regarding apprenticeships after England's Poor Laws. English guildhalls recorded apprenticeships as early as medieval times. Apprenticeships were originally begun to maintain high standards of craftsmanship and to employ the poor and destitute.

Although ideally distinct, apprenticeships and indentured servitude often blended together because of similar characteristics. Indentured servitude was essentially an economic institution which provided material comforts and food in exchange for labor. On the other hand, apprenticeship served as an educational institution and exchanged vocational training for labor.\(^\text{1}\)

Economic benefits and humanitarianism prompted the rise of apprenticeships in the American colonies, especially in the South where the binding out of children more nearly duplicated English tradition. Apprenticed youths raised their status in the community and aspired to become church and community leaders. This differed from English apprenticeships which placed a youth in a particular level in society and kept him there. Colonial apprenticeships

provided social and economic mobility rather than mere entrance into one level. This system provided the colonies with a source of skilled craftsmen, assured economic growth for individual communities, and created an opportunity for social and economic gain.

The role of the courts in apprenticing orphaned children cannot be underestimated. The courts were responsible for deciding which persons were qualified to care for apprentices. Included in this decision were factors such as a man's wealth, social position in the community, moral standing and talent as a craftsman. Rowan County courts went a step further and used apprenticeships to diversify the economy, promote certain trades, and plan for future economic demand. Frequently, the success of apprenticeships as an agency of public relief hinged on the county courts' willingness to uphold the law and to remain sensitive to key issues or needs in the community. According to Barbara Doggett, it was this regional consciousness which made apprenticeships a "local institution."  

This thesis analyzed and evaluated apprenticeships at the local level. The overwhelming majority of apprentices in Rowan County from 1753 to 1795 were white, male, and legitimate. This possibly characterizes a bias in recording apprenticeship contracts. Female orphans were more likely to enter a relative's house to learn domestic duties because women seldom received

---

formal trade education. Race may explain the low number of illegitimate apprentices. Mulatto children were more susceptible to the proverbial "legal cracks" and possibly were never brought to an orphans court. Also, society may have forced them into slavery. However, illegitimate apprentices received the same opportunities and benefits as legitimate apprentices.

The Rowan County court apprenticed indigent children to trades which were best suited to places where towns existed. The abundance of apprenticeships in certain trades suggested that Salisbury, Salem, and Bethabara provided an attractive market for these goods. The majority of male apprentices worked with leather (shoemakers, saddlers, tanners, skinners, curriers, cordwainers), cloth (tailors, weavers, hatters, fullers), and wood (coopers, carpenters, joiners, turners, wheelwrights, spinning wheel makers, wagon makers). The small number of apprentices engaged in precious and semi-precious metals may indicate strong competition from the Moravian settlers.

Economically, apprentices did not fare as well as their masters. A glance at Table V indicates that none of the apprentices occupied the highest income bracket and suggests that a pyramid structure best describes the economic status of previous apprentices. Nineteen apprentices occupied the lowest level of economic status, nine were in the mid-low category and eight comprised the mid-high category. Obviously, apprentices did not become wealthy as skilled craftsmen, but were able to live comfortably and to contribute to the community's expanding economy. Also,
apprentices were less concerned with holding offices than either parents of their masters. Admittedly, the parents of apprenticed children may not have been in a financial or a social position which allowed them to hold community or county offices. Two different possibilities explain the failure of apprentices to participate actively in official positions. First, the rise of politically motivated lawyers who actively sought community and county positions compounded the increased apathy of most citizens concerning their civic duties. Second, the courts failed to record the names of persons who held offices.

Men who were previously apprentices initiated twenty-seven lawsuits. However, these lawsuits assumed a different characteristic from those patterns of masters. The number of debt and nondebt suits was fourteen and thirteen respectively. This indicated that fewer men participated in nondebt than in debt suits. Also, fewer plaintiffs were involved in debt suits than respondents. This is contrary to the pattern established for masters. Lawsuits initiated by masters recorded more plaintiffs while the lawsuits involving apprentices recorded more respondents, or people being sued. Perhaps masters were suing their former apprentices. The fact that debt suits slightly outnumbered nondebt suits also indicates that apprentices did not fare as well economically as their masters. However, the ratio of debt suits to social

---

3For more information, see William David Martin, "The North Carolina Bar, 1746-1776" (M.A. thesis, The College of William and Mary, 1982).
classification suggests that apprentices managed to live comfortably. Debt suits involved six percent of the masters and less than five percent of the apprentices.

The evidence suggests that apprenticeship was a pragmatic and workable solution to public poor relief. It not only provided immediate care for helpless children, but also provided access to the proverbial ladder of success. The community's interest in helpless children, as well as their future expectations of indigent children, ensured the future success of apprenticeships. Perhaps a charter adapted by the townspeople of Bethania, North Carolina best described this interlocking relationship. "More particularly we will make it our Business to provide for Widows & Orphans, and if no Guardian can be appointed in the Testament, the Committee will do it, so that the Widow may know whom to advise with, & he [the guardian] again may have recourse to the Committee, which is to care for the Widows & Orphans as well as Time & Circumstances admit of it, that also these children may become Usefull People."4

---

APPENDIX

BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF APPRENTICES

Adams, George - apprenticed to James Hendriks on November 3, 1775 to become a turner and a wheelwright. He appeared as a respondent in one nondebt suit.

Adams, John - apprenticed to Paul Rousmith on May 9, 1770 to become a blacksmith. He was approximately nineteen years old and received a formal education for one month. Adams appeared as plaintiff in one nondebt suit. In 1782, records listed his estate value at one hundred dollars.

Anderson, James - apprenticed to James Magaughey on July 16, 1767, at the age of fifteen years to learn the art of shoemaking. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Anderson received freedom clothes. Anderson appeared as a respondent in one nondebt suit. In 1770, records listed his estate value at $120 and in 1790 as $195. Anderson's civic offices included: constable in 1777, appointed to road work in 1780, and roads overseer in 1788.

Baker, Amelia - apprenticed to John Johnston on May 5, 1774 at the age of four years. Baker was the illegitimate daughter of Henry Baker. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Baker received a spinning wheel.

Baker, Banabeth - apprenticed to John Dobbins on November 4, 1772 to become a blacksmith. Baker was fourteen years old at the time of the apprenticeship and his father was Henry Baker. Upon expiration of the contract, Baker received a new pair of bellows, a sledge, and a set of hammers.

Baker, Barnabus - apprenticed to William Barton on May 6, 1772 to become a cooper. Baker's father was Henry Baker. Upon expiration of the contract, Baker received one horse worth six pounds.

Baker, John - apprenticed to James Bowers on May 5, 1778 to become a hatter. He received a set of tools upon completion of his contract. Baker's father was Henry Baker. Formerly bound to Michael Anderson who was deceased, the courts reapprenticed Baker to John Luckey to become a malster. In 1790, Baker valued his estate at forty-one dollars and fifty cents. He also owned fifty acres of land.

Baker, John - apprenticed to John Baker on August 3, 1784 for five years to become a farmer. He was the illegitimate child of Mary Baker. Upon expiration of the contract, Baker received a horse worth twelve pounds, a new saddle,
a gun, a mattock, and a hoe. On February 6, 1789, the courts reapprenticed Baker to Absolam Baker at the age of nineteen years to become a farmer. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Baker received either freedom dues or twelve pounds and ten shillings.

Baker, Samuel - apprenticed to James Gibson on November 5, 1782 at the age of sixteen to become a spinning wheelwright. Upon expiration of his contract, Baker received a complete set of tools. His father was Absolam Baker.

Baker, William - apprenticed to Absolam Taylor on February 6, 1783 to learn the art of blacksmithing. Baker was approximately fifteen years old and was an illegitimate son of Margaret Baker.

Baltrip, Hannah - apprenticed to Edmund Denney on May 10, 1770 until the age of thirty-one. At the time of the apprenticeship, Baltrip was nine years old. Baltrip was the illegitimate mulatto daughter of Ann Baltrip. Baltrip was raised in a Christian manner, learned to read the Bible, and received a decent suit of clothes upon expiration of her apprenticeship.

Baltrip, John - apprenticed to Edmund Denney on May 10, 1770 until the age of twenty-one to become a cooper. At the time of the apprenticeship, Baltrip was seven years old. He was the illegitimate son of Ann Baltrip. Baltrip learned to read and to write. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, he received a decent suit of clothes, a horse and saddle worth ten pounds.

Bandon, Mary - apprenticed to Michael Barrigar on January 21, 1761, until the age of eighteen. At the time of the apprenticeship, Bandon was three years old. Bandon was the orphaned child of William Gilkey.

Beard, Andrew - apprenticed to Alexander Penny on January 21, 1760 to become a cooper. At the time of the apprenticeship, Beard was ten years old. Beard was the orphaned son of Andrew Beard. In 1785, records valued his estate at $240.77.

Beatman, Milly - apprenticed to John Hunter on August 4, 1794 at the age of six years. Beatman was illegitimate.

Bedzer, Thomas - apprenticed to John Wilson on November 4, 1783 to become a farmer. Bedzer was approximately eight years old at the time of the apprenticeship and his father was Thomas Bedzer.

Beecham, Stephen - apprenticed to William Etcheson on November 2, 1790 to learn the art of shoemaking. At the time of the apprenticeship, Beecham was approximately nine years
old and his father was John Beecham.

Bell, Mary - apprenticed to John McCorkle on November 5, 1782 at the age of five years. Her father was James Bell.

Bell, Sarah - apprenticed to John Henry on November 5, 1782 at the age of nine years. Her father was James Bell.

Bone, John - apprenticed to Daniel Jarrett on November 1, 1774 to become a joiner and a carpenter. Upon expiration of the apprentice, Boone received tools worth five pounds.

Bostain, Michael - apprenticed to John Lyteker on February 8, 1786 to learn the art of blacksmithing. His father was Andrew Bostain. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Bostain received smithbellows, a vise, and beck irons.

Bostick, John - apprenticed to Joseph Dial on May 8, 1793 to become a farmer. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Bostick received a horse, saddle, and bridle worth fifteen dollars.

Bowers, Barnet - apprenticed to Frederick Alleman on November 6, 1786 at the age of fourteen to become a saddler. Bowers's father was James Bowers. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Bowers received either a set of saddler tools or six pounds.

Brazier, Gideon - apprenticed to John Grove on May 9, 1787 until the age of twenty-one to become a tanner.

Bridgers, Gil - apprenticed to Absolam Taylor on February 6, 1777 at the age of sixteen to become a blacksmith.

Brooks, John - apprenticed to John Tolbort on February 14, 1771 to learn the trade of a fuller. Brooks's father was Joel Brooks. Brooks appeared as a respondent and as a plaintiff in debt related suits. He also appeared as a respondent in one nondebt law suit and as a plaintiff in two nondebt law suits. In 1779, records listed his estate at five hundred dollars.

Brookshire, Levin - apprenticed on August 8, 1786 at the age of eleven to become a saddler. His father was William Brookshire.

Brown Arch - apprenticed to Neil Braly on November 7, 1782 at the age of eleven to become a tailor. Brown's father was John Brown.

Brown, William - apprenticed to George Gibson on November 7, 1782 at the age of thirteen to become a spinning wheel-
wright. His father was John Brown. Brown's civic duties and responsibilities included: roads overseer in 1790 and 1791, county petit juror in 1792, road juror and talisman in 1793, and county grand juror in 1794.

Brown, William - apprenticed to Henry Wizhman on November 2, 1784 at the age of eight to become a shoemaker. His father was William Brown. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Brown received a horse, saddle, and bridle worth ten pounds and a set of shoemaker tools.

Bumper, Joseph - apprenticed to Henry Morrow on August 7, 1772 at the age of sixteen to become a house carpenter and a joiner.

Burch, Rachal - apprenticed to John Church on July 16, 1767 at the age of fourteen. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Burch received a suit of freedom clothes, a colt, a calf, and a spinning wheel.

Burch, Richard - apprenticed to Enoch Tuck on July 16, 1767 at the age of nine to learn weaving. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Burch received a suit of freedom clothes. In 1793, records valued Burch's estate at $116.20.

Burk, Elihu - apprenticed to Thomas Job on August 2, 1775 at the age of thirteen to become a weaver. His father was Thomas Burk. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Burk received a suit of freedom clothes, a loom, other weaver's tools, and five pounds.

Busley, John - apprenticed to Thomas Smith on May 7, 1782 at the age of twelve to become a farmer. His father was Rodum Busley.

Butner, Edward - apprenticed to Philip Hendricks on May 4, 1789 at the age of eleven to become a shoemaker. His father was James Butner. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Butner received twenty pounds.

Callahan, Henry - apprenticed to Valentine Callahan on May 3, 1775 for two years to become a house carpenter and a joiner. His father was John Callahan. Upon expiration of the contract, Callahan received fifteen pounds.

Campbell, Allen - apprenticed to Elizabeth Steele on August 9, 1781 at the age of six to become a weaver. His father was Collin Campbell.

Campbell, Elizabeth - apprenticed to Elizabeth Steele on August 9, 1781 at the age of nine. Her father was Collin Campbell.

Campbell, John - apprenticed to Mathew Lock on April 21, 1758
at the age of twelve. Campbell learned reading, writing, and arithmetic. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Campbell received eight pounds. In 1779, records listed Campbell's estate at $630 and in 1780 as $560.

Campbell, Margaret - apprenticed to Mathew Lock on April 21, 1758 at the age of eight years. Campbell learned to read and upon expiration of the apprenticeship, she received eight pounds and freedom clothes.

Cazbey, James - apprenticed to John Carson on November 2, 1784 at the age of thirteen to become a farmer. His father was William Cazbey.

Chambers, William - apprenticed to John Lorance, Jr. on August 4, 1778 at the age of one year. Chambers was the illegitimate son on Hannah Chambers. The courts apprenticed Chambers until the age of thirty-one. In 1816, Chambers owned three hundred acres and valued his estate at $1580.

Clark, Arthur - apprenticed to Daniel Clary on May 8, 1777 at the age of ten years to become a weaver. His father was Maurice Clark. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Clark received five pounds.

Clary, David - apprenticed to Moses Bellow on August 5, 1795 to become a blacksmith. His father was Daniel Clary.

Clary, Sally - apprenticed to William Plummer on August 6, 1795 at the age of eleven. Her father was Daniel Clary. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Clary received a spinning wheel.

Connoly, James - apprenticed to James Brandon on February 4, 1778 at the age of three years. His mother was Esther Connoly. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Connoly received twenty pounds.

Cook, William - apprenticed to Samuel Luckey on November 14, 1769 at the age of two years to become a tanner. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Cook received tools worth five pounds. Cook's civic duties and responsibilities included a county petit juror in 1795.

Cope, John - apprenticed to Jacob Bostain on August 3, 1790 to learn the art of shoemaking. At the time of the apprenticeship, Bostain was twelve years old and his father was Yost Cope.

Cornelison, William - apprenticed to Jonathan Cox on November 5, 1782 at the age of seven years to become a weaver. His father was Jarret Cornelison. Upon expiration of the
apprenticeship, Cornelison received looms, gears, and ten pounds. On August 6, 1787, the courts reapprenticed Cornelison to Martin Bazinger to become a hatter. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Cornelison received seven pounds.

Cotton, Daniel - apprenticed to John Weighunt on February 4, 1789 at the age of eleven to become a tanner. Cotton's father was Cyrus Cotton.

Cotton, Peter - apprenticed to Philip Slough on May 8, 1789 at the age of seven years to become a weaver. His father was Cyrus Cotton. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Cotton received a loom, gears, a plow, and irons.

Courtney, Josiah - apprenticed to Valentine Huft on May 7, 1795 to become a farmer.

Cowden, John - apprenticed on August 5, 1788 to become a wheelwright.

Craige, James - apprenticed to William Ireland on November 5, 1774 at the age of ten years to become a cordwainer. He was the illegitimate son of Isabella Moore. Craige's civic duties and responsibilities included a militia officer in 1790.

Crosby, Paul - apprenticed to Joseph Atkins on February 17, 1770 at the age of nineteen to become a joiner.

Crosby, Sarah - apprenticed to James Best on April 22, 1758 for eleven years. Her father was William Crosby. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Crosby received one cow and one calf.

Cross, Phillip - apprenticed to George Spraker on August 9, 1769 at the age of ten years to become a blacksmith. His father was John Cross. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Cross received a suit of freedom clothes and six pounds.

Cross, Samuel - apprenticed to Robert Bogle on August 9, 1786 at the age of fifteen years to become a tailor. His father was Samuel Cross. Upon expiration of the contract, Cross received five pounds.

Crunk, John Watts - apprenticed to George Fry on January 14, 1768 at the age of ten years. His father was Richard Crunk. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Crunk received tools worth ten pounds.

Cummins, Chatley - apprenticed to Michael Peekers on November 6, 1788 at the age of five years. Her father was Michael Cummins. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Cummins received a suit of clothes, a bed, and a spinning wheel.
Cummins, Isaac - apprenticed to Conrad Gillam on August 4, 1789 at the age of nine years to become a carpenter. His father was Michael Cummings.

Cunningham, James - apprenticed to Martin Rablin on February 9, 1793 at the age of eight years to become a shoemaker. In 1815, Cunningham owned two slaves and valued his estate at $596.28.

Cunningham, William - apprenticed to Tobias Forrer on May 10, 1792 at the age of eleven years to become a blacksmith. His father was Thomas Cunningham. Upon completion of the contract, Cunningham received seven pounds.

D'Armond, Jeane - apprenticed to Peter Faust on February 5, 1784 at the age of fifteen years. She was the illegitimate daughter of Charlotte D'Armond. Previously, D'Armond was bound to Major John Dunn, her mother's master, until the age of thirty-one.

Dagner, Peter - apprenticed to Rodrick Jinkins on February 9, 1791 at the age of sixteen years to become a hatter. Dagner's father was Peter Dagner.

Davis, Elizabeth - apprenticed to Alexander Klingerman on May 6, 1791 at the age of six years. Her father was Soloman Davis.

Davis, Simon - apprenticed on November 5, 1790 to Conrad Davis at the age of fourteen years to become a spinning wheel maker. His father was Simon Davis. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Davis received ten pounds and a set of tools.

Denman, William - apprenticed to Robert Simison on May 6, 1788 at the age of seven years to become a wheelwright. Denman was illegitimate.

Dixon, Elizabeth - apprenticed to James Carter on March 25, 1754 at the age of fourteen. Dixon learned to read.

Donnelly, David - apprenticed to Robert Luckey on August 15, 1770 for nine years to become a cooper. His mother was Mary Mullican.

Donnoly, John - apprenticed to Henry Fullinwider on February 6, 1777 at the age of fourteen to become a cooper and a miller. His father was James Donnaly. Upon completion of the contract, Donnoly received cooper's tools and forty shillings.
Dowdle, Jeane - apprenticed to William McKnight on August 4, 1778 at the age of six. Her father was Willoby Dowdle.

Dunn, Eleonor - apprenticed to Peter Faust on May 8, 1787 at fourteen years. Dunn was illegitimate.

Dwire, James - apprenticed to John Dobbins on August 9, 1786 at the age of six years to become a shoemaker. His father was John Dwire.

Eller, Elizabeth - apprenticed to Abram Eary on February 9, 1785 at the age of twelve years. Her father was Jacob Eller.

Eller, Frederick - apprenticed to Abram Eary on February 9, 1785 at the age of eighteen to become a cooper. His father was Jacob Eller. In 1790, Eller valued his estate at $519.

Elliot, Catherine - apprenticed to Joshua Pain on May 7, 1782 at the age of two years. Her father was Samuel Elliot.

Elrod, Adam - apprenticed to George McKnight on February 6, 1772 at the age of eighteen years. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Elrod received a mare worth ten pounds, a saddle, and a bridle.

Elrod, Jeremiah - apprenticed to Robert Elrod on February 6, 1772 at the age of sixteen years to become a weaver. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Elrod received a horse, a saddle, and a bridle worth ten pounds.

Eury, Esther - apprenticed to Martin Miller on May 4, 1774 at the age of thirteen years. Her father was Thomas Eury. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Eury received a bed worth five pounds and a spinning wheel.

Finson, George - apprenticed to Benjamin Robinson on August 8, 1777 at the age of six years to become a weaver. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Finson received a loom, two pairs of harnessess and ten pounds.

Fisher, Frederick - apprenticed to Jacob Routher on February 12, 1791 for two years to become a wagon maker. His father was Martin Fisher. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Fisher received ten pounds.

Fitz, Henry - apprenticed to Valentine Day on February 4, 1783 at the age of thirteen to become a farmer. His father was Wolrick Fritz. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Fitz received fifteen pounds.

Fletcher, James - apprenticed to James Carter on March 20, 1754
at the age of sixteen. Fletcher learned to read and to write. Fletcher's civic responsibilities included a Rowan County commissioner or trustee and a constable in 1769.

Fox, George - apprenticed to Casper Pringle on November 1, 1779 to become a turner and a spinning wheel maker. Fox was illegitimate.

Foy, John - apprenticed to Alesander Endsley on August 2, 1774 to become a shoemaker. His father was Mark Foy. Upon completion of the contract, Foy received eight pounds and a set of tools.

Frame, Ruth - apprenticed to William Dickey on February 6, 1787 at the age of nine years. Frame was illegitimate.

Frazier, Joseph - apprenticed to Benjamin Todd on November 6, 1793 at the age of seventeen to become a farmer. His father was Aaron Frazier. Frazier appeared as a respondent in one nondebt suit.

Frohock, John - apprenticed to James McCulloh on February 3, 1784 at the age of eighteen to become a saddler, a tanner, and a currier. Frohock's mother was Elizabeth Allison. He appeared once as a plaintiff in one nondebt suit.

Garber, Leonard - apprenticed to Peter Lentz on May 10, 1792 at the age of seven to become a tailor. His father was Leonard Garber. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Garber received a Bible and a psalm book.

Goodwin, Willis - apprenticed to George Sevits on February 6, 1777 at the age of two years to become a millsright. Goodwin was the illegitimate son of Elizabeth Goodwin.

Grady, Sally - apprenticed to Henry Freeland on November 9, 1793 at the age of six years. On February 4, 1794, the court reapprenticed Grady to William Cuningham. Grady was illegitimate.

Graham, John - apprenticed to James Gibson on August 3, 1791 at the age of fourteen to become a spinning wheel maker and a turner. His father was John Graham. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Graham received a set of tools. The court exempted his master from the money requirement for freedom dues.

Graham, Richard - apprenticed to James Gibson on May 5, 1795 at the age of seventeen to become a wheelwright. His father was John Graham. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Graham received a set of tools.
Grant, David - apprenticed to William Brown on November 5, 1771 for five years to become a house carpenter. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Grant received five pounds.

Grant, Isaac - apprenticed to William Moore on November 5, 1771 at the age of seven years to become a weaver. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Grant received five pounds.

Grant, Michael - apprenticed to William Grant on May 8, 1770 at the age of three years to become a weaver. His father was Michael Grant.

Grant, Rachal - apprenticed to William Grant on May 8, 1770 at the age of twelve years. Her father was James Grant.

Green, Arthur - apprenticed to David Miller on February 7, 1777 at the age of five years to become a cooper. His father was Arthur Green.

Green, Henry - apprenticed to Casper Kinder on July 19, 1765 at the age of ten years to become a hatter. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Green received five pounds.

Hainline, George - apprenticed to Jacob Brown on August 5, 1779 at the age of seventeen to become a wheelwright. His father was John Hainline.

Hains, Abram - apprenticed to Jacob Stallions on August 2, 1791 at the age of fourteen to become a tailor. His father was Francis Hains.

Hains, John - apprenticed to William McMahan on August 2, 1791 at the age of fifteen to become a farmer.

Ham, Betty - apprenticed to William Beard on February 5, 1779 at the age of eleven. Her father was John Ham. Upon completion of the contract, Ham received a spinning wheel, a saddle, a bridle, four cows, and four calves.

Ham, Jean - apprenticed to James Wallace on February 5, 1779 at the age of three years. Her father was John Ham. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Ham received a spinning wheel, a cow, and a calf.

Ham, John - apprenticed to Arthur Chambers on February 5, 1779 at the age of eight years to become a wheelwright. His father was John Ham. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Ham received a saddle, a bridle, and a set of tools.

Ham, Nancy - apprenticed to David Beard on February 5, 1779 at the age of nine. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Ham received a spinning wheel, a saddle, a bridle, four
cows, and four calves.

Hankins, Lewis - apprenticed to James Hart on May 5, 1795 at the age of seventeen to become a hatter. His father was John Hankins.

Hartman, Eve - apprenticed to George Hartman on August 2, 1791. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Hartman received a feather bed, a cow, a calf, and one spinning wheel.

Hartman, Jacob - apprenticed to Paul Rodsmith on November 6, 1784 at the age of eleven to become a blacksmith.

Hartman, Susannah - apprenticed to Paul Rodsmith on February 9, 1785 at the age of thirteen. Her father was Henry Hartman. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Hartman received two pounds over the amount required by law.

Hayse, Robert - apprenticed to Joseph Atkins on November 9, 1771 at the age of sixteen years to become a house carpenter and joiner. Upon expiration of the contract, Hayse received tools worth four pounds.

Headen, Bennet - apprenticed to Peter Hendley on February 10, 1775 at the age of four years to become a tinker and a pewterer. He was the illegitimate son of Margaret Headen.

Headen, Hannah - apprenticed to Peter Hendley on February 10, 1775 at the age of eight years. She was the illegitimate daughter of Margaret Headen.

Headen, John - apprenticed to Peter Hendley on February 10, 1775 at the age of six years to become a tinker and a pewterer. He was the illegitimate son of Margaret Headen.

Henry, Ann - apprenticed to Ann Sloan on May 5, 1779 at the age of eight years. Her father was Thomas Henry. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Henry received a cow and a calf.

Henry, James - apprenticed to John Mitchell on May 5, 1779 at the age of thirteen to become a wheelwright. His father was Thomas Henry. Upon completion of the contract, Henry received twenty pounds.

Henry, Margret - apprenticed to Fergus Sloan on May 5, 1779 at the age of six years.

Hicks, John - apprenticed to Benjamin Merrel on January 21, 1761 at the age of fifteen to become a blacksmith. Hicks learned arithmetic.
Hill, Ann - apprenticed to William Anderson on February 9, 1792 at the age of two years. Hill as the illegitimate daughter of Martha Forest.

Hinkle, George - apprenticed to John Miller on May 8, 1783 at the age of ten years to become a cooper. His father was George Hinkle. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Hinkle received five pounds.

Hinkle, Henry - apprenticed to Conrad Graves on May 8, 1783 at the age of fourteen to become a blacksmith. His father was George Hinkle. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Hinkle received five pounds.

Holland, Elizabeth - apprenticed to Rebecca Morrison on October 23, 1757 at the age of three years.

Holland, Hugh - apprenticed to Jonathan Thompson on October 23, 1757 to learn the art of shoemaking. His father was Terrence Holland. Holland learned to read and to write.

Holland, John - apprenticed to Samuel Watson on January 19, 1758 to become a shoemaker. His father was Terrence Holland.

Holland, John - apprenticed to George Gibson on May 9, 1793 at the age of seventeen years to become a wheelwright. His mother was Ruth Holland.

Hollaway, Jonathan - apprenticed to Charles Pain on May 8, 1782 at the age of seven years to become a shoemaker.

Hollinger, William - apprenticed to Robert Harvey on May 6, 1772 at the age of fourteen years to become a weaver.

Hughes, William - apprenticed to Valentine Horef on November 4, 1795 at the age of thirteen years to become a weaver. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Hughes received a loom and gears.

Hutcheson, Charity - apprenticed to James Bowman on August 9, 1786 at the age of four years.

Jackson, James - apprenticed to John Reitweild on November 1, 1779 at the age of five years to become a weaver. He was illegitimate.

Jewell, William - apprenticed to James McCarley on February 6, 1788 at the age of five years to become a tanner and a currier. His father was William Jewell. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Jewell received twenty pounds.

Johnson, May - apprenticed to Will Davis on May 10, 1770 at
Johnson, Nathaniel - apprenticed to Arthur Erwyn on October 21, 1768 at the age of thirteen to become a tailor. His father was Francis Johnson. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Johnson received a horse, bridle, and saddle worth eight pounds or the eight pounds.

Johnson, Thomas - apprenticed to John McConnell on May 10, 1770 at the age of eleven years to become a weaver. His father was Thomas Johnson. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Johnson received a loom and gears, and a horse, saddle, and bridle worth ten pounds. In 1782, records listed Johnson's estate at less than ninety-nine dollars.

Johnson, William - apprenticed to Samuel Dalton on November 3, 1794 at the age of fifteen to become a cordwainer or a shoemaker. Johnson appeared as a plaintiff in five debt suits, and three nondebt suits, and as a respondent in three nondebt suits. In 1816, Johnson owned two slaves and 670 acres of land valued at $1600.

Jones, John - apprenticed to James Erwyn, Jr. on August 9, 1769 at the age of fourteen years to become a saddle maker. His father was John Jones. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Jones received a suit of clothes, and a horse, bridle, and saddle worth ten pounds. On February 14, 1770, the courts reapprenticed Jones to Adam Lash for eight years to become a blacksmith. Jones appeared twice as a respondent in a debt suit and three times as a plaintiff in nondebt suits. In 1790, Jones owned one hundred acres of land and valued his estate at eighty-three dollars.

Jossey, Ann - apprenticed to Robert Brevard on July 22, 1761 at the age of five years. Jossey was the illegitimate daughter of John Walter and Ann Dorothy Jossey.

Kelly, Thomas - apprenticed to John Bullen on October 11, 1764 at the age of seven years to become a cooper. His father was John Kelly. Kelly learned reading and writing. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Kelly received a suit of clothes, a set of tools, brew worth ten pounds and a horse, saddle, and bridle worth ten pounds.

Knupp, Henry - apprenticed to Peter Ryblin on February 3, 1795 at the age of fifteen to become a shoemaker. Upon expiration of the contract, Knupp received tools and ten pounds.

Lafterty, Charles - apprenticed to William Ireland on August
Lafterty, Elizabeth - apprenticed to William Ireland on August 5, 1788 at the age of eleven years.

Lamb, John - apprenticed to Timothy Brown on November 4, 1774. His father was Manassah Lamb. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Lamb received a loom. Lamb's civic duties and responsibilities included a patroller in 1790. In 1815, he owned three hundred acres of land valued at eight hundred dollars.

Larence, Margret - apprenticed to Robert Cochran on May 4, 1784 at the age of thirteen. Her father was William Larence. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Larence received a cow and a calf.

Laverty, Arsbel - apprenticed to William Watt on April 18, 1755 at the age of twelve years. Laverty learned reading and writing.

Letsinger, John - apprenticed to Daniel McPeters on July 21, 1757 for seven years to become a cooper. Letsinger received eighteen months of formal education.

Limeberger, Peter - apprenticed to Henry Bower on November 5, 1793 at the age of seventeen years to become a blacksmith. His father was Francis Limeberger.

Lindiman, Elisabeth - apprenticed to Arnold Russian on February 4, 1790 at the age of twelve years. Her father was Henry Lindiman.

Lindiman, John - apprenticed to Arnold Russian on February 4, 1790 at the age of fourteen. His father was Henry Lindiman. Lindiman received freedom dues but was not taught a trade.

Maffett, John - apprenticed to George Davidson on November 9, 1775 at the age of eight years to become a tanner and a currier. His father was John Maffett. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Maffett received a saddle and ten pounds.

Maffett, Will - apprenticed to George Davidson on November 8, 1775 at the age of ten years to become a tanner and a currier. His father was John Maffett. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Maffett received a saddle and ten pounds.

Mais, Drury - apprenticed to George Berger on November 6, 1781 to become a tanner. His father was Drury Mais.

Man, Else - apprenticed to Moses Winslow on January 21, 1761
Man, Leah - apprenticed to George Davidson on April 17, 1759 at the age of five years. Her father was John Man. Man learned reading and writing. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Man received a young cow.

Man, Mary - apprenticed to William Hall on April 22, 1758 for sixteen years. Her father was Robert Man. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Man received a mare worth six pounds.

Mash, William - apprenticed to Adam Powell on February 3, 1795 for eighteen years to become a blacksmith.

May, Sarah - apprenticed to Christopher Lyardly on February 4, 1783 at the age of six years. Her father was John May.

McCafferty, Mary - apprenticed to Hugh Shearer on April 16, 1755. Her father was Neil McCafferty. McCafferty learned to read.

McCann, Bryan - apprenticed to Thomas Allison on April 19, 1758 at an age of nineteen years. McCann was the illegitimate son of Christopher Knibby.

McCloud, Angus - apprenticed to William Neal on May 4, 1774 at the age of seven years to become a weaver. His father was Donald McCloud. Upon expiration of the contract, McCloud received a horse, bridle, and saddle worth ten pounds. On November 4, 1776, the courts reapprenticed McCloud to George Davidson to become a tanner and a currier. McCloud learned reading, writing, and arithmetic. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, he received a horse and a saddle.

McCloud, Donald - apprenticed to Samuel Woods on May 4, 1774 at the age of fourteen to become a weaver. His father was John McCloud. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, McCloud received a horse, a saddle, and twelve pounds.

McCloud, John - apprenticed to William McLeland on May 4, 1774 at the age of eleven years to become a cooper. His father was John McCloud. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, McCloud received tools and ten pounds.

McCloud, William - apprenticed to James Ramsey on May 4, 1774 at the age of nine years to become a shoemaker. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, McCloud received tools worth ten pounds. McCloud's civic duties and responsibilities included a road juror in 1793.

McClung, John - apprenticed to Hugh Lynn on May 7, 1772 at the age of thirteen to become a copper. Upon expiration of
the apprenticeship, McClung received a set of tools.

McCoy, Isabella - apprenticed to John Stephenson on February 6, 1777 at the age of eleven years. Upon completion of the contract, McCoy received two suits of clothes, a spinning wheel, a cow and a calf. On November 6, 1779, the courts reapprenticed McCoy to Jennet McCoy. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, McCoy received two cows and two calves.

McCulloch, William - apprenticed to Arter Erwy on October 17, 1766 for eight years to become a tailor. His father was John McCulloch. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, McCulloch received a horse and a saddle valued at eight pounds.

McCulloch, Jane - apprenticed to Elizabeth Cathey on April 16, 1767 for eleven years. Her father was John McCulloch. For unknown reasons, the courts reapprenticed McCulloch to Elizabeth Cathey again on October 20, 1768.

McCulloch, John - apprenticed to John Johnson on October 17, 1766 to learn house carpentry. On May 5, 1772, the courts reapprenticed McCulloch to William Bonner for three years to become a tanner and a curriur.

McKinney, Robert - apprenticed to David Karr on May 7, 1772 at the age of eight years to become a weaver. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, McKinney received a loom and gears worth eight pounds.

Merrill, Charles - apprenticed to John Merrill on August 8, 1777 at the age of fifteen years to become a blacksmith. His father was Benjamin Merrill. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Merrill received a complete set of tools.

Merrill, Elijah - apprenticed to Samuel Merrill on August 8, 1775 at the age of fourteen to become a weaver. His father was Benjamin Merrill. Upon the expiration of the contract, Merrill received a loom, tackle, and twelve pounds.

Miller, Abram - apprenticed to Thomas White on May 8, 1783 at the age of nine years to become a tailor.

Miller, John - apprenticed to Henry Horah on May 6, 1783 at the age of twelve years to become a silversmith. His father was Benjamin Miller. On August 4, 1784, the courts reapprenticed Miller to Joseph Foster to learn the art of blacksmithing. In 1815, Miller owned 150 acres of land and valued his estate at $135.

Miller, Michael - apprenticed to Peter Mock on November 4, 1788 at the age of thirteen to become a shoemaker. His father
was Casper Miller. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Miller received tools, and a horse, saddle, and a bridle worth twenty pounds.

Mills, John - apprenticed to Samuel Willson on February 12, 1791 at the age of three years. Mills was illegitimate.

Millsaps, William - apprenticed to James McCulloch on January 12, 1764 for six years to become a saddler. His father was Thomas Millsaps.

Mitchell, Daniel - apprenticed to Maxwell Chambers on November 6, 1786 at the age of eight years to become a farmer. Mitchell was a free Negro.

Moore, Sarah - apprenticed to Adam Carn on May 5, 1778 at the age of seven years. Her father was Mathew Moore. Upon expiration of the contract, Moore received a bed and a cow.

Moorefield, John - apprenticed to Robert Dial on August 5, 1789 at the age of seven years. On August 3, 1790, the courts reapprenticed Moorefield to John Grove to become a farmer.

Morris, Isom - apprenticed to John Pinkston on November 5, 1777 at the age of seven years. Morris was illegitimate.

Moss, Peggy - apprenticed to Elizabeth Harvey on May 6, 1794 at the age of six years. Moss was the illegitimate child of Benjamin Moss.

Moss, Wyley - apprenticed to James McNeely on May 6, 1794 at the age of thirteen years to become a cooper. His father was Benjamin Moss. During his apprenticeship, Moss learned arithmetic.

Mullens, William - apprenticed to a Mr. Montgomery on August 15, 1770 for nineteen years to become a weaver. His mother was Agness Hudson.

Murphy, Archibald - apprenticed to Adlai Osborn on May 6, 1783 at the age of nine years to become a weaver. On November 2, 1790, Osborn changed the trade to shoemaker. His father was James Murphy. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Murphy received twenty-four pounds.

Murphy, James - apprenticed to Alexander Dobbins on May 6, 1783 at the age of ten to become a shoemaker. His father was James Murphy.

Murphy, John - apprenticed to Andrew Shields on November 5,
1782 at the age of thirteen to become a tailor. His father was James Murphy. On August 2, 1785, the courts reapprenticed Murphy to John White to become a saddler. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Murphy received a set of tools.

Murphy, Sarah - apprenticed to David Cowin on May 6, 1783 at the age of seven years. Her father was James Murphy. Upon expiration of the contract, Murphy received a cow, a calf, a spinning wheel, and a side saddle.

Murphy, William - apprenticed to Henry Hughey on November 5, 1782 at the age of seventeen to become a weaver. His father was James Murphy.

Murr, John - apprenticed to Tobias Furrer on May 6, 1790 at the age of fifteen to become a blacksmith. His father was Michael Murr. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Murr received ten pounds.

Nelson, Lidia - apprenticed to William Nelson on November 3, 1772 at the age of thirteen. Her father was Edward Nelson. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Nelson received a woman's saddle, a small spinning wheel, and a big spinning wheel.

Nelson, Mary - apprenticed to Thomas Silvers on April 20, 1757.

Nelson, Moses - apprenticed to George Gray on November 3, 1772 at the age of eleven to become a tailor. His father was Edward Nelson. Upon expiration of the contract, Nelson received forty pounds.

Neide, John - apprenticed to James McCulloch on July 13, 1763 at the age of six years to become a saddler. Upon expiration of the contract, Neide received a set of tools.

Nesbitt, William - apprenticed to Alexander Sloane on February 9, 1780 at the age of twelve years to become a weaver. His father was Moses Nesbitt. Upon expiration of the contract, Nesbitt received a weaving loom and a horse worth ten pounds.

Nixon, Francis - apprenticed to David Will on August 8, 1786 to become a wheelwright. He was the illegitimate son of Sarah Burch.

Nydey, Sidney - apprenticed to John Lock on February 11, 1775 for ten years. Nydey received two years of formal education. Upon expiration of the contract, Nesbitt received a weaving loom and a horse worth ten pounds.

Ormon, David - apprenticed to James Barr on November 2, 1779 at the age of six years to become a cooper. His father
was David Ormon. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Ormon received a set of cooper's tools.

Ormon, William - apprenticed to James Barr on November 2, 1779 at the age of eight years to become a weaver. His father was David Ormon. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Ormon received a loom and tackle.

Overturffs, Johaun Burket - apprenticed to John Smith on August 3, 1774 at the age of sixteen to learn the art of smithing. His father was Burket Overturffs. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Overturffs received a set of tools.

Paine, Charles - apprenticed to Joshua Paine on November 4, 1794 at the age of sixteen to learn the art of husbandry. His father was Enoch Paine. Upon completion of the contract, Paine received ten pounds.

Paine, Enoch - apprenticed to Robert Willson on May 7, 1795 at the age of sixteen to become a saddler. His father was Enoch Paine.

Paine, Mary - apprenticed to Abram Pipiage on August 5, 1794 at the age of four years. Upon expiration of the contract, Paine received a cow, a calf, a bed, and furniture. Paine was illegitimate.

Paine, Sarah - apprenticed to Joshua Paine on November 4, 1794 at the age of ten years. Her father was Enoch Paine.

Pasinger, Martin - apprenticed to Casper Kinder on May 8, 1777 at the age of fourteen to become a hatter. His father was John Pasinger. Upon completion of the contract, Pasinger received seven pounds.

Pasinger, Thomas - apprenticed to Henry Barroth on May 8, 1777 at the age of twelve years to become a potter. His father was John Pasinger. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Pasinger received seven pounds.

Patterson, Nicholas - apprenticed to Philip Swisegood on November 6, 1786 at the age of nine years to become a stonemason. His father was William Paterson.

Pellum, Ruth - apprenticed to George Sevets, Jr. on May 8, 1783 at the age of nine years. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Pellum received a cow, a calf, a spinning wheel, a bed, and several pieces of furniture.

Postain, Charles - apprenticed to William King on May 6, 1791 at the age of sixteen to become a tailor.
Quin, Nancey - apprenticed to William Temple on February 6, 1772 at the age of twelve years. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Quin received a mare worth five pounds, a cow, a calf, a spinning wheel, a pair of cards, and a set of knitting needles.

Rackley, Hyram - apprenticed to Daniel Huffman on February 4, 1783 at the age of six years to become a shoemaker. His mother was Martha Rackley. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Rackley received ten pounds.

Rackley, Noah - apprenticed to Benjamin Scrivener on February 4, 1783 at the age of seven to become a farmer. His mother was Martha Rackley. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Rackley received fifteen pounds.

Rattle, Alexander - apprenticed to Frederick Goss on November 4, 1793 at the age of six years to become a cooper. Rattle was illegitimate.

Roach, Thomas - apprenticed to John Erwin on May 8, 1782 for three years to become a tailor. His father was Samuel Roach. Roach received two months of formal education.

Roachmat, Paul - apprenticed to George Bruner on January 19, 1758 at the age of nine years to become a blacksmith. His father was Walter Roachmat. Roachmat learned reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Roberts, Betsey - apprenticed to Dr. Henry Freeland on February 7, 1789 at the age of six. Roberts was illegitimate.

Robinson, Nancy - apprenticed to Manassah Lamb on May 7, 1774 at the age of two years. Her mother was Charlotte D'Armond. The courts reapprenticed Robinson to Richard Brown on February 10, 1775.

Rouch, George - apprenticed to Michael Crite on May 8, 1782 at the age of thirteen to become a farmer. His father was Phillip Rouch. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Rouch received twenty pounds.

Rouch, John - apprenticed to Christian Crider on May 7, 1781 at the age of seventeen to become a tanner. His father was Phillip Rouch.

Rouch, Peter - apprenticed to Phillip Slough on May 8, 1782 at the age of eight years to become a farmer. His father was Phillip Rouch. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Rouch received ten pounds.

Rouch, Phillip - apprenticed to Frederick Griminger on May 8,
1782 at the age of five years to become a shoemaker. His father was Phillip Rouch. Upon completion of the contract, Rouch received ten pounds.

Rutledge, James - apprenticed to John Wallace on May 6, 1778 at the age of sixteen years to become a house joiner. His father was Isaac Rutledge. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Rutledge received twenty-five pounds.

Sawyers, John - apprenticed to Thomas Vaughn on April 10, 1765 at the age of fourteen. In 1782, Sawyers owned three hundred acres and valued his estate at two hundred dollars.

Sawyers, John - apprenticed to Joshua Whitacre on July 16, 1767 to become a farmer. His farmer was William Sawyers. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Sawyers received a young mare worth six pounds, a saddle, and a bridle.

Sawyers, Joseph - apprenticed to James Brandon on February 7, 1777 at the age of sixteen. His father was William Sawyers.

Sawyers, Mary - apprenticed to James Potts on April 10, 1765 at the age of twelve years. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Sawyers received a cow and a calf. The courts reapprenticed Sawyers on October 17, 1766 to Will McConnell.

Sawyers, Unknown - apprenticed to William Nassery on April 10, 1765 for eleven years. Upon completion of the contract, Sawyers received a mare and a saddle which were used to pay Dr. Parker and Mr. Vaughn. Sawyers' mother was Sarah Sawyers.

Sevilly, Martin - apprenticed to Henry Freeland on November 9, 1793 at the age of fifteen to become a blacksmith. His father was George Sevilly.

Shaver, Sarah - apprenticed to James Potts on October 17, 1769. Shaver was the illegitimate daughter of Margret Shaver, a servant of James Potts.

Sheffer, William - apprenticed to Joseph Roland on November 3, 1784 at the age of sixteen years to become a shoemaker. Sheffer was an orphan of the State of Maryland.

Shipton, John - apprenticed to John Tussy on February 6, 1794 at the age of fourteen to become a millwright. His father was Robert Shipton.

Shipton, Peter - apprenticed to John Tussy on August 6, 1793 at the age of sixteen to become a millwright. His father was Robert Shipton.
Shipton, Susanna - apprenticed to Benjamin Todd on August 7, 1793 at the age of eight years. Her father was Robert Shipton.

Shroat, Peter - apprenticed to Martin Rantleman on November 4, 1785 at the age of fifteen years to become a weaver. His father was Michael Shroat.

Slagle, Margret - apprenticed to Samuel Harper on August 8, 1786 at the age of fourteen. Her father was Peter Slagle.

Smith, Ralph - apprenticed to John Thompson on July 22, 1761 for four years to become a cordwainer. Smith learned reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Speck, Jacob - apprenticed to Edward Raelsbeck on November 5, 1783 at the age of seven years to become a weaver. His father was Jacob Speck.

Stapleton, Anne - apprenticed to John Lowry on August 6, 1777 at the age of nine years. Her father was Joseph Stapleton. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Stapleton received a spinning wheel worth six pounds.

Stapleton, Avis - apprenticed to James Bailey on August 6, 1777 at the age of eight years. Her father was Joseph Stapleton. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Stapleton received a spinning wheel worth six pounds.

Stapleton, Hannah - apprenticed to Hugh Cathey on August 6, 1777 at the age of eleven years. Her father was Joseph Stapleton. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Stapleton received six pounds and one spinning wheel.

Steagle, Catherine - apprenticed to John Willson, Jr, on November 8, 1785 at the age of eleven to learn spinning.

Stephens, James - apprenticed on May 6, 1788 to Drury Goldsby at the age of ten years to become a blacksmith. His father was Richard Stephens.

Stephens, William - apprenticed to Jacob Brown on August 7, 1792 at the age of fifteen years to become a wheelwright or a wagonmaker. His father was Richard Stephens. Stephens appeared as a respondent in four nondebt law suits.

Sterns, Frederick - apprenticed to Jacob Brown on February 7, 1784 for two years to become a wagonmaker. His father was Frederick Sterns.

Stuart, Susannah - apprenticed to Matthew Oliphant on May 8, 1777 at the age of four years. Stuart was the illegitimate
daughter of Margaret Abshear. Upon expiration of the contract, Stuart received forty shillings.

Swink, John - apprenticed to Samuel Hughey on February 10, 1775 at the age of sixteen years to become a blacksmith. His father was Adam Swink.

Tarr, Catherine - apprenticed to Henry Bower on May 5, 1795 at the age of twelve years. Her father was George Tarr. Upon completion of the contract, Tarr received three pounds.

Tarr, George - apprenticed to Christian Shoeman on May 5, 1795 at the age of nine years to become a blacksmith. His father was George Tarr.

Tatem, Martha - apprenticed to Henry Sevetts on February 7, 1793 at the age of five years.

Thomas, William - apprenticed to Edward Villars on May 8, 1793 at the age of thirteen years to become a farmer. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Thomas received a horse, saddle, and bridle worth fifteen pounds.

Thomason, Elizabeth - apprenticed to Henry Freeland on May 7, 1790 at the age of six months. Thomason was illegitimate.

Thomson, Sarah - apprenticed to John Sloane on May 7, 1782 at the age of one year.

Tobin, Margret - apprenticed to James White on May 4, 1779 at the age of eleven years. Upon expiration of the contract, Tobin received a spinning wheel, a cow, and a calf.

Todd, Joseph - apprenticed on January 16, 1768 at the age of sixteen to become a silversmith. His father was John Todd.

Tucker, William - apprenticed to William Watt on May 7, 1778 for twelve years as a clothier. Tucker was illegitimate.

Turner, Mary - apprenticed to Daniel Lewis on August 3, 1790 at the age of fourteen. The courts previously bound Turner to John Van Etton.

Unknown, George - apprenticed to William Frohock on November 3, 1775 at the age of four years. George was an illegitimate Negro.

Vincent, David - apprenticed to John Patton on August 9, 1777 at the age of three years to become a saddler. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Vincent received five pounds.

Vincent, George - apprenticed to Adam Philips on February 6,
1787 at the age of sixteen years to become a shoemaker.

Wails, David - apprenticed to James Gibson on November 4, 1778 at the age of fifteen to become a wheelwright. His father was William Wailes. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Wails received tools.

Wainwright, Henry - apprenticed to James Hughey on April 17, 1755 at the age of eleven. His mother was Jane Wainwright. Wainwright learned reading and writing.

Wainwright, John - apprenticed to James Hughey on April 17, 1755 at the age of thirteen. His mother was Jane Wainwright. Wainwright learned reading and writing.

Wallox, Jonathan - apprenticed to Michael Holtzouzer on May 5, 1786 at the age of seventeen to become a wagonmaker. His father was Martin Wallox.

Ward, Hastorm - apprenticed to Simon Secra on August 3, 1790 at the age of one year to become a cooper. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Ward received five pounds. Ward was illegitimate.

Wilkins, Mary - apprenticed to James Fletcher on February 13, 1771. Her father was Williams Wilkins.

Wilkins, Sarah - apprenticed to James Fletcher on February 13, 1771. Her father was Williams Wilkins.

Williams, Agnes - apprenticed to James McKnight on August 3, 1774. Her father was James Williams. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Williams received a cow, a calf, a spinning wheel, and a Bible.

Williams, John - apprenticed to Henry Sloan on January 22, 1756. His parents were Joseph and Catherine Williams.

Williams, Rebecca - apprenticed to William McKnight on August 3, 1774 at the age of three years. Her father was James Williams. Upon completion of the apprenticeship, Williams received a cow, a calf, a spinning wheel, and a Bible.

William, William - apprenticed to Mathew Gusting on August 3, 1774 to become a weaver. His father was James Williams. Upon expiration of the apprenticeship, Williams received a loom, a tackle, and a horse and saddle worth ten pounds.

Williamson, Christopher - apprenticed to Davis Johnson on February 10, 1792 at the age of ten years. Williamson is the illegitimate son of John Williamson.
Williamson, Jacob - apprenticed to Lewis Beck on February 6, 1793 at the age of eight years to become a weaver. His father was John Williamson.

Windsor, Thomas - apprenticed to Joseph Scott on November 5, 1772 for four years to become a carpenter and joiner. His father was Christopher Windsor.

Winfrey, George - apprenticed to Thomas Biles on February 5, 1793 at the age of twelve years to become a hatter.
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