"THE STRANGER IN THE GATES:" EMPLOYER REACTIONS TOWARD DOMESTIC SERVANTS IN AMERICA 1825-1875

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

BLAINE EDWARD MCKINLEY

1969

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

"The Stranger in the Gates:" Employer Reactions
Toward Domestic Servants in America, 1825-1875

presented by

Blaine McKinley

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in History

Douglas T. Miller

Date November 14, 1969

ABSTRACT

"THE STRANGER IN THE GATE": EMPLOYER REACTIONS TOWARD DOMESTIC SERVANTS IN AMERICA 1825-1875

by

Elaine [illegible] Phillips

Although more w[illegible] domestic service than in any other [illegible] nineteenth century America, historians have given [illegible] the social importance of domestic work [illegible] dealt with service were generally emphasized [illegible] nature of the expansion in pre-Civil war [illegible] democratic master-servant relationship [illegible] with the class-conscious attitude employers began to demonstrate toward their servants in the [illegible]. In fact, however, employers before 1860 were as class-conscious and as concerned with acquiring obedient and [illegible] servants as were those of the [illegible]. In regard to domestic servants, the socially stratified attitudes and regulations usually associated with the Gilded Age had deep roots in the earlier decades of the nineteenth century.

This dissertation explores the attitudes and responses of northern employers toward their servants during the middle years of the nineteenth century. Domestic service affords an especially valuable opportunity to study class

ABSTRACT

"THE STRANGER IN THE GATES:" EMPLOYER REACTIONS TOWARD DOMESTIC SERVANTS IN AMERICA 1825-1875

By

Blaine Edward McKinley

Although more women were engaged in domestic service than in any other occupation in nineteenth-century America, historians have given little attention to the social importance of domestic work. Those who have dealt with service have generally emphasized the egalitarian nature of the occupation in pre-Civil War America. This democratic master-servant relationship is then contrasted with the class-conscious attitude employers began to demonstrate toward their servants in the Gilded Age. In fact, however, employers before 1860 were as class-conscious and as concerned with acquiring obedient and deferential servants as were those of the seventies. In regard to domestic servants, the socially stratified attitudes and regulations usually associated with the Gilded Age had deep roots in the earlier decades of the nineteenth century.

This dissertation explores the attitudes and responses of Northern employers toward their servants during the middle years of the nineteenth century. Domestic service affords an especially valuable opportunity to study class

relationships because in their roles as master and servant the middle and upper classes and the lower class came together in unusually close association. This investigation therefore provides a case study of the class consciousness of the upper levels of society through focusing on their responses toward a specific group of lower-class persons with whom their relations were especially close.

Employer reactions have been assessed through popular publications of the nineteenth century. Etiquette books, household manuals, and essay collections contained extensive information about employer attitudes and policies toward domestics. Particularly valuable for their social commentary concerning servants were the popular magazines of the century, including such ladies' monthlies as Godey's Lady's Book and Arthur's Home Magazine and such general interest periodicals as Harper's and Scribner's Monthly.

From these sources it becomes clear that throughout the mid-nineteenth century employers consciously attempted to enforce social distance between themselves and their servants. They desired and worked to produce domestic workers who would "know their place," bear their burdens patiently, and submit deferentially to the regulations prescribed for them. Masters wanted service to be based not on democratic principles but on traditional and stratified concepts of master and man. Employers regarded their servants as child-like, vulgar, and undisciplined. It was

hoped that with proper "instruction" domestics would internalize such values as obedience and deference. Mistresses undertook the duty of uplifting the benighted maid and training her to be virtuous and "useful." Such paternal guidance was founded upon a sharp dichotomy between the childish and irresponsible servant and the wise and benevolent employer; it was meant to produce docile domestics who would defer willingly to the superior judgment of their social betters. The benevolent kindness to servants advocated by many writers implied no concession that domestics were to be accepted as social equals. Rather, by stressing the irresponsible nature of the employee, paternalism was one way to formalize the social gap between parlor and kitchen.

The social forms regulating the interaction between master and servant also accented and institutionalized the class differences between the two parties. Such class divisions were apparent in employers' reactions concerning matters of dress, social etiquette, meals, and the construction of houses. In regard to manners, for example, employers were often rude and impolite to their domestics from whom deferential conduct was required in return. Even those who recommended a polite demeanor toward servants thought of them as social "inferiors." A clear distinction was drawn between the cultured and genteel employer and the vulgar and unrefined domestic who was unworthy of respect. Masters

denied servants access to the family table and planned their houses to keep them inconspicuous lest domestics disturb employers or contaminate their children with lower-class habits and manners.

These class-conscious attitudes were intensified by, though not dependent on, the significant place of Irish immigrants in domestic service. Important as domestics as early as the 1820's, the Irish became virtually synonymous with servants after 1850. Because of their peasant background, Catholic religion, and "alien" habits, Irish servants were regarded with contempt by employers who preferred native American girls, who were assumed to be more neat and intelligent. The presence of Irish servants tended to widen the social gap between mistress and maid by reinforcing class divisions with ethnic and religions tensions. This process was well under way before 1860.

In the mid-nineteenth century employers of domestic servants clung to paternalistic assumptions and regulations, enforced rules which made it clear that the interests of the employer were superior to the interests of the employee, demanded deferential social conduct from domestics, and believed firmly in the social, mental, and cultural inferiority of those who served them. These conditions were as true before 1850 as they were after the Civil War; the fundamental attitudes and regulations of employers changed little between the Age of Jackson and the Gilded Age.

"THE STRANGER IN THE GATES:" EMPLOYER REACTIONS TOWARD DOMESTIC SERVANTS IN AMERICA 1825-1875

By

Blaine Edward McKinley

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of History

1969

PREFACE

Domestic service was numerically and socially the most important women's occupation in the nineteenth century. Numerically, more women earned their living by doing menial work in the homes of wealthier citizens than in any other way. Socially, in the roles of servant and master the lower class and the middle and upper classes came together in uniquely intimate association. The live-in domestic was the member of the lower class with whom the middle and upper classes, especially ladies, had the closest contact. Nineteenth-century employers had, within their own homes, the chance to observe and the necessity to deal with lower-class persons.

Despite the significance of domestic service during the previous century, it has received scant attention from historians. Most scholars have simply ignored the occupation; no studies have addressed themselves in depth to the nature of the master-servant relationship in nineteenth-century America. Standard social histories such as Carl Russell Fish, The Rise of the Common Man, 1830-1850 and Nelson Manfred Blake, A History of American Life and Thought make no mention of this important social relationship in the nineteenth century. The books which do discuss

service historically do so only briefly and superficially; moreover, they are generally popularized accounts lacking in thorough research.

In 1897 Lucy Maynard Salmon first tried to place American service in historical perspective in the opening chapters of her sociological study Domestic Service. Her discussion of domestic service between 1800 and 1860, however, is based exclusively on the accounts of European travelers, men and women who often overgeneralized those things which impressed them as democratic in the United States and whose observations were frequently at variance with the statements of Americans. Recent popular writers have added little to Miss Salmon's methods or analysis. Russell Lynes in The Domesticated Americans and E. S. Turner in What the Butler Saw: Two Hundred and Fifty Years of the Servant Problem, which is principally devoted to service in Britain, also rely solely on foreign visitors for their discussions of American service in the ante-bellum period. Because each of these authors then shifts to American-authored materials for the post-Civil War years, each makes a sharp distinction between the democratic service allegedly typical before 1860 and the class-conscious service standard after 1860. A consistent and thorough use of American source material throughout the period shows that this sudden, sharp dichotomy is unwarranted. In fact, the conditions of service were more consistent and less democratic than these authors have indicated. An occupation employing almost 32,000

persons in New York City alone in 1855 deserves considerably more historical attention than it has thus far received.

This dissertation is intended to open up domestic service as an area of investigation by assessing the class reactions displayed by employers in dealing with their domestics. I have explored what seem to me to be the most significant and interesting reactions of employers toward those lower-class persons living within their homes and performing their household labor. Because of the close, daily contact between lower-class employees and middle to upper-class employers, the class attitudes and responses of employers were clearly formulated and expressed in regard to servants. My examination will therefore provide not only an analysis of the nature and character of domestic service in the mid-nineteenth century but also a case study of the class opinions held by the upper levels of society, and of their actions based on these opinions, through focusing on their reactions toward a specific group of lower-class persons with whom they were well acquainted.

The broad implications of this study suggest that employers, who were the persons in control of the economic, religious, educational, and publishing institutions of America, were unwilling to accept their poorer countrymen as social equals. The basic assumption of the employing classes was that those below them on the social scale were

mentally, culturally, and morally inferior--that they were vulgar, ignorant, and undisciplined. On the one hand, this contrast between their own refinement and the vulgarity of the lower classes made employers think of their social "inferiors" as distasteful persons to be excluded from contact with the polite and genteel. On the other hand, this same assumption led to a conviction that the middle and upper classes had a paternal duty to uplift and improve the lower classes by training them in the standards and values which wiser persons thought proper and best for them. Thus religious instruction and vocational education were meant to discipline the lower classes and make them satisfied with their subordinate status. The lower classes were supposed to respond in a grateful and respectful manner. They were to willingly defer to the wiser judgment of the middle and upper classes and not intrude on those privileges properly reserved to those above them.

It is inaccurate to contend that the employer-domestic relationship in America was basically equilitatian in nature. Throughout the years covered by this study, employers of servants refused to accept or live up to the implications of the democratic faith most of them claimed to hold. Employers wanted service based not on democratic principles but on more traditional concepts of master and man. Furthermore, they were in many ways successful in enforcing conditions and rules in keeping with their anti-democratic outlook. Employers desired and worked to produce docile servants

who would "know their place," bear their burdens patiently, and submit deferentially to the regulations prescribed for them. Most masters and mistresses consistently opposed the practial implementation of social equality, clung to paternalistic assumptions and regulations, enforced rules which made it clear that the interests of the employer were superior to the interests of the employee, required deferential social conduct from domestics, and believed firmly in the mental and cultural inferiority of those who served them. These conditions were as true during the 1820's, thirties, or forties as they were in the seventies. Fundamental attitudes and regulations of employers changed little between the Age of Jackson and the Gilded Age.

The lack of attention given to service by social historians is particularly surprising in view of the fact that it was a common topic of parlor conversation and serious social commentary in the nineteenth century. Ladies' periodicals, general-interest magazines, household manuals, etiquette books, and a variety of other publications commented on the nature of the master-servant relationship in America and included pieces of advice to housekeepers on the handling of their servants. This body of published material dealing with domestic service has formed the basis of my investigation. Throughout, I have assumed this published commentary to have been representative of employer attitudes generally. This

seems warranted because of the consistency of the evidence on most points. Supporters and critics of the attitudes and policies of employers agreed as to what the dominant assumptions and goals of employers were. Only their evaluation of these accepted facts differed. Unfortunately, it has been impossible to locate material written by servants themselves. Like other lower-class groups in nineteenth-century America, domestics left little or no record of their own experience. Even collections of immigrants' letters have not been helpful in this regard. Therefore, this dissertation has been based upon material written by and for employers themselves.

Several points concerning the limitations of scope of this thesis should be clarified. For one thing, I have restricted my inquiry to "live-in" servants, that is, those who received their room and board from their employers as part of their compensation. Some domestic workers, chiefly washerwomen and seamstresses, were often employed by the day and returned to their own homes in the evening. This system, however, was rare in the nineteenth century for cooks, chambermaids, waitresses, and nurses. Second, I am concerned only with service in the Northern states; for obvious reasons service in the slave states would form a separate topic. Third, while some contemporary attention was directed toward men-servants, the

bulk of published information from the previous century deals with female servants, who were much more numerous than their male counterparts. Therefore, I have also concentrated on female domestics. Finally, it should be understood that I have discussed domestic service principally as it existed in an urban or urban-oriented setting where domestics were much more numerous than in rural regions. Nineteenth century authors usually treated service as an institution of cities, country towns, and country areas within the social orbit of urban centers.

This investigation covers the second and third quarters of the nineteenth century, the 1820's through the 1870's. I have begun with the 1820's principally because during that decade there appeared for the first time large circulation literature written by Americans and designed for the growing number of American women with leisure time. With the twenties came the gift book and the first monthly "ladies" magazines which survived for more than a few issues. The first of these periodicals combining verse and fiction with social and household essays was The Casket (1826), which later became Graham's Monthly Magazine. In 1828 Mrs. Sarah Josepha Hale initiated The American Ladies' Magazine, which merged in 1836 with Godey's Lady's Book, itself first published in 1830. This expanding body of

literature devoted to sentimental fiction and domestic topics implies that in the twenties American ladies, through employing servants, were gaining more leisure time for reading and were beginning to constitute a substantial literary market. Along with the advice on social topics offered by the magazines, manuals on a variety of subjects written by Americans specifically for Americans also became more numerous during the twenties. Americans were exhibiting an increasing concern for the proprieties and niceties of social and home life. In this decade employers demonstrated a growing awareness of questions involving domestic service, an awareness reflected in the publication of tracts designed to instruct domestics in their duties and social obligations to their employers and in the creation of Societies for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants in New York (1825) and Philadelphia (1829). Finally, the 1820's were the first decade when immigrant "redemptioners" indentured to their masters for a term of years disappeared from domestic service; henceforth employers were forced to rely, except in the case of bound orphans and vagrant children, on free labor.

At the other end of my time span, the 1870's provide a useful stopping point because the conditions and lines of discussion concerning service seem to have altered in two principal respects beginning with the late seventies.

For one thing, the decade roughly corresponds with the end of the period of the closest connection between the Irish immigrant and domestic service. While the stereotyped Irish Bridget remained the most commonly discussed domestic after 1875, writers began to feel less dependent on her; they noted increasing numbers of Scandanavians, Negroes, and other ethnic groups entering the occupation. Second, the process of simplifying domestic labor began to emerge in the late seventies and the eighties. Although the greatest triumphs of household mechanization did not occur until the turn of the century, the process which was eventually to eliminate service as a major social question began about 1880. Developments such as reliable washing machines, reasonably priced commercial laundries, and improved bakery products began to lessen the practical necessity for the employer to retain live-in service. One reflection of these developments was that beginning with the late 1870's servants began to receive more free time than had generally been granted before; increasingly domestics were granted portions of two days a week for their own use instead of the earlier limitation to one evening or "half-day" per week. For these reasons, the years after 1875 seem to have brought changed conditions and raised new questions regarding service which go beyond the scope of my current investigation.

During my graduate work and in the preparation of this study I have received valuable aid from many people. My greatest debt is to Professor Douglas T. Miller, my thesis director, who suggested domestic service as a topic for investigation. Without Dr. Miller's helpful advice and constant encouragement, this dissertation could not have been completed. Special thanks are also due to Professor Gilman M. Ostrander for guiding the earlier stages of my graduate work and to Professors Robert E. Brown and Marjorie Gesner for their continued kindness and assistance. In my research I received special help from the courteous staffs of the New York Public Library, the New-York Historical Society, the Free Library of Philadelphia, the Pennsylvania Historical Society, the American Philosophical Society, the Michigan State Library, and the libraries of the University of Michigan and Michigan State University.

B. E. M.

East Lansing, Michigan
October 21, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE EXTENT AND CONDITIONS OF DOMESTIC SERVICE IN THE MID-NINETEENTH CENTURY

In investigating employer attitudes toward servants, it is necessary first to look into the nature and extent of domestic service between 1825 and 1875. This chapter, therefore, will examine the number of domestic servants, where they were most common, who employed them, the nature of their duties and daily routine, and their wages and hours. The long hours and severely restricted leisure time of the domestic were especially important points in limiting the personal freedom of the employee and in making service an occupation to be shunned. Finally, attention will be directed to employer reactions toward the relatively high turnover of domestic workers.

I

In the nineteenth century more women were employed in domestic service than in any other single occupation. For example, the 1870 census recorded 139,271 female domestics for New York state, over half of the 257,039

women employed in the state. According to the same census, there were 49,155 women employed in the needle trades in in New York. Similarly, in New Jersey and Pennsylvania over half of all employed women were at service while in Midwestern states such as Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio as many as two-thirds of all employed females were domestics. Only in the industrialized regions of New England did domestics make up less than half the total female labor force. In Massachusetts 43,508 of the 128,301 employed women were servants; Vermont was the only New England state where domestics comprised over half of the working female population.[1]

Large numbers of women in major cities were employed as servants. Including female residents of all ages, one of every eleven females in New York City in 1870 was a domestic. In Philadelphia it was one of every 15.7 females and in New Haven one of every 12.5. The proportion of women in service was not very different in the growing cities of the Midwest. In Chicago one of every twelve females was a servant; in Milwaukee one of every 14.8; in Indianapolis one of every 14.5. If figures were available for the female population between fifteen and sixty, the proportion of females of working age in service would be considerably higher, of course. In Boston in 1845, for example, one of every thirteen females of all ages was a servant, but of those over age twenty the proportion was one of every eight.[2]

Because of varying methods of classification, it is difficult to compare the figures from the 1870 census with those from earlier enumerations. For example, writing of the 1870 census which he had compiled, Francis A. Walker noted that the sixteen pre-Civil War free states contained a total of 570,054 domestics, an increase of 20.5 percent over the 1860 figure for these same states. In the same decade, however, the population of these states had grown slightly over twenty-seven per cent. Walker mentioned this failure of the servant population to increase as rapidly as the general population with surprise, stating that the 1870 count had been expected to reveal a trend "more and more to place servants in the houses of the people . . . ."[3] Part of this lag may be attributed to the fact that whereas in 1860 hotel and restaurant workers had been included with other domestics, they were counted as a separate category in 1870. In addition, pre-1870 censuses in rural areas often counted farm laborers with servants. This was apparently done in the New York state censuses for 1855 and 1865 and probably also in the 1860 national census for New York.

Taking what seem to be reliable statistics which indicate long-term trends, it appears that during the middle of the century, at least in major cities, the servant population increased faster than the population as a whole. Allowing for the fact that the New York census for 1855 included hotel workers with other domestics, the proportion

of servants in private families in New York City went from about one in every twenty-one New Yorkers in 1855 to one in nineteen in 1870. In 1845 the city of Boston had 4875 servants in private homes and a total population of 114,336, or one servant in every 23.5 residents. By 1870, after waves of Irish immigrants, Boston had one servant in every eighteen inhabitants. Assuming that ten per cent of all Boston servants in 1845 were males, about one female resident in every thirteen was a domestic servant; in 1870 the proportion was one of every ten. However, while statistically there had been one servant for every 3.9 private families in Boston in 1845, in 1870 there was one servant for every 3.5 families, a much smaller increase than that of servants to total population.[4] These figures suggest that, with the influx of Irish immigrants, approximately the same proportion of Boston families employed servants in 1845 as in 1870 and that the relative increase in the number of domestics tended to go into the creation of larger staffs of servants.

Although in 1870 domestics were proportionately most numerous in Boston and New York City, servants were nearly as common in Midwestern cities as in most Eastern urban centers. Statistically, there was one servant for every 3.7 families in New York, one for every 4.9 in Brooklyn, and one for every 5.3 Philadelphia familes. Western cities were only slightly behind. San Francisco could claim one

domestic per 4.4 familes, Chicago one per 4.5, and Indianapolis one per 4.9. The respective ratios of servants to familes in Albany and Milwaukee, which were of nearly equal size, were 1:5.2 and 1:5.5. While Cleveland had only one servant for every 6.6 families, Jersey City had only one to every 6.3. Nor were domestics necessarily less common in smaller cities than in larger ones. New Haven and Indianapolis, for instance, had proportionately as many domestics as Brooklyn and more than Philadelphia. Servants were thus a prominant part of urban life in both Eastern and Midwestern cities, in both large cities and small. It seems especially significant that domestics were as numerous in newer cities of the Midwest as in older urban areas. Judging by the numbers of servants, it seems fair to suggest that social structure of cities such as Chicago, Indianapolis, and Milwaukee may not have been significantly different from those of Eastern cities during the 1860's. Such data confirms the view of an 1863 correspondent to Arthur's Home Magazine that the nature and conditions of domestic service in "our western cities and larger towns" were no different from those prevailing in the East.[5]

While the servant population was relatively constant in urban areas, it dropped off sharply in rural regions. New York state as a whole had one servant for every 5.8 familes; the ratio fell to one per 7.3 families when the state's seven largest cities were excluded. Without Boston

and Worcester, Massachusetts went from one domestic per 6.6 familes to one per 8.2; excluding its three principal cities, Pennsylvania's ratio was one servant to each 9.8 families. The difference was still greater in Midwestern states, where there were fewer towns. Outside Chicago, Illinois had only one servant per 12.7 familes; Wisconsin had only one per 11.3 excluding Milwaukee. The remaining domestics outside the major cities were probably concentrated in country towns and in suburban and "country" areas within the orbit of the major cities. Suburban areas around Boston, New York, and Philadelphia included the "country seats" of many substantial citizens. Servants were primarily a feature of urbanized areas and were uncommon in exclusively rural regions. William A. Alcott's comment that "the custom of keeping servants has not yet found its way very far beyond the precincts of our cities, towns, and villages" was probably about as true in 1870 as when Alcott made it in the 1830's.[6]

While it is very difficult to discuss the economic position of those who employed domestics, the 1845 Boston census provides an interesting comparison between the number of families employing servants and the number owning their own homes. In 1845 Shattuck found 19,037 private families in Boston; of these only 3263, one of every 5.8 families, employed domestics. The 19,037 families lived in 10,812 dwellings, of which only thirty-one per cent, or 3361, were

TABLE 1.--Domestic Servants in Major Northern Cities, 1870

	Population	Domestic Servants	Male Domestics	Female Domestics	Total Female Population	Ratio of Female Servants to Female Population	Number of Families	Ratio of Domestic Servants to Families
New York	942,292	49,440	6467	42,973	485,175	1:11.3	185,789	1:3.7
Philadelphia	674,022	24,108	1650	22,458	353,643	1:15.7	127,746	1:5.3
Brooklyn	396,099	16,208	915	15,293	206,071	1:13.5	80,066	1:4.9
Chicago	298,977	12,279	991	12,288	146,149	1:12	59,497	1:4.5
Boston	250,526	14,026	1228	12,798	130,609	1:10.2	48,188	1:3.5
Cincinnati	216,239	8,625	606	8.019	109,794	1:13.7	42,937	1:5.0
San Francisco	149,473	6,800	2742	4,058	63,291	1:15	30,553	1:4.4
Buffalo	117,714	4,209	852	3,357	59,002	1:17.3	22,325	1:5.3
Newark	105,059	2,680	161	2,519	53,715	1:21	21,631	1:8.1
Cleveland	92,829	2,787	246	2,542	46,059	1:18	18,411	1:6.6
Pittsburgh	86,076	2,867	213	2,654	42,354	1:15.9	16,182	1:5.6
Jersey City	82,546	2,666	112	2,554	41,944	1:16.4	16,687	1:6.3
Milwaukee	71,440	2,575	140	2,435	36,165	1:14.8	14,226	1:5.5
Albany	69,422	2,724	308	2,416	35,818	1:14.8	14,105	1:5.2
Providence	68,904	2,840	283	2,559	36,369	1:14.2	14,775	1:5.2
Rochester	62,386	1,994	84	1,910	32,156	1:16.7	12,213	1:6.3
New Haven	50,840	2,168	101	2,067	25,912	1:12.5	10,482	1:4.8
Indianapolis	48,244	1,853	228	1,625	23,589	1:14.5	9,200	1:4.9
Troy	46,465	1,327	161	1,166	24,099	1:20.6	9,302	1:7.0
Syracuse	43,051	1,834	144	1,690	21,859	1:12.9	8,677	1:4.6
Worcester	41,105	1,568	82	1,486	20,700	1:13.9	8,658	1:5.5

From Francis A. Walker, comp., The Ninth Census of the United States, [Census Reports], I, The Statistics of Population in the United States (Washington, 1872), Table XXI, p. 598; Table XXV, pp. 641-656; Table XXXII, pp. 775-804. Detroit, Michigan and Allegheny, Pennsylvania have been excluded because an unreasonably high number of servants was recorded for each city; the error is particularly great for Detroit.

owned by an occupant. Of these 3361 units, 2525 were single family homes and another 661 were two family houses.[7] Thus there were only 3186 families occupying one and two family houses which they owned. The number of home owners and of employers of servants were approximately the same, the families employing domestics slightly exceeding the number of owner-occupying families of one and two family units. If comparatively few Boston families employed servants, so also did relatively few own their own homes. While some renters surely hired servants and some home owners did not, it seems fair to assume that there would be a high degree of correlation between home ownership and the hiring of servants since home owners would be, in general, the most financially secure portion of the community and the most able to afford live-in domestics.

While only a minority of American families employed servants, domestics were probably nearly universal among those at the upper income levels. Servants were standard among the families of the well-to-do and the more substantial elements of the urbanized middle class. However, architects frequently added a servant's room to relatively modest houses of six or seven rooms which would seem to indicate that servants were often hired by middle-class families with comparatively "moderate" incomes. Writers discussing the servant problem tended to connect the employment of domestics with the "middle class" and the families of "moderate means."[8] Such statements indicate that writers thought

that employing domestics was common among what they considered to be the "middle class" and that domestics were viewed as an important part of the life of the urban and semi-urban middle and upper-middle classes. Hired primarily by professional and commercial families, servants were probably uncommon among clerks, shopkeepers, and independent tradesmen, who might be considered to comprise the lower middle class.

II

Those who employed servants did so in order that the lady of the family might secure "exemption from daily and wearisome toil." Housework was hard and tiresome, and those able to hire domestics were glad to be free of household "drudgery." In the mid-nineteenth century few laborsaving devices eased household labor. Carpets had to be swept with brooms, reliable washing machines had not yet been developed, and the preparation of meals was long and involved. The term "lady" was reserved for women possessing some leisure time, and in cities and towns it was considered necessary to employ one or more domestics to provide the mistress with time for reading, calling, engaging in church, charitable, and social activities, and otherwise maintaining her position as a "lady." While their husbands went to work daily, considerable numbers of middle and upper-class women were obtaining substantial leisure time by employing servants.[9]

According to the idealized nineteenth-century theory of home life, the lady, while she had benevolent, religious, and social responsibilities outside the house, was to accomplish her special "mission" within the home. The crucial task of the wife and mother was to shape the character and habits of her husband and children; her moral and spiritual influence was to be the purifying agent in the household. Women could most effectively influence society at large by improving their own husbands and offspring. The lady should strive to make her home a "Garden of Eden," a pure "sanctuary" where her husband could retire for refreshment from the cares and evils of the world of business. With her "moral influence" a mother was responsible for instructing and nurturing her children in the highest duties of morality, religion, and republicanism. As Mrs. Graves put it, the housekeeper's principal function was "to be the enlightened instructor and guide of awakening minds, her husband's counsellor, the guardian and purifier of the morals of her household." This popular theory of woman's sanctified home duties remained powerful even in the less sentimental years following the Civil War. Throughout the century, it was argued that it was the chief duty of the lady to develop the "minds and hearts" of her children and "soften and refine and elevate" the character of her husband.[10]

If a woman were to adequately perform these all-important "higher duties," it was imperative that she be released

from the menial work of the household. She needed leisure time to care for and instruct her children, improve her own intellect so as to be a better companion to her husband, and attend to the small refinements which made home life more enjoyable. This argument was the most often expressed rationale for hiring domestics. Without servants the mistress would have to become a mere "drudge," and her more elevated responsibilities would go unfulfilled; she would be unable to develop the finer aspects of home life or her own nature. Mrs. Graves argued that "the highest duties of the mother, therefore, and 'the maid of all work' would appear to be incompatible." It was impossible for the lady to do her own housework "with her own hands, and have time for the more important duties resting on her as a wife and a mother." Virginia Townsend, the editor Arthur's Home Magazine, agreed that the woman who did her own housework

> has usually little time or strength left for mental or social improvement. The probabilities certainly are that she could more wisely expend her time than in an absorbing round of household duties, be a wiser and more agreeable companion for her husband, a more competent and truer mother to her children by enriching her own intellect . . . .

Women of education and wealth should be "something more than dabblers in soap suds . . . and turners of the spit." Robert Tomes contended that

> there is no reason why the rich should execute the humbler offices of the household themselves, when they can afford to hire others to perform them. There is every reason, on the contrary, why they should not. With the superior education

> they are presumed to possess, they ought not to be so absorbed with the smaller, as to have no time to engage in the greater labors of life, of which they may be capable . . . . It is not creditable--it is, in fact, quite the reverse--for a woman with the means and opportunity to accomplish greater things, to have it in her power to boast that she has done for herself what any poor and ignorant creature would have been very glad and able to do for her . . . .[11]

Carried one stop further this argument led to the position that "the existence of civilization" itself was dependent "on the existence of a class of servants." As one tract for domestics explained,

> if there were no mechanics and no servants, then preachers and writers, and all such as have gained a good education, would have to get their own food and clothes, and do housework for themselves. And that would keep them busy all day long, and every day; so that they would not have time to preach and write books, and spread knowledge and religion.[12]

American families, however, usually retained fewer domestics than English families of similar wealth and position, two often being kept in an urban household where an English family would have four. Few American establishments contained more than four servants; an 1845 author noted that "one or two servants of all work are all the female help which a majority of American families retain." Although in later years the typical upper-middle-class, Eastern, city resident might have employed two, three, or four servants, Harriet Prescott Spofford was probably still correct for the country as a whole when she stated in the 1870's that "the average American mistress is the mistress of but one maid, or at the most two."[13]

Where only one domestic was kept, she was known as a "maid-of-all-work." In her 1857 book on domestic economy, Mrs. Elizabeth Ellet included a detailed description of the daily routine expected from the maid-of-all-work. She was to rise early, about 5:30 a.m., in order to complete the dirtier work in the morning so she would be neat and presentable for the mistress's afternoon callers. "Before the family come down" to breakfast, the girl was to clean and polish the stove, sweep the first-floor carpets, dust the furniture, sweep the front steps, shake the mats, prepare the breakfast, and set the table. While the family ate, the domestic was to make the beds and dust the bedrooms. Each family chamber was to be thoroughly cleaned once a week, "the carpets taken up and shaken, the floor scrubbed, the curtains shaken, and the furniture cleaned."[14]

After eating her own breakfast, washing the dishes, and finishing the upstairs work, it was time for whatever special duties belonged to that day of the week. Although schemes varied, the week's work might be organized in the following manner: washing on Monday, cleaning the attic and baking on Tuesday, ironing on Wednesday, finishing the ironing and doing odd jobs on Thursday, sweeping and dusting the parlor and dining-room on Friday, and cleaning the kitchen, halls, and stairs on Saturday. Unless a laundress were employed on a daily basis, the mistress cooked and did the lighter work on washing and ironing days.[15] The

servant then prepared the dinner, set the table, and waited on the table during the principal meal of the day.

Although one handbook for domestics advised them to be prepared to receive callers by noon or one o'clock, this would seem to have been impossible for a maid-of-all-work since dinner was not served until perhaps one or two o'clock. After dinner the pace of her duties eased considerably; she had only to run errands, attend the front door, prepare and serve tea or supper, and answer miscellaneous calls. By mid-afternoon, however, she had already put in an exacting day.[16]

A maid-of-all-work did not release the employer from all housework although she did provide her mistress with a good deal of leisure. While one maid could do most of the work for a family of two or three, in a family of five or six the mistress still had to do much of the lighter work. Being able to do the work of a family of six "with ease," two domestics left the lady of the house generally free of household labor.[17]

When there were two or more domestics, the work load was subdivided and made easier for each servant. Domestics considered situations where there were several servants more desirable because of the easier labor. If there were two servants, the cook prepared the meals and was responsible for cleaning the kitchen, rear hall, pantry, cellar, and kitchen stairs. She also washed the dishes and kitchen utensils. The other servant functioned as a general

housemaid responsible for the care of parlor, dining room, and chambers. She also set the table, waited at the family meals, tended the front door, and swept the walk and front steps. If no washerwoman were employed, both domestics were to aid in the washing though the principal responsibility was generally the cook's.[18]

When a third servant was added, she was referred to as a "waiter," parlor maid, or "second girl." She cared for the parlor and dining room, set the table, served as waiter at meals, attended the front door, and was responsible for washing and caring for the china, glassware, and silver. With three domestics the upstairs girl or chambermaid usually assisted with the family sewing. When there were three servants the cook was often charged with the washing while one of the maids did the cooking on wash days. Eunice Beecher, the wife of Henry Ward Beecher and the writer of a household column for The Christian Union, thought it would reduce the dislocation and chaos of washing days if one of the maids, rather than the cook, did the washing. Mrs. Beecher advised her readers that the cook should have no responsibilities beyond preparing meals and cleaning the service areas. Since doing the laundry was a full day's work, the servant who did the washing should be relieved of all other duties until it was finished. Instead of a parlor maid, the third servant might also be a nursemaid charged with caring for the children, cleaning their

rooms, and also doing some of the family sewing. City establishments of four servants generally consisted of a cook, parlor maid, chambermaid, and nurse.[19]

Although male servants were always a rather "small class," they could be found in both country and city households. Medium-sized establishments in country houses frequently consisted of two or three female servants plus a man or boy who drove the carriage, worked in the stable, and perhaps waited at the family table. In Boston, New York, and Philadelphia male servants were also quite numerous. City establishments might consist of two or three women along with a footman or waiter who waited at the table, attended the door, and ran errands.[20]

Men-servants were more common in what E.L. Godkin called "rather large, expensive, and complicated" households than in medium-sized establishments. Wealthy families might employ large numbers of servants, sometimes as many as a dozen. Such households might include a butler, coachman, footman, housekeeper, ladies' maid, scullion, seamstress, and laundry maid in addition to a cook, one or two nurses, and one or more housemaids. An 1845 author noted that no families in the free states retained as many as fourteen servants. As mansions at Newport, along the Hudson, and on Fifth Avenue increased in dimensions and ostentation after 1845, however, large establishments no doubt grew both in number and in size. Writing in 1864, Robert Tomes lamented that

> But a few years since it would have been rare to find the wealthiest housekeeper not satisfied with three or four [servants]. Now the ordinary citizen's wife, whose husband may enjoy a fair business income for the present, . . . can not do without a complete domestic establishment from butler to scullion. Laundresses, ladies' maids, and French bonnes, of whom our American grandmothers had only read of in fashionable novels of the day, have become the necessities of their granddaughters.[21]

The staffs of servants listed by Lemuel Shattuck in Boston in 1845 were smaller than those described as common in major cities after the Civil War. In 1845 Boston the 4875 domestics in private families were distributed among the 19,037 families:

TABLE 2.--Boston families employing servants, 1845.

Families hiring no servants	15,774
Families hiring 1 servant	2,194
Families hiring 2 servants	729
Families hiring 3 servants	204
Families hiring 4 servants	91
Families hiring 5 servants	31
Families hiring 6 servants	8
Families hiring 7 servants	4
Families hiring 8 servants	2

Whereas in 1845 few Boston families kept more than one or two domestics, by the sixties and seventies two or three servants were considered absolutely essential in a town house. A cook and one housemaid were the minimum for "unpretending" town house residents. In addition, there was very frequently a parlor maid; a nurse was considered

positively necessary in any family where there were small children. Even many town houses regarded as "small" were attended by three servants. One employer, speaking primarily of cities, maintained that

> at least a couple of servants are indispensable in any family where the mistress does not take on herself a considerable amount of housework; and even the staff of many moderate, middle-class houses includes cook, house-maid, parlor-maid, and one or two nurses, each with definite and specific duties, and this division of labor is continually being carried further.

Houses built in Boston's Back Bay section in the 1860's always included at least three small individual rooms for servants, and three seems to have been the usual number of servants retained in these houses.[22] As was mentioned above, the number of servants in Boston grew faster than the statistical proportion of families hiring servants. Such evidence suggests that while the percentage of Boston families hiring domestics remained fairly constant, the number of servants employed by each family tended to increase. By the 1860's the staffs of town houses in large cities seem to have usually consisted of between two and four servants.

III

As compensation the servant received a money wage as well as room and board. The wages obtained by domestics remained generally stable between the 1820's and 1850. In 1828 Mathew Carey found the wages of female domestics in

Philadelphia to vary between 75¢ and $1.50 a week while men-servants, who did less work but provided more show, received eight to twelve dollars a month. In 1830 Carey further concluded that $1.25 was the average weekly wage for a Philadelphia maid-servant. In New York City wages were said to have risen from four or five dollars a month in 1826 to six dollars in 1835. An 1832 study, however, found servants' wages in the city to average $1.25 a week while the price of labor elsewhere in the New York state varied from 75¢ to one dollar. The average rate of $1.05 a week given by the 1850 census for New York state is about the same as the rate given by the 1832 evaluation. Wages in New York City in 1845 were said to range from four dollars a month for raw maids-of-all-work to eight to ten dollars for experienced cooks, nurses, and ladies' maids; good general housemaids received five or six dollars, what they had obtained in the thirties.[23]

In the 1850's wages increased moderately, except for a temporary setback caused by the depression of 1857 which sent wages back to the levels of the 1830's and 1840's. Between 1850 and 1860 wages rose twenty per cent in New York state. Sharper gains were made in the other Mid-Atlantic states, and small gains were made in New England, where wage rates for domestics remained more stable. Virginia Penny, however, gave the wages of New York domestics as quoted by employment offices for 1857, the year of the panic, as four dollars for raw maids-of-all-work, five dollars

for "average" housemaids, six or seven for good ones, and seven or eight dollars for good cooks, approximately the same rates as those given in 1835 and 1845.[24]

As indicated by Table 3 wage rates varied widely from state to state in 1850. Outside of California, wages for female domestics were highest in New England, where industry offered serious competition for workers. Average weekly wages were considerably lower in the Mid-Atlantic states, especially in Pennsylvania. In the Midwestern free states wages ranged from 96¢ a week in Ohio to $1.27 in Wisconsin but remained below those obtainable in most of New England. By 1860 wages had become more uniform although New England's were still the highest and those of the Mid-Atlantic region the lowest.

Servants' wages rose rapidly during the Civil War and the following years. In the 1860's wages went up from a weekly average of $1.50 in New England in 1860 to $2.45 in 1870, a sixty-three per cent increase; in the Mid-Atlantic states wages rose sixty-eight per cent, from $1.24 to $2.08 a week. Although servants' real wages surely declined with the rapid price rise during the Civil War, for the decade as a whole their wage gains at least kept pace with the cost of living and may well have brought some increase in real income. Nationally, consumer prices stood at 157 in 1870, with 1860 as the base year of 100, a somewhat smaller percentage increase than that of servants'

wages in the North. Since fuel, food, and lodging were provided for the servant in addition to wages, the price of clothing is especially important for evaluating the real wages of domestics. During the war years clothing costs rose more than those of other items, reaching a level of 261 in 1864. Thereafter, however, the price of clothing dropped more rapidly than that of other goods. In relation to 1860 prices, by 1870 clothing costs were at a level of 141 while the price of food was at 157. Considering this estimation, Northern servants probably made some modest gains in real wages for the decade as a whole.[25]

They made more rapid advances in the next five years, however, because wages continued to rise from 1870 to 1875 although consumer prices steadily declined. In 1870 wages in New York City ranged between ten and fourteen dollars, but by 1872 James McCabe gave the rates of a New York chambermaid as from twelve to fifteen dollars with cooks receiving sixteen to twenty. In Massachusetts wages rose from a monthly average of $9.48 in 1870 to a little over twelve dollars in 1875. According to one estimate, wages in Pennsylvania went from $7.88 a month in 1870 to $8.40 in 1874. In these same years the index of consumer prices, using 1860 as the base year of 100, dropped from 157 in 1870 to 132 in 1875, indicating a substantial rise in servants' real wages during these years. By the mid-seventies clothing prices, which continued to decline more rapidly than

TABLE 3.--Average weekly wages of domestics, 1850-1870.

Region	1850	1860	1870
New England	$1.35	$1.50	$2.45
Maine	1.09	1.32	2.53
New Hampshire	1.27	1.63	2.58
Vermont	1.19	1.31	2.44
Massachusetts	1.48	1.58	2.37
Rhode Island	1.42	1.50	2.78
Connecticut	1.63	1.50	2.44
Middle Atlantic	.96	1.24	2.08
New York	1.05	1.25	2.22
New Jersey	.97	1.23	2.05
Pennsylvania	.80	1.22	1.83
North Central	1.06	1.33	2.14
Ohio	.96	1.22	1.98
Indiana	.90	1.28	2.11
Illinois	1.14	1.46	2.19
Michigan	1.10	1.40	2.30
Wisconsin	1.27	1.30	2.05

From Stanley Lebergott, Manpower in Economic Growth: The American Record Since 1800 (New York, 1964), p. 542.

other price categories, were almost down to 1860 levels.[26] Throughout the century wealthy families, of course, paid higher than average wages in order to secure the most able and experienced domestics.[27]

Wages by no means comprised the employer's total expense in maintaining a live-in domestic. In addition to her wages, the servant received her room and board, a substantial expense to her employers. One 1835 calculation was that the food and lodging of a servant were worth between eighty and one hundred dollars a year; Sarah Hale estimated these costs at about two dollars a week in the same decade, more than the weekly wages of most female servants. Mrs. Ellet advised her readers in 1857 that "$100, exclusive of wages, is the lowest at which the keep of a servant can be estimated" per year. The expenses involved in keeping a servant also rose sharply after 1860. Charles Loring Brace figured the total cost of retaining a chambermaid in New York in 1865 at $258, $108 in wages and $150 in keep. In 1869 Catherine Beecher and her sister, Harriet Beecher Stowe, stated that the board of a domestic sometimes cost double her wages. By the mid-seventies Harriet Prescott Spofford estimated the total annual cost of a servant to be $350, over half of which was in board and lodging. The cost of housing and feeding a domestic generally seems to have exceeded the value of her wages.[28]

The wages of the domestic consistently compared favorably with those available in the other principal occupation open to relatively unskilled female labor, the sewing trades. Writers were no doubt correct when they pointed out that a seamstress could earn more money if she went into service and that the domestic had a much better opportunity to save for the future. In New England's cotton mills wages were about the same as those obtainable in service; but in the case of the needle trades, when the costs of room and board are considered, the financial advantage clearly lay with service, In 1828 Mathew Carey, shocked at discovering a large number of destitute sewing women in Philadelphia, launched a campaign in behalf of the seamstresses who worked from dawn until dark to earn $1.00 or, at most, $1.25 per week. Carey pointed out that a woman paid the highest rate for piece work, 12.5¢ per shirt or pair of pants, could make no more than $58.50 a year, assuming she worked six days a week, fifty-two weeks a year. From this she paid fifty cents per week in rent, leaving only $32.50 a year for food, clothing, and fuel, the last a major expense in winter months. Few sewing women worked steadily, however, because unemployment was frequent among them. In addition, many of them had children to support from their meager earnings. Furthermore, comparatively few needle women received 12.5¢ per item, the government rate; ten cents or less was the rate paid by private employers.

A group of prominent Philadelphia ladies supported Carey, arguing that the best paid seamstresses had only sixty-five cents a week for food, clothing, and fuel and that piece rates of eight and six cents were common. At the same time Carey's lowest estimate of a domestic's wages, seventy-five cents a week, assured her of at least thirty-nine dollars a year with food and fuel provided in addition. While a seamstress had to pay room and board from her 90¢ to $1.25 a week, a servant received 75¢ to $1.50 a week with room and board furnished.[29]

Over the years the relative position of the needle woman improved only slightly. As William Sanger observed in 1857, the seamstress had to house and feed herself "out of earnings which do not much exceed in amount the servant's pay." In the 1840's and fifties the average wages of a journeyman seamstress were estimated to be between $1.25 and $2.50 a week; some women were said to receive only a dollar. In these same decades average servants received between $1.25 and $1.50 per week plus room and board worth at least as much. In 1868 Sarah Payson Parton wrote that ordinary seamstresses obtained only $3.00 or $3.50 a week, which was barely enough to pay for their room and board. Six dollars might be paid to skilled dressmakers. In the late sixties a few Boston needle women earned twelve dollars per week, but the average was said to be about three dollars. Except for those skilled in specialized work, New York wages

in the late sixties in tailoring and ready-made clothing establishments ranged from three to eight dollars a week.[30] In these same years a New York servant would usually receive $2.50 to $3.50 a week in addition to room and board worth more than her wages and also superior to those obtained by most sewing women. If it were cheerless and inconveniently located, the domestic's room was in a better constructed and more sanitary dwelling than a slum tenement. For a girl without great skill in sewing, the material advantage doubtless lay in domestic service. Mrs. Stowe was probably not far wrong in saying that, for most girls, service was the only occupation in which they could earn one hundred dollars a year in addition to room and board.[31]

Despite the financial advantages available in service, large numbers of women, especially native Americans, preferred sewing to housework because they considered the latter degrading. As early as the 1840's it was observed that American girls would rather work in the needle trades at wages barely adequate to purchase the necessities of life than become servants. The principal drawback to service was the loss of personal freedom which it entitled. More than any other occupation, domestic service demanded that the worker subject himself or herself to the control of the employer, control not only over the work to be done but also over the personal life of the servant. This control by the employer was inherent in the nature of the role of

the live-in domestic but was also, as shall be seen in the next chapter, furthered by the paternalistic ideal of employers. Writers agreed that in other occupations the worker was more "her own mistress;" as Mrs. Spofford put it, girls did not want to "put their necks under the tangible yoke of a daily and hourly mistress."[32]

Other aspects of this control will be discussed in later chapters, but one important part of the lack of personal freedom involved in service was the long work day coupled with a lack of leisure time. Needle women generally worked between ten and fourteen hours a day six days a week. These hours were fairly constant from the 1820's through the seventies although hours do seem to have dropped slightly after the Civil War. In the sixties and seventies many writers implied that the average working day for women in the sewing trades was ten or twelve hours. Sewing women and shop girls had Sundays off and "entire personal freedom" after six or seven in the evening. Lucy Larcom, who had worked at Lowell, thought girls preferred working in the mills to going out as "help" because they found factory labor a "freer kind of work" and because "the feeling that at this new work the few hours they had of every-day leisure were entirely their own was a great satisfaction to them." "Fanny Fern" reminded her readers that seamstresses worked at starvation wages rather than go into service because as sewing women "when six o'clock in the

evening comes, they are their own mistresses, without hindrance or questioning, till another day of labor begins. They do not sit in an under-ground kitchen, watching the bell-wire, and longing to see what is going on out-of-doors." Still another employer wrote that many a girl rejected service to go into a job in which "when her day's work is over she is free to spend her time as she chooses; she can go out with her young man without asking any body's leave."[33]

The servant's working day, the time she spent on duty, generally lasted about fourteen hours, from about six in the morning until eight or later in the evening. George G. Foster, a writer on New York life and customs for the New York Tribune, noted that servants were frequently on duty from five a.m. until ten at night. Parker Pillsbury argued that it was no wonder girls preferred working in sewing shops to becoming domestics because the servant "works seven days in the week, and from twelve to fifteen hours in a day on the average." In the early eighties Maud Nathan found that "a maid's working day began at six a.m. and didn't close until she went to bed at night."[34]

Of course, the bulk of the hard work was done in the morning and early afternoon, and much of the servant's working day was spent at light tasks or merely waiting in the kitchen for a possible summons. As one employer writing in Harper's Bazar pointed out, in a well regulated house

"though a servant's liability to be called on to do something or other may be extended over a long day, her actual work is by no means continuous . . . ."[35]

The essential point, however, is the domestic's time was not her own; by the nature of the contract virtually all of a servant's time belonged to her employers. Unlike other occupations, service required that the worker surrender an indefinite and unlimited amount of time to the mistress. The live-in servant was expected to remain on duty most of the day and was subject to call at any time, including her mealtimes and the middle of the night. As E.L. Godkin observed, "there is no real end to the day" in domestic service; the employment "confines them [servants] all day long to another person's house, and at her beck and call, and gives them no control over their own time." Lacking definite and limited hours of employment, the servant was through for the day at no certain time; when her specific work had been completed she was still liable to further duties. One author stated that a domestic was hired for "continuous service" and was therefore "liable to be rung up at all hours" whenever the bell rang.[36] The comfort of the servant counted for little when weighed against the convenience of the family.

In the 1830's Eliza Farrar found that many mistresses expected servants "to hold every moment at the command of their employers . . . ." Certainly authors of tracts of

advice for servants expected this from domestic workers. "All your time" belongs to your employers counseled an 1827 guide for men-servants; "your time or your ability is no longer your own, but your employers'; therefore, they have a claim on them whenever they choose to call for them." Another manual for servants repeated that the employer had a prior claim to "all" the domestic's time and a right "whenever she wants any thing done, to call upon the girl who lives with her to do it for her . . . ." Besides accomplishing her regular, daily duties, the girl "must be willing, any time, to put her hand to any other little thing that the lady wishes to have done."[37] The general presumption was that "all" of a domestic's time belonged to the employer and that whatever leisure time she recieved was given as a privilege rather than as a right. Those who advised mistresses to grant free time to servants did so on the grounds that by conceding such "privileges" domestics would be made more contented and loyal. The mistress's trouble "will be amply rewarded in their faithfulness and attachment," suggested one writer.[38]

In other jobs the employer's authority over the worker ended at a stated hour, but in service once a domestic was off duty for the day she was expected to spend whatever evening hours remained at home in case her employers desired further attendance. Those who counseled mistresses on the proper treatment of domestics often recommended that they

be given free time in the evenings to do their own sewing in order to be neatly dressed while at work. Others found that the servant, though on call and confined to the house, actually had "a good deal" of time in the evenings to sew or read. Frank and Marian Stockton, for instance, contended that in well managed households domestics had "nearly all" their evenings free for private activities within the house.[39]

The opportunities for the servant to socialize outside the house were severly restricted, however, again in order that she would be present when needed. Although customs varied, servants' free time was generally limited to either one evening or "half day" (part of the afternoon plus the evening) per week. Sometimes this evening or half day was granted only every other week. However, in the late seventies some mistresses began to allow their domestics both a part of Sunday and one other evening during the week for their own use. Because of their importance and bargaining power, cooks were sometimes able to secure more free time than the other domestics of a household. The half-day off was accompanied "with the usual understanding that there shall be no neglect or omission of duties, which must be performed either before going out or after her return." In general, the rule prior to the mid-seventies seems to have been to give the servant one half-day or evening per week of free time. This rule held not only in families where

there was only one domestic but also in households with two or more servants. If a girl wished to leave the house at any other time, it was necessary for her to ask special permission.[40]

The domestic was thus dependent upon her employers for the privilege of seeing her friends and relatives. To a considerable extent, servants were denied normal outside social contact with friends, lovers, and family. Compared to needle women, domestics were in a position of social isolation from their associates. Jane C. Croly wrote that the servant "sees life only through the kitchen bars; she is denied participation in social life . . . ." Mrs. Spofford agreed that the Irish maid-of-all-work, who was from a gregarious background, must have felt "lonely" since whe was "bound down to nearly day long solitude."[41] No doubt one of the advantages of serving where there was a large staff of domestics was the added companionship offered by such a situation over the comparative social isolation of the maid-of-all-work.

The most common time provided the servant for her own use was a part of Sunday, usually a half-day beginning in the mid-afternoon after the dinner had been served. George Foster found Broadway crowded on Sunday evenings by servant girls with their friends and beaux. The girls, said Foster, waited eagerly all week for this one chance "for a few hours to enjoy the luxury of being free to do as they please." If the half-day was not given on Sunday, it might be allowed

on Thursday, which fell between Wednesday's ironing and baking and Friday's cleaning. Another alternative was to give a part of Thursday afternoon in addition to Sunday evening. In the 1870's the Stockton's recommended that "an occasional afternoon or evening for visiting her friends" be added to some portion of each Sunday. Maud Nathan found in regard to the time off of New York servants in the early eighties that "every other Sunday afternoon and evening and one evening a week was the inevitable rule."[42]

Despite warnings that Christian employers should not demand service from their domestics on Sunday and accompanying recommendations that cold dinners be served on that day in order that "the least possible amount of service be required from those who serve you on Sunday," few domestics received the entire day off. With its large dinners and frequent visiting, Sunday could be one of the most trying days in the week for servants. "It is a well-known fact, that girls who do housework have nearly as much work to do on Sunday as on any other day of the week," wrote one servant to Arthur's Home Magazine.[43]

One problem was whether to permit servants to go to church on Sunday. While many allowed their domestics to attend one service, many others restricted this privilege. Some employers begrudged this liberty since it removed the cook from the house at the time she was needed to prepare

the Sunday dinner. William A. Alcott considered it "unchristian" to keep servants at all because they were often "kept at home from church on Sunday, and from the lecture on week days." The problem was heightened when the bulk of servants became Irish Catholics. The image of the bad Irish domestic included her determination to attend mass even if it was inconvenient for the family to spare her. Where there were two Catholic girls in the house, they often went to mass on alternate Sundays so that the family was never without a servant. The usually pious Mrs. Spofford was displeased by the desire of Irish cooks to attend church every Sunday; every other Sunday was sufficient, she thought. While ministers advocated maintaining the Sabbath as a day of rest and religious observance, some men of the cloth denied these privileges to servants. An American "kitchen girl" wrote in 1870 that she had worked for a Methodist minister who "severely reprimanded me for attending church on Sunday." Much earlier William Ellery Channing noted that he had heard disconcerting complaints that Boston domestics were "neglecting their duties and the interests of their employers in their anxiety to attend religious meetings." Such servants were sadly misguided, thought Channing; they failed to understand "that it is a stronger sign and expression of piety to perform hard work cheerfully as the appointment of providence" and work faithfully in their vocation "than to be excited by an ardent

preacher." The girl should realize that "home is the true place for exercising and manifesting her religion." The servant could best fulfill her duty to God by doing the work of her employer. Thus although Sunday was to be a day of leisure and religious observances for employers, servants had no guarantee of either worship or leisure on the Sabbath.[44]

Among employers, no complaint was more frequent than the lament that servants were imbued with "habits of restlessness." There is no way to measure or even confidently estimate the actual physical mobility of domestics, but whatever the actual rate of turnover it seemed too high to employers, who desired a stable work force. Many girls entered service only until they received an offer of marriage; such domestics, of course, did not regard themselves as permanent workers. The "abrupt" departure of a servant to be married was a common complaint of employers. In addition, many girls no doubt left service for occupations offering more personal freedom and leisure. Those who remained longer in service changed their places frequently. For one thing, employers were repeatedly dismissing servants for real or imagined incompetence or impertinence. There seems to have been a rather large number of transcient domestics who changed situations often and satisfied none of their successive employers. Servants themselves changed jobs for several reasons. Some moved because of employers thought to be harsh, arbitrary,

or exacting while others reportedly went to places considered more desirable because they offered higher wages, more privileges, lighter duties, or more companionship. Mistresses sometimes complained that they had no sooner made an efficient domestic of an ignorant girl than she left for a wealthier family offering higher wages and keeping several servants. This often led to charges that servants were "mercenary" or "ungrateful." Often the "good neighbors" and "kind friends" of an employer approached her best servants with better offers and lured them away, a practice Eunice Beecher thought no better than theft. Many of those who advised employers on how to deal with servants felt it necessary to remind their readers that in America a servant's aspirations to move to a "better" place or to become a housekeeper herself, if only for a poor Irish laborer, were legitimate and proper, something employers apparently often forgot.[45]

Employers were always quick to complain concerning what one 1869 writer referred to as the "excessive fondness for change" displayed by domestics. Before 1850, however, authors were more eager to cure the servant problem by preaching against such evils and awakening domestics to the perils of "restlessness." The mobility of domestics violated employers' notions of proper social order and stability and also interfered with their hopes for a docile and faithful servant class. The tendency to change places

was irksome to those who wished servants to be obedient and whose model was the legendary "old family servant" who served one employer faithfully for many years. This concern about the "instability and love of change" among domestics was the primary motive for the founding of Societies for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants in New York and Philadelphia in the 1820's.[46]

From the 1820's through the forties authors were especially anxious to advise servants on their duties and to exhort them to conform themselves to employers' conceptions of the proper place of domestics. Those who counseled servants on the proprieties of their position seldom failed to point out the alleged dangers of frequently changing situations. "To keep roving about from one place to another" was very dangerous Catherine Beecher warned servants; "stay where you are, and try to make those things that trouble you more tolerable, by enduring them with patience." A tract for servants written by Joanna Bethune, the wife of a prominent Dutch Reformed clergyman in New York City, and published by the New York Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants cautioned that "servants that often change their situations are always poor." Mathew Carey suggested the following to servants: "Let it be your pride to live for years with the same family." Parlour and Kitchen, a tract for domestics published by the American Sunday School Union in 1835 and still in print in 1876, contended that

domestics who went from one situation to another got a bad reputation, failed "to make friends of their employers," and became "unsteady" of character.[47]

A number of conclusions can be suggested concerning the character of domestic service as an occupation in the nineteenth century. Service was the largest single employment for women and tended, at least in cities, to grow at a slightly faster rate than the population. Much of this increase in servant population went into the creation of larger domestic establishments. Servants were concentrated in urban and urban-oriented regions throughout the country and were comparatively rare in rural areas. Especially common among the well-to-do and the more substantial portions of the middle class, servants became an integral part of the life of the urbanized middle class. Most American employers hired a staff of between one and four domestics; although the maid-of-all-work faced a wearing and busy daily routine, the servant's duties in larger establishments were lighter and more specialized. The domestic's wages increased only slightly between the 1830's and the Civil War but climbed steadily thereafter. When room and board are considered, the financial rewards of service compared favorably with the wages obtainable in the needle trades, the second largest female occupation. The principal drawback of service was not financial; it was the loss of personal freedom it involved. The domestic was at the constant call of her employers and received only a scant half-day a week which was really her own.

Regulations governing the hours of employment were made with regard to the possibility that the employer might require or desire service at any time and gave comparatively little thought to the comfort or convenience of the domestic. The girl was required to surrender most of her evenings to the family on the chance that they might call on her. Not surprisingly, the servant population tended to shift and move often, a fact many employers found disturbing of order.

NOTES

[1]Francis A. Walker, comp., The Ninth Census of the United States, [Census Reports] I, The Statistics of Population in the United States (Washington, 1872), Table XXVII (B), pp. 686-687.

[2]Ibid., Table XXXII, pp. 782-794; Lemuel Shattuck, Report to the Committee of the City Council Appointed to Obtain the Census of Boston for the Year 1845 (Boston, 1846), Appendix, p. 43.

[3]Francis A. Walker, "Our Domestic Service," Scribner's Monthly, December, 1875, p. 274.

[4]Census of the State of New York for 1855 (Albany, 1857), p. 191; The Ninth Census, I, pp. 778, 793; Shattuck, . . . The Census of Boston for the Year 1845, pp. 84-85, Appendix, p. 43.

[5]The Ninth Census, I, Table XXXII, pp. 775-799; "Letter to the Editor," Arthur's Home Magazine, May, 1863, p. 304. These ratios of servants to families are only statistical. Since many employers hired two or more domestics, fewer than one in four New York families actually employed servants, for example.

[6]Walker, "Our Domestic Service," Scribner's Monthly, December, 1875, p. 274; William A. Alcott, The Young Housekeeper; or, Thoughts on Food and Cookery (Boston, 1838), p. 28.

[7]Shattuck, . . . Census of Boston for the Year 1845, pp. 54-55, 84-85. Note that although statistically there was one domestic for every 3.9 Boston families, only one in 5.8 actually employed servants. The figure 2525 for owner-occupants of one family houses is somewhat too high since it includes many of the owners of the 138 Boston hotels and boarding houses.

[8]"Domestic Service," Old and New, September 1872, p. 366. For other examples of references to "middle class" and "average means" in regard to employers see William A. Alcott, The Young Wife; or, The Duties of Woman in the Marriage Relation (Boston, 1837), p. 154; Elizabeth Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper: A Cyclopaedia of Domestic Economy (New York, 1857), p. 30; "Maids of All Work," Godey's Lady's Book, March, 1857, p. 286; "Domestic Service," Harper's Bazar, May 2, 1874, p. 284;[Edwin Lawrence Godkin],"Waiters and Waitresses," The Nation, November 26, 1874, p. 346; [Jane C. Croly], "Household Needs," Demorest's Monthly Magazine, May, 1869, p. 188.

[9]Arthur W. Calhoun, A Social History of the American Family from Colonial Times to the Present (New York, 1945), II, pp. 225-230.

[10]Mrs. A. J. Graves, Woman in America: Being an Examination into the Moral and Intellectual Condition of American Female Society (New York, 1844), pp. 29-30, also pp. 60-68; "Female Influence," The Ladies' Repository,

October, 1844, p. 312; Clara Augusta, "Home," Arthur's Home Magazine, July, 1858, p. 15; "Home," American Ladies' Magazine, April, 1830, pp. 217-218; "Woman's Sphere," American Ladies' Magazine, May, 1835, p. 263; William A. Alcott, The Young Housekeeper; or, Thoughts on Food and Cookery (Boston, 1846), pp. 21-24, 35-37, 87, 93; Rev. Jessie T. Peck, "The True Woman," The Ladies" Repository, August, 1853, pp. 338-339; Edwin H. Chapin, Duties of Young Women (Boston, 1853), chapt. v; William Greenleaf Eliot, Jr., Letters to Young Women (Boston, 1854), pp. 47-48, 53-55; [Jane C. Croly], Talks on Women's Topics (Boston, 1864), pp. 31-33; Jessie H. Atherton, "Home as It Should Be," Godey's Lady's Book, May, 1866, p. 437; [Josiah Gilbert Holland], "Home and It's Queen," Scribner's Monthly, February, 1871, p. 452; "Woman's Duties," Godey's Lady's Book, February, 1873, p. 166. Mrs. Graves and many other writers thought that woman's place was in the home. While ladies should have servants to relieve them of household drudgery, they should not engage in a constant search for outside social activity. Leisure time should be devoted principally to improving the quality of home life rather than to the "idleness and folly" of fashionable society.

[11]Graves, Woman in America, p. 75, also pp. 72, 74; Virginia Townsend, "Schools for Domestics," Arthur's

Home Magazine, March, 1865, p. 204; "Doing Our Own Work," Harper's Bazar, August 2, 1873, p. 482; Robert Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household (New York, 1875), p. 153; also see Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service (New York, 1842), p. 59; "Domestic Happiness," The Ladies' Companion, August, 1834, p. 159; [Mary Abigail Dodge], Woman's Worth and Worthlessness (New York, 1871), pp. 55, 60; Joseph Bardwell Lyman and Laura E. Lyman, The Philosophy of Housekeeping: A Scientific and Practical Manual (Hartford, 1869), p. 448; Harriet Prescott Spofford, The Servant Girl Question (Boston, 1881), pp. 129-130; E. Elcourt, "The Persecuted Woman," Lippincott's Magazine, January, 1870, pp. 29-31; "Housekeepers and Housekeeping," Arthur's Home Magazine, September, 1869, p. 160.

In this regard it is informative to notice the lack of interest of the woman's rights movement in improving the conditions of domestic service. Whereas Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton demonstrated real concern for the plight of seamstresses and shop girls, they paid little attention to the problems of servants. Miss Anthony founded the Workingwomen's Association of New York, the first of several such organizations, to coordinate union activities among women and agitate for the political rights thought necessary to give women the power to improve their situation. The Revolution, the

weekly publication of the Anthony-Stanton feminists, gave wide coverage to the problems of factory girls and called for higher wages and better working conditions, but the magazine virtually ignored domestic servants. Of the few articles dealing with servants, the majority were restatements of conventional employer positions and attitudes. The only really forceful article on the servant question was written by the periodical's only male editor, the former abolitionist Parker Pillsbury.

Most feminists were middle-class women who held typical middle-class opinions on most questions, particularly those which supported their own social position. The women's rights advocates sought to remove middle-class women from the restrictive confines of the home and involve them in such professions as music, journalism, medicine, and law. Wider spheres of activity outside the household should be opened to women of talent and education. No more than other writers did feminists wish to burden the superior woman with the drudgery of housework. Indeed, if the lady were to have the leisure necessary to fulfill herself in the larger world of affairs, it was essential that domestics continue to do the menial work of the household. The Revolution approvingly quoted Jane C. Croly that many women allowed their abilities to wither while they wasted their time doing household chores when they should have left "the drudgery to some one who could do only that, and filled

up their time with something better and more satisfactory . . . ." Junius Henri Browne, a male sympathizer of the feminist cause, noted that a woman's opposition to doing her housework

> is natural and laudable. It evinces the possession of ideals, the cherishment of aspirations. Such vulgar usefulness arrests her growth, defeats the promise of her future. In order to do worthy work, she needs culture, training, development; and these must come from a higher source than the saucepan or the needle . . . . Let servants' chores be done by servants, or by those who relish them! Let women of finer mold and loftier aim gather whatever fruit their arms can reach; ascend whatever eminence their strength can mount.

The outlook of the feminists seems to have emphasized elevation of middle and upper-class women, who could achieve their deserved prominence in the larger world only if servants did their menial work.

Alma Lutz, Susan B. Anthony: Rebel, Crusader, Humanitarian (Boston, 1959), pp. 149-157 discusses the New York Workingwomen's Association; Eleanor Flexner, Century of Struggle: The Woman's Rights Movement in the United States (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), p. 119; Aileen S. Kraditor, ed., Up from the Pedestal: Selected Writings in the History of American Feminism (Chicago, 1968), p. 10; Jane C. Croly, "Woman's Rights and Woman's Duties," quoted in The Revolution, September 23, 1860, p. 181; Junius Henri Browne, "Women as Workers," The Galaxy, May, 1873, p. 685.

[12][Sidney George Fisher], "Domestic Servants," North American and United States Gazette [Philadelphia], May 23, 1857; Parlour and Kitchen; or, The Story of Ann Connover (Philadelphia, 1835), p. 20; also see Graves, Woman in America, p. 74.

[13]Olive Logan "English Domestics and Their Ways," Lippincott's Magazine December, 1877, p. 760; Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper, p. 28; "Maids of All Work," p. 286; D[avid] Meredith Reese, ed., Thomas Webster and Mrs. Francis Parkes, An Encyclopedia of Domestic Economy: Comprising Such Subjects as Are Most Immediately Connected with Housekeeping (New York, 1845), p. 365; Harriet Prescott Spofford, The Servant Girl Question (Boston, 1881), p. 20. Although not published in book form until 1881, these essays originally appeared in only slightly different form in Harper's Bazar between 1873 and 1875.

[14]Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper, pp. 42-44.

[15]Ibid., p. 44; Frank R. Stockton and Marian Stockton, The Home: Where It Should Be and What to Put in It (New York, 1873), pp. 101-106; Mary Hooker Cornelius, The Young Housekeeper's Friend (Boston, 1846), pp. 16-16.

[16]The Domestic's Companion (New York, 1834), p. 31; Ellet, The Practical Housekeeper, p. 44.

[17]Stockton and Stockton, The Home, p. 107.

[18]Sarah Josepha Hale, The New Household Receipt Book: Containing Maxims Directions, and Specifics for Promoting Health, Comfort, and Improvement in the Homes of the People (New York, 1853), p. 251; Catherine Beecher, Miss Beecher's Domestic Receipt Book (New York, 1846), pp. 247-250; "Maids of All Work," Godey's, March, 1857, p. 286.

[19]"Maids of All Work," p. 286; Eunice Beecher, Motherly Talks with Young Housekeepers, (New York, 1873), pp. 3-6.

[20][Edwin Lawrence Godkin], "Waiters and Waitresses," The Nation, December 10, 1874, p. 379; Plain Talk and Friendly Advance to Domestics; With Counsel on Home Matters (Boston, 1855), p. 38; Bainbridge Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay: An Architectural History, 1840-1917 (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), p. 137; A Philadelphia Perspective: The Diary of Sidney George Fisher Covering the Years 1834-1871, ed. by Nicholas B. Wainwright (Philadelphia, 1967), p. 236. San Francisco is a special case because of its large number of Chinese men-servants.

[21][Godkin], "Waiters and Waitresses," p. 379; Reese, ed., Webster and Parkes, Encyclopedia of Domestic Economy, p. 365; Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper, p. 28; Robert Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," Harper's New Monthly Magazine, June, 1864, p. 56.

[22]Shattuck, . . . Census of Boston in the Year 1845, p. 84; Olive Logan, "English Domestics and Their Ways," p. 760; James D. McCabe, Jr., Lights and Shadows of New York Life; or, The Sights and Sensations of the Great City (New York, 1872), p. 711; "Domestic Service," Harper's Bazar, May 2, 1874, p. 284; Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay, p. 137.

[23]Mathew Carey, "Essays on the Public Charities of Philadelphia," in Miscellaneous Essays (Phildelphia, 1830), p. 193; Stanley Lebergott, Manpower in Economic Growth: The American Record since 1800 (New York, 1964), pp. 281-283, 542; Young America January 24, 1846; U.S., Congress, Senate, Report on the Condition of Woman and Child Wage-Earners in the United States, S. Document 645, 61st Cong., 2nd. sess., 1910, IX, Helen Sumner, History of Women in Industry in the United States, pp. 179-180.

[24]Lebergott, Manpower in Economic Growth, p. 542; Virginia Penny, The Employments of Women: A Cyclopedia of Woman's Work (Boston, 1863), pp. 426-427.

[25]Lebergott, Manpower in Economic Growth, pp. 160, 549.

[26]Sumner, History of Women in Industry, p. 180; McCabe, Lights and Shadows, p. 711; Bureau of Labor Statistics of Massachusetts, Sixteenth Annual Report (Boston, 1885), p. 129; Pennsylvania Bureau of Industrial

Statistics, Reports, 1874-1875 (Harrisburg, 1875), p. 118; Lebergott, Manpower in Economic Growth, p. 549.

[27]Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy for the Use of Young Ladies at Home and at School (New York, 1842), p. 206; McCabe, Lights and Shadows, p. 711; Robert Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household (New York, 1875), p. 140.

[28]Parlour and Kitchen; or, The Story of Ann Connover (Philadelphia, 1835), p. 14; [Sarah Josepha Hale], "Hiring a Servant," The American Ladies' Magazine, November, 1833, p. 517; Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper, p. 26; [Charles Loring Brace], "The Servant Question," The Nation, October 26, 1865, p. 528; Catherine Beecher and Harriet Beecher Stowe, The American Woman's Home; or, Principles of Domestic Science (New York, 1860), p. 318.

[29]Mathew Carey, "Report on Female Wages," in Miscellaneous Essays, p. 267; Mathew Carey, "Wages of Female Labour," p. [1], in Miscellaneous Pamphlets (Philadelphia, 1831); Mathew Carey, "To the Ladies Who Have Undertaken To Establish a House of Industry in New York," pp. 1-2; in Miscellaneous Pamphlets; "Female Wages," American Ladies' Magazine, June, 1830, pp. 329-330, for a good discussion of Carey's efforts see Sumner, History of Women in Industry, pp. 123-133.

[30]William W. Sanger, The History of Prostitution: Its Extent, Causes, and Effects Throughout the World (New York, 1921, originally published 1858), p. 527; Norman Ware, The Industrial Worker 1840-1860 (Chicago, 1964), pp. 49-50, 55; Wirt Sikes, "Among the Poor Girls," Putman's Monthly Magazine, 2st ser., April, 1868, pp. 433-445; Sumner, History of Women in Industry, pp. 146-149, 262; [Sarah Payson Parton], Folly As It Flies: Hit at by Fanny Fern (New York, 1868), pp. 219-229.

[31][Harriet Beecher Stowe], The Chimney Corner (Boston, 1868), p. 12.

[32]Reese, ed., Webster and Parkes, An Encyclopedia of Domestic Economy, p. 366, Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Who are Engaged in Domestic Service (New York, 1842), chapts. v, vi; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 148.

[33]Ware, The Industrial Worker, pp. 49-50; Sumner, History of Women in Industry, p. 262; Lucy Larcom, A New England Girlhood (New York, 1961), p. 199; [Parton], Folly As It Flies, p. 222; "Domestic Service," Harper's Bazar, May 2, 1874, p. 284; see also "Woman's Work and Woman's Wages: Shall American Girls Become Servants," Arthur's Home Magazine, July, 1870, pp. 29-30; Penny, The Employments of Women, p. 426; "Domestic Service for Women," The Revolution, February 10, 1870, p. 86; Melusina Peirce, "Cooperative Housekeeping," Boston Daily Advertiser, July 7, 1869.

[34]George G. Foster, New York in Slices: By an Experienced Carver (New York, 1848), p. 87; Parker Pillsbury, "Domestic Service," The Revolution, August 12, 1869, p. 88; Maud Nathan, Once Upon a Time and Today (New York, 1933), p. 81; see also Alice B. Neal, "Mrs. West's Experience," Godey's Lady's Book, November, 1853, p. 435; Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay, p. 138.

[35]"Domestic Service," Harper's Bazar, May 2, 1874, p. 284; also Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper, p. 44.

[36][Edwin Lawrence Godkin], "The Morals and Manners of the Kitchen," The Nation, January 2, 1873, p. 7; [Godkin], "Waiters and Waitresses," The Nation, December 10, 1874, p. 380; "Domestic Service," Harper's Bazar, May 2, 1874, p. 284; also Graves, Woman in America, p. 80; Todd S. Goodholme, ed., A Domestic Cyclopedia of Practical Information (New York, 1877), p. 476; Penny, The Employments of Women, p. 427.

[37]Eliza Farrar, The Young Lady's Friend (Boston, 1837), p. 232; Robert Roberts, The House Servant's Directory, or a Monitor for Private Families: Comprising Hints on The Arrangement and Performance of Servants' Work (Boston and New York, 1827), pp. x, xiii; Parlour and Kitchen, p. 14.; also Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics: With Counsel on Home Matters (Boston, 1855), p. 184.

[38]Cornelius, The Young Housekeeper's Friend, p. 19; see also Goodholme, ed., A Domestic Cyclopedia, p. 476; Stockton and Stockton, The Home, p. 97; Penny, The Employments of Women, p. 402.

[39]Stockton and Stockton, The Home, p, 97; also Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper, p. 30; Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service, pp. 32, 84; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, pp. 48, 162; [Stowe] The Chimney Corner, p. 125.

[40]Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service, p. 111; "Our New Cook Book: Servants," Arthur's Home Magazine, March 1870, p. 181; "Woman's Work and Woman's Wages: Should American Girls Become Servants," Arthur's Home Magazine, July, 1870 pp. 29-30; "Domestic Service," Old and New, September, 1872, p. 366; Julia McNair Wright, The Complete Home: An Encyclopedia of Domestic Affairs (Philadelphia, 1879), p. 449; Parlour and Kitchen, p. 122; Catharine Sedgwick, Live and Let Live; or, Domestic Service Illustrated (New York, 1837), p. 49; Foster, Slices, pp. 99-100; R[ichard] R[odgers] Bowker, "In Re Bridget--The Defense," Old and New, October, 1871, pp. 498, 500.

[41][Jane C. Croly], "Household Service," Demorest's Monthly Magazine, January, 1873, p. 16; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, pp. 36, 37. While contemporaries sometimes noticed the socially isolated position of the

domestic, the most perceptive discussion of this aspect of service is Jane Addams, "A Belated Industry," American Journal of Sociology, I (March, 1896), pp. 543-547. Although written later in the century, this article's point is equally valid for the earlier period.

[42]Foster, Slices, pp. 99-100; Stockton and Stockton, The Home, pp. 97, 104; Nathan, Once Upon a Time, p. 81; also Sedgwick, Live and Let Live, p. 49; Parlour and Kitchen, p. 122.

[43]Cornelius, The Young Housekeeper's Friend, p. 19; "The Servant Question," Arthur's Home Magazine, April, 1870, p. 236; see also Farrar, The Young Lady's Friend, pp. 247-248.

[44]Alcott, The Young Wife, p. 167, Plain Talk and Friendly Advice, p. 59; Young America, January 24, 1846; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, pp. 30-31; "The Servant Question," Arthur's, April, 1870, p. 236; William Ellery Channing, "Letter to the Editor of the Christian Palladium," The Christian Register, February 25, 1837; also see Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service, pp. 123-124.

[45]"Letter to the Editoress," Godey's Lady's Book, August, 1865; p. 174; [Sidney George Fisher], "Domestic Servants," North American and United States Gazette [Philadelphia] May 23, 1857; Reese, ed., Webster and Parkes, Encyclopedia of Domestic Economy, p. 365;

Eunice Beecher, Motherly Talks with Young Housekeepers pp. 112-115; Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy, pp. 206-207; Sarah Josepha Hale, The Good Housekeeper; or, the Way to Live Well and to Be Well While We Live (Boston, 1839), pp. 112, 116; Joseph Bardwell Lyman and Laura E. Lyman, The Philosophy of Housekeeping: A Scientific and Practical Manual (Hartford, 1869), p. 499.

[46]First Annual Report of the Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants in New York, (1826), pp. 3-4; First Report of the Board of Managers of the Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestics (Philadelphia, 1830), p. 3; see chapter iii below.

[47]Catherine Beecher, Miss Beecher's Domestic Receipt Book, p. 280; [Joanna Bethune], "Friendly Advice to Servants," in First Annual Report . . . New York, p. 31; Mathew Carey, "Essay on the Relations Between Masters and Mistresses and Domestics," Godey's Lady's Book, June, 1835, p. 245; Parlour and Kitchen, p. 104, chapt. viii, Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service, p. 168.

CHAPTER II

EMPLOYER PATERNALISM AND THE MASTER-SERVANT RELATION

Historians discussing pre-Civil War American Society have generally emphasized its equality and openness; one support for this view has been the alleged democratic nature of domestic service in the Northern states. Writers who stress the egalitarian nature of Northern service usually rely on the comments of European travelers, who sometimes over-generalized those things which struck them as unusual. Both these travelers and subsequent writers have tended to universalize the distinctively rural system of "help" and treat it as the general type of American domestic service.[1] In fact, however, the "servant" or "domestic servant" was a common sight in American cities and towns as early as the 1820's. Furthermore, throughout the century employers tended to be hostile to the implications of democracy in regard to domestic service.

Pre-1860 authors were as concerned as post-Civil War writers with instilling obedience and submission into their servants and with extending the mistress's control over the personal life of the domestic through paternalistic

regulation. Although middle and upper-class Americans accepted the theories of political democracy, they by no means abandoned their efforts to make their fellow men, particularly the lower classes, conform to their own ideas of proper morality and orderly society. Indeed, it has been convincingly demonstrated that the benevolent, tract, and moral reform societies common in America before the Civil War were principally concerned with purposes of social control.[2] Similarly, servants, who were often regarded as wards intrusted to the care of the family, could be subjected to social control through benevolent paternalism within the home. Employers hoped to make the master-servant relationship more "affectionate" and lasting than the sort of contract made with mechanics and tradesmen. The morally superior and better-educated employer had a duty to uplift the ignorant and child-like domestic. At the same time, the servant had a duty to submit obediently to the direction of the employer. Allegedly such submission would ultimately result in the girl's improvement. Paternalism and obedience were regarded as reciprocal obligations to be exchanged by employer and employee.

Contemporaries concerned about the servant problem generally fell into one of two groups. First, there were those writers who favored a clearly subordinate postion for the domestic through paternalism and submission or other forms of discipline. Secondly, a smaller, and apparently

less influential, group of authors tried to remain more true to the spirit of democracy and condemned paternalistic assumptions and the entire outlook of the majority of American employers in regard to the master-servant relationship. In the pre-war years this latter group included Eliza Farrar, William A. Alcott, and Caroline Kirkland; the chief post-war critic was Robert Tomes, who was sometimes assisted by Harriet Beecher Stowe.[3]

It might first be useful to look at the difference in the nature of service between rural and urban areas. Domestic service actually existed in two different forms throughout the nineteenth century; while rural areas had their "helps," cities and towns had their "servants." The system of "help" was closely associated with rural New England during the first half of the century but was also common in other agricultural regions. Under this method of securing household assistance, a farm family contributed a daughter to work in the home of a wealthier neighbor in need of "help." In return for her labor the helper received not only wages but also a postion approaching equality within the employing family. The girl was from the same neighborhood, her family knew the employers, and employer and domestic usually shared the same religious and cultural background. The helper attended church with the family, often ate at the family table, and could entertain her beau in the kitchen.[4]

Such a system existed in rural areas in the mid-nineteenth century. James Stuart, a knowledgeable English traveler, recorded his encounter with an upstate New York boarding house chambermaid, an American girl from a nearby village, who was permitted to attend evening lectures and even kissed the mistress when the girl returned from a visit to her family. American authors also treated the "help" as a real type of servant. Caroline Gilman's Recollections of a Housekeeper (1834), which was based on actual incidents, related the fictional experiences of a New England mistress with a series of sometimes uncomfortably democratic "helps." In an 1844 article Elizabeth Ellet wrote of a domestic in western New York who quit because her employers, who had recently arrived from New York City, were reluctant to permit her to sit at the family table. The girl did not mean to be impertinent; she "had sturdy notions of equality instilled into her . . . . The acting out of such independence is rather troublesome, but can we help admiring it in the abstract?" Such views were said to be prevalent among domestics in western and rural areas; it was common for a "help" to illustrate "her idea of independence by asserting her social equality with her employers . . . ." These writers agreed that once a mistress adapted her attitudes, demands, and expectations to these conditions, she would be well served by these independently minded Americans. Catharine Segwick observed that the good,

rural New England domestic was a "republican independent dependent" and was "the very best servant, . . . provided we are willing to dispense with obsequiousness and servility, for the capability and virtue of a self-regulating and self-respecting agent."[5]

Care should be taken, however, not to confuse these conditions of service and employer's apparent acceptance of them with the attitudes of employers in the growing cities and towns of the North, where domestics were far more common. As early as the 1820's very different attitudes toward servants prevailed among employers in American cities. Frances Wright and many later Europeans noted that domestics "in Atlantic cities" were usually foreign-born "servants" rather than native "helps." The term "help," in fact, was hardly ever used in connection with urban servants; there the terms "servant" and "domestic" were in general usage throughout the century. American-written books and tracts for domestics, such as A Friendly Gift for Servants and Apprentices (1821) and The House Servant's Directory (1827) unashamedly preached the subjection of the servant to the will of the employer and made no concessions whatever to the independence of "helps." Although when she wrote of New England in A New England Tale, Catharine Sedgwick implied that "helps" did exist, they were notably absent from her 1837 novel of domestic service in New York City, Live and Let Live. Advice books published in the 1830's

by William A. Alcott, Eliza Farrar, and Sarah Josepha Hale,all New Englanders, treated domestic service without reference to any real equality between master and servant. Indeed, the first two authors condemned the typically imperious manner and presumption of social superiority on the part of employers while Mrs. Hale took care to lecture servants on their duties and obligations. Later, the anonymous author of Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics (1855) explained that his description of the "help" was designed to assist uncomprehending city readers in understanding what rural, New England service was like. Apparently the system of "help" was absent from large cities in the 1820's and seemed irrelevant to even many New England authors of the 1830's.[6]

The "help" still existed, however, in rural areas in the 1870's; some authors pictured service in "the fartherest nooks and crannies" as being a relation of equality. There the domestic was described as "the daughter of a neighbor, and almost, or quite, the social and intellectual equal of her mistress, and [who] enjoys privileges and immunities which would seem scarcely less than appalling to a resident of the city," including sitting at the family tale and using the front door. A western employer remarked in 1863 that whereas in Illinois cities and towns mistresses successfully imposed "whatever conditions" they chose upon servants, in the rural areas of the state domestics demanded and received

social equality.[7] Cities and towns, however, were the locations where servants were concentrated, and the bulk of material discussing servants in the mid-nineteenth century was written by and for employers in or near large cities or country towns. This material indicates that most employers were by no means ready to concede that the servant was an equal partner to a business contract similar to the contract made with other employees. The master-servant relationship desired and promoted by these employers was far removed from the rural system of equality and "helps."

Many foreign visitors to America, accustomed to European domestic service, were impressed with the seeming social equality between master and domestic. One of the aspects of American service which was especially striking to Europeans was the businesslike character of the contractual relationship between the two parties. Such a contract seemed enlightened and democratic to travelers such as Harriet Martineau, who found service to be "a matter of contract, an exchange of recompense, the authority of the employer extending no further than to require the performance of the service promised . . . ." Thomas Grattan wrote that employers and employed had a "common understanding" that service was "a mere matter of business." Employers, said Grattan, clearly realized that the contract gave them "no right to any undue assumption of power . . . ." Tocqueville

concluded in regard to northern white servants that "masters require nothing of their servants but the faithful and rigorous performance of the covenant: they do not ask for marks of respect, they do not claim their love or devoted attachment; it is enough that, as servants, they are exact and honest."[8]

Such statements are misleading and inaccurate. There was no general "understanding" on the part of American employers that they ought to have no control over the personal life of the domestic or that the contract was or should be a "mere" business transaction. Nor was Tocqueville correct that American masters and mistresses neither wanted nor expected "respect" and "devoted attachment" from their servants.

American employers widely denounced the contractual basis of the master-servant relationship, blaming it for the lack of loving, permanent connections between employers and their domestics. To judge from the public statements of employers, Grattan and Tocqueville misjudged the attitudes of American masters and mistresses and attributed to them a receptivity to democratic concepts of service which they did not deserve. Finding the existing relationship to be "cold" and "mercenary," employers again and again called for infusions of "warmth" and "affection" into the connection. The New England postess Lydia Sigourney wished "our contract with them [servants] were less mercenary in its nature . . . ." Writing in 1837, William Ellery Channing

thought that master and servant "should be bound to one another by a holier tie than self-interest. Their connection should be hallowed by Christian love." A magazine written and published by New York City charity workers denounced "this heartless and mercenary connection" between employer and domestic, lamenting that "there are no ties of long attachment between us and them, connecting each to each from generation to generation, by the endearing links of infancy and old age, of birth and death . . . ." Yet another writer noted sadly that the "delicate and sacred offices" of home life "are farmed out to be done for the lowest and most mercenary considerations." Post-Civil War authors continued in the same vein. For example, Joseph Lyman, a prominent agriculturalist, and his wife hoped that the servant could "be lifted above the mere sordid consideration of earning her wages" and serve instead from motives of devotion and affection. Writers bewailed the lack of "sympathy" between servant and employer; efforts should be made to "attach a domestic to you personally." Mrs. Spofford hopefully looked toward a type of service which would bring back "a pleasant reminisence of old feudal love and service."[9]

Even authors genuinely concerned with the welfare of the lower classes held to an ideal of the faithful servant who remained devotedly attached to one family for many years. Writing of the distress among Philadelphia working women, Mathew Carey suggested that families hire destitute females

as domestics; they would be grateful for the employment and would profit by the example set by the homes of "respectable citizens." Carey went on to remark that "perhaps there are few ties in common life more binding than those that are found to exist between a benevolent master and mistress, and a faithful female servant who has grown up under their own eyes, and under their care and protection, and that of their descendants." Similarily, in 1869 Parker Pillsbury, former abolitionist and woman's rights advocate, concluded an article highly critical of the treatment of domestics in city homes with the wistful observation that "no more refreshing spectacle blesses one's eyes than to see employers and employed growing old together, and in mutual confidence, respect, and esteem . . . ."[10]

III

The attempts of employers to bring more "affection" into what they thought to be a "mercenary" relationship with their servants were clearly evident in their paternalistic attitude toward live-in domestics. The personal life of the live-in servant could, of course, be closely controlled because the nature of her occupation dictated that she remain within the employer's house in the evening and surrender "all" her time to the direction of the employers. Authors justified the regulation of the servant's life on two grounds. First, such restrictions were essential to an orderly household. Second, the benevolent advice and

direction of the mistress was for the child-like domestic's own good. It was believed that the servant was unable to make decisions properly on her own and required the wise guidance and control of her employer, who was better able to judge what was best for the girl than the domestic was able to judge for herself. For example, Frank and Marian Stockton thought that the mistress should extend "the same surveillance and authority" over the servant that she would over the visiting daughter of a friend. The novelist and his wife admitted that it was "probable" that the servant would resent such control, but it should be imposed none the less for her own good because the domestic lacked "the careful culture to keep her from evil."[11] Throughout the mid-nineteenth century authors again and again argued for paternalistic direction of servants in hopes of producing more devoted and "attached" domestics.

The basic assumption of this argument was that mentally and morally servants were much like children, lacking the ability to make correct judgments concerning their lives. Domestics were regarded as being "wretchedly defective" in "that education which gives perception of truth, insight, the power of generalization . . . ." References comparing servants to children on the basis that both had "untutored minds" were common. Harriet Beecher Stowe found that "servants in general are only grown up children." Jane C. Croly, newspaperwoman and editor of Demorest's Monthly

Magazine, agreed that servants "are like children, they are unacquainted with natural laws, they do not trace effects to their causes or reason from cause to effect . . . ." Others made such statements as servants "should be treated with kindness and firmness, like children" and "in manners and social training servants are as children."[12]

Being child-like, the domestic was thought to be of malleable nature and might be molded by the wise mistress. As one author noted, the domestic was, like a child, very "susceptible to the moral influences under which she may be brought . . . ." Mrs. Spofford similarly felt that "the young Irish girl comes to us as plastic as any clay in the world . . . . She is completely ready to be moulded to our wish."[13]

Since "in many regards our servants come to us on the plane of children," Julia McNair Wright advised her readers to consider themselves "the girl's God-ordained guardian while she is with you." Like children, servants required training and should be taught how they might "improve;" a parental duty many authors took seriously. One book advised the mistress that "you stand in stead of parent to them, and are responsible for their good conduct, and the correction of their faults . . . ." Catherine Beecher recommended that employers attempt "so far as may be, to supply the place of parents." Since the girls' own parents were "unqualified" to teach them properly, the mistress "is bound to exercise a parental care over them" in a variety of matters.[14]

Writers repeatedly urged the "uplift" of servants as a means to improve them as workers and as people. Most etiquette books and advice manuals for ladies included chapters on the feminine duties of charity and benevolence; these chapters usually reminded readers that "charity begins at home." Benevolence was a major social obligation of the lady, and the proper place to begin was within her own home with her "weak and neglected" female servants. By this reasoning domestic service was made into a benevolent activity which could involve every mistress in charitable work within her home. No lady need lack for deeds of charity; every employer had "in her own household a field for usefulness . . . ." Such advice to mistresses was common before 1860. Lydia Sigourney wrote that mistresses should regard servants "as brought under our roof, not merely to perform menial offices, but to be made better, to become sharers in our kind feelings, recipients of our advice, subjects of our moral teachings . . . ." The most persistent theme in Miss Sedgwick's novel Live and Let Live was that servants could be uplifted within "home missions" if employers regarded servants "as 'unfortunate friends' whom it was their religious duty to instruct, to enlighten, to improve, to make better and happier." Providence had placed the domestic under the guidance of her mistress who was charged with the responsibility "to check the growth

of evil habits! to encourage the formation of good ones!" through her wise advice and counsel.[15]

Post-Civil War authors, though generally less inclined to moralisms than pre-war writers, also emphasized the missionary duty of the mistress to the servant. The employer had a special "mission to her dependent sister" within the home; R.R. Bowker advised an attitude of "missionary enthusiasm" toward "your own heathen" in the kitchen. Servants should be thought of by employers as "wards entrusted to their care," as people "to be lifted," thought Mrs. Spofford. Julia McNair Wright, one of the strongest proponents of employer paternalism, wrote that the employer should give the maid the same "friendly counsel" she would provide her own daughter.[16]

According to this line of reasoning, the employer's home was a school for the servant to receive instruction not only in domestic economy but also "in virtue and religion." The household functioned as a "primary school" for the servant's "ignorant and feeble mind." Several authors thought it to be the duty of the mistress to teach the servant to read and write if she entered the home illiterate. It was also the employer's responsibility to see that the domestic read only moral and wholesome literature. But much more than reading might be taught; one might instill "in the untutored mind the heavenly lessons of order, neatness, and all the advantages gained by contact with superiority in mind and manners."[17]

By providing the maid with education, the employer was benefiting the whole nation because she was preparing slovenly and foolish women to be "useful" and skilled workers if they remained in service, or good homemakers and mothers if they married. Mrs. Stowe thought mistresses had a "missionary" duty to train domestics to be valuable members of society and prepare them to be "good wives and mothers for the Republic." Her sister Catherine Beecher agreed that "the Christian woman's kitchen is a training-school of good servants, where ignorant heathen come to be guided heavenward, and prepared to raise healthful and Christian families of their own." If mistresses failed to instruct and advise their domestics, warned Mrs. Wright darkly, female servants would bring into the world "a brood of semi-beggars, filthy, ragged, and unschooled, to be the criminals and paupers of a generation to come."[18]

Such benevolent and paternal motives applied with special force to the immigrants so common in service. Here was an excellent opportunity to promote assimilation and school the foreign girl in the ways of American life. One enthusiatic author noted that while in service the immigrant received "unconscious education" through her contact with her employers. One example of the benefits thus produced was that "an Irish girl who has been in an American family for a year will have so much changed her accent, that, when the rest of her family follow her from Ireland . . . . they scarcely recognize her speech." Catharine Sedgwick, Jane C.

Croly, and others considered it the obligation of American mistresses to receive immigrant girls into their homes and prepare the "ignorant, undisciplined waifs" to be "useful" citizens. Mrs. Hale summarized this argument in her 1839 cook book.

> Those who do employ and carefully instruct this class of persons [Irish domestics], perform a most benevolent act to the usually destitute exiles, and also a good service to the community, by rendering those who would, if ignorant, become a burden and a nuisance, useful and often respectable members of society.

Identical arguments were still being presented in the seventies by Mrs. Croly, Eunice Beecher, and Julia McNair Wright with regard to the socialization of the immigrant through household benevolence.[19]

IV

Paternalism was a concrete program as well as a vague intention. Such control entered the actual life of the servant in several areas. Each specific measure not only guarded the girl from her own poor judgment but also, it was frequently pointed out, increased the peace and quiet of the family, an important consideration. Paternalistic rules further subjected the domestic to the will of the employer and, no doubt, strengthened the alleged feeling of servants that they were not "their own mistresses." From what critics considered the typical and general treatment of servants, it seems that most employers acted on

paternalistic impulses and created fairly rigid rules to which their domestics were expected to conform.

The most sensitive and "perplexing" issue was the "privilege" of the servant to receive visitors, particularly male "followers." Because their social life outside the house was very restricted, domestics apparently considered it a most important liberty to be permitted to receive guests. Visitors in the kitchen, however, were generally regarded by employers as "a great nuisance" because of the noise and disruption they caused. On the question of allowing servants to have guest, mistresses were divided, and practices concerning the matter varied widely. In the name of maintaining a "quiet kitchen" some employers simply forbid their domestics to have any visitors at all. A much larger number permitted female guests (although these might be "darkly frowned on") but prohibited male guests, or "followers." It was noted that "many mistresses" enforced this rule against male visitors. Part of the reason for this regulation was probably to restrict love affairs which might deprive the mistress of a valuable assistant. Eliza Farrar found that "some ladies frown upon all lovers, and consider the indulgence of a matrimonial project in the kitchen as a wrong done to them." An employer writing in Harper's Bazar on the other hand, defended her rule of "no followers allowed" as necessary for household order. While in households where there was only one servant,

it might be possible to allow "a specially licensed follower under certain conditions," this was impossible in homes employing two or more domestics. To allow each servant to receive male guests would lead to "awkward" situations as well as undesirable noise and confusion.[20] Restrictions against guests were meant to promote the comfort of the family, even if they interfered with the life of the servant.

Others advocated permitting servants to entertain visitors and "followers" at specified times though, of course, there should be limitations as to late hours." The "privilege" of having visitors should be limited to certain times because "it is very inconvenient to have the quiet and regularity of one's household broken in upon by frequent visits paid to servants by friends or relatives . . . ." Mrs. Wright wrote that the domestic should be clearly told "that you do not like much company" but that she might have in her "relatives and nice quiet friends at proper times" if they were not noisy and left at the closing hour for the house, ten o'clock in most households. On the evenings when she was allowed to go out, the domestic also had to be home by the closing hour established by the mistress.[21]

The paternalistic assumptions of employers were especially evident in the belief that they should guide the maid in her choice of "proper" friends. The mistress was to

judge the character of the girl's friends and determine those with whom she should associate. All of a domestic's friends were to be "well chosen," but such regulation was particularly important in the case of male "followers," who were often considered dangerous to both the morals of foolish girl and the property of the employer. Followers were to be permitted in the house only if they were of "good character;" if one were deemed "vicious" by the mistress, he should be forbidden from the kitchen and the girl should be warned of the dangers of such associations. A lady wrote in Arthur's Home Magazine that, although she believed domestics should be able to have male guests, she refused admittance to those she decided were "objectionable." "Guard their acquaintships" and "inform yourself of the character of her associates" advised writers.[22]

Another important area of possible paternalistic influence was religion. Although many servants were unable to attend church because of the work necessary on Sundays, some writers recommended that mistresses encourage or even "induce" servants to go to church, providing adequate arrangements could be made concerning the preparation of dinner. Much in the way of religious instruction could be done within the home by the mistress herself, however, if she took her role as a home "missionary" seriously. Since the girl's soul was divinely intrusted to the care of her employers, the mistress should attempt to inculcate Christian

principles by example and counsel and lead the servant "to Christ and to Heaven." By providing a Bible and suitable tracts and by talking "earnestly" with the maid about religion, one could add to the girl's religious knowledge. If the domestic was not religious at all, her employer should try to win her soul for Christ. If the mistress was Protestant and the servant Catholic, the employer could still do much to "direct and encourage" the belief of the domestic without resorting to heavy-handed lecturing or dictation which would seem offensive to the girl. Several authors implied that Protestant employers sometimes interfered with the religion of their Catholic servants and tried to promote their own beliefs. Catherine Beecher strongly opposed overt interference but was more favorable to more subtle means of persuasion.

> However wrong, or however pernicious we may regard their [servants'] system of faith, we should remember, that they have been trained to believe that it is what God commands them to obey, and so long as they do believe this, we should respect them for their conscientious scruples, and try not to tempt them to do what they suppose to be wrong. If we lead an ignorant and feeble mind to do what it believes to be wrong, in regard to that most scared of all duties, those owed to God, how can we expect them to be faithful to us?
>
> The only lawful way to benefit those whom we regard as in error, is, not to tempt them to do what they believe to be wrong, but to give them the <u>light of knowledge</u>, so that they may be qualified to judge for themselves. And the way to make them willing to receive this light, is to be kind to them.[23]

The parental employer might also intervene in the saving and spending habits of the live-in domestic. Authors

counselled domestics to be frugal and put their money into banks; employers were advised to "induce" servants to save rather than spend their money foolishly. Catharine Sedgwick, for instance, pointed out that it was the duty of the mistress "as far as she was qualified by superior judgment, to regulate their [servants'] expenses." Special care was to be taken to warn servants against buying fancy or expensive clothing.[24]

Through parental guidance and "kindly teaching them [servants] how to improve," employers hoped to win the "affection and gratitude" of servants, thus overcoming the "mercenary" quality of the contract relationship. Some authors assured their readers that they could "secure steady service" through "benevolent interest" in the lives of their domestics. Right-minded servants would realize their own limitations, would be grateful for the advice and interest, and would respond with loyal and affectionate service "which money cannot buy and which money cannot reward." As Joseph Lyman and his wife put it, the good mistress "comes to regard the servant more as she would a child, and such a feeling, she may be sure, will create reciprocal confidence, affection, and devotion on the part of the employee."[25]

This added up to a theory and system of paternalism which reached into thousands of American homes. Regulations restricting the personal freedom of the domestic were thought necessary to guarantee an orderly household and to

guide and control the foolish and child-like domestic who required protection from herself. Under the influence of the wiser and more experienced mistress the servant could be made better--could be taught useful womanly skills, instructed in religion, and led to personal virtue. She would be improved, and society would receive a valuable member rather than a potential pauper or criminal. Through paternalism, employers hoped to create a more stable and submissive household labor force obedient to the rules and will of the mistress. In these respects the combined benevolence and social control of the household resembled other instances of employer paternalism in the nineteeth century, including Lowell and later company towns and even the slave plantation. In fact, the rationale of Northern employers, which emphasized the child-like nature of the worker, the wisdom and benevolence of the mistress, and the home as a school of knowledge and virtue, did not differ greatly from the pro-slave argument in defense of the plantation system. What is particularly significant is that such paternalistic attitudes toward lower-class workers were not limited to plantation owners or a few large industrialists but were also part of employer attitudes toward servants and entered many thousands of middle and upper-class Northern homes.

V

The reverse side of paternalism was the servant's duty of submission to be given in return for her employer's wise benevolence. Reminders of the domestic's obligations of obedience were especially common in the tracts and books of advice published for the "betterment" of servants before the Civil War. Such material aimed directly at social control and was closely related to the activities of the major tract societies in exhorting men to conform to a particular set of moral and social values. Servants were advised to submit willingly to the regulations and guidance of the employer because such direction was really best for them. The master made the rules of the household, and "every servant must conform to those [regulations] of the family where he takes up his residence, without demur or hesitation." One tract's model servant tells her friends that she always follows the advice of her mistress because her mother "wouldn't let us work where the lady didn't look after us, and see what company we kept." Ann Connover, the heroine of Parlour and Kitchen, desired a mistress who would take "charge and care" of her and give her "good care and instruction." Ann's aunt Jane, a long-time faithful servant, considered her mistress a "kind friend" who advised her concerning what clothes she should buy and about "where I should visit, and about what company I should keep; and, in short, in every thing I took her advice." The tract further

recommended that the mistress should be regarded as one's "chief friend and counsellor" because employers "are in the way to know more than we do; and they are altogether wiser and better able to judge." Such were the words to be spoken by the right-thinking domestic who realized the superior judgment of the employer; such was the attitude employers hoped servants would display.[26]

Religion proved a useful device inexhorting servants to the duty of submission. Authors were fond of quoting such Biblical injunctions as "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters, with fear and trembling;" "Servants, obey in all things your masters;" and "Servants, obey your masters, for it is right." Other suggestions for proper deference and submission were also heavily infused with the idea that a just and wise God had assigned each person to his proper and rightful "place" or "station" in life. One tract recommended that domestics remember that "God appoints to all of us our proper places; and we ought to be satisfied with what he appoints, and say 'Lord, it is good for us to be here.'" Another advised that God

> has given each one his or her own place . . . . It is God's will that you should mind your employers, and do them service . . . . You are then to try to mind and serve them because it is the will of God . . . . God has given the master and mistress of every house command over the children and servants of that house; and you must obey your employer as children obey their parents.

Since God had assigned the girl to her proper station in life, she should be contented with her lot and not become

dissatisfied or restless. "Be clothed with humility; put on the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit: . . . be content with such things as ye have . . . ," suggested one writer.[27]

Other statements were also used to remind servants of their proper relation to their employers. Parlour and Kitchen, the tract issued by the American Sunday School Union, suggested that if a girl disliked a place, she could leave it, but as long as she remained "she must obey the master and mistress of that family" completely in every matter. "The mistress has a right to order and command as she pleases; and the servant must obey." Another author contended that "it is the duty of every servant to be submissive and obedient to their employers." A third tract suggested that "it is their [employers'] duty to command, and yours to obey."[28]

In a lengthy newspaper article on service the Philadelphia conservative Sidney George Fisher propounded the idea that the master-servant relation is "founded in the laws of man's nature, which, by endowing some with greater moral and intellectual force than others, decree that some are born to govern and others to obey, and that each should find his best happiness in his appropriate sphere." In service "equality is impossible" because when one party to the contract is rich and cultivated and the other party is poor and ignorant "the claim to equality is absurd." It is true that each party to the contract has duties, but the

duties of the master are those "always linked with power and superiority" such as justice and protection while the duties of the servant are "those which belong to weakness and ignorance" including obedience and deference.[29]

The most complete theory of subordination and submission was developed by Catherine Beecher, the eldest child of Lyman Beecher. Miss Beecher was a pioneer in the movement to provide higher education for young ladies and train women for the teaching profession. She also led the way in making domestic science an element of the school curriculum. In 1842 her book Letters to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service appeared, the avowed purpose of which was to promote the "usefulness and happiness" of domestics, apparently in that order. She further hoped, she told her humble readers, "to make you more useful and more contented with your lot." The founder of several seminaries for young ladies recommended service as an excellent occupation for building character because in it "persons form a habit of submitting their will to the will of another, with readiness and cheerfulness."[30]

In her book Miss Beecher preached a doctrine of the supremacy of the employer reminiscent of divine right theories of kingship. She instructed servants that the Lord "put you in your lot, and he it is that requires you to be obedient to those that have rule, and . . . be cheerful, industrious and content with your lot." Later

she went on to discuss the nature of the authority which men should obey, asserting that "it is by God's will and appointment that even bad men gain power to rule over others. And when they have gained this power . . . God requires . . . honour and obedience to be rendered to them" even if they abuse their authority. Whenever "men have power to make laws, customs, and ordinances, we must submit to them . . . in order to please and obey God" whether the men be good or evil. In case the maid missed the point, Miss Beecher noted that God had given the same directions to both servants and the subjects of civil magistrates. Of servants specifically:

> Their employers are appointed by God, as the rulers and overseers of the family, and those they hire are under obligation to obey, in all matters relating to family work, just as a citizen is under obligation to obey rulers . . . . The master and mistress of a family are rulers of their house, just as magistrates are the rulers of the people . . . . Whether the rulers of a family be wise or foolish, whether they make good or bad rules about their work, domestics, as long as they agree to serve them, should submit to their directions . . . . 'Obey them that have rule over you' is the law of God, given to domestics in the family state, as much as it is to subjects of the political state.[31]

Miss Beecher's emphasis on servants remaining in awe of their divinely ordained employers should not be considered apart from her injunctions to mistresses to extend "parental care" over the domestic. The two obligations went together; each party to the contract had a duty--benevolent paternalism was offered by the mistress in exchange for the reciprocal

duty of submission by the employee. According to Sidney Fisher, in the ideal relationship the domestic gave "cheerful, respectful obedience" in return for her employer's "kindness and protection." [32] Furthermore, only the servant who was submissive to the will and direction of the mistress could be completely open to the improving influences of wiser and morally superior employers.

VI

Before 1860 authors generally minimized the possibility that domestics might be "ungrateful" for the beneficience of the mistress in guiding the girl's life, but thereafter some began to notice, or perhaps admit, that servants were frequently hostile to paternalism. Those who advocated parental concern often attributed this ungrateful attitude to the foolish and perverse nature of servants. As mentioned previously, the Stocktons advised "surveillance and authority" despite the fact that domestics would probably resent them. One writer concluded that servants wished to be responsible for their own lives and did not want to be "cared for" by kindly employers. "Fanny Fern" thought that domestics failed to understand the benevolent motives of employers and hence resisted the efforts made to "civilize" and "humanize" them. Instead, maids wanted to be "let severely alone;" the fault lay not with the charitable, "right-minded" mistress but instead with the "savage" and "unscrupulous" domestic. Similarly, Eunice Beecher believed that few servants were as

grateful as they should have been for the "benevolent guidance" supplied them. Mary Virginia Terhune, better known to her readers as "Marion Harland," warned that "ignorant and illogical" domestics would reject proffered assistance and kindness, for "there is always a suspicion--more or less apparent--that you have a single eye to self-interest in all your regulations and counsels."[33]

Some authors, however, were highly critical of the paternalistic assumptions of employers and the effects such ideas had on domestic service. Those who attacked the regulation of the girl's personal life went on to condemn the entire master-servant relationship as it was interpreted by most employers. In the years before the Civil War a few observers complained that mistresses were generally unwilling to permit the implications of democracy to govern their attitudes and relations toward domestics. In the 1830's Eliza Farrar found that under "the influence of aristocratic feeling" and

> spirit of domination . . . ladies often talk as if they were living in olden times and had a right to govern with absolute sway those whom they hire. They talk of contracts made with house servants, as if the obligations were all on one side, and as if, in consideration of the wages paid, the hired person were to lose all free agency . . . .

Caroline Kirkland thought Americans, instead of treating servants as "fellow citizens," were guilty of undue "assumption" and "enforcing <u>caste</u> in our treatment of domestics . . . ." Such notions and conduct seemed to her

to be in open conflict with "our profession of democratic principle;" one day Americans would have "to harmonize more nearly our political theory and our social practice" in relation to servants. William A. Alcott condemned the keeping of servants as "highly anti-republican . . . . By having a class of persons about them whom they are accustomed to regard as inferiors," employers were, he believed, "fostering in their own bosoms, as well as cherishing in the bosoms of their children . . . a feeling which is as contrary to true republicanism as light is to darkness . . . ."[34]

After the Civil War at least four authors concluded that paternalism and control were basically undemocratic and that domestic service could be improved only after these aspects had been eliminated and the entire nature of the master-servant relation altered. These critics found paternalism to be an important part of the connection between employer and employed. One critic noted that

> the relations between mistress and servant are unlike those of employer and employed in any other department of labor. Between employer and employed, the pledges and exactions are mutual; whilst the mistress exacts everything from the servant and yields nothing, or as little as possible, to her . . . . Most mistresses lay down restrictions and regulations for their servants not only in matters concerning their work, but in things entirely of a personal nature with which they have no right to interfere, which they would find simply unbearable if imposed upon themselves or their daughters. Their incomings, their outgoings, their dress, their friends are all subjected to rules and restrictions to an unwarranted extent.

Another found "a general disposition to regard them [servants] as owing not only a peculiar deference but a sort of personal allegiance to their employers."[35]

Among those who attacked existing conditions was Harriet Beecher Stowe, who claimed to see in many of those who were kind to their domestics "a latent spirit of something like contempt for the position. That they treat their servants with so much consideration seems to them a merit entitling them to the most prostrate gratitude . . . ." These mistresses were astonished and hurt that servants would want better conditions "as a mere matter of common justice" rather than as benevolence. The author of Uncle Tom's Cabin concluded that the situation would be improved only when the contract for service was made for clearly defined duties and limited hours.

> A vast deal of trouble among servants arises from the impertinent interferences and petty tyrannical exactions on the part of employers. Now the authority of the master and mistress of a house in regard to their domestics extends simply to the things they have contracted to do and the hours during which they have contracted to serve; otherwise than this, they have no more right to interfere with them in the disposal of their time than with any mechanic whom they employ. They have, indeed, a right to regulate the hours of their own household, and servants can choose between conformity to these hours and the loss of their situation; but, within reasonable limits, their right to come and go at their own discretion, in their own time, should be unquestioned.[36]

The most complete attack on the nature of domestic service in America was launched in the 1870's by Robert Tomes. Tomes was a writer on questions of manners and

and morals, as well as health, for the publishing empire of the Harper Brothers and was a frequent contributor to the most fashionable ladies' magazine of the period, Harper's Bazar. According to him, "the mutual relation between the employer and the employed is considered one of caste and not of social convenience;" employers demanded not only service but also "the show of its subjection." The only way "the degrading concessions exacted" from domestics could be completely nullified was by abolishing live-in service altogether and having servants live outside and come to the house daily. By thus giving the girl more personal freedom domestic service would be made more like other occupations and would be more attractive to a better grade of workers.

> Servants would be relieved from the constant interference with their independence, that worrying surveillance, and that insufferable consciousness that they are never, for any single moment, in free possession of themselves. Their contact with an overbearing superiority would be diminished, their feelings would be proportionately less irritated by the provoking reminders of their own lowly position.[37]

Such arguments, however, seem to have had little impact at the time they were presented, and the advocates of paternalism and social control held sway into the eighties. The type of service relationship desired by Tomes and Mrs. Stowe began to come only at the turn of the century when household technology began to replace the live-in domestic.

In conclusion, it seems that the comments made by Tocqueville and Grattan concerning the attitudes of American employers were inaccurate when compared with the statements of Americans themselves. Americans either displayed attitudes far different from those described by these travelers or condemned what they felt to be the dominant spirit of undemocratic superiority preached and practiced by most Americans in regard to their domestics. Americans often opposed and worked against the contract relationship, striving to introduce the "warmth" of paternalistic control and ready obedience into the connection, based on the conviction that they were obliged to guide and "train-up" the ignorant domestic. The middle or upper-class home could provide useful "uplift" and social training for lower-class domestics. Furthermore, according to critics, employers thought of servants, not as equal partners to a contract, but in terms of subordination and "caste." Surely the paternal ideal of the obedient and faithful domestic submitting to the superior judgment of the employer bears little resemblance to the democratic ideal. American acceptance of political democracy does not necessarily mean acceptance of social democracy in all areas. Although virtually all Americans professed support and even reverence for political democracy, many were very reluctant to permit the spirit of democracy to intrude into their households.

NOTES

[1]See Lucy Maynard Salmon, Domestic Service (New York, 1897), pp. 55-60; Russell Lynes, The Domesticated Americans (New York, 1962), 156-161; E. S. Turner, What The Butler Saw: Two Hundred and Fifty Years of the Servant Problem (New York, 1963), chapt. xii.

[2]Clifford S. Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers: Moral Stewardship in the United States (New Brunswick, 1960), especially chapt. vi; Charles I. Foster, An Errand of Mercy: The Evangelical United Front, 1790-1837 (Chapel Hill, 1960), especially chapt. i; Joseph R. Gusfield, Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement (Urbana, 1963), chapt. ii. Griffen's thesis and work is the most complete; a concise statement of his position may be found in his article "Religious Benevolence as Social Control, 1815-1860," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLIV (December, 1957), pp. 423-444.

Here and in the next chapter I have used the term "social control" to refer to educational efforts and programs designed to mold outlook, values, and conduct. Specifically, the term is used to mean the activities of employers to shape the attitudes and behavior of servants to conform with employers' ideas of what was proper for a domestic. In the following chapter on

charities, "social control" also refers to efforts to prepare people for, and direct them into, certain, prescribed social roles or occupations, in this case domestic service.

[3]In her House and Home Papers (1865) Mrs. Stowe criticized the nature of service in America and the undemocratic attitudes of employers. In later books, however, especially The Chimney Corner (1868), she was more favorable toward service and employer paternalism. In the second book she encouraged American girls to enter service because of the many advantages it offered over other occupations.

[4]Salmon, Domestic Service, pp. 54-55.

[5]James Stuart, Three Years in America (Edinburgh, 1833), I, pp. 505-506; Elizabeth Ellet, "Helps," Godey's Lady's Book, April, 1844, pp. 193-195; Catharine Sedgwick, Home: Scenes and Characters Illustrating Christian Truth (Boston, 1835), pp. 71-72; also Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics: With Counsel on Home Matters (Boston, 1855), p. 102.

[6]Frances Wright, Views of Society and Manners in America, ed., Paul R. Baker (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), p. 238; William A. Alcott, The Young Wife; or, Duties of Woman in the Marriage Relation (Boston, 1837), pp. 155-157; Eliza Farrar, The Young Lady's Friend (Boston, 1837), p. 232; Sarah Josepha Hale, The Good Housekeeper; or, The

Way to Live Well and To Be Well While We Live (Boston, 1839), pp. 112-115; Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics, p. 103.

[7]Mary Dean, "The Doings and Goings-On of Hired Girls," Lippincott's Magazine, November, 1877, pp. 589-591; "Woman's Work and Woman's Wages: Shall American Girls Become Servants," Arthur's Home Magazine, July, 1870, p. 32; "Letter to the Editor," Arthur's Home Magazine, May 1863, p. 304.

[8]Harriet Martineau, Society in America (New York, 1837), II, p. 248; Thomas Grattan, Civilized America (London, 1859), p. 258; Alexis De Tocqueville, Democracy in America, ed., Phillips Bradley (New York, 1963), II, p. 183, also see p. 181.

[9]Lydia Howard Sigourney, Letters to Mothers (New York, 1846), p. 197; William Ellery Channing, "Letter to the Editor of the Christian Palladium," The Christian Register, February 25, 1837, p. 31; Five Points Monthly Record: The New Charitable Monthly; or, What is Done for the Poor, August, 1854, p. 113; Young America, July 24, 1846; Joseph Bardwell Lyman and Laura E. Lyman, The Philosophy of Housekeeping: A Scientific and Practical Manual (Hartford, 1869), p. 452; "Our Help," Arthur's Home Magazine, October, 1870, p. 227; Harriet Prescott Spofford, The Servant Girl Question (Boston, 1881), p. 161. See [Sidney George Fisher], "Domestic

Servants," North American and United States Gazette [Philadelphia], May 23, 1857 for an extended discussion of the position that making service a "mere" bargain between debtor and creditor destroyed its proper role as a "domestic institution."

[10]Mathew Carey, "Report on Female Wages," Miscellaneous Essays (Philadelphia, 1830), pp. 271-272; Parker Pillsbury, "Domestic Service," The Revolution, August 12, 1969, p. 89.

[11]Frank R. Stockton and Marian Stockton, The Home: Where It Should Be and What to Put in It (New York, 1872), p. 93.

[12]"Domestic Service," Old and New, September, 1872, p. 362-363; Harriet Beecher Stowe, "Little Foxes," The Atlantic Monthly, February, 1865, 227; [Jane C. Croly], "The Cellar," Domorest's Monthly Magazine, April, 1874, p. 132; Helen R. Cutler, "Journal of a Housekeeper," The Ladies' Repository, April, 1866, p. 217; "Maids and Mistresses," Scribner's Monthly Magazine, September, 1873, p. 628; also [Jane C. Croly], "The Kitchen," Demorest's Monthly Magazine, May, 1874, p. 178; [Margaret Cockburn Conkling], The American Gentleman's Guide to Politeness (New York, 1858), pp. 103-104; Lyman and Lyman, The Philosophy of Housekeeping, p. 454. The Lymans discussed the "training of servants and children" together in the same chapter.

[13]Alice B. Neal, "The Servant Question," Godey's Lady's Book October, 1857, p. 327; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 41.

[14]Julia NcNair Wright, The Complete Home: An Encyclopedia of Domestic Life and Affairs (Philadelphia, 1879), p. 447; Plain Talk and Friendly Advice, pp. 120-121; Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy for the Use of Young Ladies at Home and School (New York, 1842), pp. 207, 210; see also Sigourney, Letters to Mothers, p. 198.

[15]"The Christian Mistress," The Ladies' Repository, June, 1868, p. 465; Sigourney, Letters to Mothers, p. 197; Catharine Sedgwick, Live and Let Live; or, Domestic Service Illustrated (New York, 1837), p. 120, also p. vi; Neal, "The Servant Question," Godey's, October, 1857, p. 327; also see Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy, pp. 207, 210, 213; Catherine Beecher, Miss Beecher's Domestic Receipt Book (New York, 1846), p. 271; Elizabeth Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper: A Cyclopedia of Domestic Economy (New York, 1857), p. 31.

[16][Sarah Payson Parton], Folly as It Flies: Hit at by Fanny Fern (New York, 1868), p. 116; R[ichard] R[odgers] Bowker,"In Re Bridget.--The Defense," Old and New, October, 1871, p. 501; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 41; Wright, The Complete Home, p. 447.

[17]Sedgwick, Live and Let Live, p. 92; [Fisher], "Domestic Servants," North American and United States Gazette, May 23, 1857; Mary Hooker Cornelius, The Young Housekeeper's Friend (Boston, 1846), p. 19; Robert

Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," Harper's New Monthly Magazine, June, 1864, 58; Bowker, "In Re Bridget," Old and New, October, 1871, p. 501; Grace A. Ellis, "Our Household Servants," The Galaxy, September, 1872, p. 353.

[18][Harriet Beecher Stowe], House and Home Papers (Boston, 1865), p. 219; Catherine Beecher, Miss Beecher's Housekeeper and Healthkeeper (New York, 1873), p. 439; Wright, The Complete Home, pp. 437-438; see also [Charles Loring Brace], "The Servant Question," The Nation, October 26, 1865, p. 528; Lyman and Lyman, The Philosophy of Housekeeping, pp. 449, 457; Patience Price, "The Revolt in the Kitchen," Godey's Lady's Book, February, 1868, p. 144.

[19]Mrs. C. A. Hopkinson, "The Poor in the Cities," Atlantic Monthly, July, 1868, p. 56; Sedgwick, Live and Let Live, pp. 70-71; Hale, The Good Housekeeper, p. 124; [Croly], "The Kitchen," Demorest's, May, 1874, p. 178; Wright, The Complete Home, p. 458; Eunice Beecher, Motherly Talks with Young Housekeepers (New York, 1873), pp. 248-249; also Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," Harper's, June, 1864, p. 59.

[20]Mathew Carey, "Essay on the Relations Between Masters and Mistresses and Domestics," Godey's Lady's Book, June, 1835, p. 245; Bowker, "In Re Bridget," Old and New, October, 1871, pp. 498, 500; "Domestic Service,"

Old and New, September, 1872, p. 365; "She," Scribner's Monthly Magazine, November, 1871, p. 118; Maud Nathan, Once Upon a Time and Today (New York, 1833), pp. 81-82; [Sarah Payson Parton], Folly As It Flies: Hit at by Fanny Fern (New York, 1868), p. 116; "Our New Cook Book: Servants," Arthur's Home Magazine, March, 1870, p. 181; Farrar, The Young Lady's Friend, p. 233; "Domestic Service," Harper's Bazar, May 2, 1874, p. 184. Robert Tomes criticized the prohibition of followers, a regulation "not infrequently" enforced. The Bazar Book of Decorum (New York, 1870), pp. 231-232.

[21][Parton], Folly As It Flies, p. 116; "Our New Cook Book: Servants," Arthur's, March, 1870, p. 181; Wright, The Complete Home, p. 445; Nathan, Once Upon a Time, p. 81; Stockton and Stockton, The Home, p. 93; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 59.

[22]Neal, "The Servant Question," Godey's, October, 1857, p. 327; "Our Biddy: Cousins and Courting," Arthur's Home Magazine, March, 1865, p. 185; Stockton and Stockton, The Home, p. 93; Wright, The Complete Home, pp. 437, 447.

[23]Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper, p. 31; Neal, "The Servant Question," Godey's, October, 1857, p. 327; Bowker, "In Re Bridget," Old and New, October, 1871, p. 501; "The Christian Mistress," The Ladies' Repository, June, 1868, p. 465; Catherine Beecher,

Miss Beecher's Domestic Receipt Book, pp. 272-273. In her House and Home Papers Mrs. Stowe presented a more forceful statement opposing any and all "controversial interference with the religious faith of our servants." Expressing respect for the depth of Christian conviction on the part of Irish Catholic domestics, Mrs. Stowe found that employers should confine themselves to encouraging servants "to be good Christians in their own way" rather than point out the errors of their faith to them(pp. 220-221).

[24]Carey, "Essay on the Relations . . . ," Godey's, June, 1835, p. 245; Farrar, The Young Lady's Friend, p. 246; Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper, p. 32; Stockton and Stockton, The Home, p. 94; Sedgwick, Live and Let Live, p. 114.

[25]Catherine Beecher, Treatise on Domestic Economy, p. 207; Lyman and Lyman, The Philosophy of Housekeeping, p. 454; see also Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 23; Wright, The Complete Home, p. 437; Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper, p. 32.

[26]Robert Roberts, The House Servant's Directory, or a Monitor for Private Families: Comprising Hints on the Arrangement and Performance of Servants' Work (Boston and New York, 1827), p. 154; Plain Talk and Friendly Advice, p. 60; Parlour and Kitchen; or, The Story of Ann Connover (Philadelphia, 1835), pp. 50,

57, 97, 99-100. On the general activities of the tract societies see Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers, chapt. vi.

[27]Parlour and Kitchen, pp. 15, 63-64, 83-84; Plain Talk and Friendly Advice, p. 10; A Friendly Gift for Servants and Apprentices (New York and Baltimore, 1821), p. 10; see also Roberts, The House Servant's Directory, pp. x, xiii, "Masters and Servants," Godey's Lady's Book, August, 1856, p. 188. The last contains advice for servants reprinted from a 1743 English book which the editors of Godey's, Sarah J. Hale and Louis Godey, considered "as applicable today as in the hour in which it was first published."

[28]Parlour and Kitchen, pp. 82-84; Roberts, The House Servant's Directory, p. 70; A Friendly Gift, p. 15.

[29][Fisher], "Domestic Servants," North American and United States Gazette, May 23, 1857.

[30]Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service (New York, 1842), pp. 10, 71.

[31]Ibid., pp. 94-95, 100-101, 102.

[32][Fisher], "Domestic Servants," North American and United States Gazette, May 23, 1857.

[33]For the earlier treatment see, for example, Catherine Beecher, Treatise on Domestic Economy, p. 207; Stockton and Stockton, The Home, p. 93; "Domestic

Service," Old and New, September, 1873, p. 363; [Sarah Payson Parton], Ginger-Snaps (New York, 1871), pp. 21-23; Eunice Beecher, Motherly Talks, p. 249; [Mary Virginia Terhune], Common Sense in the Household: A Manual of Practical Housewifery (New York, 1874), p. 377.

[34]Farrar, The Young Lady's Friend, p. 232; Caroline M. Kirkland, The Evening Book (New York, 1851), pp. 168-169, William A. Alcott, The Young Wife, p. 166.

[35]"Woman's Work and Woman's Wages: Shall American Girls Become Servants," Arthur's Home Magazine, July, 1870, pp. 29, 31; Todd S. Goodholme, ed., A Domestic Cyclopedia of Practical Information (New York, 1877), p. 475. The question of the dress of servants will be considered in a later chapter.

[36][Stowe], House and Home Papers, pp. 213-214, 214-215. In 1877 Mrs. Stowe's advice was reprinted, without acknowledgment, in Goodholme, ed., A Domestic Cyclopedia, p. 476. Where Mrs. Stowe wrote "Now that" in the second sentence of the above quotation, the Goodholme book substituted "It would be well if it were clearly and generally understood that . . . . ." The succinct conclusion of the 1877 writer was that "a household servant should be recognized as one who has contracted to do a certain specified or well-understood work, and when she has done it her obligations to her employer and his rights over her cease. . . . "

[37]Robert Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household (New York, 1875), pp. 127, 132, 134, 136-137.

CHAPTER III

CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES RELATING TO SERVANTS

The impulse to improve and at the same time mold the servant which led to paternalism within the individual home was also institutionalized in the creation of charitable organizations concerned with domestics. In the purposes, philosophy, and activities of benevolent agencies dealing with servants, there existed an interplay of motives. Such charities proposed to "uplift" lower-class servants and also to serve the interests of the middle and upper-class supporters of the institutions, who as employers wanted loyal and efficient domestics. Improving domestics morally was virtually synonymous with improving them in their capacity as servants. This happy coincidence of philanthrophy and self-interest shaped the rhetoric and programs of these societies. The organizations discussed in this chapter considered themselves benevolent enterprises assisting the poor, but much of their charity consisted of providing employers with faithful, docile domestics. To a large extent, they were societies for the assistance of housekeepers.

I

The earliest American philanthropic organizations concerned exclusively with servants were the Societies for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestics founded in the 1820's in New York and Philadelphia. The Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants in New York was established in 1825 and issued annual reports through the eleventh in 1836, apparently its last. By then income from subscriptions had fallen off, some activities had been curtailed, and a third of the revenue was derived from a lease which would seemingly soon expire.[1] The Philadelphia Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestics began operation late in 1829 and was closely modelled on the New York society, most of the rules being identical with those of the earlier organization. Because of more restricted financial resources, however, the Philadelphia society engaged in a more limited range of activities. This group was still operating in 1833 and issued a report in 1834, but no information on its operations after 1831 appears to exist.[2] There is no indication that either survived after the mid-thirties. Similar but less significant societies existed briefly in Boston and Albany.[3]

The New York society was less a distinctive response to problems peculiar to American cities than a reproduction of a London society founded in 1813, The Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Female Servants. The New York

managers retained the goals and programs, and even many of the specific rules, of the London group. The New Yorkers made it clear that they were drawing carefully on the experience of the society in London. The roots of such societies to promote fidelity among servants go back to eighteenth-century Britain and the Society for the Encouragement of Good Servants founded in either 1789 or 1792. The programs of this organization were much like those of the later societies in the New World.[4]

The American societies engaged in two principal activities, operating registry offices or employment agencies for servants and giving monetary awards to domestics who had faithfully served the same subscriber for a year or more. Commercial employment agencies, known as "intelligence offices," usually charged the mistress and the domestic each fifty cents for the services of the office. Patrons of the societies, however, paid five dollars a year for the use of the office, but they could then obtain as many domestics as they needed from the society. Unlike commercial offices, the societies' agencies were free of charge to domestics. However, only servants who could produce written "satisfactory evidence of good character" were permitted to be enrolled on the books of the office.

The managers of each society reported the annual volume of business at their offices. Seemingly the average patron had need for the office about three or four times a year, indicating a considerable turnover in household servants.

TABLE 4.--Volume of Business Reported Annually at the Registry Offices of the Societies for Faithful Domestics

	Applications for Servants by Subscribers	Number of Subscribers	Applications by Servants for Places	Known Engagements Made
New York				
1826	1954	513	2164	669
1827	3167	517	3327	1217
1828	2452	541	3383	1485
1830	1686	478	3179	1369
1833	2017	509	3196	1486
1836	2360	n.a.	3920	2017
Philadelphia				
1830	993	317	971	619
1831	1513	433	1630	956

Both societies pointed out that the number of engagements actually made was considerably larger than the number given since many employers failed to inform the office when an agreement was reached with a domestic supplied by the registry.[5]

These figures indicate that although the New York society lasted only a decade, it provided a significant share of the city's domestics while in operation. In 1830 the population of Manhattan Island was 197,122; by 1855 it had more than tripled to 629,810 including 31,749 domestics.[6] Assuming that the ratio of servants to general population remained constant, there could scarcely have been more than 10,000 servants in New York City in 1830. At this time the society was receiving an average of 2000 applications a year from employers and 3200 or 3300 applications from servants. The society served more than just New York City; some members came from Brooklyn and the surrounding countryside. Nevertheless, it seems certain that the society supplied an important share of the servants in the New York area.

The other main program of both societies was furnishing graduated premiums to faithful domestics. In its early years the New York organization selected among the servants nominated for their past faithful services and awarded premiums ranging from five to twenty dollars to those chosen. This system proved unsatisfactory, however, because many worthy domestics went unrewarded; the managers confessed that they

had found "a much greater number of old and faithful domestics" than they had anticipated. Moreover, it was thought that this method of awarding premiums failed to encourage young servants who faced the most temptations. Therefore, in 1828 the organization adopted the system of the London society, reduced the size of the awards, and promised a premium to "every nominated servant." Each subscriber was given the privilege of nominating one servant who would then be eligible for an award at the end of the following twelve month period. At the end of the year each previously nominated domestic who had remained in the same home and could produce a statement of good conduct received an award. The premiums varied from a Bible or, if he or she had a Bible, two dollars for one year's service up to ten dollars for the fifth and every succeeding year of loyal attendance. Additional servants could be nominated at five dollars a piece. The society believed that this system offered more incentive to beginning servants and recommended that subscribers nominate young domestics. The servants receiving premiums were also given certificates of good conduct. If a domestic received premiums for ten years, she would obtain a total of seventy-seven dollars, probably more than equal to a year's wages. By these cash awards the managers hoped to provide incentives for long service.[7]

The New York society, having greater financial resources than the Philadelphia organization, offered additional benefits to loyal servants receiving premiums. The New Yorkers gave

those domestics receiving awards who had a bank account a prize of one per cent of their balance. Servants getting five year awards were entitled to gratuities of twenty dollars, later reduced to ten, if they later married with the approval of their employers. If she became incapicated or indigent, the five year award winner was promised an annual sum of up to ten dollars.

Both societies complained that only a small percentage of eligible subscribers made use of the privilege of nominating a servant for a premium. Although nomination cost the patron nothing, the New York managers reported in 1830 that only about 100 of the 478 subscribers had named a servant for an award.[8] This would seem to indicate that employers regarded the society principally as an agency for obtaining servants rather than as a benevolent organization to reward loyal domestics.

The leaders of the societies included men active in other benevolent enterprises. Each society was directed by a set of officers and a Board of Managers. In addition, each had a Board of Patronesses, composed of charitable ladies, who visited the registry offices and reported to the managers on the operations of the societies. John Pintard, the first vice-president of the New York organization, was the recording secretary and later vice-president of the American Bible Society. One of the New York managers was Arthur Tappan, who was active in almost every moral reform organization in America. Tappan was, among other things, a

manager of the Bible Society and the chairman of the powerful finance committee of the American Tract Society. Another manager of the New York society was Moses Allen, a treasurer of the Tract Society. Through men such as Pintard, Tappan, and Allen the aims and activities of the organization were linked to the operations and philosophy of the major religious benevolent groups. These interdenominational societies, it has been demonstrated, were interested principally in social control through persuading men to conform to what the societies thought to be proper conduct.[9] A major figure in the Philadelphia society was Mathew Carey, the publisher, writer, and philanthropist, who served as vice-president. Carey seemed to regard the society as an integral part of the charitable activity of Philadelphia. He provided publicity for the benevolent organization through a series of promotional pamphlets stressing first the need for such a society and then its activities. Carey also wrote the annual reports.[10]

Along with the benevolent, the New York society attracted the elite of the city. Among the subscribers listed in each annual report were the Haights, Livingstons, Jays, Schencks, Schermerhorns, Beekmans, Van Cortlandts, and Lorillards. Philip Hone, General Winfield Scott, James Kirke Paulding, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Stephen Whitney, John Coster, Samuel Ward (who was also active in other benevolent societies), Alexander Stewart, and John Jacob Astor were all members at one time or another.

The societies had several goals and "benevolent purposes," the foremost of which was the hope that its labors would produce a more loyal and stable group of servants. In its first report the New York organization stated that the chief obstacle to good employer-domestic relations was the "restlessness of mind and love of change" among servants. Thus

> their ability to be useful is lessened; they are exposed, by the variety of scenes and associates which they encounter, to powerful temptations, to evil conversation, to the contraction of habits inimical to the interests of their employers, and opposed to their own happiness. They become impatient of control, or of advice, negligent of their duty, and, after wandering from place to place, deteriorating at every change, they not infrequently end their days in the miserable haunts of vice.

Through their regulations and premiums the society tried to counteract these tendencies and encourage servants to be respectable "by acting well the parts which Providence has assigned to them. . . ." For true domestic harmony, thought the managers, there must be lasting ties between employers and their servants; "permanency" in a good place "has ever been regarded by the Society as an object of primary importance." The Philadelphia promoters were likewise concerned with eliminating the "roving disposition" among domestics "which is so injurious to their best interests and to their own comforts."[11]

A second aim of these organizations was to assist both employers and servants by offering the services of honest and well regulated employment agencies. The societies

warned that commercial intelligence offices were dishonest in their dealings with both mistress and maid. The agencies conducted by the societies were meant to remedy this situation. By "a proper investigation" into the habits of applying servants and the registry of only those with good references, the managers attempted to assure mistresses of obtaining trustworthy domestics of high character. Employers might have "a choice" among good servants. On the other hand, the good domestic could be sure of a place in a respectable family free of expense. Being conducted "upon the principles of justice and benevolence," the registry offices operated by the societies would protect innocent girls from fraud and deception; they would be places "where inexperienced females coming from the country might safely apply for information, and in which their ignorance and youth would be their security, not their snare. . . ." This feature of an agency where employers could be relatively certain of getting good servants and where domestics could obtain places without charge probably proved the greatest attraction to both mistresses and maids. The New York managers admitted that many of their patrons subscribed only because of the immediate need of a servant.[12]

Another important purpose of these charitable societies was "to ameliorate the moral condition and character" of the servants assisted. Like other nineteenth-century benevolent and moral reform organizations, these societies saw reform and charity principally in terms of the improvement

of morals and "character." To improve character and promote morality were the highest, and the only really effective, forms of charity. The managers in both cities spoke continually of the moral reform of servants. In a typical statement the Philadelphia group contended that the prime objects of their efforts were "to ameliorate the condition--improve the morals--and elevate the character" of domestics. The most complete statement of this gospel of uplift was the message "To The Public," which the New York managers used as a preface to their annual reports. According to this declaration, the objectives of the society were "to prevent vice, . . .to encourage a virtuous behavior among the inferior ranks of society," and "to promote the moral and religious improvement of domestic servants. . . ." The society intended to foster "morality" among servants and "aid in the maintenance of virtuous habits." The managers argued that they could advance their aims only through "the moral and religious improvement of domestic servants."[13]

Along with imparting "virtuous habits" the societies hoped, at the same time, to make better employees. In this way the organizations united benevolence, moral reform, and social control. The New York society's function was a dual one--"to ameliorate the moral condition, and to increase the usefulness" of domestics. The two things went together; by improving the character of domestics, the managers assumed they were making them more "useful" to employers. The New York society believed that the only way to produce "better

servants" was by first making them "better men and women." When their morals and habits were bettered, servants would improve "not only in their moral qualities, but in the duties of their station." The Philadelphia promoters were equally aware that a morally purified domestic was a valuable domestic. They promised that while they were reforming and assisting servants they would "inculcate principles and encourage habits calculated to promote their [servants'] own happiness and to make them more useful to their employers."[14]

Although the New York society referred to itself as a "charity" and "a benevolent institution,"[15] the appeal to the self-interest of the subscriber was clear. The managers pointed out that the patron would receive increased security, order, and comfort from his uplifting efforts. The moral reform of "To The Public" was tempered by the comment that "the money subscribed will return with increase into our own families" because of the improvement in the quality of domestics. In this charity the subscribers would "reap the immediate benefit of their own personal endeavors." The report for 1830 announced that "while a great moral good has been effected among our servants, it is evident to the managers, that the tranquility and comfort, the good order and domestic enjoyment of its patrons has also been increased, and that their liberality has returned threefold into their own bosoms." Thus philanthrophy would benefit the charitable patron. An address signed by Mathew Carey and seven others which advocated a society for Philadelphia

recommended the enterprise "not merely to the benevolence, but also to the self-interest" of potential patrons. Much of the "charitable" activity engaged in by these "Christian philanthropists" consisted, not of assisting servants, but of promoting the interests of employers. Here was a "charity" meant "to assist its subscribers in procuring competent and faithful servants. . . ."[16]

The New York society, which was more active and ambitious than its Philadelphia counterpart, worked in several specific ways to "improve" domestics. These activities were directed toward conforming servants to the organization's stated concept of good servants--"those who reverence the name of God, and are sober, honest, and industrious, in the stations they occupy."[17] Since servants were "often ignorant of their true interest" and generally "ill-advised," they needed "the prudent and salutary advice" offered by the agent of the office and the patronesses who visited the registry. The partonesses praised the agent and his wife for the guidance they provided domestics using the office. On their visits the ladies might also give useful counsel "to the humble and often friendless" servants at the registry.[18]

The organization clearly recognized the value of religion in forming a more obedient labor force. Devoutly religious servants tended, the managers found, to remain longer in their places, and those domestics who were nominated for the longest periods of service "are represented to be as remarkable for their piety, as for the faithful discharge of their secular

duties." Any scheme for the improvement of domestics, stated the First Annual Report, must "directly" aim at making them "wise unto salvation, and to point their view beyond their obscure lot in this world, to the eternal holiness and happiness of heaven, where there is neither master nor servant. . . ." In 1830 Jonathan Steele, the secretary of the society, wrote to the clergymen of New York that "servants who are Christians indeed, will, it is believed, be better servants (other things being equal) than those who have not the fear of God before their eyes."[19]

In line with such ideas the society engaged in the distribution of printed material, including the Bible, which would lead the domestic to become a better and more religious person as well as a better worker. In the early years of the organization every servant receiving an award was given a Bible, but later Bibles were given only to first-year recipients who did not already have a copy. The managers thought it important that every domestic have a Bible because it contained "divine counsel" on the relation between master and servant. The Scriptures taught masters to treat servants as fellow human beings "though in an inferior station" and taught servants "faithfulness, diligence, and obedience to their master in all lawful things."[20]

A closely related project was the publication and distribution of tracts—"little messangers of usefulness." Many servants wanted "to acquire knowledge becoming their sphere in life" and would like to read. Employers were

advised to provide domestics with "well-selected" literature, including tracts, hymnals, and "light moral tales." A judiciously chosen "kitchen library" would provide moral reading and would keep the girl away from "injurious publications" and "less innocent enjoyments." The society itself published tracts intended "to promote the diffusion of good counsels. . . ." During its early years of existence the society awarded annual prizes of thirty dollars for the best tract submitted for the instruction of domestics "in their moral and religious duties." The first winner was Mrs. Joanna Bethune for her short offering Friendly Advice to Servants, of which three thousand copies were printed. Later tracts published by the organization included Sarah; or, The Victim of Pride and A Father's Advice to His Daughter on Going Out to Service. They also reprinted Poor Richard to help instill lessons of thrift and repress extravagance.[21]

This venture into publishing involved the society closely with the larger benevolent and moral reform organizations engaged in similar operations. Some of the society's tracts were sold, others were given away to domestics at the office, and still others were distributed by the New York City Tract Society. The agent also gave away to servants other tracts supplied by the City Tract Society. The society's tracts and annual reports were printed by Daniel Fanshaw, a member, who did the printing for both the American Tract Society and the American Bible Society. In later years the society reduced its publishing operations, although there were continued

printings of Poor Richard, and relied on distributing at the office tracts provided "on generous terms" by the American Tract Society. Interlocking leadership in the persons of Tappan and Allen led to interlocking activities. In 1836 the managers especially recommended that employers supply their servants with the American Sunday School Union's "valuable little book for servants," Parlour and Kitchen, which preached the virtues of submission and obedience.[22]

Despite the fairly constant rate of applications for servants per subscriber (except for the especially heavy demand reported in 1827), the New York managers felt sure they were actually accomplishing their purposes. The replies to a circular sent to subscribers to ascertain the character and conduct of domestics obtained through the office led the society to conclude "that the moral character of servants has greatly improved--that they are rising to higher degrees of moral elevation, in respect for their own reputation, the duties of their calling, and the rights and interests of their employers. . . ." In several reports the managers claimed that domestics were staying longer in their places because of the efforts of the society. In 1830, when the rate of applications was at its lowest, the managers were especially confident in the value of the organization and pointed to the decreasing need of subscribers to apply to the office. At least one of the leaders, John Pintard, agreed privately as to the worth and success of the society. When two of his domestics received premiums in 1827, Pintard

wrote to his daughter that "this Society is rendering great services to reform the character of servants of both sexes and if continued to be supported, will continue as it has already become a resort for domestics whose character can be relied on." A short time later he added that "the Society has done and if patronized will continue to do a great deal of good."[23]

Although the initial response of domestics seems to have been somewhat suspicious, in every year after the first over 3000 servants in search of jobs made use of the registry, probably because it was free of charge and perhaps more honest than commerical offices. In the First Annual Report the managers complained that stories were circulating among servants that the society was hostile to their interests. The following year the patronesses encouraged subscribers to counteract the "false and injurious suggestions" that "tend to prejudice the minds of servants against an institution designed for their benefit. . . ." In subsequent reports, however, the managers seemed satisfied that domestics duely valued the labors of the society. Indeed, servants were credited with appreciating the society more than New York's householders.[24]

Two pieces in labor newspapers give some indication of the charges made against the societies by critics. Although printed in workingmen's papers, the articles themselves seem to have been written by men from more substantial elements of the population. A correspondent to the Mechanics'

Free Press of Philadelphia, who claimed to know various members including Carey, said that he had declined membership in the society because he "believed its tendency rather to degrade than to elevate the character of the virtuous and industrious females whom it is intended to benefit, and think a society to encourage 'faithful employers' more likely to attain the end desired." During his twenty years as an employer, the anonymous writer had come to conclude that if treated as "rational" beings, servants were generally as honest and virtuous as employers. He thought that "there is in this country less to be complained of on the part of the employer than the employed."[25]

On the same day that this letter appeared in the Philadelphia press, a more biting attack in New York's Workingman's Advocate complained that the members and directors of the New York society

> are more concerned for the spiritual interests of those who are under the necessity of hiring themselves to do the work of others, than for their temporal prosperity in this world. By the religious tracts issued by the society, it appears that heavenly treasures are held out to laborers as a better reward for their services than high wages. . . .

This writer quoted at length from an earlier assault on the organization from The Christian Inquirer of May 6, 1826. The earlier article is especially critical of the undemocratic nature and assumed superiority of Mrs. Bethune's Friendly Advice to Servants, finding Lord Chesterfield to be comparatively enlightened when contrasted with the writer of the tract. The 1826 author concluded that the duties advocated by the

society were "too much on one side, tending more to be the advantage of the hirer than the hired;" servants were to be "meek and humble" under any and all impositions. He charged that "the society appear to think that there is a certain species of mankind, born for the use of the remainder; and they talk of improving them as they would a breed of horned cattle."[26]

These criticisms contain a real element of truth. Societies to encourage faithful domestics were combined employment agencies and moral reform associations. Their emphasis was on reforming the habits and character of servants in such a way as to benefit employers. The philanthropic work of the organizations was closely connected with goals of social control; moral reform and improvemnt were equated with making the girl a "useful" and obedient worker. In leadership and in the distribution of tracts the New York society was closely linked with the religious and moral reform groups which Clifford Griffin has shown to have been principally interested in spreading their own standards of morality and bringing social order and stability. Moral reform and social control often marched hand in hand. Householders were encouraged to join these societies out of harmonious motives of benevolence and self-interest. The managers tried, they wrote, "to secure to faithful domestics such encouragement as they deserve, confident, at the same time, that they have promoted the interests of their patrons." In the final analysis the basic goal of each of these societies was to further

"the peace and order of those families on whose patronage it must depend."[27]

Although these societies disappeared after only a decade of existence, their outlook, attitudes, and programs continued, appearing in later benevolent endeavors. After the collapse of the New York society, a number of benevolent organizations in the city set up employment agencies which were free of charge to servants. Because many commercial intelligence offices were thought to be corrupt and to send unsuspecting girls to "evil houses," The American Female Guardian Society opened an office for domestics in 1837 which lasted until the 1880's.[28] The survival of the values displayed by these societies for faithful domestics can be best demonstrated, however, through an analysis of other types of benevolent enterprises dealing with servants.

II

A related type of institution designed expressly for domestics was the servants' "home," which provided both lodging and jobs for those out of a place. Ambivalent goals and motives also characterized these charitable "homes." One example, The Christian Home for Female Servants, was founded in New York in 1853 and was said to be "a noble enterprise, at once expedient and philanthropic, in a high degree." Girls who were destitute were given their room and board gratuitously. While lodging servants, the home also conducted a registry office, free to domestics, to supply

girls with jobs and mistresses with servants. Along with places, the girls in the home were given "affectionate, maternal advice and religious instruction appropriate to their circumstances." All the inmates, including those who were Catholics, were expected to attend the home's daily devotions every morning and evening. It was explained that the "Christian philanthropist" who gave servants "kindness and instruction" could gain extensive influence over them and communicate to them "new and better ideas of the qualificiations of a domestic servant." Those who wished to apply to the office for domestics were assured that the home's charity "attracts very large numbers of candidates for the employer's choice" and that its "parental interest" in the girls "tends to sift out the hardened and depraved, by mutual repulsion, and to attract the well-disposed and manageable. . . ." In its first eighteen months of operation the home found places for over a thousand girls.[29]

A similar institution which felt it was filling "a charitable need" was St. Joseph's Home for Sick and Destitute Servant Girls, a Roman Catholic organization founded in Boston in 1866. Servants out of a place were given respectable lodgings at a small cost; those in need of medical attention received it free of charge. In 1869 the home reported that while its major purpose "is to provide a temporary home for poor, friendless, and homeless women. . ., the managers also desire to discourage idleness by finding occupations for its inmates as soon as may be, and to assist

housekeepers, at the same time, in obtaining reliable domestics." The managers hoped to be "of actual service to those benevolent persons" who were always willing to contribute to worthy charities. These philanthropic persons were reminded that the home offered "the means of obtaining every kind of female servant at the shortest notice." Between 1866 and 1869 the home took in about 1200 inmates.[30] Both of these institutions openly appealed for support on the basis of the advantages they could offer employers. Helping servants was as much a means to assist employers as it was an end in itself.

III

One important type of nineteenth-century charitable enterprise was the institution providing temporary shelter, training, and finally a "Christian home" for young orphans or the children of indigent or unfit parents. Orphanages and children's homes customarily either indentured or "placed out" under somewhat less rigid arrangements their charges until they were eighteen. The children were expected to pay for the homes they received with work, the boys becoming apprentices or farm laborers and the girls becoming domestic assistants. By having the girls themselves do the general housework of the institution, the home provided them training to be domestics in the families in which they were placed. These asylums and homes believed that through this system the girls were being placed in a "useful" calling

under the close control and ennobling influence of pious, respectable, middle-class homes. It was thought that the Christian family was the best institution for the long-range control of vagrant youth. On the other hand, mistresses were furnished with servants who were dependent on their benefactors, who would find it difficult to change their places, and who had been schooled in both housework and the virtues of obedience by the charitable institution. Here again, philanthrophy worked to the advantage of those seeking domestics.

Orphanages and children's homes or societies were created to provide separate care for dependent children, to remove them from the control and authority of public almshouses where they were mixed with adult paupers and criminals. An orphanage for girls was opened in Boston in 1800, and asylums for children of both sexes were founded in New York in 1806 and Philadelphia in 1814. Such facilities expanded rapidly beginning with the thirties. During the decade groups in Cincinnati, Bangor, Maine, New Haven, Providence, Brooklyn, Buffalo, Rochester, Troy, and Utica set up local asylums. All of these were private institutions although many of them received some public support. While it had established orphanages in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Brooklyn by 1831, the Roman Catholic Church was active in organizing asylums, usually for girls only, in most upstate New York cities in the 1840's and 1850's. In all, at least seventy-seven orphanages and other institutions

devoted to child care were in operation by 1850, including homes in several western cities, notably Cincinnati (1833 and a German Protestant Orphan Asylum in 1849), Chicago (1849), and Indianapolis (1851). After 1850, such homes and institutions multiplied rapidly throughout the nation.[31]

Writers who called upon housekeepers to take part in home charity by taking girls from these homes and orphanages "to bring up" stressed both the duty of paternal benevolence and the tangible benefit to the mistress. The New York Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestics noted that the trouble involved in raising a girl of "vicious and improvident parents" would "generally be richly repaid by the capability and attachment of the servant." The patronesses expressed the hope that the society would be able to open a training school for the purpose of "educating young and friendless females, and qualifying them for respectable places of service. . . ." Under existing conditions, the ladies complained, mistresses were forced to attempt to train grown women "and do not find them very docile." Presumably "young and friendless" girls would be more "docile." Catharine Sedgwick similarily pointed out that a young girl was more malleable than a grown servant; "young subjects can be remoulded and taught" more easily. The employer would be "amply paid" in good service for her efforts in giving the girl "a moral and religious education." Lydia Sigourney suggested that to "train up" a young girl "in usefulness and piety" was "an act of benevolence;" "a deed of

mercy." By such endeavors the girl could be "moulded into an ally" who would render the sort of loving service "which could not be purchased with money."[32] In the minds of these persons charitable uplift was inseparable from acquiring a useful domestic servant. A similar interplay of motives, including a large supply of self-interest, was, no doubt, present in the minds of those who applied to institutions for girls.

Most asylums and homes for children readily cooperated with this desire for young, dependent servants, at least up to the point where the employer's self-interest turned into blatant exploitation. From their beginning, institutions for children generally disposed of girls over ten by placing them as domestic assistants in private homes. These wards were entrusted to the care of the family until they were eighteen. In return for her work the girl was to receive board, clothing and "a certain amount" of education. Writing about the Boston Female Asylum in 1844, an author indicated that throughout the institution's history from 1800 to 1844 most of its inmates had been sent out as servants. The third annual report of the New York Orphan Asylum Society, which had been established in 1806, reported that an important part of its plan was

> to bind out the girls as servants from the time they can read and write until they are eighteen; and the boys, when equally instructed, are to be put out as servants till the age of fifteen, at which time they are to be returned to the trustees of the asylum, who will then bind them as apprentices to virtuous mechanics.[33]

Nor were such activities confined to the largest urban centers. William P. Letchworth's study of institutions for children throughout New York state in 1876 makes it clear that the practice of indenturing or placing girls as domestics was typical in every part of the state. Almost every home discussed by Letchworth trained its girls in domestic work before sending them to private homes. St. Vincent's Female Orphan Asylum in Buffalo reported that "most" of its charges entered service, and other upstate homes implied the same. The situation was similar in the state-operated institutions for children created in Michigan, one of the first states to set up such homes. The Michigan State Public School for Dependent Children, which opened in 1871 in Coldwater, trained its girls in domestic skills; the superintendent noted that he had "no trouble whatever in finding homes for the girls; in fact, the demand is greater than the supply." The Michigan State Industrial Home for Girls (1881) bound out its inmates only after they had been "given a thorough education in all branches of household work."[34]

Two organizations which seem to have been typical in their programs, aims, and outlook were the Industrial Home for Girls, located in Philadelphia, and the Girls' Lodging House, one of the institutions operated by the New York Children's Aid Society. These two charities have been chosen for extended examination because their reports were especially complete and explicit concerning their activities in training girls as domestics. Although both were located

on the Eastern seaboard and neither opened before 1855, their programs and objectives seem to have been representative of similar benevolent enterprises throughout the North, some of which were in operation as early as the first decade of the nineteenth century.

The Industrial Home for Girls was opened in the fall of 1857; its attention was directed toward girls from twelve to seventeen, though girls younger than twelve were sometimes accepted. Some of the inmates were orphans, but most came from "vicious" or unworthy families who provided no "wholesome example" or "watchful care." The home indentured its girls in "respectable" families until they reached the age of eighteen. The home was a rather small institution and bound out fewer then twenty girls per year. Aware of the heavy demand for children and teen-age girls as domestics, the home gave its inmates enough instruction in ordinary housework (by having them do the labor of the house) "to satisfy those who make application for them as domestics in their families. . . ." The managers thus felt that they were accomplishing "a two-fold benefit. . .to a large class of young girls, and to the public in general. . . ." The managers of the home indicated that one of their major objectives was to meet "the demand for young girls in private families" by channeling into service those who would otherwise "grow up in idleness and sin" and probably become paupers. Although it was said that the girl would be trained in "whatever" skill or trade she showed promise, in fact, the vast majority of the girls indentured were put out as domestics.[35]

When the house appealed for money, the campaign was based heavily on its ability to supply indentured domestics, apparently in the belief that this aspect of its work would attract support. In 1868, while commenting on the efforts to raise money the previous year, the managers stated that despite continued lack of space and funds "the plan for making the home more of a training school for servants, etc., which was much dwelt upon at the time of the appeals for money to build, is not at all abandoned."[36]

Although the managers believed that the "quiet discipline" of a Christian family was the best influence over a girl, they also recognized their own ability to "improve" their charges. The matron provided daily religious instruction, and the girls "all regularly attend church and Sabbath-school." In addition to lessons in housework and religion, the girls received an elementary education and were "sufficiently well instructed for their condition in life." When the managers decided to retain the girls in the home longer to give them more household training and a more complete "common education," worried patrons were assured that such a "practical" education did not conflict with the ends of good domestic service.

> The girls are educated and fitted for service, not for ambitious effort to rise above their station in life; they will be better servants. . .by having their minds awakened to know something of the world in which they live, and their relations to it.
> . . . . . .
> They [the girls] are in school daily, not with a view of raising them above the station in which God has placed them, or of giving them what is called an

> 'education,' but in order that they may use the mental powers that their Creator has given them, for their own improvement and the good of others.[37]

"One of the greatest difficulties" of the institution was in finding good homes where the girls would be treated with kindness and patience, homes where the desire for a servant was tempered by true benevolence. Early reports reminded masters and mistresses that they were to care for and instruct the child, duties which it was implied many recipients of girls failed to fulfill. Neither were mistresses to expect the child to do the same amount of work that a mature, hired servant could perform. In later reports the managers became more barbed in regard to applicants with little or no concern for the welfare of the child. When the home decided to keep the inmates longer, an action taken largely because so many subsequent masters neglected their responsibility to educate them, many applicants were unable to obtain girls. Some of these people, stated the next report caustically, "could not quite understand that the good of the girl was, in the minds of the Managers, paramount to the supply of the pressing necessities of those wanting them as servants." The following report again noted:

> It is the wish of the Managers to prevent this from ever becoming an intelligence office for servants. Their main object is to promote the good of the girls under their care, and they desire this to be prominent also in the minds of those who take them into their families--not merely a desire to get service at a cheap and easy rate.

Thus there were limits to how far the home would go in promoting the interests of masters and mistresses. Nevertheless,

training and furnishing domestics to applicants such as those criticized above remained the principal activity of the institution.[38]

Similar work in supplying domestics was undertaken by The New York Children's Aid Society under the leadership of its founder and Secretary, Charles Loring Brace. Brace firmly believed that "no relief can be of permanent value to society, or to the poor themselves, without influence in some form, on character. . . ." The great object of the society was therefore "the permanent change of character of the children of the poor." The only way to accomplish such a complete alteration, and to keep the vagrant and deliquent children of New York from threatening the foundations of social order, was by removing them from the pernicious influences and associations of the city and sending them to rural homes where Christian training and healthful work would make possible the requisite moral reform. The Children's Aid Society did not indenture its children; it "placed" them in families under a foster home plan. Although less legalistic than indenture, the placement system still demanded that the youth work for his support. For those girls sent to farm areas through the society's general placement work, this meant doing "the common kinds of housework" in their new homes.[39]

Apart from those placed as domestics in this manner, one of the society's institutions, the Girls' Lodging House,

was especially concerned with preparing servants. The goals of the Lodging House, which was established in 1862, conformed to the general philosophy of moral reform and self-help preached by Brace and the society. The matron of the house noted that the purpose was to improve the "moral and religious condition" of poor girls. The aim was to train girls "in habits of neatness and industry, bring them under good moral influences, and then, as soon as possible, pass them through to a place." The house was not to be thought of as an asylum or "home" but rather as "merely a stepping-stone to getting on in the world." Once placed in a respectable, Christian family, the uplifting influences of self-help, regular work, and a stable home life would begin to do their work. According to Brace, the house was meant "to reform habits and character through moral and material appliances. . . ." He explained that

> we hoped to begin the work of improvement with these young girls, and then leave them to the natural agencies of society. To teach them to work, to be clean, and to understand the virtues of order and punctuality; to lay the foundations of a housekeeper or servant; to bring the influences of discipline, of kindness, and religion to bear on these wild and ungoverened creatures. . .then some good home or respectable family were to do the rest.[40]

The house was intended for "homeless and friendless" girls under eighteen. Except in cases of special hardship, those over eighteen were excluded in order to protect the girls from hardened young women of "doubtful character" and confirmed bad habits. While most of the girls admitted

were between fourteen and eighteen, many girls as young as ten passed through the house. Apparently girls of fifteen and under were usually placed in foster homes whereas the older ones were assisted in finding employment. Some girls stayed only a night or two, but others remained several weeks. By the mid-seventies 1300 girls a year passed through the house, seven to eight hundred of whom were directly placed in situations by the institution.[41]

The large majority of girls admitted to the house became domestics, due in part to the urging of the society. The first matron noted in 1863 that the girls were taught that "nothing was so honorable as industrious house-work" in hopes of breaking down their reluctance to becoming servants. The second matron reported that "great efforts have been made to induce the girls to go into domestic service. . . ." Such labors paid off; it was said of the girls who had gone through the house in 1874-1875 that "nearly all have gone into domestic service. . . ."[42] Encouraging girls to enter service fit into the society's philosophy of placing girls as completely as possible under the wise and benevolent control of a Christian family. Of course, it also coincided with the desire of employers for young, manageable domestics. To the disappointment of the society, however, few Lodging House girls wanted to go to the West with its especially beneficial influences; most went to situations "in the city and adjacent country towns. . . ."[43]

In addition to enforcing work-related virtues such as "order and punctuality," the Lodging House undertook paternal guidance aimed at forming the personal habits of the girl so as to make her a more agreeable domestic in a middle or upper-class home. On their entry into the house "the first effort was to teach the girls something like a habit of personal cleanliness. . . ." Also required was the salutary discipline of "early rising and going to bed at a reasonable hour," i.e. nine o'clock. "A great deal of stress, of course, was laid on religious and moral instruction," wrote Brace. Lessons of "neatness and sobriety" were instilled into the girls. The matron and staff provided helpful advice, and one of the society's trustees, B. J. Howland, went to the house twice a week to instruct the girls in "the principles of morality and religion" and act as a "father and counselor. . . ." Religious instruction was given every morning, and prayers were held each evening at 8:45. Services were conducted every Sunday morning and evening; the evening services were sometimes led by Brace himself.[44]

A crucial part of the reformation process provided by the house was vocational training, in this case principally teaching the girls to be domestics. Besides instructing the girl in how to do the work, the training provided valuable discipline in essential work habits such as punctuality and obedience to authority. The girls who could afford the nominal cost of daily room and board spent their day outside seeking employment. Those who could not afford to pay, the

large majority, paid for their lodging by doing the domestic labor of the house, mostly scrubbing, sweeping, and other types of general housework although some attention was given to simple cooking and laundry work. This was called the "training class" and was regarded as a service to provide the girls with "some training before going to situations" as servants.[45]

The Lodging House also had a program for teaching machine sewing on machines given to the society. The instruction was free of charge to girls. Most of those in the sewing class, however, were not staying in the house but were girls who came in daily from the outside. Of those who were actual inmates of the house, most were trained in domestic work. In 1875 the matron indicated something of the pressure on the house to concentrate its efforts on service. Somewhat defensively, she pointed out that there was a real need to train girls in sewing as well as domestic work. Supporters were assured that "we recognize fully the arguments in favor of domestic service for girls, and faithfully combat the growing distaste for it, giving it the position of importance and honor it deserves, by throwing the weight of our efforts in that direction. . . ."[46]

For a time it was intended to create a "servants' training school" which would provide a complete and thorough course in cooking, washing, and other aspects of household labor for a few girls. In the very early seventies some girls do seem to have been extensively trained under such a

program, but little actually resulted from the effort. By the mid-seventies the "training school" had become synonymous with the "training class" for the bulk of the girls. Even when the "training school" was in operation, most girls continued learning the elementary branches of housework through the work they did for their board. One reason why girls could not be more completely trained was because of the heavy demand for them as domestics coupled with the house's resolve to put them out "as soon as possible." The matron explained that "the applications [for girls] are so numerous that we seldom keep one until she is thoroughly trained, ladies being ready to take them in any stage of development rather than go to intelligence offices."[47]

When appealing for support and publicizing the Lodging House, Brace himself emphasized its role in supplying domestics. The original circular concerning the house, "A Plan for an Institution for Poor Young Girls," stressed, according to Brace's daughter, "the great need of a trained domestic service. . . ." The secretary and his associates intended to train destitute girls in housework and prepare them as servants. Emma Brace reported of her father's plan that "it was hoped that this class of young girls, growing up in idle and vagabond habits, would learn a useful industrial calling, and might be brought under the best personal influence." In his later statements Brace continued to emphasize this aspect of the institution. In <u>The Dangerous Classes of New York</u> he wrote of the training program for

servants that "nothing is more needed among this class [poor and vagrant girls], or by the public generally. . . ." Apparently referring to the short-lived, more specialized "Training School" in an article in Harper's New Monthly Magazine, Brace pointed out that the efforts of the house would benefit needy mistresses as well as needy girls. The "benevolent managers" of the Lodging House "have taken pity on our housekeepers," he wrote. "They have remembered the troubles which every family undergoes from awkward and ignorant domestic service. . . ." The house was attempting "to remedy this evil" by training domestics in hopes that "the experiment may result in producing a class, which is the greatest necessity in this country, of thorough-trained servants." In his calls for support the secretary was careful to remind readers that their desire for skilled and obedient domestics had not been neglected.[48]

Brace's personal attitudes toward servants and the occupation for which his organization was training girls was not very favorable. Three years after his "Plan for an Institution for Poor Young Girls," he contributed an anonymous article to The Nation on the general servant question. Brace found that it was perfectly understandable that American girls avoided service.

> The relation itself [of master and servant] is an unnatural and difficult one. It needs a somewhat irregular, dependent, and unambitious person to be willing to sacrifice all privacy, independence, and chances of rising in the world, and labor on in the hap-hazard way which American households require.

> A servant in America is usually an inferior sort of person, morally considered, when compared, for instance, with the class keeping their own homes. The work is not hard, but it is exacting, and entirely invades privacy, and is ill-paid.[49]

This from a man whose associates made "great efforts. . . to induce girls to go into domestic service. . . ." Such was the secretary's opinion of the occupation in which he was training and placing unfortunate and "friendless" girls. The statement also indicates something of Brace's attitude toward the girls he was helping. Apparently, he felt that these children were suited to becoming domestics because their moral inferiority and "irregular" and "unambitious" character meant that little else could be expected of them.

In view of the official doctrine of work and self-help advocated by the Children's Aid Society, Brace's comment that domestics forfeited all "chances of rising in the world" is especially interesting. The consciences of Brace and his co-workers seem to have been untroubled by placing girls dependent on them into such a lowly occupation from which their chances of rising seemed to them so poor. The reasoning was that if the child of poor and unfit parents were left in a city slum, she would have no chance of rising whatsoever; the limited opportunity for advancement offered by the efforts of the Lodging House was far more than she would have otherwise. The first matron of the house noted in her journal that a former inmate had gone West and was now married to a small farmer and that "her prospect here [in New York] never would have been above a garret or cellar." In one of the

annual reports the matron stated proudly that many of the girls "have risen to good positions as domestics."[50]

Philadelphia's Industrial Home for Girls subscribed to the same view that becoming a servant was itself a step up for these degraded "creatures." The home indentured one of its inmates because it was "the only chance she could have of improvement." Being a useful domestic servant, it was thought, was surely better than the life of vagrancy or crime the girl would almost certainly lead otherwise. The managers of the home pointed to one inmate who had "proved herself a good, faithful, Christian servant" and congratulated themselves that through their labors "this girl was lifted from pauperism to a position of respectability and comfort."[51]

The philanthrophy of the Industrial Home for Girls and the Girls' Lodging House, which were typical of the many charitable organizations dealing with destitute girls, consisted largely of training their inmates to be domestics and then finding homes for them (and conversely supplying these young domestics to mistresses) and at the same time reforming the morals and habits of the girls. In practice this latter activity meant schooling the girl in the values of her benefactors and teaching her habits which would make her a better and more humble servant. The social control in these attempts to shape the values and habits of the girl is clear.

The programs of these institutions represented social control in another sense also. The main concern of the charity was to place girls under the close, beneficent control and uplift of a respectable family; to achieve this the girl was prepared as a domestic. The institutions channeled poor girls into service, a menial occupation which even Charles Loring Brace, one of the nineteenth-century's chief apostles of self-help, conceded offered comparatively little chance for mobility. These agencies thus knowingly directed and assigned girls dependent on them to lower-class roles in society.

They furthermore placed girls under the control of masters and mistresses whose self-interest was clearly expressed. The charities themselves admitted that the self-serving motives of mistresses in securing girls often outweighed their kindness. As with the societies for faithful domestics, the public statements of these organizations connected, and indeed fused, benevolence with the interest of the employer. As Brace noted in his article in Harper's, much of the "pity" of these institutions was bestowed on housekeepers. Such philanthrophy on the part of the middle and upper classes was hardly disinterested. In turn, the institutions kept in mind the needs and desires of those who financed their work and harmonized their goals with the goals of their supporters, who were interested in getting capable and devoted servants. In the cases of societies for faithful domestics, "homes" for servants, and asylums for poor girls, the ultimate recipient of the charity was the giver.

NOTES

[1]Eleventh Annual Report of the Managers of the Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestics in New York (1836), pp. 13-14. Six of the reports were located and examined--the first, 1826; second, 1827; third, 1828; fifth, 1830; eighth, 1833; and eleventh, 1836. Among the libraries possessing one or more of these reports are the New York Public Library, the New-York Historical Society, the Pennsylvania Historical Society, the American Antiquarian Society, the Library of Congress, and the Detroit Public Library.

The Reports of the Philadelphia society for 1830 and 1831 were available at the Pennsylvania Historical Society and the American Antiquarian Society as well as the Library Company of Philadelphia. Each of these institutions also has some of the promotional pamphlets issued by the backers of the society. The New York Public Library is supposed to have a copy of the report issued in 1834, but it was unavailable and apparently missing.

[3]Fifth Annual Report of the Managers of the Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants in New York (1830), p. 14; Eighth Annual Report of the Managers of the Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants in New York (1833), p. 15.

[4]First Annual Report of the Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants in New York (1826), pp. 11, 15, 16-19; Second Annual Report of the Managers of the Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants in New York (1827), p. 5; Third Annual Report of the Managers of the Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants in New York (1828), p. 21; J. Jean Hecht, The Domestic Servant Class in Eighteenth-Century England (London, 1956), pp. 93-94.

[5]First Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 8, 10; Second Annual Report . . . New York, p. 11; Third Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 16-18; Fifth Annual Report . . . New York, p. 7; Eighth Annual Report . . . New York, p. 12; Eleventh Annual Report . . . New York, p. 15; First Annual Report of the Managers of the Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestics (Philadelphia, 1830), pp. 3, 6; Second Annual Report of the Managers of the Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestics (Philadelphia, 1831), pp. 4, 6.

[6]Robert Ernst, Immigrant Life in New York, 1825-1863 (New York, 1949), pp. 191, 215.

[7]First Annual Report . . . New York, p. 11. For the change in system see especially Third Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 12-21.

[8]Fifth Annual Report . . . New York, p. 9; also Second Annual Report . . . . (Philadelphia), p. 4; for a similar report.

[9]Clifford S. Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers: Moral Stewardship in the United States, 1800-1865 (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1960), especially chapt. vi; also see Griffin's article "Religious Benevolence as Social Control, 1815-1860," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLIV, December, 1957, pp. 423, 438-444.

[10]The series of pamphlets on the Philadelphia society consist of Observations on the Utility of Establishing a Society in Philadelphia for the Encouragement of Faithful Servants (n.d.); Address to the Public, May 6, 1829; Committee Report on the Subject of Formation . . . , May 13, 1829; "To The Public," April 12, 1829, in Mathew Carey, Miscellaneous Pamphlets, (Philadelphia, 1831); and Address To The Public, July 20, 1830. Those of May 6, 1829 and April 12, 1830 were certainly written by Carey and, judging from the repetition of ideas and even phrases, so were the others. Part of the first Philadelphia report is reprinted in Mathew Carey, Miscellaneous Essays (Philadelphia, 1830), pp. 455-457.

[11]First Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 3-4; Eleventh Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 7-8, Observations on the Utility, pp. 2, 6.

[12]First Annual Report . . . New York, p. 18; Second Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 6, 13; Observations on the Utility, pp. 5-6.

[13]First Annual Report . . . New York, p. 7; [Mathew Carey], To The Public, May 6, 1829, p. 5; "To The Public," Second Annual Report . . . New York, p. 3; also p. 9.

[14]Fifth Annual Report . . . New York, p. 15; First Annual Report . . . New York, p. 16; Observations on the Utility, p. 6; see also Address To The Public, July 20, 1820, p. 1.

[15]First Annual Report . . . New York, p. 22; Third Annual Report . . . New York, p. 20; Fifth Annual Report . . . New York, p. 7.

[16]"To The Public," Second Annual Report . . . New York, p. 3; Fifth Annual Report . . . New York, p. 7; [Carey], To The Public, May 6, 1829, p. 8; Eighth Annual Report . . . New York, p. 12; see also Second Annual Report . . . . (Philadelphia), p. 4.

[17]Third Annual Report . . . New York, p. 8; In 1833 the managers noted that "the external qualities which the Society seeks to promote among domestics" included "neat and tidy dress and respectful deportment . . . ." Eighth Annual Report . . . New York, p. 10.

[18]Fifth Annual Report . . . New York, p. 14; Eleventh Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 13-14.

[19]First Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 14, 16; Fifth Annual Report . . . New York, p. 15.

[20]Third Annual Report . . . New York, p. 9.

[21]Eleventh Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 12-13; First Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 14-15; Second Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 9-10.

[22]Third Annual Report . . . New York, p. 10; Eleventh Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 12-13.

[23]Third Annual Report . . . New York, p. 11; Fifth Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 7, 13; John Pintard to Eliza Davidson, March 22, 1827 and April 13, 1827 in Dorothy C. Barck, ed., Letters from John Pintard to His Daughter Eliza Noel Pintard Davidson, II, Collections of the New York Historical Society, LXXI (New York, 1940), pp. 340, 346.

[24]First Annual Report . . . New York, p. 5; Second Annual Report . . . New York, p. 8; Third Annual Report . . . New York, p. 17.

[25]Mechanics' Free Press [Philadelphia], January 9, 1830.

[26]Workingman's Advocate [New York], January 9, 1830.

[27]Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers, pp. 99-100; Eleventh Annual Report . . . New York, p. 8; Fifth Annual Report . . . New York, p. 14.

[28]Flora L. Northrup, The Record of a Century, 1834-1934 (New York, 1934), p. 21. This short book is a history of the American Female Guardian Society.

[29]"What Is Done For the Poor: Female Servants," Five Points Monthly Record: The New Charitable Monthly;

or, "What Is Done for the Poor," August, 1854, pp. 114-115.

[30]First Annual Report of the St. Joseph's Home for Sick and Destitute Servant Girls (1869), pp. 12-13, 15.

[31]Henry W. Thurston, The Dependent Child: A Study of Changing Aims and Methods in the Care of Dependent Children (New York, 1930), pp. 42, 55, 59, 64, 86-87; Homer Folks, The Care of Destitute, Neglected, and Deliquent Children (New York, 1902), pp. 52-54, 55; William P. Letchworth, Homes of Homeless Children: A Report on Orphan Asylums and Other Institutions for the Care of Children (Albany, 1876), pp. 33, 48, 123, 152, 411, 457, 473, 492-493.

[32]Second Annual Report . . . New York, p. 14; Third Annual Report . . . New York, pp. 12-13; Catharine Sedgwick, Live and Let Live; or, Domestic Service Illustrated (New York, 1837), pp. 90-91; Lydia H. Sigourney, Letters to Mothers (New York, 1846), pp. 199-201; for similar arguments for the post-1860 period see Mrs. Chatwitt, "Domestic Help," Godey's Lady's Book, September, 1864, p. 244; Eunice Beecher, All Around the House; or, How to Make Homes Happy (New York, 1878), pp. 312-313.

[33][Abby T. Wales], Reminiscences of the Boston Female Asylum (Boston, 1844), pp. 58-59; the report of

the New York Orphan Asylum Society is quoted from Folks, The Care of Destitute, Neglected, and Deliquent Children, p. 47.

[34]Letchworth, Homes for Homeless Children, pp. 34, 49-51, 66-67, 125, 153-155, 412-414, 456, 457-460, 474, 494; First Annual Report of the Board of Control of the [Michigan] State Public School for Dependent Children (1874), p. 34; Third Annual Report of the Board of Control of the [Michigan] State Public School for Dependent Children (1876), pp. 39, 43; Levi L. Barbour, "Corrections and Charities," The Semi-Centennial of the Admission of the State of Michigan to the Union (Detroit, 1886), p. 299.

[35]First Report of the Industrial Home for the Instruction of Girls in the Arts of Housewifery and Sewing (1859), pp. 3-4; Second Annual Report of the Industrial Home for Girls (1860), p. 4; Tenth Annual Report of the Industrial Home for Girls (1868), p. 4.

[36]Tenth Annual Report of the Industrial Home, p. 4.

[37]Third Annual Report of the Industrial Home for Girls (1861), p. 6; Eighteenth Annual Report of the Industrial Home for Girls (1876), p. 5; Fifteenth Annual Report of the Industrial Home for Girls (1873), p. 5; Seventeenth Annual Report of the Industrial Home for Girls (1875), p. 5.

[38]Fifth Annual Report of the Industrial Home for Girls (1863), p. 4; Sixth Annual Report of the Industrial Home for Girls (1864), p. 4; Fifteenth Annual Report of the Industrial Home, pp. 4-5; Sixteenth Annual Report of the Industrial Home for Girls (1874), p. 5. Other institutions reported similar difficulties with the "benevolent" persons who took girls. A writer for the Boston Female Asylum complained in 1844 that "it is true that some who apply for them [girls] may have little other purpose than that of obtaining a selfish convenience; the most service at the least price at which it can be procured; that in the idea of servant some may have lost sight of the child . . . . That disappointed in their expectation of finding an obedient and useful domestic, some [masters and mistresses] become impatient and unmindful of their obligations." [Wales], Reminiscences of the Boston Female Asylum, p. 60. Thirty years later the Buffalo Orphan Asylum reported to an investigator that some applicants for girls expected "to procure a girl out of whom they make a perfect drudge." Letchworth, Homes of Homeless Children, p. 125.

[39]Second Annual Report of the New York Children's Aid Society (1855), p. 5; Fourth Annual Report, NYCAS (1857), p. 7; Thurston, The Dependent Child, pp. 92, 102. The last phrase quoted is from the society's

circular "To Farmers, Mechanics, and Manufacturers in the Country," quoted in Thurston, The Dependent Child, p. 101.

[40]Tenth Annual Report, NYCAS (1863), pp. 13, 16; Twelth Annual Report, NYCAS (1865), p. 14; Charles Loring Brace, The Dangerous Classes of New York, and Twenty Years Work Among Them, 3rd. ed. (New York, 1880), pp. 303, 309. Brace's book was first published in 1872.

[41]Brace, The Dangerous Classes, p. 307; Twenty-Third Annual Report, NYCAS (1875), p. 14.

[42]Tenth Annual Report, NYCAS pp. 13, 16; Twenty-First Annual Report, NYCAS (1873), p. 12; Twenty-Third Annual Report, NYCAS, p. 14.

[43]Twenty-Third Annual Report, NYCAS, p. 14; also Eleventh Annual Report, NYCAS (1864), p. 12; Twenty-First Annual Report, NYCAS, p. 14.

[44]Brace, The Dangerous Classes, pp. 309-310; Twenty-Fourth Annual Report, NYCAS (1876), p. 39; Tenth Annual Report, NYCAS, pp. 14, 16; Thirteenth Annual Report, NYCAS (1866), p. 12; Nineteenth Annual Report, NYCAS (1871), p. 16.

[45]See Twenty-Third Annual Report, NYCAS, p. 15; Twenty-Fourth Annual Report, NYCAS, p. 40.

[46]Twenty-First Annual Report, NYCAS, p. 16.

[47]Seventeenth Annual Report, NYCAS (1869), p. 12; Twentieth Annual Report, NYCAS (1872), p. 8; Twenty-

Fourth Annual Report, NYCAS, p. 40; Twenty-Third Annual Report, NYCAS, p. 15. In 1873 the matron had similarly stated that girls "seldom stay long enough to get thoroughly trained. The applications for girls are so numerous that we have to let them take situations." Twenty-First Annual Report, NYCAS, p. 15.

[48]Emma Brace, ed., The Life of Charles Loring Brace: Chiefly Told in His Own Letters (New York, 1894), pp. 251-252; Brace, The Dangerous Classes, p. 315; Charles Loring Brace, "The Little Laborers of New York City," Harper's New Monthly Magazine, August, 1873, p. 329.

[49][Charles Loring Brace], "The Servant Question," The Nation, October 26, 1865. p. 528.

[50]Journal of the matron quoted in Brace, The Dangerous Classes, p. 313; Fifteenth Annual Report, NYCAS (1868), p. 15.

[51]Tenth Annual Report of the Industrial Home for Girls, pp. 6, 7.

CHAPTER IV

IRISH SERVANTS AND THE DESIRE FOR ETHNIC HOMOGENEITY

Other attitudes toward servants besides paternalism rested upon the basic assumption of the mental, educational, and cultural inferiority of domestics as compared with employers. In addition to the desire to direct the servant toward certain habits and values, there was widespread revulsion and contempt for the seeming ignorance and boorishness of domestics. Much of the assumed backwardness and inferiority of servants was linked to the fact that a large proportion of America's domestics were immigrants from the lower classes of Europe. Some wealthy families were able to hire skilled "professional servants" from Europe, but most immigrant domestics were rude peasant girls. This was especially true of the Irish who made up the largest bloc of foreign-born servants and who epitomized the problems involved with unskilled immigrants in service. In the mid-ninteenth century, and particularly after 1850, the public discussion of the servant question was closely and uniquely connected with the

figure of the Irish domestic. Attitudes toward servants and service became intertwined with attitudes toward the Irish. In books and national magazines Irish Bridget became the typical servant even though many native whites as well as substantial numbers of Germans, English, and Negroes were also engaged in service. This misrepresentation of actual conditions was probably due to the fact that most writers came from cities and towns east of the Allegheny Mountains, the places where Irish domestics were particularly common. Nevertheless, it seems significant that in nationally distributed material the Irish girl became the stereotyped servant after 1850.

Although Irish immigrants were initially welcomed as a new source of domestic labor, many Americans turned against them as servants because they were untrained and ignorant and also because they were Catholics and seemed strange and "alien" as members of the household. The divergent ethnic and religious backgrounds of master and servant no doubt contributed to an increased awareness of the cultural differences and social gap between employer and employed. To cure this problem and bring the two parties together, there was talk of maintaining ethnic and cultural homegeneity within the home by encouraging native American girls, who were thought to be suffering in the overcrowded sewing trades, to enter domestic service. If American girls would not become

servants, writers hoped to bring Chinese domestics, who had a reputation for being efficient and docile, into American households.

I

Even before the massive Irish immigration after 1846, which reached its peak between 1847 and 1854, immigrant girls made up a major portion of the servant population in seaboard areas. An 1842 writer found that "a native-born white servant was a novelty;" a New York author noted in 1845 that "Irish and German domestics are almost universally employed in Northern cities." Of the 5706 servants counted by Lemuel Shattuck in Boston in 1845 (the figure includes domestics in both private homes and boardinghouses), 3804 were foreign-born while only 1902 were native Americans.[1]

Even in these years the Irish made up the largest group of immigrant servants. The New York Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants reported each year the nativity of domestics applying at their office. While American-born servants may be underrepresented because they were in greater demand and better acquainted with persons able to assist them, and therefore less in need of the services of an employment agency, the figures of the society indicate that Bridget was very important in service in New York as early as

TABLE 5.--Nativity of Servants Applying to the New York Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants

	Total Domestics	Irish-born	German-born	English-born	Negroes	Native-born Whites
1826	2164	1279	15	126	460	259
1827	3327	1681	18	102	477	995
1828	3383	1859	20	128	510	813
1830	3179	1673	19	137	537	739
1833	3196	2063	17	139	380	511
1836	3920	2549	17	244	542	449

the mid-twenties. These statistics reveal a clear preponderance of Irish domestics; only in 1827 did half as many native whites as Irish apply to the registry. The numbers of German and English-born applicants were consistently low. Employers using the office, and these included many of the first families of the city, had to choose from among principally Irish servants. According to an 1846 estimate there were between 10,000 and 12,000 female domestics in New York City (the figure is probably too low); of these between 7,000 and 8,000 were thought to be Irish while another 2,000 were said to be Germans. Throughout the century German servants tended to be less visible to native writers than the Irish because the former usually worked in German-speaking families because of the language barrier.[2]

It is impossible to determine with complete accuracy the exact importance of the Irish within the total servant

population after 1850. To many Americans it seemed as though Irish girls virtually mononpolized the employemnt. While this was an overstatement for many areas of the country, in eastern cities during the 1850's the Irish vastly outnumbered any other group of servants and did come close to mononpolizing the occupation. A partial, but probably representative, count of Boston servants in 1850 found that of 3107 domestics 2227 had been born in Ireland and only 551 in the United States. A more complete survey of New York City in 1855 recorded 31,749 domestics in the city; of these 23,386 were Irish-born, 4493 were Germans, 665 were English, and 1025 were Negroes. Only 1225 were American-born whites, a very small fraction of the total.[3]

The first complete compilation of data on the nativity of persons in occupational categories was made in the federal census for 1870. When writing of the findings of this census, Francis A. Walker pointed out that the statistics showed many more American-born domestics than had been anticipated. The reason was that by 1870 the second-generation Irish, born in America but Irish by culture, had begun to enter service in large numbers. Although these girls were natives by the census definition, "our general instictive feeling," wrote Walker, "testifies that they are not wholly of us." Because of their different customs, their

clannishness, and "the jealousy of their spiritual teachers toward our popular institutions, . . . we speak of them and think of them as foreigners." Thus the figures for American-born domestics do not accurately represent this group of second-generation Irish who still seemed more Irish than American to employers. Although the percentage of Irish-born domestics in Boston and New York was much lower in 1870 than it had been in the fifties, the proportion of those of Irish extraction and background may have been as high.[4] Surely writers in the seventies agreed with those from the earlier period that few non-Irish servants were available.

Nevertheless, although many domestics listed as native-born were actually second-generation Irish, the 1870 figures indicate that in many parts of the country girls of Irish extraction did not comprise a majority of the domestics and that in rural and western areas large numbers of native American girls must have been at service. In only four states--California, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Rhode Island--did foreign-born servants outnumber those born in the United States, and in only California and Massachusetts were there more Irish than native-born persons in service. Even in states such as New York and New Jersey, Irish domestics seem to have been concentrated in urban areas. In the

TABLE 6.--Nativity of Domestic Servants in Northern States, 1870.

State	Total Domestics	Born in United States	Born in Ireland	Born in Germany	Born in England and Wales	Born in Japan and China
California	15,472	3,872	4,434	1,051	432	4,343
Connecticut	15,104	7,632	6,521	343	311	4
Illinois	44,903	25,684	6,346	5,603	1,097	1
Indiana	22,542	19,840	1,049	1,192	122	0
Iowa	15,725	15,118	177	182	60	0
Maine	11,321	9,344	918	11	102	0
Massachusetts	45,770	18,245	21,396	398	1,029	5
Minnesota	8,556	3,786	599	977	86	0
New Hampshire	7,481	6,482	637	10	50	0
New Jersey	26,242	14,296	9,216	1,595	581	2
New York	155,150	79,506	55,370	10,390	3,336	17
Ohio	53,599	40,554	5,587	5,270	972	1
Pennsylvania	84,343	61,682	16,451	3,431	1,490	1
Rhode Island	6,201	2,873	2,780	51	188	0
Vermont	9,588	7,997	688	7	68	0
Wisconsin	19,141	10,481	1,067	3,601	467	0

From Francis A. Walker, comp., The Ninth Census of the United States, [Census Reports], I, The Statistics of Population in the United States (Washington, 1872), Table XXX, pp. 722-764.

TABLE 7.--Nativity of Domestic Servants in Major Northern Cities, 1870

State	Total Domestics	Born in United States	Born in Ireland	Born in Germany	Born in England and Wales	Born in Japan and China
Albany	2,724	1,107	1,329	161	39	0
Boston	14,026	4,041	7,595	179	343	0
Brooklyn	16,208	3,579	10,408	1,157	458	3
Buffalo	4,209	2,207	957	596	110	0
Chicago	12,279	3,753	3,503	2,064	330	0
Cincinnati	8,625	3,921	2,309	2,027	160	0
Cleveland	2,787	1,061	760	612	142	0
Indianapolis	1,853	1,358	290	140	24	0
Jersey City	2,666	652	1,689	173	80	0
Milwaukee	2,575	1,055	255	890	58	0
Newark	2,680	933	1,286	334	50	0
New Haven	2,168	824	1,187	104	39	0
New York	49,440	17,325	24,269	5,406	905	9
Philadelphia	24,108	11,506	10,044	1,593	504	0
Pittsburgh	2,867	1,475	895	332	96	0
Providence	2,840	965	1,579	26	79	0
Rochester	1,994	1,531	222	111	23	0
San Francisco	6,800	883	3,046	671	221	1,256
Syracuse	1,834	902	608	142	66	0
Troy	1,327	245	933	52	48	0
Worcester	1,568	638	822	4	31	0

From Francis A. Walker, comp., The Ninth Census of the United States, [Census Reports], I, The Statistics of Population in the United States (Washington, 1872), Table XXXII, pp. 775-804.

principally rural states of northern New England and the Midwest, the large majority of the servant population was American-born. For example, in Ohio there were eight native-born domestics for every one of Irish birth and nineteen for every one in Indiana. Even allowing for second-generation immigrants, most servants in these states were surely native Americans.[5]

Immigrants were much more common as domestics in urban centers, however. In every city along the east coast, except Philadelphia, where Negro servants were especially common, there were more Irish-born than American-born domestics. In Boston, Brooklyn, Jersey City, Providence, and Troy the margin in favor of the Irish was very wide, reaching almost four Irish-born domestics to every one American in Troy. When second-generation Irish are included, the large majority, and in some cases virtually all, of the servants in the cities east of the Alleghenies must have been of Irish extraction. In the largest Midwestern cities--Chicago, Cincinnati, and Cleveland--native-born domestics were outnumbered by the combined total of Irish and Germans. While in every city west of Troy and Albany, except San Francisco, there were more American-born than Irish-born servants, in only three cities--Buffalo, Indianapolis, and Rochester--were a clear majority of domestics of American rather than foreign birth. In only Indianapolis and Rochester were most servants probably native

Americans rather than first or second-generation immigrants.[6] Writers, who generally reflected the standards of urban areas, certainly perceived Irish dominance in the occupation and made Bridget the standard servant character in material written after 1850.

Prior to the massive Irish immigration of the late 1840's, there was much sympathy in America for the victims of alleged British opression although even then Irish immigrants were regarded as "poor, dirty, and ignorant." Americans were attracted to the humerous, generous, and warm-hearted impulses of the Irish. In the forties many sentimental tales appeared romanticizing the heroism and virtue of the simple, peasant immigrant. Lydia Maria Child was one who found much that was poetic in the imaginative soul of the Irish. Admiring their "glowing hearts and reverent credulity," she mused "I love the Irish. Blessings on their warm hearts and their leaping fancies!" Samuel Griswold Goodrich, "Peter Parley" to his young readers, called upon Americans to welcome the sufferers of English tyranny. Through all their trials, the Irish retained their "keen sense of justice," their gallant hope, and their cheerfulness; they therefore deserved American compassion.[7]

Since, according to Americans, the English had left the Irish ignorant and unskilled, it was said to

require much energy and patience to make a newly arrived Irish girl into a valuable domestic. Catharine Sedgwick and Sarah Josepha Hale, who both apparently considered Irish servants to be common in the 1830's, thought the effort involved in training an immigrant girl was worthwhile since the appreciative domestic would almost surely repay such kindness with loyalty. Mrs. Hale wrote:

> I am aware that it is the fashion with many ladies to disparage Irish domestics, call them stupid, ignorant, impudent, ungrateful, the plagues of housekeeping. That they are ignorant is true enough; it does require skill, patience, and judgment, to teach a raw Irish girl how to perform the work in a gentleman's family; but if they are taught in the right manner, they prove very capable, and are most faithful and affectionate domestics.

As Mrs. Hale noted, however, Irish servants had already acquired a reputation for being ignorant and useless. Timothy Shay Arthur, best remembered for his temperance stories, agreed that Irish girls need not be "slovenly and dirty." If the mistress were kindly and forbearing and gave detailed instruction, an immigrant girl would be anxious to please her.[8]

Firmly established in domestic service before 1846, Irish girls became still more common as servants after large-scale immigration began. Prior to the late forties writers sometimes complained of "the scarcity of domestics." Catherine Beecher expressed concern that the increasing wealth of America meant that more and more families wanted to hire a servant but that fewer

and fewer women found it necessary to enter menial work. Only "the supply of poverty-stricken foreigners" enabled every family wanting one to have a domestic. Whatever shortage may have existed was alleviated by the influx of single girls of working age, who made up a significant part of Irish immigration. Accordingly, the Irish immigrants were initially welcomed as a large body of hopefully docile domestics who would keep wages down. An English traveler found that Irish girls were indispensable and "solved an immense difficulty." Irish servants, he reported, "are here received with a sigh of delight" in spite of their lack of skill. In later years Harriet Prescott Spofford, though disgusted with "the Irish occupation of the household," admitted that "when they first came into our homes we hailed them with open arms." Another woman agreed that since the Irish had arrived at just the time when American women were beginning to move out of service into factory work and the sewing trades, the immigrants "were looked upon as a Godsend . . . ."[9]

Despite the initial welcome extended to the Irish in hopes that they would solve America's servant problem, employers rather quickly became disillusioned with and even hostile toward the foreigners who had become such an important part of their households. Ethnic differences helped to increase the consciousness of the social gap

between employer and employed, led the mistress to view the domestic as culturally inferior and disagreeably alien, and, in general, fostered an growing sense of class consciousness as ethnic differences reinforced class divisions. Irish characteristics and lower-class attributes and occupations tended to become synonymous. Because of their alien ways, servants seemed more and more apart from and inferior to the middle and upper classes of America. Class lines became more clear and more fixed as lower-class occupations, including service, became associated with a particular and easily distinguishable ethnic group, the Irish.[10]

To many people the degradation of menial service and the degradation of the Irish immigrant who made her living at service reaffirmed one another. The Irish seemed more lower-class because they were in domestic labor, and the work itself seemed more menial because the Irish dominated it. Immigrant girls gravitated toward domestic work because it offered relatively high wages to unskilled workers. In turn, some writers began to think that only "servile," unspirited, and "inferior" persons would enter service at all. Domestic work was said to be looked down upon because of the type of vulgar, backward Irish who were so common in it. Mrs. Croly thought the occupation would be more respected when more respectable women engaged in it. One of the

principal reasons given why American girls avoided becoming servants was that they did not wish "to associate and be ranked with common Irish servants."[11]

Although it was usually agreed that an immigrant girl would be able to earn more money as a servant in America than in her homeland, writers pointed out that social equality and acceptance were not extended to the Irish in their adopted country. Speaking specifically of servants, Sidney George Fisher found that the Irish "have taken the position of an inferior race in the business of life, because by nature and education fitted for it." As to the immigrant Irish, "the theoretical equality of our law is denied by practice and opinion." Their coming to the United States "has gradually and silently built up in the North an aristocracy of race . . . . It is not yet represented in our politics and law, . . . but it is felt and understood, and acted on universally, and rules the working of society in all its departments." Fisher noted that the occupations engaged in by foreigners were those which "imply inferiority and subjection to the will of another." The growth of the Irish population, "an inferior race and class theoretically equal," was said to "have created orders of society as distinctly marked in disparity of education and habits as those of Europe." Fisher thus concluded that mass immigration had sharpened class

lines in America. Writing in 1859, E. L. Godkin, who had been born in Ireland of English parents, agreed with this assessment. "The prodigious influx of Irish during the last twenty years," he wrote, "has created a large Irish class, apart from the rest of the people, poor, ignorant, helpless, and degraded, contemned by the Americans . . . ." Godkin went on to state that immigration, "instead . . . of effacing all distinction, has traced it more deeply." He explained that "the line of demarcation between the English colonist and the 'mere Irish' of the seventeenth century in Ireland was hardly more strongly marked than that which today separates the Irish American from the native American, political inequalities of course excepted."[12]

Many authors writing for the middle and upper classes were disturbed by the immigrant's failure to understand the proper difference between political equality and social equality. Writers often complained that ignorant Irish girls took "high flown" ideas of social equality much too literally. With her "exaggerated" notions of equality, Bridget was said to believe herself "as good as a lady" and "as good as anybody" despite her "rude tongue" and "uncouth manners" simply because she was in America. Authors considered such notions absurd; mistresses viewed such "high-notioned" girls as assertive, impertinent, and presumptuous. Foreigners entertained

"strange ideas of what is meant by all being 'free and equal;'" they did not "know their places" and even demanded "privileges." According to Eunice Beecher, these "erroneous views" of liberty and equality soon turned the recently arrived "modest stranger" into a bold and wilful girl who resisted direction. Mrs. Stowe noted that the "vague notions of freedom and equality entertained by immigrant domestics were frequently "unreasonable."[13]

Of the several factors which had eroded American sympathy for the Irish generally, wrote Godkin, "one of the most prominent, and probably most powerful--[was] the conduct of the Irish servant girl in the American kitchen." The meals ruined by Irish blunders had prepared Americans to believe the very worst of the race; "it is in the kitchen that the Irish iron has entered the American soul . . . ." It was generally agreed that most Irish-born domestics were dirty, vulgar, ignorant, and awkward. Coming from a rural, peasant background, Irish girls were totally unacquainted with the manners and comforts of urban, middle-class life. Mistresses, who had to spend much time patiently training these girls and supervising them closely, complained constantly of their ignorance and carelessness. Unless and until the employer made great efforts to instruct the girl in housework and watched over her closely, Irish

domestics were said to be wasteful, indelicate, careless, "uncleanly," and virtually worthless. Even after she had been trained, Bridget retained a reputation for breaking dishes, ruining meals, misusing utensils, and generally making a shambles of domestic comfort. In short, it was a standard complaint, voiced by author after author, that Irish servants were incompetent and very inadequate for American needs.[14]

This awkwardness and unskilled blundering provided writers with a source of material for comedy pieces which often had an unfriendly sting. As Charles Dickens' magazine All The Year Round noted concerning American servant humor:

> Comic writers and artists have 'shown up' 'Biddy' and her belongings in all sorts of ridiculous, absurd, and odious lights; finding in her ignorance, stupidity, impulsiveness, irascibility, and . . . crude notions of self-assertion, an apparently inexhaustible mine of subjects. All her foibles have been descanted upon, illustrated, and laughed at, sometimes in a not very generous or considerate spirit.

Even a didactic writer such as T. S. Arthur, whose stories often called for a more compassionate attitude toward servants, was unable to resist recounting, under pseudonyms, rather unfriendly "laughable stories" about Irish domestics "for the reader's amusement . . . ."[15]

Such comedy was common in fiction and cartoons from the forties through the seventies, but it was most prevalent and most unsympathatic in the 1850's, when

Know-Nothingism was at its peak. In these humorous sketches Bridget's stupidity and failings were exaggerated for comic effect. Much of the humor of these stories depended on the bewildered girl's tendency to take her mistress's instructions too literally. One employer who had just hired a raw Irish girl tells the new domestic "we'll have some sausages with the tea;" the uncomprehending servant, who "went ahead of everything for ignorance," boiled the sausages in the kettle with the tea. While Bridget's greatest failure was in the kitchen, where she did "not know the difference between a bean and a pumpkin," she was also puzzled by the door bell and even the use of drinking glasses. The Irish domestic's presumptuous assertiveness was also ridiculed; her efforts at fashionable dress and polite manners were shown to be vulgar imitations. One girl could not understand that she was not permitted in the parlor and could not "thump" on the employer's piano. Such efforts at social equality were made at appear ludicrous.[16]

One of the principal obstacles to acceptance of Irish domestics was their Catholicism. Godkin found the religious division the "crowning and damning" difference which kept Irish and native Americans apart. Religion was a major factor in accentuating the gap between the parlor and the kitchen. One writer on the servant question decided that Catholics were often "spoken of

in terms almost of hatred by other Christians." Such feelings were fed by warnings such as that issued by Josiah Gilbert Holland, an advocate of self-help and later the editor of Scribner's Monthly, that Catholic servants thought of their employers as contemptible heretics destined for damnation. Anti-papal and anti-Catholic speakers and writers warned mistresses not to employ Catholic domestics, "lest they turn out to be Jesuit spies." A Catholic writer asked rhetorically:

> How many a good Protestant lady has heard from her pulpit and read in her religious weekly, that her servant Bridget is a committee of one from this society [the Jesuits] to report the affairs of the family to the priest, who, in turn, will report to the bishop, whose duty it will be to lay the whole matter before the Pope!

Robert Tomes observed that "there are still many fastidiously pious folks, who, seeing in every Catholic servant a Jesuit in disguise, believe that their own faith can only be secured by having their dinners cooked and beds made by Protestant hands."[17] While a few newspaper advertisements for servants placed by employers stipulated "No Irish need apply," it seems to have been far more common to advertise specifically for Protestant girls. In the papers of major cities a very large share of the advertisements for servants after 1850 stated that only Protestants would be considered for the situation.

The Irish domestic was not entirely without her defenders, however. Mistresses were requested to be

patient and sympathetic, bearing in mind the lack of opportunities for education and refinement open to the girl in her homeland. Americans were particularly impressed with the way Irish girls diligently saved money in order to send remittances to their poor relatives still in Ireland. This example of thrift and generosity to those left behind led some to overlook "many of their serious defects of training and character" and even the fact that they "generally make but sorry domestics." Furthermore, a variety of commentators agreed that Bridget was industrious, willing, eager to please, cheerful, and "almost invariably chaste." Virginia Townsend, editor of Arthur's Home Magazine, found Irish domestics to be generally warm-hearted and well-intentioned; if carefully and patiently trained they could be loyal and capable servants. Other writers similiarly concluded that a wise and benevolent mistress could fashion a good domestic from the simple peasant girl if she were willing to take the necessary trouble to teach her.[18]

By the 1870's, however, many writers seem to have given up entirely on awkward and inefficient Irish servants, denouncing them as generally incapable of all improvement. Not one Irish woman in a hundred, wrote Eunice Beecher, "can by any amount of care, patience, or indefatigable teaching, be transformed into a neat,

energetic, faithful, truth-telling servant." Jane C. Croly attacked Bridget as a household "pest," calling her "the destroyer of peace and comfort." While Godkin himself thought that much of the feeling against Irish domestics was unwarranted, he admitted that most employers accepted the statement, quoted from The Atlantic Monthly, that the Irish servant had shown "a lack of every quality which makes service endurable to the employer, or a wholesome life for the servant." This article further charged that Bridget had proved herself to be "in obedience, fidelity, care, and accuracy, the inferior of every kind of servant known to modern society." Godkin noted that "this indictment is a tolerably fair rendering, if not of the actual facts of the case, at least of the impression the facts have left on the mind of the average employer."[19]

II

Two divergent and indeed contradictory proposals were suggested as means to alleviating American dependence on the Irish and securing more faithful and capable servants. First, there was widespread discussion of attracting larger numbers of poor, native American girls into service. Others, however, eagerly awaited the expected day when Chinese menservants would replace Bridget. Many writers wanted to obtain domestics sharing more of their own values and habits while others desired servants still more alien than the Irish, but who would be more docile and efficient.

Many writers expressed the desire to remove "the alien and the stranger" from the kitchen and replace them with native servants who would have the same religion and cultural background as the employer. While this argument was made before the Civil War, it became more common from the mid-sixties on. American girls, it was believed, would be better domestics and would also be more desirable and amenable candidates for employer paternalism. It was thought that native American girls were concentrated in the overcrowded sewing trades, in which they lived under miserable conditions and worked for subsistence wages. Authors pointed out the many advantages these girls would presumably enjoy if they went into domestic work. Service was actually pleasant and healthful; only "foolish" notions of pride and respectability kept American girls out of such an agreeable occupation. In her book The Chimney Corner, Harriet Beecher Stowe emphasized the advantages of domestic labor for native girls. She summarized her argument as follows: While many American girls live in poverty as seamstresses

> there is lying, neglected and despised, a calling to which womanly talents and instincts are peculiarly fitted,--a calling full of opportunities of the most lasting usefulness,--a calling which insures a settled home, respectable protection, healthful exercise, good air, good food, and good wages,--a calling in which a woman may make real friends, and secure to herself warm affection . . . .

This pleasurable employment was, of course, domestic service.[20]

Many others agreed with Mrs. Stowe that service was better paying, more healthful, actually easier, and more warmly affectionate in character than sewing work. Mistresses were described as "loving friends" offering comfortable homes, protection, sympathy, and a chance to associate with refined persons to those native girls who would rescue employers from the "plague" of Irish servants. The daughters of American farmers, laborers, and mechanics were advised to give up their "senseless prejudice" against service and take advantage of these opportunities. "Intelligent and neat-handed" Americans would be warmly welcomed into the homes of employers in place of stupid and dirty foreigners. The girls themselves would be better off in this "safe and useful" occupation which offered "light, healthy exercise" and kind treatment. In fact, Robert Tomes and others calling for reform of the nature of service to give more personal freedom to domestics did so largely in hopes of thereby attracting American girls into domestic work.[21]

An important part of the rationale for this call for native girls to enter service was the presentation of an idealized and nostalgic version of the delights of service for all concerned in the dimly remembered days when most servants had allegedly been native "helps."

Men who had grown up in rural areas but now lived in the city recalled a paternalistic and patronizing picture of service in their rural youth; in this picture there appeared a faithful, obedient type of native servant who was an excellent worker and a paragon of domestic virtue and propriety. It seems unlikely that American "helps" in the early years of the century had always been the joy to manage that they were fondly remembered to be. Earlier Americans had found them often assertive and inconveniently democratic in manner. But such republicanism was now forgotten, replaced by a glow of warm paternalism and ethnic homogeneity. Tomes, for one, asserted that at one time domestic life had been marked by "a sympathy which softened the harshness of service into the gentleness of companionship." American girls were said to have served faithfully for long periods; there was then, wrote Samuel Griswold Goodrich in 1856,

> a perfectly good understanding and good feeling between the masters and servants. The latter were not Irish; they had not yet imbibed the plebian envy of those above them, which has since so generally embittered and embarrassed American domestic life . . . . Our servants, during all my early life, were of the neighborhood, generally the daughters of respectable farmers and mechanics, and respecting others were themselves respected and cherished. They were always devoted to the interests of the family, and were always relied upon and treated as friends

James Russell Lowell presented a similar view; in "former" days service

> was not seldom an inheritance, nor was household peace dependent on the whim of a foreign armed neutrality in the kitchen. Servant and master were of one stock; there was decent authority and becoming respect; the tradition of the Old World lingered after its superstition had passed away.[22]

This golden age of domestic efficiency and tranquility could be restored, it was believed, if only native Protestant girls would again enter middle and upper-class homes as servants.

Mary Abigail Dodge thought that the lives of New York mistresses, "who are annoyed, hindered, and injured by the incapacity of foreign servants," might be made "smooth and peaceful" if their domestics were Americans. A faithful, efficient native girl "could speedily become an honored and valued member of the family, and secure herself a home that would last as long as the family held together." She also pointed out that more social equality between mistress and servant might be possible if they were of homegeneous background. Domestics, she thought, were not treated as equals and were not permitted to eat at the family table because

> it is not reasonable to expect that an intelligent American woman [the mistress] should be willing to consort with low and ignorant foreigners. But it would scarcely be hazardous to predict, that if intelligent American women would go into American kitchens, they would quickly drive out the unintelligent foreigners; and, for the rest, the matter of equality is simply trivial. Social position adjusts itself where there is social worth.[23]

A more complete argument concerning this point that American servants would be accepted and assimilated into

American households more readily than the Irish was presented by Harriet Prescott Spofford. In regard to the Irish, she found,

> the different nationality of the maid, her unlettered state, her strange habits of speech, her wild traditions, her outlandish custom of wakes . . . may make her seem something like a creature of another race, a rougher and more primitive race . . . , a creature whom one with difficulty feels to be an individual of the family, or recognizes as the possessor of sensibilities as delicate as one's own . . . .
> . . . . . .
> Mutual forbearance goes a great way between mistress and maid, native and foreigner, Catholic and Protestant; but when the elements are naturally so antagonistic, and the interests so utterly apart, union is hardly possible, there is always something foreign in the household, and there is disintegration at the very foundation of home; but with servants of our own race, religion, and habits, the family is complete.

Because they would understand the manners, institutions, and wishes of American employers better than Irish girls, native domestics "who sympathize with us religiously and as a people . . . could be infinitely more agreeable members of our families than those now in place there . . . ." American girls would be "capable of resolution into that household, as the present servant is not capable." If the daughters of poorer natives would only become domestics, they could have more pleasant jobs and the life of the wealthier classes would be improved.[24]

This argument assumed that an American girl would always "make herself one with the household in feeling." Mrs. Spofford thought that "the good and faithful

American servant is always part of the family; she makes its interests her own, and identifies herself with it . . . ." "Knowing her place and keeping it," such a domestic would never be rudely "self-assertive" but would follow the will of her employers. Thus, with American domestics the paternal ideal of master and servant could be fulfilled. The domestic would seem "more like a relative than a servant, and will be cared for in her old age with something like veneration."[25]

Judging by the continuing lamentations on the absence of American domestics, employers apparently felt that their appeals met with little success. Any seamstress who did contemplate switching to service might have been dissuaded if she had read Louisa May Alcott's story "How I Went Out to Service," published in 1874. The tale was largely autobiographical, being based closely on Louisa's experiences in 1851 when at age eighteen she went out as a domestic to prove her independence. Here was the story of a native girl in service, a girl from a well-known and respected family. Louisa's employer was a minister who "set forth the delights awaiting the happy soul who should secure this home. He described it as a sort of heaven on earth." She was told she would "be one of the family in all respects, and only required to help about the lighter work . . . ." Ostensibly hired as a companion for the

minister's frail sister, Louisa actually received "endless" demands for service (she was to cook, wash the dishes, and scrub) and much scolding from "the reverend tyrant." When she balked at becoming a companion to the minister, who wanted Louisa to read to him and sympathize with his problems, "even the roughest work" was given to her. She became responsible for such duties as carrying water and splitting firewood. Upon quitting after seven weeks of hard and disagreeable work, she was paid the "paltry sum" of four dollars. Miss Alcott's first biographer noted that if this was the experience of the daughter of an esteemed Boston family in the home of a minister, surely much worse awaited many other girls.[26] It may be that American girls who resisted the argument that they should go into service were wise in their skepticism toward the promises made by employers.

Not everyone advocated that American girls enter kitchens in order to solve the problem of domestic labor. The small number who argued against this suggested panacea did so on a variety of grounds. Occasionally someone indicated that it was a myth to believe that American girls would be devoted domestics. Godkin wrote that "those who have ever tried the experiment of late years of employing a native American as a servant have, we believe, before it was over, generally come to look

upon Bridget as the personification of repose, if not of comfort . . . ." Native girls were even more forward and demanding than the Irish and might even want to sit at the employer's table. A second, related reason to oppose the proposal was put forward by Virginia Townsend, who pointed out that an employer would always be afraid of wounding the feelings of an American girl whereas Bridget was less sensitive and more willing to accept whatever treatment she received. "Could you put just the same sort of drudgery . . . on your countrywoman's shoulders? In short, give precisely the same orders to, and make the same demands on her that you do on your Irish girl?" Others suggested that if the sewing trades were indeed overcrowded, American girls, who were presumed to have more intelligence and ability than foreigners, should leave menial work to the immigrants and enter the new occupations opening up for women as saleswomen, clerical workers, and skilled workers such as florists. These jobs offered higher status, greater independence, and frequently higher wages than domestic work. Most American girls "have really abilities which, if rightly cultivated and directed, might lead them far higher" than service. Native girls equipped for "better things" should not be advised to go into a menial employment where they would lose their personal freedom.

> I cannot believe that an influx of American girls will prove an advantage either to the service or to the girls themselves. The system will remain

> the same, and, until this is changed, all its evils will cling to it; and the girls, instead of being able to elevate the standard of domestic service, will find themselves crowded down to its present level.

Moreover, immigrant women were said to be generally unfit for any occupation other than menial housework; if American girls with their "more acute perceptions" pushed the Irish out of domestic service, as they surely would, these foreigners would be forced into destitution or crime.[27]

If American girls refused to become domestics, mistresses would turn instead, claimed Mrs. Spofford, to "the machine, the Chinese machine, the imitative and accurate worker" for relief from Irish maids and cooks. She and others concluded that eventually "without doubt the oriental must come." Except in California, he never did come, however, and little actually resulted from such discussion; only thirty-one Chinese servants were counted in all the Northeastern states in 1870. Writing in 1875, Francis Walker noted that "the great domestic revolution which was heralded in the newspapers and magazines with so much noise five years ago, as about to follow the advent of the Children of the Sun, has, like many another announced revolution, failed to come off." Virtually all the Chinese domestics in the United States remained on the West Coast, but in the late sixties and early seventies there was widespread talk of the wonderful

days which lay ahead if and when every American family could enjoy the comfort of a Chinese houseboy.[28]

California was the state with the largest number of Chinese servants, who were all males, and much of the testimony taken in San Francisco in 1876 by Congress' Joint Special Committee to Investigate Chinese Immigration dealt with their usefulness as domestics. Although a few of the California citizens who testified said that Chinese domestics were dishonest, most agreed that they were industrious, cleanly, intelligent, systematic, meticulous, and generally compared very favorably with the Irish. Despite their ignorance of the English language and American ways of life, the Chinese were said to make excellent servants; a houseboy was a "mere machine" who would faithfully and exactly carry out the instructions given him. They were reputed to be imitative and very quick to learn. While Irish and American domestics were obtainable in San Francisco and some of the larger towns in California, virtually all the domestics in the more remote areas were Chinese.[29]

Favorable reports from California led Easterners to yearn for the day when they might acquire a Chinese houseboy to replace their troublesome Bridgets. Although a few pointed out that the Chinese were also likely to be provoking and were, on the whole, not much better than any other group of servants,[30] many writers thought they

saw a solution to all their domestic worries in the Chinese. The quick, efficient Chinese would offer competition to the Irish and would certainly drive out the latter so that a mistress need no longer depend on a series of "dirty" Irish girls. It became an article of faith that houseboys had all the attributes of perfect servants, that they were faithful, thrifty, orderly, and neat. At the same time Bridget was denounced for her failure in all these areas. The "deft hands" of the Chinese would replace "the curse of Irish servants" who made "housekeeping a prolonged misery." Moreover, that the Chinese "are not Roman Catholics and can never be made so, is a gain not to be disputed." If the choice was between a Catholic and a non-Christian with his "diabolical observances," many stood ready to choose the heathen as a more acceptable member of the household.[31]

The Chinese were also believed to be properly "docile" and "tractable" because of the servile conditions they had grown accustomed to in China. They were described as a long-suffering race who did not quickly rebel in the face of oppression and who were used to obeying directions and orders. Writers agreed that they were deferential and even "servile;" one woman with a Chinese cook found him "blindly obedient and contented . . . like a good automaton." The frequent

references to the Chinese as "machines" indicate that they were thought to be controllable servants who responded automatically to orders and made no trouble. After experiences with allegedly "high-notioned" Irish domestics, many mistresses looked forward hopefully to the happy day, which never came, of the Chinese houseboy who would be decently respectful to authority.[32]

With the development of a large number of Irish domestics, ethnic tensions complicated the master-servant relationship. The close association of service with the Irish, who were often regarded as "ignorant and uncleanly," worked to lower the status of both the occupation and the immigrant. In the eyes of employers, Irish entrance into domestic work widened the social and cultural distance between the mistress and the maid and thereby increased class consciousness within the house. Irish girls stigmatized themselves socially by engaging in menial work; service, on the other hand, became thought of as the province of vulgar, inferior foreigners. To restore the status of the occupation and obtain domestics who would seem more like themselves and hence more desirable, American employers wistfully talked about bringing more native girls, the daughters of poorer fellow countrymen, into their homes. Few doubted that American girls were better people and better workers than the Irish; this assumed superiority was used to argue both

for and against inducing American girls to enter service. In their desperation to be rid of Bridget, employers looked hopefully toward the Chinese who, though strange and alien, were thought to be intelligent, efficient, and docile. But best of all they simply were not Irish, and it seems to have been believed that any change would have to have been an improvement.

NOTES

[1]"Domestic Servitude," The Knickerbocker, June, 1842, p. 524; D[avid] Meredith Reese, ed., Thomas Webster and Mrs. Francis Parkes, An Encyclopedia of Domestic Economy: Comprising Such Subjects as Are Most Immediately Connected with Housekeeping (New York, 1845), p. 366; Lemuel Shattuck, Report of the Committee of the City Council Appointed to Obtain the Census of Boston for The Year 1845 (Boston, 1846), p. 85.

[2]The yearly figures from the New York society are given in each of its annual reports. Young America, January 24, 1846; Robert Ernst, Immigrant Life in New York, 1825-1863 (New York, 1849), p. 66; "The Greatest Plague in Life," Arthur's Home Magazine, June, 1860, p. 363.

[3]Oscar Handlin, Boston's Immigrants: A Study in Acculturation (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), p. 253; Ernst, Immigrant Life in New York, pp. 214-215.

[4]Francis A. Walker, "Our Domestic Service," Scribner's Monthly, December, 1875, p. 277. In the 1870 census no distinction was made between Negroes and Whites of American birth. The inclusion of Negroes further inflated the statistics for native-born domestics.

[5]Ibid.; see Table 6.

[6]See Table 7.

[7]Frances Wright, Views of Society and Manners in America, ed., Paul R. Baker (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), p. 238; Lydia Maria Child, Letters from New York, first series (New York, 1844), pp. 243-244; Samuel Griswold Goodrich, "A Sympathetic View of the Irish Immigrant," in Edith Abbott, ed., Historical Aspects of the Immigration Problem: Select Documents (Chicago, 1926), pp. 739-742. For typical sentimental stories dealing with Irish immigrants in this decade see, for example, Catharine Sedgwick, "The Post Office," Graham's Magazine, August, 1843, pp. 61-67; Lydia Maria Child, "The Irish Heart," Fact and Fiction: A Collection of Stories (New York, 1846), pp. 77-90.

[8]Catharine Sedgwick, Live and Let Live; or, Domestic Service Illustrated (New York, 1837), pp. 70-71; Sarah Josepha Hale, The Good Housekeeper; or, The Way to Live Well and To Be Well While We Live (Boston, 1839), pp. 122-123; Timothy Shay Arthur, "Hiring a Servant," Godey's Lady's Book, March, 1842, pp. 166-171.

[9]Eliza Farrar, The Young Lady's Friend (Boston, 1837), p. 231; Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy, for the Use of Young Ladies at Home and at School (New York, 1842), pp. 40-41; Handlin, Boston's Immigrants p. 61; William Chambers, Things as They Are in America (London and Edinburgh, 1854), pp. 188-189; Harriet Prescott Spofford, The Servant Girl Question

(Boston, 1881), pp. 5, 30; "The Housekeeper's Millennium," Lippincott's Magazine, July, 1869, p. 80.

[10]For a general discussion on the impact of immigration on class structure in New York City see Douglas T. Miller, Jacksonian Aristocracy: Class and Democracy in New York, 1830-1860 (New York, 1967), pp. 99-105.

[11][Harriet Beecher Stowe], The Chimney Corner (Boston, 1868), p. 14; Robert Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household (New York, 1875), pp. 121-122, 125-127, 133; [Charles Loring Brace], "The Servant Question," The Nation, October 26, 1865, p. 528; [Jane C. Croly], "Household Needs," Demorest's Monthly Magazine, May, 1869, p. 188; Lula Gray Noble, "A Small Part of the Woman Question," Scribner's Monthly, February, 1872, p. 485.

[12][Sidney George Fisher], "Domestic Servants," North American and United States Gazette [Philadelphia], May 27, 1857; Life and Letters of Edwin Lawrence Godkin, ed., Rollo Ogden (New York, 1907), I, pp. 182, 184. Godkin's letter was written March 16, 1859.

[13]Sarah E. Henshaw, "The Kitchen," Lippincott's Magazine, September, 1868, p. 312; Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household, pp. 131-132; Eunice Beecher, Motherly Talks with Young Housekeepers (New York, 1873), p. 304; [Fisher], "Domestic Servants;" Virginia Penny,

The Employments of Women: A Cyclopedia of Woman's Work (Boston, 1863), pp. 426-427; [Jane C. Croly], "Household Service," Demorest's Monthly Magazine, January, 1873, pp. 15-16; [Harriet Beecher Stowe], House and Home Papers (Boston, 1865), p. 210; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 89; Abby Sage Richardson, "A Plea for Chinese Labor," Scribner's Monthly, July, 1871. p. 289.

[14][E. L. Godkin], "The Morals and Manners of the Kitchen," The Nation, January 2, 1873, p. 6. Denunciations of Irish incompetence can be found running throughout the literature of the servant question written after 1850. For representative examples see [Harriet Prescott Spofford], "Bridget," Harper's Bazar, November 11, 1871, p. 706; [Croly], "Household Service," Demorest's, January, 1873, p. 16.

[15]"Servants in America," All the Year Round, October 3, 1874, p. 585; [Timothy Shay Arthur], "Cooks," Godey's Lady's Book, May 1852, p. 395.

[16][Arthur], "Cooks," p. 395; Kate Harrington, "Irish Blunders," Godey's Lady's Book, September, 1855, p. 247; Virginia De Forest, "Biddy's Blunders," Godey's Lady's Book, April, 1855, p. 329. For several other such sketches by Arthur see his stories "Something More About Cooks," "Lots of Things," and "Pavement Washing in Winter" all in Confessions of a Housekeeper (Philadelphia, 1852).

[17]Life and Letters of Edwin Lawrence Godkin, I, p. 183; "Parlor and Kitchen," Lippincott's Magazine, August, 1869, p. 210; [Josiah Gilbert Holland], Letters to the Joneses, (New York, 1863), p. 94; Carl Wittke, We Who Built America: The Saga of the Immigrant (New York, 1939), p. 489; Rev. James O'Connor, "Anti-Catholic Prejudice," American Catholic Quarterly Review, I, January, 1876, p. 13; Robert Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," Harper's New Monthly Magazine, June, 1864, p. 57. For an example of the type of literature which warned against Catholic servants as Jesuit spies, see the American edition of the English book The Female Jesuit; or, The Spy in the Family by Jemima Thompson Luke (New York, 1851). See especially pp. vii-ix which purport to prove that Catholic chambermaids in America sometimes kept notes on the finances, politics, religious attitudes, and general character of the families for whom they worked. These detailed notes were allegedly sent to the Jesuits and eventually to Rome.

[18]"Our Irish Immigrants," Arthur's Home Magazine, October, 1854, pp. 245-246; "Editor's Table," Godey's Lady's Book, August, 1860, pp. 174-175; [Stowe], House and Home Papers, pp. 219-220; John Francis Maguire, The Irish in America (New York, 1868), pp. 315-319, 333-337; Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," Harper's, June, 1864, p. 57; Virginia Townsend, "Our Irish Girls,"

Arthur's Home Magazine, November, 1875, pp. 668-669; Thomas Low Nichols, Forty Years of American Life, 1821-1861 (New York, 1937), p. 155.

[19]Eunice Beecher, Motherly Talks, p. 249; [Croly], "Household Service," Demorest's, January, 1873, p. 16; [Godkin], "The Morals and Manners of the Kitchen," The Nation, January 2, 1873, p. 6.

[20][Stowe], The Chimney Corner, p. 17.

[21]Elizabeth Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper: A Cyclopedia of Domestic Economy (New York, 1857), p. 30; "Honorable Service," Harper's Bazar, December 19, 1869, p. 946; Letter from Eleanor Kirk, The Revolution, June 11, 1868, p. 358; "Table Talk," Putnam's Magazine, May 1868 p. 648; Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, "What Shall They Do?," Harper's New Monthly Magazine, September, 1867, p. 521; Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," Harper's, June, 1864, p. 59; Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household, pp. 132, 137; "Editor's Table," Godey's Lady's Book, April, 1863, p. 397.

[22]Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household, pp. 121-122; Samuel Griswold Goodrich, Recollections of a Lifetime (New York and Auburn, 1856), I, pp. 84-85; James Russell Lowell, Works, II, Literary Essays, (Boston and New York, 1892), p. 290; see also [Stowe], The Chimney Corner, pp. 50-51; Grace A. Ellis, "Our Household Service," The Galaxy, September, 1872, p. 352;

[Fisher], "Domestic Servants," North American and United States Gazette [Philadelphia], May 23, 1857.

[23][Mary Abigail Dodge], Woman's Wrongs: A Counter-Irritant (Boston, 1868), pp. 118-119, 127, also see pp. 123-124.

[24]Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, pp. 84-85, 146-147, 158, 160.

[25]Ibid., pp. 159-161; [Harriet Prescott Spofford], "The Last Resort," Harper's Bazar, February 27, 1875, p. 38.

[26]Louisa May Alcott, "How I Went Out to Service," The Independent, June 4, 1874, pp. 1-3; Ednah D. Cheney, ed., Louisa May Alcott: Her Life, Letters, and Journals (Boston, 1889), p. 67.

[27][Godkin], "The Morals and Manners of the Kitchen," The Nation, January 2, 1873, p. 7; Towsend, "Our Irish Girls," Arthur's, November, 1875, p. 668; "Woman's Work and Woman's Wages: Causes of Suffering Among Seamstresses," Arthur's Home Magazine, March, 1870, p. 151; "Woman's Work and Woman's Wages: Shall American Girls Become Servants," Arthur's Home Magazine, July, 1870, pp. 29-30, 31-32; Parker Pillsbury, "Domestic Service," The Revolution, August 12, 1869, p. 88. Virginia Penny, confronted by the argument that American girls should enter domestic work, replied that she would "prefer to see our present class of servants fit themselves better

for the discharge of their duties, and American girls enter occupations of a more refined and exhalted nature." The Employments of Women, p. 402.

[28]Spofford, The Servant Girl Question. p. 181; [Spofford], "Bridget," Harper's Bazar, November 11, 1871, p. 706; [E. L. Godkin], "Social Distinctions from Bridget's Standpoint," The Nation, August 5, 1869, p. 107; Walker, "Our Domestic Service," Scribner's, December, 1875, p. 278. See Table 6.

[29]U. S. Congress, Senate, Report of the Joint Special Committee to Investigate Chinese Immigration, Senate Report 689, 44th Cong. 2sd sess., 1877, pp. 43, 54, 505, 572, 622, 733, 897-898.

[30]Sarah E. Henshaw, "California Housekeepers and Chinese Servants," Scribner's Monthly, September, 1876, pp. 736-742; Thomas J. Vivian, "John Chinaman in San Francisco," Scribner's Monthly, October, 1876, p. 868.

[31]Mary Hosmer, "Mary Ann and Chyng Loo," Lippincott's Magazine, October, 1870, pp. 355-357; Abby Richardson, "A Plea for Chinese Labor," Scribner's Monthly, July, 1871, p. 289; C. C. Coffin, "China in Our Kitchens," The Atlantic Monthly, June, 1869, p. 750; Minna Wright, "My Chinese Cook," The Ladies' Repository, April, 1870, pp. 302-304; "Table Talk," Putnam's Magazine, July, 1869, 127. Some mistresses, no doubt, regarded "the benighted coolie" as an object for household missionary work.

Hopes of converting the houseboy probably entered the minds of many. However, two mistresses who had entertained such hopes wrote that their Chinese servants had no interest in Christianity and thought their own religion superior. See Hosmer, "Mary Ann and Chyng Loo," p. 359; Minna Wright, "My Chinese Cook," p. 304.

[32]Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 165; Frank H. Norton, "Our Labor System and the Chinese," Scribner's Monthly, May, 1871, pp. 69-70; Minna Wright, "My Chinese Cook," pp. 302-303.

CHAPTER V

CLASS DISTINCTIONS WITHIN THE HOME

Nineteenth-century middle and upper-class Americans, whose social position and status were principally based on wealth, were deeply concerned with the proprieties of social conduct. The businessman and his wife wanted to learn what behavior would assure them the reputation of being a true "gentleman" and "lady." Authors responded with a deluge of books and articles describing acceptable rules governing the details of social behavior. This literature dealt not only with polite manners but also with the proper forms regulating a variety of social relationships, including the relationship between the lower-class servant and the middle or upper-class employer. Advice on this relationship generally appealed to the class consciousness of employers. Class distinctions were taken seriously; servants were frequently referred to as social "inferiors," and domestics were told to be humbly respectful toward their social "superiors." Writers went into considerable detail concerning both the proper forms controlling the master-

servant relation and the forms actually employed by many families. In their discussions authors attempted to institute and maintain social distance and social distinctions between employer and employee. In their actual treatment of domestics employers seemed equally concerned with indicating, formalizing, and preserving differences based on social class.

I

Foreign visitors and Americans agreed that wealth was the key to the class structure in the United States, a class structure regarded as fluid but very real. Money, rather than birth or education, was the principal standard of social position. That wealth was the route to the middle class or the "aristocracy" in America was understood and remarked upon by many contemporaries. In 1849 one woman wrote:

> a certain line of distinction has been drawn in society, and has been assuming a greater and greater stringency . . . . It is not the aristocracy of family and birth . . . nor yet the true aristocracy of intellect and moral worth--but the peculiarly American aristocracy of money! Caste, determined by the possession or non-possession of estates and bank-stock, is scarcely more rigidly guarded on Hindoo ground than here . . . .

Thomas Grattan, an English traveler, observed that birth and other marks of distinction were "only valued while . . . allied with money."[1]

Wealth alone, however, did not inevitably or automatically guarantee acceptance as a "gentleman" or

"lady;" if a merchant or broker and his wife were to receive social recognition in keeping with their income, they were expected to exhibit refinement, good-breeding, and self-assurance in their social conduct. The desire to be regarded as a "gentleman" accounted for the great popularity of etiquette books during the nineteenth century. From these books the newly prosperous could learn the social manners of the well-bred and cultured. Wealth required confirmation through careful attention to approved social conventions, including both proper conduct toward servants and the correct forms of deference to be demanded and required from domestics.

In a further effort to legitimatize and consolidate their social position, the fortunate labored to convince themselves and others of their importance through openly asserting, and thereby reaffirming, their social superiority. Francis Grund discovered that in republican America men were frequently "more eager after aristocratic distinctions" than were more self-confident Europeans. According to Grattan, Americans in "fashionable society" were engaged in a "struggle to maintain their mock dignity . . . ." Thus the relative fluidity of class lines paradoxically increased class consciousness by heightening anxiety concerning one's position. Men sought to confirm their status through securing deference from those whom they regarded as social "inferiors." As

one often reprinted etiquette book stated, because position was more secure in Europe "there does not exist the same necessity for a jealous guarding of the barriers [of social class] as there does here."[2]

Such conditions applied with special force to domestics, the social "inferiors" with whom employers had the most intimate contact. If a man could not command the respect and deference of his own servant, from whom could he claim it? Grattan perceptively observed that because employers had "no security of position," they were very apprehensive that the domestic "may not have a fitting sense of the difference between them--may not treat them with sufficient difference--may take undue liberties with them." As a result, while the incompetence and unfaithfulness of servants were heartily condemned, the greatest sin a domestic could commit was "impudence."

> Among all the transgressions which these obnoxious persons [servants] are guilty of, I have observed that there is none which causes such general distress among mistresses, as a failure on the part of the servant to 'know her place.' A little negligence, or incapacity, or even a few wilful errors the lady can tolerate, but any forgetfulness of the vast difference between her own position and that of her handmaid, not at all.[3]

In case the domestic was in any doubt concerning her proper place within the household, employers presented continual reminders of the relative status of mistress and maid. "Manners" and forms regulating

the master-servant relationship emphasized the disparity in class between the two parties. As Robert Tomes found, "forms of reverence and awed silence" were expected from the servant; "a great deal that is humiliating in service comes from the ceremonial observances exacted from it." These customs and attitudes indicate that, in relation to domestics, the egalitarian implications of political democracy broke down. "While extolling freedom," noted one critic, "we are unwilling to accept the disagreeable petty issues of republicanism." This was certainly true in the case of domestic service.[4]

II

Two items which showed the class consciousness of employers and their anxiety concerning their status were the usage of the term "lady" and the manner in which domestics dressed at home and particularly on the street. In regard to the former, employers were aggravated and offended because domestics sometimes referred to themselves or other lower-class females as "ladies," a term properly reserved for mistresses. The terms "lady" and "gentleman" on the one hand and "woman" and "man" on the other were used with a definite and limited meaning which corresponded with class distinctions. Catherine Beecher pointed out to servants that "we find that it is common to call persons who have wealth and education 'ladies,' and persons who have no education,

and labour for a support 'women.'" A "lady" would feel very offended, she added, to be called a "woman" because "persons whom she regards as below herself are so-called." A writer often sympathetic to servants noted that a "lady" was "a woman whom circumstances and inclinations do not compel to work for a living . . . . The masses of working women are not ladies by nature or education." It was thus an assault on what employers considered proper social distance for a domestic to call herself a "lady," as servants sometimes did in newspaper advertisements or conversation. Robert Tomes found it "vulgar" and ludicrous for the term "lady" to be applied to servants. One tract for servants advised them "not to assume names conferred only upon the well-bred and highly educated." Domestics were told to "distinguish properly" between such terms and to use them with correct discrimination--an egg woman or washerwoman was not to be called a "lady" and the wife of an important person was not to be referred to as a "woman."[5]

In the matter of dress within the house, employers made it clear what type of apparel they desired servants to wear while on duty, but few made any real effort to impose a distinctive uniform on female servants. Basically, domestics were to wear neat, simple, modest clothing in keeping with their duties. Torn, soiled, or ragged clothing should not be worn about the house; a

"slovenly" girl was said to be "an object of positive disgust." The waitress was to take special care to be neatly attired while serving the table; she was not to wear the same clothes for serving which she had worn for her dirtier chores. On the other hand, it was equally objectionable for a maid to be "too finely dressed" while working about the house. For one thing, a showily dressed girl called attention to herself when she was supposed to be inconspicuous and unobtrusive. Furthermore, as a domestic went about the house, a long hoopskirt "knocks over articles, and catches in doors, and trips up the unlucky worker doing her housework, or waiting on table."[6]

Americans seldom went beyond such general statements or requirements about the dress of domestics on duty, largely because of opposition by servants. In contrast to Europeans, American employers rarely advocated specific regulations which smacked of a uniform or "livery" for maids. Waiters, male and female, were to wear white gloves while serving the table, and female domestics were expected to wear an apron, but few employers made more stringent demands. Sarah Josepha Hale did suggest that domestics be required to follow the English custom of wearing a cap or handkerchief, but Caroline Kirkland reported in 1851 that few mistresses attempted to enforce any such regulation.

Since few American domestics were willing to wear a plain costume supplied by the employer, only "a few" employers insisted on the usual English costume of white cap, white apron, and plain black dress for nurses and house-maids. American girls were thus responsible for supplying their own work-clothes whereas in England and a few larger American establishments these clothes, usually a standard uniform, were provided by the employer.[7]

What really disturbed and irritated class-conscious mistresses, however, was what the maid wore on her time off when away from the house and largely beyond the control of the employer. With her room and board supplied in addition to her pay, the servant had a comparatively large share of her wages available to spend on clothing and could afford some outfits which were "elegant" and the height of current fashions. In a nation where status was dependent chiefly on the appearance and display of wealth, the domestic could erase or threaten to erase much of the social distance between herself and her mistress simply by dressing to look like a "lady." In public the servant could appear to be the social equal of her employer. Such threats to class distinctions between mistresses and maids were deeply unsettling to employers, who wanted servants to dress and look like servants and to preserve class differences among females

in matters of dress. Servants, it was said, "have a great fancy for copying their mistress in dress . . . ." Mistresses complained along with Harriet Prescott Spofford that domestics took on "airs of gentility, with assumption of equality in dress." Eunice Beecher grumbled that "it requires keen eyes to distinguish across the street the millionnaire from her cook, as far as dress is concerned . . . ." Other ladies made similar comments and so did some men. One male writer observed that on Sunday domestics arrayed themselves in clothes "that would not disgrace the neatest carriage in Hyde Park." Robert Tomes found that on her day off the servant looked like "as fine a lady as her mistress and might easily be mistaken for her."[8] Such statements from men could scarcely have been comforting to insecure "ladies."

In order to reassure themselves that real distinctions did exist between the true lady and the "overdressed" servant on the street, mistresses sneered that the dress and ornamentation of the domestic was only a "vulgar imitation" of the fashions worn by ladies. It was suggested that persons of real refinement and discrimination would not be misled by the cheap copies worn by the domestic into imagining her to be a lady. According to female writers, servants' ribbons were always "dirty" or "greasy," their artifical flowers "soiled," their jewelry "tawdry," their finery "faded"

and "gaudy." In their pathetic and futile ambition to "hide their social position," domestics strove to appear "as much as possible" like their social superiors. But even with her bows, ruffles, and lace, the domestic's costume allegedly remained "bedraggled." Servants were very wrong if they thought they were "indistinguishable" from "ladies," whose clothes were always "dainty and fresh." Mrs. Parton claimed that when a poor woman wore "a stunning, glaring outfit, . . . the truth she would conceal, is patent to every beholder . . . ." Moreover, writers pointed out that in the servant's quest to keep up with fashion she foolishly purchased expensive dresses and trimming rather than durable work-clothes, decent underclothing, or warm winter garments. Mrs. Graves thought that few finely dressed domestics "possess such useful articles of apparel as are requisite for health, comfort, and true respectability." Mrs. Parton agreed that although the maid had gay bonnets, her showy skirt hid "dilapidated and soiled underclothing, and a very questionable state of shoe and stocking." A true lady, of course, would not spend her money so imprudently, saw such things in proper perspective, and was always ladylike from head to toe.[9]

In line with the desires of employers, tracts for domestics sought to instruct servants in what was deemed "proper" in regard to dress and to discourage girls from

dressing like those above them in station. "Foolish" spending for "expensive" and "useless" muslin and silk dresses was opposed; calico was "more proper and becoming" for a servant. Girls should concentrate on purchasing useful garments and avoid copying the styles worn by the young ladies of the family. In her Letters to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service, Catherine Beecher reiterated several times the point that "if a woman has a small income, and yet appears in dresses and ornaments that are suitable only for persons of great wealth, every one pities or laughs at her for her want of taste and propriety." Another such book suggested to domestics that "as expensive houses, rich furniture, and showy equipage belong, or should belong, exclusively to the rich, so should feathers, flounces, laces, and the expensive superfluities of dress." The maid should dress modestly; to attempt to imitate the fashions of the mistress or her daughters would only expose a domestic to the "mirth and witty jest" of the family. Efforts at such imitation indicated that the servant possessed "a tawdry and vulgar taste." One tract advised that it was deceitful, and therefore obnoxious in the sight of God, for a servant-girl to dress in such a way as to appear to be anything other than a servant. A domestic should wear clothing "proper for a person in her situation."[10]

In regard to such advice and other discussions of servants' dress by status-conscious employers, Tomes observed that mistresses were motivated by "a desire to repress the uppishness, as it is termed, of the dependent,

to keep her in her appropriate place." He charged that the employer, who was alarmed by attempts at "outward assimilation" on the part of servants, regarded current fashions "as belonging exclusively to those of her own rank." Mistresses displayed the desire, if not sufficient authority, to enforce class distinctions in street dress. Although regulations concerning the public clothing of domestics were difficult to enforce, many mistresses allegedly interferred to the extent of giving irritating "advice" and "suggestions" on matters of "appropriate" dress to their employees. Tomes commented on the "frequent interference" by mistresses in these matters; Catherine Beecher advised ladies that the "most successful" way to "interfere" in questions of servants' dress was to first gain their confidence and then disseminate proper "views of propriety and economy . . . ."[11]

III

Etiquette books, books on domestic economy, and numerous magazine articles advised employers on how they should conduct themselves toward domestics in order to secure willing compliance with directions. Throughout the century most authors found it necessary to condemn the haughty arrogance of manner and the "severe and imperious mode of giving orders" which impressed observers as all too common. William Alcott explained the reasons behind such rudeness and arrogance by noting

that those with only a "precarious" hold on their status feared losing it through "any apparent condescension."

> Where nobility is hereditary, no one fears that a little condenscension will injure him . . . . But as what I call our nobility, here, is usually acquired, and may therefore be lost, our nobles are more cautious with whom they associate. And it is this cautious spirit . . . which makes republican nobles so much more proud, and haughty, and intolerable than monarchical ones.

Such conduct toward domestics was, Alcott pointed out, common not only among American "nobles" but also among those in moderate circumstances able to hire only one servant or even only a washerwoman once a week. Indeed, women in the middle classes were likely to be especially "haughty" since they were less sure of their position than were "nobles." Most American writers followed Lord Chesterfield in recommending "perfect self-command" and "steady assurance" in one's manner toward domestics, but those who felt insecure in their social position must have found such relaxed self-assurance difficult to maintain. For their lack of confidence, employers often substituted overbearing arrogance. In 1835 Mathew Carey condemned those "whose deportment is tyrannical; whose orders are given in a style becoming an eastern despot . . . ." During the Civil War another writer attacked the many employers "who seem to imagine it adds to their importance to treat domestics with rudeness and incivility, especially in the presence of others."[12]

Americans frequently failed in their relations with domestics, noted one critic, "in the matter of little politenesses." Employers neglected the subtle signs of social respect; they did not say "good morning" to servants; they did not apologize when they walked in front of a maid; they did not say "please" when they wanted some service. Several authors indicated that many employers did not use the terms "please" and "thank you" when dealing with servants. Tomes, for example, found that these phrases "seldom pass the lips of our fine ladies when they command their servants;" such details of social intercourse pointed up the existing "social distance between the employer and the employed," he thought. It was said that such courtesies were denied to domestics because they were generally thought unworthy of them; but one writer reminded readers that servants, like other persons, "value such little proofs of regard, if offered as from equal to equal . . . ."[13]

Such rude conduct was criticized as serving only to demonstrate the vulgarity of the employer and unnecessairly antagonize the servant. It should be noted, however, that these criticisms were not democratic in tone. Politeness was a means to secure "obedience;" furthermore, many of these who recommended a more polite and kindly demeanor toward servants also assumed that domestics were social "inferiors." As Samuel Wells told

the readers of his etiquette book, "there is no surer sign of inherent vulgarity than a needless assumption of the tone of authority and a haughty and supercilious bearing toward servants and inferiors in station generally." Virginia Terhune agreed that "if you can only maintain your position by haughitness and chilling disregard for the feelings of inferiors, your rank is false and you unfit to hold it." In dealing with domestics and other "inferiors in social position," stated another writer, one should be pleasant and use "the language of request" rather than that of command; this would elicit "more ready as well as cheerful obedience . . . ." Advocates of politeness to domestics usually agreed with Robert Tomes that servants would "seldom fail to respond with a more zealous service and a readier obedience to exactions and commands rendered less harsh and domineering by a soft word and subdued mastery."[14]

If arrogance and rudeness were condemned, so also was the opposite "evil" of "undue familiarity." Pampering a servant would only fill her "with burnings for the higher station she can never occupy" and "lead to contempt and general disobedience of orders." A girl treated with familiarity would become disrespectful, make fun of the "indiscreet" mistress, and become contemptuous of the weak employer. If she yielded "her proper authority and control," the mistress would find

herself under the domination of the servant. To make a maid a sort of "companion" would only degrade the mistress in the eyes of her subordinate and lower her to the level of the servant. "On no account be familiar with them," was the motto of those concerned with maintaining proper deference and social distance.[15]

Lest they be thought to be suggesting familiarity or social equality, authors calling for politeness toward servants carefully disclaimed any intention of subverting "the due subordination necessary for a well-ordered household . . . ." Politeness did not imply any concession of equality. While one's manner should be kindly and polite, it should also be firm and determined so that the domestic clearly understood that the mistress was in charge and would tolerate no rebellion. One article calling for more politeness toward servants opened with the statement that "our readers must not infer that we would advocate the abolishment of any proper distinction between the employer and the employed . . . . [Politeness] is perfectly consistent with a course that would ever command the most perfect deference."[16]

Such qualifications were also possible in discussions which were more general than those dealing with manners toward servants. One of the most critical articles on the usual nineteenth-century treatment of domestics was written in 1871 by Richard Rodgers Bowker. Bowker

attacked the restrictions on the personal freedom of servants, their lack of leisure time, the limitations on visitors, and the poor lodgings provided them. Severely critical of the "inhumane" way domestics were treated, he argued that motives of "charity" and "selfishness" should combine to encourage a more benevolent and considerate attitude on the part of mistresses. Discipline and deference were to be retained, however. Although they were entitled to humane kindness, "there is no call to treat servants, socially, as any thing but inferiors . . . ." Bowker asked rhetorically, "Would I have you treat servants as your social equals? Would I have them eat at your own table, using your piano, occupying your parlor and your front chamber? Nothing of the kind."[17]

A related concern was the proper treatment of servants and other lower-class women in public. Authors were divided on both the prevailing behavior of men toward such women and what the conduct in such cases should be. While an English traveler found American men to be polite and deferential to even "poorly-dressed" women on the street, an American remarked that courtesy was "not often seen" to lower-class women in public. Another writer found that men seldom offered the courtesies to servants which they extended to other females. Whatever the actual situation, it seemed excessively democratic to

some who favored open class distinctions in etiquette with one standard of conduct for "ladies" and another for "women," particularly domestics. The first edition of one popular etiquette book, published in 1836, noted concerning the etiquette of travel that

> when women appear at the door of the coach to obtain admittance, it is a matter of some question to know exactly what conduct it is necessary to pursue. If the women are servants, or persons in a low rank of life, I do not see upon what ground of politeness or delicacy you are called upon to yield your seat. Etiquette, and the deference due to ladies have, of course, no operation in the case of such persons. Chivalry . . . was ever a devotion to rank rather than to sex . . . . Such persons have nerves considerably more robust than you have, and are quite as capable of riding backward, or the top, as you yourself . . . . The only reason for <u>politeness</u> in this case is, that perhaps the other passengers are of the same standing with the woman, and might eject you from the window if you refuse to give place . . . . If <u>ladies</u> enter--and a gentleman distinguishes them in an instant--the case is altered.

In later editions the anonymous author apparently decided that the chances of being thrown from the coach were great enough to alter his recommendation, if perhaps not his real opinion. Subsequent editions simply stated the more democratic principle that "if women apply at the door, when you are occupying the best seat in the coach, you must give place to them."[18]

Others, however, were equally ready to argue for a more class-conscious approach to public etiquette and voiced objections to democratic manners. Eliza Leslie expressed disgust at the custom in hotels and board-

inghouses whereby mothers sometimes sent their nursemaids with the babies to sit in the drawing room. The "ladies" were "thus liable to have a vulgar and obtrusive servant girl, most probably 'from the old country,' boldly taking her seat in the midst of them . . . ." Such conduct was similarly condemned by Nathaniel Parker Willis who thought that "true politeness" depended upon proper "discrimination" between those females worthy of such attentions and the unworthy, including servants. All too often in public, felt Willis, "the lady and the house-drudge are put upon a level--the first as much robbed of her proper distinctive deference, as the other is over-honored and absurdly complimented." By showing respect to a domestic, one dishonored the mistress; "selection" should be made between "your friend's dainty daughter and your neighbor's greasy cook" if the lady was to receive the full measure of respect due her. A man wrote to the feminist periodical The Revolution that lower-class women should not be surprised if a gentleman did not yield his seat to someone as strong and as able to stand as he. Men would never "grant such an implied confession of superiority unless to one of his own or a higher class." Complaints about the public rudeness of American men, the correspondent thought, generally came from "those who by attempted assumption of rights and privileges beyond their legitimate sphere, are thus

publicly brought to grief . . . ." Parker Pillsbury replied that a real gentleman would give his seat to a tired washerwoman or cook as quickly as he would to a "lady."[19] Public etiquette was difficult to regulate according to class, of course, especially when servants were dressed like their employers. Differentiated codes of conduct could be more easily enforced within the home.

IV

Whatever forms of etiquette were advisable for the employer, a rigid code of deference was expected in return from the servant. A writer in Godey's stated that the average mistress insisted "on her right to respect on account of her position . . . ." "As to the term of social intercourse," wrote Mrs. Stowe, "it seems somehow to be settled in the minds of many employers that their servants owe them and their family more respect than they and the family owe to servants." If familiarity on the part of the mistress was thought unwise, that on the part of domestics was considered the height of impertinence. Employers could freely comment on or question a servant's personal affairs, but the girl could not reciprocate such familiar treatment. Mistresses could be rude and discourteous to domestics "while yet they require that the dissatisfaction of servants shall be expressed only in terms of respect . . . ." Among

those who thought along these lines was Mrs. Stowe's own less republican sister, Catherine, who believed that in the relations of "superior" and "subordinate," including the relations of master and servant, the superior could "command" while the subordinate could only "request."

> It is suitable for a superior to take precedence of a subordinate, without any remark; but not for an inferior, without previously asking leave, or offering an apology. It is proper for a superior to use language and manners of freedom and familiarity, which would be improper from a subordinate to a superior.[20]

A good example of such differentiated etiquette can be seen in the forms of address between employer and employee. Employers were advised to "always address them [servants] by their Christian names." This seems to have been the universal rule throughout the century; in dialogue and discussions writers almost invariably spoke of servants by their first names, even if the servant was older than the mistress. On the other hand, domestics were to address their employers and their guests "in a style which is appropriate to their relative positions." In addressing an employer only a very impertinent servant, who placed no great value on retaining her job, would reply in a manner of "unbecoming familiarity." A servant who "knew her place" would always use the prefixes "Mrs.," "Miss," and "Mr.," when referring to a "superior in station." "Sir" and "Ma'am" were always to be used in speaking with an employer. One tract

warned domestics that "it is a great breach of good manners to reply 'Yes,' or 'No,' omitting the 'Sir,' or 'Ma'am,' to questions addressed to you by your superiors." In the dialogue between servants and employers included in articles, domestics, including those inclined to insubordination, always used the proper terms of respect, indicating that such phrases were generally employed by domestics.[21]

General suggestions on the proper demeanor for servants show the humble deference they were expected to give their masters. While these were included in books of advice for servants published before the Civil War, such expectations no doubt continued after 1860 and constituted what Robert Tomes called the "antiquated forms of servility" connected with domestic service. There were manners deemed specifically suitable for domestics; the correct attitude was one of humble respect. Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics contained an entire chapter on proper etiquette for servants. It was explained that "good manners require that you should treat your superiors with respect, your employers with deference . . . ." The maid was not to imitate the polite manners of the parlor because that would be "ridiculous" and "unbecoming your station." Correct deportment for domestics included silence, humility, and promptness; the "polite" servant was one who served

her employer cheerfully and efficiently. Another tract found Biblical support for recommending that the maid treat the employer "with perfect respect" at all times and under all circumstances. Catherine Beecher expected servants "to regard the heads of a family as superiors in station, and treat them with becoming respect" just as children treat their parents or citizens their rulers.[22]

It was considered very rude for a domestic to be at all forward in conversation with her employers or their friends. A girl was not to gossip with them, intrude into their discussions, or initiate a conversation with them. It was thought "forward and disrespectful" for a domestic to break into the conversation of her betters with opinions or remarks of her own on the topic. It was also "a very impertinent thing to strive to force a conversation on your superiors . . . ." The employee was to talk with employers only when they first spoke to her. Unless spoken to, she was to remain silent. Familiarity in conversation would not be tolerated; Mrs. Spofford found that among most employers if the servant were to "jest with her mistress, it would be [considered] an unpardonable liberty, overthrowing all discipline . . . ."[23]

When the maid entered a family room to ask questions or receive instructions, she was to "stand

modestly inside the door . . . ." The servant would remain standing unless or until invited by the employer to sit down. "Remember always to stand in the presence of master or mistress, or their guests and friends," stated one tract. A man-servant was "always to stand in the presence of any of the family . . . ." Such rules seem to have continued after the Civil War. One 1872 critic of etiquette toward domestics indicated that employers seldom rose in the presence of their standing servants or requested them to be seated.[24]

V

One important area in which class distinctions were effectively made within the home was in relation to meals. Throughout the nineteenth century domestics in cities, towns, and surrounding areas generally ate at the "second table" located in the kitchen rather than at the family table in the dining room. This condition seems to have existed in well-to-do homes even in the early years of the century. Samuel Griswold Goodrich remembered that during the first decade of the century, in his youth in Ridgefield, Connecticut, "in families where all were laborers, all sat at the table, servants as well as masters . . . . In families where the masters and mistresses did not share in the labors of the household or the farm, the meals of domestics were had separate." Elizabeth Ellet and Catharine Sedgwick both

indicated that in seaboard cities servants did not eat at the employers' tables in the 1830's and 1840's although it was said to be done often in rural, western areas. William Alcott found that in Massachusetts in the 1830's a lady worried about her dignity "will no more let her [the servant or washerwoman] eat at the same table, than if she were of some other race of animals . . . ."[25]

Two plans were used in feeding domestics at their "second table." In many cases servants took "their meals immediately after and on the remains of the family meals." This method of feeding servants on "the remains and natural waste of the family table," whereby dishes were sent to the kitchen after the family had eaten the portion they desired, was especially common in establishments of one, two, or three domestics. Servants, of course, could not eat until after the family because the cook and waitress were busy while the family was eating. In larger households there was often "separate food for separate tables." In this case domestics did not share in the expensive desserts, fresh fruits, and other "table dainties" which might be served in the dining-room; many employers bought cheaper cuts of meat, sometimes called "servants' meat," for the kitchen table. One lady defended this system, pointing out that while "servants do not always partake of

exactly the same dishes as their master and mistress . . . [and] although the servants' table is not furnished with the delicacies of the season, their fare is usually more abundant and not less nutritious than that served up stairs."[26]

Some, however, objected to these usual systems of feeding servants, calling them offensive reminders of the "subordinate" status of the domestic. One article alleged that supplying servants with "coarse and insufficient viands," as many employers were said to do, produced "discontent by the painful contrast between the luxurious appointments and well supplied family table, and the meager fare provided for the kitchen department." The system commonly employed in smaller households was attacked by Robert Tomes who suggested that

> by proper management, the common impression that . . . , the scraps of the table are thrown out, as it were, to the servants, might easily be avoided. A proper division of the food, and a setting apart of the portion allotted for the kitchen, before the upper table is served, would tend to lessen this humiliation.

Mrs. Spofford noted that maids-of-all-work generally had to "eat of the scraps in loneliness."[27]

Employers went to some pains to explain why domestics were not permitted to eat with the family, usually attributing it to a desire to maintain family privacy against the unwanted presence of the "stranger" within the home. Employers said they felt unable "to

talk freely of their private affairs" at meals when "restrained by the constant presence of a stranger." This argument was first presented by Catherine Beecher, but it was most completely stated by Mary Abigail Dodge in the following passage:

> Anyone can see that the table is often the only place where the family can meet, and a stranger's presence destroys the confidence and freedom which make the charm of family life . . . . [Employers] are quite right, family seclusion can scarcely be too sacredly guarded; and the woman who wishes to encroach upon it--who is so blind that she cannot see that there is anything to be encroached upon--shows by that token her unfittness to share it.

Thus domestics who would want to eat with the family were dismissed as forward and boorish.[28]

None of those who put forth this argument for prohibiting servants from eating at the family table expressed any objection to having a girl wait on the table, however, although a waitress would also be able to overhear family discussions. One writer, Eliza Leslie, did point out that some families preferred not to have servants wait on the table "considering them a restraint on the freedom of conversation," but those authors who were so concerned about domestics sitting with the family expressed no such apprehension about having a waitress serve them. Indeed, Mrs. Spofford, one of those who advocated exclusion, noted that a servant would be unable to sit at the table with

comfort because she was expected to change courses, make trips to the kitchen, and generally wait on the table.[29]

Authors supporting the prohibition of the domestic from the dining room sometimes emphasized that "the family does not object to the servant's presence necessairly because she is not equal to themselves, but because she is not one of themselves." Harriet Beecher Stowe also disclaimed any class feeling in these regulations, stating that "there are quite other reasons than the asumption of personal superiority for not wishing to admit servants to the family privacy."[30]

Nevertheless, class consciousness does seem to have been one component in such rules. Many servants were said to consider it an important symbol of social equality within the house to be permitted to eat with the family. Mrs. Stowe found that such permission might be sought by self-respecting girls "as signs that they are deemed worthy of respect and consideration . . . ." Therefore, the denial of the privilege took on the aspects of a class issue. Furthermore, the typically lower-class behavior and manners of the domestic contributed to her relegation to the kitchen table. Mrs. Stowe implied that there would be no objection to a girl being at the table if she did not act like a lower-class person but instead "sat at the table and observed all its decorums with the modest

self-possession of a lady." A minister wrote that his wife was worried that if a servant-girl were allowed to eat in the dining-room, she would be ignorant of the typics being discussed and would commit such improprieties as "eating her dinner with her knife; talking bad grammer . . . ." The minister himself suggested that a servant would be welcome at the table only if she behaved like a member of the middle class, if she were a girl "of taste and refinement." Finding such a refined girl in a distinctly lower-class occupation was no doubt most difficult. Because everyone at the table was expected to be neatly and cleanly dressed, have their hair in place, and "abide by all the rules of propriety," the domestic, it was argued, would actually feel more comfortable eating in the kitchen where proper etiquette was not required and the girl "could talk, eat, and dress, as she pleased." Mary Abigail Dodge did not think that permitting a servant to eat with the family showed a lady's generosity or sense of justice; rather "it is far stronger presumptive evidence of lack of discrimination and delicacy than anything else."[31]

The desire for physical separation from servants expressed in excluding them from the family table and, as will be seen in the next chapter, from the family portions of the house generally was related to the

distastefulness of having lower-class persons, who behaved in a lower-class rather than a middle-class way, around employers. The lines of "class" depended on such things as "culture" and "good breeding;" social behavior was the visible sign of class standing. "There is nothing that tends more to a separation of classes than difference of manners," said Miss Sedgwick. "This is a badge all can see." Domestics were thought undeserving and unworthy of social equality because they were "vulgar," lacked "good-breeding," and did not abide by middle and upper-class proprieties.[32]

Such ideas can be seen in some of the statements cited previously in connection with forbidding servants to eat at the family table, but they were most generally expressed by Catherine Beecher. Distinctions within the home, she wrote, were necessary because of the domestic's rude manners, lack of education, and generally lower-class behavior.

> If domestics neglect their persons, if their dress is negligent and untidy, if they are rough and coarse in their manners, and rude and disrespectful in address, if they use incorrect language and neglect the rules of propriety at table and in society, there is a very good reason for excluding them from the table and parlour, where their example would injure children and be offensive and disagreeable to visitors.

These were the reasons "why there often is a <u>necessity</u> of making so much difference between the situation of employers and domestics, as is generally seen in the

most worthy and intelligent circles." A person with "good education and good manners" always deserved and received, she thought, more respect than a person "who is ignorant, rude, vulgar, and ill-mannered." Employers would alter their attitudes toward servants and accept them as social equals only if somehow "all" domestics "were suddenly changed into refined, well bred, well educated persons . . . ." Such unlikely and impossible requirements effectively kept domestics in a subordinate position within the house as people to be kept apart from the family.[33]

A number of other authors agreed with Miss Beecher that because servants were "of low birth" and "without refinement," they should not be allowed to have extensive contact with or influence over the children of the family. One writer pointed out that nurses and other domestics "are but little else than a compound of ignorance, coarseness, passion, and vulgarity." From contact with such persons children might become "vicious" in manners and mind. The impressionable and imitative child might learn incorrect grammer, "vulgar" manners, and "rude" or even immoral habits from the "unwholesome" example of the servant, warned authors. William A. Alcott cautioned darkly that domestics "besides setting a bad example, . . . do sometimes inculcate, directly, such habits, and practices, as should make any virtuous

parent shudder." Years later, Jane C. Croly believed that "the children of very wealthy, and even cultivated parents, sometimes by their association with servants, acquire rude, untidy, and authoritative ways, that they find it difficult afterwards to get ride of . . . ."[34]

In the details of social interaction employers manifested a class-conscious attitude toward the domestics who resided with them. Both the terms and the concepts of social "superior" and "inferior" were pervasive, even among those who called for a kindly demeanor toward servants. In matters of dress, employers had definite ideas on the proper apparel for domestics, emphasizing that they should not dress to look like their social betters. In matters of meals, employees were excluded from the family table and ate either left-overs or less "dainty" food. Writers frequently regarded servants as vulgar, ill-mannered people whom it was desirable and necessary to remove from the family because of their distasteful, lower-class characteristics. In matters of etiquette and deportment, many employers were said to be arrogant and rude. Those authors who criticized this approach emphasized, however, that the servant was an "inferior" and that politeness did not mean either familiarity or social equality. Forms of etiquette and various

household regulations were instituted which emphasized social distance, compelled outward respect, and reminded the girl of her proper "place" within the home. Taken as a whole, these attitudes and rules show an effort to institutionalize and formalize class differences and thereby elicit deference from the servant.

NOTES

[1]Mrs. M. J. B. Browne, "Jessie Lincoln," Graham's Monthly Magazine, September, 1849, p. 164; Thomas Grattan, Civilized America (London, 1859), p. 198; also see Thomas Hamilton, Men and Manners in America (Edinburgh, 1833), p. 109; Robert Tomes, "The Houses We Live in," Harper's New Monthly Magazine, May, 1865, p. 736; Douglas T. Miller, Jacksonian Aristocracy: Class and Democracy in New York, 1830-1860 (New York, 1967), pp. 57, 158-164, 170, 172-173.

[2]Francis Grund, Aristocracy in America: From the Sketch-Book of a German Nobleman, ed., George E. Probst (New York, 1959), pp. 22, 52, 170; Grattan, Civilized America, pp. 209-210; The Laws of Etiquette; or, Short Rules and Reflections for Conduct in Society (Philadelphia, 1836), pp. 10-11; also see Miller, Jacksonian Aristocracy, p. 60; William T. Coggeshall, "American Aristocracy," The Ladies' Repository, June, July, 1857, pp. 337-339, 421-423. The Laws of Etiquette pointed out that in the United States in remodelling the form of administration, society remained unrepublican. There is perfect freedom of political privilege, all are the same upon the hustings or at a political meeting; but this equality does not extend to the drawing room or the parlour,

[3]Grattan, Civilized America, p. 261; "Servants," Godey's Lady's Book, March, 1864, p. 286; also see, [Harriet Beecher Stowe], House and Home Papers (Boston, 1865), p. 210; Robert Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household (New York, 1875), pp. 128-129. One lady reported that again and again I have heard ladies say, 'Impudence must be put down. No servant should be allowed to stay a day after being saucy.'" The author concluded that although all other shortcomings could be forgiven, "it has come to be an accepted idea with many mistresses that impudence is never to be passed over." "Parlor and Kitchen," Lippincott's Magazine, August, 1869, pp. 208-209.

[4]Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household, pp. 125, 149; "Domestic Service," Old and New, September, 1872, p. 363.

[5]Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service (New York, 1842), pp. 164-165; "Woman's Work and Woman's Wages: The Dress of Working Women," Arthur's Home Magazine, February, 1870, p. 91; Robert Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," Harper's New Monthly Magazine, June, 1864, p. 55; Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics: With Counsel on Home Matters (Boston, 1855), pp. 128, 130-131; also see Abby Sage Richardson, "A Plea for Chinese Labor," Scribner's Monthly, July, 1871, p. 289; "Domestic Servitude," The Knickerbocker, June, 1842, p. 521.

[6]Parlour and Kitchen; or, The Story of Ann Connover (Philadelphia, 1835), pp. 75-76; Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Engaged in Domestic Service, p. 148; Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics, pp. 104, 143-147; [Sarah Payson Parton], Ginger-Snaps (New York, 1871), pp. 169-170; also see Robert Roberts, The House Servant's Directory, or a Monitor for Private Families: Comprising Hints on the Arrangement of Servants' Work (Boston and New York, 1827), pp. 15-16; Etiquette for Ladies; With Hints on the Preservation, Improvement, and Display of Female Beauty (Philadelphia, 1838), p. 94; Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," p. 55; Eliza Leslie, The House Book; or, A Manual of Domestic Economy (Philadelphia, 1849, p. 261.

[7]Mrs. Sophie Orne Johnson, A Manual of Etiquette with Hints on Politeness and Good Breeding (Philadelphia, 1873), p. 71; Sarah Josepha Hale, The New Household Recipe Book: Containing Maxims, Directions, and Specifics for Promoting Health, Comfort, and Improvement in the Homes of the People (New York, 1853), p. 254; Sarah Josepha Hale, The Good Housekeeper; or, The Way To Live Well and To Be Well While We Live (Boston, 1839), p. 115; Caroline Kirkland, The Evening Book (New York, 1851), p. 166; [Parton], Ginger-Snaps, p. 169; Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," p. 155.

In regard to male servants, liveries for coachmen and footmen seem to have become increasingly common in

large cities as the decades past. While James Fenimore Cooper and many Europeans commented on their absence in the 1820's and 1830's, Lydia Maria Child reported them to be increasing yearly in New York in the 1840's and Mrs. Kirkland found them worthy of extended discussion in 1851. By the late 1860's and 1870's liveries were a not unusual sight in New York although still scarce by English standards. American writers were hostile to this form of "public advertisement" of a man's "servitude" and "servility." These degrading "badges of menial service" were said to rob the wearer of his manly independence. Mrs. Parton condemned American liveries as "servile and badly executed imitations of old-country flunkyism," and Mrs. Stowe regarded a servant in a livery as "a mere appendage of another man, to be marked like a sheep with the color of his owner." Despite these attacks, the number of liveries apparently grew steadily, as those who wanted to achieve an elegant, aristocratic look for their establishments put their men-servants into showy uniforms. James Fenimore Cooper, Notions of the Americans (New York, 1963), I, p. 162; Harriet Martineau, Society in America (New York, 1837), II, p. 254; Lydia Maria Child, Letters from New York, second series (New York, 1845), p. 279; Kirkland, The Evening Book, pp. 164, 166-167; Maria Thersa Longworth, Teresina in America (London, 1875), I, p. 6; George Makepeace Towle, American

Society (London, 1870) I, pp. 309-310; [Sarah Payson Parton], Folly as It Flies: Hit at by Fanny Fern (New York, 1868), pp; 197-198; [Stowe], House and Home Papers, p. 221.

[8]Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy for the Use of Young Ladies at Home and School (New York, 1842), p. 209; Alice B. Neal, "Mrs. West's Experience," Godey's Lady's Book, November, 1853, p. 433; Harriet Prescott Spofford, The Servant Girl Question (Boston, 1810, p. 88; Eunice Beecher, All Around the House; or, How to Make Home Happy (New York, 1878), p. 275; Thomas Low Nichols, Forty Years of American Life, 1821-1861 (New York, 1937), p. 256; Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," Harper's, June, 1864, p. 55; also see [Parton], Folly as It Flies, p. 110; Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics, p. 104; [Jane C. Croly], Talks on Women's Topics (Boston, 1864), pp. 109-111; Mrs. A. J. Graves, Woman in America: Being an Examination into the Moral and Intellectual Condition of American Female Society (New York, 1843), pp. 109-110.

[9][Sarah Payson Parton], Fresh Leaves (New York, 1857), pp. 295-296; "Dress: How to Adorn the Person," Godey's Lady's Book, March, 1860, p. 231; "Servants' Dress," Harper's Bazar, March 14, 1868, p. 315; [Parton], Folly as It Flies, pp. 81, 110; "Woman's Work and Woman's Wages: The Dress of Working Women," Arthur's Home

Magazine, February, 1870, p. 92; Graves, Woman in America, pp. 109-110; [Parton], Ginger-Snaps, p. 170; Parlour and Kitchen, p. 152; [Harriet Beecher Stowe], The Chimney Corner (Boston, 1868), p. 44.

[10]Parlour and Kitchen, pp. 149-150, 152-153; Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service, p. 147, also pp. 148, 173-174, 177; Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics, pp. 140-151, 144; A Friendly Gift for Servants and Apprentices (New York, and Baltimore, 1821), pp. 9-10; also see Hale, The Good Housekeeper, p. 115; Mrs. L. G. Abell, The Skillful Housewife's Book; or, Complete Guide to Domestic Cookery (New York, 1857), p. 161; Roberts, The House Servant's Directory, p. 77. The last book cited makes the same point in regard to men-servants--the servant who would try "to outvie his master" in dress "does not know his place . . . ."

[11]Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household, pp. 145-146; "Woman's Work and Woman's Wages: Shall American Girls Become Servants," Arthur's Home Magazine, July, 1870, p. 31; Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy, p. 209.

[12]Catherine Beecher, Miss Beecher's Domestic Receipt Book (New York, 1846), p. 269; William A. Alcott, The Young Wife; or, Duties of Woman in the Marriage Relation (Boston, 1837), pp. 154-155, 157; The American

Chesterfield (Philadelphia, 1828), pp. 142, 146; Mathew Carey, "Essay on the Relations Between Masters and Mistresses and Domestics," Godey's Lady's Book, June, 1835, p. 244; "Don't Scold," Arthur's Home Magazine, March, 1862, p. 185. At least one other author agreed with Alcott that middle-class ladies were more likely to want "extreme submissiveness" in their servants than upper-class employers. Wealthy "ladies do not feel compelled to be constantly on the alert, to convince themselves and others that they have any authority." "Servants," Godey's Lady's Book, March, 1864, p. 286.

[13]"Domestic Service," Old and New, September, 1872, p. 364; Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," Harper's, June, 1864, p. 58; also see Samuel Robert Wells, How to Behave: A Pocket Manual of Republican Etiquette (New York, 1856), p. 65; [Mary Virginia Terhune], Common Sense in the Household (New York, 1874), p. 379. Tomes noted that even if one could not use the terms of politeness out of real respect, it was still expedient to do so, for this "cheap courtesy . . . is surprisingly grateful [sic] and provocative and good service." "Your Humble Servant," p. 58.

[14]Wells, How to Behave, pp. 64-65; [Terhune], Common Sense in the Household, p. 380; Robert Tomes, The Bazar Book of Decorum (New York, 1870), pp. 230-233, 234; [Margaret Cockburn Conkling], The American Gentle-

man's Guide to Politeness and Fashion (New York, 1858), pp. 102-103; for similar statements see Etiquette for Ladies, p. 94; Eliza Farrar, The Young Lady's Friend (Boston, 1837), p. 236; "Treatment of Servants," Godey's Lady's Book, November, 1855, p. 424; "The Family Circle," The Ladies' Repository, October, 1865, p. 630. This last article was reprinted under the title "Politeness to Servants," in Godey's in November, 1865.

[15][Terhune], Common Sense in the Household, pp. 374-376; Catherine Beecher, Miss Beecher's Receipt Book, p. 270; "The Family Circle," The Ladies' Repository, October, 1865, p. 630; Etiquette for Ladies, p. 93; for other cautions against "undue familiarity" see Rev. Jessie T. Peck, "The Kitchen," The Ladies' Repository, January, 1858, p. 34; The Laws of Etiquette, pp. 121-122.

[16]Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," Harper's, June, 1864, p. 58; Catherine Beecher, Miss Beecher's Receipt Book, p. 270; [Conkling], The American Gentleman's Guide to Politeness, pp. 102-103; "The Family Circle," Ladies' Repository, October, 1865, p. 630.

[17]R[ichard] R[odgers] Bowker, "In Re Bridget.--The Defence," Old and New, October, 1871, pp. 498, 501.

[18]David W. Mitchell, Ten Years in the United States: Being an Englishman's View of Men and Things in the North and South (London, 1862), p. 265; [C. E. Norton], "Good Manners," The Nation, May 3, 1866, p. 571; "Woman's Work

and Woman's Wages: Shall American Girls Become Servants," Arthur's Home Magazine, July, 1870, p. 31; The Laws of Etiquette, first edition, 1836, pp. 106-107; The Laws of Etiquette, "new edition," 1836, pp. 191-192.

[19]Eliza Leslie, The Behaviour Book (Philadelphia, 1853), p. 296; Nathaniel Parker Willis, The Rag-Bag: A Collection of Ephemera (New York, 1855), pp. 167-172; Parker Pillsbury, "Lady Versus Woman," The Revolution, October 22, 1868, p. 250.

[20]"Servants Godey's, March, 1864, p. 286; [Stowe], House and Home Papers, pp. 215-217; Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy, p. 141.

[21]Etiquette for Ladies, p. 95; Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics, pp. 127-128, 186; Parlour and Kitchen, p. 87; Roberts, The House Servant's Directory, p. 69; Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Engaged in Domestic Service, p. 143.

[22]Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household, p. 125, 128; Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics, pp. 123-125; Parlour and Kitchen, p. 86; Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy, p. 208; also see Catharine Sedgwick, Live and Let Live; or, Domestic Service Illustrated (New York, 1837), p. 39; Roberts, The House Servant's Directory, p. 69.

[23]Parlour and Kitchen, pp. 87, 88-89, 93; Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics, p. 135;

Roberts, The House Servant's Directory, p. 69; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 38.

[24]Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics, pp. 136, 186; "Domestic Service," Old and New, September, 1872, p. 364; see also Sedgwick, Live and Let Live, p. 110; Carrie Carrol, "Six Months in the Kitchen," The Ladies' Repository, August, 1861, p. 477.

[25]Samuel Griswold Goodrich, Recollections of a Lifetime (New York and Auburn, 1856), I, p. 84; Elizabeth Ellet, "Helps," Godey's Lady's Book, April, 1844, p. 194; Sedgwick, Live and Let Live, p. 45; Alcott, The Young Wife, p. 157.

[26]Elizabeth Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper: A Cyclopedia of Domestic Economy (New York, 1857), p. 28; Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," Harper's, June, 1864, p. 56; Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics, p. 38; "Domestic Service," Old and New, September, 1872, p. 365; Sedgwick, Live and Let Live, p. 45; "Domestic Service," Harper's Bazar, May 2, 1874, p. 284.

[27]"Our Cook Book," Peterson's Magazine, August, 1859, p. 149; Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household, p. 147; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 48; also see The Workingman's Advocate, January 9, 1830.

[28]Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy, pp. 208-209; [Mary Abigail Dodge], Woman's Wrongs: A Counter-Irritant (Boston, 1868), p. 128. This argument

can also be found in Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Engaged in Domestic Service, p. 88; [Stowe], House and Home Papers, pp. 217-218; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, pp. 153-154.

[29]Eliza Leslie, The House Book; or, A Manual of Domestic Economy (Philadelphia, 1849), p. 267; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, pp. 153-154.

[30][Dodge], Woman's Wrongs, p. 128; [Stowe], House and Home Papers, p. 218; also see Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy, pp. 208-209.

[31][Dodge], Woman's Wrongs, p. 127; [Stowe], House and Home Papers, pp. 141, 218; Rev. Eli Hartness, "Wanted: A Domestic," Old and New, October, 1871, p. 493; Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy, pp. 208-209; [Mary Abigail Dodge], Woman's Worth and Worthlessness (New York, 1871), p. 101. Speaking of servants, Mrs. Croly found that such qualities as "cleanliness, system, accuracy, [and] good judgment . . . can hardly be expected in ignorant persons of the most ordinary parentage." The mistress could be presumed to have these traits, however, because of her "superior culture." [Jane C. Croly], "Household Needs," Demorest's Monthly Magazine, May 1869, p. 188.

[32]Catharine Sedgwick, Home: Scenes and Characters Illustrating Christian Truth (Boston, 1835), p. 39. See, for example, Abby Sage Richardson, "A Plea for Chinese Labor," Scribner's Monthly, July, 1871, p. 289.

[33]Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Who Are Engaged In Domestic Service, pp. 67-68, 86-87, 142. Miss Beecher's statements make no reference to the Irish or to immigrants in general and suggest class-based discriminations and distinctions quite apart from ethnic considerations, though these doubtless reinforced class consciousness.

[34]Mrs. Helen Brown, The Mother and Her Work (Boston, 1862), p. 67; J. S. Tomlinson, "On Female Influence," The Ladies' Repository, March, 1841, p. 77; Alcott, The Young Wife, pp. 163-164; [Jane C. Croly], "The Dining Room," Demorest's Monthly Magazine, December, 1874, p. 459.

CHAPTER VI

DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE AND DOMESTIC SERVICE

In 1842 Andrew Jackson Downing published his Cottage Residences, the first of a number of house-plan books to include lengthy explanations of the architect's floor plans. As increasing numbers of persons desired professionally designed residences, more such books appeared in the fifties and sixties. These plan books provide a comprehensive discussion of the ideas which entered into the arrangement of houses in the mid-nineteenth century.

Attempts by middle and upper-class employers to define and institutionalize the lower social position of the servant included not only exclusion from the family table and differentiated forms of etiquette, but also entered into the planning and construction of the house shared by mistress and maid. Expectations that the residents of a house would have one or more lower-class employees who would live within the dwelling influenced the architect's arrangement of many aspects of the nineteenth-century house. As we have seen,

employers were well aware of the differences in class, manners, and education between themselves and their servants. Such feelings increased as the Irish, who were regarded as especially rude and "alien," became more important in service. Not surprisingly, employers appeared anxious to keep their "dirty," "ignorant," and "vulgar" servants at arm's length within the house. Servants were to be kept inconspicuous and unobtrusive for, as Catherine Beecher noted, their presence could be disagreeable to guests. Furthermore, in the allocation of space within the house, the comfort and convenience of the servant were concerns of small importance when balanced against the ease and "seclusion" of the family. Architects carefully took into account such matters and explained to their customers that the presence of the domestic had been taken into due consideration in their floor plans.

I

The outstanding feature of houses built in the nineteenth century for those "in comfortable circumstances" was their large size. Suburban and rural houses of nine to twelve rooms, including attic bedrooms, were common; and large villas and country houses might contain fifteen or more rooms. Representative of these larger houses was Nathaniel Willis's home on the Hudson, Idlewild, which

had fifteen rooms, eleven of them bedrooms.[1] From one to three of the bedrooms in these houses were usually planned for the use of servants. Large additional amounts of space in these homes were devoted to a room-sized main hall, side passages, and stairways. As will be shown, much of this hall space was planned in relation to the presence of servants.

Town houses contained a similar number of rooms although narrow city lots, usually of twenty-five feet or less, forced them to extend upward rather than outward. City dwellings were of one basic type--the narrow row house. Rooms were distributed two or three deep over four, five, or six levels, including the attic and the basement. The latter contained the kitchen and also usually the dining room or another family apartment in the front basement. The only windows in these houses were at the narrow front and back; the sides abutted the neighboring houses. Throughout this period what James McCabe referred to as the "moderate sized" New York house consisted of between nine and eleven rooms spread over four floors, including attic and basement. More ambitious row houses covered five or six levels and including eight to eleven family rooms in addition to the kitchen and at least three small servants' rooms in the attic, for a usual total of between twelve and sixteen rooms.[2]

The labor connected with these large houses fell, not upon the housekeeper, but upon her servants. While the presence of domestics increased the size of the house because of the rooms they required, such spacious residences were made possible only because servants existed to do the work they entailed. Without lower-class labor, houses of such size and design would have been impossible to maintain. A minimum of two servants was considered necessary to keep up a town house. James McCabe stated that his "moderate sized" house "will require the services of at least two women . . . ." By the 1860's the usual number of domestics in town houses seems to have been between two and four.[3]

Architects wrote that because of the difficulty of obtaining good servants, it was important to plan houses compactly and conveniently in order to save labor; but designers and builders apparently paid little heed to their own advice in this regard. Writers complained of the large and poorly planned houses that made it necessary to hire several servants. Mrs. A. J. Graves, writing in the 1840's, lamented that ladies were unable to do without domestics because of "large and inconveniently constructed houses, and a greated number of apartments than is needful." Thirty years later another critic charged that houses of "the middling class" contained "useless rooms" and were planned with

little attention to the functional arrangement of apartments.[4]

The most inconvenient dwelling was the town house. A recent student of Boston Back Bay domestic architecture has concluded that fashionable row houses were planned without regard to efficiency or convenience. The great number of steps was the worst thing about these houses. Having only two or three rooms on a floor, the town house was, charged James Richardson, "little else than a string of stairs, with more or less extended landings . . . . To go from one room to another, costs a climb of from twenty to a hundred steps." According to Richardson, the steps and "the endless drudgery of ill-planned [town] houses" forced American women, the vast majority of whom were physically unable to do the work of a city residence, into dependence on their more muscular Irish servants. Realizing that she was essential, Bridget became assertive and demanding. Servants would become more tractable when they became less necessary and could be dispensed with, thought Richardson.[5]

By the 1870's the demand for more compact and "sensibly constructed" city living units produced apartment houses in Boston and New York. An important argument in favor of apartment living was that it permitted the family to reduce the number of live-in

servants necessary. One advocate wrote that with apartments "the great servant-question is to some extent solved. A system which enables us to dispense with half the usual service may well be rejoiced at."[6]

Few urban, middle-class families lived in apartments, however, and most housekeepers had to learn to live with their servants in more traditional row and free-standing houses. The rest of this chapter will deal with the planning and construction of the single-family, middle or upper-class house in relation to its lower-class inhabitants.

II

To the domestic the most important room in the house was the kitchen. The province of the cook, it was also the place where other servants waited while on duty for the ring of their employer. Further, the kitchen functioned as "the servant's evening sitting room." Here she ate her meals, spent her evenings, and entertained her friends. A separate room for these purposes, the so-called "servants' hall," was comparatively rare in American houses. It was most common in large city mansions and sprawling villas such as those in Newport. Henry Hudson Holly, a prominent architect, advocated servants' halls in all houses where more than two servants were employed, and architects occasionally included them in their more

expensive designs. However, few domestics in even such fashionable areas as Back Bay Boston had any room other than the kitchen available for social life. Gervase Wheeler called the servants' hall "a very necessary, though not usually provided apartment." The kitchen must often have been a most unattractive place for meals and evening hours of leisure. Harriet Beecher Stowe found the kitchen frequently to be "the most cheerless and comfortless place in the house." Other observers made similar comments.[7]

The kitchen might be located either in the basement or on the main floor. Partially underground basement kitchens were the rule in urban houses and were also common in suburban and country homes, especially those built in the 1840's and 1850's. Although Andrew Jackson Downing noted in 1850 that in country houses the basement kitchen was "giving way to the more rational and convenient mode of putting it on the first floor," basement kitchens continued to appear in some plans for free-standing houses during the 1860's and 1870's. Basement kitchens were best suited to hill-side lots where one side of the basement would be entirely open and above ground level. In houses of seven to nine rooms located on sloping lots, the servant's bedroom was frequently also placed in the basement, next to the kitchen.[8]

In suburban and country designs it was always a matter of choice where to place the kitchen. The

advantages of the first-floor kitchen were added convenience and fewer stairs. Placed on the main floor, kitchens were closer to the vigilant eye of the mistress. First-floor kitchens were also better lighted and less damp than those in the basement; houses with main floor kitchens sold or rented more easily than those with domestic offices in the basement.[9]

On the other hand, there were certain advantages to a basement kitchen in detached houses. Most importantly, it made the home cheaper to build by eliminating the cost of an additional wing. Second, basement kitchens did not block off the view from the family's rooms in any direction, an important consideration in senic locations. Third, they were more convenient to food storage areas in the basement. In addition, a kitchen below the family rooms meant that "the noise and disagreeable odors from the kitchen are more effectually excluded from the main house." Apparently employers did not consider their kitchens to be very agreeable or pleasant rooms. An important related advantage was the opportunity to keep the servants apart from the family. Henry Hudson Holly found that "many persons, especially if brought up in cities, claim that there is a greater degree of privacy when the kitchen and offices are below . . . ." In an earlier book Holly himself, in discussing one of his designs in

which both the kitchen and the servants' bedrooms were located in the basement, mentioned that by this plan "the servants have apartments so removed that they are not brought into immediate contact with the family . . . ." Andrew Jackson Downing admitted that basement kitchens were less convenient, but they were "more elegant." With the domestic offices in the basement, each department of the household intruded "itself but little on the attention of the family or guests when not required to be visible . . . ."[10]

Basement kitchens were standard in row houses. Restricted space was probably the principal reason for this uniform plan, but the arrangement had the additional advantage of keeping the servants separated from the family. As Holly observed above,urban residents were especially anxious to have basement kitchens in detached dwellings, probably because of the privacy they had come to expect by having the servants below stairs in row houses. Mrs. Jane C. Croly thought that because domestics were noisy, troublesome,and disagreeable, city families were glad to have them in the basement, as remote and isolated from the family as possible.[11]

The typical urban kitchen was in the rear basement below the main, family floor. Although the basement was partially underground, the kitchen opened at the back onto a walled area excavated below the level of the

kitchen floor. The rear area provided the service entrance for domestics and tradesmen, except in New York City, where this entrance was placed in the front of the house, below the main entrance. The natural lighting of these kitchens was poor, especially when architects placed first-floor verandas or other projections over all or part of the area. Many basement kitchens received some illumination from a narrow light well served by a skylight high above on the roof. These basement kitchens were usually pictured in highly unpleasant terms. Parker Pillsbury, writing in The Revolution, the woman's rights periodical of which he was an editor, described the

> low, dark, hot, subterranean kitchen into which the sun never looked and never can . . . . In many, if not in most of the larger houses in cities, everywhere, the kitchen is a dismally dark, unventilated, uncomfortable out-of-the-way place, with sink and all other odorous and disagreeable appointments festering about it . . . .

Robert Tomes found city kitchens to be "infernal quarters" full of "reeking odors." He went on to write that in these kitchens it was "difficult to secure that supply of air and light especially necessary for a room where there must be a superabundance of heat at all seasons, and an accumulation of various odors to be got rid of . . . ." Other writers, such as Henry Hudson Holly, Harriet Prescott Spofford, and Sarah Josepha Hale, agreed

that underground kitchens were generally "damp," "gloomy," "close," and "hot."[12]

The significance of the servant's low social position in relation to the fact that her place of work was often in the basement did not escape contemporaries. Tomes remarked that "the single pair [flight] of stairs which leads from the parlor to the kitchen would seem to separate, as it were, by an unfathomable abyss, the woman above from the woman below." Similarly, Parker Pillsbury found that "labor in the city at once gravitates to class and caste, and the kitchen girl, like the place where she does her work, is the lowest of all, and she is respected accordingly."[13]

When the kitchen emerged from the basement, efforts to exclude its odors, noise, and inmates from the family did not cease. When located on the first floor, the kitchen was commonly placed in a separate wing at the rear of the house. If there was no wing, it was located in a rear corner of the house. Kitchens were placed in the rear because they were meant to be hidden. Especially should attention be paid to disposing the plan so that the kitchen and its offices should be placed upon a screened or blind side, or one that can be easily concealed by planting," wrote the popular architect Andrew Jackson Downing. Calvert Vaux added that "the inferior rooms and offices" should always be placed, if possible,

in "the uninviting north or northwest corner of the house, and thus occupy that portion of it which can best be spared from the living rooms."[14]

Although lighter and better ventilated than their basement counterparts, rear, first-floor kitchens provided a view that was scarcely better than looking into an area. Kitchen windows in country houses, noted Mrs. Spofford, commanded "lively views of the barn-yard." In another portion of her book, she indicated that she thought some servants were sensitive to such arrangements; she wrote that servants would have more self-respect when they came to understand that "if the kitchen itself is in the rear of the house, it is for the sake of convenience to pump and shed and cellars, to avoid obtruding household economies upon the street or upon guests, and not for casting a slur on labor."[15]

The internal arrangement of cottages and villas was designed to further disconnect and separate the kitchen from the rest of the main floor. Again, employers seemed to think of kitchens as foul-smelling and disagreeable rooms to be hidden from view and excluded from the thought of the family and guests. To shut off the "occasionally offensive . . . sound, sight, and smells" of the kitchen from the family rooms, architects placed back halls, rear entries, and cross passages between the kitchen and the main hall and family rooms. A rear

passage usually separated the kitchen from the principal hall; these passages had a door at either end or side so that the kitchen could be closed off more completely and effectively from the family portion of the floor. As Andrew Jackson Downing explained, this passage removed "the kitchen, with its concomitant noises and odors, to some distance from the main hall, and these may be still further lessened in effect by having a door at both ends of this passage . . . ." While it was most common to have two doors between the kitchen and the main hall, a rear lobby or entry was sometimes included, adding a third door between the kitchen and the front part of the house. If the main hall was divided by a door into a front hall and a stairway hall, there might be as many as five doors between the kitchen and the parlor. Gervase Wheeler hoped to position the kitchen "conveniently near the main body of the house, and yet so shut off, by means of double entries and other separation, as to be of no annoyance." When the kitchen was located in a corner of the main house, rather than in a wing, halls, passages, and doors could be placed so that the kitchen's "contiguity to the principal rooms does not interfere with the privacy that properly belongs to the apartments in constant use by the family."[16]

The family room closest in function, and usually in location, to the kitchen was the dining room, and

care was taken to disconnect these two rooms. "It is undesirable that any dining-room . . . should be directly connected with the kitchen," thought Calvert Vaux. Either the private or the main stairs were often placed between the two rooms, which provided a measure of separation and space. Generally, communication between the kitchen and dining room was by a butler's pantry, walk-through closet, or short passage, with a door at each end, positioned between the two rooms "so as to shut off the view of the kitchen." Similarly, architects of town houses placed closets, stairs, and pantries between the kitchen and the family room in the basement, which was often the dining room. By such planning "any noise and unpleasantness in the culinary apartments" would not disturb or bother the family.[17]

By shutting off the kitchen's undesirable sounds (principally the noise made by servants) and odors, architects also shut off and separated the servant from the family, relegating the domestic to portions of the house which the employers considered distasteful. The practical effect of this was to accent the dissimilarity of mistress and maid, minimize contact between them, and isolate servants in less desirable parts of the building.

III

"It may be that the worst thing, so far as the physical and material part of her [the domestic's]

situation is concerned, is her sleeping-room," suggested Mrs. Spofford. As with the kitchen, servants' rooms were placed in the least valued locations, locations which would keep servants inconspicuous and protect cherished family privacy. Mrs. Spofford pointed out that the servant's room was "usually the worst and most cheerless and remote in the house." Pillsbury accused families of providing domestics with rooms "in whatever garret, or other space is not, and cannot, possibly be otherwise appropriated!"[18]

The most common place to put the servants' rooms was the attic. Attic rooms for servants were standard in city row houses of four or more levels and were also very common in suburban and country designs. In both free-standing and four level row houses attics frequently contained spare family bedrooms as well as the servants' rooms. Although short-term guests or even occasionally a family member might be lodged in the attic with the servants, attic rooms were considered less desirable than others and were always closely associated with domestics, their principal inhabitants. In five or six level row houses the only sleeping rooms in the attic were those for servants; there were usually at least three small servants' rooms in these attics, four or five flights of stairs above the basement.[19]

These attic rooms were deficient in several respects. For one thing, attics had no plumbing

facilities; they lacked even wash basins with running water. In major cities the convenience of running water was readily available to employers by the late 1840's. Philadelphia had installed an efficient water system in 1822 and many private houses in the city and its suburbs had bathrooms by 1840. John Hall's designs for Baltimore row houses, published in 1840, included upstairs water closets and bathrooms which drew hot water from the boiler in the kitchen or wash room. In New York, bathrooms and running water were rare until 1842 when Croton reservior began to supply water to the city and an efficient water system was constructed. By the late 1840's or early 1850's all well-designed town houses, and many suburban ones, in the major cities contained running water and upstairs plumbing. These facilities never extended to the attic, however.[20]

In suburban and country homes whatever plumbing conveniences were located within the house were apparently available "for general use," but this was not the case in city houses. There, plumbing facilities on the family floors were seemingly denied to servants, who were expected to use the water closet in the basement. As the attic had no wash basin, a domestic had to wash and comb in the kitchen unless the mistress provided her with a pitcher and bowl for her room. Even in this case, the servant still had to go to the basement

kitchen to enjoy the comfort of hot and cold running water. This convenience was often brought directly into the chambers or the adjacent dressing rooms of her employers.[21]

Nor did servants always share in the advances made in heating the employer's home. By the 1840's individual room stoves were rapidly replacing fireplaces. While room stoves were common by 1850, hot air furnaces were becoming popular during this same period. Many city and suburban houses had furnaces installed during the late 1840's, and most urban, middle-class housing built in the 1850's included furnaces. These early furnaces were inefficient, however, and could heat only the first two family floors; only in the 1870's did furnaces powerful enough to heat attic rooms begin to come into use. Prior to the installation of these improved furnaces, detached houses sometimes had fireplaces in some or all of the attic rooms, and four level row houses might have fireplaces in the larger attic rooms, though not in the smaller ones likely to be occupied by servants. Larger town houses, where only servants inhabited the attics, had no fireplaces in attic rooms. Thus, in town houses individual stoves were the only means available to heat servants' rooms until the 1870's.[22]

Although it is impossible to be certain how often employers actually permitted servants to use room stoves,

attic rooms had the reputation of being cold and unheated. In Catharine Sedgwick's 1837 novel Live and Let Live, the inconsiderate Mrs. Ardley says blithely, "Servants are accustomed to cold rooms . . . ." Statements from the 1870's indicate that domestics were still expected to sleep in unheated quarters. In 1874 Mrs. Croly referred to "freezing attics" for servants. Frank and Marian Stockton advised that some method, preferably central heating, be used to warm servants' rooms in winter because far too many domestics had to sleep in cold rooms. Individual room-stoves would be much cheaper than central heating, but the novelist and his wife warned that only the most reliable servants could be trusted with stoves in their rooms. Henry Hudson Holly observed in 1878 that "it is generally thought that to warm their [servants'] rooms is treating them with far too much consideration, and placing them beyond the sphere to which they belong . . . ."[23]

Furthermore, servants' rooms in row house attics sometimes had no windows. Bedrooms lighted from a skylight were often placed in the center of the attic with no access to front or rear windows. The worst aspect of these windowless rooms was that they were very poorly ventilated. Although family rooms in row houses also often lacked windows, their absence detracted further from the cheerfulness, comfort, and livability of the servants' rooms.[24]

In country and suburban houses where there was no attic or where the attic was left unfinished, servants' rooms were generally placed on the second floor of the rear wing, above the kitchen. When there was a finished attic accessible by the back stairs, servants usually went to the attic rooms, and the bedrooms on the wing were used by the family. However, domestics remained in the wing rooms if the private stairs were also in the two-story wing and did not extend to the attic. The "inferior rooms" on the second floor wing, which might or might not have fireplaces, were commonly designated as servants' rooms in plans and descriptions. As the kitchen ceiling was lower than the height of the other rooms on the main floor, the servants' rooms over the kitchen were "on a level with the landing of the main stairs," a few steps below the family chambers on the second story of the main wing. The bedrooms on this "half-story" were reached by a back hall or passage leading from the landing of the main stairway and also by the back stairs, which were often placed in the wing. The second floor of the wing also usually contained the bathroom, which was apparently available for the domestic to use.[25]

Occasionally a detached house had neither a finished attic nor a kitchen wing. In this case servants' rooms were placed on the second floor in the rear corner over the kitchen. Designers were careful that these rooms, which were on the same level as the family bedrooms, be "disconnected with the other apartments;" or,

as another architect said, "shut off from the other chambers . . . ." Such rooms were approached from a door and a side entry rather than directly from the main hall. Inner halls and private stairs also frequently served to separate these servants' rooms from those of their employers. The same techniques could be used in attics to divide servants' rooms from the spare family bedrooms.[26]

In some row houses, usually small ones of three levels without an attic, the servant was given a tiny basement room next to the kitchen. Mrs. Spofford described such a room as "a little black hole" beside the kitchen "at least two flights of stairs away" from the family.[27] Some servants did not receive even these minimal accomodations but had to sleep in the kitchen itself on a bunk settee or other makeshift bed.[28]

Other matters of design and construction, beside the frequent absence of heat and running water, served to make domestics' rooms uncomfortable wherever they were located. Whether in attic or rear wing, servants' rooms were often immediately beneath the roof and could become hot in summer due to the poor insulation of nineteenth-century houses. Architects often put an air chamber or low storage garret between the attic and the roof, but this was not always done. In some town houses very little, if any, space was left between the attic ceiling and the nearly flat roof. The sides

of a sloping roof which bordered directly on the servant's room offered very little protection from the sun's heat.[29]

Secondly, although servants often had individual rooms, at other times two or three domestics shared one room, little or no provision being made for individual privacy. Although these shared rooms were sometimes quite large, they were frequently small and overcrowded. One critic charged that in houses "regulated like the most" as many as three girls were packed into one of the smallest bedrooms in the house. There were complaints that respectable girls had to share rooms and even beds with "distasteful" or "odious" fellow servants.[30] Further, domestics' rooms were sometimes built without closets, and servants had only pegs or nails on which to hang their clothes. Finally, although the furniture provided for these rooms varied greatly, they were often pictured as carpetless, barren, half-furnished with decrepit beds and bureaus, and without any cheerful appointments.[31]

Several writers felt that poor sleeping accomodations, as well as uncomfortable kitchens, provoked much discontent among domestics. An 1877 work on domestic economy advised that the inadequate living and working apartments provided for domestics contributed to

> the position of contemptuous inferiority to which servants feel themselves consigned, and which in this country at least they are certain to resent . . . . Everything and every place

> provided for their use is generally not only inferior to, but in marked contrast with, the rest of the house.[32]

Although servants were generally better housed than other lower-class working women, they were poorly housed in comparison to the other residents of the dwelling in which they lived. Authors noted that servants had the opportunity to compare their own rooms with those of the ladies of the house. As Mrs. Spofford put it, "We say to ourselves that, bad as it [the servant's room] is, it is infinitely better than any thing she ever had before; but she has already seen the difference between our own rooms and that." One of Catharine Sedgwick's characters, the chambermaid Martha, tells Lucy Lee that uncomfortable and unpleasant rooms "show which way the wind blows; what rich folks think of poor folks." Martha adds that the elegant rooms of the ladies present "something of a contrast to our sky-rooms! It gives one thoughts to think of it, and feelings too."[33]

Since the provision of poor accomodations was thought to have "justly excited rebellion" among domestics, it was believed that many problems with servants would be eliminated or reduced if they were given dry, light kitchens and warm, cheerful rooms. Such appeals for improved quarters were particularly prevalent after the Civil War. Good rooms would attract

better servants, would make "them satisfied to remain longer in one place," and would "create in them habits of order and cleanliness . . . ." Robert Tomes thought that good accomodations would help produce "more docile, contented, faithful, and intelligent servants."[34]

But although mistresses were advised to be more humanitarian and considerate in providing comfortable facilities for their servants, social distinctions were to be maintained. Many things could and should be done to improve the comfort of the domestic, but social equality was not to be acknowledged or conceded. Thus, although their rooms should certainly be comfortable, "it is not to be expected, of course, that servants shall share in all the luxuries of the family . . . ." In comparison to the rooms of the young ladies of the house, servants' rooms should be, recommended Mrs. Spofford, "if not, of course, so luxurious, at least proportionately as decent and cheerful . . . ."[35]

IV

In other respects also, houses were planned to keep servants from being obtrusive. In the arrangement of entrances, stairs, and halls, the architect, keeping the servant's presence in mind, strove to provide maximum privacy for the family. Domestics were to enter and leave the house by the back entrance, the "servants' entrance;" it was considered very impertinent

for a domestic to go in or out at the front door. One tract for servants advised them that "you should remember, at all times, to go in and out at this [back] door, and instruct your friends, who are likely to call upon you, to do the same. You may save yourself much mortification by knowing at once your position in the house, and being willing to take it." Back entrances were placed to provide for maximum family seclusion. While discussing a design for a suburban residence, Calvert Vaux pointed out that the servants' entrance "is shut off by its position from interfering with the privacy of the veranda." If servants showed "excessive sensibility" to social distinctions such as separate entrances and as a result became "forward and disrespectful," they should be reasoned with by "better-educated minds," thought Catherine Beecher.

> They should be taught that domestics use a different entrance to the house, and sit at a distinct table, not because they are inferior beings, but because this is the best method for securing neatness, order and convenience. They can be taught . . . that these very regulations really tend to their own ease and comfort, as well as that of the family.[36]

Another feature of the house which was related to live-in servants was the "private" staircase for the use of domestics. Back stairs became increasingly popular in the years prior to the Civil War. New York row houses built in the 1820's and early 1830's usually had only one staircase, but thereafter back stairs became standard in

these dwellings. In the 1830's and forties well-known architects such as Andrew Jackson Downing and Alexander Jackson Davis planned detached houses of ten, eleven, or twelve rooms--including servants' bedrooms--with only one staircase. By the 1850's, on the other hand, it was usual to place two staircases in houses of eleven or twelve rooms; steadily increasing numbers of eight and nine room houses could also boast a second flight of stairs. By the sixties back stairs were being included in all town houses of five levels and most of four levels as well as most free-standing of more than nine rooms.[37]

Private stairs were considered to be an important addition to a residence. Although essential for large houses, private stairs also added "greatly to the comfort and privacy of even small villas," wrote Downing in 1850. In the 1870's Henry Hudson Holly recommended that "except in houses of very small dimensions, we consider the back staircase indispensable." Holly added that a back staircase adds to the convenience of the lady of the house, saves wear on the main stairs, and "keeps the servants retired . . . ."[38]

These "narrow, crooked . . . steep and dark" service stairs were usually located in or near the back passage leading from the main hall to the kitchen. With the back staircase in this position, the upper floors

were "easily accessible to servants, without using the exhibited flight of the main stairs" and without them using the exposed main hall. Domestics at work would not be seen on the prominent main stairs or in the principal hall by family or guests. The servants would not have to make a "thoroughfare" out of the front part of the house, which could be more effectively reserved for the family. One author implied that employers installed these "separate and obscure ways" for servants because they and their guests took "offence" at meeting domestics on the main stairway.[39]

Architects pointed out that with proper planning, one staircase could suffice nearly as well as two for keeping servants out of the front hall and the front part of the house. In detached houses the single staircase could be placed, not in the main hallway, but in a shielded side passage. Thus placed, the stairs were "sufficiently retired to be used by servants without incommoding the family." Andrew Jackson Downing wrote that by such an arrangement

> the servants are enabled to go from the basement to the chamber story without passing through the principal hall; thus making this single staircase to serve the purposes, in a great measure, of the two frequently seen in the [sic] villas, viz., the stairs in the hall used by the family, and the private stairs used chiefly by the domestics.[40]

A back staircase located in the kitchen wing, however, provided an additional benefit which was impos-

sible to duplicate with only one flight. Henry Hudson Holly explained as follows:

> The main advantage of this arrangement is that, when the family are absent, the domestics may be cut completely off from the main portion of the house, by simply locking the doors of the wing on each story, free access still being allowed them to their own apartments.

As Holly pointed out, this same system worked very well also in town houses. There, only the private stairs extended to the attic; by locking one door on each floor the servant could be "utterly excluded" from all the family rooms.[41]

The installation of private stairs was probably the most conscious part of the effort to separate employer and employee. Basement kitchens and attic bedrooms combined motives of economy with those of exclusion, but in the case of back stairs employers spent additional money to keep servants removed from the family portions of the house. Servants' stairs were especially costly, and indeed wasteful, in town houses, where floor space was scarce and valuable.

The servant was also to be guarded against while engaged in her duties about the family rooms on the first floor. No feature of the nineteenth-century house is more prominent than the large amount of space allocated for the main hall, back halls, and other passageways. An important function of these halls was to allow servants on duty to go about the house without going

through any of the family rooms. The main hall was connected with the kitchen and private stairs by the back hall or entry. Every room on the first floor opened onto this system of hallways. Even in narrow row houses, a hall seven feet wide ran most of the length of the house, connecting every room, the front door, and the private stairs. As Samuel Sloan wrote concerning a suburban house, "All the principal rooms, the kitchen included, are reached . . . without the necessity of making a thoroughfare of any room . . . ." The connecting halls permitted a servant to answer the front door or answer a call in any family room without going through any other room and thus intruding on the family. "The passages passing through the whole depth of this house, make all rooms private," pointed out the Baltimore architect John Hall in relation to one of his designs for row houses. Gervase Wheeler wrote that the main hall and back passage combined to form "means of access for the servants to the front door . . . ."[42]

A good discussion of this point was provided by George E. Woodward, a New York architect who advocated country and suburban living. Many people, especially those from cities, objected to a reduction of hall space and to interconnecting rooms because with a more compact arrangement "the servants, in attending the

front door, must pass to and fro through either dining-room or living-room." While he agreed that interconnecting rooms could be annoying in town houses, Woodward thought the difficulty was less important in country houses, where there were fewer visitors than in town houses, "and thus only a possible chance exists of both rooms being occupied at the same time in such a manner that the servant's presence would be offensive." Unlike many of his clients, Woodward himself saw nothing disagreeable or improper about having a servant walk through the dining room on her way to the front door; after all, the same domestic waited on the family table in that very room.[43]

Nor was the servant to even pass through the family halls if it could be avoided. As previously mentioned, the back stairs were intended to keep servants out of the prominent front hallway. Dumbwaiters and pantries were also included partly to exclude servants from halls. If the kitchen was in the basement, a dumbwaiter is essential, thought Andrew Jackson Downing, "or the privacy of the hall is unnecessarily intruded upon by the repeated coming and going of domestics arranging the dinner." Similarly, pantries and walk-through china closets with doors at each end between the dining room and the kitchen provided the servant with a means of direct communication between these two

rooms "without loss of privacy" to the family. Calvert Vaux added one pantry because he considered it "inconvenient to have halls and passages that belong to the other apartments occupied several times a day by the servant whose business it is to prepare the table and clean away afterward."[44]

These arrangements represented a conscious effort to minimize contact between employers and their domestics, to protect the family from intrusions by their lower-class employees. The exclusion of the domestic as a motive in planning can be clearly seen in Andrew Jackson Downing's Cottage Residences. Its clearest articulation and most consistent application came later, however, especially in the writings of Calvert Vaux and Henry Hudson Holly. The latter combined rigorous exclusion of the servant from the family rooms with pleas to make servants more comfortable in their own portion of the house.

Certain advantages also accrued to the servant as a result of such arrangments. Domestics doubtless frequently found it more convenient to use the back staircase than to go through the front of the residence. Where the domestic's bedroom was over the kitchen, for example, the servants' stairs formed an easy access between her room and the kitchen. Similarily, the separation of the kitchen and the family rooms gave

the maid increased privacy when she had visitors. On the other hand, she must have been aware that she was not welcome in the front portion of the house and that employers did not like her using the front stairs even if this was more convenient for her purpose. Furthermore, considerations of the comfort and convenience of servants were not often mentioned when architects explained the purposes behind their plans to middle and upper-class readers. Employers appeared more anxious to know how the domestic would be kept apart from them than they were to know what provisions had been made for her comfort. The explanations provided by architects for back stairs and separated kitchens emphasized the convenience and interests of employers, not servants. The reason actually given for these arrangements was to remove the domestic from the family; whatever advantages domestics received from them was incidental to their stated purpose.

For the servant to appear in the family portion of the house, even while at work, was considered an annoying necessity or an intrusion. Residents were anxious to maintain their cherished seclusion from the lower-class employees living within the house; architects naturally strove to satisfy this desire. Designers explained their designs in terms which would assure employers that care had been taken to separate master and servant.

Kitchens, stairs, hallways, entrances, and bedrooms were all planned with a view toward making the servant inconspicuous. The physical space between the kitchen and the parlor, and the several doors between, accented the social gap between mistress and maid; each was to have her own separate part of the house. Given the construction of these houses, it is not surprising that Harriet Prescott Spofford wrote that domestics "remain almost literally the stranger within our gates."[45]

Furthermore, domestics were given uncomfortable, "out-of-the-way" places in which to work and sleep. They received the least desirable rooms in the house. These rooms were generally markedly inferior in location and comforts to those of their employers, a fact which emphasized the class distinctions existing within the house. Even those who thought masters should give better quarters to their servants were quick to point out that social equality was not to be recognized. As in other aspects of their relationship with their servants, employers imposed class distinctions and continual reminders of social differences upon those in their employ.

NOTES

[1]Calvert Vaux, Villas and Cottages: A Series of Designs Prepared for Execution in the United States (New York, 1857), pp. 246, 251.

[2]James D. McCabe, Jr., Lights and Shadows of New York Life; or, The Sights and Sensations of the Great City (New York, 1872), p. 711; Montgomery Schuyler, "The Small House in New York City," The Architectural Record, VIII, nos. 4-6 (April-June, 1899), pp. 357-360; Talbot Hamlin, Greek Revival Architecture in America: Being an Account of Important Trends in American Architecture and Life Prior to the War Between the States (New York, 1944), pp. 127-130; Bainbridge Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay: An Architectural History, 1840-1917 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1967), pp. 129, 136-137. The house described in 1872 by McCabe is little changed from that characterized by James Fenimore Cooper in the 1820's as "a species of second-rate, genteel houses" occupied by "merchants or professional men, in moderate circumstances . . . ." Notions of the Americans, I, (New York, 1963), p. 143. For complete plans of typical row houses see especially Samuel Sloan, City and Suburban Architecture: Containing Numerous Designs and Details for Public Edifices, Private Residences and Mercantile Buildings (Philadelphia, 1859), designs X, XV, XVII.

[3]McCabe, Lights and Shadows, p. 711; Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay, p. 137.

[4]Vaux, Villas and Cottages, p. 34; Andrew Jackson Downing, Cottage Residences; or, A Series of Designs for Rural Cottages and Cottage Villas and their Gardens and Grounds Adapted to North America (New York, 1842), p. 5; Mrs. A. J. Graves, Woman in America: Being an Examination into the Moral and Intellectual Condition of American Female Society (New York, 1843), p. 76; "Living Rooms and Back Stairs," Arthur's Home Magazine, December, 1876, p. 644.

[5]Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay, p. 138; James Richardson, "The New Homes of New York," Scribner's Monthly, May, 1874, p. 67.

[6]P. B. Wright, "Apartment Houses Practically Considered," Putnam's Monthly Magazine (2d ser.), September, 1870, p. 309; also see Richardson, "The New Homes of New York," Scribner's Monthly, May, 1874, p. 67. Before apartment living became a reality, many urban, middle-class families, especially young couples, resorted to living in boarding houses in order to escape the care and expense of maintaining a town house. A principal factor in boarding-house living was the young wife's desire to avoid the trials of housekeeping, particularly the duties of managing servants. Moralists condemned the boarding house as destructive of family life, a

threat to the very institution of the family. Writers blamed troublesome, incompentent domestics for forcing families into boarding houses and thus endangering home life. Servants were charged with being "responsible for one of the worst evils of American life--an evil which is not only corrupting but fast extinguishing the chief source of personal and national virtue--domestic existence." Robert Tomes, "Your Humble Servant," Harper's New Monthly Magazine, June, 1864, p. 54; also Graves, Woman in America, pp. 132-133; J. Dana Howard, "The Standpoint of the Boarding House," The Atlantic Monthly, Fevruary, 1867, pp. 248-250; [Jane C. Croly], "A Happy Household," Demorest's Monthly Magazine, September, 1866, p. 231; Rev. William Aikman, "The Evils of Boarding House Life," Arthur's Home Magazine, February, 1870, pp. 109-110.

[7]Frank R. Stockton and Marian Stockton, The Home: Where It Should Be and What to Put in It (New York, 1873), p. 77; Henry Hudson Holly, Modern Dwellings in Town and Country Adapted to American Wants and Climate (New York, 1878), p. 93; Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay, p. 138; Gervase Wheeler, Rural Homes; or, Sketches of Houses Suited to American Country Life (New York, 1852), p. 83; [Harriet Beecher Stowe], House and Home Papers (Boston, 1865), p. 213; also Todd. S. Goodholme, ed., A Domestic Cyclopedia of Practical Information (New

York, 1877), p. 477, [Sarah Payson Parton], Folly as It Flies: Hit at by Fanny Fern (New York, 1868), p. 112.

[8]Andrew Jackson Downing, The Architecture of Country Houses: Including Designs for Cottages, Farm Houses, and Villas (New York, 1850), p. 272. For basement kitchens in the 1860's and 1870's see, for example, Isaac H. Hobbs and Son, Hobbs's Architecture: Containing Designs and Ground Plans for Villas, Cottages, and Other Edifices (Philadelphia, 1873), designs 9, 16, 19, 21, 24, 54, 65.

[9]Holly, Modern Dwellings, p. 114.

[10]Henry Hudson Holly, Holly's Country Seats: Containing Lithographic Designs for Cottages, Villas, Mansions, etc., with their Accompanying Outbuildings (New York, 1863), p. 53; Holly, Modern Dwellings, p. 114; Downing, Cottage Residences, p. 3; also see George E. Woodward and F. W. Woodward, comps., Woodward's Country Houses (New York, 1865), p. 146.

[11][Jane C. Croly], "The Kitchen," Demorest's Monthly Magazine, May 1874, p. 177.

[12]Parker Pillsbury, "Domestic Service," The Revolution, August 12, 1869, pp. 88-89; [Robert Tomes], "The Kitchen," Harper's Bazar, October 5, 1872, p. 650; Harriet Prescott Spofford, The Servant Girl Question (Boston, 1881), p. 38; Holly, Modern Dwellings, p. 114; Sarah Josepha Hale, The Good Housekeeper; or, The Way

to Live Well and to Be Well While We Live (Boston, 1839), pp. 113-114.

[13]Robert Tomes, The Bazar Book of Decorum (New York, 1872), p. 231; Pillsbury, "Domestic Service," The Revolution, August 12, 1869, p. 89.

[14]Downing, The Architecture of Country Houses, p. 271; Vaux, Villas and Cottages, p. 176.

[15]Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, pp. 38, 153.

[16]Downing, Cottage Residences, pp. 4, 130; Gervase Wheeler, Homes for the People, in Suburb and Country: The Villa, the Mansion, and the Cottage, Adapted to American Climate and Wants (New York, 1850), p. 71; Vaux, Villas and Cottages, p. 149; see also Downing, The Architecture of Country Houses, p. 287; Holly, Holly's Country Seats, p. 122.

[17]Vaux, Villas and Cottages, p. 149; Samuel Sloan, The Model Architect: A Series of Original Designs for Cottages, Villas, Suburban Residences, etc., II (revised ed., Philadelphia, 1868), p. 89; Holly, Modern Dwellings, p. 112; John Hall, A Series of Select and Original Modern Designs for Dwelling Houses, for the Use of Carpenters and Builders (2nd ed., Baltimore, 1840), p. 9.

[18][Harriet Prescott Spofford], "Bridget," Harper's Bazar, November 11, 1871, p. 706; Pillsbury "Domestic Service," The Revolution, August 12, 1869, p. 89.

[19]Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay, p. 137; Hamlin, Greek Revival Architecture in America, pp. 127-128.

[20]Robert E. Riegel, Young America, 1830-1840 (Norman, Oklahoma, 1949), p. 50; Hamlin, Greek Revival Architecture in America, p. 129; Hall, A Series of Select and Original Modern Designs, pp. 7, 9-10, 12; Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay, pp. 137-138. Both Pittsburgh and Cincinnati had water systems in operation by 1830. Richard C. Wade, The Urban Frontier: The Rise of Western Cities, 1790-1830 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1959), pp. 294-295, 297.

[21]Vaux, Villas and Cottages, p. 183; Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay, pp. 135, 138; Julia McNair Wright, The Complete Home: An Encyclopedia of Domestic Life and Affairs (Philadelphia, 1879), p. 449; Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy, for the Use of Young Ladies at Home and School (New York, 1842), p. 315.

[22]Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay, pp. 138-129, 278; Hamlin, Greek Revival Architecture in America, p. 127. For early discussions of heating see: Downing, The Architecture of Country Houses, pp. 461-484; William H. Ranlett, The Architect: A Series of Original Designs for Domestic and Ornamental Cottages and Villas, I, (New York, 1847), pp. 27-28.

[23]Catharine Sedgwick, Live and Let Live; or, Domestic Service Illustrated (New York, 1837), p. 116;

[Jane C. Croly], "The Sleeping Room," Demorest's Monthly Magazine, November, 1874, p. 415; Stockton and Stockton, The Home, pp. 95-96; Holly, Modern Dwellings, p. 115.

[24]Pillsbury, "Domestic Service," The Revolution, August 12, 1869, p. 89; Samuel Sloan, City and Suburban Architecture, design XV, plate 75; R[ichard] R[odgers] Bowker, "In Re Bridget.--The Defence," Old and New, October, 1871, pp. 498-499.

[25]Vaux, Villas and Cottages, p. 298; Holly, Holly's Country Seats, p. 98.

[26]Vaux, Villas and Cottages, p. 175, 189, 287; Wheeler, Rural Homes, p. 153.

[27]Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 39. See, for an example, Charles D. Lakey, Lakey's Village and Country Houses; or, Cheap Homes for all Classes (New York, 1875), design 42, plate 57. In this plan a three level row house has a basement room for the servant the measurements of which are 7' 1" by 8' 6".

[28]Catherine Beecher, Miss Beecher's Domestic Receipt Book (New York, 1846), p. 255; Pillsbury, "Domestic Service," The Revolution, August 12, 1869, p. 89.

[29]Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay, p. 273, fig. 183.

[30]Bowker, "In Re Bridget," Old and New, October, 1871, pp. 498-499; Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy, p. 206.

[31]Bowker, "In Re Bridget," Old and New, October, 1871, p. 499; Sedgwick, Live and Let Live, p. 191; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 39; Robert Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household (New York, 1875), p. 149; Wright, The Complete Home, p. 449; Russell Lynes, The Domesticated Americans (New York, 1957), p. 157.

[32]Goodholme, ed., A Domestic Cyclopedia, p. 477.

[33]Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 39; Sedgwick, Live and Let Live, p. 191; see also [Stowe], House and Home Papers, p. 218.

[34]Goodholme, ed., A Domestic Cyclopedia, p. 477; Holly, Modern Dwellings, p. 114; [Tomes], "The Kitchen," Harper's Bazar, October 5, 1872, p. 650; also [Stowe], House and Home Papers, p. 218.

[35]Goodholme, ed., A Domestic Cyclopedia, p. 477; Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 158.

[36]Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics: With Counsel on Home Matters (Boston, 1855), pp. 18, 104; Vaux, Villas and Cottages, p. 174; Catherine Beecher, A Treatise on Domestic Economy, p. 208; also see Carrie Carrol, "Six Months in the Kitchen," The Ladies' Repository, August, 1861, p. 473.

[37]Compare Hamlin, Greek Architecture in America, pp. 127, 129 with Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay, pp. 131, 136. For large houses from the 1840's without back stairs see Downing, Cottage Residences, designs

VI and VIII; Downing, The Architecture of Country Houses, pp. 292-294.

[38]Downing, The Architecture of Country Houses, p. 272; Holly, Modern Dwellings, p. 113.

[39]Samuel Sloan, Sloan's Homestead Architecture: Containing Forty Designs for Villas, Cottages, and Farm Houses (Philadelphia, 1861), p. 75; Sloan, City and Suburban Architecture, p. 99; Vaux, Villas and Cottages, p. 260; "Living Rooms and Back Stairs," Arthur's, December, 1876, p. 644.

[40]Henry Hudson Holly, "Designs for Houses," Harper's Bazar, July 3, 1869, p. 418; Downing, Cottage Residences, p. 53.

[41]Holly, Modern Dwellings, pp. 112-113, 150; also see Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay, p. 136.

[42]Sloan, Sloan's Homestead Architecture, p. 249; Hall, A Series of Select and Original Modern Designs, pp. 7, 13; Gervase Wheeler quoted in Downing, The Architecture of Country Houses, p. 331.

[43]George E. Woodward and F. W. Woodward, comp., Woodward's Architecture and Rural Art, No. II (New York, 1868), p. 73, pp. 73-74. This work was republished ca. 1873 as George E. Woodward, Woodward's Suburban and Country Homes.

[44]Downing, Cottage Residences, p. 52; Vaux, Villas and Cottages, p. 150.

[45]Spofford, The Servant Girl Question, p. 36.

CONCLUSION

The middle and upper classes of nineteenth-century America consciously attempted to enforce social distance between themselves and their servants. The basic assumption of employers was that domestics were inferior to themselves in character, habits, and mental abilities. Servants were regarded as child-like, undisciplined, and vulgar. These attitudes rationalized and supported a variety of employer responses to domestic servants.

Employers hoped that with proper "instruction" servants would internalize such values as obedience, deference, and faithfulness. Mistresses undertook the duty of uplifting the benighted domestic and training her to be virtuous and "useful." Such paternal guidance was based on a sharp dichotomy between the foolish and irresponsible servant and the wise and benevolent employer; it was meant to produce docile servants who would defer willingly to the judgment of their social "superiors." The benevolent kindness advocated by many writers implied no concession that domestics were to be accepted as social equals. Rather, by emphasizing the servant's childish and foolish nature, paternalism was

one way to formalize the social gap between parlor and kitchen. Efforts to instill "proper" attitudes in servants were especially evident in the tracts for domestics published before the Civil War and in the programs and objectives of charities dealing with servants throughout the century.

Any domestic who failed or refused to internalize the duties of submission and deference still had to accept continual reminders of her lowly social position. The servant was at the constant beck and call of other people. Her employers retained the right to regulate her social and religious life as well as her hours of employment; whatever liberties she received in such matters were granted as "privileges" which existed at the sufferance of the mistress. The social forms regulating the interaction between master and servant also institutionalized the class difference between the two parties. The domestic was to say "Sir" and "Ma'am" to persons who addressed her in terms of familiarity; she was to eat the family's left-overs; she was to come and go by the back door; she was to remain inconspicuous within the house and was assigned to rooms regarded as undesirable or unpleasant. Servants were excluded from places and situations where they might disturb employers or contaminate their children with lower-class habits and manners. "Unrefined" domestics were considered

disagreeable associates for genteel persons and were not thought worthy of the marks of social respect shown to members of the middle and upper classes. Again, a clear distinction was drawn between the cultured and refined employer and the vulgar domestic. In these ways masters sought to define and enforce social distance between themselves and servants.

Such efforts to maintain social distinctions and deference were as prevalent before 1850 as after the Civil War. It has been traditional to refer to the years between the political triumph of Andrew Jackson and the 1850's by such terms as "The Age of the Common Man." According to the interpretations based on such assumptions, the 1820's, thirties, and forties constituted a period of democratic class structure and social equality which contrasted sharply with the stratified social structure and conventions of the Gilded Age. Fixed class divisions and class consciousness emerged only during the 1860's because of the combined pressures of immigrant labor, industrialization, and a new "plutocracy." Such general interpretations have influenced most of the previous work done by social historians on domestic service. Writers have tended to distinguish clearly between the egalitarian nature of service allegedly general before 1860 and the class differences employers began suddenly imposing on domestics after 1865. The

evidence, however, does not support such conclusions about domestic service during the nineteenth century.

In actuality, the attitudes and practices of employers in cities and towns changed little during the two middle quarters of the nineteenth century. Employers of the Jacksonian era were as interested in formalizing social distance and making servants obedient and deferential as were those of the seventies. Arguments in favor of employer paternalism made by Catharine Sedgwick, Lydia Sigourney, and Sarah Josepha Hale in the thirties and forties were identical with those advanced in the seventies by Julia McNair Wright, R. R. Bowker, and Jane C. Croly. Domestics possessed no more personal freedom or control over their own lives before 1850 than they did in the post-Civil War years. In the early decades of the century orphan asylums were already sending out their charges as domestics to mistresses whose motives combined benevolence and self-interest; in the twenties and thirties supposedly "charitable" Societies for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants in New York and Philadelphia attempted to promote standards of social order among domestics and to make them more "useful" to employers. Tracts for the advice and "instruction" of servants had similar purposes of control; these publications stressed the duty of the servant to submit deferentially to her employer.

Differentiated forms of social etiquette between employer and domestic were already established. Employers were said to be rude and arrogant to their domestics. As early as 1842 Andrew Jackson Downing was explaining how his house designs would exclude servants from the family portions of the residence. Such were the attitudes and conduct of employers during the Age of Jackson, the alleged height of American democracy. Even before the massive Irish immigration of the late forties and fifties, masters desired to enforce social distinctions and stability.

The movement of large numbers of Irish girls into domestic service intensified many of these reactions, especially those based on feelings of hostility and revulsion. The influence of the Irish was felt well before 1850; they were a very important element of the servant population in the New York area as early as the 1820's and had acquired a reputation for being ignorant and slovenly by the late thirties. Furthermore, the greatest impact of Irish servants came between 1845 and 1860 rather than after the Civil War. After 1850 domestic servants and the Irish became virtually synonymous. Because of their peasant background, Catholic religion, and "alien" habits, Irish girls were especially open to charges of being vulgar and undesirable residents of the home. With these "half-

barbaric" girls in service, it doubtless became more imperative to separate them from the family table and family rooms. The presence of Irish servants tended to widen the existing social gap by reinforcing class divisions with ethnic, cultural, and religious tensions. As noted by E. L. Godkin and Sidney George Fisher in the late fifties, however, this process was well under way before 1860.

The basic responses of employers were carried over from the Jacksonian period into the post-war years. Social attitudes remained essentially the same, stressing the child-like and vulgar characteristics of domestics. Regulations designed to accent and institutionalize social separation also antedated the Civil War. It is clear that in regard to domestic servants the class-conscious attitudes and regulations generally associated with the Gilded Age had deep roots in the earlier decades of the nineteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ESSAY

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ESSAY

The bulk of the material for this study has come from contemporary printed sources--especially periodical literature, household and etiquette manuals, and essay collections. Comparatively few secondary sources have been of assistance in either the formulation of ideas regarding the topic or specific points of information. There is a rather surprising lack of historical discussion regarding domestic service, the most common female occupation of the nineteenth century. No historical study provides an in-depth or comprehensive discussion of the historical nature of service in America. The standard work on the servant problem in the late nineteenth century is Lucy Maynard Salmon, Domestic Service (New York, 1897). Miss Salmon was a professional historian, but her book is principally an attempt to apply the nascent methods of social science to domestic service in the 1890's. The historical portion of her discussion is based largely on the accounts of European travelers and overemphasizes the democratic aspects of the master-servant relation in the United States earlier in the century. Two more recent, popularized accounts which maintain a similar emphasis are

E. S. Turner, What the Butler Saw: Two Hundred and Fifty Years of the Servant Problem (New York, 1963), an account of service in England with two chapters on the New World, and Russell Lynes, The Domesticated Americans (New York, 1957), a general study of American manners. Lynes's book contains some insightful and useful material on domestic architecture as it related to servants and on the life of the domestic, but both of these authors follow Miss Salmon in suggesting that service was generally a democratic relationship which varied little between backcountry and urban center. All three writers lead the reader to view the "help" as the typical servant in both city and country before the Civil War. All also tend to make a sharp distinction between the democratic nature of service before 1860 and the suddenly class-conscious service of the post-war years. This dichotomy seems unwarranted; the actual division was between urban and rural service throughout the century.

A more scholarly and accurate picture is presented in the few pages addressed to the history of service in the excellent early study by Helen Sumner, History of Women in Industry in the United States, volume IX of Report on Conditions of Woman and Child Wage-Earners in the United States (Senate Document 645, 61st cong., 2d sess., 1910). Miss Sumner made extensive and careful

use of early labor newspapers; her findings are particularly helpful in regard to wages and criticisms of the activities of the New York and Philadelphia Societies for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestics. Her analysis is a good starting point for anyone interested in the conditions and problems of working women in the nineteenth century. Three more recent books have also been of valuable assistance. Robert Ernst, Immigrant Life in New York City, 1825-1863 (New York, 1949) contains some useful material on domestics in America's largest city. Douglas T. Miller, Jacksonian Aristocracy: Class and Democracy in New York, 1830-1860 (New York, 1967) includes suggestive comments not only on domestic service but also on the general nature of class relationships in nineteenth-century America. Stanley Lebergott, Manpower in Economic Growth: The American Record Since 1800 (New York, 1964) is a helpful and readable quanitative study which provides a detailed analysis of the money wages and, for the period after 1860, the real wages of servants.

Turning to contemporary published materials, books devoted exclusively to the servant question were uncommon in America. The most important books on the topic were the tracts published for servants before the Civil War. These books of advice were intended to guide and instruct servants in their duties and

the proper ways to please their employers. A short, early example of this type is the pamphlet A Friendly Gift for Servants and Apprentices (New York and Baltimore, 1821). Robert Roberts, The House Servant's Directory; or, A Monitor for Private Families: Comprising Hints on the Arrangement and Performance of Servants' Work (New York and Boston, 1827) is a book of advice for men-servants allegedly written by a worthy Boston servant. Although it contains much material relevant to my analysis, most of it is devoted to recipes and the proper way to carry out the details of domestic work. There are three especially useful tracts which provide extended discussions of the behavior and attitudes employers desired to cultivate in their servants. One of these is Parlour and Kitchen; or, The Story of Ann Connover (Philadelphia, 1835), a tract issued by The American Sunday School Union which was in print as late as 1876. The others are Catherine Beecher, Letters to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service (New York, 1842) and the anonymous Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics: With Counsel on Home Matters (Boston, 1855). Each of these books sets forth a notion of the master-servant relation emphasizing the duties of obedience and submission owed by the grateful and rather awed employee to the benevolent employer.

Two other book-length treatments deserve special notice. Catharine Sedgwick's didactic novel Live and

Let Live; or, Domestic Service Illustrated (New York, 1837) contains much useful material on the life of the urban domestic in the 1830's as well as Miss Sedgwick's personal views. The only extended contemporary analysis of the servant problem is Harriet Prescott Spofford, The Servant Girl Question (Boston, 1881). Though published in 1881, her book actually represents a viewpoint of the early and mid-1870's, for it is a compilation of essays originally published in Harper's Bazar between 1873 and 1875. The New England writer and poetess made few important changes between the articles and the book although the latter contains stylistic revisions and some additional material.

An especially important source of information for this study has been the large body of periodical literature of the nineteenth century. Most monthlies included an index or detailed table of contents in each volume, facilitating their use. These magazines contain a wealth of material dealing with social and home life. Of the popular ladies' monthlies the most valuable for my investigation have been Godey's Lady's Book (1830-1876), the largest circulation monthly prior to the Civil War, edited by Louis Godey and Sarah Josepha Hale and Arthur's Home Magazine (1852-1876) edited by Timothy Shay Arthur and Virginia Townsend. Both of these Philadelphia publications contain many didactic and

descriptive essays on a wide variety of topics; Arthur's carried an especially large number of articles concerning domestic servants during 1870. Some useful articles may also be found in Mrs. Hale's early Boston venture, The American Ladies' Magazine (1828-1826) which she edited before she went to Philadelphia to work for Godey. The Ladies' Repository (1841-1876), a publication sponsored by the Methodist Church, presented an evangelical viewpoint and a more Midwestern flavor than any other national monthly. It was published in Cincinnati for many years; even after the periodical moved to New York, many Ohio writers continued to contribute to its pages. After the Civil War, New York magazines became more important in the women's market. The foremost of these new publications based in New York were Demorest's Monthly Magazine (1864-1876) and the very successful weekly Harper's Bazar (1868-1876). The Bazar was the most important fashion magazine of its time, but its editorials, many of them written by Harriet Prescott Spofford, Robert Tomes, or Mary Abigail Dodge, frequently condemned the ostentation of the day. Harper's Bazar is not indexed, but the editorial page appears at regular intervals in the sixteen-page weekly. Demorest's proved useful chiefly for the spirited regular column contributed by Mrs. Jane C. Croly under the pen-name "Jennie June." Two other long-lived Philadelphia ladies' periodicals

proved disappointing--Graham's Monthly Magazine (1826-1858) and Peterson's Magazine (1842-1876), the latter being the most popular women's monthly after about 1860. Graham's was composed principally of literature and travel narratives and contained comparatively few essays on social manners or the household. Peterson's was devoted almost exclusively to low-quality sentimental and melodramatic fiction and presented few essays of any sort.

A number of general interest periodicals were also very valuable, largely for the post-Civil War years. The most helpful general magazines were Harper's New Monthly Magazine (1850-1876) and Scribner's Monthly (1870-1876). Scribner's contained an especially large number of articles on social topics; almost every volume included material dealing with service. E. L. Godkin contributed several informative articles on domestic servants to The Nation (1865-1876), for which there is a separately published index for the years prior to 1917. The Unitarian monthly Old and New (1870-1875) edited by Edward Everett Hale has some useful articles as does Lippincott's Magazine (1870-1876). The most important pieces in Old and New were critical of the existing attitudes and behavior of employers toward their domestics. Boston's general magazine The Atlantic Monthly (1857-1876) included the house-

hold essays by Harriet Beecher Stowe later collected into her books on domestic life, but it is generally less useful for the social historian than its New York rival, Harper's. More complete sketches of each of these magazines may be found in the first three volumes of Frank Luther Mott, A History of American Magazines, first published in 1930 and 1938.

Aside from the periodicals of the time, the most helpful type of source relating to servants was the cook book or manual of domestic economy. A useful bibliography of pre-Civil War publications is found in Waldo Lincoln, "Bibliography of American Cookery Books, 1742-1860," Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, new series, volume XXXIX, October, 1929. While some cook books, including the large number written and compiled by Eliza Leslie, contained little or no material on domestics and others took their advice on service from more influential American or English volumes, many of the frequently reprinted books included a chapter on the management of servants. The most important family in diffusing information on domestic economy in the nineteenth century was the Beecher clan. Catherine Beecher, the eldest child of Lyman Beecher, led the way with A Treatise on Domestic Economy, for the Use of Young Ladies at Home and School, which first appeared in 1841 although what became the standard edition was issued by Harper Brothers in 1842.

Miss Beecher, who thought every girl should study cooking and domestic economy, followed this book with Miss Beecher's Domestic Receipt Book: Designed as a Supplement to her Treatise on Domestic Economy (New York, 1846) containing additional advice to both mistress and maid. Both of these books were reprinted a number of times. In 1873 there appeared Miss Beecher's Housekeeper and Healthkeeper (New York), in which the recommendations concerning servants were largely reprinted from Miss Beecher's books of the 1840's. During the Civil War Catherine's sister Harriet Beecher Stowe brought out her House and Home Papers (Boston, 1864). Mrs. Stowe's outlook was generally less rigid and authoritarian than that expressed earlier by her sister. Together the two sisters co-authored The American Woman's Home (New York, 1869), a popular book which was actually little more than a sissors-and-paste compliation of material from their earlier books. In their chapter on servants advice from each author was reprinted, but that of Mrs. Stowe predominated. Another Beecher who advocated firm discipline in dealing with servants was their sister-in-law Eunice Beecher, the wife of Henry Ward Beecher. Mrs. Beecher wrote a column of household advice for The Christian Union, the evangelical weekly edited by her husband. Two useful collections of her articles appeared during 1870's, Motherly Talks with Young Housekeepers (New York,

1873) and All Around the House; or, How to Make Homes Happy (New York, 1878).

Other household manuals of the pre-Civil War years with helpful discussions of domestic service were Mrs. Elizabeth Ellet, ed., The Practical Housekeeper: A Cyclopedia of Domestic Economy (New York, 1857) and the often-reprinted Mrs. Mary Hooker Cornelius, The Young Housekeeper's Friend (New York), which first appeared in 1845 but retained the same advice concerning servants through expanded editions lasting into the 1870's. Another valuable source was David Meredith Reese's American edition of the English volume by Thomas Webster and Mrs. Francis Parkes, An Encyclopedia of Domestic Economy: Comprising Such Subjects as Are Most Immediately Connected with Housekeeping (New York, 1845). Following the English authors' remarks on service, Reese, a New York physician, included his own observations on American servants. The editor of Godey's, Mrs. Sarah Josepha Hale, published several books on cooking and domestic economy; for the purposes of this study the most useful was The Good Housekeeper; or, The Way To Live Well and To Be Well While We Live (Boston, 1839). The same advice was later reproduced in Mrs. Hale's The Ladies' New Book of Cookery (New York, 1852).

Useful chapters on servants appeared in a number of housekeeping manuals written after the Civil War.

The first of these to appear was Joseph Bardwell Lyman and Laura E. Lyman, The Philosophy of Housekeeping: A Scientific and Practical Manual (Hartford, 1869). Books from the 1870's included Julia McNair Wright, The Complete Home: An Encyclopedia of Domestic Life and Affairs (Philadelphia, 1879) and Mary Virginia Terhune, Common Sense in the Household: A Manual of Practical Housewifery (New York, 1874), the first of several books of domestic advice Mrs. Terhune wrote under the name "Marion Harland." The writer or writers of the essay on servants in Todd S. Goodholme, ed., A Domestic Cyclopedia of Practical Information (New York, 1877) combined their own advice with some unacknowledged borrowings from Mrs. Stowe. The novelist Frank Stockton and his wife Marian Stockton included a valuable chapter on domestics in The Home: Where It Should Be and What To Put in It (New York, 1873). Robert Tomes, The Bazar Book of the Household (New York, 1875) offered the most complete contemporary attack on the nature and conditions of domestic service although he agreed that some form of household assistance was essential. Tomes's views expressed in this book show an interesting development from his more moderate and conventional, as well as highly informative, article "Your Humble Servant" presented in Harper's in June, 1864. Tomes was much more aware than most contemporaries of the subtleties involved in the social relationships between employer and employee.

Another fruitful source of information has been the etiquette book or behavior manual, a type of publication which was extremely popular in the nineteenth century. A good general study of the content of this literature is Arthur Meier Schlesinger, Learning How to Behave: A Historical Study of American Etiquette Books (New York, 1947). A helpful guide to the books themselves is Mary Reed Bobbitt, A Bibliography of Etiquette Books Published in America Before 1900 (New York, 1947). The Bobbitt bibliography, however, omits many volumes which offered advice on social manners and relationships but which were not strictly speaking etiquette books. Among those she does not list which were useful are William A. Alcott, The Young Wife; or, The Duties of Woman in the Marriage Relation (Boston, 1837), one of his numerous books on proper conduct, and Mathew Carey, Philosophy of Common Sense: Containing Practical Rules for the Promotion of Domestic Happiness (Philadelphia, 1838), which included his 1835 article in Godey's, "Essay on the Relations Between Masters and Mistresses and Domestics." Alcott recommended that householders not employ servants for a variety of reasons--they were expensive, they encouraged idleness in the family, they were denied Christian privileges, and they fostered anti-democratic attitudes in employers. Typical statements on domestics can be found in Etiquette

for Ladies: With Hints on the Preservation, Improvement, and Display of Female Beauty (Philadelphia, 1838), Samuel R. Wells, How to Behave: A Pocket Manual of Republican Etiquette (New York, 1857), and Margaret Cockburn Conkling , The American Gentleman's Guide to Politeness and Fashion (New York, 1857). Each of these volumes was reprinted a number of times. Eliza Farrar, The Young Lady's Friend (Boston, 1837) was reprinted into the seventies and was particularly sympathetic to servants. On the other hand, an especially class-conscious and firm attitude was advocated by The Laws of Etiquette; or, Short Rules and Reflections for Conduct in Society (Philadelphia, 1836) which was reproduced fourteen times under a variety of titles. One of the most popular etiquette books of the 1870's was Robert Tomes, The Bazar Book of Decorum (New York, 1870), a book compiled from articles in Harper's Bazar and which was generally sympathetic to domestics.

In the nineteenth century the increasing number of female journalists and writers frequently collected their scattered articles into more easily available volumes. Probably the most popular and prominent of these lady writers was the outspoken "Fanny Fern," Mrs. Sarah Payson Parton. Her books of essays are Fern Leaves from Fanny's Portfolio (first series, Auburn, New York, 1853) which was followed by a second series under the same

title in 1854, Fresh Leaves (New York, 1857), Folly as It Flies: Hit at by Fanny Fern (New York, 1868), Ginger-Snaps (New York, 1871), and Caper-Sauce: A Volume of Chit-Chat, About Men, Women, and Things (New York, 1872). Every volume contains useful essays on a wide range of social topics, but the books which were most useful for this study were Folly as It Flies and Ginger-Snaps. Another important lady journalist was Mary Abigail Dodge, known to her readers as "Gail Hamilton," who wrote spirited, often caustic, essays for a variety of newspapers and magazines. Two of her books, Woman's Wrongs: A Counter-Irritant (Boston, 1868) and Woman's Worth and Worthlessness (New York, 1871) have been especially helpful. The former was written as a reply to Rev. John Todd who had advocated the continued social subordination of women; the latter book is a collection of articles which originally appeared in Harper's Bazar. A collection of Jane C. Croly's newspaper articles preceding her column for Demorest's is available in her book Jennie Juneiana: Talks on Women's Topics (Boston, 1864). Harriet Beecher Stowe, The Chimney Corner (Boston, 1868) is a volume of essays on domestic life originally appearing in The Atlantic Monthly. In this book Mrs. Stowe advocated domestic service as a pleasant, warmly paternal occupation for girls, a reversal of some of her earlier,

more critical comments in House and Home Papers. A helpful article comparing English and American servants is included in Caroline M. Kirkland, The Evening Book (New York, 1851). Mrs. Kirkland was the editor of the short-lived Sartain's Union Magazine (1847-1852) in which this material first appeared.

Two other general, contemporary books deserve special mention. Mrs. A. J. Graves, Woman in America: Being an Examination into the Moral and Intellectual Condition of American Female Society (New York, 1843) attempts a comprehensive discussion of the place of various types of women in American society. Another significant volume is Virginia Penny, The Employments of Women: A Cyclopedia of Woman's Work (Boston, 1863). Miss Penny's book contains a wealth of detailed information on hundreds of female occupations. It is very poorly organized, with sentences coming in no particular logical order, but it is indispensable as a descriptive guide to the jobs open to women in the nineteenth century.

The most valuable sources for the charitable organizations discussed are, of course, the annual reports cited in the text. Some of the difficult-to-obtain material on the Philadelphia Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestics can be found in two more accessible publications by Mathew Carey.

There is an extract from the society's first report included in Carey's Miscellaneous Essays (Philadelphia, 1830), and one of his promotional leaflets for the organization is collected in his Miscellaneous Pamphlets (Philadelphia, 1831). Two books are particularly illuminating on the activities of the New York Children's Aid Society. The foremost of these is Charles Loring Brace, The Dangerous Classes of New York and Twenty Years Work Among Them (New York, 1872). Brace was a constant promoter of the society, of which he was the founder and Secretary. Much additional and otherwise unavailable material may be found in a book by his daughter--Emma Brace, ed., The Life of Charles Loring Brace: Chiefly Told in His Own Letters (New York, 1894). Two sources which are valuable for their general information concerning charitable activities for children, and which are useful for an understanding of the motives behind them, should be noted. A comprehensive and careful study of the institutions dealing with children throughout the state of New York in the 1870's is William P. Letchworth, Homes of Homeless Children: A Report on Orphan Asylums and Other Institutions for the Care of Children (Albany, 1876). This informative contemporary volume by the Commissioner of the New York State Board of Charities indicates how widespread the custom was of training and sending out girls from institutions as domestics.

The most significant secondary source is Henry W. Thurston, The Dependent Child: A Story of Changing Aims and Methods in the Care of Dependent Children (New York, 1930). In this rather old though valuable book, Thurston traces the transition of institutional care from the almshouse to the orphan asylum to various foster home plans such as Brace's "placement" system. He rightly stresses the continuity between Brace's methods and the indenture system.

In regard to architectural history, the best sources are naturally the plan books by Andrew Jackson Downing, Calvert Vaux, Samuel Sloan, Henry Hudson Holly, and others mentioned in the text. A comprehensive bibliography is supplied by Henry-Russell Hitchcock, American Architectural Books: A List of Books, Portfolios, and Pamphlets on Architecture and Related Subjects Published in America Before 1895 (Minneapolis, 1946). Most of the important contemporary books on architecture, including all of those used in this analysis, are fortunately readily available on microfilm in The American Culture Series of University Microfilms. Two secondary works merit particular mention. One of these is the comprehensive study by Talbot Hamlin, Greek Revival Architecture in American: Being an Account of Important Trends in American Architecture and American Life Prior to the War Between the States (New York and London,

1944). The other is a recent local study--Bainbridge Bunting, Houses of Boston's Back Bay: An Architectural History, 1840-1917 (Cambridge, Mass., 1967). This excellent book should serve as a model for furture investigations; unlike many architectural historians, Bunting provides detailed information on the floor plans of the urban homes being examined.