

Compulsory Education in the Southern Colonies. II. Virginia

Author(s): Marcus W. Jernegan

Source: *The School Review*, Feb., 1920, Vol. 28, No. 2 (Feb., 1920), pp. 127-142

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1077712>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The School Review*

JSTOR

COMPULSORY EDUCATION IN THE SOUTHERN COLONIES

MARCUS W. JERNEGAN
University of Chicago

II. VIRGINIA

In previous articles the author has discussed the factors influencing the development of education in the southern colonies and sketched the legislation of Virginia relating to compulsory education.¹ It was shown that a system had been developed which provided for the compulsory education of certain classes of children, mainly through the system of apprenticeship, including the machinery for the enforcement of the legislation, similar to that of the New England colonies. In this paper we shall study the question of the enforcement of the laws and give illustrations of their workings in particular counties.

The laws enacted by colonial assemblies for the regulation of society, such as the criminal codes, slave codes, laws involving public and private morals, religion, education, and in fact most other subjects, represent an ideal or a theory. In most cases the actual practice did not coincide with the laws, either because they were contrary to public sentiment, or because they could not be enforced, owing to inefficient machinery or officials whose duty it was to put them into operation. On the other hand, customs or practices sometimes became so regular and certain that laws were enacted to register this condition and to give added force to what was recognized as desirable. In such cases the practice often coincided to a remarkable degree with the laws. In either case general laws or practice seldom operated in the same way over a large area. Indeed, important variations might occur in adjoining counties or even in parishes. The account which follows is intended to show that the laws on compulsory education were put into operation in the cases cited, leaving open for further study the question how far the counties and parishes from which illustrations are given were typical of all the counties and parishes in Virginia.

¹ See "The Educational Development of the Southern Colonies," *School Review*, XXVII (May, 1919), 360-76 and "Compulsory Education in the Southern Colonies," *Ibid.* (June, 1919), 405-25.

ORPHAN CHILDREN

The chief agency provided by law for the enforcement of the legislation concerning orphans was the county court. This body was made up of justices of the peace appointed by the governor, and met quarterly to attend to the business of the court. The powers of county courts were derived not only from statutes conferring direct powers, but also from custom and common law. They were quite independent bodies and often paid but slight attention to the laws passed fixing their powers. In fact, many of the laws appear merely to confirm existing practices of the county courts. The general practice under the acts relating to orphans tended to bring them under the jurisdiction of the county court in various ways. The first act, passed in 1642, required guardians and overseers to report annually to the court an account of their service; the second, in 1656, required the court to inquire yearly whether orphans were educated; if not, they were to be bound out as apprentices. The law of 1659 required sheriffs to summon all persons to bring in their accounts of orphans' estates, and that of 1740 ordered the justices to summon all guardians failing to appear, under a penalty of five thousand pounds of tobacco.¹ It was customary also for a person to make application to the justices for appointment as guardian. Such petitions might be presented at any court, but some counties, from an early date, had one term of the court called "Orphans' Court," for the purpose of attending to all business relating to orphans.

While no law was enacted until 1705 specifying the exact character of education to be given to apprenticed orphans, yet the first act passed, that of 1642-43, had specified that guardians were to educate orphans "in Christian religion and in rudiments of learning," and that of 1656, in proportion to the interest of their estate. The following cases illustrate early seventeenth century practice. There was a session of the York County Court called "Orphants Cort" held as early as August 24, 1648. Stephen Gill, godfather to John Foster, an orphan child without maintenance or estate, petitioned the court that he might have "tuition and bringing upp" of the orphan, whom he had already provided for and kept for about one year. The court ordered that the orphan should "live and remain

¹ For these laws in detail, see *Ibid.*

under tuition" for nine years, during which Stephen Gill was ordered to provide sufficiently for him and "take care that he bee brought upp in the feare of God and taught to Reade."¹ Two years before, in 1646, a record of the same court shows that the fathers-in-law of three families of orphans, involving six children, filed their accounts. The court ordered that the increase of their estates should belong wholly to the orphans, without further charges for their subsistence or education as long as they remained under the tuition of their guardians.² The cases of two orphan girls are interesting. An orphan's court of Isle of Wight County, on May 1, 1694, received the petition of Charles Edwards for Grace Griswood, an orphan girl, to live with him till eighteen years old or until she was married. The petition was granted on condition that the said Charles "doth hereby oblige himselfe to mainteyn her decently and see that she be taught to read, sew, spinn and knitt," etc.³ So the Elizabeth City County Court, on July 18, 1698, bound Ann Chandler, an orphan girl, apprentice, "to be taught to read a chapter in the Bible, the Lord's prayer, and ten commandments, and Sempstress work."⁴ The Essex County Court bound out an orphan boy, James Evans, January 10, 1697, to John Williams, who agreed to give the boy "two years schooling," with orders to take care of what estate belonged to the orphan.⁵ After the act of 1705, which required a clause in the indenture of an apprenticed orphan boy providing that he be taught to read and write, indentures containing the clause in question are common in the county court and parish records.⁶

The number of orphans in Virginia was apparently quite unusual. Mr. Bruce states that there are in the Surry County Records, 1679-84, fifty bonds in which guardians bound themselves to educate orphans in their care, viz., to have them taught in school

¹ L. G. TYLER, "Education in Colonial Virginia," *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine*, V, 221. This article consists principally of extracts from the records of six county courts relating to some fifteen indentures of apprenticeship of orphans and poor children or court orders concerning the same.

P. A. BRUCE, in his *Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, I, 308-15, gives data from other counties up to 1700.

² TYLER, *op. cit.*

³ TYLER, *Ibid.*, V, 222.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *MS Records Essex County Court*, 1695-99, p. 89. (Transcript in Virginia State Library.)

⁶ Cf. *Virginia Magazine of History*, II, 345. Indenture of a boy, 1714, from *Princess Anne County Records*.

according to their estate or quality.¹ In Spottsylvania County, Will book B contains a list of forty-five guardians' bonds between 1749 and 1761, involving seventy children. Will book D contains thirty-eight guardians' bonds, 1762-72, involving seventy-two children.² There is evidence that the proportion in other counties was even larger.

Compulsory education of orphans did not depend solely upon the law or upon the order of the county court setting forth the conditions under which a person might be appointed guardian. The orphan, his friend, or the grand jurors could bring the case to the attention of the court if there was negligence on the part of guardians, or failure to carry out the terms of the indenture. For example, an orphan complained on July 2, 1685, that he was held in a severe and hard servitude illegally and that he was taken by one Major Hawkins "under pretense of giving him learning." The case came before the court again on August 2, but the justices decided that he must continue in the service of his present master.³

Under the act of 1656 the county court was given power to apprentice orphans whose estate was too small to give them a free education. This act called only for a change of master if he neglected to teach him the trade agreed upon. Nevertheless, under the general powers granted to vestries by the act of 1657-58,⁴ they had control over parish matters, including the care of the parish poor. An interesting method of enforcing the educational provisions in indentures of orphan children by one parish is that adopted by the vestry of Petsworth Parish, Gloucester County, October 8, 1724; viz., "It is also ord^d by this p^rsent vestry thatt all Orphant children, bound out by the Parish hereafter, that if they cannot Read at thirteen years old that they shall be sett free from there s^d Mast^{rs} or Miss^{rs} or be taken from them."⁵ This seems to be an isolated case, but it illustrates the fact that educational practice in Virginia did not depend solely on general laws any more than it did in

¹ BRUCE, *op. cit.*, 310-11.

² W. A. CROZIER, [ed.] *Virginia County Records*, I, 72-76.

³ *Records Rappahannock County Court*, 1683-86, p. 105. (Transcript in Virginia State Library.) There is, however, evidence that the laws respecting orphans were poorly enforced. For example, an order of the Stafford County Court of October 9, 1750, declared that guardians failed to appear when summoned to make up their accounts and that little care was taken throughout the county to put the acts relating to orphans into effect. *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine*, XII, 77-78.

⁴ W. W. HENING, *Statutes of Virginia*, I, 438.

⁵ TYLER, *op. cit.*, V, 220.

Massachusetts. County courts as well as parishes imposed penalties of their own making for the purpose of enforcing the terms of an indenture. Thus the Elizabeth City County Court bound out an orphan boy on July 18, 1694, till he became twenty-one years of age, on condition that the master teach him "to Read a Chapter in the Bible, the Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments," or in case of delinquency pay the apprentice, when free, five hundred pounds of "Legall Tobacco in Casque."¹

Since guardians were obliged by law to report annually to the county court (act of 1642) and the justices were likewise obliged to inquire annually whether orphans were educated (act of 1656), we find that county court records contain data (other than court orders) which illustrate the enforcement of the laws on education of orphans. These data consist of the records of guardians' bonds and accounts, sometimes kept in separate volumes. The record for Louisa County, covering the period from 1767 to 1819, has a dozen or more such accounts from 1767 to 1777. For example, the account of Thomas Pullet respecting the education of two orphan girls, 1766-70, is interesting, for it shows the amount and expense of their education during this period.²

The Estate of Ann Sanders and Mary Sanders to the Estate of Thomas Pullet,
Decd. Dr.

1766—Oct. 22

To 8 months schooling	13s. 4d.
To Boarding for 1 Year.....	£8

1768

To 3 Months Schooling	10s.
To the Danc ^s Master	£2
To Seven Months Schooling.....	£1 3s. 4d.

1770

To half Year's Schooling for Ann.....	10s.
To 1 years Ditto for Mary.....	£1

The account for William Lipscomb, guardian of two orphan girls, Elizabeth and Sarah Hall, shows expenditures of 10s. 10d. February 10, 1775, "For Schooling" and £2 on December 24, "To Schooling" the two children. There is also a total charge of 2s. 1½d., consisting of "To one Battledor 3d., To one Primer 7½d., To one Spelling Book ⅓."³

¹ MS Records *Elizabeth City County Court*, 1684-99, pp. 29-30. (Transcript in Virginia State Library.)

² MS Record Book of *Guardians Bonds and Accounts*, Louisa County, 1767-1819, pp. 33-34. (Original.)

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 68, 69.

POOR CHILDREN

By the act of 1646 justices of the peace were given power to bind out children of parents "whose poverty extends not to give them good breeding"; the act of 1672 gave power to county courts to bind out children whose parents were not able to bring them up apprentices; that of 1727 gave power to the church wardens, on order of the county court, to bind out children of idle and dissolute parents who could not support, or did not take due care of, their children or their instruction in "Christian principles," and provided for a clause in their indenture to teach boys to read and write; the act of 1748 gave power to the county court to bind out the children of *any* person who was judged incapable of bringing up his children or who failed to take due care of their education. Apprenticed boys and girls were to be taught reading and writing.¹

There are numerous examples, dating from the seventeenth century, of the education of poor children through the system of apprenticeship. These cases occurred before there was any law requiring book instruction of the apprentices. For example, a boy, William Rogers, was bound out by the Surrey County Court, June 15, 1681, "his master to teach him his trade of blacksmith, and to read and wright."² Another boy was bound out by the church wardens of Petsworth Parish, Gloucester County, April 4, 1700; the master promising and obliging himself by the indenture "to give unto the above Richard Allen three years' Schooling and he to be sent to school at the years of twelfe or thereabouts."³ An indenture recorded September 24, 1690, provided that Rebecca Ffrancis serve as an apprentice till twenty-one years old, to be "virtuously brought up" and given a "Compleat yeares schooling to be Educated in Reading the Vulgar tongue, to bee taught as aforesaid within the aforesaid term of Apprenticeship."⁴ There are six cases of boys bound out by the Essex County Court in the month of July, 1698. One was to be taught to read and write, one to read and have a year's schooling, two to be put to school at nine years of age and kept there until twelve, and two others to be

¹ See "Compulsory Education in the Southern Colonies," *School Review*, XXVII (June, 1919), 405-25.

² TYLER, *op. cit.*, V, 220.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 222. Cf. also BRUCE, *op. cit.*, I, 311. Another indenture, October 11, 1694, provided that the master give her "a years schooling and to have her taught to sew." *MS Records Essex County Court*, 1695-99, p. 73. (Transcript in Virginia State Library.)

given two years' schooling.¹ Even free negro boys bound out as apprentices were sometimes given the benefit of an educational clause in the indenture. Two such cases occur in the Princess Anne County Records: one, in 1719, to learn the trade of tanner, the master to "teach him to read," and the other, in 1727, to learn the trade of gun-smith, the master to teach him "to read the Bible distinctly."²

The enforcement of the terms of the indenture, as in the case of orphans, depended on the success of the apprentice in getting his case brought to the attention of the court through friends or grand jurymen. To make the enforcement more certain, the court might fix heavy penalties for neglect of the terms of the indenture. Thus a boy was bound out on July 18, 1694, on condition that the master "Teach him to Read a chapter in the Bible the Lords Prayer and Ten Commandments and in case of delinquency in any of the premises the s^d Mr. Lowry his Executor or Adm^r Shall forfeit and pay unto the s^d apentis when ffree the sume of five hundred pds of Legall Tobacco in Casque."³ Direct complaints to the county courts were not infrequent. Thus two men declared under oath on April 1, 1685, that Thomas Pell had been bound for nine years as an apprentice on condition that his master, William Gemovel, teach him the trade of carpenter and "give him Convenient Learning." The court ordered that the apprentice "be taught to Write and Read."⁴ On May 26, 1690, the parents of a boy apprenticed for nine years brought suit against the master, Robert Green, because he employed his apprentice "to labor daily in the ground contrary to the Indenture." This law provided that he be taught the "Arts and Mistery of a taylor and to teach or cause him to be taught to reade and write a Leagable hand." It was complained also that the master had omitted to give him "Learning or teach him his trade which is to ye said Apprentice utter Rewing and undoing." It was therefore ordered that the master enter into a bond of 4,000 pounds

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 102-3.

² *Virginia Magazine of History*, II, p. 429. The Lancaster County Court, on August 10, 1719, bound out the son of a free negro woman with the provision that he was to be taught to read and write. (*William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine*, VIII, 82.) Another class of children who were sometimes given the advantage of an education were imported servants, boys and girls who were indentured. The Lancaster County Court bound out two of this class, a girl who was to be taught to "Reade the Bible well" and a boy, an orphan, who was to be taught to "read and write." *Ibid.*

³ *MS Records Elizabeth City County Court*, 1684-97, pp. 29-30. (Transcript in Virginia State Library.)

⁴ *MS Records Rappahannock County Court*, 1683-86, p. 79. (Transcript in Virginia State Library.)

of tobacco and give good and sufficient security to fulfil every clause of the indenture.¹ Another case is that of the failure of a master (apparently) to give the instruction promised. The Surrey County Court, May 4, 1697, ordered "that unless Jn^o Clements do put John High to School to learne to reade and write, he do appeare at the next court, and bring the said John with him, that the Court may then do therein as shall be found fitt."² Another example is the complaint of William Creek and wife that "Steephen Howard" and wife had not performed an order of the Elizabeth City County Court of September 16, 1688, respecting Thomas Powell, an apprentice bound to Howard's wife. The court ordered that the master enter into bond, with security, to put the "Apprentice to Schoole and learne him to Reade a Chapter in the Bible," or forfeit to the apprentice, when free, one hundred pounds of tobacco.³ The interest of a county court in education is shown by the case of one Sarah Oulton who was neglecting her son. She was ordered to give bond and good security for maintaining and "Educating of her Son," and if she failed, the sheriff was ordered to take the son into custody and place him under the care of one "Allexander Marshall under whose care and charge the s^d Lodowick hath been formerly maintained and educated."⁴ The Princess Anne County Court ordered the Sheriff on May 1, 1717, to summon George Smyth to the next court to answer the complaint of his apprentice and "Shew the court reasons why he does not Teach him to read as by Indenture he is obliged." On June 5, Smyth appeared and promised "to put his apprentice forthwith to Schoole."⁵

Under the acts of 1727 and 1748 the apprenticed poor boys and girls were to be taught to read and write. The laws declared that a failure to instruct children in "Christian principles" or to take "due care of their education" was sufficient reason for taking them from their parents and binding them out as apprentices. Complaint was made to the Charles City County Court in March, 1737, by Benjamin Harrison, that Richard Bragby and Elizabeth his wife, and Mary Evans, did not bring up their children to "an honest way of Liveing as well as in the fear of God." It was ordered

¹ TYLER, *op. cit.*, V, 222-23.

² *Ibid.*, p. 222.

³ *Ibid.*, VI, 35.

⁴ MS Records *Henrico County Court*, August 20, 1706, p. 48. (Original.)

⁵ *Virginia Magazine of History*, II, 345.

that the parents mentioned be summoned to the next court to show cause why their children should not be bound out as the law directs. They appeared as ordered but failed to give satisfaction to the judges. The children were accordingly bound out.¹ So on October 1, 1760, it appeared to this same court that John Warren, father of Matthew Warren, "is not able to bring up and educate him in a Christian like manner." Accordingly the church wardens were ordered to bind the boy out "agreeable to Law."² Similarly the Elizabeth City County Court, on March 2, 1763, ordered "that the church wardens of this parish bind out the children of Joseph Bonshell and John Lewis according to law, it appearing to the court that they have neglected their education."³ The following case is one in which the terms of the indenture were not observed. On complaint of Eleanor Dunn, June 21, 1769, James Steward was summoned to court to explain why he did not teach his apprentice, Walter Dunn, his trade and "cloathe and provide for him according to law."⁴ Another case is that of the petition of the mother of an apprentice, May 19, 1773, to the effect that her thirteen-year-old son, who had been bound out to James Sallas, "could be better educated if bound to Adam Wall." The court so ordered.⁵ The law only required that indentures should provide for reading and writing, but this did not prevent the inclusion of other requirements. For example, the Augusta County Court ordered a boy to be bound out "to have the trade of a Weaver, and to read, write and cypher as far as the rule of three."⁶

ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN

Illegitimate children as a class could be considered as falling under the general heading of poor children. There was no special

¹ TYLER, *op. cit.*, V, 223.

² MS *Records Charles City County Court*, 1758-62, p. 223. (Original.) It appears that the Charles City County Court was particularly active in enforcing the law. Thus "William Smett being summoned to show Cause why he has neglected the Education of his Children, John and Joseph Smett appeared, and Promising to take proper Care of them for the Future, the Complaint is dismiss wth Costs." *Ibid.*, September 7, 1756, p. 75. Cf. also cases in CHALKLEY (ed.). *Abstracts of Augusta County Court Records*, December 3, 1751, I, 49. "Thos. Smith fails to provide for his children in a Christian-like manner and they are to be bound out." For similar cases see November 29, 1770, and August 23, 1773, *Ibid.*, pp. 162, 175.

³ TYLER, *op. cit.*, VI, 35. Compare also the following. "Ordered that the Sherif sumon Richard Smith who it is said neglects the Education of his Children to the next Court to Shew Cause why they should not be bound out according to Law." *Records of York County Court*, 1748-52, December 19, 1748. (Original.)

⁴ CHALKLEY, *op. cit.*, I, 157.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 163.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 176.

law involving the education of this class until 1769, but they were recognized as having a right to educational advantages. Lancaster County Court on January 6, 1655, ordered that such a boy "bee kept" by Roger Harris and wife till eighteen years of age, provided the "child be taught to write and reade."¹ Another case is that of a girl of this class bound out November 10, 1696, the master promising in court and "obligeing himselfe to learn the s^d [Jane] Holding to Read."² The vestry books of Virginia parishes contain numerous examples of binding out this class of children, especially from 1727 on, when complaint was made of the large number of such children.³ The indentures, however, did not contain educational requirements so frequently as was the case with orphan and poor children.⁴

MULATTO CHILDREN

The mulatto class of children presented an early educational problem. Though no special law was passed until 1765, involving their education, instances of educational clauses in the indentures of such children occur long before this date. The vestry book of Petsworth Parish, Gloucester County, contains an indenture dated October 30, 1716, stating that Ralph Beves agrees to give "A Molattoe boy of the age of 2 years, 3 years' schooling, and carefully instruct him afterwards that he may read well in any part of the Bible."⁵

Occasional cases of the action of the county courts or vestries respecting the inclusion of educational requirements in indentures are less valuable as an indication of average practice than a series of cases covering a period of years, for the records give evidence that some indentures were made with no educational requirement, despite the law. It was the practice in some parishes for the church wardens to keep a separate record of indentures, especially after the acts of 1672 and 1727, the former providing that they must bring to the county court lists of children in their parish whose parents were not able to bring them up apprentices, and the latter giving them power to apprentice poor children on order of the

¹ TYLER, *op. cit.*, V, 221.

² *Records Essex County Court*, 1695-99, p. 32. (Transcript in Virginia State Library.)

³ HENING, *Statutes of Virginia*, IV, 208-13.

⁴ See Table II.

⁵ TYLER, *op. cit.*, V, 219. See also Table II.

county court. Two such record books are those of Fredericksville Parish, Louisa County, 1742-85, and Dettingen Parish, Prince William County, 1745-82. In the former, sixty-three indentures are recorded, and in the latter ninety-eight. A study of these indentures is of great interest because of the light they throw on the education of the various classes of children provided for by apprenticeship laws.¹

These indentures are analyzed in Tables I-III according to the distribution of the children described—orphans, poor, illegitimate, mulatto; the sex, the character of the book education, or the period of time in school prescribed; and the industrial training mentioned, trade or occupation.²

TABLE I

CLASSES OF CHILDREN	DETTINGEN PARISH		FREDERICKSVILLE PARISH		BOTH PARISHES		TOTAL
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	
Orphans	26	11	19	6	45	17	62
Poor	30	5	22	7	52	12	64
Illegitimate . .	9	4	2	2	11	6	17
Mulatto	8	5	4	3	12	8	20
Total	73	25	47	18	120	43	163

Other trades mentioned were: bricklayer (2), saddle-maker (1), tailor (3), millwright (2), silver-smith (1), barber (1). In the remaining cases the description is general, such as "apprentice," "servant," "suitable trade or employment," or merely "bind out" with no trade specified. No trade is mentioned for girls unless we may call "spinster" a trade, mentioned once.

Attention may be called to certain details concerning these tables. The orphans constituted 38.01 per cent of all the children apprenticed and were, with one or two exceptions, bound out by the church wardens of their own parish on an order from their county court. The boys were most often apprenticed to learn the trade of carpenter, shoemaker, blacksmith, and planter or farmer. The reason for the predominance of artisans over farmers is

¹ The data given are made from a study of these manuscript records by the writer.

² One indenture was for two boys and another for a boy and a girl, with the result that we have 161 indentures for 163 boys and girls.

explained by the fact that the various acts passed from 1656 on were designed to meet the shortage of skilled tradesmen, a condition always present in Virginia in the colonial period. Girls were usually apprenticed as domestic servants with no particular trade men-

TABLE II

Classes of Children	Reading and Writing	Reading	Reading Writing Cyphering	One Year	Eighteen Months	Two Years	"As Law Allows" or "Learning"	No Education Required	Total
Orphans									
Boys	27	4	3	4	7	45
Girls	3	12	1	1	17
Poor									
Boys	22	2	6	1	4	6	11	52
Girls	2	4	5	1	12
Illegitimate									
Boys	3	1	2	5*	11
Girls	2	1	3*	6
Mulatto									
Boys	1	2	9	12
Girls	1	2	5	8
Total	61	18	3	13	1	7	18	42	163

*Three boys and one girl were illegitimate children of a free negro woman.

tioned. However, in nine of the cases where reading is required in the indenture of girls, there is an additional requirement that they be taught to knit, spin, and sew. The educational requirement, it will be seen, is sharply differentiated as between boys and girls. The minimum for every boy was reading and writing, when the degree of education was specified. We may assume that one or two years' schooling and the phrase "as the law allows" or "learning," the

TABLE III

Trade	Dettingen Parish	Fredericksville Parish
Blacksmith	3	3
Cooper	3	2
Carpenter and joiner	10	10
Cordwainer and twiner	8
Shoemaker	18
Weaver	4	2
Planting and farming	5	9

latter description occurring only once, contemplated or required reading and writing. Girls, on the other hand, were to be taught both to read and write in only three cases, and no provision was made for sending any orphan girl to school. Reading and writing for girls were required by the act of 1748, but there were some indentures after this date in which such a requirement is lacking, showing that the law was not strictly observed. Since orphans apprenticed were supposed to be without an estate, the fact that seven boys were to have from one to two years' schooling is interesting. This may be due to the endeavor to give certain orphans greater advantages because of their "quality." The percentage of indentures of orphan boys which did have an educational clause is 84.5, while that of girls is 94.1, a somewhat surprising figure considering the oft-repeated assertion that the education of girls, especially of the poorer class, was almost totally neglected in Virginia. It will be noted that a high percentage of poor girls apprenticed also had an educational clause in their indenture.

The table shows that there were fifty-two boys and twelve girls apprenticed, described as poor children or undescribed. In the latter case we have considered that they should be placed in this class. These children constitute 39.3 per cent of all those apprenticed. About the same trades are conspicuous as in the case of orphans, and for the same reasons. The percentage of boys to be sent to school from one to two years, 21.1, indicates the use of organized schools as an agency the master *must* employ for the education of his apprentice. The inclusion of the requirement of "cyphering" in only two cases (1763 and 1769) indicates the comparatively late development of the notion that arithmetic should be included in the indentures of this class of children. One of the two indentures of this class, that of 1769, uses the phrase "to read the Bible and write and cypher as far as the rule of three." The percentage of poor boys to be given book education was 78.8. As in the case of orphan girls, it was specified in only two indentures that they were to be taught both to read and to write, and these indentures were dated 1752 and 1779, after the act of 1748 which required both subjects in the indentures of girls. Besides reading, three indentures for girls called for instruction in spinning, knitting, and sewing. The fact that only one indenture of an apprenticed girl failed to provide some book education shows about the same

interest, 91.6 per cent, in the education of poor girls as was shown in the case of orphan girls.

The number of cases of illegitimate children is rather small for the determination of general practice with respect to this class. They were apparently treated as poor children and considered as falling under the same laws. No act specifically providing for the education of these children was passed until 1769, and all of the indentures are dated before the passage of this act. It is noteworthy that in four out of seven indentures for boys and two out of three for girls, where the degree of education is specified, both reading and writing are included, and in the case of one boy, cyphering in addition; also that two of the boys and one of the girls should be sent to school. The percentage of indentures not having an educational qualification is larger than in the two previous classes, but three of the boys and one of the girls not having such requirements were the illegitimate children of a free negro woman, a class that was not looked upon with favor. On the whole, the educational requirements were high for this class, for considering the white children only, out of a total of thirteen indentures, nine had an educational clause, or 69.2 per cent.

The mulatto class was not provided for until the act of 1765, and then only partly, when a mulatto servant sold as a slave a second time must be taken from the master and apprenticed and be taught to read and write. Nevertheless, six out of twenty indentures have an educational clause, three for boys and three for girls. One of the boys was to be taught to read and write. Two boys were to have education "as the laws allows." One of the girls was to be taught to read and write. One other girl not included in the above was to be brought up in a "Christian-like manner." Only two of all of these indentures were dated after 1765, one, that of a boy, having an educational clause, and the other, that of a girl, making no such provision.

Considering the forty-two cases where no educational clause occurs, we note that fourteen were for mulatto children and four for children of free negroes, twelve boys and six girls. This leaves a total of only twenty-four white children out of one hundred and forty-five apprenticed for whose benefit no educational clause is found in the indenture, twenty boys and four girls. The percentage of indentures in which such a clause is found is thus 83.4. It

may be noted further that it was possible, at least in some of the cases, that a boy or girl already knew how to read or write before being indentured, and if so, there would be no reason for including such a requirement. This is certainly an exceedingly good record for Virginia, so far as observing the intent of the law is concerned, and shows that in the parishes mentioned, at least, elementary education was an important characteristic of the apprenticeship system. The figures given, however, prove rather a sentiment for the education of these classes than the fact, for it is impossible to say how faithfully masters of apprentices lived up to the educational requirements of the indentures. Occasional cases in the county records have been cited to show the possibility and actuality of enforcement, but we have no method of determining the percentage of cases in which the apprentice received the education provided for. It must be confessed that this depended largely on the individual master or mistress. It was not at all certain that the master who neglected to have his apprentice educated according to the terms of the indenture would actually be called into court. We cannot assume that the apprentice was always anxious for the book education to which he might be entitled, or that he or his friends, if he had any, would bring the case to the attention of the court. Moreover, it is likely that justices of the county courts and the church wardens were more interested in relieving the parishes of the burden of supporting poor children and in providing skilled workers in the trades than they were in the book education of these children. When the children were once indentured, these two main purposes of the apprenticeship system had been accomplished. Except in the case of orphans, no penalties were provided by law for officials who neglected their duty. On the other hand, both the parish and the county court could and did impose penalties on masters for failing to carry out the terms of the indenture.

We may conclude that Virginia did establish and develop a real system of compulsory education for the classes of children mentioned; that the legal requirement for a clause in the indenture requiring book education was actually included in a large percentage of the indentures examined; that the motives expressed in the laws reappear in the indentures—first, economic, the desire to increase the number of artisans for the production of manufactured goods and to encourage industrial efficiency, to provide industrial or

vocational education, and to relieve the parish of the support of poor children; secondly, humanitarian, a desire to alleviate the condition of the unfortunate children whose parents were poor, idle, or dissolute, including those of illegitimate birth; thirdly, religious, to promote the teaching of the Christian religion and the practice of reading the Bible; fourthly, educational, to give these children a minimum of education, reading and writing for boys and girls. We may also conclude that the county court records give evidence of the actual enforcement of the law and the terms of the indentures where the master failed to give the education required; that this system did provide many children with the rudiments of an education and an opportunity to obtain industrial skill—children who otherwise would probably not have received any, or as much, education had this compulsory system not been in force; that the percentage of children who were actually taught to read or write under the terms of the indenture cannot now be determined any more than it can be in Massachusetts or any other colony; and finally that the system of apprenticeship was an important agency in colonial Virginia for the elementary education of poor children.