2011

# Living in Two Worlds: Kinship Networks and Pennsylvania's Integration into the Atlantic World

Thomas R. Saxton
*Lehigh University*

# Living in Two Worlds:
# Kinship Networks and Pennsylvania's Integration into the Atlantic World

by

Thomas R. Saxton

A Dissertation

Presented to the Graduate and Research Committee

of Lehigh University

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Department of History

Lehigh University

April, 2011

Approved and recommended for acceptance as a dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Thomas R. Saxton
Living in Two Worlds: Kinship Networks and Pennsylvania's Integration into the Atlantic World

_____

Defense Date

_____

Jean R. Soderlund
Dissertation Director

_____

Approved Date

Committee Members:

_____

James S. Saeger
Member

_____

John Pettegrew
Member

_____

Susan E. Klepp
External Member

## Table of Contents

**Abstract**

This is a study of the form, functions, and activities of kin groups in the British Atlantic world. The early modern Atlantic world was complex and intricately composed of a web of contacts, and networks of kinship shaped vital interactions and exchanges based on reciprocity. The thesis is that familial networks enhanced Pennsylvania's connections to the wider Atlantic community by forging links and helping migrants and their descendants look outward into the Atlantic world.

Defining features of the Atlantic world—the process of migration, communications, commercial enterprises, and cultural identity—all followed lines of kinship. Networks of kinship supported migration chains, facilitating the movement of people as free passengers, indentured servants, or redemptioners and linking migrants in the colonial destination of Pennsylvania to kinfolk in multiple sending communities of the European Atlantic. Kin correspondence circulated throughout the Atlantic, providing a crucial link for geographically separated family members. Affective communication and expressions of kin sentiment sustained emotional bonds of kinship. Migrants and their descendants used relations by blood and marriage to create economic associations and joint business undertakings. Overseas kin connections provided an entrepreneurial advantage, acting on behalf of relatives and transmitting news about market prices and conditions while simultaneously connecting Philadelphia's mercantile community to other Atlantic port cities. Various familial memory practices were used by the colony's upper class to assert claims to gentility. Endeavors in family history, such as tracing lineage, stimulated interchanges between geographically distant relatives and fostered a

sense of belonging for migrants and their descendants to an ancestral past that spanned the Atlantic.

The dissertation utilizes a range of sources to explore the utility and symbolic value of kinship, including letters, Quaker certificates of removal, newspapers, wills, ship passenger lists, autobiographical accounts, Bible record-keeping, and genealogical research. The project's research foundation rests heavily on letters, and a qualitative orientation allows for a nuanced understanding of the nature, practice, and implications of kinship. Material objects, such as heraldic devices, and other kin-based customs shed light on kinship identification. These sources recapture the richness of kin relationships and produce a vivid understanding of aspects of kinship functioning.

## Introduction

The early modern Atlantic was animated by an incredible number of moving parts, and networks of kinship were a salient component of that dynamism. Kinship networks were deeply embedded in the British Atlantic world, lacing together peoples and far-flung places. The dissertation argues that Pennsylvania was extensively linked to the early modern Atlantic world by networks of kinship. An Atlantic-spanning network of kin carried out a wide repertoire of activities. The various activities of kin networks—their participation in the process of migration, letter writing, commercial enterprises, and pursuit of family-based cultural traditions—enlivened the British Atlantic world, stimulating exchanges of written words, commercial transactions, and cultural transfer. Kinship networks were vital nodes for the exchange of migrants, communication, commerce, and culture; it was through these kin ties that Pennsylvania was Atlanticized.

Kinship has been a largely neglected area in the study of British Atlantic history.[1] This study shows that kinship networks were crucial to understanding how the Atlantic world was linked. A kinship perspective puts Pennsylvania in a broad Atlantic context,

[1] David Cressy, *Coming Over: Migration and Communication between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), argued for the survival, significance, and operation of Atlantic kinship networks. Douglas Hamilton, *Scotland, the Caribbean and the Atlantic World, 1750-1820* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), has recently argued that kinship networks were crucial for Scottish participation in the Atlantic. The importance of kinship networks has largely been addressed for business connections. See Ida Bull, "Merchant Households and their Networks in Eighteenth-Century Trondheim," *Continuity and Change* 17, no. 2 (2002): 213-31; Richard Grassby, *Kinship and Capitalism: Marriage, Family, and Business in the English-Speaking World, 1580-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Peter Mathias, "Risk, Credit, and Kinship in Early Modern Enterprise," in *The Early Modern Atlantic Economy*, ed. John J. McCusker and Kenneth Morgan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 15-35; and David Hancock, *Citizens of the World: London Merchants and the Integration of the British Atlantic Economy, 1735-1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

and enables a handle on the agglomeration of Atlantic history.[2] Such an approach provides an opportunity to consider how Pennsylvania kin groups functioned within the larger Atlantic world, shaping its contours over the course of the long eighteenth century.

This study is centered in Pennsylvania and expands outward across the ocean, exploring the colony's relationship and linkages with the Atlantic world. The direction of this dissertation adopts historian David Armitage's concept of "cis-Atlantic history," a conceptualization "which aims to study the interplay between a particular place or places and a wider, interconnected Atlantic world of which they form a part."[3] The cis-Atlantic approach, in essence, is regional history, set at a local level, and explores a particular place within a more general Atlantic context. The interactions between kin in the

---

[2] Atlantic studies continue to grow, evolve, and face challenges. For overviews of the model, its maturation, impact on scholarship, explanatory utility, and future direction, see Nicholas Canny, "The British Atlantic World: Working Towards a Definition," *The Historical Journal* 33, no. 2 (June 1990): 479-497; Alan L. Karras, "The Atlantic World as a Unit of Study," ed. Alan L. Karras and J. R. McNeill, *Atlantic American Societies: From Columbus through Abolitionism, 1492-1888* (London: Routledge, 1992), 1-15; Bernard Bailyn, "The Idea of Atlantic History," *Itinerario* 20, no. 1 (1996): 19-44; Ian K. Steele, "Exploding Colonial American History: Amerindian, Atlantic, and Global Perspectives," *Reviews in American History* 26, no. 1 (March 1998) : 70-95; Nicholas Canny, "Writing Atlantic History, or, Reconfiguring the History of Colonial British America," *Journal of American History* 86, no. 3 (December 1999): 1093-1114; William O'Reilly, "Genealogies of Atlantic History," *Atlantic Studies* 1, no. 1 (2004): 66-84; and Alison Games, "Atlantic History: Definitions, Challenges, and Opportunities," *American Historical Review* 111, no. 3 (June 2006): 741–757. For critiques of the paradigm, see Peter A. Coclanis, "Drang Nach Osten: Bernard Bailyn, the World-Island, and the Idea of Atlantic History," *Journal of World History* 13, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 169-182; and idem, "Atlantic World or Atlantic/World?," William and Mary Quarterly 63, no. 4 (October 2006): 725-742. For surveys, general overviews of Atlantic approaches, and historiographic themes, see David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick, eds., *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002); Bernard Bailyn, *Atlantic History: Concepts and Contours* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005); Jack D. Greene and Philip D. Morgan, eds., *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); and Barnard Bailyn and Patricia L. Denault, eds., *Soundings in Atlantic History: Latent Structures and Intellectual Currents, 1500-1830* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009).

[3] David Armitage, "Three Concepts of Atlantic History," in *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, ed. David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 15, 21-23. Armitage traced the term's origin to the late eighteenth century and Thomas Jefferson, who used the phrase "to mean 'on this side of the Atlantic,'" and asserted that the Atlantic can best be understood as a series of cis-level histories.

Delaware Valley and in other locales can delineate the impact of the Atlantic on developments in this location and the region's impact on the Atlantic world. The cis-Atlantic model concentrates on the way specific regions were defined by relationships to peoples living in other areas bordering on the ocean. Pennsylvania's Atlantic kin groups embodied the cosmopolitan nature of the early modern Atlantic world, helping shape its social, economic, and cultural complexity. A cis-Atlantic approach, then, provides an opportunity to consider how networks of kinship provided a set of connections that were so critical in Atlantic history.

The Atlantic teemed with interconnections. "There were Atlantic networks everywhere," historian Bernard Bailyn noted.[4] Kinship networks, underpinned by implicit reciprocal obligations, functioned on many levels. They provided the apparatus capable of supporting different types of interaction in Atlantic exchanges: structuring and organizing migration, sustaining social relationships, coordinating commercial and entrepreneurial activities, and transmitting aspects of culture. For migrants, kinship was a matter of great practical and symbolic significance. Networks were complexly overlaid, multi-tiered, and interrelated; different kinds of networks were embedded in one another.[5] Networks of kinship overlapped and intersected with migration networks,

[4] Bernard Bailyn, *Atlantic History: Concept and Contours* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005), 100.

[5] For a discussion of interdisciplinary approaches to network analysis, see David J. Hancock, *Oceans of Wine: Madeira and the Emergence of American Trade and Taste* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009); and "The Trouble with Networks: Managing the Scots' Early-Modern Madeira Trade," *Business History Review* 79, no. 3 (Autumn 2005): 467-491. For examples of networks in early American studies, see Lorri Glover, *All Our Relations: Blood Ties and Emotional Bonds among the Early South Carolina Gentry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000); Lorena S. Walsh, "Community Networks in the Early Chesapeake," in *Colonial Chesapeake Society*, ed. Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean B.

networks of communication, and merchant networks. Networks, then, were not mutually exclusive but quite entangled. Kinship networks were circular and expansive, spreading out and overlapping with similar networks.

What, then, did kin relationships add to networks? Kinship was flexible and highly adaptable and could be mobilized in a variety of ways. Kinship networks were a far-reaching and accommodating resource of ties. Networks of kin extended beyond the household. Through the branchlike kin network, one was theoretically related to an infinite number of relations.[6] Given the unique character of kin relationships, individuals could call on close and more distant kindred with the understanding that the kinship component of a relationship gave it more of an enduring quality, as distinct from the contingency of friendship.[7] Kinship ties, whether by blood or marriage, involved mutual obligation. The early modern English kinship system included "a well-understood system of duty, opportunity, and reciprocity."[8] In a culture of kinship based on ideals of

---

Russo (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 200-241; and Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman, *A Place in Time: Middlesex County, Virginia, 1650-1750* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1984). Marianne S. Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers: The Beginnings of Mass Migration to North America* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), detailed the extensive networks of correspondents among Rhine boatmen, English shippers, and merchants in Rotterdam and Philadelphia and demonstrated their crucial role fueling the German-speaking migrant trade. Also, Sheryllynne Haggerty extensively used the concepts of networks of people, credit, and goods in *The British-Atlantic Trading Community, 1760-1810: Men, Women, and the Distribution of Goods* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers, 2006), chaps. 4-7. For helpful discussions of social science network theory and kinship-based networks, see Douglas S. Massey and others, "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal," *Population and Development Review* 19, no. 3 (September 1993): 449-50; and Harvey M. Choldin, "Kinship Networks in the Migration Process," *International Migration Review* 7, no. 2 (Summer 1973): 163-175.

[6] Gary R. Lee, *Family Structure and Interaction: A Comparative Analysis* (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1982), 144.

[7] Naomi Tadmor, *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship, and Patronage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 164.

[8] David Cressy, "Kinship and Kin Interaction in Early Modern England," *Past and Present* 113 (November 1986): 51.

altruism and amity, one was expected to treat kin with generosity and readiness. The salient trait about kinship networks, historian David Cressy observed, was "not network density or frequency of involvement, but rather the potency and instrumentality of family ties."[9]

To better understand kinship networks, this dissertation draws on a wide variety of primary sources that includes especially rich manuscript collections, letters, private journals, autobiographies, firsthand accounts, church documents (Quaker certificates of removal and other records), Bible record-keeping, newspapers, wills, and ship passenger lists. The study also draws upon material objects, such as bookplates, domestic silver, wax seals, coaches, and buildings. Of course, there are limitations to the source material that raise questions of representativeness. Elites were more likely than lower social classes to leave documentary evidence. Because qualitative sources are more abundant for elite groups it is easier to identify their kinship networks. The disproportion of archival source material reflects that few average and poor people of some three hundred years ago could write. It is crucial to recognize that the class position of migrants played a major role in influencing their participation in the Atlantic world. Historians Ida Altman and James Horn raised the disparity of experiences based on class; for the wealthy, they observed, the Atlantic world was an "expansive" community compared to the more constricted experiences of the poor.[10] More often than not, ordinary families did not save their papers for posterity as frequently as elite families saved written

[9] Ibid., 49.
[10] Ida Altman and James Horn, "Introduction," in *"To Make America": European Emigration in the Early Modern Period*, ed. Ida Altman and James Horn (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 20.

documents.[11] Elites deposited family papers at local repositories beginning in the early nineteenth century.[12] Their surviving material usually includes long runs of documentation, covering decades and including many individuals of a family. On the other hand, surviving letters from common people are less numerous and more sporadic.

Specifically, there is a bias in manuscript archives for colonial Pennsylvania toward Quakers and elite white men. Quakers offer a rich case study; yet, the dominance of one group brings risks of exaggeration and distortion, especially in colonial Pennsylvania's multiethnic, multiracial, multicultural, and multilingual society. I was fortunate to locate scattered resources from individuals outside the circle of Quaker grandees (wealthy merchants) to counterbalance their writings. Letters from middling sort Quakers and family members from other ethnic and religious groups provide additional evidence of kin functions.

Manuscript letters were my most important primary source for this study. Although letters and retrospective accounts must be interpreted carefully,[13] these documents put people at the center of Atlantic history; a study of kin groups focuses on Atlantic lives and the processes that were located in the life experiences of kinfolk. Moreover, source material has special bearing upon the study of kinship. The type of

[11] For a compilation of essays exploring political, racial, gender, and religious aspects of poverty in early North America, see Billy G. Smith, ed., *Down and Out in Early America* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004).
[12] For instance, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania was founded in 1824 as a voluntary association. See Sally F. Griffith, *Serving History in a Changing World: The Historical Society of Pennsylvania in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 2001); and Nicholas B. Wainwright, *One Hundred and Fifty Years of Collecting by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1824-1974* (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1974).
[13] On the inherent risks using letters, see Jan Lewis, *The Pursuit of Happiness: Family and Values in Jefferson's Virginia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), xiv-xv.

evidence used can lead historians to different assessments of the importance of kin. The qualitative evidence such as wills, for instance, usually reveals few bequests outside the nuclear family. On the other hand, qualitative evidence such as letters shows "a vibrant kinship system."[14]

Also, a word about the term migrant is necessary. Throughout the dissertation I have used the word migrant to more accurately reflect the high degree of mobility and constant movement of people around the Atlantic; kin were often spread out over different Atlantic locales. The long-held dichotomy of treating migration as individuals who either departed (emigrants) or arrived (immigrants) does not capture the multiple attachments of migrants, the dispersal of family members, and the general fluidity of the early modern Atlantic world.[15]

The chapters of the dissertation explore the richness of kin interaction and the multi-dimensional functions of kinship networks. The first chapter examines the role of kinship networks in migration to Pennsylvania. Networks of kinship ties were instrumental in promoting migration across the Atlantic to the colony. Through family migration networks, potential voyagers to Pennsylvania drew on ties to relatives who had migrated before, gained access to knowledge, assistance, and other resources that

[14] Cressy, "Kinship and Kin Interaction in Early Modern England," 59. On the different historiographical approaches, see Naomi Tadmor, "Early Modern English Kinship in the Long Run: Reflections on Continuity and Change," *Continuity and Change* 25, no. 1 (2010): 15-48.

[15] Alison Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), used terms such as traveler, voyager, and passenger in order to avoid the sense of purpose suggested by the word immigrant. Anthropologists have also developed broader perspectives on migration. See: Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch, and Cristina Szanton Blanc, "From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration," *Anthropological Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (January 1995): 48-63.

facilitated movement. Networks of kinship assisted geographical mobility but at the same time maintained communication and identification among its members. In the process, kin-based migrant networks created and maintained links between the community of settlement in Pennsylvania and overseas sending communities. Chapter two explores cycles of kin correspondence. Dictates of kinship made letter writing an obligation and duty, increasing the flow of contact. Also, family letters conveyed affectional or emotional ties that buttressed bonds of kinship spanning the Atlantic. While sensitive to letter-writing conventions of the time period, the exchange of kin sentiment and attachment in written correspondence linked diffuse kinship networks. If networks were sets of interpersonal ties, letter writing and letter reading connected the lives of kin and were a basis for significant interactions and connections between Pennsylvania and the Atlantic community.

Chapter three looks at how kinship networks helped shape commercial ties. Kin were valued for their assumed trustworthiness in the high-risk trading environment of the Atlantic market economy and as contacts for those entering into business, expanding their operations. Kinship was also the basis of commercial enterprises. In addition, kinship networks were conduits for business information, relaying valuable updates about market conditions and prices and insurance rates. Kinship networks were entrepreneurial resources that expanded economic opportunities and Pennsylvania's engagements with Atlantic port cities. The last chapter on familial memory practices illustrates the continuing importance of kinship for migrants and their descendants. Networks of kinship preserved family-based traditions; networked memory was long-lived among kin

groups. Interest in family origins and history, genealogy (often to a common or illustrious ancestor), and heraldry signaled pretensions to aristocratic gentility for some families but also fostered a series of exchanges through the kinship network. Familial memory practices promoted a sense of connectedness and relatedness for Atlantic kin groups.

Thus, kinship activities, governed by cooperation and mutuality, allowed kin groups to live in two worlds. Networks of kin were stretched, reconfigured, and activated across the Atlantic world in response to geographic mobility and spatial separation. Kinship networks linked its members across great distances through various exchanges. At the same time, chains of kinship supported a web of intersecting activities that enhanced transversal connections between Pennsylvania and various Atlantic locales.

## Chapter 1

## "To Goe Over the Seas Into Pensilvenia":

## Family Migration Networks

In April 1712, part of Quaker migrant Jane Marriot's preparations for her Atlantic voyage to Pennsylvania included obtaining a certificate of removal from the monthly meeting at Gutershedge, Middlesex, England. The religious document, issued to members of the Society of Friends in good standing transferred membership from one monthly meeting to another when Quakers changed location, indicated that she "intended to goe: over the seas into Pensilvenia"[1] and join her husband already settled in the colony. Family migration networks supported many forms of chain relationships, such as Jane Marriot's venturesome arrangement. The course for migration charted by the Marriots illustrated that kin on both sides of the Atlantic participated in migration networks. In this way, networks of kinship facilitated migration and had a fundamental role shaping the colony's Atlantic ties.

A veritable flood tide of migrants reached the Delaware Valley. William Penn (1644-1718) received his land grant and proprietary title in March 1681 from England's King Charles II, and by 1685 ninety shiploads carried some 8,000 migrants to Penn's colony.[2] By 1690, Philadelphia reached a population of 2,000 inhabitants.[3] The new colony grew rapidly through the 1680s, reaching over 11,000 by 1690 and nearly 18,000

[1] Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1714, no. 127, Film MR-Ph 381, Friends Historical Library at Swarthmore College (hereafter cited as FHL).
[2] Gary B. Nash, *Quakers and Politics: Pennsylvania, 1681-1726* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1968), 49-50; Marion Balderston, "William Penn's Twenty-Three Ships, with Notes on Some of their Passengers," *Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine* 23 (1963): 27-67 (hereafter cited as *PGM*); and idem, "Pennsylvania's 1683 Ships and Some of their Passengers," *PGM* 24 (1964): 69-114.
[3] John J. McCusker and Russell R. Menard, *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 202.

by 1700.[4] In the 1710s, the resident population of Philadelphia was almost 5,000 inhabitants. Between 1720 and 1740, the population of Pennsylvania grew from about 31,000 to 85,600, while Philadelphia itself swelled to just over 10,000 urban residents.[5] As a result, the port on the Delaware River quickly grew into one of the largest cities in the British Atlantic.

Family migration networks promoted geographic mobility.[6] Kinship connections brought the new colony more fully into an early modern Atlantic world that was migration oriented. In the process, families participated in the most characteristic feature of the Atlantic world.[7] Migration was ubiquitous in the early modern Atlantic world but was highly differentiated; each and every individual migrant

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] For colonial Pennsylvania population figures, see McCusker and Menard, *The Economy of British America*, Table 9.4 on p. 203. Another reference table for the estimated population Pennsylvania and selected towns between 1680 and 1780 can be found in Susan E. Klepp, "Encounter and Experiment: The Colonial Period," in *Pennsylvania: A History of the Commonwealth*, ed. Randall M. Miller and William Pencak (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), Table 2.1 on p. 61. Scholars have debated population figures for colonial Philadelphia. See: Susan Klepp, "Demography in Early Philadelphia, 1690-1860," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 133, no. 2 (June 1989): 85-111 (hereafter cited as *PAPS*); Billy G. Smith, "Death and Life in a Colonial Immigrant City: A Demographic Analysis of Philadelphia," *The Journal of Economic History* 37, no. 4 (December 1977): 863-889 (hereafter cited as *JEH*); John K. Alexander, "The Philadelphia Numbers Game: An Analysis of Philadelphia's Eighteenth-Century Population," *PMHB* 98, no. 3 (July 1974): 314-324; and Gary B. Nash and Billy G. Smith, "The Population of Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia," *PMHB* 99, no. 3 (July 1975): 362-368.

[6] In the words of one scholar, "Transatlantic migration would not have functioned without transatlantic networks." Quote from Hartmut Lehmann, "Transatlantic Migration, Transatlantic Networks, Transatlantic Transfer: Concluding Remarks" in *In Search of Peace and Prosperity: New German Settlements in Eighteenth-Century Europe and America*, ed. Hartmut Lehmann, Hermann Wellenreuther, and Renate Wilson (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), 308.

[7] Alison Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), 247, emphasized that migration was "an ordinary activity" in the Atlantic. She further argued the British Atlantic world "was made by migration," cementing the nascent empire's colonial holdings, connecting distant places, and bringing together diverse peoples. See Alison Games, "Migration," in *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, ed. David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 31. Sarah M. Pearsall, *Atlantic Families: Lives and Letters in the Later Eighteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 31, noted how the Atlantic was simultaneously "both a source of separation and trauma" for migrants and a source "of cohesion and growth" for Britain's overseas possessions and Atlantic empire.

t moved for specific reasons. The decision to set out across the Atlantic was informed by a complex set of causes and reactions, marked by many subtle and intricate reasons and unique to timing and distinctive environments. Scholars have long utilized the push and pull conceptualization of migration,[8] and those who made their way to Pennsylvania elicit the customary range of religious and socioeconomic reasons, motivated by political and religious upheaval, population growth, dislocations from economic cycles, failed harvests, and labor markets.[9] Against this background, kinship networks influenced the movement of peoples to Pennsylvania. Family considerations may not have acted as "a uniform determinant"[10] in the decision to cross the Atlantic for Pennsylvania, but were part of a cumulative influence impelling migrations. Kin groups were enmeshed in the political, religious, and economic milieu of the locales in which they lived. In addition, the movement of people was structured by dependable transportation.[11]

---

[8] Everett S. Lee, "A Theory of Migration," *Demography* 3, no. 1 (1966): 47-57. Lee's analysis included a discussion of E. G. Ravenstein's laws of migration (1889).

[9] See for instance, Games, "Migration," in *The British Atlantic World*, 39. James Horn, *Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 264, highlighted a variety of factors that prompted migration to the Chesapeake: rapid population growth, innovations in land use and husbandry, and the decline of the cloth industry put a surplus population on the move within England, and a portion of those mobile people, mostly young and male, opted to migrate. Virginia DeJohn Anderson, *New England's Generation: The Great Migration and the Formation of Society and Culture in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), argued that settlement in Massachusetts Bay did not result from economic motives that linked contemporary internal English migration to the Chesapeake. In contrast to the larger seventeenth-century migrations to Virginia, she contended, the Great Migration attracted migrants who were more religiously motivated.

[10] Susan E. Klepp, Farley Grubb, and Anne Pfaelzer de Ortiz, "General Introduction: German Immigration to Early America," in *Souls for Sale: Two German Redemptioners Come to Revolutionary America: The Life Stories of John Frederick Whitehead and Johann Carl Büttner*, ed. Susan E. Klepp, Farley Grubb, and Anne Pfaelzer de Ortiz (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006), 7.

[11] Marianne S. Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers: The Beginnings of Mass Migration to North America* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), chap. 3, detailed the development of "a transportation industry," organized by an active group of merchant entrepreneurs in the Dutch port city of Rotterdam, for German-speaking migrants. Quote on p. xxvii. Wokeck's analysis of Irish migrants took account of strong commercial ties linking Philadelphia "with much of Ireland"; she indicated that Atlantic sailing patterns between ports in Ireland and Philadelphia were determined by the flaxseed trade. See

Mobile kin groups were a significant component of Pennsylvania's migrant population structure. Ties of kinship were deeply embedded among different European migrant groups crossing the Atlantic for Pennsylvania. In particular, the mobility of families especially influenced patterns of long-distance migration among the large waves of English, Welsh, Irish, and West Indian Quakers, German-speakers, and Scots-Irish (Ulster Presbyterians) voyaging to the Delaware Valley.[12] Atlantic migration to the

---

*Trade in Strangers*, 197-198. Patrick Griffin, *The People with No Name: Ireland's Ulster Scots, America's Scots Irish, and the Creation of a British Atlantic World, 1689-1764* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001), 88, 96, 159, also identified some of the "vital ties" that bound together Ulster and ports in the Delaware Valley, including the Atlantic trade of linen for flaxseed that generated ship traffic and an increasingly established network of passengers.

[12] The volume and composition of the migration flows were complex. On Quakers, see David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 417-451; Barry Levy, *Quakers and the American Family: British Settlement in the Delaware Valley* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), chaps. 1-3; idem, "Quakers, the Delaware Valley, and North Midlands Emigration to America," *WMQ* 48, no. 2 (April 1991): 246-252; Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, chaps. 1-2; Ned C. Landsman, "William Penn's Scottish Counterparts: The Quakers of 'North Britain' and the Colonization of East New Jersey," in *The World of William Penn*, ed. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 241-257; idem, *Scotland and Its First American Colony, 1683-1765* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1985); Albert Cook Myers, *Immigration of the Irish Quakers into Pennsylvania, 1682-1750: With their Early History in Ireland* (Swarthmore, 1902; reprint, Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1969); and Larry Gragg, *The Quaker Community on Barbados: Challenging the Culture of the Planter Class* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2009). For general overviews of British expansion and migration in the Atlantic world, see Meaghan N. Duff, "Adventurers Across the Atlantic: English Migration to the New World, 1580-1780," in *The Atlantic World: Essays on Slavery, Migration, and Imagination*, ed. Wim Klooster and Alfred Padula (Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2005), 77-90; James Horn, "British Diaspora: Emigration from Britain, 1680-1815," in *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. 2: *The Eighteenth Century*, ed. P. J. Marshall (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 28-52; and Nicholas Canny, "English Migration into and across the Atlantic during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," in *Europeans on the Move: Studies on European Migration, 1500-1800*, ed. Nicholas Canny (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 39-75.

On the migration of German-speaking peoples, see Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers*; Aaron Spencer Fogelman, *Hopeful Journeys: German Immigration, Settlement, and Political Culture in Colonial America, 1717-1775* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996); Farley Grubb, "German Immigration to Pennsylvania, 1709 to 1820," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 20, no. 3 (Winter 1990): 417-436 (hereafter cited as *JIH*); Rosalind J. Beiler, *Immigrant and Entrepreneur: The Atlantic World of Caspar Wistar, 1650-1750* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008); A. G. Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property: German Lutherans in British Colonial America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993); and Stephanie Grauman Wolf, *Urban Village: Population, Community, and Family Structure in Germantown, Pennsylvania, 1683-1800* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1976). For overviews, see: Rosalind J. Beiler, "Searching for Prosperity: German Migration to the British American Colonies, 1680-1780," in *The Atlantic World: Essays on Slavery, Migration, and Imagination*, ed. Wim Klooster and Alfred Padula (Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Pearson Prentice Hall,

colony was strongly mediated by kinship in a number of ways, helping form a quintessential Atlantic colony made by pluriform streams of migration—free and coerced[13]—and marked by extraordinary societal diversity. Pennsylvania was a multiethnic, multiracial, multicultural, and multilingual society.[14] Colonial Pennsylvania quickly became a vivid example of heterogeneity, a characteristic feature of life in the British Atlantic world.[15]

---

2005), 91-106; Klepp, Grubb, and Pfaelzer de Ortiz, eds., "General Introduction: German Immigration to Early America," in *Souls for Sale*, 1-24; Hartmut T. Lehmann, Hermann Wellenreuther, and Renate Wilson, eds., *In Search of Peace and Prosperity: New German Settlements in Eighteenth-Century Europe and America* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000); and Georg Fertig, "Transatlantic Migration from the German-Speaking Parts of Central Europe, 1600-1800: Proportions, Structures, and Explanations," in *Europeans on the Move*, 192-235.

On migrants from northern and southern Ireland, see Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers*, chap. 5; Griffin, *The People with No Name*; H. Tyler Blethen and Curtis W. Wood, Jr., eds., *Ulster and North America: Transatlantic Perspectives on the Scotch-Irish* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1997); L. M. Cullen, "The Irish Diaspora of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," in *Europeans on the Move: Studies on European Migration, 1500-1800*, ed. Nicholas Canny (New York: Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, 1995), 113-149.

[13]Migrants used kinship networks to obtain Afro-Caribbean slaves, adding to the colony's heterogeneous social structure and helping spread the cancer of slavery in the British Americas. At the turn of the eighteenth century, for example, Quaker merchant Jonathan Dickinson paid £6 for the "freight of two Negroes. Toby & Sossoway" from the family's Pepper plantation on Jamaica. See Jonathan Dickinson Ledger, James Logan Papers (collection no. 379), vol. 31, p. 46, HSP. Also, before leaving London in 1683 and after arriving in Philadelphia, James Claypoole requested that his brother at Barbados send slaves. See James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, Philadelphia, December 2, 1683, in Marion Balderston, ed., *James Claypoole's Letter Book: London and Philadelphia, 1681-1684* (San Marino, Calif.: The Huntington Library, 1967), 223.

[14] For a bold statement about the importance of the region's diversity, see the introduction to Michael Zuckerman, ed., *Friends and Neighbors: Group Life in America's First Plural Society* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982), 3-25. Zuckerman argued that the region prefigured the subsequent contours of American life, writing that the "Middle Atlantic exhibited more fully than any other colonial region the shape of things to come." Quote on p. 13. See also Zuckerman's "Farewell to the 'New England Paradigm' of Colonial Development," *Pennsylvania History* 57, no. 1 (January 1990): 66-73 (hereafter cited as *PH*). For more on the cultural, ethnic, and religious pluralism of colonial Pennsylvania, see Sally Schwartz, *"A Mixed Multitude": The Struggle for Toleration in Colonial Pennsylvania* (New York: New York University Press, 1988); and Liam Riordan's community study, *Many Identities, One Nation: The Revolution and Its Legacy in the Mid-Atlantic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), chap. 1.

[15] Many studies have drawn attention to diverse people of the Atlantic world, populated by men and women from several continents, Europe, the Americas, and Africa. Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World*, 11, 213-14, acknowledged that heterogeneity was characteristic of the seventeenth-century Atlantic colonies. "English colonies contained people from a vastly expanded range of cultural, linguistic, and national groups," highlighting that migrants "created and joined societies far more culturally, linguistically, and ethnically complex than anything in their previous experience." In particular, for

Atlantic-spanning networks of kinship were formed through currents of migration, creating paths along which people, information, and resources flowed between Pennsylvania and migrants' various communities of origin. Geographic mobility bestrewed families throughout the Atlantic world; yet, migrants remained tied into networks of kinship. Migration to Pennsylvania did not automatically uproot people from kinship networks; rather than eroding ties, the kinship system flexibly adapted to meet the long-distance demands and needs created by new circumstances. Networks of kinship were not monolithic entities devoid of change; they possessed the remarkable capacity to adapt customary supports and operate over long distances. In fact, geographic mobility rendered the family all the more important, strengthening aspects of kinship functioning. Kinship networks promoted additional movement to Pennsylvania, exerting considerable impact on migration decision-making, influencing migratory behavior, the timing and spacing of migration, circulating information among potential migrants, distributing resources, offering useful assistance, and channeling advice on transportation and opportunities in the colony. Dispersed families maintained networks of interconnection that crisscrossed the Atlantic and operated across multiple locales.

Migrant networks were sets of interpersonal ties, based on family, friendship, neighborhood, and shared religion, that connected migrants and those left behind in

---

English migrants the presence of Indians and Africans especially signaled what it meant to live in an Atlantic world. Historian Bernard Bailyn asserted that the diversity of eighteenth-century transatlantic migration flow was its most salient feature, and Pennsylvania was at the forefront that development. See *Voyagers to the West: A Passage in the Peopling of America on the Eve of the Revolution* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1986). Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker, *The Multi-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000), argued for a multiracial, multiethnic, and multinational Atlantic working class. David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), maintained that early modern British conceptualization of imperial ideology and imperial identity in the first empire had to be sufficiently broad to encompass the pluralism of a multinational and multidenominational polity.

communities of origin. Family migration networks were of a decidedly interactive and "circum-Atlantic"[16] character; they forged and sustained simultaneous multi-stranded connections that linked together Pennsylvania and European Atlantic communities of origin, helping shape the Atlantic as "a single arena"[17] of interaction. The migration networks established and used by kith and kin were a means by which information and resources were organized and exchanged. Through active family migration networks kin continued to interact with family communities of origin, linking Pennsylvania with areas of origin across the Atlantic, creating dynamically intertwined worlds.

Migrants established, utilized, and extended network connections spanning multiple places. Migration, one scholar elucidated, created "a series of umbilical links,"[18] and the functioning of kinship networks joined together geographically separated Atlantic

[16] David Armitage explained that the phrase circum-Atlantic approached Atlantic history as a "zone of exchange and interchange, circulation and transmission." In this sense "it is mobile and connective," helping create an Atlantic system where there was "continuing interaction between the societies migrants had left and those they created together" across the ocean. Accordingly, the circum-Atlantic approach is "transnational oceanic history" of the Atlantic world. See David Armitage, "Three Concepts of Atlantic History," in *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, ed. David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 17, 18.

[17] D. W. Meinig, *The Shaping of America: A Geographical Perspective on 500 Years of History, Volume 1: Atlantic America, 1492-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), explored how transoceanic enterprises fashioned "a single arena of action" in the Atlantic. Quote on p. 6. For more on the integrative forces at work in an "emerging Atlantic system," see Bernard Bailyn, *Atlantic History: Concept and Contours* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005), 81-101. Quote on p. 83. My thinking in this sense has also been informed by the work of social scientists on the concept of transnationalism and the analytical paradigm of transnational migration. On these set of terms, consult the work of anthropologists Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch, and Cristina Szanton Blanc: *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race, Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism Reconsidered* (New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1992); and "From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration," *Anthropological Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (January 1995): 48-63. See also Nina Glick Schiller, "Transmigrants and Nation-States: Something Old and Something New in the U. S. Immigrant Experience" in *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, ed. Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind (New York: Russell Sage, 1999), 94-119. In a transnational perspective, the focus is on how the familial, economic, cultural, and political ties of contemporary migrants make "the home and host society a single arena of social action." Quote from Nancy Foner, *In a New Land: A Comparative View of Immigration* (New York: New York University Press, 2005), 63.

[18] Roger Ballard, "Migration and Kinship: The Differential Effect of Marriage Rules on the Processes of Punjabi Migration to Britain," in *South Asians Overseas: Migration and Ethnicity*, ed. Colin Clarke, Ceri Peach, and Steven Vertovec (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 244.

communities in close relationships. Stretching across wide geographic distances and despite physical separation, kinship networks linked migrants in the colonial destination of Pennsylvania and kinfolk in multiple home communities of the European Atlantic. Connections between the colony and areas of migrant origin were developed through concrete interactions of kinship-based migration networks.

Through ties of kinship, networks connected migrants in Pennsylvania and relatives left behind in origin areas. At the same time, mobile families contributed significant connections between the colonial destination of Pennsylvania and many places of migrant origin throughout the Atlantic. Through the process of migration families increased cross-territorial linkages and flows, drawing kin and the colony into greater involvement with the Atlantic world. More than simply developing along parallel tracks, these two interlocking developments were woven together like strands of a braided rope.

To better dissect how kinship ties pervaded the migration process, this chapter examines how family networks were a mechanism driving the movement of people to Pennsylvania and forging connections between the colony and sending regions of the Atlantic world. Kinship was an essential link in the construction of Atlantic migration chains. The first several sections look at the effect of kin-based migrant networks on patterns of migration chains: variations of chain migration included sending male family members ahead to the colony; Quaker family migration networks developed chains of migration; family migration networks incorporated indentured servitude; and extended family ties were strong enough to support chains of migration, used to facilitate the migration of young kindred. The next sections explore the supportive functions of family

migration networks: kinship ties generated and received flows of information, by which hopeful migrants received advice and learned of opportunities abroad, creating lines of communication; migrant kin influenced migration by encouraging overseas relations to join them in the colony; and once migrants reached Pennsylvania members of the Atlantic kin group maintained ties of assistance in numerous ways. A following section compares John Reynell's relationships with two sisters, illustrating the possible differences in familial support for migration. The concluding part is directed toward German-speaking redemptioners and the challenges of keeping migrant families together.

Migration to Pennsylvania was related in a systematic way to family economics, family cycle, and gender. Questions of class and gender further a more complex understanding of family migration patterns. This chapter, then, also considers how family migration networks intersected and interacted with class and gender, looking at the implications of these dynamics and how they produced particular dimensions of kin-based migration.

**Sending Family Members Ahead to the Colony**

To establish and activate Atlantic migrant networks, male family members made the journey to Pennsylvania ahead of the rest of the kin group.[19] This process, sometimes referred to as family stage migration,[20] was essentially a form of chain migration. As such, family members relocated from a sending community to the colony in lagged

[19] Anderson, *New England's Generation*, 22, discussed that migrants to New England did leave behind close kin and family groups and were usually rejoined "within a year or so"; however, she concluded that such an arrangement was "by no means the rule" to the Great Migration and did not further investigate this practice as a feature of family migration networks.

[20] This type of family migration was defined in Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 39.

stages, with one or more of the family migrating first and other members following after the initial voyagers had become established in the destination; delayed family migrants most frequently tended to be spouses and children but also included siblings and parents. Those who went ahead to the colony made all manner of preparations, taking up land, setting about erecting buildings, and working on other improvements in advance of the family's coming. A staggered pattern of migration established links between the family group on both sides of the Atlantic.

The initial move of a pioneer migrant led to network formation. In 1684, recent arrival Joris Wertmuller gave notice to an overseas brother-in-law about sending off the migrant's sons, who were staying with their uncle Jochem Wertmuller in Amsterdam. In order for Wertmuller's children to follow in his footsteps, he promised capital sufficient to defray the expenses of traveling to the colony, summoning, "So if you bring or send to me here one or two of my sons who are with my brother I shall pay all the costs."[21] As a father, Joris Wertmuller first made the Atlantic voyage and then offered to fund his children's passage with the purpose of having them join him in Pennsylvania. The arrangement, moreover, illuminated the close kinship connection of migratory networks and the process of migrant network construction, revealing how such patterns of chain migration operated among far-flung relatives dispersed through the early modern Atlantic world.

Quaker Thomas Bye and his son John Bye arrived in Pennsylvania by December 1699, and were to be followed later by his wife Margaret Bye and the rest of the nuclear

[21] "Letter from Germantown in Pennsylvania, March 16, 1684," in Samuel W. Pennypacker, *Hendrich Pannebecker: Surveyor of Lands for the Penns, 1674-1754* (Philadelphia: Privately Printed, 1894), 30.

family. Thomas Bye's July 1699 certificate of removal from the monthly meeting at Horsleydown, Southwark indicated that his wife supported her husband's decision to relocate to Pennsylvania, "and Intends to goe thither also," once "she hath an account that her husband & son is settle[d] There[.]"[22] Before departing England, he had acquired 250 acres of Pennsylvania land from Nathaniel Pask, possibly a brother-in-law, and another 250 acres, "both [of] which Purchases have been taken up by the said Bye since his arrival in this Province." He was also able to secure a February 1700 letter of attorney for 250 acres, empowering Bye "to take up and dispose of" the Pennsylvania land.[23] By June 1701, with preliminary land matters in order, Margaret Bye and two daughters were in Pennsylvania. Wives, daughters, and younger sons joined family groups in the Delaware Valley after their spouse or father sent for them, once arrangements were in place. Using chain migration, family members made their way to Pennsylvania in successive waves over a period of time. The delayed migration of family rested on the ability to maintain contact with widely separated groups of kin, keeping them apprised and giving them notice to take ship when preparations were completed.

Entire nuclear families did not always migrate together as intact households; some family members migrated at a later time to join the family group in the colony. Quakers Aaron Goforth, his wife, son, and two daughters migrated from Southwark, London to Philadelphia by June 1712. Two other daughters, Alice and Mary Goforth, made preparations in early 1715 to join their family who had "Lately Removed into your parts" across the Atlantic. It was unclear exactly why these two siblings remained behind in

[22] Falls Monthly Meeting, Removals Received, 1683-1743, p. 27, Film MR-Ph676, FHL.
[23] "Minutes of the Board of Property of the Province of Pennsylvania, Minute Book 'G,'" *Pa. Archives*, 2nd ser., vol. XIX, 229, 241.

England; perhaps they were servants in another household (leaving home was a normal part of the life cycle). Nevertheless, even after a few years there was no evident weakening of family migration chains as the two sisters were "about to Transport" themselves to the colony.[24] Members of the family remaining behind continued to move to Pennsylvania over a period of years, moving in stages as part of the family group by following the route of the main body of migrant kin. Such an arrangement for migration required coordination from kin on both sides of the Atlantic.

Migrants who had preceded kin across the Atlantic sent for their relations. Of course, reuniting with migrant kin in an expansive colonial Atlantic world inevitably led to broken migration chains. Some were thwarted in attempts to locate or reach family already settled on the far side of the Atlantic. Thomas Griffitts (d. 1746) first migrated from the city of Cork to Jamaica. In 1709, Martha Griffitts departed Cork with a certificate from the women's meeting indicating she was traveling to her husband Thomas Griffitts. He had already "settled at Kingston in Jamaica and hath wrote for his wife to come over to him" and rejoin him in the West Indies. She was "willing to goo" and set out across the Atlantic "by an opertunity of Shipping" bound to Jamaica; however, the vessel was "put into this Harbour [Philadelphia] by contrary winds," preventing her, at least temporarily, from reaching her husband. Years later in 1716, Thomas Griffitts left Jamaica and relocated to Philadelphia. Martha Griffitts was deceased by the time Thomas Griffitts moved to Philadelphia, for in 1717 he married

[24] Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1681-1758, p. 96, Film MR-Ph 374, FHL.

Mary Norris, the daughter of Isaac Norris.[25] Arrangements to meet up in the colonies, then, did not always work out as planned, and migrant wives were sometimes forced to search far and wide for their husbands throughout the Atlantic colonies. From Philadelphia, Esther Lightfoot placed a May 1760 newspaper notice in an effort to locate her husband. James Lightfoot, she advertised, "left his Wife, about two Years ago, in Bristol, in England, and sent for her over here; upon which she accordingly came, and arrived here" six months earlier. Since her arrival, Esther "heard" her husband worked in Annapolis, Maryland, and "wrote several Letters, but is uncertain whether he receive[d] them as she never had an Answer." She concluded by petitioning "if any Person can give any Information of him" to "direct a Line to me," hopeful somebody could help her get in contact with her hard-to-reach spouse.[26]

Reunification was also complicated when, quite possibly, a spouse landed in another colony. One wife's newspaper advertisement, for instance, served to notify her husband of her whereabouts. A 1740 notice appearing in a Pennsylvania publication announced that "the Wife of Alexander Gilbert is lately arrived in Maryland from Scotland," and mentioned that her husband's letters, "which she has at present to show, did press and invite her to come over to the Country" so that they may be reunited. The notice continued to explain, "as she understands by several Letters from her said Husband dated in 1734, 1736, and 1737 that he lodged at one John Van Boskerk's in Philadelphia County in the Mannor of Moreland," at considerable distance from her point of

[25] On Thomas Griffitts, see Albert Cook Myers, *Immigration of the Irish Quakers*, 262, 288; idem, *Quaker Arrivals at Philadelphia*, 68.
[26] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, May 29, 1760.

disembarkation in Queen Anne's County, on Maryland's Eastern Shore.[27] This particular wife crossed the Atlantic at her husband's signal, put ashore in the wrong location, and could not locate her spouse in the colonies. The separated couple was able to remain in contact but this migrant network failed to reunite spouses.

Joining up on the far side of the ocean was filled with uncertainties and a chancy undertaking, and when plans to meet up in the colony went awry wives took decisive action to track down wide-roaming husbands. In 1747, Margaret Wall advertised for her husband Henry Wall, a native of Warwickshire, in England's West Midlands, who four years earlier "went from Londonderry" in northern Ireland "to Antigua" in the Leeward Islands. Margaret was admittedly "desirous to see her husband," and accordingly she "came lately to Philadelphia in quest of him," but "after frequent enquiries, cannot be rightly informed where he is, or whether dead or living" anymore. The wife instructed her husband, "if alive," that "he could direct for her" a message "to be left at the Post Office, Philadelphia," and petitioned for "any person" to "let her know where he is," certainly attesting to the difficulty of locating an individual in an expansive colonial Atlantic world. This particular wife demonstrated a willingness to travel to her spouse, regardless of the location. Margaret Wall was in Philadelphia when she placed her notice, but would go to her elusive husband, making clear that "she will wait on him in any Part of America," regardless of the location.[28] It was unclear whether Henry Wall passed away, relocated, or abandoned his wife. Embarking for the colonies without a spouse jeopardized the chances of ever reuniting again in the vast Atlantic world.

[27] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, July 31, 1740.
[28] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, July 2, 1747.

The difficulties of arriving at different intervals affected all of Pennsylvania's various migrant groups; close kin already in the colony and new arrivals unsuccessfully attempted to reunite on the western shores of the Atlantic. In 1752, Margaret Lenox tried locating her migrant sister and brother-in-law, advertising in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* that "David Moore, and Janet his Wife, came in the ship Holderness, Capt. Simpson, from Learn, in Ireland, this fall, and landed at Newcastle[.]" The newspaper notice was "to inform them, that Margaret Lenox, sister to the above Janet Moore, desired they will let her know where they live, that she may come or send to them."[29] An advertisement appearing in a German-language newspaper on February 1, 1752 indicated that "Jacob Storck arrived last autumn from Alsace," and that "His mother, Anna Maria Storckin, with her son Dewald and daughter Anna Maria, arrived this autumn and they are free of passage costs. They seek Jacob." The newcomers were "with Johannes Kuhn, near the Reformed Church, Philadelphia."[30] In an advertisement circulated on March 1, 1752, Johannes Mueller, from Knittlingen in the region of Württemberg, "son of a gold refiner, arrived in America 16 years ago. This autumn his brother Andreas arrived and he seeks Johannes."[31] Another German-language newspaper notice on April 1, 1752 detailed that two years earlier Daniel Schneider "came from" territory under the authority of the House of Nassau-Siegen, in the western German regions of the Rhenish Palatinate and Westphalia. "Two brothers, Caspar and Hansz Henrich, arrived last autumn" and were

[29] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, December 14, 1752.
[30] Edward W. Hocker, *Genealogical Data Relating to the German Settlers of Pennsylvania and Adjacent Territory: From Advertisements in German Newspapers Published in Philadelphia and Germantown, 1743-1800* (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1980), 31.
[31] Ibid., 32.

living in Amwell, New Jersey "together with their brother in law, Anton Stutt."[32] Recent arrivals sought pioneer migrant kin who previously went to the Delaware Valley to reestablish family ties and for added security in a new land.

The movement of people to early Pennsylvania was structured and organized by delayed family migration. This particular family-based model of transatlantic migration was flexible, allowing for pioneering migrant kin to move first, make preparations, and establish migration chains. At the same time, however, the stepwise approach was tremendously risky, requiring family to be reunited at a later time, and easily set up an uncertain outcome. It was a pattern of migration subject to chance and potentially hampered with complications. Family members still had to locate one another and reunite in Pennsylvania or perhaps another colony. Thus, complex calibrations of the family migration network were necessary to stagger the migration of kin.

**Quaker Family Migration Networks and Chain Migration**

An extensive web of kinship marked Pennsylvania's early Quaker migration. The early wave of Pennsylvania's Quaker migrants traveled within individual nuclear families (parents with children),[33] otherwise known as family unit migration.[34] The evidence for

[32] Ibid., 32. The stated origin was out of date by the 1750s because the House of Nassau-Siegen was extinct by the early 1730s.

[33] Two surviving but incomplete registers offer perspective on the Friends' migrant population structure. The Philadelphia registry for the years between 1682 and 1687 showed 39 percent of Quaker migrants arrived in nuclear families. The list for Bucks County, covering the same span, recorded nuclear family units among 58 percent of Quaker settlers. The extant registers, while fragmentary, suggested that between 40 and 60 percent of Pennsylvania's earliest Quaker migrants traveled across the Atlantic in nuclear family units. For figures, see David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed*, 434. See also: "A Partial List of the Families who Arrived at Philadelphia between 1682 and 1687," *PMHB* 8, no. 3 (October 1884): 328-340; and "A Partial List of the Families who Resided in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Prior to 1687, with the Date of their Arrival" *PMHB* 9, no. 2 (July 1885): 223-233. The originals are at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania (Registry of Arrivals in Philadelphia, 1682-1686, Am.213) and the Spruance Library, Bucks County Historical Society.

[34] This migration typology was defined in Hondagneu-Sotelo, *Gendered Transitions*, 40.

Quakers, through, complicated the picture of the Friends' migrant population. Quaker families migrated in an interdependent and progressively complex movement through migrant networks. Quaker migratory patterns saw nuclear families interwoven into extensive kin migration networks. As a result, both nuclear family households and multilateral kinship relations converged in the migration process. Of course, migrating as free passengers within the family migration network reflected some degree of class-privileged background; these migrants had the financial ability to make the Atlantic voyage simultaneously as an intact nuclear family and with other relatives.[35]

Pennsylvania colonization cannot be adequately understood without analysis of kin-based migration chains.[36] Kin-based migratory networks created complex chains of migration through interrelated families. For example, the workings of kinship ties and migration to Pennsylvania were observable through the connections of the Heath sisters. Three Heath sisters, Anne, Jane, and Margery, all migrated to Pennsylvania on different ships during 1682 and 1683; the sisters also had a brother Robert Heath who migrated from England. They were the children of Richard Heath of Kinsley, Staffordshire, in the

[35] Gary B. Nash, *Quakers and Politics: Pennsylvania, 1681-1726* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 52, put forward that society in colonial Pennsylvania was dominated by the middling sort; he estimated that 80 to 90 percent of free migrants were artisans and yeomen. Levy, *Quakers and the American Family*, chap. 1, also discussed that "the great majority" of late seventeenth-century northwestern Quakers were from the middling sort (chiefly yeoman, husbandmen, and artisans). Quote on p. 26. Occupationally, of the 352 purchasers of land in 1681-1685, a striking 48 percent of Pennsylvania investors were craft workers, 23 percent were identified as farmers, and 14 percent were merchants or shopkeepers. Also, 8 percent of the First Purchasers identified themselves as gentlemen. The figures for purchasers were from Richard S. Dunn, "Penny Wise and Pound Foolish: Penn as a Businessman," in *The World of William Penn*, ed. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 46. Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 53, showed that more than two-thirds of smaller purchasers migrated to the colony whereas less than one-third of wealthy buyers moved to Pennsylvania.

[36] For a seminal statement on the role of chain migration in the formation of migrant communities, consult John S. MacDonald and Leatrice D. MacDonald, "Chain Migration, Ethnic Neighborhood Formation, and Social Networks," *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (January 1964): 82-97. The Rutmans, *A Place in Time*, chap. 4, demonstrated a clear pattern of chain migration and settlement among early Virginians, where new colonists typically settled in areas close to relatives or friends.

West Midlands of England. Ann Heath (1623-1689) married James Harrison (1628-1687) in 1655; Margery Heath (1640 – *ca*. 1699) married Thomas Janney (1633-1697) in 1660; and Jane Heath (d. 1691) married William Yardley (1632-1693) in 1663. These men migrated along their spouses' family ties. Through these sisters many prominent settlers of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, were related by blood or marriage, and members of these interconnected families were active in colonial Pennsylvania's civil and religious affairs. Moreover, Phineas Pemberton (1649-1701/2) married Phoebe Harrison (1660-1696), daughter of James Harrison and Anne Heath Harrison, adding another layer to the kin group's migration; both the Pemberton and Harrison families crossed the ocean in 1682.[37] Tightly-knit groups of related nuclear family units formed a broad family network, shaping the contours of migratory flows to Pennsylvania; migration was built upon such networks of family.

Male siblings were also vital component of family migration networks. Horizontal family connections, particularly those between brothers, formed migration chains that transported additional kin across the Atlantic to Pennsylvania. For example, Joseph and Daniel Milner were brothers from Pownal, Cheshire and joint First Purchasers, or those who bought shares of Pennsylvania land in England from William Penn before he sailed to the province in August 1682; they purchased 250 acres of land in the colony.[38] The two siblings traveled to Pennsylvania in the summer of 1682 on the

[37] "A Partial List of the Families who Resided in Bucks County," 230; and L. Taylor Dickson, "The Sailing of the Ship Submission in the Year 1682 with a True Copy of the Vessel's Log," in *Passengers and Ships Prior to 1684, Volume1 of Penn's Colony: Genealogical and Historical Materials Relating to the Settlement of Pennsylvania*, ed. Walter Lee Sheppard, Jr. (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1970), 190.

[38] "The First Purchasers of Pennsylvania, 1681-1685," in *The Papers of William Penn*, vol. 2: *1680-1684*, ed. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), 649

*Friend's Adventure*. Daniel Milner remained in Pennsylvania to look after their adjoining tracts of land in Makefield Township, Bucks County, and Joseph Milner returned to Cheshire to bring over their mother and sister on the *Endeavour*. Ralph Milner, another brother, came on the same ship with his wife Rachel and son Robert. The second wave of the Milner family reached the Delaware River together just over a year after the brothers' initial voyage.[39] Brothers played a key role establishing a chain of migration that moved with cumulative energy for the larger family group. Such back-and-forth passages between Pennsylvania and other locations of the European Atlantic, part of the larger movement of people around the Atlantic, fostered contact among regions. The circulatory movement of peoples to and from Pennsylvania placed it squarely within the wider Atlantic community and vitally connected the colony to an Atlantic world in motion.[40]

The return of migrant kin set in motion family migration chains. In 1760, Richard Wells suggested that the bonds of blood and kinship superseded attachment to a homeland as a determining factor in making the migration decision. Wells migrated to Philadelphia ten years earlier, and returned to Lincolnshire to the "only ties I have now in England," his mother and brother, hoping to convince them to move to Pennsylvania. He believed his mother would "fondly give up her affection to her native soil and attend me

---

(hereafter cited as *PWP*). See also: "Minutes of the Board of Property of the Province of Pennsylvania, Minute Book 'H,'" *Pennsylvania Archives*, 2nd ser., vol. XIX, ed. William H. Egle, M.D (Harrisburg: E.K. Meyers, State Printer, 1890), 653-4.

[39] "A Partial List of the Families who Arrived at Philadelphia," 330. For more on the Milner family, see Balderston, "William Penn's Twenty-Three Ships," 47 n.75; and idem, "Pennsylvania's 1683 Ships and Some of their Passengers," 83 n.52.

[40] Meinig, *The Shaping of America*, broadly explored "the creation of a vast Atlantic circuit, a new human network of points and passages binding together four continents, three races, and a great diversity of regional parts." Quote on p. 3.

to America." Nor did Wells anticipate any trouble in persuading his sibling to leave England and take ship across the Atlantic with their mother. Since the younger brother was "just at an age to set out in the world for himself, being not so strongly attached to his mother country, as to his two nearest relations," Wells felt confident that his sibling "will likewise accompany me" to Philadelphia. [41] Wells was certain that his brother, with less attachment to home because of his youth, would be more inclined to travel with his close kin and pursue his future on the western shores of the Atlantic. Family ties, then, were a critical force driving migration. In addition, Wells's return to England and plans to bring over his remaining family to Pennsylvania further promoted the Atlantic's nexus of mobility. His actions demonstrated a flexible network of migration and return. As a temporary returnee and linchpin of the family's chain of migration, he operated across the Atlantic and within multi-local areas of the colony and home area.

Complex chains of migration, sustained through interrelated families, organized the Atlantic migration of Quakers.[42] For example, kin following the initial migration of Thomas Janney to Pennsylvania included various branches of his family and followed collateral lines. Migrant Thomas Janney, a noted Quaker preacher, was the fifth of six children born in Cheshire to Thomas Janney and Elizabeth Worthington Janney. Thomas Janney arrived in the colony aboard the *Endeavour*, with his wife Margery Heath Janney and their four children in September 1683, settling in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.[43] Kin

[41] Richard Wells to Richard Hill, Cottness, England, November 26, 1760, in John Jay Smith, ed., *Letters of Doctor Richard Hill and His Children: Or, The History of a Family, as Told by Themselves* (Philadelphia: T. K. and P. G. Collins, Printers, 1854), 176-177.
[42] Helen Forde, "Derbyshire Quakers, 1650-1761" (Ph.D. diss., University of Leicester, 1977), found patterns of chain migration that continued over many generations. Fisher, *Albion's Seed*, 434 n.1, incorporated her findings in his study of the Friends' migration.
[43] "A Partial List of the Families who Arrived at Philadelphia," 330.

reached the colony at that time, making the voyage together in the same vessel with the Janney nuclear family. The Quaker preacher's oldest sister Mary Janney married Robert Peirson, and members of that family came to Pennsylvania in the first year of colonization. Thomas Peirson was from Pownall Fee in Cheshire, and his wife Margaret Peirson, brother John Peirson, and sister Mary Smith, took passage in the *Endeavour* with the Thomas Janney's family.[44] Siblinghood, then, was an influential factor in arranging family-based chain migration. In addition, more Janney kin came to the colony with the arrival of the migrant Thomas Janney's nieces; these offshoots of the family furthered the kin group's chain migration to Pennsylvania. Thomas Janney's younger brother Henry Janney, of Cheshire, married Barbara Baguley Janney, and together they had three daughters, Elizabeth (1677-1728), Mary (1680-1764), and Tabitha (1687-1744). After the decease of their parents, the three sisters migrated from England to Pennsylvania in 1698 to be under the care of their uncle Thomas Janney of Bucks County.[45]

The kinship network continued to encourage chain migration through collateral branches of the Janney family. Family chains followed more distant kinship connections, as extended kin of the Janney family made their way to Pennsylvania. Migrant Thomas Janney's first cousin William Janney had two children who settled in the colony as well;

---

[44] "A Partial List of the Families who Arrived at Philadelphia ," 330. On Thomas Pearson and family, see Horace Edwin Hayden, *Virginia Genealogies: A Genealogy of the Glassell Family of Scotland and Virginia* (Wilkes-Barre, Pa.: E. B. Yordy, Printer, 1891), 342, 354.

[45] The three sisters married influential members of colonial Pennsylvania society: Mary Janney married Joseph Drinker in 1708; Tabitha Janney married William Fisher in 1709; and in 1710, Elizabeth Janney married Pentecost Teague. For the genealogical information, see William W. H. Davis, *History of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, from the Discovery of the Delaware to the Present Time*, 2nd ed., vol. III, (New York: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1905), 55-56; Edward Carpenter and Louis Henry Carpenter, comp., *Samuel Carpenter and his Descendants* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1912), 216; and Henry Drinker Biddle, *The Drinker Family in America, to and including the Eighth Generation* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1893), 7.

William was a son of Thomas Janney's uncle Randle Janney (his father's brother). William Janney's son Randle migrated to Philadelphia in 1699, and another son Thomas, brother of Randle, also made his way to the colony, initially settling in Chester County, Pennsylvania.[46] The migration history of the extended Janney family evinced a kin-based web of connections that provided foundational support for chain migration to Pennsylvania. The continuing flow of kindred created elaborately complex networks of migration, helping fuel migration to the colony. Kinship networks, whereby fresh migrants followed relatives to the same destination, stimulated migration across the Atlantic to Pennsylvania. This sustained migration chain was made up kin that formed a broad family network; together they generated an accumulative process of chain migration so that members of the kin group moved over an established route, along which migrants continued to travel over a fifteen-year period.

There were many advantages to venturing within a family migration network, especially when in the company of a host of kin, including pooled resources, coping, and protection while surrounded by familiar faces. The dynamics of families, while facilitating geographic mobility, also complicated kinship networks. Sibling squabbling could breakdown into disputes over a number of issues, such as loans of money; the resulting strained relationships altered arrangements among close kin intending to set out together for Pennsylvania. In 1682, London Quaker merchant James Claypoole wrote his brother Edward Claypoole, a plantation owner in Barbados, that there was "some probability" their brother Wingfield Claypoole would be "going with us to Pennsylvania," and alluded to the possibility that they would visit their sibling on the

[46] Davis, *History of Bucks County*, vol. III, 55-56.

island "to stay 3 or 4 weeks," before continuing on to the Delaware Valley. Among all of the planning that went into preparing for migration across the Atlantic, James even proposed a way for the voyaging family members to go see a brother while in transit to Pennsylvania, indicating how Wingfield "likes that well" as an idea.[47] Wingfield, however, did not go to Pennsylvania with James Claypoole and his family after the two brothers argued over a £50 debt.[48] The cash-strapped James could not pay back Wingfield in a timely manner and the brothers had a falling out. Quarrels between siblings disrupted migrant networks, bringing an end to the kin group's plans to make a sojourn in the West Indies for a stopover visit and collective migration to Pennsylvania.

Ties of kinship shaped migratory patterns. Quaker migration was more than the actions of isolated nuclear family units cut off from networks of kinship. On the contrary, nuclear families acted in concert with a large group of kin. Attention to underlying kin relationships, such as sibling ties, revealed that migration was a collective enterprise for Quaker kinship groups. Family groups constituted a social structure to sustain migration across the Atlantic; the self-perpetuating dynamic that was characteristic of ongoing kinship network migration also increased the level family mobility. Migration networks based on kinship facilitated the process of chain migration and maintained migration momentum.

---

[47] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, London, September 23, 1682, in Jean R. Soderlund, ed., *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania: A Documentary History* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983), doc. 44, p. 181.
[48] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, London, July 10, 1683, in Balderston, ed., *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 219-20.

## Indentured Servitude:

## A Feature of Quaker Family Migration Networks

Indentured servitude was a fixture of migration in the Atlantic world and found throughout the British American mainland colonies.[49] The bound labor system was a feature of Pennsylvania colonization from the beginning of Quaker settlement in 1681, and figured prominently in the family-based system for migration as a way to assist kindred. Historian Gary B. Nash cited that "at least one-third" of all early migrants and "probably one-half" of adult male arrivals were indentured.[50] More specifically, historian Sharon Salinger reckoned that in the 1680s "at least 196 servants" arrived in the colony.[51] Quakers used bonded servitude for kin to make the Atlantic crossing. Prior to embarking, indentured servants usually signed contracts (so-called indentures) for a fixed term of years in service, committing to conditions and stipulations. They contracted to serve, perhaps three or four years, in return for the cost of their passage across the Atlantic, board, and lodging, and might receive clothes, a small sum of money, and a parcel of land

[49] Horn, *Adapting to a New World*, 25 and 25n.7, determined that 70 to 85 percent of the approximately 120,000 migrants voyaging to Virginia and Maryland in the seventeenth-century were indentured servants. Similarly, scholars have demonstrated that servants were a significant proportion of participants in the so-called Great Migration of the 1630s to New England: almost 34 percent of travelers departing from London in 1635 were servants in Alison Games's cohort drawn from the port register for that year; almost 21 percent were servants in David Cressy's study of migrants who sailed to New England in the 1630s; and Virginia DeJohn Anderson's group of nearly 700 migrants traveling in seven ships between the years 1635 and 1638 (after the Winthrop fleet of 1630) included 17 percent servants. See: Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World*, 51-52; David Cressy, *Coming Over: Migration and Communication between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 52-63, 66, 68; and Anderson, *New England's Generation*, 24-25, respectively. For an analysis of migrant indentured servitude and servant incidence in migrant populations, see Christopher Tomlins, "Indentured Servitude in Perspective: European Migration into North America and the Composition of the Early American Labor Force," in *The Economy of Early America: Historical Perspective and New Directions*, ed. Cathy Matson (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006), 146-182.

[50] Gary B. Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 50. He deduced these figures by drawing upon lists of arrivals for Philadelphia and Bucks County.

[51] Sharon V. Salinger, *To Serve Well and Faithfully: Labor and Indentured Servants in Pennsylvania, 1682-1800* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987). "The size of the unfree labor population in seventeenth-century Pennsylvania," she admitted, was "difficult to determine." Figure and quote on p. 21.

after fulfilling their service agreements and earning their freedom. Those who took up these terms traveled within a family migration network as indentured servants, either sponsored by relatives or bound with kin. Family groups were anomalous in the Atlantic migratory system, surpassed by the overwhelming stream of indentured servant passengers.[52] Even so, migration within the Atlantic was multilayered, and family and labor migration to early Pennsylvania occurred in interdependent waves; the movement of people from the British and Irish Isles to the colony combined two predominant features of European migration. Class, moreover, shaped the migration pattern. Entering servitude made the passage available to members of the kin group with limited financial resources. Since bound laborers had different occupational positions than their kin-sponsors, this system of family migration was also marked by internal class stratification.

Historian Sharon Salinger identified three phases of the unfree labor system in Pennsylvania. The first stage of indentured servitude began with the founding of Penn's colony and lasted until the 1720s. During this time period, during the height of the Quaker migration, the first servants were mostly English, skilled, and tended to serve people they knew personally or who were known to, or related to, their families. For many masters, she argued, indentured servitude was a means of helping poorer relatives and friends make the journey to Pennsylvania.[53] For example, Andrew Heath migrated from Staffordshire, in the west midlands of England, as an indentured servant to William

[52] Games, "Migration," in *The British Atlantic World*, 42.
[53] Salinger, *To Serve Well and Faithfully*, 2-3. For more on families and indentured servitude in the Friends migration, see Fischer, *Albion's Seed*, 434. Cressy, *Coming Over*, 58-59, made the point that some settlers in New England recruited servants through kinsman in England but did not elaborate if kin-servants made the passage with family. Anderson, *New England's Generation*, 24-25, likewise did not indicate if migrating families brought kin as servants.

Yardley and Jane Heath Yardley, both of Staffordshire. A younger brother, nephew, or cousin to Jane Heath Yardley, he was indentured for four years and promised fifty acres of land in the colony after fulfilling his contract. Together with members of the Yardley family, Andrew Heath took passage aboard the ship *Friend's Adventure* and on September 28, 1682 reached the Quaker colony.[54] Using indentured servitude as a means of migration, Andrew Heath crossed the Atlantic as a bound laborer and was able to join other members of the Heath kin group.

Family members availed themselves of the opportunity to set out for Pennsylvania as indentured servants to relatives, which formed an integral component of the kinship-based structure of migration. The Hough kin group, from Cheshire, was illustrative. Richard Hough, a chapman from the market town of Macclesfield, was a First Purchaser who obtained 500 acres of Pennsylvania land for £10; he was among the first of the family to arrive in the Delaware River on September 29, 1683 aboard the *Endeavour* of London. He brought four servants to Pennsylvania, including Francis Hough, possibly a nephew or brother, who was indentured for two years and to receive 50 acres of land on completion of service.[55] Samuel Hough, another kin member, crossed on the *Endeavour* at the same time, as a servant for four years to John Clows, also from the county of

[54] "A Partial List of the Families who Resided in Bucks County," 223. The register was begun in 1684 by a law directing inhabitants in the province, and those arriving, to register with the authorities in their respective counties of residence. This statute was not actively enforced and penalties for non-compliance were abolished in 1690; hence, there are only two incomplete lists of arrivals for Philadelphia and Bucks. The originals are at the Spruance Library, Bucks County Historical Society and Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

[55] "The First Purchasers of Pennsylvania," *PWP*, vol. 2, 645; "A Partial List of the Families who Resided in Bucks County," 226-227; and "A Partial List of the Families who Arrived at Philadelphia," 331.

Chester.[56] More Hough kindred landed in Pennsylvania two months later on a different ship. John Hough, Richard Hough's brother,[57] was a yeoman from Cheshire who landed at Pennsylvania in November 1683 on the *Friendship*, together with his wife Hannah and their son John. He also crossed the Atlantic with five servants, including Thomas Hough, a younger brother or nephew, who was to serve four years in the colony.[58] The Hough kin group's migrant network included making use of indentured servitude as a means for transporting relatives from England to the new colony.

Servant migration to early Pennsylvania was organized under the auspices of kinship. It was unclear if servants traveling with kin were part of household groups in England before taking ship to Pennsylvania or extra-household kin. Nevertheless, the kinship network was operative before the actual move across the Atlantic. As part of the family migration network, kin transported relatives as servants to the new colony. The arrangement reinforced ties of family and expanded migration networks with the additional incorporation of kinfolk.

**Family-Based Information Networks**

Advice for migrants appeared in pamphlets from the beginning of Pennsylvania colonization.[59] In addition, informal networks and lines of communication at the familial level played a crucial, if more inconspicuous, role in promoting Pennsylvania as an

[56] "A Partial List of the Families who Resided in Bucks County, Pennsylvania," 226; and "A Partial List of the Families who Arrived at Philadelphia," 330.
[57] In 1701, Richard Hough sought a warrant for his brother John Hough's land. See "Minutes of the Board of Property of the Province of Pennsylvania, Minute Book 'G,'" *Pennsylvania Archives*, ed. William H. Egle (Harrisburg: E. K. Meyers, State Printer, 1890) 2nd series, vol. XIX, 194.
[58] "A Partial List of the Families who Resided in Bucks County," 226, 229.
[59] For instance, see "Information and Direction to Such Persons as are Inclined to America, More Especially those Related to the Province of Pennsylvania [1682]," *PMHB* 4, no. 3 (1880): 329-342.

Atlantic destination and facilitating migration.[60] Kinship networks provided a ready channel for the transmission of instrumental information about opportunities available overseas and the migration route best followed in order to get to Pennsylvania. Kin were communication nodes in Atlantic migrant information networks; kin formed an informal network of reported migration experiences. Familial information networks operated on two levels, at once cosmopolitan in their Atlantic reach and parochial in their pluri-locality ties with the different sending areas. Mutual communication—instruction filtering back to prospective voyagers from migrant-kin predecessors and inquiries sent from potential migrants in the community of origin—was a salient feature of Atlantic migratory movement. The kinship structure provided a pervasive line of communication, channeling information between kinfolk in the home areas and colonial destination of Pennsylvania.

A key function of the kinship network included the exchange of specific and general information between migrants and their kin remaining behind. Migrants communicated recommendations to relatives about the long-distance relocation, spreading specific and reliable information about the circumstances of the voyage across the Atlantic and making suggestions to help kin prepare for the venture. At the same time, prospective migrants sought advisement from knowledgeable kindred familiar with making the move and relocating to the colony. Migrant kin served as destination-based contacts, allowing family back in the community of origin to ask about necessary

[60] On the workings of religious communication networks, see Rosalind J. Beiler, "Distributing Aid to Believers in Need: The Religious Foundations of Transatlantic Migration," *PH* 64, no. 5 (Summer 1997): 73-87; and idem, "Information Networks and the Dynamics of Migration: Swiss Anabaptist Exiles and Their Host Communities," in *Religious Refugees in Europe, Asia and North America (6th-21st century)*, ed. Susanne Lachenicht (Münster, Germany: Lit Verlag, 2007).

provisions and generally what to expect. Those contemplating or getting ready to leave drew on the advice of family with valuable first-hand Atlantic migratory experience; such experience was a migration resource for kin. Letters exchanged across the Atlantic were filled with inquiries, lengthy descriptions, and practical advice, acquainting kith and kin with particulars about the Atlantic voyage and living abroad.[61]

Experienced migrants who had already made the Atlantic crossing sent advice back to kith and kin about the voyage, so that their relatives would not be subjected to the same conditions as they had endured and would be spared from weeks of onboard misery. In 1699, George Haworth cautioned, "if my Brother or any of my Neighbours do incline to come into this country, let them be careful that they do not come too many in the Ship as we did."[62] Kinship networks transmitted news, disseminating information about the Atlantic voyage and prospects in the colony. The details family relayed back to relations informed kin and circulated news back across the Atlantic. By 1701, George Haworth, residing in Pennsylvania for several years, continued offering advice to family in Lancashire who might be potential migrants. He recommended, "if any of my relations have a mind to come to this country, I think it is a very good country and that they may do well, but be sure to come free, but if you come [as] servants," he further explained, "they must be sold for 4 or 5 years and work hard," and suggested they "bring such things as will suit plantation work[.]" In order to assist his kin, he advised "if any of you come I

[61] On the role and importance of information for migrants intending for New England, see Cressy, *Coming Over*, chap. 1.
[62] George Haworth to Isabel Haworth, Bucks County, Pa., October 26, 1699, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania, 1699-1722," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 37, no. 3 (1913): 331 (hereafter cited as *PMHB*).

desire you to send me word hard."[63] Migrant kin sent favorable reports and information back home, even if unsolicited, forgoing the hyperbole of illusory promotional tracts and raising familiarity with colonial living across the Atlantic.

Merchant James Claypoole was a First Purchaser of Pennsylvania land on two occasions, purchasing 5,000 acres for £50 in September 1681 and another 1,000 acres in April 1683.[64] As he was preparing to set out to the far shores of the Atlantic, Claypoole corresponded with two migrant brothers who had already made the ocean voyage to the colonies. In particular, James Claypoole sought guidance from these two siblings on a variety of questions pertaining to his family's overseas relocation. In October 1681, he wrote his brother Norton Claypoole, settled in New Castle on the Delaware River, then a major settlement in the region, asking "in what time a man may, if he arrive there in the 7th month [September], with the help of 3 or 4 servants, clear ground enough to afford corn and feed cattle for a family of 15 or 20, what safety or hazard may be expected from the Indians, in what time and with what charge a house with 10 or 12 rooms, and barn and stables, etc., may be built." He also wanted to know "In what time an orchard will bear" a harvest of fruits.[65] He made an effort to learn as much as he could from his sibling, drawing on his brother's experiences with establishing a family and farm in a new land across the Atlantic. James Claypoole also wrote another brother, Edward, who owned a plantation on the West Indian island of Barbados, inquiring into land management. "I have bought some land in Pennsylvania, 5,000 acres," he acquainted his

[63] George Haworth to Isabel Haworth, May 14, 1701, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 332-333.
[64] "The First Purchasers of Pennsylvania," *PWP*, vol. 2, 640.
[65] "James Claypoole to Norton Claypoole, London, October 28, 1681, in Balderston, ed., *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 69.

brother, and indicated that he "shall want some advice how to improve it." James turned to his other brother, familiar with cultivation and land practices as an estate owner, about handling his purchase, requesting, "let me have a few lines from thee about this particular [matter]" of land development.[66]

Before departing for Philadelphia, James Claypoole also sought advice from both of his brothers on what newcomers needed for their transplantation. In April 1682, James asked his sibling in the Caribbean for guidance, writing, "Pray, brother, in thy next, give me what advice thou canst about carrying things necessary for our first settling and planting" in the Delaware Valley.[67] Several months later James Claypoole wrote his other brother settled in the mid-Atlantic mainland to "thank thee for thy advice about goods that may be proper to send, and I desire thee give me what farther advice and direction thou canst, which may be very beneficial to me. So be not sparing of thy pains, but let thy advice be large and full."[68] Potential migrants utilized family ties, looking to other members of the kin group who already established themselves overseas to provide direction, taking advantage of their relation's familiarity with living in Atlantic colonies.

Other prospective migrants likewise turned toward kin, seeking advice on the colony and relocating. In 1685, Benjamin Coole wrote from Wiltshire, England to his brother-in-law Phillip Roman, removed to Chester County, Pennsylvania, requesting, "I much desier thee to send me a letter of y$^{e}$ affaires of y$^{e}$ Country & w$^{t\ way}$ may be most advantagous w$^{n}$ there & w$^{t}$ to bring over ffor I know not but I may come [over] to you at

[66] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, London, December 16, 1681, in Balderston, ed., *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 79.
[67] Ibid, London, April 20, 1682, 111.
[68] James Claypoole to Norton Claypoole, London, July 14, 1682, in Balderston, ed., *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 134.

Last if all things goes well ffor shall I tell you I Long to see you[.]" At the end of the same letter, Coole reasserted his assumption and anticipation that his kin would send him helpful information about his possible move, expressing, "I shall Expect to hear ffrom you as soon as posible and to have a p$^{r}$ticuler account of y$^{e}$ maters afore mentioned[.]"[69] Before taking passage, preparatory measures included collecting information from kindred already living in the colony.

David Lindsey planned on leaving northern Ireland's province of Ulster in 1758, and making the Atlantic voyage to join his cousin Thomas Fleming in Pennsylvania. The prospective migrant had "expected a letter from you more oftener" with instructions and believed "that Cusen W$^{m}$ Fleming would come over before this time" for a visit, first-hand account, and possibly to act as an escort. For Lindsey, though, "these things does not discourage me to goe" to Pennsylvania. He was not dissuaded from journeying to the colony, but made plain that "only we Depend on y$^{e}$ for Directions in the goods fitting to take to that place." Intending migrants expected kin who already migrated to assist them with practical knowledge. In addition, on behalf of a younger member of the kin group, Lindsey asked his kinsman in the colony about the prospects of migrant servitude as a way to make the Atlantic voyage. Nephew Robert Lindsey, his brother James Lindsey's son, had "service to his uncle, James Martin, and desires to know if he will redeem himself if he goes over there. He is a good favour and is willing to work for his passage

[69] Benjamin Coole to Philip Roman, Goatacre, Wiltshire, England, July 13, 1685, Taylor, Harris, Roman, Frazer, and Smith Families Papers (collection 150), box 5, folder 8, Chester County Historical Society (hereafter cited as Roman Family Papers and CCHS).

till it's paid."[70] Among kin expectations, overseas relatives looked to Fleming, as the kin group's migrant predecessor, to impart his knowledge about necessary supplies so that they could made appropriate preparations beforehand and for insight into Pennsylvania's servant labor market for those unable to pay the passage costs.

Calculations in the migration decision were influenced by kin reporting on Pennsylvania's employment market. In the fall of 1717, Joseph Wood, his wife, and two daughters prepared to leave the Quaker community at Mountmellick, County Laois, in the Irish midlands and head for Pennsylvania. The couple "gave account that they had Relations there and that he understood that his trade ($w^{ch}$ is making parchment and glue) is far better there than here."[71] Kinship networks provided prospective migrants with knowledge of employment opportunities in Pennsylvania. Migrants were guided by kin in their choice of Pennsylvania as a colonial destination and responded to attractive reports of more favorable conditions across the Atlantic.

Network ties allowed potential migrants to collect information on a range of matters from knowledgeable kin migrants. Prospective migrants relied on relatives already settled in the colony and familiar with the journey and relocation. Kin in Pennsylvania proffered helpful recommendations and instructions gained by experience, and intending migrants were able to draw on the advice of kin to help make the move across the Atlantic. Familial communication channels facilitated the circulation of information among members of the kinship network and beyond, disseminating

[70] David Lindsey to Thomas or Andrew Fleming, County Londonderry, March 19, 1758, in *Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan: Letters and Memoirs from Colonial and Revolutionary America, 1675-1815*, ed. Kerby A. Miller and others (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), doc. 3, p. 29. See also E. R. R. Green, ed., *Essays in Scotch-Irish History* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), 91.
[71] Quoted in Myers, *Immigration of the Irish Quakers into Pennsylvania*, 290.

indispensible knowledge about necessities for overseas migration, such as food and other supplies for a distant Atlantic destination. For those integrated into kin migrant networks, relatives on the far side of the Atlantic served as brokers of information; such network connections were an advantageous resource for reliable information about long-distance migration and relocation.

**Encouragement to Take Passage for Pennsylvania**

Kinship was a powerful inducement in the decision to migrate to Pennsylvania. Family members already in the Delaware Valley wanted their relatives to join them in the colony, and their injunctions played a significant role in persuading some to undertake the overseas relocation. Quaker migration to Pennsylvania was considerably influenced by coaxing from siblings settled in the colony. Migrant kin had a drawing power, and encouragement lubricated familial migration chains. Eleanor Davis's 1711 certificate of removal from the monthly meeting at Sodbury, Gloucestershire, in southwestern England, indicated she was "now Ready to Imbarque for" Pennsylvania, "having a sister already there one Elizabeth Howell," settled with her husband Reece Howell in Newtown, Chester County, "who have given her much Encouragement to come unto her" in the colony.[72] Martha Zealy's brother urged her to leave England, and in March 1712 the monthly meeting at Nailsworth, in the Gloucestershire Cotswolds, informed Philadelphia Friends that it was "having a brother in your parts who by Invitation hath Induced her to Come to him" in Pennsylvania.[73] Elizabeth Johnson's brother wanted her

[72] Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1684-1758, p. 76, Film MR-Ph 374, FHL.
[73] Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1684-1758, p. 88, Film MR-Ph 374, FHL.

to come over to the colony from the English county of Durham. Her 1742 certificate of removal from Sunderland, on the northeast coast, noted that she was unmarried and inclined to move to Pennsylvania because of a brother's request. The English Friends explained that it was "on the Encouragement & Invitation of her Brother Ralph Loftus of Philadelphia [that she] removed from this place about ten Months since with Intention to settle with you in which she had the Consent & approbation of her Mother[.]"[74] Beckoning from siblings in the colony could be incentive enough to leave home, and their implorations were a persuasive and precipitating factor influencing a family member's decision to migrate to Pennsylvania. Eagerness on the part of the migrants to bring their kin to Pennsylvania kept migration an ongoing process. In this manner, kin networks helped construct migratory pathways to the colony.[75] The decision to migrate was made after a relative had moved; encouragement and help from migrant kin, in turn, influenced the migration decision of other family remaining behind. Thus, a migration chain was established when one member of the family moved and others follow. Prospective migrants made decisions within familial networks that simultaneously connected Pennsylvania to multiple sending communities.

Migrant siblings in the colony prodded their brothers on the other side of the Atlantic with appeals to emotion. Despite reservations about putting relations through

[74] Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1736-1742, no. 595, Film MR-Ph 381, FHL.

[75] Games, "Migration," in *The British Atlantic World*, 40, observed that European migrants traveling throughout the British Atlantic world oftentimes "followed the routes of friends, kin, and neighbors." Horn, *Adapting to a New World*, 59, stressed the importance of kinship connections for the "relatively few" free migrants who traveled in family groups to Virginia and Maryland, and in such cases family "were significant in influencing the decision to emigrate, facilitating the move, and sometimes determining where individuals finally settled." Glover, *All Our Relations*, chap. 1, found that extensive family ties played a crucial role in migration to South Carolina.

"the long and toilsome journey" across the ocean, Germantown settler David Seipt indicated to his brother in a 1734 letter, "it would give me much pleasure if the dear Lord were to allow us to meet again upon earth," nudging that "I would much rather that you would come here" to Pennsylvania.[76] Another German-speaking migrant wrote his brother living on the European continent, longing ardently, "Oh! I have often wished you were here with your family"; his thoughts were often of far away kin. "Sell your little piece of land," the migrant brother entreated his sibling across the ocean, "and if you only get enough to bring you to Philadelphia, I will bring you from there up to our place which is about eighty miles."[77] Family members already in the colony were sources of assurance, assuaging possible uneasiness about a transition to a new place; kinship assistance was an added reason for relocating to Pennsylvania.

Siblings encouraged their brothers and sisters to migrate to the colony, but were not always successful at finding one another on the other side of the Atlantic. To reunite in the colony, newcomers made use of colonial newspapers in their search for kin. In the summer of 1743, Johann Casper Repp, from Wetterau Dauernheim in the west-central region of Hesse, "arrived in this country six years ago, and then notified his sister, Anna Maria Repp, also to come. She arrived last autumn and is now in Germantown, and she seeks news of her brother."[78] In another instance, it was "by a Letter, dated October 1760" that Thomas Bell, a native of northern Ireland, "informed his Father John Bell" of "his Success" while "cruising in several of the Privateers belonging to New York[.]" On

[76] [David Seipt], "An Immigrant's Letter, 1734," *The Pennsylvania-German* IX (January-December 1908): 369.
[77] "Early Letter," *The Pennsylvania Dutchman*, vol. III, no. 11, Lancaster, Pa., November 1, 1951, p. 1.
[78] Hocker, *Genealogical Data Relating to the German Settlers of Pennsylvania*, 1.

account of such prosperous activities, Thomas wanted his father "to send his Brother William to this Country, on whose Arrival he was to apply to Mr. Beard in Water street, three Doors above Walnut street, Philadelphia, or write to him at Mr. James Smithin Milford Township[.]" The recently arrived brother William followed these arrangements, only to discover that the two men he was supposed contact about getting in touch with his brother "have left the Places they then occupied" in the city. William, the notice concluded, "takes this Method to inform his said Brother, that he may hear of him, by applying to Mr. Redmond Conyngham, Merchant in Market street, Philadelphia, or to Mr. John Crawford, in Warrington Township, Bucks County."[79] William moved to the colonies on account of his migrant brother's promising recommendation but failed to join up with his sibling.

Encouragement from migrant kin played a major role in the decision-making process, and could be a deciding factor spurring relatives to travel to Pennsylvania. Such strong influences affected female migration; siblings especially sent for sisters to join them in the colony. However, there were chinks in the kinship chains of migration, and arrangements did not always go as smoothly as planned. Also, other considerations, such as networks of care, discouraged migration. Yet, active encouragement reinforced family chains of migration and promoted relocation to Pennsylvania.

**The Reynell Family:**

**Constraints of Supportive Family Migration Networks**

There were many forms of family-based assistance and flexible strategies for migration across the waters of the Atlantic. Motivated by obligation, kindred could be

[79] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, July 16, 1761.

invaluably supportive for making the Atlantic passage and settling in Pennsylvania. The functioning of kinship, however, carried certain expectations from members of the family, and there were limitations of kin assistance for transatlantic migration. Unconditional familial support was not automatic or universal, and, in some cases, migrants were especially careful of helping kin after receiving warnings from overseas relations about potentially difficult family members trying to make the Atlantic voyage. A close comparison of the Reynell family's divergent treatment, and especially John Reynell's radically different offers, toward two sisters revealed much about the nature of forthcoming support from networks of kinship. Family migration networks could be a highly contested arena and were not always mobilized for close kin; nor were resources always shared or equally accessible. Even when kindred considered curbing support for intending migrants from the family group, members of the migration network continued to engage in deliberations that spawned additional contact.

In 1734, Samuel Reynell, residing in the city of Exeter, Devon, warned his migrant son John Reynell, who arrived in Pennsylvania from Jamaica about five years earlier, to be wary of his sister Sarah; she had an unsettled past and was trying to leave England, "with a designe to com[e] to philadelphia,"[80] but could not scrounge together enough money for the passage costs. After more than a year in debtor's prison and a period of time in Ireland, Sarah returned to her parents' home in the southwest of England, where she was a burden to her father, owing him twenty to thirty pounds after only six months, and overexerted her already ailing mother with the added encumbrances

[80] Samuel Reynell to John Reynell, August 9, 1734, Box 1, Folder 12, Series 1a.: Incoming Correspondence, 1719-89, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.

of "a Maiden Child"[81] and Scottish partner she met while incarcerated. For these reasons, Samuel forewarned his son John of their obtruding, "I caution thee to beware of them if thou shouldst see them in [thy] part of the world."[82] Samuel Reynell did not hesitate to advise a child about another sibling, recommending that his son refrain from helping his sister with travel across the Atlantic and resettlement in Pennsylvania; she would have no intent to repay anything she cadged. There were, then, standards and dictates for aiding relations, and what family members judged as intrusive and reprehensible behavior, such as imposing oneself on the generosity of close kin, would not make it easy for someone to secure needed support from family members. As a father, Samuel Reynell helped his daughter, but, at the same time, he also looked out for the welfare of his migrant son in Pennsylvania and suggested that John Reynell protect himself by avoiding his troublesome sister.

Beyond his father, other overseas kin also suggested Reynell take no notice of his sister if she made her way to Pennsylvania, because of her incorrigible behavior and the "disregard of her ffathers advice to her & vain Conceit of herself & her own ways." At the beginning of April 1732, when Sarah Reynell and her partner were in debtor's prison, Dr. Michael Lee Dicker dissuaded his kinsman John Reynell, "I wou'd not advise thee to incourage her coming to Philad.[a] w.[ch] I am sensible, will be neither for thy Ease, Interest nor Reputation" in the city.[83] Two years later, Dicker volunteered the same opinion,

[81] Samuel Reynell to John Reynell, February 20, 1733/4, Box 1, Folder 10, Series 1a.: Incoming Correspondence, 1719-89, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[82] Samuel Reynell to John Reynell, August 9, 1734, Box 1, Folder 12, Series 1a.: Incoming Correspondence, 1719-89, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[83] Michael Lee Dicker to John Reynell, April 1, 1732, Series 1a: Incoming Correspondence, Box 1, Folder 6, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.

warning of her "desier to go over to thee at Philad.[a]" and recommending "I wou'd advise thee to discourage it."[84] In his view, Dicker believed in no uncertain terms that Sarah Reynell brought reproach on the family in England and cautioned about the same happening to his kinsman in Philadelphia. In fact, his letters on the matter were increasingly filled with vituperative remarks. By the beginning of 1734/5, Dicker continued reporting that "I hear thy Sister Sarah & her Man (whether Husband or not I can't tell) are preparing to make thee a Visit, & I Suppose thou wilt be wise enough to give them as good a Reception as they deserve."[85]

John Reynell took his father's and kinsman's cautionary words under advisement and punctiliously obeyed the conventions governing improvident kin by not extending help to Sarah Reynell. Leery of the disruptions his sister might cause in Philadelphia, John Reynell wrote in November 1734 to his kin in England that "I never gave my poor unhappy Sister any manner of Encouragement to come here for I don't desire to see her the Trouble she had brought on her Parents Especially on her good Mother who was I know Exceedingly fond of her has Effected me so much that I should not show any regard to her if she came."[86] Some of the last words spoken by Samuel Reynell, "but a few days before he died," revealed that he still "Seem'd unwilling (to y.[e] very last) that thou Shou'dst give any Countenance to thy Sister Sarah 'till She gave Tokens of true

[84] Michael Lee Dicker to John Reynell, August 17, 1734, Series 1a: Incoming Correspondence, Box 1, Folder 12, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[85] Michael Lee Dicker to John Reynell, Exeter, England, January 25, 1734/5, Series 1a: Incoming Correspondence, Box 1, Folder 13, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[86] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, Philadelphia, November 26, 1734, John Reynell Letter Book, vol. 2: October 1734-March 1737, p. 5, Coates and Reynell Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.

Repentance & a [thorough] Reformation" of her conduct.[87] The overseas family's scrutiny affected John's view of his sibling. In June 1735, he reported that "I have heard nothing from my Sister neither do I desire ever to hear from her unless She takes better Courses."[88] Sarah Reynell passed away in 1735, precluding any possible confrontation between the siblings or a change of heart from John Reynell. Nevertheless, the example illustrated that there were limits to assistance from close kin, and familial obligations for transatlantic migration and settlement only went so far. The same kinship system that provided support and helped transport relations to Pennsylvania also operated to forewarn against ne'er-do-well family members who might take advantage of kin assistance. The kinship group delimited accepted standards for its members, dispensing resources or applying pressure on its members to withhold migration auspices.

Compare the opprobrium directed at Sarah Reynell with the openhanded propositions John Reynell extended to his other sister Mary Reynell. After the deaths of their father, mother, brother, and sister in 1735, the only living members of the Reynell family were siblings John Reynell in Philadelphia and Mary Reynell in Exeter. Within the year, John Reynell invited his sister Mary, without any immediate family remaining in Devon, to join him in the colonial port city. She wrote her brother, acknowledging that he "wert so kind as to give me an Invitation to come & live a long with thee for which I think my Self extremely oblig'd to thee for," especially "as we two are now only left of the family it wou'd be of all things the most agreeable to me" to be united again. While

[87] Michael Lee Dicker to John Reynell, Exeter, England, June 14, 1735, Series 1a: Incoming Correspondence, Box 1, Folder 14, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[88] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, June 11, 1735, John Reynell Letter Book, October 1734-March 1737, p. 13, vol. 2, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, John Reynell Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.

expressing her gratitude and eagerness, however, Mary Reynell also asked her brother if "thou woudes be so kind as to defray the expence of my passage & Setting out" across the ocean, explaining she was "afraid the Expence of my having new Cloaths Setting out & passage wou'd Sink the Greatest part of what I have which I Shou'd be very loath to do as I have nothing besides that but the Labour of my hands to trust" and "the favour" of kinsman Dr. Michael Lee Dicker. Otherwise, she indicated, "I am very willing to come over to thee," but not before settling their father's affairs.[89]

From the beginning, John Reynell tried to make the migration process easier for Mary Reynell. As part of her preferential support, Reynell searched for propitious voyage conditions, locating a vessel that would reach Philadelphia in the spring of 1736; he personally knew the ship's master, someone he felt would "be very kind to her & take great care of her for my Sake." In addition, he made numerous suggestions for the voyage and relocation: "I would have her Sell all the Good Saving a Feather Bedd & a few other things She may want for her Use on Board unless there by any particular things that are Valueable which She may bring with her[.]" The migrant brother also recommended Mary buy "a good Suite of Grazet" [a finely woven worsted and silk camlet used especially for gowns] and "Some pretty good linnen," as well as advising she "lye in Something of a Sea Store" and "Some other Small things that She may want."[90] Taking into consideration his sister's limited financial resources for the Atlantic passage, John Reynell even contributed £15 sterling "to Defray the Expences for y:[e] Voyage and if

[89] Mary Reynell to John Reynell, Exeter, England, February 21, 1735, Series 1a: Incoming Correspondence, Box 1, Folder 15, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[90] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, [Philadelphia], November 15, 1735, John Reynell Letter Book, October 1734-March 1737, p. 25, vol. 2, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, John Reynell Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.

that Should happen not to be Enough I will besides Pay her Passage here" to Philadelphia. As a merchant, moreover, he was able to advise that his sister "must Agree for At as low a rate as She Can" for the voyage and recommend that she "not Come Via London because its Dearer from thence much then from Bristoll or Plymouth."[91] Reynell drew on his knowledge of early modern transatlantic maritime shipping and transportation to help his sister secure a favorable and cheaper passage. Unlike his disinclination toward Sarah, John Reynell went out of his way planning to make it less difficult for Mary to migrate.

In the summer of 1738, several years after the family friction and series of deaths in the family, John Reynell still tried enticing his sibling Mary to venture across the Atlantic and join him in Philadelphia. "I think thou need not doubt but that if my Sister arrives Safe here, She will meet with a very kind Reception," Reynell assured his kinsman.[92] In the end, his cajoling was unsuccessful; his sister remained in England for the time being. The manner in which the sisters would be received in Philadelphia was quite opposite; a kinship chain could be two-sided. The welcoming proposal, financial assistance, and warm treatment assured to Mary stood out in stark contrast against the castigation Sarah was subjected to and the cold reception she was promised. Nuclear family as well as extended kin, mincing no words, made sure Sarah Reynell was denied support from the kin group for contravening familial norms of behavior. Even when

[91] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, Philadelphia, December 6, 1736, John Reynell Letter Book, vol. 2: October 1734-March 1737, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[92] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, Philadelphia, August 9, 1738, John Reynell Letter Book, vol. 3: May 1737 – October 1738, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.

withholding support, Atlantic kinship networks were still operational and actively connecting Pennsylvania and the home community.

**Extended Family and Migration to Pennsylvania**

The strength of extended family ties contributed to the successful continuation of migration chains. Extended relations—kin beyond the nuclear unit—were an integral part of family migration networks. In the Atlantic setting, kin groups functioned as a crucial agent in promoting the welfare of migrating extended family members through a variety of supportive activities; helping a wide group of relatives migrate was a family obligation. The working and persistence of the kinship system was particularly evident in assisting young relatives with migration. Extended kin were an advantageous resource, mitigating the risks associated with overseas relocation. The availability of kin, and the support they offered, made it more possible to leave home and move to Pennsylvania. Indeed, with a larger kin group there was a greater potential resource base.[93] Younger and unmarried members of the kin group particularly relied on extended relations for assistance making the move, sometimes taking passage together or heading to relatives already settled in Pennsylvania. In the process, extended family exerted considerable influence on the Atlantic destination of young migrants from the kin group.

Migrants living in Pennsylvania petitioned extended members of the Atlantic kin group to join them in the colony, actively recruiting relatives as potential migrants with assurances of assistance. In 1712, over a decade after his passage across the Atlantic, George Haworth remained "concern'd sometimes for some of my relations" back in

[93] David Cressy, "Kinship and Kin Interaction in Early Modern England," *Past and Present* 113 (November 1986): 69, highlighted that "A dense and extended kindred was a store of wealth, like a reserve account to be drawn upon as need arose."

Lancashire, especially "Uncle Henrys children for fear there is not care taken of them," a worry that weighed heavily upon the migrant years out from his migration. The migrant suggested that his brother "if it be not too much trouble for thee to send me one of them over, or any of my cousins" from northwestern England. Haworth promised to assist with travel expenses and set up kindred that might be sent to Pennsylvania, pledging that "if thou be free to send me one over I will give him a good trade or if any be minded to come I will pay their passage here or send thee return" for the costs.[94] Family migration networks were broadly inclusive, encompassing more distant relations. Migrants continued to think about a range of kindred back across the Atlantic, and tried to persuade extended relations to take passage for Pennsylvania with proposals of backing and help. Family assistance from extended relations beyond the nuclear unit was a particularly successful way of facilitating the passage of young kin to the colony. The conspicuous link between uncles and nephew and nieces was a useful kinship function and a visible part of the family-based migration system that brought migrants to settle in Pennsylvania.

A key component of family migration network included sending younger kindred to uncles already established in Pennsylvania. This type of assistance made it possible for kin in their juvenile years to move across the Atlantic without their parents. Josiah Mark's 1727 will, for instance, recorded that he had "Lately come ffrom old England" and was "now Living at Unckle Thomas Watsons" in Bucks County.[95] In 1749, Quaker Elizabeth Gridly's certificate of removal from the monthly meeting at St. Ives, Huntingdonshire stated that she "has resided for some years a Servant in the Family of

[94] George Haworth to James Haworth, Buckingham, Bucks County, Pa., November 3, 1712, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 338.
[95] Bucks County Wills, Book 1, p. 111, file no. 252.

Thomas & Elizabeth Gray" in the small town of Godmanchester. She announced her intentions of leaving eastern England and moving "to her Unckle Samuel Gridley," who lived "within the Compass" of the Philadelphia monthly meeting.[96] Extended relations fulfilled a major role in helping young and unmarried relatives, and in the process facilitated the movement of people across the Atlantic to the colony. By heading to kin in Pennsylvania, such as uncles and no doubt aunts as part of nuclear or conjugal family units, extended kinship ties also strongly influenced the direction of migration and location of settlement for this subsequent wave of migrants. In these ways, migration to the Delaware Valley was considerably influenced by kinship relations that extended beyond the nuclear family.

Minors traveled with uncles to Pennsylvania, whether parents were living or deceased. Kin groups carried on this activity as a method of assistance and part of the family-based system for migration. Quakers "Joshua Crosby and Thomas Crosby his Nephew" migrated together in 1746 from Jamaica to Philadelphia.[97] Henry Flower, nephew of the First Purchaser and Philadelphia schoolmaster Enoch Flower, "came into this Province" from Wiltshire with his uncle on the *Bristol Comfort*, landing on the banks of the Delaware River at the end of September 1683, and "dwelt several years with his uncle" after arriving in the colony.[98] Seth Flower, Henry Flower's father and Enoch

[96] Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1684-1758, p. 206, Film MR-Ph 374, FHL.
[97] Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1684-1758, p. 182, Film MR-Ph 374, FHL.
[98] "Minutes of the Board of Property, Minute Book 'I,'" *Pa. Archives*, 2nd Series, vol. XIX, 754. Henry Flower was summoned as a witness in a case involving a missing deed for 250 acres of property his uncle Enoch Flower sold and conveyed to William Mountjoy. For more on Henry Flower, see Hannah Benner Roach, "Philadelphia Business Directory, 1690," *The Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine* 23 (1963): 123-124. On the vessel *Bristol Comfort* and the goods Flower shipped onboard, see Marion Balderston,

Flower's brother, was living in England when the pair left for the Quaker colony, and was still alive after his migrant brother Enoch Flower passed away in late September 1684, leaving his migrant son alone a year after reaching Pennsylvania.[99] Nephews set out for Pennsylvania in the company of uncles with the consent of parents they left behind. Frequently, though, young kin took passage across the Atlantic in order to join extended family after the passing of a father.

Kinship networks helped support children at risk, especially when the death of a father occasioned a young kin member's migration to relations in Pennsylvania. In February 1701, Elizabeth Parker, a widow of Bartholomew Close, London, sought a certificate of removal for her son Joseph Parker, "a Lad of fourteen years of age," who was "desirous to go over to an Uncle of his (viz:) Robert Heath" in Pennsylvania.[100] As youths, George and Elizabeth Deeble made their way from Cork, in the south of Ireland, to Pennsylvania in 1722, with assistance from overseas kinfolk. Richard Deeble, their father, passed away three and a half years earlier, leaving "Nine Small Children behind him" in need of care and support. In response to their situation, "some of their near Relations in Pensilvania having lately given some Encouragement to Receive Some of them [the children] if they were Sent thither," and "the two Eldest" siblings, George and

---

"Pennsylvania's 1683 Ships and Some of Their Passengers," *The Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine* 24 (1964): 84, 86 n.63.

[99] "Enoch Flower, by his last Will, Dated 21st of the 6th Mo'th [August], 1684, appointed Seth Flower and the said Seth's son, Henry Flower, his Ex'ors. But Seth Flower being Resident in England renounced and left the whole to his Son, Henry Flower." See "Minutes of the Board of Property, Minute Book 'G,'" *Pa. Archives*, 2nd ser., vol. XIX, 288; and Philadelphia Wills, Book A, p. 17.

[100] Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removals (Received), 1684-1758, p. 45, Film MR-Ph 374, FHL.

Elizabeth, "were very desireous to go, with a younger sister."[101] Extended family ties made it more possible for younger members of the kin group to travel to Pennsylvania. The siblings in Ireland were broken up by the move across the Atlantic, but, on the other hand, overseas kinfolk aided in their charge, caring for the children in distress. Migrants receiving and looking after young relations participated in a transatlantic kin-based support system, and provided a means of transporting additional kindred to the colony. Despite long-distance migration, kin settled in the colony continued to function as part of the kinship system. Traditional obligations toward kin that were found in communities of origin also fit the needs of an Atlantic-wide kinship system. Forms of help, such as placing children with relatives, expanded to encompass long-distance functions of kin.

Elizabeth Spackman Hawley (1735-1796) was born in the small village of Hankerton, in Wiltshire, England. Her father, a worsted-comber, passed away around 1746 when she was about eleven-years-old and her mother Esther Spackman raised a large family of seven small children by teaching them all "to spin Worsted" woolen yarn. Joseph Hawley (1735-1817), Elizabeth's widower, recorded his wife's life story, including that her uncle, William Beale, who had settled in Whiteland, Chester County, in 1750 "went over from Pennsylvania to see his Relations and friends in England and Inviting some of y$^{e}$ family over to America they Readily accepted of y$^{e}$ Invitation" to relocate. Four of widow Esther Spackman's children, Thomas, Mary, Elizabeth, and Isaac, "Cheerfully gave up to leave their Native land, their mother, brother George (which came over in about 12 years after) two sisters and Cross the Atlantic with their

[101] Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1714-1729, no. 225, MR-Ph 381, FHL.

Unkle for Pennsylvania." When the nieces and nephews arrived in Pennsylvania, their uncle, under "whose care they came over," bound out the children and "Disposed of them in a manner that he thought best in order to enable them to provide for themselves" with a trade in the future. It was Elizabeth Spackman's "lot was to live with her unkle for whom she always had a particular regard." In fact, she "continued with him about seven years, four whereof was allowed to pay for her passage, the other there for wages," after which time she traveled to Wilmington to learn "Mantuamaking," or crafting the loose gowns, open in front to reveal an underskirt, that were worn by women in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. After learning the trade of a dressmaker, she "went to live with her brother Thomas" in East Bradford, Chester County; he had migrated with Elizabeth and their uncle.[102] This uncle played a crucial role in the migration of his nieces and nephews to Pennsylvania, establishing them in a new land. Esther Spackman, who stayed behind in Wiltshire, entrusted her brother William Beale with the supervision and guardianship of her sons and daughters in Pennsylvania. Thirteen years after their departure she still expected him to assume responsibility for his nieces and nephews, writing her children in 1763, "I should be Glad to have my Brother to be as a Father to you all[.]"[103] More than a parental figure, William Beale's years of direct care and guidance for his nieces and nephews had essentially made the uncle a surrogate father.

The role of the kinship network in Atlantic migration was especially evident in the case of Quaker minister Elizabeth Sampson Ashbridge (1713-1755); her physical

[102] "An Account of Elizabeth Spackman Hawley Written by Joseph Hawley," in *Letters and Other Papers of Daniel Kent Emigrant and Redemptioner, to which have been added a few interesting Hawley and Spackman Papers*, comp. Ella K. Barnard (Baltimore, Md.: [s. n.], 1904), 118-19.
[103] Hester Spackman to My Dear Children [Thomas, George, Isaac, Mary], Hankerton, Wiltshire, England, May 29, 1763, in *Letters and Other Papers of Daniel Kent*, 113.

mobility was the result of family discord.[104] She was born in Middlewich, Cheshire, England, and was the only child of Thomas Sampson and Mary Sampson, an active member in the Church of England. At the age of fourteen, she became estranged from her father after an opposed elopement that left her widowed within five months. When Elizabeth's father refused to let her move back home, her mother sheltered the young woman among neighbors before turning to kinfolk living in Ireland for help. At first, Elizabeth stayed with "a relation" of her mother in Dublin and then went beyond the pale to "a distant relation" living in the west of Ireland. The father kept her "at so great a distance" emotionally that she felt "quite shut out of his affections, and therefore concluded, since my absence was most agreeable he should have it" permanently. After

[104] Migrants engaged in substantial internal migration at home and prior to embarking across the Atlantic for Pennsylvania. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, migration was a common feature of European life. Local migration, historians have found, was a normal activity in early modern England and internal mobility led to overseas migration. On migration in early modern Europe, see Leslie Page Moch, *Moving Europeans: Migration in Western Europe since 1650* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), chap. 2. John Wareing recognized that setting out across the Atlantic was a further stage in the migration process. Many traveled considerable distances to make their way to London. He found that more than half the migrants traveling to the city came from areas over 130km (or over 80 miles). See "Migration to London and Transatlantic Emigration of Indentured Servants, 1683-1775," *Journal of Historical Geography* 7, no. 4 (October 1981): 356-78. Peter Clark, "Migration in England during the Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries," in *Migration and Society in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Clark and David Souden (London: Hutchinson, 1987), 213-252: argues for continuing high levels of physical mobility, but with most migration short distance and the apparent disappearance of long-distance subsistence movement; migration was becoming increasingly localized. David Souden, "'Rogues, Whores, and Vagabonds'? Indentured Servant Emigration to North America and the Case of Mid-Seventeenth-Century Bristol," in *Migration and Society in Early Modern England*, pp. 150-171,argued for seeing emigration patterns as an extension of patterns of internal migration, with large numbers of long-distance subsistence migrants taking ship. James Horn made a connection between growing levels of poverty and limited opportunities in England and the overseas exodus of poor laborers, emphasizing that "Migration within England and immigration to America were of the same piece." See *Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 420. Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World*, chap. 1, contended westward movement was part of a much larger pattern of mobility in England. She contextualized her collective biography of the 7507 travelers who left the port of London in 1635 with a portrayal of seventeenth-century migration to London that was embedded in broader patterns of migration within England (often part of the life cycle). See also Nicholas Canny, "English Migration Into and Across the Atlantic During the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," in *Europeans on the Move: Studies on European Migration, 1500-1800*, ed. Nicholas Canny (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 39-75.

five years with relatives in Ireland, Ashbridge looked out into the Atlantic toward the American colonies, in particular Pennsylvania, "where I had an uncle, my mother's brother" already residing. She endured many hardships and beguilement, including a kidnapping and illegal terms of indenture that landed her in New York by July 1732. Once in the colonies, she set out on a visit to her uncle in Philadelphia; after making it to her uncle's she learned of his passing but was welcomed by her remarried aunt, who "received me in the kindest manner."[105] Nonetheless, Ashbridge made her decision to cross the Atlantic with the intention of joining her uncle in Pennsylvania. Estranged from her father, and evidently without any hope for reconciliation, Ashbridge looked outside her nuclear family and into her kin universe throughout her relocations.[106] Ashbridge's movements to different destinations in the British Atlantic were made possible by extended relations; the kin network factored prominently in her peregrinations to Atlantic locales. Able to rely on extended kin, she was not left to find her way alone. Ashbridge's geographic mobility, impelled by a family rift and planned bearing in mind availability of kin assets, culminated in her ultimate Atlantic migration.

---

[105] [Elizabeth Ashbridge], *Some account of the early part of the life of Elizabeth Ashbridge, who died, in truth's service, at the house of Robert Lecky, in the county of Carlow, Ireland, the 16th of 5th month, 1755* (Philadelphia: Sold by Benjamin Kite, 1807), Am 1807 Ash4866.D (Cox), LCP. This narrative can also be found as "Some Account of the Fore-Part of the Life of Elizabeth Ashbridge who Departed this Life, in Truth's Service in Ireland, the 16th of the 5th Month [July], 1755. Wrote by herself. (Nantwich, 1774)," in Cristine Marie Levenduski, "Elizabeth Ashbridge's 'Remarkable Experiences': Creating the Self in a Quaker Personal Narrative" (Ph.D. diss.: The University of Minnesota, 1989), Appendix B. For more discussion of the text and author, see idem, *Peculiar Power: A Quaker Woman Preacher in Eighteenth-Century America* (Washington, D.C: Smithsonian Institution, 1996). See also Daniel Shea's edition of Ashbridge's autobiography, with a detailed introduction and textual notes, in William L. Andrews, ed., *Journeys in New Worlds: Early American Narratives* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990).

[106] Migrants to early modern English towns and cities lived with their kin and benefitted from their support. See: Peter Clark, "The Migrant in Kentish Towns, 1500-1700," in *Crisis and Order in English Towns, 1500-1700: Essays in Urban History*, ed. Peter Clark and Paul Slack (London: Routledge, 1972), 135-9; Vivien Brodsky Elliott, "Single Women in the London Marriage Market: Age, Status and Mobility, 1598-1619," in *Marriage and Society: Studies in the Social History of Marriage*, ed. R. B. Outhwaite (London: Europa Publications, 1981), 81-100.

The kin group continued to participate in an extended family system that spanned the Atlantic, offering aid and adding to the high degree of kin-supported geographical mobility. Kinship ties provided support for the wellbeing of children and shaped migratory patterns. In particular, this form of assistance allowed for the mobility of a kin group's younger members. Extended relations in the wider family migration network guided the directional pattern of young migrants, exerting considerable influence on the choice of Pennsylvania as a destination. Moreover, the family migration network brought about a degree of coalescence, whereby part of the kin group was drawn together in the Delaware Valley.

**Kinship and Network Assistance**

Migrants relied on a wide network of relatives to make the journey to the colony. Kinship support was provided after landing, helping to alleviate many of the asperities attending migration to Pennsylvania.[107] Furthermore, patterns of kin assistance extended across the Atlantic. Overseas relations sent useful tokens and supplies to help their migrant kinfolk. The absence of institutional assistance from welfare agencies magnified

[107] Peter Clark, "Migrants in the City: The Process of Social Adaptation in English Towns, 1500-1800," in *Migration and Society in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Clark and David Souden (London: Hutchinson, 1987), 267-291, suggested that kinship networks were an important mechanism for the assimilation, integration, and socialization of newcomers to early modern English towns. Michael Anderson, *Family Structure in Nineteenth Century Lancashire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 62-66, 152-60, indicated that kinship was of considerable importance for migration to nineteenth-century towns. Historians of early modern Atlantic migrations have noted how the "distinction between migrants who had kin, friends, and contacts in America and those who did not constituted a crucial difference between settlers and had a significant bearing on their fortunes in the colonies." Quote from Ida Altman and James Horn, "Introduction," in *"To Make America": European Migration in the Early Modern Period*, ed. Ida Altman and James Horn (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 20. Lorri Glover, *All Our Relations*, 1-2, 17-19, 21, 87-89, argued that because South Carolina's earliest settlers faced harsh demographic conditions, they depended on siblings and other extended kin for support; she found that settlers who came to the colony with supportive kin ties thrived and those without family support networks rarely succeeded. Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers*, chap. 4, discussed the assistance newcomers received from family, friends, and co-religionists.

the indispensably supportive role of the kin group;[108] the benefits accrued from family migration networks made a real difference.

Network financial resources supported Atlantic migratory movement. Prospective migrants had to deal with the trammels of finance, which was a disincentive to taking passage. Migration across the Atlantic was an expensive proposition, perhaps exceeding half of a year's or a whole year's income for adult migrants.[109] In 1695, John Allred, together with "my wife and my Suns," were designing to leave Manchester, northwestern England, for Pennsylvania and looked to preceding migrant kin for financial help. To that end, Allred supplicated his "loving cosen" Phineas Pemberton, who migrated to the colony in 1682, to "let mee kno how I Shall have youre good asistens for I am not abule to fun[d] of my Self[.]"[110] Over a decade after Pemberton crossed the Atlantic, an intending migrant kinsman in need could tap into the family network for aid

[108] Before the establishment of ethnic-based aid societies, which enacted laws regulating conditions on the Atlantic voyage and provided food, money, and clothing for the poor migrants on their arrival at Philadelphia, the protection and aid of recent arrivals fell upon kith and kin. See: Erna Risch, "Immigrant Aid Societies Before 1820," *PMHB* 60, no. 1 (January 1936): 15-33; John G. Frank and John E. Pomfret, "The German Lutheran Aid Society of 1790," *PMHB* 63, no. 1 (January 1939): 60-65; and Aaron Sullivan, "'The Charity which begins at Home': Ethnic Societies and Benevolence in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia," *PMHB* 134, no. 4 (October 2010): 305-337.

[109] In his first promotional tract published in 1681, William Penn advertised that making the Atlantic voyage to his new colony would cost "£6 a head" for men and women, £5 to transport an indentured servant, fifty shillings for a child under seven-years-old, and was free for nursing children. See "Some Account of the Province of Pennsylvania," in Soderlund, ed., *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, doc. 15, p. 64. For German-speaking migrants, eighteenth-century passage from Dutch ports to Philadelphia ranged between £5 to £14 sterling. These transportation cost figures can be found in Susan E. Klepp, Farley Grubb, and Anne Pfaelzer de Ortiz, eds., *Souls for Sale: Two German Redemptioners Come to Revolutionary America: The Life Stories of John Frederick Whitehead and Johann Carl Büttner* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006), 13.

[110] John Allred to Phineas Pemberton, Manchester, England, November 11, 1695, Pemberton Family Papers (collection no. 484A), vol. 2, p. 115, HSP. John Allred's first wife was Ellen Pemberton (d. 1684), the sister of Phineas Pemberton's father Ralph Pemberton. Thus, Phineas Pemberton was John Allred's nephew. On the genealogical connection, see John W. Jordan, *Colonial Families of Philadelphia* (New York: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1911), 277.

funding the costs of the passage.[111] Kin-based networks of support were not eroded by their geographic extension, nor did the passage of time undermine Pemberton's involvement in the migration of relatives; he was part of Allred's strategy for making the voyage. Longevity marked kin-based Atlantic networking, and kinfolk who had already established themselves overseas were still embedded in the family migration network. An ability to draw on the resources of the kinship network reduced difficulties for potential migrants. Effective support networks supplied tangible aid to hopeful migrants and were a critical factor in advancing migration across the Atlantic to Pennsylvania.

Kinship networks provided a safety net for those landing in the Delaware Valley. Migrant kin already in the Delaware Valley provided vital assistance to newly arrived relatives.[112] Family members were among those turning out to greet migrants, distributing provisions to newcomers. Arriving migrants received immediate material help from relatives, sometimes as soon as a ship appeared in the region's waterways. In 1733, for example, David Scholtze migrated from Berthelsdorf, Saxony and recorded how his brother boarded the incoming vessel with sorely needed supplies. He documented for September 28th that at "9 o'clock in the morning my brother, George Scholtze, came to us, having journied twelve miles in a boat to meet our company. He brought us apples, peaches, and wheaten bread, and staid with us on the ship till we

[111] In a 1678 letter to his father Ralph Pemberton, Phineas Pemberton discussed his "Uncle J. Alred" as "very begerly" in appearance, suggesting a long-term impoverishment. See Phineas Pemberton to Ralph Pemberton, November 2, 1678, Pemberton Family Papers (collection no. 484A), vol. 1, p. 88a, HSP.
[112] On the historical interdependence among kin, see Tamara K. Hareven, *Families, History, and Social Change: Life-Course & Cross-Cultural Perspectives* (Boulder, Col.: Westview Press, 2000). Hareven noted that "the role of kin in the past has been central in individuals' functioning and adaptation to new social and economic changes and in coping with critical life situations." Quote on pp. 305-306.

reached Philadelphia."[113] George Scholtze went through considerable effort to greet and receive his migrant brother with fresh produce and other foodstuffs after his sibling's Atlantic voyage. With the tumult of leaving home and landing in a new place, kin assistance from the migrant network was an essential resource.

Kin offered lodging for new arrivals to recuperate after the ocean passage. A rough 1699 voyage left Quaker migrant George Haworth fatigued, and his sister Mary Haworth Miers, already settled in the region, provided him with a place to stay where he could regain his strength. In a letter to their mother back in Lancashire, Haworth recounted how he located his sibling and took shelter at her home, writing, "I got well on shore at a place 100 Leagues short of Philadelphia, where I was informed that my Sister dwelt there at a place called Hurbills [Whorekill or Lewes, Del.], and so in much weakness I got to the place and quickly found her, and staid there one week, and then set sail in a Sloop for Philadelphia" after a respite.[114] The recently arrived Haworth reconnected with his migrant sister and relied on her hospitality to recover his health after an arduous Atlantic crossing. Kin aided relations by providing temporary housing to convalesce following a tiring voyage. Kin-based migrant networks provided recent arrivals with care and initial accommodations, relieving a critical concern for newcomers.

Relatives remaining in the communities of origin provided continued assistance and backup support. Members of the kinship network directed a steady stream of small items or money to help their relatives on the other side of the ocean. In a 1704 letter to

---

[113] David Scholtze, "Reisebeschreibung [Itinerary]," in *The Genealogical Record of the Schwenkfelder Families: Seekers of Religious Liberty who Fled from Silesia and Saxony and thence to Pennsylvania in the Years 1731 to 1737*, ed. Samuel K. Brecht (New York: Rand McNally and Co., 1923), 35.
[114] "George Haworth to Isabel Haworth, Bucks County, Pa., August 26, 1699," in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 330.

his mother in Lancashire, George Haworth confirmed that "I received your tokens which was half a crown [two shillings and six pence] from thee, and a shilling from my loving Brother, which I received very gladly" as a gesture of affection and helpful financial support.[115] Such remittance from overseas relatives, as a form of kin-based assistance and a function of the kinship system, furnished migrants with valuable specie.

In other ways, the long-distance functions of kinship continued to serve the needs of migrant kin through a network of assistance. The family-based support system spanned the Atlantic, and was instrumental in sending provisions to migrant kin living abroad. At the turn of the eighteenth century, the parents of migrant Elizabeth Beasly provided financial and material assistance. Before taking leave at Gravesend, a clearing point for outward bound ships on the south bank of the river Thames, her step-father Robert Elliot paid for goods that Beasly took on the Atlantic voyage and on to Pennsylvania. From England, Beasly's mother continued supplying her migrant daughter with an assortment of garments; after her daughter's "safe arrival" in Philadelphia the mother sent a pair of black silk gloves as well as a "Scarfe, a Green Apron, and two hood[s] because thou usest to be Subject [to the cold]."[116] Beasly's mother sustained her assistance once the daughter reached Pennsylvania.

---

[115] George Haworth to Isabel Haworth, Bucks County, Pa., March 26, 1704, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 333-334.

[116] [Mother] to Elizabeth Beasly, July 18, 1700, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), vol. 8: Dickinson Family, folder 4. Part of the letter dealt with a discrepancy over expenses for these items. The Beaslys protested a bill for £18 from Hannah Medcalf, who, they believed, "charg'd a considerable sum more for things" supplied to migrant Elizabeth Beasly; the parents wrote their daughter to ask for "a true acc.$^{t}$" of goods and the amount owed because they "understood by thee there was no mo[re] to pay." For more on Elizabeth Beasly's Atlantic crossings and death, see Robert Elliott's letters to Isaac Norris in the George W. Norris Collection (collection no. 961), HSP.

Philip Roman, a shoemaker from Lineham, Wiltshire and 1681 First Purchaser of 250 acres,[117] settled in Chester County, Pennsylvania, and received a steady stream of practical goods from an array of overseas kindred. In July 1684, Edward Bayley mentioned to his "cozen" Phillip Roman that "I have sent thee 2 cheesses" and a piece of brown serge [strong twilled worsted] "as a token of my love" from Pickwick, Wiltshire.[118] Philip Roman and Sarah Coole Roman, his second wife, received a regular supply of items from her relations in Wiltshire. In February 1683, William Coole let his sister in Chester County know "I sent severall Letters" and "a box with butons & knives & other things I hope they are Reced[.]"[119] In May of that year, William Coole "sent some things in a box" for his brother-in-law, and also informed him that "Cozen Scot" had "sent thee her saw," indispensible for felling trees in Penn's woods and brining land under cultivation. Family remaining behind in England took requests from relatives living in the colony. In the same letter, Coole passed along that "Mother do long to know how it is with you as to your Settlement" and asked whether "you wante anything or noe[.]"[120] In April 1684, William Coole "sent 2 straw hats" to his migrant sisters Sarah Coole Beazer and Jean Coole.[121] In July 1685, William Coole again wrote his sister and brother-in-law in Pennsylvania, letting them know "Mother have sent thee som[e]

[117] "The First Purchasers of Pennsylvania," *PWP*, vol. 2, 652.
[118] Edward Bayley to Philip Roman, Pickwick, Wiltshire, England, July 24, 1684, Roman Family Papers, box 5, folder 7, CCHS.
[119] William Coole to Sarah Beazer, Devizes, Wiltshire, England, February 24, 1683, Roman Family Papers, box 5, folder 3, CCHS.
[120] William Coole to William Beazer, Devizes, Wiltshire, England, May 28, 1683, Roman Family Papers, box 5, folder 1, CCHS.
[121] William Coole to Sarah Beazer and Jean Coole, Devizes, Wiltshire, England, April 18, 1684, Roman Family Papers, box 5, folder 4, CCHS.

seeds[.]"[122] Two months later, William Coole also sent "some garden seeds" to the Roman family recently settled at Marcus Hook, near Chester, Pennsylvania.[123] Thus, the kinship network provided ongoing assistance from across the Atlantic to directly aid migrant relations, demonstrating a capacity to engage in support from a distance.

Relatives on both sides of the Atlantic continued to engage in various exchanges, and kin assistance flowed back and forth. In 1739, members of the Hill family moved to the Atlantic island of Madeira off the west coast of Africa, and as of 1743 the migrants continued exchanging items with relatives in Philadelphia. Deborah Hill thanked her son for sending hams and candles, "which were very acceptable" because they "are dear," and was "much obliged for the garden seeds," requesting "a few slips of raspberry, gooseberry, currants, and tansy, or their seeds, and a few of any sort of flower seeds." In return, the mother sent exotic species of flora to relations in Philadelphia.[124] Family networks fashioned through migration contributed to Atlantic-wide diffusion of vegetable and culinary herb seeds as well as botanical species.[125] Seemingly small tokens, sending a shilling or stock of seeds, were a particular stage in the migration process. Financial aid and material goods were part of the continuing support flowing through the kinship network that aided migrant kin and helped meet their needs in the colony. Relations remaining in the community of origin continued to fulfill a crucial function of the kinship

[122] William Coole to Phillip Roman, Devizes, Wiltshire, England, July 24, 1685, Roman Family Papers, box 5, folder 9, CCHS.
[123] William Coole to Phillip Roman, Devizes, Wiltshire, England, September 19, 1685, Roman Family Papers, box 5, folder 10, CCHS.
[124] Deborah Hill to Richard Hill, Madeira, May 16, 1743, in *Letters of Doctor Richard Hill and His Children: The History of a Family, as told by themselves*, ed. John Jay Smith (Philadelphia: Privately Printed, 1854), 33.
[125] For a seminal historical study on the global passage of foodstuffs, see Sidney W. Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1985).

network, abetting migrant kin and providing a long-distance reservoir of supplemental aid. Furthermore, the different forms of family support and network exchanges forged links between Pennsylvania and various Atlantic areas.

**Redemptioners and Mid-Eighteenth-Century Newspaper Advertisements: Reconstituting German-Speaking Migrant Families in the Delaware Valley**

The large-scale movement of German-speaking peoples across the Atlantic involved the migration of family groups. Yet, the redemptioner system, under which many traveled on credit to Philadelphia from 1720 to 1820, could sunder families. Families took a chance of hazard and loss making the Atlantic voyage, and after reaching port in Philadelphia there was a possibility of experiencing separation.[126] Travelling as a family group, however, did not avail against the possibly disintegrative effects of the redemptioner system. Paradoxically, a method of close kin migration potentially contributed to the fracturing of the family unit.

At the beginning of German-speaking migration (late 1600s to the 1720s), migrants made the journey to Pennsylvania in relatively well-off groups of family and friends. Possessing considerable means, they were able to pay their fares in advance, store saleable trade goods on the voyage, and travel with servants. German migration, though, became less family oriented. As migration continued to grow until its peak in the late 1740s and early 1750s, the proportion of families began to decline as the number of younger, single, and poorer male voyagers rose over time. Families with dependent children were still a substantial component of this migratory flow, but they had limited

[126] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World*, 203-204, considered migration and family separation. For more consideration of family and Atlantic separations, see Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, 1, 29-31, 45, 145, 163-4, 240.

financial resources. Families taking ship in the mid-eighteenth century, unlike those of the earlier period, needed to repay passage debts and assume labor obligations once they reached Philadelphia.[127] Class, then, affected this form of migration by the redemptioner method. In order to migrate as a unit, these German-speaking families needed credit to finance the Atlantic passage; these were not paying passengers but depended on a form of debt servitude as part of a family strategy.

While some migrants signed agreements with captains prior to departure from Rotterdam or were inveigled into contracts in the Palatinate by unscrupulous recruiters, known as newlanders, the majority of redemptioners arrived without a work contract. Under the system, migrants were given about two weeks after docking in Philadelphia to negotiate with employers or their agents a way to repay their credit amount, or redeem the costs, either by drawing up a servant contract, having the debt paid off by a guarantor, or securing help from friends or relatives. If no servant contract was negotiated within the time limit, and if no relatives or friends were willing or able to pay off the redemptioners' outstanding sum, the ship's captain or contract dealer could sell by auction the redemptioners' labor contracts.[128]

---

[127] On the changing composition of German-speaking migration and dynamics of family migration, see Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers*, chap 4. She explained that when migration ebbed after the 1750s, "fewer migrants had the necessary funds to finance their passage." Quote on p. 151. See also Farley Grubb, "German Immigration to Pennsylvania, 1709 to 1820," *JIH* 20, no. 3 (Winter 1990): 420-27, for more on the family composition of German-speaking migration. Aaron Fogleman, *Hopeful Journeys*, chap. 2, found that many German-speaking villagers made the move overseas as part of extended family networks or larger neighborhood groups. Out migration from the Kraichgau involved chain migration by families and villagers. In his study, 85 percent of the sample traveled with family members on the same ship. The northern Kraichgauers, he found, tended to migrate with other family members and villagers on the same ship or in the same year. Figure on p. 63.

[128] On credited fares and arrangements for paying debts, see Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers*, 84-86, 89-90, 123-25, 127-28, 227-228

The redemptioner system allowed variable terms of service according to how much or little the voyager was able to contribute toward the migration debt, including what was owed recruiters, the base passage fare that was a freight (space and rations) charge, as well as fees for taxes, baggage, extra provisions, registration, and inspection charges, plus high interest rates on the fares.[129] Migrants tried negotiating terms, their own and children's, upon arrival in the port of Philadelphia; children could assume labor obligations to defray overall costs.[130] In addition, children of indigent migrant parents were bound out by the overseers of the poor.[131] As a result, the undesirable feature of this system was that German-speaking families became separated because members contracted different labor agreements and had no choice where they would settle, cutting family contact and connection to the kinship network in a new land. Over time, separated

[129] For example, Johann Carl Büttner and John Frederick Whitehead [Johann Friedrich Kukuck] both travelled on board the same ship, the *Sally*, in 1773; yet, Büttner's passage debt was 30 Pennsylvania pounds while Whitehead's debt was 28 pounds, 13 shillings, and 6 pence in Pennsylvania currency. For the debts of Büttner and Whitehead, see Klepp, Grubb, and Pfaelzer de Ortiz, eds., *Souls for Sale*, 136-37, 145-46, 178, 179-80, 183 n.24. Farley Grubb, "Babes in Bondage? Debt Shifting by German Immigrants in Early America," *JIH* 37, no. 1 (Summer 2006): 5, explained that German-speaking families did not sign fixed-length servant contracts before setting out (like British migrants) because they incurred a range of debts before embarkation. For more on the passage debts, see Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers*, 100-102.

[130] Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers*, 162-63, suggested that German-speaking families relied on teenage children to share the cost of the relocation by entering into servant labor contracts. Selling children into bondage was a financial necessity for families without sufficient funds to pay for the whole family's passage and "a last resort" for families with exhausted resources because they were swindled by an agent's exploitative practices. Grubb, "Babes in Bondage?," *JIH* 37, no. 1 (Summer 2006): 1-34, analyzed the contemporary literary evidence of the German-speaking servant trade and examined quantitative evidence from servant auction records, concluding the evidence cast doubt that German-speaking parents shifted their passage debts onto their children travelling in the family unit. Intra-family debt shifting existed, but was used "only on a limited basis" as a strategy for parents to finance their own migration and only affected children within a narrow age group (nine-year-olds to fourteen-year-olds). Rather, he found that parents tried to arrange a way to supervise their children's servant contracts. Parents did not usually sell their children under the age of sixteen into contracts that required them to serve beyond the age of maturity, meaning a child aged fourteen- or fifteen-years-old would be under contract for five and a half or six years. He also pointed out the alternative; if migrant parents could not use their children's servant contracts to pay for migration costs, parents would have been faced with the decision of either leaving children behind in Europe or not taking the passage themselves. Quote on p. 2.

[131] On the binding out of indigent children and colonial poor-relief law, see Grubb, "Babes in Bondage?," *JIH* 37, no. 1 (Summer 2006): 25-29.

kin would not know if they still had family living or where relatives resided in the Delaware Valley region.

Printed cautionary tales, intending to dissuade migration and reduce naïve credulity among potential voyagers, highlighted the fragmentation of German-speaking families. Gottlieb Mittelberger, a Lutheran schoolteacher and organist, traveled in 1750 from Enzweihingen in Württemberg to Pennsylvania to deliver an organ. He returned to the European continent in 1754, inveighing against the abuses of the redemptioner system: "It often happens that whole families, husband, wife and children, are separated by being sold to different purchasers, especially when they have not paid any part of their passage-money." He decried how "fathers and mothers often do not know where or to what masters their children are to be sent, it frequently happens that after leaving the vessel, parents and children do not see each other for years on end, or even for the rest of their lives." Mittelberger painted a bleak picture when family members were "separated and sold away into places far removed one from the other!" Children, he claimed, were "destined never to see or recognize parents, brothers, and sisters again" in the colony.[132] Another description likewise explained that "Those who have no [money for the] passage are torn from each other—parents from children, man from wife, one here, the other there—and sold for several years. Often much is promised in words but not put in

[132] Gottlieb Mittelberger, *Journey to Pennsylvania*, ed. and trans. Oscar Handlin and John Clive (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960), 18, 21. For additional information on Mittelberger's journey and his publication, see Aaron Spencer Fogleman, *Hopeful Journeys: German Immigration, Settlement, and Political Culture in Colonial America, 1717-1775* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996), 33-34, 69-71, and 190 n.42. Scholar Farley Grubb pointed out that not only was Mittelberger's commentary aimed at trying to discourage German-speaking migration, he was dismissed from his position as an organist for a sexual offense and then returned to Württemberg—"casting doubt on the general integrity of his travel account." See Grubb, "Babes in Bondage? ," *JIH* 37, no. 1 (Summer 2006): 8 n.13.

writing or kept."[133] Such warnings were a reminder that migration across the Atlantic potentially pulled apart families, even those that journeyed together.

Further drawbacks of the system complicated how long recent migrants would be required to serve, possibly breaking up families for considerable periods of time. In his polemic, Mittelberger explained offspring were at heightened risk of separation when "both parents have died at sea, having come more than halfway, then their children, especially when they are still young and have nothing to pawn or cannot pay, must be responsible for their own fares as well as those of their parents, and must serve until they are twenty-one-years-old."[134] Under certain circumstances, then, children quite possibly faced years of obligatory service separated from their surviving siblings. Hence, children could be taken far distances from their family members and remain apart for years. Placed with masters as children, a juvenile migrant may easily be a young adult when he or she inquired about family members in newspapers. If separation was long, the reunited family would first have to get reacquainted. Moreover, for those who were very young children at the time of separation, reunification would essentially require a first-time meeting; the nature of the evidence did not yield insights into whether young members felt any disconnection from the family unit.

Migrant networks were an asset that made a great difference; the absence of social support was just as vitally significant for migrants facing multiple challenges.[135]

---

[133] Christopher Sauer and others, "Authentic OPEN LETTER from Pennsylvania in America," in *The Brethren in Colonial America: A Source Book on the Transplantation and Development of the Church of the Brethren in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Donald F. Durnbaugh (Elgin, Ill.: The Brethren Press, 1967), 48.

[134] Mittelberger, *Journey to Pennsylvania*, 19.

[135] It was through kinship networks that recently arrived migrants received care. The difference kith and kin made was noted in migrant accounts. See for example, Christopher Sauer and others, "Authentic

Separated redemptioners were isolated from migrant networks and cut off from wider kinship ties. The splintering of families obstructed the formation of networks of people, stunting kinship network development and potentially lessening the vitality of migrant networks. Patterns of separation interrupted the continuity of family networks and limited their expansion, curtailing of the extent of possible social ties. Family break-up adversely affected the strength, density, and functions of network ties that members of a migrant family could establish. Beyond any emotional suffering that resulted from severed bonds, when people were removed from migrant families, networks were eviscerated and deprived of a vital part. Moreover, separation from network ties influenced how migrant adjusted into the new society. When a missing family member was located, it was possible for that migrant to re-embed within the local extension of Atlantic kin and community networks. By reincorporating kin, migrants were able to add another link in the network chain and enriched their personal lives.[136]

Historian Aaron Fogleman uncovered the example of redemptioner Maria Barbara Kober, who vanished for nearly thirty years among the English settled in Philadelphia's hinterland. All the time, she was unable to connect into community networks. She migrated with her husband in May 1738 from the village of Schwaigern in the Kraichgau region. After reaching the port city at the end of October 1738, she contracted to become an indentured servant and left her husband behind on the ship *Elizabeth*. Kober never saw her spouse again; he died shortly after her departure, unbeknownst to Kober for

---

OPEN LETTER from Pennsylvania in America," in *The Brethren in Colonial America*, 48; and "The Life of John Frederick Whitehead Containing his Travels and Chief Adventers," in *Souls for Sale*, 133.

[136] Glover, *All Our Relations*, 17, asserted Carolinian families "surrounded by wide webs of kin and friends both enhanced their chance at success and made them happier."

decades until informed by members of the home village. She reappeared in 1767 and was then able to reintegrate into the communication networks of the colony and the home village, allowing her to claim an overseas inheritance. For years, Kober was separated from the network of former Schwaigern neighbors. On her own and severed from network resources, Kober was cut off from advice and support.[137]

If there was dispersion on the shores of the Delaware, migrant family units were split apart and members were left to try and reassemble at a later date. The resiliency of family attachments were powerfully demonstrated in notices carried in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, a leading colonial newspaper, after 1729 printed by Benjamin Franklin. In the early 1730s, it cost five shillings, the equivalent of one crown, to place an advertisement in Franklin's *Pennsylvania Gazette*, and could cost seven shillings for a lengthier advertisement.[138] In addition, advertisements for family members appeared in German-language newspapers; notices were printed in Johann Christoph Sauer's newspaper, *Pennsylvanische Geschicht-Schreiber*, later called *Pennsylvanische Berichte*, published in Germantown between the years 1743 and 1762. Between the years 1739 and 1750, Sauer, a pharmacist and later printer who migrated from Wittgenstein in 1724, did not charge for advertisements, making it feasible to post notices for missing kindred.[139] Gripping advertisements in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* and German-language newspapers testified to the inherent risks of migration for kin groups voyaging under a commercial

[137] Fogleman, *Hopeful Journeys*, 77-79. He portrayed a stable, community-oriented German-American population, not one that was rootless and individualistic. See chap. 3.
[138] Figures from David Waldstreicher, *Runaway America: Benjamin Franklin, Slavery, and the American Revolution* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2004), 24. He noted the revenue generated by ads were critical for the newspaper printing business, more so than subscriptions. Advertisements placed by migrants, then, would have been an important part of the money collected by the paper.
[139] A. G. Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property: German Lutherans in British Colonial America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 188, noted that Sauer did not charge a fee.

establishment used in conveying non-English passengers. Advertisements made clear that this was not a first attempt to find kindred; publicized appeals were another effort in an expanded and continuing, sometimes seemingly indefatigable, search. The newspaper notices were also a compelling testament to determined efforts to piece together fragmented family units and bring together close kin, attesting to the persistence of bonds among scattered members of migrant kin group. Newspaper advertisements made publicly known the persistent and earnest desires for family reunification and restoration of wholeness; of course, many family separations went unadvertised. The notices, while often formulaic in style, nevertheless captured an ardent wish to be reunited with kin.[140]

From the beginning of a child's bound labor, parents tried to maintain direct contact with their child and the master. When sons and daughters from migrant families entered into servitude, there was some effort on the part of those who purchased servants to inform family when a child passed away in their employ. For instance, a June 16, 1743 notice in a German-language newspaper announced that "Rudolph Diebendoerffer, in service in New Jersey, lost his life while with his master. This is to notify his mother, Barbara Diebendoerffer, of his death."[141] This was not a widespread courtesy, however; the onus was on kin to search for bound out teenage children. With the tumult of moving or a resold contract, over the years family members lost track of kin sold into service; to prevent such an occurrence, some attempted to document a servant contract as best as

[140] Konstantin Dierks observed the "proliferation of missing persons advertisements" in newspapers around the middle of eighteenth century. He described the "clinical prose" of such advertisements but still conceded that behind such formulaic writing "lay innumerable stories of American families that had been splintered by geographic mobility." See, "Letter Writing, Gender, and Class in America, 1750-1800" (Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1999), 157-158.
[141] Hocker, *Genealogical Data Relating to the German Settlers of Pennsylvania*, 1.

possible, especially keeping a record of the person holding the indenture. Jacob Bickel of Berks County, for example, sold his twelve-year-old son Johannes Bickel in the autumn of 1754, and placed a June 1, 1755 advertisement in an effort to clearly ascertain the name of the buyer. "The name of the master in the indenture paper is illegible," the notice read, and "it looks like Johannes Hach or Hay. Information about him is desired."[142] Not knowing the name of the master would make it increasingly difficult to continue knowing what happened to his son as time passed. *Pennsylvanische Berichte* carried a mother's plea on September 16, 1752, explaining that Anna Barbara Braeunischoltz "came to America with her son, Hansz Adam Braeunischoltz. The son was indentured to a German named Jacob Frey, who cannot now be found, and the mother seeks information about him."[143] Without keeping close tabs on masters and keeping a record or verifying contract information, parents might be unable to keep in contact with their servant children.

In their efforts to rejoin family, migrant kin put out well-timed notices. Parents tried restoring contact with a child when he or she was about to gain their freedom from servitude. A 1747 advertisement in a German-language newspaper was placed for Jacob Rincker, "a Swiss," who arrived in the Delaware Valley four years earlier "and still has a year to serve." "His mother, who is free and lives near Germantown, seeks information about him and asks that he come to see her and his brothers, Caspar and Henrich, living with Thomas Lorentz, four miles from Merion Meeting House, across the Schuylkill

[142] Ibid., 49.
[143] Ibid., 35.

(Montgomery County)."[144] With a child nearing the end of a labor contract, this mother thought it was a good time to advertise in hopes her soon-to-be free son would visit the family and reestablish ties. Years after arriving in the port of Philadelphia and family separation, young members of the family sold to a master began searching for parents and siblings. In 1752, Henrich Mueller, from the Zurich area of Switzerland, "arrived in America eight years ago, with his daughters, Regely and Elisabeth, and they were separated. Elisabeth is with Peter Zimmerman . . . and will be free in the autumn of next year." With her approaching freedom, Elisabeth took out an advertisement because she "seeks news of her father and sister" as she tried to recover ties with her kin and reenter the family network.[145] Timely advertisements were part of a family's endeavors to synchronize a reunion as kin got closer to earning their freedom from servitude.

The newspaper was a useful medium, broadcasting to the Atlantic world at large longings to be reunited with migrant kin. The appeals, often another step in ongoing searches for kin, incorporated every part of the split-up migrant family group; spouses, parents, children, and siblings all acted to reconstruct family ties broken apart after reaching the American side of the Atlantic. Printed appeals were multidirectional; parents looked for children and vice-versa, while brothers and sisters demonstrated that they wanted to find siblings. There was no sex-based difference when advertisements were placed for lost family members. Notices placed by fathers, sons, and brothers echoed the same themes and desire as those placed by mothers, daughters, and sisters.

[144] Ibid., 8.
[145] Ibid., 33.

The printed appeals of siblings, bound out as children, occupied a particularly noticeable place in newspaper advertisements; both brothers and sisters pursued inquiries for one another in their attempt to reestablish sibling ties.[146] Johannes Recher published an advertisement in *Pennsylvanische Berichte* on August 1, 1749, detailing that he was "born at Brattle, two miles above Basel, [and] was indentured eleven years ago, along with his brother Friedrich and his sisters, Elisabeth and Margretha." Over a decade after landing in Philadelphia and getting split up, Recher, then living in New Jersey, took out the notice to let his three siblings know that he "wishes to hear from them."[147] Regina Miller Kahn, possibly the youngest sibling, tried to get in touch with her brother and sister, Rudolph and Barbara Miller, who "came over from Switzerland to this Province, with their Father Jacob Miller, since deceased" at the time of the advertisement's publication in 1760. When the family reached the colonies, "Rudolph and Barbara were then bound out Apprentices; and the said Regina has never since heard of her Brother and Sister: She therefore desired them, or either of them, if they hear of this Advertisement, to direct a Letter to her, or to her Husband" to reestablish contact.[148] In a 1765 request for information, one sister, named Mary, recounted what happened to her family after reaching the mouth of the Delaware River, and indicated her hopes of finding her brothers. She travelled with her siblings Henry and Adam Moworn "about 24 Years ago, with their Father and Mother," but when the vessel was "cast away" at the capes of the

[146] For more on emotional ties between siblings and the longevity of sibling bonds, see Glover, *All Our Relations*, especially chap. 2.
[147] Ibid., 14.
[148] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, October 30, 1760. The she knew her of father's passing suggested she might have remained with him after the family's arrival. Grubb, "Babes in Bondage?," *JIH* 37, no. 1 (Summer 2006): 10, 29, found children younger than five-years-old "were almost never bound out by their parents" and were kept with parents. If she had remained with her father, he could have discussed her siblings.

Delaware Bay, "the People got to" the town of Lewes on the headland of Cape Henlopen, "where the Boys were given away by their Father, who afterwards proceeded to Philadelphia, where he and his Wife soon died, and left a Daughter, named Mary, who still lives in Philadelphia, and is desirous to know if either of her Brothers are living: If this therefore should come to their Knowledge, she desires them, or either of them to let her know where they lie." In order that her brothers might "hear of her," she also provided the name of a contact person.[149] Such an extended period of separation, nearly a quarter century, complicated the challenge of bringing separated family back together; the death of both parents made the problematic search all the more difficult. Yet, locating brothers and sisters would allow all of these sibling sets to renew emotional and social attachments after years of separation and develop more local kin ties.[150]

Jacob Whitmar and two sisters, Elizabeth and Margaret, "came from Switzerland into this province about nine years ago, at which time they were separated." The brother's 1753 newspaper posting shared how he "has not been able to obtain any intelligence of them since, which gives him very great uneasiness[.]" He placed the notice "to beg the favour of any person who may be acquainted with either of them, that they would be pleased to inform them, that their brother lives with Harmon Fisher, in Upper Hanover township, Philadelphia county."[151] Whitmar was troubled that he enjoyed no contact with his two sisters for nearly a decade. Ulrich Wintsch, a 1762

[149] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, December 5, 1765.
[150] The high death rates of the early Chesapeake meant that nuclear families were short-lived, resulting in a complex recombination of family units and transitory kin relationships. In such an environment, the Rutmans emphasized the importance of networks of kin and neighbors, especially for young family members. "Stability for children as well as for adults lay . . . in the permanent network of friends and relations within which the family was embedded." See, Rutman and Rutman, *A Place in Time*, 114.
[151] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, January 16, 1753.

notice stated, "is desirous to know what is become of his Sister Margaret Wintsch." The advertisement described that Margaret Wintsch "was born at Horben, in the Swiss Canton of Zurich, and twelve Years ago came to this Country with her said Brother, who does not know to what Place or Person she was bound, neither has he heard of her since that Time," when the two were separated. Driven by his yearning to be reunited with his sibling, the advertisement continued, "takes this Method, if she be alive, and this comes to her Knowledge, to invite her to come to him, if her Circumstances will allow it; or to acquaint him by Letter, of the Place of her Abode, requesting withal, every other Person who knows any thing of her, to give Notice thereof in writing to her abovesaid Brother."[152] Johannes Schautz, "having been informed that his Sister, Eve Schautz, arrived at Philadelphia from Germany some Time in October, in the Year 1753," ran a 1765 advertisement in an attempt to pinpoint her whereabouts, after about twelve years of unsuccessful efforts. Taking out an advertisement in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* was one in a series of efforts to track down his sibling. The determined brother, "having often attempted in vain to find out his said Sister," only ascertained that "she was bound to one Randle Hutchinson, of Bucks County," and had otherwise been unable to gather information about Eve. Johannes, therefore, was motivated to place the notice, asking "if any Body can inform him of his said Sister, and will be so kind to let him know, by a few Lines," or, more hopefully, "if his said Sister is living, she is kindly desired to let him know of her Place of Abode."[153] Advertisements showcased the deep, life-long

[152] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, November 25, 1762.
[153] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, February 21, 1765.

attachments among siblings; finding brothers and sisters would allow migrants to surround themselves with a wide web of sibling ties and other kin.

Disconcerted parents were not content to leave their family disrupted, and looked for children in the hopes that they could put the severed family back together again. Scholar Farley Grubb asserted that German-speaking migrant parents were not callous for binding out children; nor did they selfishly and largely thrust the burden of the passage debt on children. Searches for children reinforced the view that German-speaking parents were concerned about their children's welfare and believed they had "emotional familial value."[154] A 1761 notice described that "about ten Years ago" John Krag and his wife Beatrice "came to this Province from Germany, and brought several Children with them" at that time. The parents related that "one of their Sons, called GEORGE KRAG, was bound to some Person in the Jerseys, down the River Delaware, and was never heard of since[.]" The father and mother "desired" their son, if he "is yet in Being, and hears of this," to "enquire for his said parents" through listed contacts.[155]

A 1753 newspaper notice solicited information on Magdelene Jouvenal, "daughter of David Jouvenal, who came over with her father from Holland last fall," and soon after sold. The inquiry was made because "her said father is very desirous of knowing what is become of her," and requested "her said master, or any other will [well] disposed person, to inform" named contacts in Philadelphia "where she may be met with."[156] In another newspaper posting, Conrad Hartman, a cordwainer living in Lower Salford Township, Philadelphia County, explained he "came over to this Province from Germany in the year

[154] Grubb, "Babes in Bondage?," *JIH* 37, no. 1 (Summer 2006): 2, 13, 33. Quote on p. 2.
[155] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, March 5, 1761.
[156] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, April 19, 1753.

1753, he brought with him his Wife and four Children" at that time. Two of the father's children, Johann George and Anna Catharina, "were bound out, but to whom, the said Conrad Hartman cannot tell, neither could he ever since hear what is become of his said two Children, nor where they live." Six years after the family reached Pennsylvania, he placed the notice in hopes "any Person can give him Intelligence of his said Children."[157]

An advertisement in *Pennsylvanische Berichte* on November 16, 1745, narrated that "Henrich Hausser came from Switzerland to Philadelphia two years ago. He and his wife were sick on the ship, and he died. Their children were indentured, and the mother lost trace of them. She has since located three of the children, and she now seeks information about her son, Caspar, who is 10-11 years old."[158] Re-coalescing after separation was an ongoing process, full of protracted attempts to bring together the family. In 1759, Ann Margaret Brown posted a notice in the *Pennsylvania* Gazette, describing "that about 5 years ago she arrived at the City of Philadelphia from Germany, and that she brought a Son with her, named Adam Brown, who was bound out to a Person unknown to this Advertiser, and hath no heard of her said Son ever since." As a course of action, she appealed to the public for help in locating her child, asking for "any Person" to "give her Intelligence of her said Son," or wished that if her child "is alive, and hears this, she desires him to come and see her."[159] Advertisements documented that parents looked for children to rejoin the family.

The separated migrant took the initiative and looked for the rest of the family. As of 1762 John File "hath never heard from his Father, Mother, Brother or Sisters[.]" He

[157] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 20, 1759.
[158] Hocker, *Genealogical Data Relating to the German Settlers of Pennsylvania*, 4.
[159] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, November 29, 1759.

"came from Germany about 8 Years ago," and "served his Time" in Chester County, Pennsylvania, but "during that Time" had no contact with his family. Isolated from his family, the son and brother called upon "all Persons who hath any Knowledge of them" to "acquaint" him about his close kin.[160] Separated from the whole family, File had been disconnected from his network of kin and sought to reestablish relationships with his parents and other family members. File faced an increased risk of struggling to live alone and support himself; re-immersing in his kin group could positively affect his subsequent post-servitude adaption in the colony.

Thus, many migrants separated from family found themselves completely cut off from close kin in a new world; such ruptures in familial relations could be highly disruptive. "Enquiry after a lost HUSBAND," was the eye-catching first line of a July 1765 plea made by recent migrant Magdalene Bayer. She "came into this Country last Fall with her Husband Erhard Bayer, and her Brother Hans Sax, but as she was Sick, and sent amongst others to the House provided for Sick, and during the Time of her Confinement there the Merchant cruelty was so great as to sell her Husband from her, but to whom, or to what Part of this Province, or in the neighbouring Provinces, she cannot find out." To make matters worse, "after her Recovery" she was sold, "big with Child," and taken to west New Jersey. She made her difficult ordeal public "to request any Person, who shall read the above, and knows any Thing of the for[e]said Erhard Bayer or her Brother, to give Notice thereof" to a designated contact in Philadelphia, "who will take Care to inform me thereof, and will berry [*sic*] much oblige the distressed

[160] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, December 16, 1762.

MAGDALENE BAYER."[161] Her landing and transition was particularly stressful. Separation exacerbated the usual practical challenges of arrival for Bayer, at a time when family ties were accentuated and migrant kin turned to one another for support. With a young child, Bayer was anxious to end her marital separation by locating her husband (and new father) as well as find her brother; finding her relations would provide emotional and psychosocial benefits and allow her to draw on financial resources that were made available through the family.

As migrants assiduously attempted to reconstitute disrupted family units, the public pleas were successful at times in bringing kin back into contact. A family reunion unfolded in the pages of the *Pennsylvania Gazette* over the years 1760 and 1761, where a migrant brother and sister reconnected. They had remained apart for about sixteen years, since she "was about nine Years of Age" and despite numerous attempts. "WHEREAS Maria Catharina Streter, alias Baker," the brother's December 1760 posting explained, "came over from Germany, with her Father Hans Baker, in the Year 1744, and was bound to one Mary Tomlinson, but has not been heard of by her Brother Henry Streter." The sister was "desired to come or send her said Brother, living in Greenwich Township, Sussex County, in New Jersey."[162] The sister, then about twenty-five years old, responded to her brother's advertisement five months after it was printed, and communicated with him nearly two decades since their last contact. She confirmed her sibling's account, how her brother "came into this Province from Germany in the Year 1744 with his Father Hans Baker," and detailed she was "married to Jacob Stuckke," a

[161] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, July 11, 1765.
[162] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, December 4, 1760.

"Stocking Weaver" by trade. At the time of her May 1761 notice, the sister lived "in Market street, Philadelphia," and declared she "would be glad to see him there, as she has long made Enquiry after him, but cannot find him."[163] Restoring family ties meant that the two could reconstruct a relationship by once again partaking in family interactions and becoming re-embedded within a locally based kin network.

Migration under the redemptioner system could have profound implications, even a destabilizing effect, for German-speaking families. When a family landed, the dissolution of nuclear groups could make for an especially difficult transition and accommodation to a new place. Migration could introduce instability to the family structures of German-speakers and impeded the development of personal network ties among the newcomers, but members from truncated families were persistent and resilient in their attempts to track down relatives. Whether separation was short or lengthy, and even as they probably formed new community ties, kin took action to reestablish family ties. The ability to reconnect meant they could access resources shared and borrowed among kin and members of the migrant group community. Advertisements running in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* and other newspapers gave expression to the enduring migrant family attachments; bonds did not necessarily weaken or fade with time.

## Conclusion

Networks of kinship played an active role in the complex phenomenon of Atlantic migration to Pennsylvania; they helped kindle and mobilize migration, generating and sustaining migratory flows. Ties within the family migration network were both vertical (between parents and children or uncles and nephews) and horizontal (between brothers

[163] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, May 14, 1761.

and sisters). Migrant kin encouraged further migration, stimulating greater Atlantic geographic mobility. Family was a motivational force and causative factor, directly inducing kin to migrate. Family acted as both a positive and negative push factor for migration to Pennsylvania. Fathers, for instance, could induce departure because of alienation. Elizabeth Ashbridge was rejected by her father's rebuke and driven to seek out an available pool of extended kin who made it possible for her to travel throughout different parts in the British Atlantic. Kin already settled in Pennsylvania helped pull their relatives across the Atlantic to the colony through advice and encouragement. Migrant kin played a role in attracting new migrants and in providing crucial links along which migration took place. After reaching Pennsylvania, migrant kin sent for other relatives and coordinated the migration of family members. Entreaties from family members already settled in Pennsylvania influenced overseas kin to make the voyage. Also, extended family ties perpetuated migration to Pennsylvania and shaped migratory directional patterns. Children were sent to live with relatives in the colony, often in response to family crisis, such as the death of a parent.

Family migration networks were a vital resource for an Atlantic world in motion. Information exchanges and resources flowed through Atlantic kinship networks. By channeling information, kinship networks oriented prospective voyagers to Pennsylvania, where migrant kin were already established. Shared information fed network ties, generating a powerful momentum and giving further impetus to migration. Supportive kin networks offered practical advantages and help: firsthand descriptions, knowledge of opportunities, and a way to get around barriers to migration, such as cost. Migrant kin

instructed overseas relations about bringing household goods, tools, and farm implements and advised investing in profitable wares for resale in the colony. Prospective migrants drew on the family network for essential information about life on the far side of the Atlantic. Once migrants reached the shores of the Delaware, family already in the colony were accommodating to newly arrived kin, lending substantial support to their relatives. Migrant kin assisted newly arrived relatives in the colony. Moreover, networks of kin assistance and involvement were functionally effective from across the Atlantic. Geographic distance did not disrupt basic modes of kin cooperation but led, rather, to long-distance forms of assistance that adapted in response to the requirements of migration within the Atlantic. Migrants were not cut off from kinship networks but tapped into traditional support functions. Kin who remained in Europe fulfilled a crucial function in providing continued assistance for the migrating family members.

Gender interacted with family migration networks in multiple ways. The gender composition of the family migration network was inclusive; members of the entire family group migrated. Chains of migration were organized along female kinship networks, such as the Heath kin group. Sibling ties in migrant networks increased female migration. Also, some kinship patterns of migration had gender-specific associations. Male family members spearheaded migration to Pennsylvania for the kin group; after going first and settling, they sent for other relatives. Gender, then, influenced the establishment of Atlantic migrant networks.

Class differentiated a migrant's experiences within family migration networks; they could make the passage to Pennsylvania free, indentured, or on credit. Among

Quaker migrants, the web of kinship influenced the free passage of family groups under a constellation of approaches. Migration for some, such as John Allred and indentured servants, was network dependent. Quakers sponsored the migration of kinfolk, increasing family mobility. Indentured servitude and the family migration network dovetailed, contributing to the Atlantic mobility of labor. German-speaking migrant families without the necessary cash promised to repay migration debts after arrival.

There should not be an overemphasis on the resilience and strength of migrant networks.[164] There was the potential for conflict and tension, as seen with the Claypoole brothers and within the Reynell family. Family migration networks were cohesive and sources of support but could be fluid and contingent. Migrant networks were also weakened and broke down at the destination point. The inability to pay the passage fare had deleterious effects on some German-speaking families migrating under the redemptioner system; their disadvantageous position, traveling with limited financial resources, effectively undermined family networks of support among German-speakers and led to the dissolution of kin ties. Networks were not impervious to structural forces such as poverty and socioeconomic resources. Nonetheless, kinship networks underlay the migration process to Pennsylvania, augmenting the mobility of the early modern Atlantic world. The movement of people to the Delaware Valley was directed, organized, and supported by family migration networks in salient ways. At the same time, migratory networks based on kinship enhanced Pennsylvania's Atlantic connections, bringing the colony more fully into the Atlantic world.

[164] David Hancock, "The Trouble with Networks: Managing the Scots' Early-Modern Madeira Trade," *Business History Review* 79, no. 3 (Autumn 2005): 467-91, critiqued one-dimensional studies that too often only looked at positive aspects of networks and network successes.

## Chapter 2

## "Do Not Neglect Writing to Me":

## Kin Correspondence, Affective Communication, and Familial Social Networks

George Haworth arrived in Philadelphia in August 1699, and soon thereafter wrote home to family in Lancashire, England. By March 1704, a few years after he crossed the Atlantic for Pennsylvania, a restlessly anxious Haworth wrote to his "Loving Mother," "I do much admire that I never received no Letter from you since I came here it makes me think you have allmost forgotten me; I am very sorry and sore troubled that you so neglect writing to me, I desire you to write to me by the next oppertunity and not to fail." On the same sheet of paper, Haworth noted to his brother that he "sent 9 or 10 letters to thee but never could get one from thee," imploring "do not neglect writing to me."[1] Just a couple of years later in March 1706, Haworth grew increasingly distraught that his family so "soon forgotten me" because, he complained to his mother, "you never writ to me since I left you." His concerns were such that he was driven to contemplate even returning home for a visit, writing, "I would not have you to forget me, tho' I be far distant from you I have some thoughts of coming to England and see you."[2] George Haworth's heart-rending appeals for more kin correspondence, heightened by years of separation, demonstrated that despite the distance between them the love for his family was genuine and unaffected. Letters were a basis for expressing familial affection and developing networks of communication with overseas relatives. Bonds of kinship,

[1] George Haworth to Isabel Haworth, Bucks County, Pa., March 26, 1704, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania, 1699-1722," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 37, no. 3 (1913): 334-335 (hereafter cited as *PMHB*).
[2] George Haworth to Isabel Haworth, Bucks County, Pa., March 1706, Ibid., 336.

captured in affecting letters, created networks of social relations that tied inhabitants of Pennsylvania together with the wider Atlantic world.

There were various types of written correspondence, such as business letters or courtship letters.[3] This chapter concentrates on letters as a primary source of contact between geographically separated kin. Although focusing on relations by blood and marriage, it is important to remember that the wider household family also included servants, apprentices, and slaves; oftentimes their affiliation to the family was described in terms of kinship.[4] Families were part of a mobile Atlantic world and kin ties were maintained through different ways, such as visits. Nevertheless, family correspondence provided a crucial link for diffuse kinship networks. Historian David Cressy aptly described family letters as providing "an emotional lifeline, a cord of communication."[5] Writing letters, kin made an active effort to counteract and overcome separation.

Kinship networks bandied letters throughout the Atlantic. Under the impact of migration, letter writing was integral for Atlantic kin groups to carry on family relations.

---

[3] On letter writing generally, see Konstantin Dierks, *In My Power: Letter Writing and Communications in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009); Sarah M. S. Pearsall, *Atlantic Families: Lives and Letters in the Later Eighteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Clare Brant, *Eighteenth-Century Letters and British Culture* (Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); Eve Tavor Bannet, *Empire of Letters: Letter Manuals and Transatlantic Correspondence, 1688 - 1820* (Cambridge University Press, 2005); Rebecca Earle , ed., *Epistolary Selves: Letters and Letter-Writers, 1600-1945* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), On belletristic culture, see David Shields, *Civil Tongues and Polite Letters in British America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997). See also Toby L. Ditz's work on eighteenth-century letter writing: "Shipwrecked; or, Masculinity Imperiled: Mercantile Representations of Failure and the Gendered Self in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia," *Journal of American History* 81, no. 1 (June 1994): 51-80; "Formative Ventures: Eighteenth-Century Commercial Letters and the Articulation of Experience" in *Epistolary Selves: Letters and Letter-Writers, 1600-1945*, ed. Rebecca Earle (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), 59-78; and "Secret Selves, Credible Personas: The Problematics of Trust and Public Display in the Writing of Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia Merchants," in *Possible Pasts: Becoming Colonial in Early America*, ed. Robert Blair St. George (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000), 219-42

[4] See Naomi Tadmor, *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship, and Patronage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), esp. chap. 2.

[5] David Cressy, *Coming Over: Migration and Communication between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 213.

Kin correspondence and letter exchanges were enabled by the spread of literacy,[6] a communication system and infrastructure (the growth of postal services),[7] and the purchase of certain writing equipment and stationery supplies.[8]

---

[6] By 1720, the literacy rate in England was about 45 percent for men and 25 percent for women; for women in London it was as high as 48 percent. See David Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 129, 176; and Kathryn Shevelow, *Women and Print Culture: The Construction of Femininity in the Early Periodical* (New York: Routledge, 1989), 30. See also R. A. Houston, *Literacy in Early Modern Europe: Culture and Education, 1500-1800* (London: Longman, 1988). Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, 34-35, indicated increased rates of literacy in the early modern period and, "in particular, in the eighteenth century, especially for women." She also emphasized the rise of a literate culture in both Britain and the American colonies because of more access to printed texts (book production and consumption and newspaper production).

On the American side, Alan Tully, "Literacy Levels and Educational Development in Rural Pennsylvania, 1729-1775," *Pennsylvania History* 39, no. 3 (July 1972): 301-312, used signature mark analysis and found that the literacy figure for white adult males was 72 percent in Chester and 63 percent in Lancaster; specifically, for the earliest period between the years 1729 to 1744 Chester had a 65.4 percent literacy rate and Lancaster had 59 percent literacy rate. Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), 540, determined that the rate of people who could sign their names for Philadelphia was 82 percent in the 1760s and 1770s. Of course, Philadelphia would have a higher literacy rate than surrounding rural areas. New England has received considerable scholarly attention. Lockridge, *Literacy on Colonial New England*, placed adult male literacy—defined in its broadest sense as signature literacy—at less than 50 percent in the seventeenth century and 60 percent well into the eighteenth century; literacy may have expanded to 80 percent by the third quarter of that century. David D. Hall, *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989), 33, described "a population of readers, and, surprisingly, of more writers than at first we might suspect." For female literacy rates in the region, see: Gloria L. Main, "An Inquiry into When and Why Women Learned to Write in Colonial New England," *Journal of Social History* 24 (1991): 579-89; Joel Perlmann and Dennis Shirley, "When Did New England Women Acquire Literacy?" *William and Mary Quarterly* 48 (1991): 50-67; E. Jennifer Monaghan, "Literacy Instruction and Gender in Colonial New England," *American Quarterly* 40 (1988): 18-41; and Linda Auwers, "Reading the Marks of the Past: Exploring Female Literacy in Colonial Windsor, Connecticut," *Historical Methods* 13 (1980): 204-14. Richard D. Brown, *Knowledge is Power: The Diffusions of Information in Early America, 1700-1865* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 12, concluded that in 1700 "the gap between male and female literacy" among the white population on the British North American mainland "was considerable throughout the colonies." The gender gap, manifested in writing skills, "all but vanished during the course of the eighteenth century." Ross W. Beales and E. Jennifer Monaghan, "Practices of Reading, Part 1: Literacy and Schoolbooks," in *The History of the Book in America*, vol. 1: *The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 380, claimed that "Unmistakably, the rate of literacy . . . increased in the course of the eighteenth century." Dierks, *In My Power*, 156, generally noted that by the eve of the Revolutionary War the literacy rate for adult white women was half that for men.

[7] Bernard Bailyn, *Atlantic History: Concept and Contours* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005), 83, discussed how the ocean's physiography, comprising the circulation of winds and ocean currents, "drew the Atlantic into a cohesive communication system." On the speed and frequency of Atlantic crossings and English maritime empire spreading information, see Ian K. Steele, *The English Atlantic, 1675-1740: An Exploration of Communication and Community* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986). He demonstrated that, during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the north Atlantic narrowed, in an experiential sense, as communication by ship, post, and press became more

Kin were divided but not disconnected; letters were forms of social commerce that bound kin together. Kin were linked to one another through letter-writing social networks. Family correspondence exemplified a fluid Atlantic world where writing relationships transcended distance.[9] As an instrument of kin-based sociability letters were "a form of intimate conversation,"[10] enlivening and enacting links between people and places over time and distance. Letters were responsible for "carving out a familiar social space,"[11] allowing separated kin to reinforce their connections. Kin correspondence helped maintain interpersonal relationships. Mutual interactive exchanges between kin meant that long-distance social relationships could be real, close, and personally significant. Social anthropologist Ulf Hannerz noted that "What is personal, primary, small-scale, is not necessarily narrowly confined in space."[12] Letters embodied a direct personal connection between kin that linked Pennsylvania to the wider Atlantic community.

The exchange of letters interactively situated writers and readers in diffuse kinship networks. Letters were an elemental tie between migrants and overseas kin as

---

frequent, routine, predictable, and economical. For the literate, he asserted that the English Atlantic "was coming closer together as a community." Quote on p. 271. On postage rates for letters, see Harry M. Konwiser, *Colonial and Revolutionary Posts: A History of the American Postal Systems, Colonial and Revolutionary Periods* (Richmond, Va.: Press of the Dietz Printing Co., 1931), 20, 31. See *Pennsylvania Gazette*, February 12, 1756, for arrival of packet boats.

[8] On the material culture and consumer culture of letter writing, see Konstantin Dierks, *In My Power: Letter Writing and Communications in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 4, 66, 93-94, 96, 120, 141, 143, 177-88, 283; and idem, "Letter Writing, Stationery Supplies, and Consumer Modernity in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World," *Early American Literature* 41, no. 3 (2006): 473-94.

[9] Historians have documented that lines of correspondence existed between English families in the Atlantic world. See, Cressy, *Coming Over*, chap. 9; idem, "Letters Home: Old and New England in the Seventeenth Century," *History Today* 37, no. 10 (October 1987): 37-41.

[10] Marilyn Ferris Motz, *True Sisterhood: Michigan Women and their Kin, 1820-1920* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983), 62.

[11] Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, 56.

[12] Ulf Hannerz, *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 98.

well as sending and receiving communities in the Atlantic. Kin correspondence contributed to the elaboration of Atlantic social networks. Families, Pearsall argued, were "liminal entities"[13] in the Atlantic world, and letters were crucial in helping bridge physical distance and permitting family life to continue. Letters exchanged within kinship networks contributed to ever-growing Atlantic connections.

"Letters exchanged among family members," a scholar noted for the nineteenth century, "reveal the use of language to create and manipulate networks of kin."[14] Hence, the instrumentality of letters was to maintain kin relationships on which relatives might later depend. Letters were utilitarian but also provided an instrument for maintaining emotionally salient kin connections with separated relatives. Communicating personal details and writing with feeling of palpable emotion, kin remained a vital part of each other's family lives in the Atlantic setting. Intimate interactions marked the experiences of letter writing and reading. Kin engaged in a process of "conversion and reconversion between feeling and text"[15] when they exchanged letters. Historian Sarah Pearsall explained that letter writers "had to exchange feelings for text" and "readers of letters had to exchange texts for feelings."[16]

Letters serve as indicators of emotional involvement between separated kin.[17] Letters were a method for separated kin to display kin sentiment. Of course, lexical

---

[13] Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, 54.
[14] Marilyn Ferris Motz, *True Sisterhood: Michigan Women and their Kin, 1820-1920* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983), 55.
[15] Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, 89.
[16] Ibid.
[17] The theoretical foundations for the field of the history of emotions were established in Peter N. Stearns and Carol Z. Stearns, "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards," *American Historical Review* 90, vol. 4 (October 1985): 813-36. Also, on American emotional life, see Carol Z. Stearns and Peter N. Stearns, eds., *Emotion and Social Change: Toward a New Psychohistory*

terms such as emotions, feelings, love, and affection were laden with specific

(New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1988); and Peter N. Stearns and Jan Lewis, eds., *An Emotional History of the United States* (New York: New York University Press, 1998). For a recent study of eighteenth-century emotions history, see Nicole Eustace, *Passion is the Gale: Emotion, Power, and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008). She argued that eighteenth-century Pennsylvanians harnessed emotional language to articulate authority, power, submission, and status.

Historians have been at pains studying emotional life in the western European past; the crux of the arguments have centered on changes or continuity in emotional experience and expression. Lawrence Stone's influential work, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1977), argued that the early modern family was distinguished by distance and deference. Since Stone, work on emotions in the family has questioned sharp premodern – modern emotional dichotomies. Alan Macfarlane, *The Family Life of Ralph Josselin, A Seventeenth-Century Clergyman: An Essay in Historical Anthropology* (Cambridge University Press, 1970; Paperback, New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1977), showed that while the diarist had selective interchanges with kin other than his wife and children, affective attitudes were present. In her study of English peasant life, Barbara A. Hanawalt found that affection usually characterized relations among family members. She asserted that "biological necessities" ensured that "many aspects of medieval life must be similar to our own"; emotional ties between medieval family members in England were probably much like modern ones. See *The Ties that Bound: Peasant Families in Medieval England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986). Quote on p. 268. Steven Ozment, *When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983), argued that the patriarchal family in Reformation Europe commonly incorporated companionate marriage and deeply affectionate relationships between parents and children. For more on the debate about the development of the sentimental nuclear family, see Steven Ozment, *Ancestors: The Loving Family in Old Europe* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001). Richard Grassby, "Love, Property and Kinship: The Courtship of Philip Williams, Levant Merchant, 1617-50," *English Historical Review* 113 (April 1998): 335-50, evaluated the subject of emotions, acknowledging their cultural construction and that the expression of emotions may be constrained and circumscribed by convention. Nevertheless, he contended, "emotions themselves are timeless" and conclude that the range of contradictory feelings "between head and heart can immediately be experienced and easily understood, despite the passage of three centuries." Quotes on p. 350. Rainer Beck, "Traces of Emotion? Marital Discord in Early Modern Bavaria," in *Family History Revisited: Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Richard Wall, Tamara K. Hareven, and Josef Ehmer (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2001), 135-160, argued that affection and love were of deep concern in married life. Beck found men and women articulating emotional needs and sensitivities in petitions for divorce; when a wish for affection went unfulfilled a spouse filed for divorce.

For American colonies, debate existed about planters' affectionate relationships with nuclear relatives and romantic love. Daniel Blake Smith, *Inside the Great House: Planter Family Life in Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake Society* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1980), 286, asserted that by the second half of the eighteenth century there was the "development of a more openly affectionate, intimate family environment in which emotional attachments were deeply values [*sic*], indeed cherished." On the other hand, Jan Lewis, *The Pursuit of Happiness: Family and Values in Jefferson's Virginia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 30, concluded that "pre-Revolutionary gentry relationships lacked—or, more precisely, stifled—emotional intensity. Put another way, love was important, but it was not central." For the Delaware Valley special consideration must be given to the role of what Barry Levy termed "Quaker domesticity," which spiritualized family relations. See *Quakers and the American Family: British Settlement in the Delaware Valley* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988). Lisa Wilson, *Ye Heart of a Man: The Domestic Life of Men in Colonial New England* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1999), acknowledged some significant changes in emotional expression in the late eighteenth century yet held that they do not reflect changes in experience; she saw abiding affection in parental and marital relationships throughout the colonial period. "Forms of expression—not feelings—changed," she maintained. Quote on p. 139.

connotations over the course of the long eighteenth century.[18] Emotions and feelings were filtered through language.[19] Language and an available choice of words were vehicles for the expression of kin sentiment.

While there had been earlier invocations of tender feelings, scholars have found that emotions took on a novel force in the second half of eighteenth century. By the 1740s, new conventions for writing styles took on significance in Anglo-American culture. Older epistolary traditions in polite and business letter manuals emphasized the demonstration of reason and rhetorical elegance. However, innovative letter-writing manuals and popular literature, endorsed emotion and heartfelt sincerity. In the mid-eighteenth century, the familiar letter became the dominant mode of letter writing; catering to middling sort readers, the familiar letter was conversational in style and its leading purpose was the expression of affection and duty among family and friends. Manuals also specifically addressed women and encouraged children to write, breaking down gender and generational divisions of correspondence.[20] These developments in letter writing had roots in the family. Many eighteenth-century theorists believed that sensibility, sympathy, and sentiment originated in the family; affections and the language

[18] On the nuances and implications of early modern emotional language and terms—affections, feelings, sensibilities, passions, see Eustace's helpful "Appendix: Toward a Lexicon of Eighteenth-Century Emotion," in *Passion is the Gale*, 481-86.

[19] On the question about change or constancy in emotions history, scholarship has been broadly divided between biological and cultural approaches. Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 11-12, 495-96 n. 11 and n. 12, reviewed and analyzed the debate between social constructivists and "universalists," or those who viewed emotional reaction as psychobiological processes. She favored "a hybrid perspective" that recognized feelings are universal while also acknowledging that their linguistic descriptors vary across time and culture. On this point, see William M. Reddy, "Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotion," *Current Anthropology* 38, no. 3 (June 1997): 327-51.

[20] On familiarity in epistolary culture and how a familiar style was inculcated by texts, see Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, chap. 2. On the popularization of familiar letter writing, see Dierks, *In My Power*, chap. 4; and idem, "Letter Writing and Social Refinement in America, 1750-1800," in *Letter Writing as a Social Practice*, ed. David Barton and Nigel Hall (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.), 31-41.

of familiar sensibility radiated out from domestic origins.[21] For instance, familiarity "was a mode of interaction that stemmed from the family setting."[22] In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, letter writers within Atlantic kin groups used language of domestic sentiment to stress continued affection. Salient features of kin correspondence—terms of affection and attachment—prefigured the nascence of familiar and sensible languages.

Elements of this language—sensibility and sympathy—resonating in kin correspondence helped to maintain emotional intimacy. Sensible impulses set down by the letter writer portrayed the impact they had on the body, such as tears of joy or sadness. Sensibility connoted "writing with feeling," allowing husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, and children to move beyond the letter as simply cataloging their activities and maintain emotional connections. Sensibility emphasized awareness of one's own emotions and those of others.[23] By expressing the "feeling heart," letter writers could convince themselves and their absent families that physical separation need not result in emotional distance.[24] Sympathy, an "ageless" necessity for letter writing, brought about "the relationship between two individuals."[25] In this respect, sympathy allowed for the sharing of emotions. These feelings, in turn, could influence another and thus had an

---

[21] On the emerging language of sensible attachments in the later eighteenth century, see Pearson, *Atlantic Families*, chap. 3.
[22] Ibid., 59.
[23] For more on emotions as person focused, see Bennett W. Helm, *Love, Friendship, & the Self: Intimacy, Identification, & the Social Nature of Persons* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009). In this work of philosophy, Helm argued that love is concern for the other's sake and that capturing the sense of intimacy is essential to love.
[24] On the concept and notions of sensibility, see Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, chap. 3. Quote on p. 84.
[25] Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, 84. On the history of ideas of sympathy in eighteenth-century philosophy, see John Mullan, *Sentiment and Sociability: The Language of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, 1988), chap. 1.

impact on the letter reader. This relationship allowed correspondents to bridge the gap of distance when sharing their emotions and feelings, and brought them closer together, even when far apart.

Letter writing was an act of performative affection. Long-distance physical separation required demonstrative affection and kin to write down their feelings in letters, encouraging family cohesion despite separation. Perhaps distance encouraged migrants and their overseas relatives to sentimentalize family relationships. Historian Sarah Pearsall elucidated that the appearance of the language of sensibility in family letters "often occurred at the very moments when feeling seemed most imperiled because of distance, war, death, or conflict." There was a recognizable form that characterized a great majority of letters; they were composed of greetings, rosters of names, references to health and other letters, and attached messages from others. Kin correspondents also made professions of sentiment. Some epistolary conventions, such as the salutation and farewell, were formulaic in style but not perfunctory and stilted. Letters exchanged between migrants and their overseas kin were too individuated, complex, rich, and subtle to be disregarded merely as a pattern of stock phrases, inquiries, and responses.

The focus on affective emotion is not to dismiss the presence of troubled relations in Atlantic family correspondence.[26] The waters of the Atlantic were not always tranquil, and while the ocean separated kindred, creating an obstacle to heartfelt exchanges, it was also a route of escape from families for distressed individuals. One newspaper article, for

[26] Antagonisms among various family members are not as visibly prominent in correspondence. Lorri Glover, *All Our Relations: Blood Ties and Emotional Bonds among the Early South Carolina Gentry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 20, noted how "the literary evidence favors those colonists who enjoyed harmonious kin ties. Estranged relatives do not, by definition, communicate with one another."

example, reported a suicide on November 6, 1759, in which a young man, who arrived at Philadelphia only three weeks earlier, "shot himself in the Church Yard at Burlington [N.J.]." "By a Letter found in his Pocket, wrote to his Father," the exact details of which are now unknown, it was learned "that he left Ireland upon some Family Discontent."[27] Beyond positive emotions, some letters were of a more hopeless and desperate nature, charged by hurtful thoughts and carrying disheartening messages. The Atlantic social world was full of conflict and disputes, and this certainly applied to family affairs, with letters further distancing family members.

Letters were a means of clearing up disputes and restoring harmony in the kinship network.[28] Some situations elicited strong words from kin. In December 1730, James Logan had not received word if his son safely reached Bristol, England, prompting the father to write "two or three complaining Letters" to his brother "w$^{ch}$ may, perhaps, appear ever harsh."[29] Kindred exchanged censorious lines in their letters, not afraid to be assertive and contentious in tone. In 1732, Philadelphia merchant John Reynell replied to his kinsman Michael Lee Dicker in England, noting his bantering remarks "seems to have been written w$^{th}$ a great deal of heart & passion & contains a great deal of Railery for I Cant call it any thing else but I am not to be frighten'd by it[.]"[30] He dismissed the letter because it evinced no self-restraint. While letter writing could become contentious and

[27] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, December 27, 1759.
[28] Glover, *All Our Relations*, 56, contended that elite Carolinians quelled family conflicts because "relatives recognized the greater importance of the kin network" over feuding.
[29] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, December 15, 1730, James Logan Letter Books, vol. 4, p. 205, Logan Family Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[30] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, March 9, 1732, John Reynell Letter Book, vol. 1, Sept. 1729-June 1734, Coates and Reynell Papers, collection no. 140, HSP.

tempestuous, kin correspondents maintained amity in the kinship network by discussing disputes freely and airing out grievances.

Not every migrant maintained contact either, including those who departed on good terms. The lack of communication left family back home uncertain of a migrant's location and overseas relatives made inquiries after them in colonial newspapers. A posting in 1754 sought out "Nicholas Lysaght (son of John Lysaght, of Hartfordshire, in England) who left his Father in 1739, and, as is suppos, went to some part of North America, but has not since been heard of " after his departure.[31] Another family tried to get in touch with a missing relative through a 1763 newspaper announcement, "WHEREAS Mr. WILLIAM JONES, formerly of the City or County of Cork, came into this Country about Twenty Years ago, and his Relations not hearing from him these Eighteen Years past, they request, if he is alive, that he will direct a Letter to James Rose, opposite the George, in Arch street, Philadelphia, mentioning his Place of Residence, or where to be directed to" for correspondence. "If he is not alive," the notice continued, "it is hoped that some of his former Acquaintances will be kind enough to signify the same by Letter" to his overseas kin.[32] Links with the kinship network could be easily broken. Those who fell silent, either because they passed away or ignored familial letter writing responsibilities, remain obscured.

The form, language, and personal detail of letters exchanged between migrants and overseas kin was the fabric of Atlantic familial relationships. Letters were a crucial means of communicating and sustaining long-distance social networks of migrants and

[31] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, August 29, 1754.
[32] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, February 10, 1763.

relatives linked by kin relationship (descent and in-law); they allowed kin to remain embedded in long-term relationships. The first section explores the process by which separated kin established cycles of written correspondence. The collection of family updates cluttering letters home and letters sent to migrants were usually a main reason for correspondence.[33] Letter writers were solicitous about the health of kin. The following section explores the exchange of family news and its role in sustaining kinship orientation.

Themes of family duty and affection pervaded kin correspondence; these recurring attributes also defined letter composition. The next section considers a kin-based ethos to write letters and the ways in which obligation supported networks of kin correspondence. Affectional ties permeated the Atlantic flow of written communication examines, and a subsequent section examines how separated kin remained linked through affecting letters. Indeed, the emotional tenor of family correspondence brings the Atlantic world down to human scale.

Letters were exchanged between a wide array of kindred, playing a major role in keeping extended family relationships together over time and geographic distance. The last section looks at how letter writing strengthened relationships within a broad family

[33] Edmund S. Morgan touched upon the frequent letter writing of New England Puritans. He used Samuel Sewall (1652-1729/30) as an illustrative example. Sewall, who had migrated from Hampshire as a nine-year-old, "wrote letter after letter to relatives in England, recording births, marriages, and deaths of his family and asking correspondents of similar accounts of his 'dear relations' there." See *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper and Row, Harper Torchbooks, 1966), 150. Konstantin Dierks, "Letter Writing, Gender, and Class in America, 1750-1800" (Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1999), 160, documented how the Delafons brothers "managed to correspond only intermittently," but nevertheless sustained a correspondence between South Carolina and England in the late 1750s and early 1760s. He described that the physically separated brothers "filled their letters with mention of the steady cycles of births, marriages, illnesses and deaths that beset the kin network."

network, cementing extensive and intensive connections across generations. Poignant letters tightened long-distance bonds of kinship and opened channels of communication between Pennsylvania and the Atlantic world.

**Establishing and Maintaining Kin Correspondence**

Letters had a key role in maintaining communication across time and space, allowing kin to stay connected. The chain of communication—necessary for maintaining networks of kinship—was established after migration by transmitting letters. Letters crossing the Atlantic alleviated anxiety for recipients and established lines of communication. Family migration occasioned letters; indeed, "the relationship between crisis, distance, and letter-writing is always at the forefront."[34] Geographically mobile family members communicated via letters with their kin. Historians have noted that literates had a propensity to migrate,[35] suggesting that a proportion of migrants could be inclined and capable of writing letters home. An initial reason for composing letters was to confirm or determine migrant kin survived the Atlantic voyage. Building on communication after migration, subsequent letter exchanges expanded kin correspondence.

Migrants promised to write family after reaching the colony. As German-speaking migrant Francis Daniel Pastorius waited to set sail from the English Channel port of Deal on the southeast Kentish coast, he vowed in a 1683 letter to his father that "as soon as the Lord helps me over to Pennsylvania, I shall give a more detailed account

[34] Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, 74.
[35] Kenneth Lockridge, *Literacy on Colonial New England: An Enquiry into the Social Context of Literacy in the Early Modern West* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1974), 5, 46-48, 74-75, 78, 82; and Farley Grubb, "Colonial Immigrant Literacy: An Economic Analysis of Pennsylvania-German Evidence," *Explorations in Economic History* 24, no. 1 (January 1987): 65 n.5, 67, 74.

of everything."[36] Before leaving the home community, migrants pledged to stay in contact with relatives, an assurance that those remaining behind did not forget. In the late seventeenth century, Thomas and Ann Noris of Preston, Lancashire reminded their migrant kinsman Philip Roman that "wee do desire a line or t[w]o from his hand as hee promised us before hee went out of England."[37] Members of the kin group were eager to reestablish contact with migrants as soon as possible. John Hinton expressed unease after not receiving any word from his migrant son William Hinton. In 1717, the father wrote to his son in Pennsylvania, "I am very glad to heare of your well fare; I wass Much afraid that you wass Dead, & that I should Never have Heard ffrom you More[.]"[38]

Once in the Delaware Valley, newly arrived migrants wrote to established correspondence with overseas kin. With "heartfelt greetings" David Seipt wrote in 1734 to his "Dearly loved brother" on the European continent, detailing his family's Atlantic voyage because "it is but reasonable that I should write you a detailed account of the long and distant journey which we have (Thank God) safely ended and tell you how uneasy I was that this was not done upon the first opportunity." Seipt accounted for the delay to his brother, explaining that someone neglected to notify him "when the mail would be gathered."[39] Recent arrivals had little time to write at length. Edward Jones explained to John ap Thomas shortly after his arrival in 1682 that "Time will not permit me to write

[36] Francis Daniel Pastorius to Melchior Adam Pastorius, Deal, Kent, England, June 7, 1683, in Albert Cook Myers, ed., *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania, West New Jersey and Delaware, 1630-1707* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912; reprint, New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1959), 412.
[37] Thomas and Ann Noris to Phillip and Amy Roman, Preston, Lancashire, England, n.d., Taylor, Harris, Roman, Frazer, and Smith Families Papers (collection 150), Box 6, Folder 5, Chester County Historical Society (hereafter cited as Roman Family Papers and CCHS).
[38] John Hinton to William Hinton, n .p., n.d., in Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1713, MR-Ph 381, February 6, 1717, no. 179, FHL.
[39] [David Seipt], "An Immigrant's Letter, 1734," *The Pennsylvania-German* IX (January-December 1908), 367.

much more for we are not settled."[40] In the tumult of such a momentous undertaking, even a brief message served to establish contact that was vital to the kin network. Family left behind wrote to stimulate communication from migrant kin. Richard and Mary Walter wrote from Wiltshire in 1697, requesting of Mary Roman "wee shall be glad to heare from you how it is with you" in Pennsylvania.[41]

Kin correspondence bridged the Atlantic for relatives on both sides of the Atlantic. In 1683, Mary Coole wrote her "deare sisters" in Chester, "though wee are at a Great distance one from another" she longed to hear from her family.[42] Letters were the primary means for overcoming long distances, connecting families living far apart. Letters carried bonds over the Atlantic, a fact underscored by the frequent references to those family members gone "b[e]yond y$^{e}$ sea"[43] and removed to "such a far away country."[44] Thus, kin delighted in receiving a letter from kin. Thomas and Ann Noris informed Phillip and Amy Roman that "wee have Resived your letter with much Joy."[45] From Warwickshire, England John and Mary Clifford wrote their migrant brother Thomas Clifford to acknowledge receiving his letters from Pennsylvania "with great

[40] Edward Jones to John ap Thomas, Schuylkill River [Pa.], August 26, 1682, in Jean R. Soderlund, ed., *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania: A Documentary History* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983), doc. 42, p. 177.
[41] Richard and Mary Walter to Amy Roman, Stanton Barnard, Wiltshire, England, November 1697, Roman Family Papers, Box 6, Folder 3, CCHS.
[42] Mary Coole to Sarah Beazer, Devizes, Wiltshire, England, February 18, 1683, Roman Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 3, CCHS.
[43] William Coole to Phillip Roman, Devizes, Wiltshire, England, September, 19, 1685, Roman Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 9, CCHS.
[44] Francis Daniel Pastorius to Melchior Adam Pastorius, Philadelphia, May 30, 1698, in Myers, ed., *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, 435.
[45] Thomas and Ann Noris to Phillip and Amy Roman, Preston, Lancashire, England, n.d., Roman Family Papers, Box 6, Folder 5, CCHS.

Joy."[46] More dramatically, Francis Daniel Pastorius was elated after receiving an unexpected letter from his father in 1697, writing back "I had already resigned myself (after I had received no letters from my honored father for so long a time) to receive nothing more from his dear hand, when by chance I received his last in the street as I was going into our church-meeting, and I could not read it through, without happy tears of affection."[47] Letters were symbols of the importance of kin relationships and were an emotional experience.

Prolonged silence caused concern among overseas family members. Even though Pastorius maintained correspondence with his father, lags and delays in delivery caused uncertainty. Emboldened by "paternal anxiety and affection for my son," in 1698 Melchior Adam Pastorius wrote to the colony's proprietor William Penn, explaining that "I have received no letter for a long time, and therefore my natural and fatherly affection has impelled me to make some inquiries in regard to his condition and method of life."[48] For William Coole and his family in Wiltshire, a 1683 letter from migrant relatives brought "great satisfaction to us because we long weighted to hear from you[.]" With such anticipated and welcome contact, the family remaining in England were "satisfied to hear from you and should be glad to hear as often as you can" by letter.[49] Correspondence was vital to carrying on a long-continued interaction between family members.

---

[46] John and Mary Clifford to Thomas Clifford, January 31, 1722, Barford, Warwickshire, England, Pemberton Papers—Clifford Correspondence (collection no. 484A), vol. 1, p. 6, HSP.
[47] Francis Daniel Pastorius to Melchior Adam Pastorius, Germanopolis [Germantown, Pa.], May 13, 1697, in Myers, ed., *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, 431.
[48] Melchior Adam Pastorius to William Penn, Windsheim, June 20, 1698, in Myers, ed., *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, 443.
[49] William Coole to Sarah Beazer or Jean Coole, Devizes, Wiltshire, England, April 18, 1684, Roman Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 4, CCHS.

Years after separation, family members relished letters from overseas. In 1764, Esther Spackman expressed her delight to her migrant son Isaac, "I long wanted to Receive a Line from you & therefore my pleasure was the greater at the Receipt of your Letter and the same pleasure to your sisters."[50] Mary Haworth Miers wrote at 1725 letter to her brother in Lancashire, over two decades after her migration, so "that we may still remember one another."[51] With the passage of time, letters were vital connection for them to maintain their sibling relationship.

In addition, letters were not a purely private correspondence; letters were personal as well as public. Letters were read aloud, sharing its contents and, in the process, imparting a sense of involvement and connection with overseas kin. Also, writers shared paper when composing messages to overseas kin. Nevertheless, the impact of letters was not diminished for their primary recipients. In the course of their delivery, letters passed through the hands of many intermediaries. Letters were shared among family members on both sides of the Atlantic. In 1685, Benjamin Coole informed Pennsylvania migrant Philip Roman that "thy Letters I Reseved w$^{ch}$ thee sent to thy sister & W. Bayly w$^{ch}$ I delivered w$^{th}$ my own hand & also Read[.]"[52] It was commonplace for letters to be shared, circulated and read aloud, allowing for their contents to be disseminated, practices that included a number of relations. Thus, letter writing maintained

[50] Esther Spackman to [Thomas, George, Isaac, and Mary Spackman], Hankerton, Wiltshire, England, December 31, 1764, in *Letters and Other Papers of Daniel Kent*, 114.
[51] Mary Haworth Miers to James Haworth, Lewistown [Lewes, Del.], June 4,1725, in "A Collection of Letters Written at Various Times from America, 1699-1745, Correctly Copied from the Originals by Caleb Haworth, the Originals are now at Shuttleworth Hall, in the Possession of James Haworth, 1816," Historical Abstracts, Box 34, p. 35, Brinton Coxe Collection (collection no. 1983), HSP. These unpublished transcriptions contain five more Haworth family letters in addition to those sent by migrant George Haworth reprinted in *PMHB* 37, no. 3 (1913): 330-340.
[52] Benjamin Coole to Philip Roman, Goatacre, Wiltshire, England, July 13, 1685, Roman Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 8, CCHS.

communication and relationships with a much wider group of kin. Establishing and sustaining a written correspondence allowed for the maintenance of kin ties and the continuity of emotional intimacy with close relatives across the Atlantic.

**The Exchange of Family News**

A primary function of kin correspondence was simply to report on the condition of relatives spread throughout the Atlantic world. Accounts chronicling the health or physical afflictions of relatives were no empty formula but an essential element of family letters. The exchange of family news served to bind together Atlantic kin groups. Through detailed updates, families on both sides of the Atlantic remained intricately connected to their kinfolk. Writing and receiving letters offered separated kin an ability to vicariously experience and become absorbed into events that defined the family cycle—childbirth, marriage, and death.[53] The updates shared between kin were all encompassing. John Lloyd's January 1689/90 letter to his brother Thomas Lloyd in Pennsylvania extensively covered the latest births and marriages among numerous cousins and other kin in Wales and England, summarizing "all the ordinary domestic News that at present occurs to my Memory."[54] As subject matter, family news bolstered an emotional connection between letter writers and letter readers, affirming personal attachment.

[53] Tamara K. Hareven, "The Family as Process: The Historical Study of the Family Cycle," *Journal of Social History* 7, no. 3 (Spring 1974): 322-29, advocated a revisionist approach in the historical study of the family, moving from a limited view of the family as a static unit at one point in time to an examination of the family as a process over the entire lives of its members.

[54] John Lloyd to Thomas Lloyd, London, January 7, 1689/1690, "Scrapbook containing letters from Thomas Lloyd, 1642-1779," Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.

The health of family members was a major concern among separated kindred. George Haworth wrote "to let you understand that I am well at present, hoping these few lines may find you all in good health also, and I have had my health reasonably ever since I came into" Pennsylvania. He indicated how "glad" it would make him "to hear from you especially of your welfare."[55] In a January 1689/90 letter John Lloyd asked after his brother Thomas Lloyd, removed to Pennsylvania nearly seven years, and was "glad . . . to hear of the Welfare of yourself & family" from a previous correspondence.[56] He wrote another letter several days later to his sibling, greeting, "We hope these Lines will find you all in good health[.]"[57] Given the preoccupation over various, potentially life-threatening, ailments any news of good health was met with relief. From Wales, Hugh Roberts addressed a 1710 letter to his nephew Thomas Jones, directing attention to a previous written communication "in which you informed me that you and brothers were well and their families, which was very pleasant to my heart and all that heard it that belonged to us in this land."[58] Ten years after leaving his father and other family behind in Windsheim, Franconia, Francis Daniel Pastorius expressed his relief at learning about their well-being. "I cannot refrain from saying," in a 1693 correspondence, "what unparalleled joy come over me when I receive letters bringing news of the good health and prosperity of my honored father and of the dear ones belonging to him, and since I

[55] George Haworth to Isabel Haworth, [Bucks County, Pa.], May 14, 1701, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 332-333.
[56] John Lloyd to Thomas Lloyd, London, January 3, 1689/90, "Scrapbook containing letters from Thomas Lloyd, 1642-1779," Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.
[57] John Lloyd to Thomas Lloyd, London, January 7, 1689/90, "Scrapbook containing letters from Thomas Lloyd, 1642-1779," Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.
[58] Hugh Roberts to Thomas Jones, November 1710, "Copy of a Welsh Letter," James J. Levick Collection (collection no. 898), case 59, HSP. The original document is in Welsh; a typed translated copy of the letter is in the file.

suppose that similarly some in your country desire now and then to know somewhat of our condition, and how it fares with me in this new and somewhat desolate western world" across the Atlantic.[59] John Swift sent a 1748 letter from Philadelphia, updating his brother Joseph in England that "Sister Molly is married & has got a Son & a Daughter, & I believe is very happy" in the colony.[60] Sampson Lloyd wrote back to Isaac Norris, Jr. in 1759, describing how his kinsman's previous "most affectionate letter was a welcome messenger to me of the welfare and situation of thy self and family" in Pennsylvania.[61] Decades after Mary Haworth Miers left England, she wrote her brother James Haworth in Lancashire to "satisfy that I am alive," and requested "let me know how my sister Sarah does and her children and all my relations there[.]"[62]

Kin kept their overseas relatives abreast of recent occurrences with each letter by enclosing birth announcements and accounts of childhood deaths. On January 22, 1716/17, James Logan penned a short letter to his brother William Logan in the English port city of Bristol to announce the birth of a boy in Pennsylvania. "Having but very little to Say I have taken up only a half sheet to write on. But tho' it takes but little room to tell it, it is fitt I should inform thee that on y$^{e}$ 9$^{th}$ Ins$^{tt}$ my Wife brought me a Son" named James.[63] Even when using few words, kin transmitted news that was meaningful for the kin group. Six months later James Logan informed his brother about James's

[59] Francis Daniel Pastorius, "Further News from Germantown, June 1, 1693," in Myers, ed., *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, 435.
[60] John Swift to Joseph Swift, Philadelphia, August 2, 1748, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am. 944, HSP.
[61] Sampson Lloyd to Isaac Norris, Birmingham, January 22, 1759, HSP.
[62] Mary Haworth Miers to James Haworth, Lewistown [Lewes, Del.], June 4, 1725, in "A Collection of Letters Written at Various Times from America," Historical Abstracts, Box 34, pp. 35-36, Brinton Coxe Collection (collection no. 1983), HSP.
[63] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, January 22, 1716/7, James Logan Letterbook, 1702-1720, Logan Papers, Mfilm Z6616.A2L639, reel 1, HSP.

decease, describing the course of the child's decline and the effect it had on the parents. The father repeated how "Last Winter, I inform'd thee that y$^{e}$ 9$^{th}$ of Jan$^{ry}$ I had a Son born whom his mother would have to be my namesake," continuing to inform that "for about 4 Months he continued athriving lovely child but then was subject to some illness" for a time. The unspecified malady, Logan wrote with emotional overtones, ultimately "putt an end to his Life & y$^{e}$ next day he was laid in the earth to y$^{e}$ great grief of his mournful mother, & not a little to mine[.]"[64] Conveying family news, Logan shared the anguish of grief; he described his wife's acute personal sorrow and intimated his own private distress over the loss. Kin separated by the ocean chronicled changes in family form, with letters capturing both the highs and the lows of family life in the Atlantic world.

In addition, letters carried somber news about the passing of relatives left behind. By way of a 1710 letter from his brother, George Haworth learned of his mother's death in England. The news of her passing left him saddened, and Haworth bereaved, "the thoughts of it made me mourn[.]" Far from his mother's deathbed he related to his brother in England how he coped with the news, writing, "I take it as patiently as I can" far removed in Pennsylvania.[65] Letters eulogizing the departed consoled mourners and displayed affection for the deceased. From Philadelphia in 1753, John Reynell wrote his "Loving Cousin" Alice Dicker to express his condolences on "The Loss" of her husband, whom he regarded as an "affectionate Kinsman[.]" Reynell admitted that the death "has been a great affliction to me, & deprived me of pleasure," explaining, "I often used to

[64] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, July 9, 1717, James Logan Letter Books, vol. 4, p. 35, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[65] George Haworth to James Haworth, Buckingham, Bucks County, Pa., n. d. [ca. 1710-1712], in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 336.

feed myself with, of making a voyage to England, & seeing him once more: but the good account thou gives of his Exit, & the satisfaction he expresses, in his own kind Letter, doth in part allay my trouble[.]"[66] His letter evoked melancholy, but receiving final words and a proper account of someone's death could bring closure for kindred on the far side of the Atlantic. Sorrowful recitations also reminded separated relatives that the Atlantic kin group was not immutable. John Hinton informed his migrant son in January 1717, "you[r] sister Mary Harris Departed this Life in April Last & soe Did not see your Letter."[67] Migration-related separations created malleable family forms, marked by shifts, changes, and reconfigurations over time; indeed it is difficult to generalize or typologize Atlantic family life because kin groups had a fluid structure. Familial worlds, as the Atlantic world, were in a constant state of flux that had an effect on the kin correspondence network.

Letters also informed relatives about new additions to the Atlantic kin group. The birth of children on either side of the Atlantic multiplied consanguineous (blood) relations. In a 1737 letter Christina Hopewell acquainted her son in Pennsylvania of an impending birth in the family remaining in England, mentioning that "your Sister Betty is at Down lying on her seventh Child[.]"[68] This mother wrote as a daughter lie in childbed, providing her son with the most up-to-the-minute information possible. Happy news about a widening family circle produced a wellspring of emotion. Upon learning of a recently born grandson in Pennsylvania, Esther Spackman wrote in 1763 to her migrant

[66] John Reynell to Alice Dicker, Philadelphia, July 1, 1753, John Reynell Letter Book, 1752-1754, HSP.
[67] John Hinton to William Hinton, n. p., January 6, 1717, in Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1713, no. 179, MR-Ph 381, FHL.
[68] Christina Hopewell to Nathaniel Hopewell, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, England, July 25, 1737, in Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1713, p. 489, MR-Ph 381, FHL.

son Thomas, "pray give him a kiss for me."[69] The birth of children contributed to the geographical expansion of kin groups and enlarged the structure of Atlantic kin groups, multiplying potential kinship connections.

Marital bonds created ramifying affinal (in-law) ties, influencing kin group formation, and family embraced new affinal kin in the network via letter. After Esther Spackman's son was married, she sent her son and new daughter-in-law well wishes, assuring the newly united couple that "it was a particular pleasure to me to hear that you have a Loving wife whom I also shall Love as a mother tho' unknown in person."[70] Words substituted for greetings, but a mother's embrace could not be reduced by physical distance. Learning of his sister's marriage, in 1685 Benjamin Coole wrote to welcome his new brother-in-law Phillip Roman to the family. Coole found out about his sibling's nuptials "when I saw y$^{e}$ Letters my sister sent to my mother wherein I understand y$^{t}$ thee hadst married my sister w$^{ch}$ did Rejoyse me very much." Highlighting the surprising nature of the letter's contents, and the time and distance lag in learning about far-off family, Coole signed his letter to his newest relative, "I am your Loving Brother much unexpected to me."[71] Given the interval in the transmittance of news, relatives were forced to send their fond regards and demonstrate their reactions through pen and paper.

Because of migration, kin faced the prospect of never seeing each other again, and this very real possibility, in turn, placed a high premium on written exchanges. A 1737

[69] Esther Spackman to [Thomas, George, Isaac, and Mary Spackman], Hankerton, Wiltshire, England, May 29, 1763, in *Letters and Other Papers of Daniel Kent*, 114.
[70] Esther Spackman to [Thomas, George, Isaac, and Mary Spackman], Hankerton, Wiltshire, England, May 29, 1763, in *Letters and Other Papers of Daniel Kent*, 114.
[71] Benjamin Coole to Phillip Roman, Goatacre, Wiltshire, England July 13,1685, Roman Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 8, CCHS.

letter from Christina Hopewell to her son in Pennsylvania illustrated the role correspondence played for family who recognized they would never see migrant relatives again. She asked, "pray let me hear from you assoon as you can and as often as oppertanity will give leave[,] which will be a great Satisfaction to me whilst living[.]"[72] Despite separation, parent-child bonds were lifelong, and were only cut short by mortality. In a 1737 letter Ralph and Mary Marshal reassured their migrant son that "we remain your Loving father and Mother till death[.]"[73]

Given uncertainties letters were infused with religiosity; family members on both sides of the Atlantic contented themselves with affirmations of faith.[74] Abraham Marshall knew he would die without ever again seeing his brother Samuel Marshall in England. The migrant reconciled himself to that prospect in 1733, writing his sibling that "if it happen So that wee may never See one another in this world more I desire that wee may live in fear [of] god so that wee may have an answer of peace When time to us here shall be no more[.]"[75] Some looked forward to an afterlife to reunite with separated family members. Shortly after landing at Philadelphia in 1683, Francis Daniel Pastorius found solace in religious belief, hoping that if he and his father "see one another no more on this side of the grave, we shall meet in Heaven."[76] As families were pulled apart

[72] Christina Hopewell to Nathaniel Hopewell, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, England, July 25, 1737, in Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1713, no. 489, MR-Ph 381, FHL.
[73] Ralph and Mary Marshal to Joseph Marshall, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, England, July 25, 1737, in Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1713, no. 489, MR-Ph 381, FHL.
[74] Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, chap. 3, delineated a shift from a language of religion to a language of sensibility in letters over the course of the eighteenth century.
[75] Abraham Marshall to Samuel Marshal, [Chester County, Pa.], ca. 1733, Ms. 14092, Chester County Historical Society.
[76] Francis Daniel Pastorius to Melchior Adam Pastorius, Deal, Kent, England, June 7, 1683, in Myers, ed., *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, 412.

across the Atlantic, some emphasized spiritual yearnings for an afterlife together in letters to kin.

Written correspondence was a substitute for personal contact, albeit with certain limitations. After fourteen years of separation, Esther Spackman did not allow herself to get her hopes up of seeing her son Isaac, responding to him, "you talk to Coming to see us again but I Can scarce expect so great a pleasure."[77] From Wiltshire, England, Thomas Bayly wishfully wrote his cousin Phillip Roman in 1711, "I should be very glad to see thee or any of thine heare."[78] Written correspondence was the indispensable link for families separated by the ocean and far removed from one another. Letters made it possible for scattered families to remain in contact, but kin correspondents understood that they might never see each other again, which made kin on both sides of the Atlantic naturally desirous to receive messages. Despite a relative's best efforts to capture on paper their feelings, it did not suffice for the longing desire to see the countenance of kin. In 1683, Benjamin Coole wrote to his sister and brother-in-law in Pennsylvania, and clearly felt their absence, remarking how "glad I should be to see your ffaces" again.[79] In 1685, Mary Coole let her sisters in Pennsylvania know that she "should be glad to hear from you as often as you can send for wee know not whether ever wee may see one anothers faces again but If so wee are very glad to heare from you[.]"[80] Family members emphasized a strong desire to see their relatives but were openly doubtful that they would

[77] Esther Spackman to [Thomas, George, Isaac, and Mary Spackman], Hankerton, Wiltshire, England, December 31, 1764, in *Letters and Other Papers of Daniel Kent*, 114.
[78] Thomas Bayly to Phillip Roman, Pickwick, Wiltshire, England, July 23,1711, Roman Family Papers, Box 6, Folder 11, CCHS.
[79] Benjamin Coole to William Beazer, Goatacre, Wiltshire, England, September 2, 1683, Roman Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 2, CCHS.
[80] Mary Coole to 'Dear Sisters,' Devizes, Wiltshire, England, September 19, 1685, Roman Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 10, CCHS.

ever visually behold each other again, and had to settle for updates enclosed in letters. Written messages were a welcome and necessary, if imperfect, substitute for the lost intimacy of physical nearness.

Updates were a crucial way to link together members of the Atlantic kin group, minimizing the disruptive effects of geographic distance. Letters provided a means for spreading family news. Births, marriages, and deaths marked the family at different points in their cycle, constantly altering the makeup of kinship networks in the Atlantic. Sharing family news was a key component of letters that significantly added to the correspondence networks of kin.

**Familial Ethos of Letter Writing**

At the center of kin correspondence was an ethos of letter writing, marked by a prevailing expectation for continued contact between separated family members. Good kinsmanship, it was expected, included composing letters. Writing letters was an affirmation of dutifulness and reciprocity. Reproaches for not remaining in correspondence, often guilt-arousing, were framed in terms of mutual responsibility; thus, migrants and their overseas kin often demonstrated that they kept up with an exchange of letters. Exhortations against unfulfilled letter-writing duties demonstrated a recognition that the strength of a kin group's communicative network was only as strong as the continuance of correspondence.

Letter writing, when financial circumstances permitted, allowed family relationships to continue despite the vast distances of mobility-related separation. Cost was an impediment to kin correspondence and family members got around this problem

in a number of ways. For instance, relatives combined messages in a single outgoing letter. Ester Spackman wrote to "My Dear Children all together" in 1764, addressing three sons and one daughter each within their own paragraph, because, she explained, "I have thought proper to write you this all in one Letter to save Expence."[81] Families persisted in letter writing, despite the many challenges and costs, testifying to the high value placed upon continued contact. Others appended a letter to a Quaker certificate of removal as a resourceful way to transmit written correspondence. In 1737, for instance, Ralph and Mary Marshall composed a letter on their son's certificate and also "M.$^{rs}$ Hopewell has written 2 or 3 lines to her son on y$^{e}$ other side" of the sheet.[82]

Families tried to arrange a practical system for the Atlantic exchange of letters, pooling resources to facilitate conveyance and reduce costs. In 1737, Christina Hopewell suggested that her son Nathaniel and fellow migrant Joseph Marshall alternate sending letters to their parents in Nottinghamshire, England; she recommended they "may always write in one letter directing to me one time and to them a nother."[83] Living in Pennsylvania, Lawrence Growdon wrote to his daughter Elizabeth in England's West Country before she went away to school. He concluded a 1742 letter by telling Elizabeth to share the contents with her sister, promising his intent to write his other daughter next

[81] Esther Spackman to [Thomas, George, Isaac, and Mary Spackman], Hankerton, Wiltshire, England, December 31, 1764, in *Letters and Other Papers of Daniel Kent, Emigrant and Redemptioner, to which have been added a few interesting Hawley and Spackman Papers*, comp. Ella K. Barnard (Baltimore: n. p., 1904), 116.
[82] Ralph and Mary Marshall to Joseph Marshall, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, England, July 25, 1737, Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1713, no. 489, MR-Ph 381, FHL. See also John Hinton to William Hinton, n. p., January 6, 1717, Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1713, no. 179, MR-Ph 381, FHL.
[83] Christina Hopewell to Nathaniel Hopewell, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, England, July 25, 1737, in Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1713, no. 489, MR-Ph 381, FHL.

time, and recommended that the two of them rotate writing letters to their father, as he did with their letters. "Give my Dear love to thy sister and If thee art still at home let her Read this letter," further explaining that "by the next Oppertunity I Will write to her and then to thee, And then to her again, and do you both Write to me by turns."[84] Such collaborative efforts suggested the collective character of familial correspondence; not only was space on paper shared but so too were the details of the letter's contents. Also, combining letters was economical and effective for kin correspondence. As letter writers members of Atlantic family groups were full of initiative, dealing skillfully with financial constraints to support kin correspondence.

Kin on both sides of the Atlantic upbraided family members for transgressing the normative notions of familial duty to write letters. In March 1704, Pennsylvania migrant George Haworth received money from his mother and brother in Lancashire, but he candidly admitted "I should have been more glad to have received a letter with it" as well.[85] He expressed gratitude and disappointment; the remittance was a mere trifle compared to family correspondence. "I seeing the distance between us," Haworth pointedly wrote two years later to fault his mother for acting "so negligent" by not sending a letter some six years after his migration across the Atlantic.[86] Christina Hopewell of Nottinghamshire indicated to her migrant son Nathaniel that "I have sent 3 letters to you and has received but one[.]"[87] This mother kept count of letters she sent

[84] Lawrence Growdon to Elizabeth Growdon, Trevose, Bucks County, Pa., May 14, 1742, Society Collection: Growdon Family, Letters, etc., 1682-1747, HSP.
[85] George Haworth to Isabel Haworth, Bucks County, Pa., March 26, 1704, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 333-334.
[86] George Haworth to Isabel Haworth, March 26, 1706, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 335-336.
[87] Christina Hopewell to Nathaniel Hopewell, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, England, July 25, 1737, in Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1713, no. 489, MR-Ph 381, FHL.

and received and was disappointed in her son's deficient correspondence. She also upbraided him in a public way by writing her dissatisfaction on his certificate.

In outgoing letters, kin made clear that they had not ignored their familial obligation to write. On November 30, 1709, wealthy Philadelphia Quaker merchant Isaac Norris, Sr. wrote his wife's kinsman in England; after no reply and fearing the letter lost, he wrote again in June 1711 and enclosed a copy of the previous letter "to shew I have not been wholly negligent in my dutty."[88] In 1737, Ralph and Mary Marshall wrote from England's North Midlands to assure their son in Pennsylvania that they kept up with their written correspondence; the parents explained "you complain for want of hearing from us but you may be assured we have wrote 3 letters to you and have with this last Received 3 from you & this is our fourth letter" sent across the Atlantic.[89]

In 1729, Samuel Reynell wrote his brother John Reynell in Philadelphia simply because he had a "convenient opportunity" and "was willing to Imbrace it" for the sake of sending a letter from southwestern England. He explained that "I have noe great matter of News to acquaint thee of. But write for the sake of writing."[90] Confident of upholding his end of mutual responsibility, in 1734 Samuel Reynell sharply questioned his migrant brother's fidelity to the family. He chided his sibling for not writing their father, "w.$^{ch}$ I think is not a little unkind as well as Disrespectfull." In addition, he expressed exasperation at John Reynell's seeming lack of concern for his parents in the

[88] Isaac Norris to Sampson Lloyd, Philadelphia, June 20, 1711, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 7½, p. 273, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.
[89] Ralph and Mary Marshall to Joseph Marshall, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, England, July 25, 1737, Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1713, p. 489, MR-Ph 381, FHL.
[90] Samuel Reynell to John Reynell, Bristol, England, December 2, 1729, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), series 1a: Incoming Correspondence, Box 1, Folder 1, HSP.

city of Exeter. Indicating that "I writt thee Several Letters" describing the strain their sister Sarah Reynell placed on their parents, Samuel Reynell was perplexed "to all which thou has been Intirely Silent, thô our letters have been repeatedly Sent to thee, which Conduct is quite Different to thy former Behaviour & Character. By thy disrespect to thy relations and Friends here thou Seems ∧ to have lost the Common Obligations of Filial Duty & respect" as well as "Fraternal Love" expected of close kin. "I am very certain," he continued, "that all our Letters that were Sent was not with any Veiw (∧ at least not to my knowledge) of receveing any Assistance from thee, what surprizes me is that as soon as thou heard of thy Sisters Misfortunes thou Immediately refrain'd writing to thy Parents, and according to my Information w.ch is by their Letters thou Never writt above one Letter to them Since w.ch is now near 3 Years." Samuel Reynell assured John Reynell the purpose of the family correspondence was not an appeal for assistance; at least there was no specific request for help. He leveled criticism at John Reynell for growing detachment; there was no balanced reciprocity in kin correspondence and, regardless if there was an explicit appeal, he failed to meet the duty of children to support their parents in distress. Also, it was more than the sibling openly expressing intense disapproval at John Reynell for not fulfilling familial obligations. Samuel Reynell indicated that "the above is writt by the Desire of our Parents." The letter, then, captured a collective admonitory voice of familial disapproval at home. Despite the disapprobation, the letter was signed, in stylistic convention, "I am with due respects thy affectionate Brother Samuel Reynell[.]"[91]

[91] Samuel Reynell to John Reynell, Bristol, England, April 6, 1734, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), series 1a: Incoming Correspondence, Box 1, Folder 11, HSP.

In 1741, Dr. Richard Hill wrote his son Richard Hill in Philadelphia, "I have little to say, but complain of thy long silence, which I am very much surprised at, as everybody here is." He continued to describe how his son's negligence mortified his father living at Madeira.[92] "I have good reason to believe that the people here think I have neither son, friend, or relation that cares for me," the father wrote. Hill explained that because of the postal delivery method on the island, "everybody may easily know who have letters; I assure thee great notice has been taken, and some remarks made that thou and Sammy would not care to hear, when letters have come from others in your parts, and none from you."[93] Conveying his embarrassment, the language of Hill's letter served to arouse guilt and a sense of filial obligation. His criticism also included his son-in-law Samuel Preston Moore in Philadelphia.[94] In-laws, too, were expected to meet standards of filial duty and were not spared reproach for neglecting to write. Drawing in comparisons with neighbors who had received letters, Hill illustrated a way that correspondence was a social ritual of gentility and increasingly an instrument of aspirations for rising social groups, symbolizing a person's social status, and, therefore, linked to class identity.[95] Hill migrated to Madeira in 1739 to escape bad debts and rebuild a mercantile fortune.

---

[92] On rumors as "a sharp affliction" for new migrants to the colonies, see Shields, *Civil Tongues and Polite Letters*, 277-79. Quote on p. 278.

[93] Dr. Richard Hill to Richard Hill, Madeira, March 4, 1741, in John Jay Smith, ed., *Letters of Doctor Richard Hill and His Children: The History of a Family, as told by themselves* (Philadelphia: Privately Printed, 1854), 24. Hill family papers are part of the Gulielma M. Howland Papers, Ms. Coll. 1000, Box 4, Quaker and Special Collections, Haverford College.

[94] Richard Hill and Deborah Moore Hill's daughter Hannah Hill married her cousin Samuel Preston Moore shortly before members of the Hill family migrated to Madeira.

[95] Glover, *All Our Relations*, 85, explained that "Letter writing, along with dress, leisure activities, and houses, served as symbols of refinement in the eighteenth century." On genteel refinement, see also Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York: Knopf, 1992). Konstantin Dierks, "Letter Writing and Social Refinement in America, 1750-1800," in *Letter Writing as a Social Practice*, ed. David Barton and Nigel Hall (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.), 31-41, documented the mid-eighteenth century emergence of a new range of letter writing manuals that enabled middling families to pursue claims to social refinement and upward mobility.

Accordingly, he was sensitive to the appearance of gentility, with aspirations to social advancement, respectability, and leisured cultural refinement.[96] Thus, class refinement and navigating the social domains of Madeira's foreigner community at the port city of Funchal influenced the construction of communication networks among elite kin.

Failure to fulfill or satisfy letter writing obligations resulted in expressions of reproval. Migrant John Swift tried establishing a more personal correspondence with his somewhat taciturn uncle John White, living in Croydon, Surrey. In 1747 he complained that "He tells me very little of himself, but I dont know whether it is because he dont choose that I should know more of him, or because he dont care to be at the trouble of doing it,—I rather imagine the latter to be the reason."[97] By the summer of 1749, John Swift challenged his uncle, expressing, "I have often told you that nothing could give me a greater pleasure than hearing from you, and therefore I think I have great reason to accuse you of being very unkind, because I cannot charge myself with being guilty of any Error that could deserve so severe a reprimand."[98]

Letter writing was supposed to continue despite circumstances beyond the control of kinfolk. In the midst of the Seven Years' War, David Lindsey's 1758 letter from Ulster to his cousin Thomas Fleming in Pennsylvania recognized the violent upheaval, attributing a lack of correspondence to the conflict. "I expected account oftener from you," he wrote, "only times being troublesome in that country with wars that we were

[96] Shields, *Civil Tongues and Polite Letters*, chap. 8, discussed the "mechanics of social climbing" and the rites of admission for newcomers seeking to be accepted by provincial elites in the local society of British American port cities. Quote on p. 277.
[97] John Swift to "Grosvenor Bedford Esq att the Gen.[l] Excise Office [London]," Philadelphia, March 22, 1747, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am. 944, HSP.
[98] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, June 1, 1749, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am.944, HSP.

assured that you were all dead or killed."[99] Maintaining networks of kin correspondence required constant and earnest effort. Manifest failure to write was cause for protest because it possibly betokened a weakening of bonds of affection. Collectively addressing his "Very dear Brethern" at Derry, Ireland, Pennsylvania migrant Job Johnson reproached his siblings in a 1767 letter, whose "Chief purport" was "to acquaint you that I have not had the favour nor happiness of one Letter from any of you this year." He was disappointed in the lack of communication, but recognized the uncertainty of Atlantic conveyance, writing, "if I were not sensible that letters between this [place] and Ireland are subject to Miscarry, I would really be apt to lose you with unkindness." It was only "on that account," he maintained, "I shall not insist on your infringement of Brotherly sincerity and regard" with writing practices. Despite the exoneration, Johnson did not hesitate to express disapproval at his brothers as letter writers.[100] Regardless of conditions, family members were not relieved from the task of letter writing.

Apologies filled kin correspondence, reflecting that letter writers knew about the expectation of continued contact and the need to keep up with letter writing. William Coole failed to address one sister in an earlier letter, and in 1685 wrote contritely to the overlooked sibling, "I would not have thee take amis in y$^{t}$ I did not write to thee in perticuler when I wrote to Sister Jane."[101] In 1690, Edward Bayley informed Philip

---

[99] David Lindsey to Thomas or Andrew Fleming, County Londonderry, March 19, 1758, in *Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan: Letters and Memoirs from Colonial and Revolutionary America, 1675-1815*, ed. Kerby A. Miller and others (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), doc. 3, p. 29. See also E. R. R. Green, ed., *Essays in Scotch-Irish History* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), 91.
[100] Job Johnson to John, Robert, and James Johnson, Oxford Township, November 27, 1767, in "'As Good a Country as any Man Needs to Dwell in': Letters from a Scotch-Irish Immigrant in Pennsylvania, 1766, 1767, and 1784," *Pennsylvania History* 50 (1983): 319.
[101] William Coole to Phillip Roman, Devizes, Wiltshire, England, July 24, 1685, Roman Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 9, CCHS.

Roman he "gladly receved" his kinsman's letter in Wiltshire, England, but also was "very much conserned because I mist y$^{e}$ opertunity of sending a leter" in return. He asked Roman, "I would desire thee not to take it amiss," and assured the migrant, "I will assewer thee it was not for want of Love and respect to thee."[102] In 1754, Rachel Parsons thought that updates about her side of the family in Bristol, England "have made amends for my past neglect" in writing, since she had not sent a letter to her kinsman at Philadelphia in two months.[103] From Warwick in 1769, Edward Clifford wrote his Pennsylvania-born kinsman Thomas Clifford, admitting, "I readly acknowledge my fault in not answering sooner your very Friendly and Respectful Letters wich I assure you wass out of no disrespect to y[ou]rself or Family but from a natural backwardness I have to wrighting—But I promiss an amendment" for future correspondence.[104] Kin recognized that lapses in correspondence were a breach of familial communication, threatening the kinship connections and emotional ties necessary for maintaining letter writing networks.

Parents attached importance to Atlantic correspondence, and tried to inculcate the usefulness of letter writing to their children. Sarah Read Logan and James Logan both prodded their son William Logan to be mindful of writing his family in Philadelphia during his education abroad in Bristol, England. The mother reminded him in 1730, "when thou art at Leisure be writeing to us all, thy Sisters would be glad to have Long

[102] Edward Bayley to Philip Roman, Pickwick, Wiltshire, England, September 11, 1690, Roman Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 13, CCHS.
[103] Rachel Parsons to William Logan, Bristol, England, April 10, 1754, Logan-Fisher-Fox (collection no. 1960), Box 2, Folder 1, HSP.
[104] Edward Clifford to Thomas Clifford, February 16, 1769, Warwick, England, Clifford-Pemberton Papers--Vol. 5, p. 108, HSP.

Letters from thee."[105] The father also told him, "Be Constant in writing to us," adding his son should even correspond in Latin as proof of his advancement in learning.[106] Writing from Pennsylvania in 1734, Lawrence Growdon encouraged his young daughter Elizabeth in England to practice literacy skills necessary for conducting family letter writing activities. He wanted his daughter to be able to send messages, telling her, "I hope thee wilt be diligent in Learning to read, and to write too; that thee may be able to write me a Letter thy self." In the meantime, he instructed the young girl to "Ask thy Aunt to hold thy hand while thee writes a little Letter to thy Papa" across the Atlantic.[107] Growdon attempted to stimulate his daughter's enthusiasm for kin correspondence, cultivating early writing skills and lasting habits that were required to remain in touch with distant family members.

Letter writers on both sides of the Atlantic defended their output while requesting more letters be sent off. Piqued by reproofs, James Haworth explained to his migrant brother that "Thou writes in the last thou hath sent 9 or 10 letters, but we have but received 3, so we understand by that some fails by the way."[108] The familial duty to exchange letters called for diligence, and in a 1722 letter George Haworth, over twenty years after his migration, wrote "Dear Brother I often think on you, forget not to write to

[105] Sarah Logan to William Logan, December 22, 1730, vol. 7, p. 124, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[106] James Logan to William Logan, August 30, 1731, James Logan Letter Book, vol. 4, p. 287, Logan Papers(collection no. 379), HSP.
[107] Lawrence Growdon to Elizabeth Growdon, Philadelphia, October 22, 1734, Society Collection: Growdon, HSP.
[108] James Haworth to George Haworth, Habergham Eaves, Lancashire, England, March 12, 1704/05, in "A Collection of Letters Written at Various Times from America," Historical Abstracts, Box 34, p. 17, Brinton Coxe Collection (collection no. 1983), HSP.

me by what oppertunity thou can."[109] In 1718, Samuel Marshall wrote to his brother Abraham Marshall in Pennsylvania, "I may Lett Thee under stand that I have had no Letter from Thee . . . And I have sent thee severall my dear Loving Brother Abraham I diser thee to send to me as Oft as thou canst."[110] Years later the migrant likewise wanted his brother to understand, "I have sent one letter since I received thy letter and had no answer so I desire thee to send as often as thou hast opportunity[.]"[111] In a 1722 letter to his brother in Pennsylvania, John Clifford regretted that "I had writt to you sooner but could not hear of aney opertunity of sending" a letter.[112] Five years later, John Clifford wrote "I send 2 letters last year to Bristole this comes by London," asking his brother "pray mis no opurenity of writing" back.[113]

James Logan was blunter in a 1717 letter to his sibling across the Atlantic, warning, "If thou art not more punctual in writing our Correspondence will drop[.]" The lapse in correspondence roused James Logan's ire and he called attention to all the chances William Logan missed to transmit a letter, "Thou mist Several Vessels bound thence directly hither this year and many more to New York."[114] Writing reproachfully about his brother's neglect, Logan's letter threatened a fraternal rift was not unreasonable or inconceivable. A decade later, James Logan kept after his sibling about the lack of written messages, indicating, "Thy Silence y.$^{t}$ I've mentioned, Dear Brother really

[109] George Haworth to James Haworth, [Buckingham, Bucks County, Pa.], October 15, 1722, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 340.
[110] Samuel Marshall to Abraham Marshall, n.p., December 18, 1718, Ms. 14092, CCHS.
[111] Abraham Marshall to Samuel Marshal, n.p., ca. 1733, Ms. 14092, CCHS.
[112] John and Mary Clifford to Thomas Clifford, January 31, 1722, Barford, Warwickshire, England, Pemberton Papers—Clifford Correspondence, collection no. 484A, vol. 1, p. 6, HSP.
[113] John and Mary Clifford to Thomas Clifford, April 6, 1727, Barford, Warwickshire, England, Clifford-Pemberton Papers, vol. 1, p. 7, HSP.
[114] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, November 25, 1717, James Logan Letter Books, vol. 4, p. 70, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.

grieves me, and gives me many anxious thoughts that I cannot very readily quiet[.]"[115] In this correspondence, James Logan expressed uneasiness; he was greatly worried about his sibling's hurtful uncommunicativeness that was the result of either his decease or indifference to fraternal bonds of affection. If one was not conscientious, family could easily be remiss on written interaction and disrupt kin correspondence. Failure to fulfill one's obligations meant that correspondence was subject to decay and collapse.

Siblings, both brothers and sisters, made it clear they expected letters, and took it as an affront to their relationship when they felt forgotten or left out. Sisters addressed one another about keeping up a shared written correspondence. Mary Coole's 1683 letter from Wiltshire to her sister Sarah Beazer in Pennsylvania indicated that "Wee have not Receved any letter from you sence wee heard our Brother was dead[.] I would desire you to send us word how it is with you and how you gos aLong in your foraing Country[.]" In the same letter, Mary Coole relayed that "mary shouring desires to be Remembered to her sister alis and she doe advise that her sister never sends her any Leter[.]"[116] In March 1704/5, James Haworth suggested his migrant brother's next letter include a message for their sister Susan living with her brother in Habergham Eaves, Lancashire. "I would have thee when thou writes put a line or two in concerning her only," James Haworth requested.[117] As of 1725, it had been years since Mary Haworth Miers heard from her brother James Haworth in Lancashire and raised the issue to him, "I write to thee about 5

[115] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, May 10, 1727, James Logan Letter Book, vol. 3, p. 72, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[116] Mary Coole to Sarah Beazer, Devizes, Wiltshire, England, February 18, 1683, Roman Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 3, CCHS.
[117] James Haworth to George Haworth, Habergham Eaves, Lancashire, England, March 12, 1704/5, in "A Collection of Letters Written at Various Times from America," Historical Abstracts, Box 34, p. 36, Brinton Coxe Collection (collection no. 1983), HSP.

years ago and has had no answer." The sister also felt slighted because her brother did not take notice of her in earlier correspondence, writing James, "I find by a letter of thine which thee sent to my Brother George that thee writes nothing concerning me which makes me wonder at it."[118] Sisters showed dissatisfaction and directly questioned their brothers' lack of written correspondence. After seeing his sister Mary in 1748, John Swift wrote to his younger brother Joseph in England that their sibling "enquired after you, as she often does, you should write to her."[119] An older sibling took it upon himself to urge a younger brother to remain in touch with their sister. Fraternal and sororal bonds and cross-sibling relationships occupied a special place in the cycle of kin correspondence. Letters symbolized familial ties and written interactions were crucial for sibling relationships to endure over the life span and across the Atlantic.

In-laws were held to the same standards and expected to participate in letter writing, too. It had been some time since Isaac Norris, Sr. received any message from his sister-in-law Deborah Lloyd and voiced his disappointment in a 1700 letter. "What not one Line to thy Poor Brother[?]"; Norris tried to understand why he had not heard from his wife's sister. He questioned her observance of etiquette for not reciprocating his letters, pointing out her access to the stationery goods and command of prose necessary for written correspondence. "If thou stands upon thy Punctilio's," Norris pointed out, "I have long since Answ$^{r}$ed thine – I say thine in y$^{e}$ Singular Numb.$^{r}$ for I never had but one since thou went – I know thou hast y$^{e}$ Command of all Materials, Pen, Ink, Paper, and

[118] Mary Haworth Miers to James Haworth, Lewistown [Lewes, Del.], June 4, 1725, in "A Collection of Letters Written at Various Times from America," Historical Abstracts, Box 34, p. 36, Brinton Coxe Collection (collection no. 1983), HSP.
[119] John Swift to Joseph Swift, Philadelphia, August 2, 1748, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am. 944, HSP.

Choice of words, Expression, are not wanting[.]"[120] A brother by marriage, Norris believed his sister-in-law possessed the means and ability to articulate her regards, and therefore expected to carry on exchanges of letters.

Gender and generational differences had an impact on letter writing and the ability to take part in social activities of the kin network. In 1717, James Logan suggested some challenges his wife faced when crafting a letter to her brother-in-law. "I have this instant ask'd thy Sister what I Shall Say to thee," he wrote, "and all She gives me in charge besides her hearty Affection is to tell thee . . . that it is my fault she did not write" previously. Sarah Read Logan missed an opportunity for sending a letter; "she once Sett about" writing but her husband informed her she had more time to compose the letter than was the case and "She did not finish it" in time, "and now she Says she has two small children." Child rearing influenced the frequency of kin contact. James Logan added, "I remember she began a very civil Letter but in so girlish a hand I was scarce pleased with it and now I question whether . . . She will ever write."[121] Logan held a low opinion of his wife's letter writing capabilities; his comments, moreover, provide some idea about the fewer experiences and opportunities his spouse had to pen letters. To his brother, Logan explained, "Thy Sister here fully designed to write by this opportunity[.] She has a great respect for thee, but having never wrote a Lett[r] in her life except two to me at NYork Since She was married[.] She is very backward that way She

[120] Isaac Norris to Deborah Lloyd, Philadelphia, August 2, 1700, Isaac Norris Letter book, 1699-1702, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), vol. 5, p. 213, HSP.
[121] James Logan to William Logan, March 23, 1716/17, James Logan Letterbook, 1702-1720, Logan Papers V. 2, Mfilm Z6616.A2L639, reel 1, HSP.

has now awash in hand She Sayes."[122] Some ten years later, James Logan again raised his wife's difficulty composing a letter, "my Spouse who ought to doe it had She not an almost insuperable aversion to her pen[.]"[123] With limited writing literacy and the domestic responsibilities of motherhood, Sarah Read Logan participated indirectly in the letter exchanges of the kin group.

A lack of epistolary training and experience adversely affected women's letter writing. While Sarah Read Logan was of a generation when most girls were not taught to write, James Logan provided writing instruction to their daughter—highlighting the interplay of gender, age, and status on literacy skills.[124] By the middle of the eighteenth century, writing was increasingly used to mark a person's class, regardless of gender.[125] James Logan came from "inconsiderable" origins and a peripatetic Lowland Scottish family,[126] but by virtue of proprietor William Penn's invitation to serve as his secretary in Pennsylvania he held many political offices in the colony and accumulated considerable wealth through land investment, fur trade with the Indians, and trade in provisions. It was as an established man in the province, then, that he taught his daughter to read and write through copying exercises. For instance, in advance of changing customs on female education, in 1731 he had his eleven-year-old daughter Hannah copy a duplicate

[122] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, November 25, 1717, James Logan Letter Books, vol. 4, p. 70, Logan Papers(collection no. 379), HSP.
[123] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, May 10, 1727, James Logan Letter Books, vol. 3, pp. 70, 72, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[124] On literacy, see E. Jennifer Monaghan, *Learning to Read and Write in Colonial America* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005).
[125] Dierks, *In My Power*, 238.
[126] Quote from Frederick B. Tolles, *James Logan and the Culture of Provincial America* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1957), 6. On the family's migrations between Scotland, Ireland, and England, see "Notes on his early life leaving England, etc. Notes on Children of Isaac Norris 1st And on his own brothers and sisters," Logan Papers, vol. 2, p. 104, HSP. James Logan's account can be found in Albert Cook Myers, *Immigration of the Irish Quakers into Pennsylvania, 1682-1750. With their Early History in Ireland* (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1969), 238-40 (page citations are to the reprint edition).

of a letter to her brother William in England, as "an exercise to her pen[.]"[127] Perhaps because of his wife's elementary skills in writing, Logan trained their daughter in writing by involving her in kin correspondence. By such practices, Logan helped develop his daughter's writing literacy skills. Writing conferred status and made possible the ability to stay connected with her family by letter.

To meet letter writing obligations, some relatives took advantage of every chance to transmit a letter and expected the same of their kin.[128] William Coole was in the middle of writing his sister Sarah in 1683, but "hearing of a ship goeing from London next week I am in hast to conclude."[129] Family members wrote when they had a moment's chance, even if there was little time for elaboration. In 1686, William Coole wrote to his "deare Sister Sarah" in Pennsylvania, because "having now an opertunity I could not but write a few lines unto thee."[130] Thomas Bayly wrote his kinsman Phillip Roman in 1712, "I Having this opartuniti was willing to Imbras it[.]"[131] Quite often different family members added quick messages to outgoing letters, so that Atlantic correspondence incorporated an assortment of kinfolk.

Marriage did not alleviate the duty to write; on the contrary, it was cause for recognizing new relations by marriage and an expanding kinship group. In 1706/7, Isaac

---

[127] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, September 29, 1731, James Logan Letter Book, vol. 4, p. 294, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[128] Konstantin Dierks, "Letter Writing, Gender, and Class in America, 1750-1800," 159, highlighted that Atlantic correspondence could be prompted when a family member met with a convenient opportunity to send a letter. "Often enough," he elucidated, "opportunity made a letter happen, while the persistent lack of opportunity could prevent letters from ever being written."
[129] William Coole to Sarah Beazer, Devizes, Wiltshire, England, February 24, 1683, Roman Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 1, CCHS.
[130] William Coole to Sarah Coole Roman, Devizes, Wiltshire, England, August 29, 1686, Roman Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 11, CCHS.
[131] Thomas Bayly to Phillip Roman, Pickwick, Wiltshire, England, June 17, 1712, Roman Family Papers, Box 6, Folder 12, CCHS.

Norris, Sr. sent a letter to his niece in Jamaica, remarking, "I Confess I have not wrote Since, I heard of thy Marri^a^ge Expecting first that thy Self^or my^Kindsman [*sic*] would have fav.rd mee w.th a Direction for Address"[132] to correspond with the newlyweds. A litmus test for family cohesion was when bifurcated Atlantic kin groups inevitably began branching off. Starting a family in the Delaware Valley endangered kinship relations, threatening to shift orientation away from relatives left behind. When migrant Joseph Marshall informed his parents in England about his intention to marry in the late 1730s, the concerned father and mother wrote to their son, "I hope if you do Marry you will not forget us but let us hear from you as often as Opportunity will permit."[133] James Logan wrote to his brother in 1727, "with out one line" recently from newlywed William Logan; he reprimanded his sibling that "if thou imagines thy Marriage can create any coolness in me or abate y^e^ sincere affection I have ever bore thee thou misreckons widely" in supposition. After his brother got married, James Logan "expect[ed] an Improvem.t rather than any Decay of that brotherly Love that has hitherto, at least on my side Existed between us" in correspondence and favors.[134] Letters incorporated new spouses into Atlantic kin groups and prevented relations by blood from falling out of step with network obligations.

Displeased parents expected letters from migrant children to be more than hasty and superficial. In a 1752 letter dated from Dublin, Ireland, Samuel Bryan informed his

[132] Isaac Norris, Sr. to Prudence Moore, London, March 3, 1706/7, Isaac Norris Letter Book, 1706-1709, vol. 7, pp. 34-35, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.
[133] Ralph and Mary Marshal to Joseph Marshall, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, England, July 25, 1737, in Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1713, no. 489, MR-Ph 381, FHL.
[134] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, May 10, 1727, James Logan Letter Books, vol. 3, pp. 70, 72, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.

son George Bryan in Philadelphia that he received an unsatisfactory letter. The father found the length of his son's letter insufficient. Samuel straightforwardly opened his reply by letting his son know that "so short a one [letter] does not please me." "Letters writ in a hurry are never well done," the father warned, and rebutted his son's unconvincing "idle excuses" about missing a ship's departure and rush to finish the letter.[135] Family members articulated standards for acceptable letter writing. Kin correspondence demanded attention and care, thought and regard; anything less was transparent and unsuitable for communicating with kin.

Family letters were replete with commentary to goad kin into writing. The writing of letters was a crucial obligation to be performed and evaluated as a ready measure of a relation's fulfillment of and adherence to prevailing kin expectations. Kin wrote prescriptive letters that set epistolary standards and ideals.[136] Kin, then, contributed to the articulation of epistolary conventions in social practice. Remarks about the imperative of letter writing were set forth as a mutual ideal, premised on an equal regard between writer and reader, each of whom was supposed to yearn to receive letters and hence supposed to remain mindful of dutifully writing letters.

**The Language of Affective Communication**

[135] Samuel Bryan to George Bryan, Dublin, September 23, 1752, George Bryan Papers (collection no. 90), Box 1, Folder 1, HSP. It is a typescript copy of an original letter. This letter is available in Kerby A. Miller and others, eds., *Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan: Letters and Memoirs from Colonial and Revolutionary America, 1675-1815* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 481-483.

[136] Dierks, *In My Power*, 174, argued that the "mutual encouragement and instruction" between family members was pervasive and carried "prescriptive force" for letter writing. In this way, they dictated "the rules of social interaction and conventions of personal expression they preferred" in their social relationships.

For Atlantic kin groups formed in the crucible of migration, letter writing served the basic social function of maintaining affectionate bonds.[137] Letters brimmed with expressions of kin sentiment. This language, expressed on the basis of kinship, built an emotional connection between letter writers and readers of letters, affirming the depth of personal attachment between the two. In the eighteenth century, terms of love and tender affection were part of a "ritualised form of sentiment"[138] used in different household relationships. Various linguistic terms, however formulaic, cannot be dismissed as empty words or constraining; separated kin had to set down and invoke feeling in writing. Using terms of affection and attachment, kin indited emotion.

Kinfolk asserted their family connection in letters by underscoring a relationship by blood.[139] Such an understanding was a baseline for notions of family duty and affection. In a 1704 letter, Isaac Norris, Sr. emphasized the ties of kinship he shared with his niece Prudence Weymouth Moore. The uncle in Pennsylvania reminded her that "thou art my Nearest relation by blood Living," after he lost members of his birth family in the cataclysmic June 7, 1692 Port Royal, Jamaica earthquake.[140] Norris acutely felt and valued the bonds of kinship—reckoned as blood relationship—to his niece in the Caribbean. In 1733, James Logan reminded his younger brother that he was bound by kin responsibility to his nephew, emphasizing, "he is thy Nearest Relation by blood

[137] On the role of letters as an instrument to maintain family bonds, see Dierks, "Letter Writing, Gender, and Class in America, 1750-1800." He recognized the function and significance of family letters for those "splintered apart" because of migration: "People took up letter writing as a coping mechanism, a possible way to try to sustain the emotional bonds of family, kinship, and friendship." Quote on p. 158.
[138] Tadmor, *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England*, 60.
[139] This was one usage of the language of kinship. On understandings of the language of kinship in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see Tadmor, *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England*, chap. 4.
[140] Isaac Norris to Prudence Weymouth, Philadelphia, September 28, 1704, Isaac Norris Letter Book, 1702-1704, vol. 5½, pp. 194-195, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.

Except myself" as the only two siblings of nine to survive childhood and live into adulthood.[141] James Logan wrote of a blood relationship governing the bond between an uncle and his nephew. He elaborated in a 1734 letter to his sibling, underscoring that his children were "the nearest in blood to thee, and in the very next rank to being thy own."[142] James Logan's order of kinship emphasized the bonds between his children and his brother based on consanguinity, or, sharing common blood. Family correspondents articulated an identity of kinship with blood relationship; ties of blood involved special obligations. In the writing of letters, biological connections and social bonds became mutually reinforcing.

Migrants and their overseas kin were linked through bonds of kinship captured in affecting letters. Endeared love and affection were common locutions in family letters sent across the Atlantic. With feeling, Richard and Mary Walter sent a 1697 letter to Amy Roman on the far shore of the Atlantic, putting into words what they inwardly held, "tho: wee be farr distant one from another in the outward, I hope our love one to another may bee near one to another pray as you have an opportunity let us have a few lines from you, and you shall have the like from us."[143] In the late seventeenth century, Thomas and Ann Noris concluded "wee do furder Remember our loves to our Cozen phillip," in Pennsylvania.[144] In1717, John Hinton wrote a letter from the Gloucestershire Cotswolds, mentioning to his migrant son in Pennsylvania that "all your brothers and Sisters are well

[141] James Logan to William Logan, Stenton [Germantown, Pa.], November 5, 1733, pp. 357-58, HSP.
[142] James Logan to William Logan, Stenton, August 3, 1734, James Logan Letter Book, vol. 4, p. 406, Logan Papers, HSP.
[143] Richard and Mary Walter to Amy Roman, n.p., November 1697, Roman Family Papers, Box 6, Folder 3, CCHS.
[144] Thomas and Ann Noris to Phillip and Amy Roman, Preston, Lancashire, England, n.d., Roman Family Papers, Box 6, Folder 5, CCHS.

and remembers their love to you[.]"[145] After signing her name to a 1737 letter with "my Sincear affections," Christina Hopewell described herself as an "ever loving mother" to her son in Pennsylvania.[146] In 1706, migrant George Haworth wrote his mother in Lancashire, reassuring, "I desire you accept of my goodwill and dutiful affection towards you" as a way of stressing his continued attachment and family bonds.[147] Affection, kin correspondents reiterated, was a natural inclination within family relationships. In 1730, Pennsylvania migrant James Logan, with a reputation as somewhat of a dour man, asked his brother in England to be "Sensible to the Emotions of natural affection."[148] In 1734, as "an only brother," James Logan described himself as one "who was not wanting in Proofs of natural affection" to his younger sibling "when thy occasions required it" and felt he did not need to expand upon the innate relationship of their fraternal bond.[149] Separated kin reaffirmed their affection in outgoing letters. Others tried to stimulate written correspondence by expressing how kin were held in affection. In 1700, Elizabeth Beasly's mother wrote her migrant daughter at Philadelphia, urging, "I Desire the[e] to write a Letter to thy [step] Father, for he is very much affected towards thee."[150]

Declarations of loving attachments and affectionate remembrances helped shape a sense of belonging that extended throughout the Atlantic family circle, cementing long-

---

[145] John Hinton to William Hinton, n. p., January 6, 1717, in Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1713, no. 179, MR-Ph 381, FHL.
[146] Christina Hopewell to Nathaniel Hopewell, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, England, July 25, 1737, in Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received), 1686-1713, no. 489, MR-Ph 381, FHL.
[147] George Haworth to Isabel Haworth, March 26, 1706, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 335-336.
[148] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, December 15, 1730, James Logan Letter Books, vol. 4, p. 205, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[149] James Logan to William Logan, Stenton, August 3, 1734, James Logan Letter Book, vol. 4, p. 406, Logan Papers, HSP.
[150] [Mother] to Elizabeth Beasly, July 18, 1700, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), vol. 8: Dickinson Family, folder 4.

distance relations. Benjamin Coole wrote from England to reassure his migrant kinsman Philip Roman of his enduring deep attachment, despite interrupted contact and miles of distance. He wrote in 1691, "Although for some years thou have heard nothing from me yet be Assured y$^{t}$ Lengths of time cannot obliterate y$^{t}$ Bond of Affecttion by w$^{ch}$ we are spiritually & natarely United to Geather" as Quakers and kinsman.[151] Historian Konstantin Dierks noted that before the Revolution, most people received mail infrequently;[152] intermittent communication was not uncommon or detrimental to social relationships. A lull in the cycle of kin correspondence did not mean diminished kinship bonds. Letter writing kept kin links alive, regardless of frequency; far from eroding, letters accentuated the potency of kinship ties.

In 1699, when his brother-in-law's letter writing began to wane, Isaac Norris, Sr. would rather have accused his kinsman of lacking in attention to duty than construe the drop in correspondence as a sign of diminishing bonds of affection. He sharply wrote Thomas Lloyd in London, "It Is so long since I had any from thee that I fear somew$^{t}$ Amiss for I must not believe thee to Grow cold In Effection [*sic*] - - - I would Rather charge thee with Neglect[.]"[153] Also, kin duly noted when letters were conspicuously reticent. James Logan helped his brother travel in 1709 to Leyden in the Netherlands for medical training. In consideration of this brotherly assistance, James Logan was dissatisfied that William Logan's letters were not demonstrative enough. The younger

[151] Benjamin Coole to Phillip Roman, Bristol, England, September 18, 1691, Roman Family Papers, Box 6, Folder 1, CCHS.
[152] Konstantin Dierks, "'Let Me Chat a Little': Letter Writing in Rhode Island before the Revolution," *Rhode Island History* 53, no. 4 (November 1995): 127.
[153] Isaac Norris, Sr. to Thomas Lloyd, June "12 or 13$^{th}$," 1699, Isaac Norris Letter Book, 1699-1702, vol. 5, p. 8, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.

sibling defended the restrained tone of his previous letters, "I . . . impute y$^{t}$ distance w$^{ch}$ you take notice of in my writing not to any want of warmth, but rather to y$^{e}$ respect w$^{ch}$ your more y$^{n}$ fraternal care justly claims from me."[154] James Logan misread his brother's reserved style; William Logan clarified that his evidently unadorned and measured prose were a mark of respectful regard, perhaps reflecting the dynamics of sibling hierarchy as the younger brother.[155] Kin correspondence could be marred by misunderstanding as letter writers navigated a balance between open expression of affection and propriety.

In 1710, Isaac Norris, Sr. conveyed longing affection for his niece in Jamaica. Writing with ardor, the uncle in Pennsylvania could still vividly "remember y$^{ee}$ w$^{th}$ a great deal of Affection & Love not only from y$^{e}$ prettinesses & fondness w$^{th}$ a Child but y$^{e}$ perfect Love and Union [that] was always between My ffathers Children of whom thy D[ea]$^{r}$ mother [Elizabeth Norris Weymouth] was y$^{e}$ Eldest and very near in Affection & all Offices of our Duty & Love to Each other" whilst she was alive. Despite "Our Different Years" separating the two, Norris wanted more "than a prudent Respect and Civill Notice as thy Mothers Brother," assuring his younger kinswoman that "our Affection would be reciprocall" as steadfast kinfolk.[156]

---

[154] William Logan to James Logan, London, November 16, 1709, James Logan Letter Book, vol. 1, p. 69, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.

[155] Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, 60, described that boundaries of familiarity were shifting in the eighteenth century. An earlier familial ideal held that even close family relationships should involve some degree of formality.

[156] Isaac Norris to Prudence Weymouth Moore, Philadelphia, April 17, 1710, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 7½, pp. 147-148, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.

Separated kin used the language of the heart and affections in their letters.[157] Invoking the language of the heart denoted the depth of emotion and sincerity for letter-writing kin. In 1697, migrant Francis Daniel Pastorius evoked his "unbroken, enduring, and unfeigned heartfelt affection" for an overseas brother.[158] In a 1734 letter, migrant David Seipt wrote from Germantown of his "heart-loved brother," lamenting "how it pains me that we are so widely separated, your own heart will tell you, for I am persuaded that you feel as I do." "Though thousands of miles lie between us," he further described, "my spirit often lingers with you; indeed, I may say not a day passes without thoughts of you." The Pennsylvania colonist implored, "I beg you will always keep in remembrance me and mine," assuring his far-away sibling that "I will do the same for you" in return.[159] By way of a 1764 letter, Esther Spackman let her son in Chester County, Pennsylvania know that the ocean's expanse did not lessen a mother's love for her children. Spackman reaffirmed her feelings when she expressed, "I took it very kind of you to write me & your Letter stirred up the tender affection of a mother's heart and my heart is near you often tho at such Distance and I often think of you and the Rest of my Dear Children with tear[s] of Love."[160] Neither time nor distance eroded feelings of attachment with overseas relatives. Letter writers used metaphors of the heart in

[157] Robert A. Erickson, *The Language of the Heart, 1600-1750* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997) traced the view of the heart as the seat of feeling, sincerity, and love. The phrase "the language of the heart," he documented, was old by the time it was used in 1734 by early Georgian poet Alexander Pope. The early modern history of the heart was an accumulation of meaning, fundamentally a linguistic heritage from Shakespeare and Milton forward; by the eighteenth century, the heart was associated as the organ of appeal. Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, 82, cited that the language of the heart was a dominant language of the later eighteenth-century Anglophone world, and its origins were domestic.
[158] Francis Daniel Pastorius to Melchior Adam Pastorius, Germanopolis [Germantown, Pa.], May 13, 1697, in Myers, ed., *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, 431.
[159] [David Seipt], "An Immigrant's Letter, 1734," *The Pennsylvania-German* IX (January-December 1908), 369.
[160] Esther Spackman to Joseph Hawley [and Elizabeth Spackman Hawley], Hankerton, Wiltshire, England, December 31, 1764, in *Letters and Other Papers of Daniel Kent*, 116.

correspondence as a means to express affection for far-away kindred; family remained connected to one another by letter and a feeling heart.

Sensibility placed considerable emphasis on physicality and the body. The body was critical both for the generation of sympathy and for displays of sensibility. In kin correspondence, emotion had a connection to the body and its processes. Letter writers made reference to kisses and hearts to demonstrate continued bonds of affections with distant kin. German-speaking migrant Francis Daniel Pastorius struggled to conclude his 1698 letter, not knowing if he would have another opportunity to correspond with his father. "All must have an end," he wrote, "and therefore this letter also, in closing which I greet my honored father a thousand times, and kiss him (through the air) with the heart of a child, perhaps for the last time" in a missive.[161]

Letter writers invoked physical displays of affection for children. Lawrence Growdon was residing in Pennsylvania in 1734,[162] and his three daughters were living with their maternal grandparents in the town of Bridport, Dorset, on England's southwestern coast. Growdon addressed his "dear Betsy," writing, "I want to come to Bridport again to Embrace my little daughters in my Arms, receive their loving Kisses, and hear their pretty Prattle, but I cant come Yet, next year may be I may." Unable to be with his daughters, the absent father sent "a Thousand Kisses with more Love than I can

[161] Francis Daniel Pastorius to Melchior Adam Pastorius, Philadelphia, May 30, 1698, in Myers, ed., *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, 442.
[162] Lawrence Growdon's father Joseph Growdon and grandfather Lawrence Growdon were First Purchsers from Cornwall, England; each bought 5,000 acres of Pennsylvania land for £100. See "The First Purchasers of Pennsylvania, 1681-1685," in Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, eds., *The Papers of William Penn*, vol. 2: *1680-1684* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), 644.

Express," since they were an ocean apart.[163] Families used letters to vicariously pass on displays of affection, and in this manner children were lavished with attention from a distance. Lawrence Growdon effusively expressed warmth for his children; to share his feelings, all the way from Pennsylvania, the father had to be demonstrative in his letter. At such a distance, such doting was captured in writing and served to tie together geographically separated family members.

Family letter writers were able to put down in writing a springtide of emotions and sensations. Writers indited the shedding of tears in kin correspondence. For those composing a letter in tears, their emotions could not be any clearer; descriptions of shedding tears produced sympathy in the reader.[164] Letters elicited affections and feelings for recipients. Hugh Roberts was overcome at the thought of living so far away from his mother and the probability of lifelong Atlantic separation. In a 1696/7 letter, Roberts reminded his children still in northwest Wales to "Remember my love to all my dear friends whom I Cannot forget but Namely to my dear Mother the Remembrance of her tenders my soul that I Can hardly writ of her becau[s]e of weeping for I thinks I shall see her No More."[165] Receiving a letter also brought forth tender tears. "I read them over with tears of joy and thankfulness," Deborah Moore Hill described to her sister and daughters in Philadelphia.[166] In 1706, migrant George Haworth lamented the absence of

[163] Lawrence Growdon to Elizabeth Growdon, Philadelphia, October 22, 1734, Society Collection: Growdon Family, Letters, etc., 1682-1747, HSP.
[164] Pearsall, *Atlantic Families*, 84, situated tears, a physical attribute expressed through the body, as a sign of sensibility. It was through the body, she explained, that sympathy was most easily achieved.
[165] Hugh Roberts to his Children, February 28, 1696/7, Charles Morton Smith Manuscripts, vol. 1, p. 31, HSP.
[166] Deborah Moore Hill to "My Dear Sister [Rachel Moore] and Daughters," Madeira, n.d. [ca. 1741], in Smith, ed., *Letters of Doctor Richard Hill and His Children*, 25.

any letters from his mother, making a fretful son "ready to weep often."[167] Composing a letter to family could be a painful exercise, especially if writers felt that a parent was unfeeling. Haworth's physical response, part of what would later characterize sensible suffering, was meant to provoke an emotional reaction and invoke family feeling and influence a response. Haworth's correspondence was a physical manifestation of despondency in letter form. The body, with its tears, could display authentic affections. In written correspondence, though, the body was missing and the epistolary prose had to take the place of physical feeling; words had to inspire sympathy.[168]

Letters themselves were much affected by the recipient and helped define long-distance kin relationships. Affective letters written by family were intended for a particular audience and likely to be of little value to anyone else. If a vessel was taken during an Atlantic voyage, Francis Daniel Pastorius wrote his father in 1699, marauders would be disappointed seizing such "small plunder" as a family letter.[169] For members of the kin group, though, letters were a direct connection between kinfolk. Deborah Moore Hill described receiving "affectionate letters" from her sister and daughter in Philadelphia. Living on the island of Madeira, she remarked the "fond letters were to me like a friendly hand to a drowning man"; letters were held in affection, providing sustenance and anchoring their Atlantic relationship.[170]

---

[167] George Haworth to Isabel Haworth, March 26, 1706, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 335-336.
[168] On sympathy, see Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*; and Sarah Knott, *Sensibility and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009).
[169] "Still further Information from Pennsylvania," [Philadelphia, Pa.], March 4, 1699," in Myers, ed., *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, 447.
[170] Deborah Moore Hill to "My Dear Sister [Rachel Moore] and Daughters," Madeira, n.d. [ca. 1741], in Smith, ed., *Letters of Doctor Richard Hill and His Children*, 25.

Death within the Atlantic family group occasioned letters that emoted sharp sorrow and generated mutual sympathy. A bereaved Jonathan Dickinson communicated the death of his wife to her siblings in Jamaica. "In my great Distress must I impart the greatest Loss y.$^{t}$ Could be fall mee and myne" in Philadelphia. "This I Doubt must strongly afflict thee w$^{th}$ us," he grieved.[171] Several days later Jonathan Dickinson wrote bereavement verses to his wife's other brother Jonathan Gale.[172] John Reynell's brother Samuel Reynell died in April 1735 and his father Samuel Reynell passed away on May 25, 1735; it fell upon Michael Lee Dicker to write his kinsman in Philadelphia as "y.$^{e}$ Messenger of Melancholy Tidings."[173] Upon learning that "my Father and Brother are both Dead" in England, John Reynell responded that the news "has been a Sore Affliction on me[.]"[174] In the back-and-forth correspondence the kinsmen shared grief. On the death of his father Charles Willing in 1754, Thomas Willing's "affliction almost overwhelms me" as he wrote to his uncle in London. He also referenced that his mother Anne Shippen Willing's "distress is inexpressible" on her husband's decease. In light of his passing and its effects, Willing assumed his uncle would "Mingle sorrows" with overseas kin and commiserate, believing "I am sure you will Sincerely Sympathize." He continued, "I am very sorry my Pen, must be the Messenger of such disagreeable News to you" as the deceased's brother. Writing instruments impressed the language of

[171] Jonathan Dickinson to Isaac Gale, Philadelphia, December 4, 1719, Jonathan Dickinson, Copybook of his Letters, 1715-1721, p. 307, Yi 2 1628 F Log, HSP.
[172] Jonathan Dickinson to Jonathan Gale, Philadelphia, December 7, 1719, Jonathan Dickinson, Copybook of his Letters, 1715-1721, p. 309, Yi 2 1628 F Log, HSP.
[173] Michael Lee Dicker to John Reynell, Exon, England, June 14, 1735, Series 1a: Incoming Correspondence, Box 1, Folder 14, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[174] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, [Philadelphia], November 15, 1735, John Reynell Letter Book, October 1734-March 1737, p. 25, vol. 2, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, John Reynell Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.

sensibility and served as proxies for communicating the burden of grief to kin. Yet, letter writers felt they did not have the capacities to convey the terrible news to all kin. "I dread the Effect," Willing wrote, "this Mellancholly News will have on my poor G.father, & therefore choose your better Judgment shou'd Inform him of it."[175]

Furthermore, the strokes made by kin as they composed letters, captured in ink, brought about a response to readers. In the second half of the eighteenth century, cultural ideals led to the evaluation of handwriting as an indicator of ability or self-improvement.[176] For kin exchanging letters across a perilous Atlantic world, receiving a letter in a relative's handwriting elicited a reflexive, basic, and immediate reaction based on feelings. Letters were tangible objects, capable of being touched and felt. There was a sensory stimulation and visceral experience to seeing and holding a letter written in the hand of a far-away family member. The handwriting of kin affected, as in the literal meaning of being acted upon, the sensations of the reader. Given the likelihood of never seeing family members again, heartfelt expressions captured in the handwriting of relatives took on a special significance for members of Atlantic kin groups.[177] Physically putting ink to paper made letters from overseas family members particularly cherished; kin recognized and looked for writing peculiar to a particular person. From Wiltshire, England, Benjamin Coole pleaded in 1683 to his sister Jeane Coole in Chester, "I would

[175] Thomas Willing to Thomas Willing, Philadelphia, December 6, 1754, Letter Book: Charles Willing and Son, June 15-November 30, 1754; Thomas Willing, November 30, 1754-May 1, 1757, Willing and Morris, May 1, 1757-February 6, 1761, pp. 48-49, Am. 9320, HSP.
[176] On the monitoring and scrutiny of letters, see Dierks, *In My Power*, 245. For more on penmanship, see Tamara Plakins Thornton, *Handwriting in America: A Cultural History* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1996).
[177] Dierks aptly described that letters became "the very substance of" relationships for those who would probably never see relatives again. See "Letter Writing, Gender, and Class in America, 1750-1800," 160.

also desier thee to send mee a letter ffrom thy own hand and directed to me."[178] After receiving a 1698 letter from his father, migrant Francis Daniel Pastorius "was greatly rejoiced by the sight of his dear handwriting."[179] Words captured in the hand of kin brought separated relatives into closer proximity. Other settlers longed to be reassured by the sight of written correspondence from members of the family. In a 1706 letter to his family, migrant George Haworth admittedly grappled with his emotions "when I think how I cannot have so much as one letter from some of your hands."[180] A letter in the handwriting of kin became a physical reminder of family affection.

The kin network was bound together by affectional ties. Family relationships were sustained by expressive and affectionate letters. Assurances of unflagging affection and feeling in family correspondence maintained intimacy and helped bond members across kinship networks. Letter writers used affective language to cement ties with kinfolk across the Atlantic and create a sense of solidarity within the Atlantic kin group.

**Written Correspondence between Extended Family**

Bonds of kinship extended widely; horizontal and vertical ties connected family members. Multigenerational ties revealed the breadth of the Atlantic kinship network. Letters allowed separated kin to establish familiarity between relatives within the larger web of relationships. Correspondents were diverse in terms of kinship.[181] Just who was

[178] Benjamin Coole to Jeane Coole, Goatacre, Wiltshire, England, May 29, 1683, Roman Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 2, CCHS.
[179] Francis Daniel Pastorius to Melchior Adam Pastorius, Philadelphia, May 30, 1698, in Myers, ed., *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, 435.
[180] George Haworth to Isabel Haworth, March 26, 1706, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 336.
[181] Kin terms in the early modern era were oftentimes malleable and multipurpose, and appellations such as kinsman, kinswoman, and cousin broadly encompassed a wide array of people or were applied interchangeably to refer to one particular relative. Michael Zuckerman, "William Byrd's Family," *Perspectives in American History* XII (1979): 274, 286-90, found that a wealthy planter in early eighteenth-

reckoned as kin was rather open-ended; however, these ambiguities of terminology did not mean that early modern kin relationships "were necessarily shallow or insignificant."[182] Imprecision, in fact, could reflect versatility and variability, allowing for greater inclusion. Letter exchanges between extended family broadened networks of relationships along bilateral kinship lines and over several generations. The ability to incorporate intergenerational and intragenerational relations attested to the profound influence of sustained correspondence for kinship networks.

Isaac Norris, Sr.'s immediate family perished in the wake of the destruction and pestilence caused by the June 7, 1692 earthquake that destroyed the Jamaican city of Port Royal.[183] After migrating to Philadelphia by 1694, Norris corresponded with Prudence Weymouth Moore, the daughter of his deceased sister Elizabeth Norris Weymouth; their correspondence maintained a line of communication that spanned decades and geographical distance. The example demonstrated a mutual interest between an uncle and his niece in keeping up a written correspondence. In April 1710, Norris was grateful for letters from his niece Prudence, which he took "very Kindly & Shal[l] be always pleas.[d]

---

century Virginia blurred ascribed status in family language with an "irreducible imprecision." Kinship terminology among European families was ambiguous. David Cressy, "Kinship and Kin Interaction in Early Modern England," *Past and Present* 113 (November 1986): 65-66, argued that basic relational terms "were used without precision or consistency." Tadmor, *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England*, chap. 4, discussed the permutations and "plural usages" of kinship terminology during the seventeenth and eighteenth century.

[182] Cressy, "Kinship and Kin Interaction," 66.

[183] Norris had ventured to Philadelphia, returning to Jamaica shortly after the natural disaster. His father Thomas Norris was killed in the earthquake, his older sister Elizabeth (1657-1692) died a week before he arrived back, and his older brother Joseph (1661-1692) passed away a day after he reached the island; his mother Mary Moore Norris previously passed away in 1685.

w$^{th}$ such a Correspondency[.]" Without visiting, letters would have to suffice "to renew or rather Establish our relative acquaintance" as separated kin.[184]

The children of Isaac Norris, Sr. were socialized into a relationship with Prudence Weymouth Moore, reading his niece's letter aloud to his gathered family, sharing its contents and involving younger kin. After Isaac Norris, Sr. passed away in 1735, his son Isaac Norris, Jr. continued writing to Prudence Weymouth Moore, and credited his late father with instilling a sense of kin connectedness with his first cousin. "The uncommon affect.$^{n}$ my fath.$^{r}$ bore the only Daugh.$^{r}$ of his beloved sist.$^{r}$ made him fond of cultivat$^{g}$ a correspond.~ w$^{th}$ you," he wrote in 1737. Isaac Norris, Sr. managed to impart his affinity for Prudence to his children, promoting the development of a kin correspondence between members of the next generation. The father imparted a kinship bond to his children; in a letter to his cousin in the West Indies Isaac Norris, Jr. recalled how his father "taught us all to regard & Love you" during his life. The bond was with Isaac Norris, Jr. explaining to Prudence how her uncle "parted w$^{th}$ you then very young after y$^{e}$ terrible Loss he had suffard in y$^{e}$ Earthquake in Jam.$^{a}$" and held her in particular fondness because she was the sole surviving member of a once "numerous family" that the elder Isaac Norris lost. His offspring were now "wittnesses for him that this regard & Love" for his niece "Lasted while he lived" and would be carried on by Prudence's other relations in Pennsylvania. "The duty we owe to his memory obliges us" Her aunt Mary Lloyd Norris still looked forward to hearing from Prudence, and Isaac Norris, Jr.

[184] Isaac Norris to Prudence Weymouth Moore, Philadelphia, April 17, 1710, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 7½, pp. 147-148, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.

explained that his "mother Joins with me in this or any thing in her power and will acknowledge the fav[r] of aline from you with a particular pleasure," continuing an intergenerational bond within the kin network.[185] Instructed by his father, Isaac Norris, Jr. appreciated the importance of kin relationships, and took it upon himself to continue the Philadelphia family's communication with Prudence Weymouth Moore.

In 1747, Isaac Norris, Jr. sent a letter to his cousin Prudence "by our kinsman Capt.[n] Thomas Lloyd,"[186] a first cousin on his mother's side. Norris still thought it would "be very obliging to let us hear from thee as any suitable opportunity may p[re]sent" for conveying a letter. He wrote his cousin of "all who now remain of my fathers numerous family" in Pennsylvania, discussing his seventy-three-year-old mother, four sisters, and brother and that with all the siblings either widowed or single there was "no great prospect of an immediate addition" to the family group. Isaac Norris, Jr., though, did have his own children and writing a letter presented an opportunity to send Prudence a few lines of correspondence from her first cousin once removed (meaning there was a difference of one generation). "My little Daughter," seven-year-old Mary (1740-1803), "seeing me writing presses me to let her write to thee too and I suffer her to send those little impertinencies which are y[e] forerunners of Reason and early dawnings," cautioning Prudence that her lines "will need thy excuse not withstanding her Age[.]" Despite his daughter's young age, Norris encouraged Mary's writing because he was "willing she

[185] Isaac Norris to Prudence Moore, Pennsylvania, June 12, 1737, Wall-Paper Letter Book, 1735-1755, p. g, Logan Papers(collection no. 379), HSP.
[186] Thomas Lloyd (d. 1754) was a prominent merchant in Philadelphia. He was a grandson of migrant Thomas Lloyd (1640-1694). His father was Thomas Lloyd (1685-1717/18), a merchant based in London, and his mother Sarah Young Lloyd moved her children to Pennsylvania in 1718 after her husband's decease. His father and Isaac Norris, Sr. were brothers-in-law and was, therefore, Isaac Norris Sr.'s affinal nephew. Isaac Norris, Jr. and Thomas Lloyd shared the same maternal grandfather.

should early know the Relationship and Obligation She lyes under to Love and honour thee"[187] as a kinswoman. The Norris family's contact with their kinswoman extended over three generations, continuing the solid foundation of contact established by Isaac Norris, Sr. Indeed, the kin group shared a multigenerational relationship, evolving from an intergenerational relationship between an uncle and niece into an intragenerational relationship between first cousins and progressing to the beginnings of another intergenerational relationship between first cousins once removed.

William Logan's education in Bristol, England during the early 1730s enlarged his kinship universe, and years after his schooling abroad he continued corresponding with members of an extended network of kinswomen. In a 1743 letter he asked his uncle William Logan, "I should Esteem it a Very great favour Could my Aunt find some leisure Minutes to advise me of the State of Affairs in respect to all our Relations" across the Atlantic, "for I can assure her it affords me a great Satisfaction to peruse her Lett.[rs] Over & Over Even 12 Mo[nths] after their Date" of composition.[188] Letters embodied personal attachment in a form that retained its emotive power long beyond the occasion of writing. There was an immediacy to letters but they also allowed for reflection.

At times, his aunt's sisters, Elizabeth and Rachel Parsons, conducted the duties of letter writing in place of Logan's uncle. In 1753, the nephew was apprehensive about his uncle's lack of correspondence and it fell upon kinswomen to explain his failure to keep up with his nephew's letter writing. "I asure you he is not in the least displeas'd with

[187] Isaac Norris to Prudence Moore, Fairhill, November 21, 1747, Wall-Paper Letter Book, 1735-1755, p. 48, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[188] William Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, June 7, 1743, Logan-Fisher-Fox (collection no. 1960), Box 2, Folder 1, HSP.

you," Elizabeth Parsons wrote back, "only you must not expect him to answer all your letters nor express uneasiness if he does not, he has but very little time to himself" because of a busy schedule.[189] In 1754, Rachel Parsons wrote with a sense of an inclusive Atlantic kin group, extending her "Sincere Love" to "all your Relations who are likewise ours" by extension.[190] That William remained in contact with these in-law kinswomen, even after his uncle passed away, testified to the strength of kinship bonds.

Abraham Marshall migrated to Pennsylvania in 1697, settling in West Bradford, Chester County.[191] After moving across the Atlantic, Abraham Marshall exchanged family news over the years with his younger brother Samuel Marshall in England. In the 1730s, more than thirty years after he left the village of Gratton, Derbyshire, Abraham Marshall warmly concluded the draft copy of a letter to his brother with thoughts of the family collectively, closing, "So no more but my Dear love unto thee and my wives and Childrens love unto thee and thy wife and Children and all our Relations as if named[.]"[192] Even if he did not list all his kinfolk particularly, Marshall broadly remembered a multigenerational array of family members, subsumed under an all-embracing acknowledgment, including both consanguinial (blood) and affinal (in-law) kin—siblings and their spouses, nieces, nephews, and cousins. The catchall phrase "all our relations" often recurred in family letters, and it fittingly captured the essence of an inclusive understanding of kinship.

---

[189] Elizabeth Parsons to William Logan, Bristol, England, July 7, 1753, Logan-Fisher-Fox (collection no. 1960), Box 2, Folder 1, HSP.
[190] Rachel Parsons to William Logan, Bristol, England, April 10, 1754, Logan-Fisher-Fox (collection no. 1960), Box 2, Folder 1, HSP.
[191] Information on the Marshall family gathered from Joseph B. Marshall, *Marshall Family of Pennsylvania, Records: 1650-1952* (Wilmette, Ill.: n. p., 1952), 1-3.
[192] Abraham Marshall to Samuel Marshal, n.p., ca. 1733, Ms. 14092, CCHS.

Forty years later the next generation of Marshall kin engaged in an exchange of family information, carrying on the contact of the preceding generation. From Derbyshire in 1771, John Marshall (b. 1703) wrote his Pennsylvania-born first cousin Humphry Marshall (1722-1801).[193] Nearly seventy-five-years after Abraham Marshall migrated, his son Humphry Marshall wrote to kin to learn more about the English branch of the family. John Marshall was pleasantly surprised to receive questions from his overseas cousin, for "not Hearing of y.[r] Famaley of a great Number of Years, Expected I Should never Have heard of y:[u] more," but was delighted to respond to Humphry Marshall's inquiry about his "Fathers Age and whether aney of His Family or Relations was Living" in the East Midlands of England. John Marshall wrote that he was sixty-eight-years-old, and was the last living Marshall of his generation, "all the Nephews y.[r] Father hath Living," further noting that he still lived "in the Same Hamlet [Gratton] where my Uncle Abram was born and all his Brothers," Humphry, Samuel, and John. He also mentioned that his father "died when He was about 60 years of age" and that their "Uncle Samuel," with whom the migrant corresponded, "lived a maney years after my Father and left 2 daughters," more of Pennsylvania-born Humphry's first cousins. In his letter John Marshall indicated that he then had eight children living, naming five sons and three daughters, and further stated that he was a stonemason like his father. The cousin's letter gave some account of the English branch of the family, filled with specific descriptions about kin members and their lives. In turn, John Marshall wanted to know

[193] Humphry Marshall was a noted early American botanist and the eighth child of Abraham and Mary Hunt Marshall. John Marshall was the son of Humphry Marshall (b. 1667), the older brother of Abraham Marshall; thus, John was the migrant's nephew.

more about his kindred in Pennsylvania, requesting, "If these Lines comes safe to you which I hope the[y] will I Beg you will Be so Kind . . . as to Send me a few Lines of the Number and welfare of y.[r] Famely for you See By my age that my glass runs apace and I must Exspect soon to be cald Hence But Should be glad if God permit to Heare from you before I die[.]"[194] The exchange of letters between cousins Humphry and John Marshall illustrated how kin contact could lie dormant but also demonstrated the durability of networks of kin correspondence.

The Clifford kin group maintained communication over three generations; years of written correspondence culminated in the migrant's grandson visiting English kin in 1770 and again in 1782. Sometime before 1690, Thomas Clifford (d. 1737/8) migrated to Pennsylvania from Warwickshire in England's West Midlands. The family rose from middling origins to prominence in Philadelphia's community of shipping merchants; their predecessors and kin in England were tradesmen, among the ranks of millers, coopers, and silk dyers.[195] Migrant Thomas Clifford exchanged letters with John and Mary Clifford, his brother and sister-in-law, living in Barford, a village three miles south of Warwick. In 1722, for instance, they were pleased to hear that Thomas Clifford had "so good a wife [Sarah Cowgill Clifford] to be a comfort to you in a Strange contrey" across the ocean. John and Mary Clifford also informed their brother in Pennsylvania that he was an uncle to another niece "since our last written," and with the recent birth "wee have now 4 children liveing 2 sons and 2 Daughters"; they also wrote of James Clifford,

[194] John Marshall to Humphry Marshall, Gratton, Derbyshire, England, August 14, 1771, Box 1, Folder 18, Humphry and Moses Marshall Papers, William L. Clements Library, The University of Michigan.
[195] For more information on Clifford family genealogy and history, see John Jordan, *Colonial Families of Philadelphia*, 279-302; and Grace Hutchison Larsen, "Profile of a Colonial Merchant: Thomas Clifford of Pre-Revolutionary Philadelphia" (Ph.D. diss.: Columbia University, 1955), chap. 1.

another brother in England, with news of his newborn child. The brother and sister-in-law closed their letter by expressing how they both "bege you would not lous ane [lose any] opertunity of written for wee are verey glad of a letter from you[.]" They closed with assurances of their love and affection as "Brother and Sister till Death," and included the names of cousins and in-laws who "Desiers to be Rememberd to you[.]"[196] Years later in 1727, Thomas Clifford and John and Mary Clifford continued exchanging updates about their children; the kin in England wrote that "wee have now 7 Chilldern living the youngest is a Son wee have named him James he is about a year and quarter olde" and also mentioned "the Rest of the fameley" and that they "are well and desire to be Rembered to you," specifically mentioning that "Brother James is well and his family and Send their loves to you[.]"[197]

In their correspondence, family members indicated preparations for the continuance of intergenerational ties within the Atlantic kin group. John and Mary Clifford indicated that "our Eldest Son" Thomas "has gone to writing pretey while [well]" and promised that "he shall write the next Letter to you,"[198] laying the groundwork for communication with his uncle and extended kin in Pennsylvania. John Clifford later wrote his brother in Pennsylvania that "thes[e]" lines "com[e] to aquint you that my Son goes to Scule [school] and I was willing that he shuld write to you to lay a founddacion for a Coraspondons between him and you and your Chilldern if I shuld

[196] John and Mary Clifford to Thomas Clifford, January 31, 1722, Barford, Warwickshire, England, Pemberton Papers—Clifford Correspondence (collection no. 484A), vol. 1, p. 6, HSP.
[197] John and Mary Clifford to Thomas Clifford, Barford, Warwickshire, England, April 6, 1727, Pemberton Papers—Clifford Correspondence (collection no. 484A), vol. 1, p. 7, HSP.
[198] John and Mary Clifford to Thomas Clifford, Barford, Warwickshire, England, April 6, 1727, Pemberton Papers—Clifford Correspondence (collection no. 484A), vol. 1, p. 7, HSP.

die,"[199] thereby ensuring kin contact would continue over generations and across the Atlantic.

Migrant Thomas Clifford passed away in 1737/8, and his second son, also named Thomas Clifford (b. 1722), continued to remain in contact with Clifford kin in England. In 1750, he exchanged letters with his cousin Edward Clifford of Warwickshire. "In your Letter to mee," Edward wrote his cousin Thomas, "you desired mee to send you a particular account of your Cousin Thomas and all your Re[l]ations there." His English kinsman detailed that his brother Thomas "has bin Dead upwards of five Year[s]," leaving a wife and two boys, "John is now about twelve Years Old, and Tho[ma]s about ten[.]" Edward conveyed his desire to maintain contact with his kin in Pennsylvania, writing, "tho I cannot see you Face to Face, nor converse with you in so Friendly a maner as I could wish; yet I shall allways be glad to Enquire after your Wellfaire, to communicate my Thoughts to you in writing, and to keep up this agreeable Correspondence w[h]ich is now begun."[200] In 1757, Thomas Clifford communicated with another kinsman James Clifford; the English kin "Shall be very glad to see thee" overseas but was "glad" to receive "a Letter from thee[.]"[201] Over a decade later, Edward and Thomas Clifford continued in their correspondence. Thomas Clifford acknowledged his kinsman's "good Spouse" was "kind enough to write me" in 1768, adding "I hope she

[199] John Clifford to Thomas Clifford, n.d, Pemberton Papers—Clifford Correspondence (collection no. 484A), vol. 1, p. 17, HSP.
[200] Edward Clifford to Thomas Clifford, April 16, 1750, Warwick Castle Mill, Pemberton Papers—Clifford Correspondence (collection no. 484A), vol. 1, p. 19, HSP.
[201] James Clifford to Thomas Clifford, London, August 27, 1757, Pemberton Papers—Clifford Correspondence (collection no. 484A), vol. 1, p. 283, HSP.

will again[.]"[202] Edward Clifford wrote his kinsman in 1769, "Your desire of keeping up an acquaintance with y[ou]r Relations in England is very agreable to me and naturally leads me to give you a true account of them,"[203] enclosing a long account of deceased and living uncles, cousins, and other kin.

Thomas Clifford and Anne Guest Clifford had nine children, and their third child and eldest son was another Thomas Clifford (b. 1748)—the migrant's grandson. He traveled to England in 1769 in service of the family business, affording an opportunity to visit with Clifford kin. The family visits were especially poignant to the migrant's son, who appreciated that the youngest Thomas Clifford was "favoured to meet in the place of his G[rand] Fathers Nativity" and "to see a Descendant of one that was so far separated from his Brethren, & dwelt in a Land so remote," nostalgically reflecting that "whenever I enter on this subject, I look back with pleasure and remember what Love & Affection subsisted in the Family, notwithsg how great the Distance was they were placed from each other"[204] when Thomas Clifford migrated to Pennsylvania some eighty years earlier. Kinship ties were so enduring from generations of correspondence that in 1782, the Pennsylvania branch of the kin network was identified as the next of kin for "Cousins John & James Clifford," both joiners by occupation who died unmarried and intestate.[205] Each Thomas Clifford—the migrant, the son, and the grandson—participated in letter

[202] Thomas Clifford to Edward Clifford, Philadelphia, February 23, 1768, Thomas Clifford Letter Book, 1767-1773, Pemberton Family Papers—Clifford Correspondence, (collection no. 484A), vol. 28, HSP.
[203] Edward Clifford to Thomas Clifford, February 16, 1769, Warwick, Pemberton Papers—Clifford Correspondence, vol. 5, p. 108, HSP.
[204] Thomas Clifford to Edward Clifford, Philadelphia, October 20, 1769, Thomas Clifford Letter Book, 1767-1773, vol. 28, Pemberton Family Papers—Clifford Correspondence (collection no. 484A), HSP.
[205] Thomas Clifford, Jr. to Thomas Clifford, Bristol, England, June 6, 1782, vol. 6, p. 179, Pemberton Papers—Clifford Correspondence (collection no. 484A), HSP. In this letter to his father, Clifford indicated that he wrote to kin while in England and reported back on a whole host of kin and their circumstances.

writing with their English relatives. Kin on both sides of the Atlantic sustained a network of written correspondence and close familiarity through intragenerational and intergenerational relationships.

After George Haworth migrated to Pennsylvania at the turn of the eighteenth century, he established an ongoing pattern of kin correspondence; he wrote letters with updates about kin on the far side of the Atlantic and was eager to remain acquainted with relations still in northwestern England. In 1710, a decade after taking ship across the Atlantic, George Haworth sent "my love to my Sisters and Brother Isaac and to my cousins and all my relations in general" still living in Lancashire. The migrant inquired after his extended kin, asking his brother James Haworth, "thou writes of my Uncle George's both pray thee send in thy next how it is with them both and especially my Mothers Brothers[.]"[206] A couple of years later, the migrant continued enclosing gestures of recognition to his kinfolk collectively, requesting that his brother "give my kind love to Sister and Brothers and Cousins and to all my relations."[207]

The families of migrants George Haworth and Mary Haworth Miers maintained a pattern of visitation in the Delaware Valley, when they openly circulated letters and news from James Haworth. "Two of my Sister Mary's children, John and Mary came to see me this Spring," George wrote in the summer of 1715, and indicated that "they were glad

[206] George Haworth to James Haworth, Bucks County, Pa., 1710, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 337.
[207] George Haworth to James Haworth, Bucks County, Pa., November 3, 1712, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 338.

to see and read the letters I received from thee";[208] the nieces and nephews were familiarized with their overseas uncle through his letters.

Years later in 1722, George Haworth continued writing letters to inform his brother about the growing family in Pennsylvania, explaining "I have 4 children 3 Boys and one daughter." The migrant acted as a go-between for members of the family in the Delaware Valley. George Haworth wrote "to let thee know that we thy kindred are all in good health," adding that "Sister Mary and children desire dearly to be remembered to thee and the rest of our kindred in England . . . ."[209]

Mary Haworth Miers also directly corresponded with her sibling in England. In a 1725 letter, Mary informed James that their brother George passed away, leaving behind six children. Despite the death of George, the related nuclear units of the Haworth family in the Delaware Valley continued their gatherings and shared letters from England during such occasions. She told James that "my Son John Miers has been up lately to see them and they were all in health and desires to be remembered to thee and all their relations about thee" in Lancashire. Similar to her brother George, Mary Haworth Miers also asked after particular siblings, nieces, nephews, and kin more generally, writing, "I desire thee to let me know how my sister Sarah does and her children and all my relations there[.]"[210] John Miers took the same opportunity to write his uncle James Haworth in Lancashire, appealing that he "not fail in sending" letters "as often as thee can possible,

[208] George Haworth to James Haworth, Buckingham, Bucks County, Pa., July 27, 1715, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 338.
[209] George Haworth to James Haworth, n.p., October 15, 1722, in "Early Letters from Pennsylvania," 340.
[210] Mary Haworth Miers to James Haworth, Lewistown [Lewes, Del.], June 4, 1725, in "A Collection of Letters Written at Various Times from America," Historical Abstracts, Box 34, p. 36, Brinton Coxe Collection (collection no. 1983), HSP.

for we have great desires to hear from you oftener." He explained in 1725, "I cannot find that my uncle George had received any letter since 1722, which has been long," and, therefore, requested increased communication between the extended family members. The nephew closed his letter, "so nor more but my dear love to thee and thine and all our relations," appealing "Let us not forget one another tho unknown by face."[211] Born in the Delaware Valley, Miers never met his uncle in England, but the longstanding written correspondence exchanged between kin led him to plea to be remembered and for continued contact among multigenerational members of the kin group.

In 1745, nearly a half century after his mother left England, John Miers wrote back to his uncle James Haworth "with great satisfaction" after receiving a letter, which he "perused and shewn it to as many of our relations as I have had oppertunity[.]" John Miers continued his migrant mother and uncle's tradition of sharing letters received from relations across the Atlantic and sending back news of their families. John Miers discussed his immediate family, mentioning that his mother "has been dead about 17 years" and a deceased brother survived by four daughters. His sister Mary was deceased "about 8 years," leaving a daughter and two sons, while another sister Sarah was "yet living" with six children from four marriages. "Uncle Georges children are all living, I heard from them all last Spring" by a relative, and informed the family in England that some migrated into Virginia and North Carolina. Having "been particular to answer thy request as to our names" John Miers continued to "say something as to our

[211] John Miers to James Haworth, Lewistown [Lewes, Del.], June 4, 1725, in "A Collection of Letters Written at Various Times from America," Historical Abstracts, Box 34, pp. 36-37, Brinton Coxe Collection (collection no. 1983), HSP.

circumstances" on the far shores of the Atlantic.[212] The kin correspondence of the Haworth family spanned and included multiple generations; John Miers, the son of a migrant mother and the nephew of a migrant uncle, took an active part in exchanging letters with overseas kindred. Letter writers included a combination of kinship relationships between and across generations, perpetuating a network of kinship ties. Written correspondence within the kin network supported the longevity of contact among groups of geographically separated relatives.

## Conclusion

Letters illustrated the movement of kinship networks in the context of Atlantic migration. Letter writing allowed migrants and their overseas relatives to function as a kinship network even though separated by space and time; they preserved kin ties and strengthened the social cohesion of the kinship network. The exchange of letters signified a widespread desire to maintain divided families as affective groups, despite the challenges of distance. Kin correspondents demonstrated resiliency to stay in touch and remain connected. Letters exchanged in a process of migration created Atlantic connections that were sustained materially and emotionally over time and space through communication. Cycles of kin correspondence were indispensible for sustaining the unity of kin groups, manifesting the persistence of familial solidarity in spite of the fissile effects of Atlantic migration.

---

[212] John Miers to James Haworth, Lewistown [Lewes, Del.], October 25, 1745, in "A Collection of Letters Written at Various Times from America," Historical Abstracts, Box 34, pp. 38-41, Brinton Coxe Collection (collection no. 1983), HSP. On the paths of movement through the Appalachian Valley to Virginia and the Carolina backcountry, see Larry Dale Gragg, *Migration in Early America: The Virginia Quaker Experience* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, 1980), chapter 2.

Letters were a visible sign of enduring kin relationships. Lines of kinship were clearly demarcated in kin correspondence. Members of separated families addressed kinship relationships by blood (consanguinity) and marriage (affinity). Letter writers wrote in terms of the affirmation of kinship relations. Kin correspondence included filial, parental, sibling (fraternal and sororal), and cousinage relationships; kinsman and kinswomen interacted in flexible and intimate ways.

Relationships within Atlantic kin groups were of an epistolary nature. Letter writing among kin was an activity that cataloged litanies of births, marriages, and deaths. Letters sustained social networks and eased fears about death, illness, and isolation. A primary function of letter writing was to provide a flow of life course news about members of the Atlantic kin group, drawing distant readers into the personal worlds of the writers.

In letters, kin included strong prescriptions toward family duty and affection. Letters crystallized the extent of kinship duties and obligations. Letter writing was guided by a normative code of kin correspondence. The manner in which kin voiced a sense of duty elucidates the importance attached to letter writing. The operation of kin-based letter writing networks was demanding and it required writing dutifully. The obligatory nature of kin correspondence helped make the epistolary networks of Atlantic kin groups durable. As an avenue of communication, the traffic of letters cemented family ties. Also, letters activated emotional bonds with kin relations. The obligations, responsibilities, and loyalties of kinship networks contributed to expression and preservation of emotional links. Reciprocity, for instance, contributed to attachment

bonds. Family letters became objects of emotional satisfaction; a handwritten letter was very meaningful. Kin sentiment formed a foundation of letter-writing networks. Geographic distance required demonstrative affection and emotional mutuality. The physical distance, perceived and felt by kin correspondents, made those writing letters explicitly express and impart their affection, if they were to convey a sense of abiding kinship bonds. Bonds of affection, expressed in language that was spontaneous and emotive, held separated kin close.

## Chapter 3

## Acting in "the Best for your Interest":

## Kin Networks and Atlantic Commerce

In May 1744, Thomas Willing (1679-1760) wrote from Bristol, the leading seaport in western England, to his son Charles Willing (1710-1754) in Philadelphia confirming that he received "directions to make £800 Insurance on the [ship] Dorothy to Bristol," his son's vessel. The father explained about high marine insurance premiums caused by the threat of capture or destruction on the open ocean, explaining, "I have Sent to London to know how ~~how~~ it can be done there," and assured his son that he "Shall do the best for your interest."[1] In this particular case, a Bristol merchant warned his son about the high cost of marine insurance, promising his utmost assistance in securing the best rates. The Willing family example revealed one of the multifaceted roles kin networks played in Atlantic commercial transactions. The exchange also highlighted that the underlying ideal was to serve and advance the interests of kin in business.

The market economy of the early modern Atlantic "was highly networked."[2] Kin were part of complex networks of trade connections. Commercial interactions within kin networks linked Pennsylvania to the larger trading Atlantic community. Indeed, kinship

[1] Thomas Willing to Charles Willing, Bristol, England, May 31, 1744, Wallace Papers (collection no. 686), vol. 4, p. 146, Historical Society of Pennsylvania (hereafter cited as HSP). This letter was also reprinted in *Willing Letters and Papers Edited with a Biographical Essay of Thomas Willing of Philadelphia (1731-1821)*, ed. Thomas Willing Balch (Philadelphia: Allen, Lane, and Scott, 1922), 11.
[2] David Hancock, *Oceans of Wine: Madeira and the Emergence of American Trade and Taste* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2009), 118.

network activity more closely tied Pennsylvania to merchant communities in various Atlantic port cities.[3]

This chapter explores the nature and role that bonds among blood and in-law kin played in early modern Atlantic commercial enterprises. As a way to assess the workings of kin ties, it looks at the services and activities performed by family that helped animate early modern business relationships and Atlantic commercial transactions. Ties of blood and marriage generated mercantile vitality and business connections; kin interaction and communication also facilitated commercial relationships in the Atlantic. Business relationships and mercantile dealings between overseas relatives fostered an expansion in trade and simultaneously cultivated kin contact. In the Atlantic's commercial world, moreover, family was a valuable currency, performing a range of roles and providing a variety of commercial services. Family members served as business agents known as factors or correspondents, relayed information and advice, transmitted referrals and contacts, and reciprocated favors. In these ways, merchants made personal investments in the kin group and relatives promoted the interests of kinfolk in their enterprises. Kin were instrumental in advancing, serving, and protecting the commercial interests of their members.

Kin networks figured prominently in the British Atlantic trading system.[4] Merchants, of course, worked with non-kin, and, in fact, the majority of associates, agents, and regular customers were not relations. Ledger indexes of English

[3] Bernard Bailyn, *Atlantic History: Concepts and Contours* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005), 81-101, noted that pan-Atlantic commercial webs drew places together.
[4] David Hancock, *Citizens of the World: London Merchants and the Integration of the British Atlantic Economy, 1735-1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), argued that London merchants relied heavily on their extended family, kinship, and ethnic networks in overseas operations.

businessmen, for instance, demonstrate the predominance of outsiders.[5] The same was also true for the ledgers and account books of Philadelphia merchants. Members of English trading firms were decidedly not related by blood or religious affiliation to every one of their customers. In an expanding and increasingly sophisticated economy, no business could be entirely built on the family.[6] Also, there may have been little continuity in elite Philadelphia business families,[7] and the great majority of families lasted in business for only one or two generations.[8] Thomas Doerflinger suggested a shift in the role kinship played for the Philadelphia mercantile community. Settlers initially relied on family contacts for business and trading links; however, after the middle of the eighteenth century, the structuring of commercial networks "depended far less on kinship."[9] An established businessman was also less dependent on family and more capable of broadening their horizons.[10]

Even if the greater part of trade was not conducted with kin and the preponderance of family businesses were short-lived institutions, the "tenacity of family values"[11] in early modern business relationships cannot be underestimated. Kinship networks were invaluable and oftentimes open-ended connections for merchants. Scholar Peter Mathias argued that the "family matrix was so often central to the operations of

---

[5] Richard Grassby, *Kinship and Capitalism: Marriage, Family, and Business in the English-Speaking World, 1580-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 330, 296.
[6] Ibid., 61, 309.
[7] Gary B. Nash, "The Early Merchants of Philadelphia: The Formation and Disintegration of a Founding Elite," in *The World of William Penn*, ed. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 337, 340, 344.
[8] Grassby, *Kinship and Capitalism*, 361.
[9] Thomas M. Doerflinger, *A Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise: Merchants and Economic Development in Revolutionary Philadelphia* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 61.
[10] On this principle, see Jacob M. Price, *Capital and Credit in British Overseas Trade: The View from the Chesapeake, 1700-1776* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980), 50.
[11] Grassby, *Kinship and Capitalism*, 310.

business."[12] Families were critical in ameliorating the risks of the early modern economy. The need for trust and obligations meant that personal and business considerations were not separate concerns. Even if a merchant's commercial dealings were not exclusively or primarily conducted with kin, relationships within the kin network helped a merchant's position in the Atlantic economy. Kin were a component of a diversified trading network and a key part of a merchant's overall strategic framework. Merchants were opportunistic and effectively utilized their kin to create a competitive advantage. In an age when commercial activities were subject to the hazards of Atlantic shipping, the uncertainties of fluctuating prices, inaccurate or belated information, and the necessity of relying on uncontrollable and frequently unknown agents, there was little wonder why "businessmen were much more comfortable when they could deal with a kinsman"[13] regardless how far removed in relation. Indeed, working with kinfolk—valued for their assumed trustworthiness however close or remote in relation—assuaged the uncertainty and risk inherent in far-flung commercial enterprises.

Studies have identified family-based merchant networks spread throughout the English Atlantic world, where immediate family and in-laws "operated in a constantly shifting series of combinations, as partners, as agents, or merely as customers to each other."[14] Quakers solidified commercial ties through Atlantic kin relations. While the

---

[12] Peter Mathias, "Risk, Credit, and Kinship in Early Modern Enterprise," in *The Early Modern Atlantic Economy*, ed. John J. McCusker and Kenneth Morgan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 15-35. Quote on p. 16. For more on family and kinship relations as a crucial element in the merchants' networks, see Ida Bull, "Merchant Households and their Networks in Eighteenth-Century Trondheim," *Continuity and Change* 17, no. 2 (2002): 213-31.

[13] Grassby, *Kinship and Capitalism*, 299.

[14] On kinship ties serving as a basis for commercial bonds, see Bernard Bailyn, *The New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), 35, 87-90. Quote on p. 89. See also: Edmund S. Morgan, *The Purtian Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in*

merchant class represented only ten percent of Quakers, they exerted profound influence.[15] Scholar J. William Frost explained that Friends in America operated within "an international Quaker community of merchants." It was common practice to engage in endogamous trade with other Quakers, "however distantly related, whom they could term 'kinsman.'" By the latter half of the eighteenth century, the effect of extensively intertwined business and familial ties made prominent Delaware Valley Quakers a veritable "financial aristocracy bound together by religion and kinship."[16] Quaker merchants were cosmopolitan, and historian Frederick B. Tolles explained that "the Philadelphia Quakers were in close touch with the entire north Atlantic world from Nova Scotia to Curaçao and from Hamburg to Lisbon."[17] Families in colonial Philadelphia demonstrated active patterns of kinship interaction, and their business networks could be solidified by familial and religious affiliation. Members of the Philadelphia mercantile community made use of kinship networks, and familial links were found among Quakers, Anglicans, and other groups.

This chapter draws heavily on business letters, which were documents that served a double purpose in their time; they were vehicles for conducting trade and were often

---

*Seventeenth-Century New England*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper and Row, Harper Torchbooks, 1966) 155; David Cressy, *Coming Over: Migration and Communication between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 204; and James Horn, *Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 61, 181.

[15] J. William Frost, *The Quaker Family in Colonial America: A Portrait of the Society of Friends* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973), 218.

[16] Ibid., 204.

[17] Frederick B. Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia, 1682-1763* (The University of North Carolina Press, 1948; Reprint, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1963), 91.

used to enclose health updates and pass along well wishes.[18] Nowhere was the mingling of business and personal correspondence more evident than in Isaac Norris's 1708 letter to his brother-in-law Thomas Lloyd. "Now to business"[19] was his segue marking a readiness to shift from family news and transition to commercial transactions. Business correspondence was an essential part of continuing commercial connections within the kin network.

To explore the roles of kinship networks in commercial activities the first section of the chapter looks at the obligations of kinship, which included reciprocity and a sense of duty in conducting transactions for kinfolk. A following section examines apprenticeship, which opened doors, and how kinship provided access to patronage. The next section looks at how kin networks conferred reputation and made referrals, a valuable protection against fraud and dishonest merchants operating sight unseen in the Atlantic market economy. Another section identifies the different commercial services provided by kin, including keeping family informed about up-to-date market prices, insurance premiums, and other news. A subsequent section considers financial support from kin networks. A further section investigates how networks helped establish and maintain trade connections. Women's involvement in commercial transactions is the subject of the next section. The last section analyzed how networks of kinship structured commercial partnerships.

[18] Frost, *The Quaker Family in Colonial America*, 73; and Grassby, *Kinship and Capitalism*, 303.
[19] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, [Philadelphia], September 5, 1708, Isaac Norris Letter Book, 1706-1709, vol. 7, pp. 180-182, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.

## The Obligations of Kinship

Cultural norms dictated the obligations of the kinship system.[20] Kin were supposed to be complaisant. Kin groups functioned as a primary agent in promoting the welfare of family members through a variety of mutually supportive activities. Cooperative activity, mutual aid, and favors were forms of social commerce that expanded functional relationships in the world of trade and bound kin together.

Relations assured close and distant kin alike of their duty in commercial transactions. Kinship and early modern business were both systems of relationships, in which individuals were bound to one another by ramifying ties. Networks of kin involvement complemented the long-distance commercial ties lacing together the Atlantic world. Kin assistance functioned as an agent promoting the welfare of its members and took many forms, including myriad services, and was motivated by a sense of affection and reciprocal obligation. Moreover, affiliations among kin and associations between kin in business worked to reinforce ideas about familial obligations and ties. In January 1727, a month after landing in Philadelphia, Samuel Powel (d. 1747) wrote his cousins Edward and Hannah Hopkins in England, expressing that because of "the Affection Shown me" while overseas, he had "more reason to Value & Love" them than "any other of our relations in Brittain[.]" In "Considera$^{tn}$ of your kindness," Powel insisted that "any Service I am capable of doing you or your ffr[ien]d$^{s}$ will give me much

[20] Grassby, *Kinship and Capitalism*; and idem, *The Business Community of Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). See also David Hancock, "'A Revolution in Trade': Wine Distribution and the Development of the Infrastructure of the Atlantic Market Economy, 1703-1807" in *The Early Modern Atlantic Economy*, ed. John J. McCusker and Kenneth Morgan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 122-23.

Satisfaction[.]"[21] Kin pledged a readiness to perform services on behalf of kindred. Powel concluded an April 1727 letter, "I Shall always be glad to hear of your welfare and that what I do for you is Agreeable[.]"[22]

A sense of kin obligations pervaded Joseph Growdon's 1694 letter to his "Cousen Brocklsby" in Barbados, who wrote asking for assistance collecting a bill and aiding his son Edward. Growdon helped his kindred because of strong urging from his father and because of the bonds of kinship. After receiving the letter, Growdon wrote back, "taking notice of their contents [I] shall to the utmost of my ability answer thy request therein as being thereunto firmly obliged as well by my ffathers injunction as allsoe by the naturall duty incumbent on me to serve my so dear & near relations[.]"[23] Growdon acknowledged the rights and duties that extended kindred could expect relatives to fulfill, kindly accommodating his kin's request.

In 1732, John Reynell declared to his kinsman that "I have hitherto taken all the care that has been in my power to make thee Remittances" that were "the most for thy Interest" and vowed to "continue doing the best I can for thee" in trade.[24] Michael Lee Dicker, in turn, wrote to John Reynell in 1733/4, "As I am the only Relation thou hast Capable of promoting thy Interest on this side the Water, I should for that Reason be willing to do something in the Philadelphia trade, if I can make it turn to any Acco.[t]" and

[21] Samuel Powel to Edward and Hannah Hopkins, Philadelphia, January 1, 1727, Samuel Powel Letter Books, 1727-1747, vol. 1: Letter Book, 1727-1739, p. 10, Powel Family Papers (collection no. 1582), HSP.
[22] Samuel Powel to Edward Hopkins, Philadelphia, April 5, 1727, Samuel Powel Letter Books, 1727-1747, vol. 1: Letter Book, 1727-1739, p. 20, Powel Family Papers (collection no. 1582), HSP.
[23] Joseph Growdon to "Cousen Brocklsby," September 25, 1694, Society Collection, HSP.
[24] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, March 9, 1732, John Reynell Letter Book, vol. 1, Sept. 1729-June 1734, Coates and Reynell Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.

accordingly prepared to ship an assortment of woven fabrics.[25] Mutual duties and interests overlapped, fostering mutual interaction among kin.

In the mid-eighteenth century, kinship functions included acting in behalf of members to their advantage. John Reynell assured his kinsman Michael Lee Dicker in 1735 that he was "very much Obliged to thee for the favours already receiv'd & hope Shall always do the best in my Power to Serve thee[.]"[26] In 1754, John Reynell unreservedly promised reciprocal exchange to his cousin Thomas Sanders, assuring he "Shalt take pleasure in keeping up a Correspondence with thee, & if it be in my power to tender thee any Service [I] shall be glad" and "ready to do it."[27] John Swift sold merchandise in Philadelphia that was supplied by his uncle John White in England. "You may assure your self that I shall do every thing in my Power for your Interest," Swift wrote in 1747 about his uncle's commercial enterprise, and also acknowledged "that I shall ever have a just sense of the obligations I am under to you" for all that his uncle had done and provided.[28] Reciprocity and mutuality between kin embodied the ideal of kin cooperation.

Jewish businessmen also brought a network of foreign trade connections to Philadelphia, second only to that of the Quakers. The Gratz brothers, migrants from Silesia, in central Europe, established a long-lasting business collaboration. The core of

[25] Michael Lee Dicker to John Reynell, Exeter, England, February 17, 1733/4, Series 1a: Incoming Correspondence, Box 1, Folder 10, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[26] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, September 15, 1735, John Reynell Letter Book, October 1734-March 1737, vol. 2, p. 19, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[27] John Reynell to [Thomas Sanders], Philadelphia, March 11, 1754, John Reynell Letter Book, December 1752-September 1754, vol. 8, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[28] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, November 15, 1747, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.

such relationships was a sense of kinship duty and obligation. Migrant Barnard Gratz wrote his cousin Solomon Henry in London in 1758, asking about his brother's voyage to India. Commenting on his brother Michael starting out in the mercantile business, Barnard assured his cousin in London, "I would assist him as far as is in my power as a brother."[29] Hyman Gratz, an older brother of Michael, wrote a letter of advice from Silesia. "You well know that I have been at all times both brother and father to you," pledging "I will continue, with the help of God, to promote your interests further."[30] Contributing to the advancement of kinfolk and acting in their interests was a salient feature in the web of kin obligations. Access to a kinship network made available the resources of a wide kin group. In 1748, when Joseph Swift entered an apprenticeship in England, his older sibling John Swift, then in Philadelphia, wrote offering brotherly advice and promising "if any thing y$^{t}$ I can say or do will any ways contribute to it, you may be assured that I shant be deficient in performing my part."[31]

In 1754, Charles and Thomas Willing approvingly noted their kinsman Charles Mayne's "Inclintation to bee Jointly Concerned with us in one or two Cargoes for the Lisbon Market." The father and son in Philadelphia affirmed, "We shall always be pleased to engage with You in any thing that may turn to our Mutual Advantage."[32] Samuel Preston Moore wrote to his father-in-law Dr. Richard Hill in 1758, updating him

[29] Barnard Gratz to Solomon Henry, Philadelphia, November 20, 1758, Etting Manuscripts (collection no. 193), HSP.
[30] Hyman Gratz to Michael Gratz, Tworog, Silesia, in *Merchants in Philadelphia, 1754-1798: Papers of Interest to their Posterity and their Posterity of their Associates*, ed. William Vincent Byars (Jefferson City, Mo.: Hugh Stephens Printing Co., 1916), 37.
[31] John Swift to Joseph Swift, [Philadelphia], October 11, 1748, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.
[32] Charles Willing and Thomas Willing to Charles Mayne, Philadelphia, September 14, 1754, Letter Book: Charles Willing and Son, June 15-November 30, 1754; Thomas Willing, November 30, 1754-May 1, 1757, Willing and Morris, May 1, 1757-February 6, 1761, p. 23, Am. 9320, HSP.

about five pipes of Madeira wine he sold and pledging "I shall make the most of these or any other thou mayst think proper to commit to my care, notwithstanding my other Business" affairs.[33]

In 1758, James Clifford of London sent a reply letter to his merchant kinsman Thomas Clifford in Pennsylvania, indicating that he "Layd out thy money" for a financial matter to his kin's "Best advantage as I could which I hope will prove to Satisfaction" and approval. James Clifford also enclosed a list for an order of dry goods "Bought of Sarah Livingston" worth over £16.[34] The relation and contact between the two branches of the family allowed for an informal association, with each side helping the other in commercial matters. Kinship did not have to produce a formal partnership but mutual obligations could be advantageous when one side was in need of assistance or help with various transactions.

Those experienced with the world of business provided advice out of a sense of duty, hoping to avert the potential financial ruin of kin. In 1768, merchant Thomas Clifford wrote his kinsman Edward Clifford "to explain the Nature & Circumstance of bills of Exchange" in trade. "I hope nothing I have wrote will be taken as though I had a Design to invite thee to be concerned in a trade to America, thats not my Design but to shew thee the Nature of it & then thou may judge & act as thou thinks proper I have nothing in Vein but for thy Information & should be glad to receive thy Answer with

[33] Dr. Samuel Preston Moore to Dr. Richard Hill, Philadelphia, June 7, 1758, in *PMHB* 14, no. 3 (October 1890): 326.
[34] James Clifford to Thomas Clifford, London, November 15, 1758, vol. 2, p. 108, Pemberton Family-Clifford Correspondence, collection no. 484A.

Acco[t] of my Relations" in Warwickshire.[35] Writing with an obligation to help, Clifford's intention was to preserve the welfare of his kinsman. Kin were willing to help for reasons of family affection and duty.

**Apprenticeships and Patronage**

Those beginning a career in trade made use of family to get started with apprenticeship training and introductions and tapped kin for clientage and start-up capital. Family was a crucial source of contacts, as "kinship networks readily translated into trading networks" and provided "readymade business connections" for aspiring merchants. New merchants found it difficult to borrow money outside of a kinship network.[36] Apprenticeship advanced the interests of kin by preparing young family members to enter overseas trade and establishing advantageous connections that could pay dividends for lifelong careers in trade. The system provided neophytes with much needed hands-on experience, presenting an opportunity to learn prices and other skills requisite for a successful mercantile career, as well as the chance to establish connections with other merchants. Most businessmen were trained outside the family, with friends and close business associates often serving as masters. Nevertheless, kin trained relatives as their apprentices, and this practice closed the Atlantic family circle.

Before settling in Philadelphia, James Claypoole considered sending his restless son, also named James, to his brother Edward Claypoole in Barbados for training. In July 1681, he explained, "My son James has more mind to be abroad than at home" in

[35] Thomas Clifford to Edward Clifford, Philadelphia, February 23, 1768, Thomas Clifford Letter Book, 1767-1773, Pemberton Family Papers—Clifford Correspondence, vol. 28, collection no. 484A, HSP.
[36] On this principle, see Jacob M. Price, *Capital and Credit in British Overseas Trade: The View from the Chesapeake, 1700-1776* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980), 50.

England "and thinks he shall do better with another than with me." The nearly seventeen-year-old son wrote with "a good hand" and did "very well" in arithmetic, and the father thought of sending the youth to his uncle in the West Indies. The father raised the idea to Edward, writing, "I have proposed to him to be with thee as a writer, etc., to which let me have thy answer, and upon what terms I may send him."[37] Young James Claypoole did not join his uncle but ultimately went with his family to Pennsylvania.

The kinship network provided mercantile training for younger members of the family group. John Reynell grew up in the city of Exeter; at the age of eighteen, he recalled, "my father sent me to Jamaica to live with a nephew of his, by the mother's side, to be a merchant" by occupation. Reynell was trained in mercantile business by Samuel Dicker, establishing long-lasting kin connections with this branch of the family.[38] Years later, in 1754, John Reynell offered to apprentice his nephew in England, so that "perhaps when thy Son grows up, & is fit for a compting [counting] House, thou wilt find more dificulty in parting with him than thou now Imagines, but there may be great alterations before that Time; However if it please God to preserve mine & the Boys Life 'till that Time, & I carry on Business, shall be much pleas'd to take him."[39] John Dickinson, son of Jonathan Dickinson, served his apprenticeship to Thomas Nyam, a kinsman in London.[40] In addition, Jonathan Dickinson apprenticed the boys of his

[37] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, London, July 13, 1681, in *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 41.
[38] John Reynell to Rev. W. H. Reynell, Philadelphia, March 5, 1769, in John Austin Stevens, et al, *The Magazine of American History with Notes and Queries*, vol. II (New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, 1878), 492.
[39] John Reynell to Mary Groth, Philadelphia, September 29, 1754, John Reynell Letter Book, September 1754-June 1756, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, vol. 9, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection 140), HSP.
[40] Jonathan Dickinson to Thomas Mayleigh, September 24, 1717, p. 152; and Jonathan Dickinson to John Asker, May 3, 1718, p.190, Dickinson Letter Book, 1715-1721, HSP.

brother-in-law, Isaac Gale.[41] Both John Reynell and Jonathan Dickinson were cosmopolitan businessmen, having made their ways through the Atlantic world to Philadelphia via Jamaica.

Patronage among the Philadelphia merchant community made positions available on the basis of family relationships, as was the case for Thomas Willing (1731-1821), who went into business with his father Charles Willing (1710-1754). Thomas Willing described the beginning of his mercantile career and the key role his father Charles Willing played in establishing his son. In the spring of 1749, Thomas Willing returned to Philadelphia from his overseas education, "where I served my Father in his counting house till his return from England in October 1751." It was "the execution of his business during his absence," the son recalled, when "I had given him so much satisfaction, that he took me into partnership with him."[42] The father and son business enterprise operated for several years, until Charles Willing's passing in late November 1754. Thomas Willing profited from the powerful connections and established reputation of his father's commercial house, enabling him, after his father's decease, to enter into business with Robert Morris and establish the firm of Willing, Morris, and Company, thereby founding one of the most successful partnerships in the colonial era. In 1763, at the age of twenty-one, Thomas Fisher (1741-1810) entered his father's merchant firm, Joshua Fisher and Sons, and traveled to Bristol, England to serve as a representative of

[41] Jonathan Dickinson to Isaac Gale, September 7, 1717; and Jonathan Dickinson to John Asker, May 3, 1718, Dickinson Letter Book, 1715-1721, HSP.
[42] Autobiography of Thomas Willing, Philadelphia, February 4, 1786, in *Willing Letters and Papers Edited with a Biographical Essay of Thomas Willing of Philadelphia (1731-1821)*, ed. Thomas Willing Balch (Philadelphia: Allen, Lane, and Scott, 1922), 123-124.

his father's business, corresponding with his brother Samuel about goods to be sent back to Philadelphia.[43]

Francis Hopkinson used claims of kinship in pursuit of patronage. In the eighteenth-century British empire, few men got anywhere without influential connections and overseas kin were used to secure coveted colonial posts. Nowhere was familial patronage more critical than for appointment and advancement in the bureaucracy of imperial government.[44] Ten years before signing the Declaration of Independence, Philadelphia-born Francis Hopkinson (1737-1791) used a 1766 trip to England to avail himself of James Johnson (1705-1774), his mother's first cousin and the Bishop of Worcester in the Church of England. Hopkinson tried to get a recommendation from his kinsman in a bid to be appointed one of the Commissioners of the Customs for North America, an office in the government's gift. Bishop Johnson—as a member of the Lords Spiritual—sat in the House of Lords by virtue of his ecclesiastical office and would have been well positioned in the government to aid Hopkinson.[45]

Hopkinson was welcomed by his English kin, staying for long lengths of time at Hartlebury Castle, the bishop's residence in Worcester. With the influence of his eminent relative, someone he had never met before, Hopkinson had every expectation "that this Voyage will produce some thing materially to my Advantage" and remained

[43] Thomas Fisher's activities can be traced in Series 4, vol. 8, Logan-Fisher-Fox Family Papers (collection no. 1960), HSP.
[44] On the English patronage system and the second-class status of Virginia colonials, see Carole Shammas, "English-Born and Creole Elites in Turn-of-the-Century Virginia," in *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society*, ed. Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1979), 274-296.
[45] The Church of England, as the established church of the nation, enjoyed special rights and privileges, including the allowance of a number of its bishops to sit in the House of Lords, the upper house of Parliament.

optimistic of his chances to obtain a colonial post with the help of his bishopric kin.[46] When in London in September 1766, Hopkinson wrote home to his mother in Philadelphia, indicating that his English kin "assured me that they only want to be informed in what way they shall exert their Interest in ^my Behalf."[47]

Four months later in January 1767, Bishop Johnson was to "soon make himself acquainted" with Thomas Penn (1702-1775), William Penn's son and colonial proprietor of Pennsylvania, to "strongly secure my Interest with him" about a position. His ambitions clearly hinged on his kin's sway.[48] Hopkinson received the bishop's assurances that he would "let no future Opportunity of being beneficial to me pass unnoticed: but will be allways ready to exert his Interest in my Behalf on any Vacancy that may happen worthy of my Acceptance[.]"[49] Hopkinson wrote of the "good-will in the Bishop," reiterating to his mother in April 1767 that he "has done every thing in his Power in my Behalf[.]" The encouraging news for Hopkinson was that "His Lordship," as he deferentially referred to his episcopal kin, "has indeed greatly strengthen'd my Interest with M.^r Penn; and laid a good Foundation for me with some of the Nobility, which may be of Service when Occasion offers" in the future.[50]

---

[46] Francis Hopkinson to Mary Hopkinson, London, September 22, 1766, Hopkinson Papers, vol. 2: Letters, 1736-1800, [pp. 82-83] HSP.
[47] Francis Hopkinson to Mary Hopkinson, London, September 23, 1766, Hopkinson Papers, vol. 2: Letters, 1736-1800, [pp. 85-87] HSP.
[48] Francis Hopkinson to Mary Hopkinson, London, January 24, 1767, Hopkinson Papers, vol. 2: Letters, 1736-1800, [pp. 88-90] HSP.
[49] Francis Hopkinson to Mary Hopkinson, London, February 21, 1767, Hopkinson Papers, vol. 2: Letters, 1736-1800, [pp. 98-100] HSP.
[50] Francis Hopkinson to Mary Hopkinson, London, April 20, 1767, Hopkinson Papers, vol. 2: Letters, 1736-1800, [pp. 104-106] HSP.

Female kin were also members of influential social circles and could recommend Hopkinson to further his standing. He recounted to his mother back in Philadelphia that "M.rs Johnson likewise waited on Lady Drake & Lady North (who are both distant Relations of your's) & urged every thing in my Favour that they might influence L[or].d North for me, which was also done; & his Lordship promised me all his Interest." The lobbying left an impression on proprietor Thomas Penn, who Hopkinson described, "assured me that not only in Consequence of these Applications but for the personal Regard he had for me & my Character he should be glad of an Opportunity to do me Service."

Bishop Johnson's position gave him access to officials connected with the government and empire, and when attending Parliament he used the means of patronage at his disposal to help his kinsman. On one occasion in the summer of 1767, Johnson "was summoned up to London to attend the House of Lords on particular Business: which gave him an Opportunity of doing every thing for me in his Power & he accordingly very kindly exerted himself; but to no Purpose" for Hopkinson. Yet, the bishop's earnest attempts had raised his profile among high-ranking people. Hopkinson reflected on his time with Bishop Johnson and how he had been "very affectionately & magnificently entertained by a very great & good Man, who has contracted such a Friendship for me that I doubt not will one Day show itself to my Advantage," and "by whose Means also I have established a very good Interest here not only with those who have much to say in the Disposition of the King's Favours, but with M.r Penn our own

Vice Roy."[51] Despite the fact that Hopkinson's pursuit of a colonial post ended in disappointment, his kinfolk left an indelible influence on him, and he was able to write of "tender Feelings for the Favours recieved."[52] Hopkinson's English relations dutifully served their kin's career interests. Such a case was certainly far from typical, but nevertheless accentuated the desire of kin to be of use and render help.

While kin solicited patronage from another kinsman, offers of patronage came from within the kinship network. John Reynell tried persuading his sister Mary Reynell Groth and her spouse Andreas Henry Groth to migrate in 1757 to Philadelphia. He wrote his sibling in England, "thy Husband I think was Educated a Merchant & Perhaps might do as well or better in that Station in America than in the Business he now followeth. Court favours are very uncertain & often long a Coming, but here he would be Sure of my help and Assistance."[53] Kinship underlay patronage ties.

**Reputation and Recommendation**

The early modern Atlantic economy was built on credit and reputation. Business relationships were based upon personal reputation and recommendation. Historian Sheryllynne Haggerty portrayed a common culture of trade that included a concern for risk, trust, and reputation. In particular, she emphasized, "networks themselves had to be trusted."[54] Historian Sarah Pearsall described a "man of credit" as one who was

[51] Francis Hopkinson to Mary Hopkinson, Hartlebury Castle, July 4, 1767, Hopkinson Papers, vol. 2: Letters, 1736-1800, [pp. 107-109] HSP.
[52] Francis Hopkinson to Mary Hopkinson, Hartlebury Castle, July 4, 1767, Hopkinson Papers, vol. 2: Letters, 1736-1800, [pp. 107-109] HSP.
[53] John Reynell to Mary Groth, Philadelphia, June 5, 1757, John Reynell Letter Book, July 1756-December 1759, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, vol. 10, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection 140), HSP.
[54] Sheryllyne Haggerty, *The British-Atlantic Trading Community, 1760-1810: Men, Women, and the Distribution of Goods* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers, 2006), 113.

trustworthy, respectable, and capable of paying back his loans. A man's credit in society represented his reputation.[55] Hence, in 1743 when William Logan entered mercantile affairs he aimed "to Deport my Self in Such a Manner as to recommend my Self " to others.[56] Trust was at the core of business dealings and a cornerstone in the formation of new associations, and commercial transactions were predicated upon familiarity with a businessman's character and creditworthiness.[57] In this regard, the benefits of family support included referrals and access to client bases, which helped new entrants into the Atlantic's commercial world cultivate contacts and develop confidence among members of the business community. Not surprisingly, then, young merchants embarking upon their career often turned to kindred for help forging personal relationships and launching their enterprises.

In an environment marked by reputation, a surname could place some at a distinct advantage. A recognized family name that was held in regard and known to be in good standing carried weight in the personal business of trade, and the commercial success of some families rested upon the foundation of good reputation laid by predecessors. Thomas Willing (1731-1821), for instance, attributed the family's solid footing in commerce to his father, migrant Charles Willing (1710-1754), who was born in Bristol, England, and descended from a long line of merchants. Thomas Willing (1679-1760) first visited Philadelphia in 1720 with his younger brother Richard (1681-1736), returning

[55] Sarah M. S. Pearsall, *Atlantic Families: Lives and Letters in the Later Eighteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), chaps. 4 and 5.
[56] William Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, June 7, 1743, Box 2, Folder 1, Logan-Fisher-Fox Family Papers (collection no. 1960), HSP.
[57] Grassby, *Kinship and Capitalism*, 300; and Mathias, "Risk, Credit and Kinship in Early Modern Enterprise," in *The Early Modern Atlantic Economy*, 24.

in 1728 with his then eighteen-year-old son Charles and a cousin. Charles took over the merchant house founded by his brother Thomas. In November 1730, after setting up the two in business, the elder Thomas returned to Bristol, England. "By his own good conduct, and the consequent esteem of his fellow citizens," Thomas Willing wrote of his father Charles, "he has given us a letter of extensive credit, to which I have found due honour in every part of the mercantile world—He has paved the way for a favourable reception to us all."[58] Charles Willing helped establish the family's good name in commercial circles and his groundwork benefited later generations that, in turn, built upon the migrant's reputable name, which continued to have widespread currency. The family name, then, helped make possible long-term success in business.

James Pemberton's birthright also bestowed a well-respected name in the commercial world of the Atlantic. In 1745, Philadelphia Quaker merchant John Reynell advised George Laurence, a Madeira wine merchant, that James Pemberton (1723-1809) was "a young Man just going Into Trade, and Perhaps it may be worth while to Endeavour to Please him, not only on his own, but on his fathers and Brothers Account."[59] James Pemberton was born into of one of the Delaware Valley's most prominent religious and mercantile families, benefiting from the reputations of his father Israel Pemberton, Sr. (1685-1754) and older brother Israel Pemberton, Jr. (1715-1779).

Business was conducted through connection, and the most important task for any new businessman was assembling a client base and expanding a network of business

[58] Autobiography of Thomas Willing, Philadelphia, February 4, 1786, in *Willing Letters and Papers*, 123.
[59] John Reynell to George Laurence, Philadelphia, May 29, 1745, Reynell Letter Book, May 1744-October 1745, vol. 6, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection 140), HSP.

associates.[60] Recommendation was an area where family could perform a valuable service in favor of its members. In 1745, as Thomas Willing, Jr. embarked upon a career in commerce, he sought help from his respected and well-known brother Charles Willing, established in Philadelphia. "You are certainly sensible of what infinite consequence a good Introduction is to a Man's setting out in the World," Thomas wrote from Bristol, England. He pleaded a sense of brotherly duty, "I know y.$^{r}$ heart too well to fear you will neglect any Opportunity of serveing me." Thomas Willing, Jr. wrote to "intreat" his brother "to press y.$^{r}$ Freinds & acquaintance[s] in Philad$^{a}$ as warmly as possible on my Behalf," specifying that "anyy Consignments to me" were to be "singly" to himself.[61] He was certainly not about to share his brother's influence and procurements with anybody else; they were to be to his sole benefit.

Thomas Willing, Jr. contemplated trying "to get into a House at Lisbon" because there was "no Bristol Man there" at that time in the Iberian port city. Believing the "Plantation Trade" in Bristol was "monstrously bad," Thomas thought that in Lisbon "a Man has an opening to many Parts of the World, & supplies of all Kinds will always be wanting there." He also made plans "in Case no Market should then offer at Lisbon," asking his brother in Philadelphia to "press y.$^{r}$ Freinds to give me a Line with assurances of their Business there, the more of these the better," and even thought "if it could be done I shall be heartily glad if you can get three or four Lines from the Governor, which may be of very great service to me there as a Confirmation of my haveing a good

[60] Grassby, *Kinship and Capitalism*, 302.
[61] Thomas Willing, junr. to Charles Willing, Bristol, July 8, 1745, Letters & Papers of William Penn, Vol. 1, p. 82, Ferdinand J. Dreer Collection (collection no. 176), HSP.

Interest" on the British North American mainland. The younger brother in Bristol, furthermore, wanted "a List of what Gentlemen you know in N[ew]York or Boston, that I may make them offers of Service[.]" Knowing that "Great Quantiteis of Fish" were "sent from Boston & N[ew]F[ound] Land to Lisbon," he thought "that it will be worth while" for his older brother Charles "to push all opportunities of Correspondence there, and for that End I beg you will write to your Freinds there upon that Head, as will [well] as any other Ports especially S$^{o[uth]}$Carolina." Thomas Willing, Jr. would "rather be dead than unactive," and with his brother's aid was "determined to push as boldly as I can to settle upon a good footing soon." An integral part of that "push" included capitalizing on his brother's recommendation and contacts.[62]

Dr. William Logan used his good name to assist his nephew William Logan in Philadelphia. The younger William Logan wrote his uncle in 1743, for he was "Very much Obiged to thee for thy Diligence in the Affair of getting me Consignmts. which I know very well many are backward in grant.$^{g}$ unless they are sufficintly acquainted with the persons Character" before entering business relationships.[63]

Kinfolk wrote referrals directly to correspondents on behalf of their relatives. In this way, family provided access to contacts and prospective clients. Hannah Penn wrote from Bristol, England in 1704, introducing James Logan, a close friend and ally to the Penn family, to Samuel Hollester, her "kinsmans son," who completed his apprenticeship. Having "serv'd his time" with a master, Penn explained that Hollester

[62] Thomas Willing, junr. to Charles Willing, Bristol, England, July 8, 1745, Ferdinand J. Dreer Collection (collection no. 176), Letters & Papers of William Penn, Vol. 1, p. 82, HSP.
[63] William Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, June 7, 1743, Box 2, Folder 1, Logan-Fisher-Fox Family Papers (collection no. 1960), HSP.

left England because "his Indifferency to his trade, his small stock [capital], & dulness of the times, discourages his following that, & Incourages his Inclination to Travill." She admitted, "I know not what he can, or will sum to, but if it Lye in thy way to advise him for his advantage w[i]thout being Burdensom[e] or Troublsom[e], to thee I shall take it kindly."[64]

In 1749, Thomas Navasor recommended his brother who was in the Delaware Valley on a business venture. From London, Navasor wrote William Trent that the "Bearer of this Letter is my Brother and has never [be]en in America or Indeed much us'd to Trade w[h]ich makes me Request the favour of you to Lead h[im] a Little in your Leisure howers into the Custo [hole] d in Philad.a and Likewise to Recommend [him to] Persons that may want any thing he has got to [sell]—This Little Venture he has with him no[w] [is] [de]sign'd as an Introduction to him in Busin[ess][.]" Navasor concluded with a request, "pray Sir do him what Service you [can and] Direct him"; help which Navasor "shall allways Acqknowl[edge]" and promised to reciprocate when in his power.[65]

English Quaker Samuel Fothergill wrote members of the influential Pemberton family in 1759, on behalf of a William Evans, who was "a relation to me and served mee faithfully seven years as an apprentice" and "requested of me a few lines of recomendation which might intitle him to the notice of some Friends in the mercantile way: a request I can freely comply with." Fothergill indicated that Evans, after his apprenticeship, settled for "several years" as a factor in Jamaica, assuring the Pemberton

[64] Hannah Penn to James Logan, Bristol, England, October 5, 1704, Logan Papers, vol. 1, p. 53, HSP.
[65] Thomas Navasor to William Trent, London, October 9, 1749, Cadwalader Collection, Series IV: George Croghan Papers, Box 6, Item 17, HSP. The document was badly damaged and had a long hole running down the center of the sheet.

brothers that "those who knew him there and those on this side [of] the water who employ'd him" found he "conducted himself with skill, aplication & fidelity" in his business dealings. "If any of you or your acquaintance would make trial of him," Fothergill believed that "you would not have any occasion to repent it[.]" As Evans's expanding "concerns in trade may draw him to Philadelphia and some other places in N[orth] America," he relied on his kinsman for contacts and "any asistance in extending his business."[66]

In 1768, Josiah Wedgwood used a mutual friend, Dr. John Fothergill, an English Quaker medical doctor, to introduce a young kinsman to Thomas Fisher. Dr. Fothergill, Wedgwood explained, "has permitted me to make use of his name . . . in recommending the bearer, my Nephew to your notice, and protection." Wedgwood, furthermore, requested that "if he shou'd be inclined to settle in your province, if you wou'd be so kind to assist him in procuring a tollerable situation, it will greatly add to the obligations you lay me under . . . ."[67]

In 1748, John Swift wrote his uncle John White in England on behalf of Abraham Claypoole, who was "just entering into business," calling upon his relative to make a connection for the neophyte trader with David Barclay, a Quaker merchant in London. Claypoole, Swift explained to his uncle, "is a Stranger to M$^{r}$ Barclay both as to Character & Circumstances," and promised considerable business because Claypoole "proposes to trade pretty considerably so that it will be worth M$^{r}$ Barclays while to use him well now

[66] Samuel Fothergill to Israel, James, and John Pemberton, Warrington, January 25, 1759, Pemberton Papers, vol. 34, p. 86, HSP.
[67] Josiah Wedgwood to Thomas Fisher, Burslem, Staffordshire, England, June 28, 1768, Box 1, Folder 24, Logan-Fisher-Fox Family Papers (collection no. 1960), HSP.

in order to encourage a future Correspondence." Swift acknowledged that he would "take it as a particular favour" that his uncle would "acquaint" Barclay with Claypoole.[68]

Relatives took license to ask overseas kinfolk to assist acquaintances and associates. Thomas Clifford (b. 1722), who rose from a middling family to prominence as a Philadelphia merchant, received a 1769 letter from Edward Clifford, a kinsman in Warwick, England. In his letter, Edward Clifford expressed his "regard" for a "Mr. Hiron Jun[io]$^{r}$," the carrier who delivered their exchanges, indicating that he "shall esteem it as a Favour done to my self if you will please to serve him with y[ou]$^{r}$ Direction and Advice in any matters relating to his Buisness in America where he may need y[ou]$^{r}$ Assistance[.]"[69] In turn, merchants also extended promises to help their kin's contacts. In 1754, Philadelphia Charles and Thomas Willing assured their kinsman Charles Mayne that they "shall be glad to serve" anyone "you should recommend to our Notice."[70]

Atlantic-wide networks were a result of contacts, and kin were able to help establish contacts by making recommendations and introductions. Jonathan Dickinson conducted considerable business with his brother-in-law Isaac Gale over many years.[71] Dickinson acted as mediator between his kin in Jamaica and members of the Philadelphia mercantile community. Thus, kin contacts led to the progressive expansion of correspondents.

---

[68] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, June 20, 1748, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.
[69] Edward Clifford to Thomas Clifford, February 16, 1769, Warwick, England, Clifford-Pemberton Papers, vol. 5, p. 108, HSP.
[70] Charles Willing and Thomas Willing to Charles Mayne, Philadelphia, September 14, 1754, Letter Book: Charles Willing and Son, June 15-November 30, 1754; Thomas Willing, November 30, 1754-May 1, 1757, Willing and Morris, May 1, 1757-February 6, 1761, p. 23, Am. 9320, HSP.
[71] See for instance, Jonathan Dickinson to Isaac Gale, Philadelphia, April 24, 1701, Letterbook of Jonathan Dickinson, 1698-1701, Maria Dickinson Logan Collection (collection no. 382), HSP.

Established businessmen wrote letters of introduction and recommendation on behalf of their kindred, vouching for young relatives entering the trade and promoting their reputation within the business community. Influential kin connections, with presumed trustworthiness and reliability, were needed as endorsements and to make contacts in the mercantile community. Kinship networks helped multiply the people an individual might meet from other social networks traversing the Atlantic.

**Commercial Services: Market Information, News, and Insurance**

Among the advantages provided by kin was the performance of various commercial services necessary to conducting business and remaining competitive. Family members fulfilled a multitude of duties and served the interests of their kindred by passing along information on various matters. The ability to obtain the latest news about war or harvests and the most up-to-date reports on market conditions and prices or insurance rates was vital to Atlantic commercial enterprises. In addition to the circulation of commercial news available to merchants through the talk at colonial coffee houses and other public places, traders looked toward overseas members of the kin network as a source for reliable information. Having contact with kin across the ocean ensured sound business decisions based upon the best available commodity prices, insurance rates, freightage, and news.

James Claypoole had planned to bring about £700 worth of goods across the Atlantic to start his Philadelphia business, but what he shipped cannot be traced in the London Port Books for 1683.[72] James Claypoole wrote his brother Norton Claypoole

[72] Marion Balderston, "Pennsylvania's 1683 Ships and Some of their Passengers," *The Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine* 24 (1964): 90-92.

residing at New Castle on the Delaware. In October 1681, he sought advice about what goods were most advantageous to bring over. Claypoole requested that his brother, already settled in the Delaware Valley, "write at large" about "what commodities is most proper and profitable to carry" to the colony and "what sorts of trade is not amongst them, and like to be as the people increase." He was interested in finding out the most marketable items to transport, reiterating the point to his brother, "especially give me advice on merchandise, what quantities and what sorts are most vendable, and what returns may be expected."[73] Claypoole's inquiry to his brother was also very much concerned with making business plans and learning what products were likely to do well in resale. Soon after arriving in Philadelphia in 1683, James Claypoole contacted his brother Edward Claypoole on Barbados, requesting, "send me some rum and molasses which are now in great demand" in colonial city. He offered to "dispose of it for thee and send the produce either in bills for England or silver or oil, or some other way which yet we know not."[74] The kin network took advantage of promising market conditions.

Kin directives instructed overseas relatives what to ship and what would sell. In April 1727, Samuel Powel wrote his kinsman Edward Hopkins in England about some of his cousin's goods he had on hand in Philadelphia, describing particular items that were difficult to sell. He offered commercial advice to his cousin, discouraging Hopkins from sending more mohair and pewter buttons and needles for sale, recommending that "if thee has a mind to send anything more this way I would advise" shipping nails, shalloon [a

[73] "James Claypoole to Norton Claypoole, London, October 28, 1681, in *James Claypoole's Letter Book: London and Philadelphia, 1681-1684*, ed. Marion Balderston (San Marino, Calif.: The Huntington Library, 1967), 69.
[74] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, Philadelphia, December 2, 1683, *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 223.

lightweight wool or worsted twill fabric], and other fabric types in specific colors. Powel did not "write this because I want business," but was looking out for his cousin's choices of goods, "because If thee hast a mind to ship this way thee may send som[e]thing thats likely to turn to better Account then what thee has formerly sent[.]"[75]

John Reynell informed his kinsman about Atlantic markets, noting in March 1732 that the market at Antigua "is so bad that it won't do to ship any thing there on thy acco.[tt]."[76] In 1730, John Reynell explained a downturn in Philadelphia's market. "Trade is at present very dull & I am afraid it will Continue so all this Sumer" because "y[e] Small Pox is among us & proves very Mortall," he wrote. "People in y[e] Country are so afraid" of the disease, Reynell described, that "they won't Come to Town to buy things w:[ch] makes y[e] Shopkeepers buy but little Goods" in the city.[77] In September 1735, John Reynell reported on "poor Sales" in Philadelphia to his kinsman. "Times are very dull here at present Goods Sell very Slow," he wrote Michael Lee Dicker, and anticipated that the sluggish market might "discourage People from Shiping much next Year." To have the advantage, Reynell advised sending merchandise by the first available vessel if they were to reach Philadelphia at the most favorable time. If Dicker sent taffeta [thin glossy silk] "in the Spring," Reynell recommended, "let 'em not be Ordinary Ones" if they were to sell in the city. He believed his kinsman "could not have Send worse Colours" that were unmarketable; to help his kinsman better understand what kind of colors and

[75] Samuel Powel to Edward Hopkins, Philadelphia, April 5, 1727, Samuel Powel Letter Books, 1727-1747, vol. 1: Letter Book, 1727-1739, p. 20, Powel Family Papers (collection no. 1582), HSP.
[76] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, March 9, 1732, John Reynell Letter Book, vol. 1, Sept. 1729-June 1734, Coates and Reynell Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[77] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, March 10, 1730, John Reynell Letter Book, vol. 1, p. 18, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.

patterns would be suitable for sale Reynell enclosed a sample pattern. Kin served as agents, providing overseas relatives with valuable information about the saleability of different articles that could be readily sold across the Atlantic in Philadelphia.

Through kinship connection, merchants sending goods to Philadelphia learned about market conditions and forecasts in the city. Reynell provided Michael Lee Dicker with first-hand knowledge about the sale of goods in Philadelphia. For instance, Reynell was able to explain why his kinsman's stock of sugar was not selling quickly in Philadelphia. In March 1730, Reynell informed his kin that it was due to "a very large quantity brought in from London last fall w:$^{ch}$ has quite Glutted the Market" in Philadelphia. [78] In June 1731, Reynell also noted the impact made by migrant tradesmen on the local market. "We have had Sugars lately made here by a Couple of Irish Sugar Bakers," he explained. As a contact for information, Reynell was able to discuss why a commodity was unprofitable.[79] At the same time, Reynell turned to his kindred for information about overseas market forecasts. "I Desire thou will keep me well Advised of your Markets & not only tell me the prices of Goods but also give me thy Opinion concerning its rising or falling for on Sitting the Market very much depend y$^{e}$ Profit of your Trade[.]"[80]

John Swift's arrangement with his uncle, selling goods on consignment in Philadelphia, revealed one way that a kin network lent itself to overseas business

[78] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, March 10, 1730, John Reynell Letter Book, vol. 1, p. 17, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[79] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, June 19, 1731, John Reynell Letter Book, vol. 1, p. 24, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[80] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, November 15, 1730, John Reynell Letter Book, vol. 1, p. 10, Series 1b. Outgoing Correspondence, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.

association. Kin relayed market information to obtain and ship the most appropriate, in-demand, and best quality goods for the Philadelphia market. John Swift kept his uncle John White apprised with descriptions about the quality of merchandise. He discussed "the unsaleableness of many articles in the Cargo" his uncle sent to Philadelphia. Swift cataloged the undesirable goods "that you may know the reason that they remain so long on hand." The nephew maintained "I have done the best I could." Swift advised his uncle John White about items that did not do that well, such as osnaburgs, a coarse linen cloth, was "some of the worst that ever was seen," so that a customer "would not take it at any price" because they were "as thin as a Cobweb" and "they dont look well neither[.]" He reported back to his uncle in England that "I have had complaints" about the merchandise and "have lost more reputation by it than little," and planned on sending the remaining supply to public auction, "where perhaps it may not meet with so nice an inspection before its pay'd for as it does when I sell it."[81]

Swift openly corresponded with his uncle John White about the shipments he received, seeking quality goods at a reasonable price that were likely to be bought up in Philadelphia. In October 1748, Swift "could not get any body to take" an entire parcel of tea cups and saucers, indicating the problem "was because the Town was filled with China from Holland which came just at the time yours did" and that merchandise was "as good as yours." Swift also indicated that "spice will be but a poor article," because cinnamon was "brought in great quantities" from the Caribbean island of Curaçao. To help his uncle make appropriate purchases for the demands of the Philadelphia buyers, "I

[81] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, July 26, 1748, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.

have sent you a list of some goods that I imagine will Answer as well as any that can be sent for" from England. Swift ultimately "left it to you to do as you thought proper in regard to sending more" merchandise, only adding, "pray buy them cheap" whenever possible.[82] With his nephew's input, John White was better able to supply Philadelphia with goods and wares that were most marketable. Swift offered feedback on the goods he received to help guide his uncle's decisions. Toward the end of October 1749, Swift confirmed the arrival of his uncle's latest shipment. After opening and examining the goods for color and quality, he detailed, "I made the following observations on them, which I mention to you for your future government" in purchasing.[83]

The timing of shipments was also crucial for sales in a commercial market. Swift wrote so that his uncle would be able to bring products to the Philadelphia market faster than competitors. In May 1747, Swift arrived in Philadelphia late in the sales season and regretted the limited opportunity of selling his uncle's goods, believing that "if I had happen'd to have got in last fall two months sooner than I did I should have sold the greatest part of the Cargo very soon, but being so late, people had supplyed themselfes[.]"[84] In his letters, Swift regularly emphasized to his uncle the difficulty of selling out-of-season goods. It was crucial for the commercial success of such enterprises that goods arrived in time for a particular season. Goods intended for the spring season were shipped in the new year to reach America in February and March. To arrive by the

[82] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, October, 1748, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.
[83] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, October 25, 1749, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.
[84] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, May 30, 1747, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.

end of September, autumn goods needed to be sent out in June and July. By the end of October 1749, for instance, Swift had "already sent you a list of Goods for a Spring Cargo" and continued making further additions.[85] A reliable supply of merchandise on time "would have made a very considerable difference in the Sale."[86] In early October 1749, Swift expected the next arrival of goods, "because the Season is now come for the Sale of a Fall Cargo, & people are every day supply[g] themselves with Goods for the Season," reiterating to his uncle that "its a very great advantage to have them in the first Vessel, either in the spring or fall" season.[87] From early on Swift recognized and regularly pointed out the necessity of receiving in scheduled goods "Suitable"[88] to the season of the year.

It was essential for merchants to know the prices of merchandise at different markets, and a price current was a prevalent feature of business correspondence. At the end of a 1681 letter James Claypoole enclosed "a price Curr[en].[t]" for his brother Edward in Barbados.[89] Months later in the same year he added the market prices for commodities that were selling well, including white and yellow cotton and white ginger, which when scraped went for 35s per bag or 20s per bag when scalded.[90] In 1699, Isaac Norris wrote Thomas Lloyd, his brother-in-law in London, "I wish y.[u] [thou] would

[85] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, October 25, 1749, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.
[86] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, June 1, 1749, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.
[87] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, October 1, 1749, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.
[88] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, May 30, 1747, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.
[89] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, London, August 15, 1681, James Claypoole Letter Book, 1681-83, p. 67, Am .045, collection nos. 108 and 133, HSP.
[90] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, London, December 16, 1681, in *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 79.

advise me prises of Furrs or Send a price Current often If one may Depend on them and send me what Duty there Is on Drest skins[.]"[91] Norris turned to his brother-in-law as a source to learn and stay informed about the going rates in the valuable market for North American furs and skins. Ten years later, in 1709, as a joint enterprise between brothers-in-law Isaac Norris, Richard Hill, and Samuel Preston moved forward—to ship wheat and flour to Lisbon on the Iberian peninsula—Norris wrote their brother-in-law Thomas Lloyd in London about European cereal prices. With sizeable sums of money invested in the venture, Norris constantly reminded Lloyd to be more consistent with updated market prices. He petitioned to be advised about "the price of wheat In England & Portugall constantly as Itt shall after this may be of great Importance" determining the profit margin.[92] Obliging family members regularly enclosed the latest prices for a variety of goods in their written correspondence. In 1745, Thomas Willing, Jr. indicated that with a letter to his sibling in Philadelphia, "Inclosed you have Price Curr[en]t, at our Market" in Bristol, England. Underneath his signature, were listed the prices for an assortment of goods, including the "Best" and "Second Sorts" of "White French Sugars," "Jamaica Sugars," "Lew.[d] Island [sugar]," "Muscovadoes [sugar]," as well as "Tortoishell," indigo, cotton, "New" and "Old Rice," and "Pitch & Tarr."[93]

Prices, of course, fluctuated with market conditions. Family members helped keep their relatives apprised of events that affected prices and forewarned kin about

[91] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, Philadelphia, June "12 or 13th," 1699, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 5, 1699-1702, p. 9, Norris Family, Papers, collection no. 454, HSP.
[92] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, Philadelphia, September 26, 1709, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 7½, p. 83, Norris Family, Papers, (collection no. 454), HSP.
[93] Thomas Willing, junr. to Charles Willing, Bristol, July 8, 1745, Ferdinand J. Dreer Collection, (collection no. 176), Letters & Papers of William Penn, Vol. 1, p. 82, HSP.

fluctuating rates of supply and demand. For instance, in July 1745, Thomas Willing, Jr. wrote his brother Charles in Philadelphia about the situation of European markets. "I hope you [d]on't send any Wheat to Ireland such Vast Quantiteis [sic] are pouring in there," Thomas explained from Bristol, England, "that in a short time the Markets will be very low."[94] Timely notification could help relations involved in commercial activities make the best decisions for shipment. A little over a month later in August 1745, Thomas gave notice that the price of wheat "got up to 420 reis & rising," which he explained was "on account of the bad Harvest" that occurred "all over Spain" and the lack of rain in England. Thomas Willing reported to his brother in Philadelphia that "never was known [such] shocking Harvest weather, so that Corn will rise very much." He concluded by advising, "You may depend on it Portugal can be supplyed from America only."[95] Such information about scarcity-heightened prices helped Charles Willing plan for cargoes that would bring in the largest return. Years later the Willings of Philadelphia continued to received updates from overseas relatives. In 1754, Charles and Thomas Willing, father and son, thanked their kinsman in England for information about "y[ou]$^{r}$ having a prospect of a plentifull Crop next Year."[96]

Beyond weather and harvest yields, other geopolitical events influenced the market. In 1755, Thomas Willing, son of Charles Willing, wrote his uncle Thomas

[94] Thomas Willing, junr. to Charles Willing, Bristol, July 8, 1745, Ferdinand J. Dreer Collection, (collection no. 176), Letters & Papers of William Penn, Vol. 1, p. 82, HSP.
[95] Thomas Willing, junr. to Charles Willing, Bristol, August 19, 1745, Ferdinand J. Dreer Collection, (collection no. 176), Letters & Papers of William Penn, Vol. 1, p. 82, HSP. [Second letter written underneath the end of the first letter; letters on sheet of paper folded into a booklet]
[96] Charles Willing and Thomas Willing to Charles Mayne, Philadelphia, September 14, 1754, Letter Book: Charles Willing and Son, June 15-November 30, 1754; Thomas Willing, November 30, 1754-May 1, 1757, Willing and Morris, May 1, 1757-February 6, 1761, p. 23, Am. 9320, HSP.

Willing in England, in which the Philadelphia-based merchant described "Letters in Town Via Lisbon & Virginia" that mentioned "the taking of Madrass," a city in southeastern India on the coast of the Bay of Bengal that was captured by the French in 1746 and returned to Britain in 1748, and "the Apprehensions of a War," which "set some folks on Buying up all the Tea & Loaf Sugar in Town, befor[e] twas Publick" news. Willing expressed disappointment that his uncle had not given him notice of such events, writing, "I wish you had advis'd me of it, as 'twou'd have prevented me from selling, tho[ugh] Perhaps not have induced me to risque a purchase." He also asked that "in future make Use of Mess: Mayne Burn & Mayne's house," a kindred's firm, "as a Convey.[a[nce]] in Case of any thing material & in y.[r] next Quote the Price of Tea, & y.[r] opinion of the Effect the taking of Madrass may have."[97]

Merchants could also put kindred in contact with reliable businessmen who could provide market updates from other port cities. Charles and Thomas Willing recommended their kinsman to Paul Richards, "Our Friend in N[ew]york . . . whom we know to be a Man of Fortune & of Strict honour & we believe as Capable to serve you as any there." The father and son in Philadelphia were to correspond with their associate in New York city for a prompt response, promising, "We shall desire him to advise y.[o[u]] by the 1st Convey.[a[nce]] the Occurences of the Market." The Willings took the opportunity

[97] Thomas Willing to Thomas Willing (of London), Philadelphia, April 5, 1755, Letter Book: Charles Willing and Son, June 15-November 30, 1754; Thomas Willing, November 30, 1754-May 1, 1757; Willing and Morris, May 1, 1757-February 6, 1761, pp. 82-83, Am .9320, HSP. For an overview of European and British commercial dealings with Asia in the eighteenth century, see P. J. Marshall, "The British in Asia: Trade to Dominion, 1700-1765," in *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Eighteenth Century*, vol. II, ed. P. J. Marshall (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1998),

to indicate that the New York market "as well as ours are at present very high for the produce of their own & are reverse for all those of others."[98]

Given the inherent risks involved in long-distance seaborne trade, insurance was essential to protect against misfortune and an entire loss. In 1744, Charles Willing's father helped him get the best possible maritime insurance rates.[99] Over a decade later, Thomas Willing wrote his father's brother, or "Dear Nunk" as he referred to his uncle Thomas Willing, Jr., in Bristol, England, to "desire you'l[l] advise me Premiums of Insurance from hence to England Lisbon & the West Indies; & the Price of Logwood Navall Stores, Sugars & Rum with you."[100]

Reliably handling financial transactions was another way family functioned as a trusted guardian of their kin's interests. For instance, merchant James Claypoole wrote his brother Edward in 1681, "I take notice of several bills thou hast drawn on me for £260, which shall all be accepted and punctually paid . . . ."[101] Bills of exchange, also referred to as drafts, were commonly run through family members; these were written orders issued by a person directing the recipient to pay a specified sum of money to a third party; they basically acted as a check or promissory note, entitling an exporter to

[98] Charles Willing and Thomas Willing to Charles Mayne, Philadelphia, September 14, 1754, Letter Book: Charles Willing and Son, June 15-November 30, 1754; Thomas Willing, November 30, 1754-May 1, 1757, Willing and Morris, May 1, 1757-February 6, 1761, p. 23, Am. 9320, HSP.
[99] Thomas Willing to Charles Willing, Bristol, England, May 31, 1744, Wallace Papers (collection no. 686), vol. 4, p. 146, HSP. This letter was also reprinted in *Letters and Papers Relating to the Willing Family*, 11.
[100] Thomas Willing to Thomas Willing [of London], Philadelphia, June 15, 1756, Letter Book: Charles Willing and Son, June 15-November 30, 1754; Thomas Willing, November 30, 1754-May 1, 1757; Willing and Morris, May 1, 1757-February 6, 1761, pp. 199-201, Am. 9320, HSP.
[101] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, London, August 15, 1681, in *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 50.

receive immediate payment in the local currency for goods that would be shipped elsewhere.

Services performed by kin also included monetary help and legal arrangements. In times of economic difficulties, family members buoyed their loved ones, ideally, loaning money on good terms to those in duress. "As to the Money I lent you, am glad it has been of service to you," Philadelphia merchant John Reynell wrote his sister Mary Reynell Groth in England. Reynell was pleased that his assistance helped, and was lenient when it came to repayment, insisting, "when it suites you to pay it without streightning yourselves you may . . . but as for Interest I'll not have any, neither do I want you to Hurry yourselves in the Payment of the Principal faster than you can w[i]th conveniency & Ease."[102] Granting powers of attorney, a legal instrument authorizing one to act as another's attorney or agent, was entrusted to family members. Joseph Growdon named his father Lawrence Growdon in a 1683 power of attorney.[103] When Isaac Norris left Great Britain in 1708 to return to Philadelphia, he made a power of attorney for his brother-in-law Thomas Lloyd of London. Norris detailed, "I have Left among my papers in thy hands (of w$^{ch}$ herew:$^{th}$ Comes a List) a Power of attorney in w$^{ch}$ because ~~of~~ my Engagem.$^{ts}$ are Large on this Side, & to provide ag[ain]$^{st}$ Mortallity[.]" Norris hoped "there may be no Occasion to us it," but nevertheless took such a legal measure to protect his business interests in England because in "some unforseen Case [you] may want it &

[102] John Reynell to Mary Groth, Philadelphia, November 10, 1753, John Reynell Letter Book, December 1752-September 1754, vol. 8, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection 140), HSP.
[103] Joseph Growdon, Power of Attorney to his Father, Lawrence Growdon, August 30, 1683, Society Collection: Growdon Family, Letters, etc., 1682-1747, HSP.

therefore I Leave it[.]"[104] In other instances, family members were charged with delivering documents such as a power of attorney. A 1765 newspaper announcement gave "Notice to Peter Wiley, who left Balymenough, in this County of Antrim, in Ireland, and has been in this Country two Years, that his Wife, and John McIlroy and his Wife, are come in, and have brought the Power of Attorney he wrote for." The new arrivals were "living in West Nottingham, Chester County," and waiting to hear from Wiley to deliver the document.[105]

Kin merchants asked family for their input on major business, financial, and personal decisions. Concerned about an attack in November 1755 by the French and Indians, Thomas Willing indicated to his uncle Thomas Willing in London that "if I could Close my Affairs in any tollerable man[n]er I would move off all the Family to England directly," but felt he could not leave so abruptly. Willing could scale down his business dealings, though, and informed his uncle that "I'le order no more goods from England, & will Remitt a sum of Money to be laid out in the Bank, or some stock, by way of precaution," asking, "on this write me your advice."[106] Kin acted as trusted sources providing reliable business information and knowledge of commercial markets. Kin networks channeled the provision and receipt of reliable information, influencing commercial decision making and shipments to local markets.

---

[104] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, Portsmouth, England, May 10, 1708, Isaac Norris Letter Book, 1706-1709, vol. 7, p. 167, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.
[105] *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 26, 1765.
[106] Thomas Willing to Thomas Willing, Philadelphia, November 22, 1755, Letter Book: Charles Willing and Son, June 15-November 30, 1754; Thomas Willing, November 30, 1754-May 1, 1757; Willing and Morris, May 1, 1757-February 6, 1761, p. 148, Am. 9320, HSP.

**Financial Support of a Kin Network**

Kin provided a financial support network. In 1699, Jonathan Dickinson borrowed £400 from his father Francis Dickinson in Jamaica to purchase the sloop *Hopewell*.[107] Kin provided access to capital, underwriting large expenditures for trading activities. In 1735, John Reynell made available generous credit to his kinsman, promising, "I will Constantly imploy £500 of my own in thy favour that is I will be always that in Advance for thee" in response to his kinsman's offer of "So Considerate Comissions" in their trade dealings.[108] In 1769, John Reynell wrote to brother-in-law Andreas Henry Groth in England, assuring him that "if thou art in a real want of Money, let me know & thou shalt have it[.]"[109] The financial assistance of a kin network provided an economic support system in times of need, helping kin avoid insolvency.

Yet, family dynamics complicated financial support flowing through kinship networks. Debt especially produced family strife. Between 1681 and 1683 James Claypoole became ensnared in thorny financial disputes with several of his brothers. John Claypoole borrowed £300 from James, reneged on repaying the debts, and refused even to see his brother or answer letters. [110] James Claypoole "trusted" Norton Claypoole with over £200 and had little prospect of recovering the loan.[111] At the same time,

---

[107] Jonathan Dickinson Ledger, 1699-1701, vol. 31, p. 5, James Logan Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[108] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, September 15, 1735, John Reynell Letter Book, October 1734-March 1737, p. 19, vol. 2, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, John Reynell Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[109] John Reynell to Henry Groth, Philadelphia, April 2, 1769, John Reynell Letter Book, February 1767-April 1769, vol. 13, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, Coates and Reynell Papers (collection 140), HSP.
[110] James Claypoole to Norton Claypoole, London, October 28, 1681, and July 14, 1682, in *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 69, 134.
[111] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, Philadelphia, December 2, 1683, in *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 224.

Wingfield Claypoole threatened James Claypoole with "prison and disgrace" for owing "but £50" to his brother.[112] James Claypoole's financial predicament left him "ashamed" of the debts and his inability to purchase goods from Edward Claypoole.[113] The network of mutual assistance among kin could breakdown into sibling squabbling and threatened mutual solidarity. Family in-fighting adversely affected money transactions and debt relations, with special bearing for merchant James Claypoole preoccupied with trust and reputation. Ideally, though, networks of kin assistance and involvement promoted the welfare of family members.

**Kinship and Atlantic Trade**

Kinship provided a basis for business relationships spanning the Atlantic.[114] Indeed, merchants were opportunistic and most conscious of networked approaches.[115] Commercial transactions were initiated and sustained by ties of kinship. After inherited wealth, which put some in a good position for mercantile pursuits, another advantage available to a merchant were family ties and connections. Kin drew on their members to be partners or clerks in counting houses, serve as representatives in trading markets, present introductions to the family's clientage, and ship goods.

Migrants intending for Pennsylvania stored a variety of goods onboard ships preparing to set sail across the Atlantic. Joris Wertmuller indicated in 1684 that he resold clothes and linen he transported to the new colony for double the profit. Consequently, "I

[112] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, London, July 10, 1683, in *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 219-20.
[113] Ibid.
[114] Grassby, *Kinship and Capitalism*, 330.
[115] David Hancock, "The Triumph of Mercury: Connection and Control in the English Atlantic Economy," in *Soundings in Atlantic History: Latent Structures and Intellectual Currents, 1500-1830*, ed. Barnard Bailyn and Patricia L. Denault (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009), 118.

have written to my brother in Amsterdam that he should send me a chest full of clothes."[116] The migrant used his brother Jochem Wertmuller to acquire more goods for sale in a new colonial market.

James Claypoole carried on commercial transactions with his older brother Edward Claypoole, who exported sugar from Barbados to James for sale in England. In August 1681, James Claypoole acknowledged that his brother wrote "very kindly concerning the intentions of consigning to me, and so I receive it," promising he "shall endeavor with all care and diligence to promote thy interest, that my advantage may not be thy loss."[117] Between June 1682 and September 1682, James Claypoole sold over 58 hogshead of sugar and assured his brother that he dealt with purchasers he believed were "correct men."[118]

As James Claypoole planned to leave London—having "a great drawing in my mind to remove with my family" to Pennsylvania—he wrote his sibling in April 1682, assuring him that "In the meantime I am very willing and desirous to serve my correspondents here and shall do it with the same care and diligence as formerly, and thee in particular, brother." The London merchant acknowledged his responsibility to business associates, declaring his duty to an older brother above all others. "I hope thou wilt not lessen or withdraw thy business," promising that when he did leave for Philadelphia "I shall certainly leave a letter of attorney with some very honest, sufficient

[116] "Letter from Germantown in Pennsylvania, March 16, 1684," in Samuel W. Pennypacker, *Hendrich Pannebecker: Surveyor of Lands for the Penns, 1674-1754* (Philadelphia: Privately Printed, 1894), 30.
[117] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, London, August 15, 1681, in *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 49.
[118] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, London, June 27, 1682, and September 23, 1682, in *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 126-27, 155

man, to answer all bills, and to make full returns both to thee and all others, so that none shall have any cause to complain of me, for I shall do justly and honestly by all people."[119]

In December 1683, shortly after reaching Philadelphia, he described his favorable waterfront property to Edward Claypoole. "So I desire thee," the recent migrant offered to his brother in the West Indies, "let us have a little trade together," continuing their business relationship from his new city. In fact, James followed through on his intentions. He arrived in Philadelphia in the late fall of 1683 and by the beginning of December he reinitiated commercial transactions with a consignment of goods valued over £65, shipping 18 beaver hats, a 450lb. barrel of French barley, and 13 knives for his brother to sell.[120]

A merchant's success depended heavily on an ability to be supplied regularly with quality wares; merchants involved kin to procure goods and handle other matters of trade. As a Philadelphia merchant, James Logan (1674-1751) was a middleman in the fur trade, purchasing deer, bear, fox, otter, and mink furs, and then consigning the assorted skins and furs to merchants in England in exchange for so-called Indian goods: duffels [a coarse woolen cloth], strouds [a coarse woolen cloth or blanket], firearms, lead, and gunpowder.[121] Logan often dealt with John Askew, a Quaker merchant of London, to

---

[119] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, London, April 20, 1682, *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 110.
[120] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, Philadelphia, December 2, 1683, *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 223. The invoice is on p. 225. This revealing letter can also be found in Jean R. Soderlund, ed., *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania: A Documentary History* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983), 340-41.
[121] On Logan's involvement as a fur merchant in the Indian trade, see Joseph E. Johnson, "A Statesman of Colonial Pennsylvania: A Study of the Private Life and Public Career of James Logan to the Year 1726," (Ph.D. diss.: Harvard University, 1942), 474. For more on Logan's role in this trade, see James H. Merrell,

purchase trading goods that were often used in the commerce of the fur business. Among other correspondents, James Logan applied to his brother William Logan for assistance with his overseas commercial affairs. Dr. William Logan purchased items and made contacts in Bristol, England for his brother James Logan in Philadelphia. In July 1717, James Logan explained to his brother that "I have generally some Money in Engl$^{d}$ to be return'd hither in Goods & should be pleased to have some sorts from your Port," requesting that "if any Ship offers thence for this place before winter & freight can be had reasonablly" William was to send a delivery of woolens and hardware. He also asked William to find an "honest careful Ironmonger" in Birmingham, England, someone reliable with whom he could set up a standing order. James prevailed upon William on the basis of their bond as siblings, petitioning, "if thou couldst qualify thy Selfe to Serve a Brother in Such cases I should be obliged to thee" for the favor.[122]

With no agent in Bristol to supply his orders, in November 1717 James asked that William, "to the best of thy Judgement to pitch on y$^{e}$ fittest [factor] thou canst think of & gett him to buy me" a host of fabrics "at your next fair" in Bristol. James instructed that the merchandise was to "all be bought for ready money," not protracted terms of credit, and shipped at the most reasonably priced charge, insisting, "Pray lett the freight be gott as reasonable as may be." Also, William was to "In Sure on these" goods "y$^{e}$ full Cost" of the cargo and see to it that all the merchandise was sent "by y$^{e}$ very first Vessel

*Into the American Woods: Negotiations on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1999), 62-63, 78, 83, 96, and 123-24.

[122] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, July 9, 1717, James Logan Letter Books, vol. 4, p. 36, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.

bound hither."[123] James Logan appreciated his brother's efforts, acknowledging in late May 1718, "I am obliged to thee for y$^{e}$ trouble thou hast given thy self in purchasing those goods free from y$^{e}$ charge of commissions, but I hope it has been no disservice to thee." He was all the more thankful, especially in consideration that William Logan was not trained for such dealings. "I wish thou couldst have believed that I was a better Judge of my own business; I know much better than to desire a Doct[o]$^{r}$ to buy goods for me of the Bristol shopkeepers in a whole sale way; Had it not been for the advantage of y$^{e}$ fair, I should not have sent to Bristol, and I desired a person might be employed, who would not be bit." To compete in a crowded market, James Logan leveraged his kin contact to obtain goods cheaply. "Our trade is so bare here," James Logan described from Philadelphia, "that we must buy at y$^{e}$ best hand or we cannot follow it." He recognized that such undertakings were not his brother's strong suit, "very sensible things of this kind are out of thy way," and promised the physician he "shall give thee no further trouble about them."[124]

In addition, James sought recourse through his brother when he was unhappy with the goods an agent procured, applying to William to set matters right. When his London counterpart sent unsatisfactory products, Logan's main redress was through writing querulous letters. On the other hand, if Logan encountered a problem with an agent in Bristol he could call on his younger brother William to intervene on his behalf. On one

[123] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, November 25, 1717, James Logan Letter Books, vol. 4, pp. 68-70, Logan Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[124] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, May 26, 1718, Logan Mss., Letter Book, 1717-1731, p. 18, HSP.

occasion in 1725, for instance, James Logan was dissatisfied with a shipment of goods he received from a supplier in Bristol, and he turned to his brother for help resolving the matter. "I must request thee to See" the agent, James Logan wrote, and on "my behalf to request him y$^{t}$ he would not fail this time to retrieve his Credit w$^{th}$ me for I Suffer very much by y$^{e}$ last p[ar]cel he Sent me," which were "not at all Saleable" in Pennsylvania because the cloth fabric was too coarse, the colors were "not deep enough," and lines in the pattern were "also too broad." Complaining letters were ineffectual, explaining to his brother that "I have wrote lately very fully to him, but thy calling upon him sometimes might be of greater Service."[125] Having a brother personally see the supplier would be a more direct and effective way to ensure the shipment of the desired goods. James Logan relied on his brother to acquire trade goods from Bristol and for other services, believing his younger sibling was someone who could be trusted to act for his best interest in England.

Sons and nephews served as factors for their fathers and uncles in ports throughout the British Atlantic world, linking different areas of trade through kinship ties.[126] John Swift went to Philadelphia in the fall of 1746 in the employ of his maternal uncle, setting up a store and selling goods John White supplied from England.[127] John White also sought to establish his other nephew Joseph Swift, John's younger brother, to Philadelphia, where the brothers could work together. In a 1748 letter to his uncle in England, John Swift declared that "you may depend upon my doing every thing in my

[125] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, October 9, 1725, James Logan Letter Book, vol. 3, p. 43, Logan Family Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[126] Grassby, *Kinship and Capitalism*, 90.
[127] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, October 1748, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP. Swift referenced his arrival in this letter.

power for his advantage" on the other side of the Atlantic. John Swift, however, admitted his uncertainty to John White, "'tho I must own that if I was to be left entirely to my own Choice a Brother would be the last person, I should fix on to take under my direction, & in this I believe you would be of my opinion, because I could give many very good reasons for it, but as I am sensible that good ones may be likewise given for my taking him I shall offer none against it, but will cheerfully acquiesce, (as far as is in my power) in whatever you shall conclude to be for the best, but do consider the thing before you come to a determination[.]"[128] John Swift accepted his uncle's decision and within a year came to view his brother's possible arrival as an opportunity, allowing him to pass over the responsibility of running the business in Philadelphia. "If my Brother Comes over in the Spring he will soon be capable of taking care of the Store in my Absence."[129] When Joseph Swift returned to Philadelphia, after an education in England, he entered into the mercantile business with his older brother John Swift. In turn, John Swift's son Joseph (b. 1752) entered the counting house of his uncle Joseph Swift, thereby perpetuating a familial business relationship that began with John White's designs for his nephews. The ability to employ nephews in distant Atlantic commercial markets was an entrepreneurial advantage for merchants able to draw from the kin group.

**Women's Involvement in Obtaining Commercial and Personal Goods**

Overseas relations served a vital role supplying their migrant kin with a variety of items, for both personal and commercial purposes. Goods shipped across the Atlantic

[128] John Swift to John White, [Philadelphia], November 24, [1748], John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.
[129] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, October 25, 1749, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.

and reaching Pennsylvania included practical items, such as building materials, household items, clothing supplies, as well as luxury goods. This Atlantic trade also included a wide variety of dealers in commerce. Beyond male merchants, women also participated in networks and were part of the circulation of goods across the Atlantic.[130]

Welsh migrant Mary Jones made acquisitions for the household and family through her husband's correspondence. In an August 1682 letter, Edward Jones conveyed that "My wife desires thee to buy her one iron kettle 3s. or 3s. 6d.; 2 pair of shoes for Martha, and one pair for Jonathan, let them be strong and large. Be sure and put all your goods in cases; if they be dry they keep well, otherwise they will get damp and moldy."[131] Beyond mercantile concerns, women's directives and acquisitions increased the early Atlantic flow of goods reaching the colony.

Migrating to Pennsylvania required a a variety of goods and migrants tapped into kin networks for supplies. Moreover, women furnished goods to settlers in Pennsylvania. In July 1684 John Lloyd (1639-1695), one of six clerks in Chancery, sent his recent migrant brother Thomas Lloyd items totaling £46.7s.6d., including "things necessary for your Stable," a cloak, "two Beaver Hats," and "a Periwig." John Lloyd explained that

[130] Sarah Fatherly, *Gentlewomen and Learned Ladies: Women and Elite Formation in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia* (Bethlehem, Pa.: Lehigh University Press, 2008), 55-58, discussed wealthy women's involvement in commercial practices and the operation of family businesses, pointing to how they used this knowledge to acquire British consumer goods. Linda Sturtz, *Within Her Power: Propertied Women in Colonial Virginia* (New York: Routledge, 2002), discussed women's involvement in Atlantic commerce. For more on trading opportunities open to women and their approaches to commerce, see Sheryllyne Haggerty, "'Miss Fan can tun her han!' Female traders in eighteenth-century British-American Atlantic port cities," *Atlantic Studies* 6, no. 1 (April 2009): 29-42; and idem, *The British-Atlantic Trading Community*. For gendered representations of commercial culture in literature, see Catherine Ingrassia, *Authorship, Commerce, and Gender in Early Eighteenth-Century England: A Culture of Paper Credit* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); and Margot C. Finn, *The Character of Credit: Personal Debt in English Culture, 1740-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

[131] Edward Jones to John ap Thomas, Schuylkill River, Pa., August 26, 1682, in *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, doc. 42, p. 177.

procuring such items was too much of a burden but indicated that his wife, Jane Gresham Lloyd,[132] would be able to carry on dealings from across the Atlantic. "I hope for the future you will not put me to any further trouble of this nature," John Lloyd wrote, "being very troublesome to me (my circumstances considered) however I shall endeavour to persuade my Wife to correspond with you hereafter" about such orders. John added, "I know she can buy as cheap & cunningly as most Persons," and contended that with fair terms and timely payment, "she shall supply you and your friends with what goods you please" from overseas. He concluded by assuring his brother Thomas in Philadelphia that "by correspondence with my Wife [you can] be furnished at will, and be sure to have good goods, sincere dealing, & have them at the lowest price—&c$^{a}$."[133] Women, then, played an active role in conducting Atlantic transactions within the kin network, handling financial accounts, and furnishing goods to kinfolk in Pennsylvania.

Women, together with male family members, acted corporately to send goods intended for Pennsylvania. Ambrose Barcroft, a migrant to Solebury, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, wrote a 1722/23 letter to his father in England, which contained portions concerning a financial arrangement with his sister. From the colony, Ambrose Barcroft reported about "goods that my S.$^{tr}$ has bought will I do not fear answer 80$^{l}$ p[er]Cent (of this currency) profit by whole sale and 120 by retail." He looked to their father because he was concerned "I do not see how she can answer the bill without your assistance"

[132] Jane Gresham descended from Sir Thomas Gresham, founder of the Royal Exchange.
[133] John Lloyd to Thomas Lloyd, Chancery Office, July 1, 1684, "Scrapbook containing letters from Thomas Lloyd, 1642-1779," Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.

covering accounts in England.[134] Furthermore, women and nuclear family members were also trusted, if only temporarily, with managing mercantile enterprises. For example, when James Claypoole was occupied with his duties as Treasurer of the Free Society of Traders, he had confidence that "my wife and children with my direction shall manage the business as well as if I did it myself," but still made clear that "I will be accountable for all."[135]

In cases of untimely death, arrangements were made in wills to settle any outstanding commercial transactions. In a will proved in July 1715, Rachel Hayhurst, of Middletown, Bucks County, inherited the trade affairs of her deceased spouse. She took measures to ensure the transactions would be completed after her death, including "Money due for goods sold by way of London as admix" for her husband William Hayhurst's will.[136] Women were entrusted with carrying out affairs in England, suggesting another way that women participated in kin networks ordering, providing, and securing goods.

**Kin-Based Partnerships**

In seventeenth-century England, kinship was the basis of many long-term and temporary partnerships.[137] Such partnerships, a form of business in which trading vessels and cargo were jointly owned by investors in shares, were a way to reduce individual

[134] Ambrose Barcroft to Thomas Barcroft, Solebury, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, March 1, 1722/23, Reference: DDB 61/20, Lancashire Record Office, Preston, England. These portions of the letter were omitted in Harold B. Hancock, ed., "Life in Bucks County in 1722/23," *Pennsylvania History* 27, no. 4 (October 1960): 397-402.
[135] James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, Philadelphia, December 2, 1683, in *James Claypoole's Letter Book*, 223.
[136] Bucks County Wills, Book 1, p. 19.
[137] Grassby, *The Business Community of Seventeenth-Century England*, 90. For more on commercial partnerships in eighteenth-century British trading circles, see Hancock, *Citizens of the World*, chap. 3.

risks and a strategy that lent itself to kin participation. In September 1735, John Reynell was seeking new partnership opportunities. He looked toward his kinsman Michael Lee Dicker, with whom he had a long-standing relationship. "I intend in the Spring," he wrote, to invest quarter ownership in a vessel "if I can meet with a Partner to my mind & I know of none I Should like better then thy Self if thou will be Concern'd." Reynell immediately began proposing his design for a new Atlantic business enterprise; he would have the vessel "make 3 Voyages to Jamaica or 2 Voyages to Jamaica & one to Medera Yearly[.]" He believed this "would be the best Trade we could follow" together. He further enticed his kinsman with favorable terms, offering, "I Believe if thou fell into this Scheme it would be to thy Advantage & the best way of making Returns[.] However thou may make a Tryall for a Year or two & if thou don't find thy Acco.$^{t}$ in it we can then Sell her. I will Charge thee no Comiss. On her Outsets & Wages after the first Outset."[138] Reynell emphasized sharing profits over the risk of losses and liable obligations, as well as offering the possibility of dissolving the entrepreneurial venture, to get Dicker to agree to become a copartner. Over a year later, Reynell suggested outfitting their vessel to a different area of the Atlantic for better profit. "As thou Observes the Lisbon and Cadiz Likewise, has Answerd Better of Late then the West India, and I Should without Doubt be willing to have her follow that trade, that to all Probability was Like to turn out to the best Advantage."[139] Philadelphia merchants drew from members of the kin network when forming a new partnership making kin part of commercial operations spanning the

[138] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, September 15, 1735, John Reynell Letter Book, October 1734-March 1737, p. 19, vol. 2, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, John Reynell Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.
[139] John Reynell to Michael Lee Dicker, Philadelphia, November 19, 1736, John Reynell Letter Book, vol. 2, Coates and Reynell Family Papers (collection no. 140), HSP.

Atlantic; it also showed how kin continued developing networks that they themselves built up.

Atlantic commercial partnerships were forged through marriage, providing new business contacts and opportunities for joint ventures.[140] Advantageous marriages into the Lloyd family opened new connections for Isaac Norris, Sr. (1671-1735), Richard Hill (*ca.* 1667-1729), and Samuel Preston (*ca.* 1665-1743), creating a network of brothers-in-law. Each of these men married daughters of migrant Thomas Lloyd (1640-1694)—Samuel Preston married Rachel Lloyd (1667/8-1716) in 1688, Isaac Norris, Sr. married Mary Lloyd (1674-1748) in 1694, and Richard Hill married Hannah Lloyd (1666-1726/7) in 1700—thereby joining them together in affinal (in-law) relation and, ultimately, business association. Their marriage into the Lloyd family also put them in contact with Thomas Lloyd (1675-1717/18), son of migrant Thomas Lloyd and a merchant of Goodman's Field, London, who assisted in the commercial enterprises of his overseas brothers-in-law. The partnership integrated the Lloyd kinship group, stimulating not only financial transactions but also a regular correspondence between brothers-in-law in Philadelphia and London.

In 1709, Isaac Norris, Richard Hill, and Samuel Preston, with lesser partners, entered into a joint ownership of two sloops, the *Rachell* and *Hope Galley*. In that year, the brothers-in-law put up three-quarters of the venture capital for the cargo of the sloop

[140] Historian Jacob M. Price documented how Timothy Bevan's two marriages "commenced a course of alliances that within two generations. See "The Great Quaker Business Families of Eighteenth-Century London: The Rise and Fall of a Sectarian Patriciate," in *The World of William Penn*, ed. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 370.

*Rachell*. Norris, Hill, and Preston invested one-quarter each, and James Logan[141] and Thomas Masters each owned a one-eighth share; thus, the three brothers-in-law held the majority ownership in the joint partnership.[142] Nor was this the only venture between these brothers-in-law.[143] The *Rachell*, the product of the Norris, Hill, and Preston majority partnership, made its way down the Delaware River and left Philadelphia on October 19, 1709,[144] carrying "Two Thousand bushells of wheat & ab.$^{t}$ 10 Tunn[s] of bread & flour to Lisbon consign'd for sales there" to John and Thomas Batt. These factors in Lisbon were to remit the net proceeds of the cargo to Thomas Lloyd and "procure If possible" a freight for the sloop to take on to London. Norris then instructed his brother-in-law in London to "carry" the proceeds "to o.$^{r}$ severall acco.$^{ts}$ in proportion" of investment and if the *Rachell* made it "to London receive her fr.$^{t}$ money & any thing else shee may bring or procure to thy hands" to the credit of his kin's accounts.[145]

As the *Rachell* departed in October 1709, the *Hope Galley* was "now loading," delayed because "wheat is pretty hard to get at this Juncture y.$^{e}$ old being near all gone &

---

[141] Minority partner James Logan was almost either a brother-in-law or cousin-in-law among the others in the extended Lloyd family. In 1704, he courted Deborah Lloyd, another daughter of migrant Thomas Lloyd, but failed to woo her, and she married Mordecai Moore. On a trip to Europe in 1709, when Logan sailed aboard the *Hope*, he visited with Judith Crowley at Stourbridge and Birmingham in the west of England; she was a cousin of Mary Lloyd Norris. Her father Ambrose Crowley did not consent to the courtship and rejected Logan as a suitor, thereby preventing Logan from marrying into the British branch of the Lloyd family and making him an in-law member of an influential Quaker merchant nexus of kin.

[142] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, Philadelphia, October 17, 1709, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 7½, pp. 94-95, Norris Family Papers, (collection no. 454), HSP.

[143] Norris and Preston, for instance, were partners in a number of additional oceangoing vessels: in 1710, the two brothers-in-law shipped wine to Barbados in return for rum in the *Little Mary*; loaded a cargo of rum in 1712 in the *Charlestown Galley*; shipped cargo to Lisbon and England in 1713 and 1714 aboard the *Greyhound*; and in 1714, loaded a cargo in the *Margaret*.

[144] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, Philadelphia, October 20, 1709, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 7½, p. 95, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP. Norris wrote Lloyd to inform him that the *Rachell* "Sail'd Yesterday" from the Delaware River.

[145] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, Philadelphia, October 17, 1709, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 7½, pp. 94-95, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.

the farmers loath to thrash new, yet we hope to get her out before the frost setts in[.][146] In a December 1709 letter, Isaac Norris informed Thomas Lloyd that if the ship *Hope Galley* arrived in London, after leaving Lisbon, the vessel was "consign'd to thee[.]" Norris instructed his brother-in-law to "Receive the fr[eigh].$^{t}$ money & act for o$^{[u]r}$ Int$^{r}$est in any thing relating to y.$^{e}$ s[ai].$^{d}$ ship." Norris also wrote on behalf of his partners "ab.$^{t}$ y.$^{e}$ sale of y.$^{e}$ Rachell," leaving "it to thy Prudence in consultation w$^{th}$ James Logan," who sailed on the *Hope Galley*, "To do w$^{t}$ shall appear most for o$^{r}$ Int$^{r}$est whither to sell or take$_{\wedge}$$^{a}$fr.$^{t}$ hither w$^{th}$ goods & passeng.$^{rs}$ if it offers[.]"[147] Norris, Hill, and Preston entrusted Thomas Lloyd in London with managing their overseas accounts, depending on him to help administer their business concerns. The involvement of the brothers-in-law evinced the interdependence of kin-based mercantile activities that helped animate the Atlantic's commercial world. As family, moreover, the brother-in-law partners took for granted that Thomas Lloyd acted in the best interests for his kin, supposing he would be especially dutiful in the conduct of their affairs.

Over the course of their written correspondence, Norris's comments to his brother-in-law—he addressed and referred to Lloyd simply as his brother—suggested that kin were held to high expectations for prompt service and better dealings. That accountability was evident when Norris repeatedly implored Lloyd to be more keenly attentive handling his accounts. If Norris felt that Lloyd was not performing his services

[146] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, Philadelphia, October 20, 1709, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 7½, p. 95, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.
[147] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, Philadelphia, December 1, 1709, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 7½, p. 111, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP. Logan's log of this voyage can be found as the manuscript "My Voyage to Great Britain," Gulielma M. Howland Papers (Ms. Coll. 1000), Box 6, Folder 22, Quaker and Special Collections, Haverford College.

quickly or efficiently, he had no qualms about openly writing his thoughts on his brother-in-law's business acumen. Norris trusted Lloyd's discretion to act in his interest when acquiring goods at the best price and obtaining the most competitive freight charges for transporting items across the Atlantic. "Brother be a good husband [i.e., manager] & make my shipping charges as Easy as thou can" because, Norris advised Lloyd, "good husbandry must maintain & Encourage trade[.]" Norris directed his overseas kin to manage affairs with prudent economy. To ensure quality, Norris also requested that Lloyd be watchful about the goods sent to Philadelphia and recommended that he inspect the packaging, writing in the summer of 1709, "pray take care that none impose on thee such goods as are not sortable and fresh — & it may be worth while to treat[148] on the prices and see the goods packt" for protection.[149] Norris's directives included warnings to Lloyd not to be swindled by shrewd sellers and reminders that he should negotiate with prudence for his merchant brother-in-law. Acting on behalf of his brother-in-law, Lloyd was expected to exercise good judgment and prudence for Norris's commercial interests.

Procuring and shuttling goods was one component of the business relationship between Norris and Lloyd. Norris also depended on Lloyd to take care of his financial matters, and reiterated to his brother-in-law, time after time, about making payments in good time. He made the point clear, writing in May 1708, "I must Entreat & beg of y.$^{ee}$ for y.$^{e}$ sake of both our reputations, & y$^{e}$ Encouragm.$^{t}$ of further buissiness y$^{t}$ thou

[148] Treat in this usage meant to engage in negotiations and agree on terms.
[149] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, Philadelphia, August 30, 1709, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 7½, p. 66, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.

Punctually answers those bills at Due Time[.]"[150] Norris affirmed his familial bond with Lloyd while at the same time underlining his desire that his kin in England would acquire merchandise sensibly and perform his services reliably, out of concern for his brother-in-law's good name. In September 1708, he wrote Lloyd, "Relation and affect: tyes me to y$^{e[e]}$[.] I have recommended all I Can to y$^{e[e]}$ be Dilligent & Expeditious and take Care to buy Goods well Especially for whole Saile Men," emphasizing "how much" his credit was "at Stake" in their commercial partnership.[151] Norris continually wrote Lloyd to heed his appeals to be more conscientious in the management of his brother-in-law's affairs.[152] In May 1709 Norris persisted in objecting to Lloyd's handling of affairs. He wrote with dissatisfaction, "I have so often Told y.$^{e[e]}$ w.$^{th}$ Earnestness my Great Desire to be Out of Debt & press thy speedy paying as Comes To hand," but curbed his tone in the letter, conceding to his kin, "y.$^{t}$ To add would seem Distrust & I Doubt$_{\wedge}$ $^{not}$thy diligence for My Creditt[.]"[153] Norris was firm in his purpose, but tempered his writing, pulling back from an indictment of his brother-in-law.

In October 1714, Isaac Norris, Richard Hill, and Samuel Preston collectively wrote to Thomas Lloyd expressing concern over their brother-in-law's business affiliations and dealings; any questionable associations reflected on them, too. Lloyd was to "Receive this [letter] with the Same Candour it is written" by kin associates.

---

[150] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, Portsmouth, May 10, 1708, Isaac Norris Letter Book, 1706-1709, vol. 7, p. 167, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.
[151] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, postscript dated September 6, 1708, to a letter from September 5, 1708, Isaac Norris Letter Book, 1706-1709, vol. 7, p. 190, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.
[152] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, [Philadelphia], October 11, 1708, Isaac Norris Letter Book, 1706-1709, vol. 7, pp. 197-198, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.
[153] Isaac Norris to Thomas Lloyd, Philadelphia, May 13, 1709, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 7½, p. 11-12, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.

Despite their concerns and threat to terminate their business relationship, the brothers-in-law closed with assurances of their loyalty. Norris, Hill, and Preston wrote candidly of their own concerns and out of concern for their brother-in-law, expecting Lloyd to be forthright about his circumstances and the status of their affairs. Business challenges were more than an economic problem; they were also a problem for the kinship unit. The brothers-in-law expressed their uneasiness but moderated any outright condemnation. To read Norris's appeals over the years, it seemed as though Lloyd's actions did not fill Norris with confidence; yet, Norris continued to work with Lloyd and never betrayed thoughts that his brother-in-law was unreliable, undependable, or untrustworthy; family loyalties took precedence.

## Conclusion

Kin networks had a wide range of engagements in business and were important to Pennsylvania's commercial integration into the Atlantic. Kin, both blood ties and in-laws, shaped commercial relationships. Kinship networks gave merchants a form of social capital—connection—to operate more effectively in the commercial world of the Atlantic. The activities of kin were a salient feature of robust commercial exchanges forged by merchants. Networks of kinship coordinated commercial activity, organized business operations, and personalized market transactions. Networks were created by interaction and communication, and kin involvement in mercantile pursuits enhanced the colony's interchanges with the Atlantic community.

There were many social and economic benefits of kin networks. Kin were trusted links. Merchants clearly believed that kin correspondents would act in their best

interests and trusted the judgment of kin on various matters of trade. Kin passed along reliable market information (conditions and prices) and knowledge of insurance. Kin also tried to reduce costs for relatives. Kinship served to cement the relationships between merchants. Networks of kinship provided apprentices with starting points of access, allowing young traders to make contact with merchants in various Atlantic ports and construct their own web of commercial ties. Kinship also provided recognized personal reputation and status, central to the commercial life of merchants. Kinship provided access to patronage. Kinship ties provided a basis for entrepreneurial collaboration; in particular, marriage established a network of affinal ties that were used to create commercial connections and expand opportunities. Branchlike kin connections were valuable assets, adding reach, creating links, and integrating Pennsylvania to the Atlantic market economy.

## Chapter 4

## "That natural Curiosity which People have to know something of their Relations": Familial Memory Practices among Delaware Valley Settlers and their Descendants

In May 1765, Philadelphia resident Mary Johnson Hopkinson (1718-1804) employed the services of Benjamin Franklin (1706–1790), then in London and a friend of her deceased husband Thomas Hopkinson (1709-1751), to gather information about her family history. "Agreeable to your Request," Franklin wrote her, "I did, soon after my Arrival here, begin an Enquiry after your Family." For assistance in unearthing the lineage and heraldry of the Johnson family Franklin turned to a well-connected friend, James Burrow, the "Vice President of the Royal Society" and "Master of the Crown Office in the King's Bench," who "could readily obtain Acces[s] to the Records and Places where the Enquiry should be made." Franklin, who pursued his own genealogical interests, could speak to the appeal of researching one's ancestry and family connections. In a correspondence to Burrow, Franklin surmised that "Mrs. Hopkinson's Motive to the enquiry we have made for her, I take to be chiefly that natural Curiosity which People have to know something of their Relations, there being a Satisfaction in learning their Circumstances and hearing of their Welfare, however remote in Degree or Situation."[1] Almost two months later, Franklin enclosed a "Bundle of Papers" for Hopkinson, which when "read in order" showed her "the Progress and Success" of his inquiry. His research was fruitful enough to pass along a note of congratulations on the findings.[2] Franklin

[1] Benjamin Franklin to James Burrow, London, May 10, 1765, in *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, vol. 12, ed. Leonard W. Labaree (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1968), 126.
[2] Benjamin Franklin to Mary Hopkinson, London, July 6, 1765, Hopkinson Papers (collection no. 1978), vol. 2: Letters, 1736-1800, [p. 27], Historical Society of Pennsylvania (hereafter cited as HSP).

continued to forward additional documentation, sending Hopkinson "the extract of the Church Register, in which you will find the Names of your Father and Uncle." He also provided Hopkinson with a sketch of her paternal grandfather George Johnson's coat of arms, dating from 1675 and taken from the halls of the Middle Temple, one of the four Inns of Court in London.[3] The genealogical inquiries of Mary Johnson Hopkinson and her active pursuit of family and heraldic information reflected a strong "natural Curiosity" among Delaware Valley families about their ancestral past across the Atlantic.

This chapter argues that migrants and their descendants used networks of kinship in their articulation and preservation of an Atlantic familial past. It was through kinship networks that Delaware Valley migrants and their descendants pursued and acquired objects related to their family's history and passed on an awareness of previous generations. Also, aspects of British cultural traditions flowed through family lines. Cords of memory were the fullest expression of kinship ties and were a distinctive way families bound Pennsylvania to the Atlantic world.

Kin groups in Pennsylvania actively cultivated Atlantic cultural influences. It was through personal acts of remembering and commemoration that Old World embers continued to burn, so to speak, deepening connections traversing the Atlantic. Certain memory practices, both objects and customs, asserted genteel status and social standing; however, mnemonic devices held significance for individual families and were vehicles through which Atlantic familial affiliation passed broadly and deeply over generations. In addition, familial memory practices shaped salient cultural features found among

[3] Benjamin Franklin to Mary Hopkinson, London, July 26, 1765, Hopkinson Papers (collection no. 1978), vol. 2: Letters, 1736-1800, [pp. 27-28], HSP.

Delaware Valley settlers. The cultural makeup of Philadelphia and its environs was, to a considerable degree, organized around familial memory practices. These cords of memory, moreover, had far-reaching implications, tapping into and expanding Atlantic networks of kinship. As Atlantic traditions and linkages, memory practices sustained family-centered identity in a new land and transmitted and diffused aspects of home and metropolitan culture.

Pennsylvania migrants and their descendants manifested a continuing interest in their European roots and family histories in a variety of ways. In New England, by comparison, historian David Cressy found the later generations of colonists had less attachment to old England. It makes intuitive sense that by the eighteenth-century an English worldview had been gradually eclipsed by a localist sentiment and outlook, as the vast majority of colonists were now New England born with increasingly remote English associations. Overseas ties, he found, were a powerful element in the lives of the founders but Atlantic bonds attenuated over time. Familial relationships continued through the memory of long-deceased relatives, while cousinage in a neighboring New England town proved more enduring than increasingly remote overseas relations. Cressy argued that the corrosion of ties encouraged a new identity to surface.[4] Pennsylvania families were more akin to the Carroll family of colonial Maryland. Members of the Carroll family had a fierce pride in their lineage, naming their lands in Maryland after their townlands in Ireland, using armorial bookplates, and maintaining their Gaelic genealogy for generations after their settlement in the New World. Similar to the

[4] David Cressy, *Coming Over: Migration and Communication between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

progeny of Delaware Valley Quakers, descendants of the Carroll kin group made nineteenth-century visits to ancestral homes in the British Isles.[5] The pull of Atlantic kinship, especially among weighty and wealthy Friends, was not effaced with the passage of time. High mortality, low fertility, male majorities, and stunted family formation plagued many Atlantic colonies throughout the early modern period, circumscribing the ability of settlers to transfer Old World cultures. In the Delaware Valley, the presence of migrant family groups and normative kinship structures mitigated such adverse effects. The family-centered nature of early Quaker migration ensured that many cultural endeavors would be kinship-oriented.

The different memory practices cast light on what Pennsylvania families remembered and how they remembered. The appeal of an ancestral past was expressed in physical objects and customs of symbolic value, such as the powerful attraction of family coats of arms. The prevalent use of heraldic insignia was a visible way by which Delaware Valley kin groups showed a continuing interest in their European past, engaging migrants and their descendants alike. Armorial regalia appeared in many forms, including the blazon of arms and illustrations exchanged between overseas kindred, armorial bookplates, engraved domestic silver, carriage door adornments, wax seals, embroidered silk needlework, and ornamental plaster. Heraldic devices were visual representations of a family identity that spanned both the genealogical and geographic distance of the early modern Atlantic world. Furthermore, written family histories, Bible record keeping, naming patterns, and nostalgic attachment to home grounds were also the

[5] Ronald Hoffman, *Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland: A Carroll Saga, 1500-1782* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

loci for the preservation of a Atlantic kin group identity and remembrance. In particular, members of the provincial elite sought to establish their genealogical roots in England, Wales, and Scotland. Such familial memory practices provided the basis for a sense of belonging and identification with a Atlantic kinship group and furthered the region's connections to a broader Atlantic cultural world. Symbolic ties with an ancestral oversea lineage helped to define familial identity that played a role in fostering the formation of a colonial Atlantic society in the Delaware Valley.

The effects of kinship-based traditions were twofold for merchants and their ilk. Familial memory practices formed a self-defined community of interest among wealth merchants based on an Atlantic kinship identity. Assembling an Atlantic lineage family was part of constructing an elite colonial identity and carving out cultural space in the pluralistic setting.[6] Historian Sarah Fatherly argued that well-to-do merchant families in Philadelphia, riding an economic upturn during the 1720s and 1730s, created a colonial gentry—fashioned after an increasingly fluid British gentry—to reinforce their power and privileges in response to challenges from upwardly mobile middling sorts, such as petty traders and recent newcomers. She asserted that the ability of wealthy Philadelphians to define their elite rank depended on women's activities.[7] In addition, elite identity formation revolved around Atlantic family history. Upper-class families, both men and women, formed an exclusive identity around kinship, solidified by Atlantic lineage and

[6] Patrick Griffin, *The People with No Name: Ireland's Ulster Scots, America's Scots Irish, and the Creation of a British Atlantic World, 1689-1764* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001), 4, raised this issue of identity in an Atlantic world, especially in a region of great ethnic and religious diversity as the mid-Atlantic.
[7] Sarah Fatherly, *Gentlewomen and Learned Ladies: Women and Elite Formation in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia* (Bethlehem, Pa.: Lehigh University Press, 2008).

heritage. The urbane elite of Philadelphia used traditional status symbols, rooted in ancient lineages, as a way of testifying to their genteel lifestyle and setting them apart from middling and lower orders. Once Philadelphia's wealthy merchant families created an intertwined set of family trees,[8] the elite mapped their lineage and traced their ancestry back across the Atlantic, bolstering their claims to elite rank. Quaker and Anglican grandees, with their construction of large dynastic kin groups and use of heraldic devices, exhibited the pretensions of an aristocratic ideology with pedigreed lineages.[9] At the same time, though, familial memory practices provided a sense of connectedness and belonging to an Atlantic kinship group. Familial memory practices formed an Atlantic community of kin, and helped bring the region further out into the Atlantic.

This chapter begins by examining child-naming patterns; the choice of names reflected a strong desire to maintain continuity with the migrant kin. The following section considers how families preserved their history, looking at Bible record-keeping, the pursuit of genealogy, and other written accounts. Heraldry, its meaning for families, and its role in elite culture is the topic of the next section. A section on the names of farmsteads and country estates reveals how migrants and their descendants remained connected to ancestral places across the Atlantic that were significant to the kin group. The last section explores reminiscence about homelands that were funneled through the

[8] On dynastic patterns of marriage as part of elite class formation in Philadelphia, see Fatherly, *Gentlewomen and Learned Ladies*, chap. 2.

[9] A hierarchal social order and expectations about privileged status were not inconsistent with Quaker beliefs. Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House*, 109-112, addressed the hierarchical view of social classes and the seeming contradiction and reconciliation of a Quaker aristocracy with the social and economic philosophy of Friends.

kinship network. Familial memory practices fostered a sense of relatedness and connectedness with a kin group that spanned the Atlantic.

## Child-Naming Practices

Studies of onomastics have focused on the choice of children's names and the values and social meaning reflected in selections. Historians have explored trends in New England and Chesapeake where a child's given name honored maternal and paternal lines or when assigned names drew upon biblical sources or virtues.[10] Clues to the character of the early Delaware Valley culture appeared in the ways that migrants and their descendants named their children.[11] Certain child-naming practices in Pennsylvania showed continuity of a broad sense of Atlantic family identity. Names were selected for reasons of familial pride and social prestige, or to sustain an emotional bond and keep alive a connection in the kinship network. The selection of a name linked generations of kindred living on opposite shores of the Atlantic and connected a child to the memory of a migrant ancestor.

It was a traditional practice to name a newborn child after a member of the family—a so-called namesake. In the face of separation, the custom assumed new implications for kinfolk. A namesake became a gesture of Atlantic kinship affiliation. William Logan (1718-1776), the son of migrant James Logan and Sarah Read Logan,

---

[10] John J. Waters, "Naming and Kinship in New England: Guilford Patterns and Usage, 1693-1759," *The New England Historical and Genealogical Register* 138 (July 1984): 161-81; Daniel Scott Smith, "Child-Naming Practices, Kinship Ties, and Change in Family Attitudes in Hingham, Massachusetts, 1641 to 1880," *Journal of Social History* 18 (Summer 1985): 541-66; David Hackett Fischer, "Forenames and the Family in New England: An Exercise in Historical Onomastics," in *Generations and Change: Genealogical Perspectives in Social History*, ed. Robert M Taylor, Jr. and Ralph J. Crandall (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1986), 215-241; and Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman, "'In Nomine Avi':Child-Naming Patterns in a Chesapeake County, 1650-1750," in *Generations and Change*, 243-265.
[11] Fischer, *Albion's Seed*, 503, 505, found an "even-handed" naming pattern and "onomastic equality" for Delaware Valley Quakers.

was the namesake of his paternal uncle William Logan, a physician in Bristol, England. Writing his younger brother across the Atlantic, James Logan informed William Logan that Sarah Read Logan "would have called" the newborn James "after his father"; however, having previously lost a son named James in infancy, "she feared" it was too soon "to have two of y$^{e}$ same name so quick one after y$^{e}$ other," and instead his nephew "goes by thine" first name.[12] Choosing namesakes from kindred living across the ocean was a meaningful expression within the Atlantic family circle. The custom was an inclusive way of drawing together members of the separated kin group, particularly children, who were embraced into an extended Atlantic family. Philadelphia merchant John Reynell, for instance, asked his sister Mary Reynell Groth in England to "Give my Name sake & young Kinsman a Kiss in my behalf[.]"[13]

The selection of a child's forename spanned generations and geographical distance to preserve family ties and maintain traditions of family naming practices. In 1764, Esther Spackman wrote her daughter Elizabeth, who had migrated from England some fourteen years earlier, on the birth of her "Little Daughter Esther," remarking that "I Rec[eive]$^{d}$ it as a token of your Love that you have Called her by my Name."[14] The grandmother Esther, who also had a daughter named Esther still residing in Wiltshire,

[12] James Logan to William Logan, Philadelphia, May 26, 1718, Letter Book, 1717-1731, p. 18, Logan Papers, HSP. In a letter to a London trader, the Philadelphian boasted of "the blessing of a son called after his Uncle at Bristol." See James Logan to John Askew, Philadelphia, May, 31, 1718, Letter Book, 1717-1731, p. 20, Logan Papers, HSP. See also, James Logan to John Andrew in Bristol, Philadelphia, July 22, 1718, Letter Book, 1717-1731, p. 31, Logan Papers, HSP.

[13] John Reynell to "Dear Sister," [Mary Groth], Philadelphia, November 10, 1753, John Reynell Letter Book, December 1752-September 1754, Series 1b: Outgoing Correspondence, vol. 8, Coates and Reynell Family Papers, collection no. 140, HSP.

[14] Esther Spackman to "My Dear Son and Daughter Hawley," [Joseph Hawley and Elizabeth Spackman Hawley], Hankerton, Wiltshire, England, December 31, 1764, in *Letters and Other Papers of Daniel Kent, Emigrant and Redemptioner, to which have been added a few interesting Hawley and Spackman Papers*, compiled by Ella K. Barnard (Baltimore, Md.: New Era Printing Co., 1904), 116.

England, delighted in the news that her grandchild born in Pennsylvania shared the same first name, and took it as a gesture of affection. In this instance, moreover, the use of Esther among female members of the kin group reached across the Atlantic into a third generation.

The forename of the family's founder in the Delaware Valley was often perpetuated, signifying a connection to the first generation over a long duration.[15] There was a marked continuance of names taken from the first settlers, such as Samuel in the Allen family, or Thomas in the Wynne family. The name of migrant Edward Shippen (1640-1712)—born in Yorkshire, England, migrant to Boston, Massachusetts, and settler in Philadelphia—was an especially popular patronymic, carried uninterrupted through generations of this elite family.[16] In fact, there were five male members of the family successively given the name Edward Shippen, stretching over the late seventeenth century through the first half of the nineteenth century.[17] As leading Philadelphia families intermarried, furthermore, the name of the migrant continued its longevity, reappearing with Edward Shippen Burd (b. 1779) and Edward Shippen Willing (b. 1822).[18] Edward Shippen Burd, in turn, named his first son Edward Shippen Burd (b.

[15] In New England, the function of naming was to honor the memory of predecessors. Naming patterns among New Englanders "placed a child socially in relation to the older generation." See Christopher M. Jedrey, *The World of John Cleaveland: Family and Community in Eighteenth-Century New England* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1979), 77-78, 84, 160.
[16] The Philadelphia of our Ancestors: Old Philadelphia Families, vol. 5, p. 296, Campbell Collection, HSP.
[17] Jordan, *Colonial Families of Philadelphia*, 100-105. Following migrant Edward Shippen (1640-1712) were: son Edward Shippen (1677/8-1714); grandson Edward Shippen "of Lancaster" (1703-1781), the child of the migrant's other son Joseph Shippen (1678/9-1741); great grandson Edward Shippen the Provincial Councillor and Chief Justice (1728/9-1806); great great grandson Dr. Edward Shippen (1758-1809); and great great great grandson Edward Shippen (1789-1832). Moreover, the name of the migrant continued to be given into the twentieth century, as seen with Edward Shippen Morris (b. 1906).
[18] Edward Shippen Burd was the son of Edward Burd (1750/1-1833), a son of James and Sarah Shippen Burd. His father Edward Burd was a nephew of Chief Justice Edward Shippen (1728/9-1806), with whom

1811).[19] The prolonged use of the patriarch's name among descendants continued to be used over generations. Edward Shippen Yeates (b. 1782) was a great great great grandchild of Edward Shippen.[20] The name of the migrant ancestor was caught up in the whirlwind of the American Revolution and circled the globe, reaching far parts of the second British empire. Edward Shippen Arnold, another great great great grandson of Edward Shippen, was born in 1780 at Philadelphia to Margaret ("Peggy") Shippen and Benedict Arnold, the revolutionary hero who became an infamous turncoat serving in the British army. The family relocated to London and Edward Shippen Arnold followed his father's service in the British military, dying at Dinapore, on the Indian subcontinent in 1813, an officer of the 6th Bengal Cavalry.[21] The name's continued usage reached into the years of the early Republic. Edward Shippen McIlvaine (b. 1787) was the grandson of the Chief Justice Edward Shippen and great great great grandson of the migrant, and Edward Shippen Watson (b. 1826) was the great great great great grandchild of the migrant.[22] This particular name had enduring appeal in the kinship network through the numerous branches of the extended Shippen family tree and over the course of the colonial and post-revolutionary periods.

Prominent Philadelphia families retained their family-based identities, even after members of the kin group married into other leading dynasties from different colonies. For instance, Mary Willing (1740-1814), daughter of Charles Willing and Anne Shippen

---

he studied law, and also became a son-in-law after marrying the Chief Justice's daughter Elizabeth Shippen.

[19] The son passed away in infancy. Keith, *The Provincial Councillors of Pennsylvania*, 71.

[20] Keith, *The Provincial Councillors of Pennsylvania*, 68.

[21] Keith, *The Provincial Councillors of Pennsylvania*, 64.

[22] Ibid., 61, 64.

Willing, was the second wife of William Byrd III (1728-1777), successor of a wealthy and powerful tidewater Virginia planter family. The couple had ten children, four of whom carried the Willing name as a middle name, placed before the Byrd surname, as testimony of filial respect and an expression of familial pride.[23] Attaching the Willing name reflected regard for relations and maintained an enduring connection to the influential kin group in Philadelphia. The use of Pennsylvania family names also had longevity over time, maintaining the memory of a well-known migrant ancestor and sustaining the prestige associated with names such as Edward Shippen (1640-1712). The family name that traversed the Atlantic in 1668 when Edward Shippen left Yorkshire, was transplanted to Boston, where he resided for twenty-five years, and in 1694 became established in the Quaker city, also appeared in the extended lineages of Virginia planter families. Dr. William Shippen the younger (1736-1808) of Philadelphia, great grandson of migrant Edward Shippen and director general of the Continental army hospitals, married Alice Lee (1736-1817), descending from the Lees of Virginia. One of the Shippen-Lee descendants was a great great grandson named Shippen Wallace (1850-1874). He was born in Philadelphia and died in Burlington, N.J., and the Shippen name certainly resonated in the area and reflected this particular line's regional affiliation.[24] Such child-naming customs carried on associations with elite family bloodlines, solidifying bonds to privileged ancestral derivation, and demonstrated recognizable ties

[23] Several of the children carried the name of the maternal grandparents: Anne Willing Byrd (b. 1763) ; Charles Willing Byrd (1765-1766); Charles Willing Byrd (1770-1828); and Richard Willing Byrd (b. 1774). See Keith, *The Provincial Councillors of Pennsylvania*, 120-121.
[24] Keith, *The Provincial Councillors of Pennsylvania*, 138-139; and Charles Henry Browning, *Americans of Royal Descent: A Collection of Genealogies of American Families whose Lineage is Traced to the Legitimate Issue of Kings* 2nd edition (Philadelphia: Porter and Coates, 1891), 485.

to renowned early Pennsylvania families. The durability of family-identity among these kin groups, expressed in the continued use of surnames.

Edward Shippen Willing, moreover, made use of a kinswoman's name from the other side of his family who was mentioned in an inherited account of family history and genealogy. His daughter Ava Lowle Willing was born in 1868 at Philadelphia, and her name came from the family's Atlantic ancestral past. Thomas Willing (1731-1821), in a 1786 autobiography, narrated that Ava Lowle was his great grandmother from Gloucestershire, England who "had a good estate" that "descended to her thro' several generations from her Saxon ancestors."[25] Written accounts of Atlantic traditions further informed the selection of names among Delaware Valley families. Names were taken from texts intended to record family history and genealogy.

The names of Thomas Lloyd, Isaac Norris, and Nicholas Waln were found among descendants of these often intermarried families. Numerous offspring were given configurations of these names: Thomas Lloyd Norris (1803-1828); Thomas Lloyd Norris (1831-1862); Thomas Lloyd Norris (1874-1876); and Thomas Lloyd Norris Horwitz (1863-1900). Nicholas Waln (d. 1721/2) and his wife Jane Turner Waln (1653-1747) migrated to Penn's colony with three children. Several of the couple's youngest twelve children were born in Philadelphia, including Nicholas Waln (1689/9-1721/2). Richard Waln, the eldest son of the couple born in 1678 in England, had a son named Nicholas Waln (1709/10-1744), who with his wife Mary Shoemaker Waln (d. 1756) also named a child Nicholas Waln (b. 1742). Other members of the kin group included the family

[25] Autobiography of Thomas Willing, Philadelphia, February 4, 1786, in *Willing Letters and Papers Edited with a Biographical Essay of Thomas Willing of Philadelphia (1731-1821)*, by Thomas Willing Balch (Philadelphia: Allen, Lane, and Scott, 1922), 117.

name, such as Mary Howell, great great granddaughter of the migrants, who married Henry Drinker and conferred the surname as a middle name on two sons, Henry Waln Drinker (b. 1787) and William Waln Drinker (b. 1799).[26] Other derivations and configurations were drawn from family surnames. A great great grandchild of migrant James Logan was given the name Logania Carter.[27] Multiple networks of kinship converged with generations of intermarriage between distinguished families, epitomized with the birth and naming of Dickinson Norris Logan (1848-1851), great great great grandson of migrant James Logan and great great grandson of migrant Isaac Norris, Sr.[28] To be sure, these names were a mark of distinction that carried clout. At the same time, by design there was a marked continuance of eminent names taken from migrants in the kin network.

Years after the migrant generation planted roots in the Delaware Valley, well-to-do kin groups continued to practice a familial-oriented naming system. The Willing family, for instance, evidenced a densely layered naming pattern. Thomas Willing Francis (1767-1815) was the son of Tench Francis (1730-1800) and Anne Willing (1733-1812), and the child's name invoked the memory of his uncle Thomas Willing (1731-1821), successful merchant, Mayor of Philadelphia (1763), Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania (1767-1774), and President of the Bank of North America (1781), as

[26] Henry Drinker Biddle, *The Drinker Family in America: To and Including the Eighth Generation* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1893), 19.
[27] Keith, *The Provincial Councillors of Pennsylvania*, 24-25.
[28] Keith, *The Provincial Councillors of Pennsylvania*, 23, 53-54. Dickinson Norris Logan was the son of Gustavus George Logan (1815-1876) and Anna Armat; Gustavus George Logan was the son of Albanus Charles Logan (1783-1854) and Maria Dickinson (1783-1854), daughter of John Dickinson (1732-1808) and Mary Norris Dickinson (1740-1803). John Dickinson was born on his family's tidewater homestead along Maryland's Eastern Shore; he was the great grandson of Walter Dickinson, who migrated in 1654 from England to Virginia.

well as evoking the family's English progenitor Thomas Willing (1679-1760). Furthermore, Thomas Willing Francis and Dorothy Willing (1772-1847) named their son Willing Francis (b. 1798), receiving the surname of an eminent Philadelphia family as his first name, albeit reinforced by the close kin marriage of his first cousin parents.[29] Hereditary derivations of family names continually linked scions connected by kinship to their migrant forebears and founders of the oldest families of Philadelphia.

The transmission of family identity was particularly revealed when a surname was given as a first name to a child born in the Delaware Valley. The surname of Lloyd had a long endurance as a given first name among members of the kin group in Pennsylvania. For example, Lloyd Zachary (1701-1756) received his mother's maiden name. He was the child of Elizabeth Lloyd Zachary and Daniel Zachary; Elizabeth was the daughter of Welsh Quaker Thomas Lloyd (1640-94), who migrated to Pennsylvania in 1683.[30] This particular family name was also used for other offspring born in the Delaware Valley. Susannah Lloyd Wharton (d. 1772), a great-granddaughter of settler Thomas Lloyd, married Thomas Wharton (ca. 1735-1778), president of the Supreme Executive Council (1777-1778), and they named their first son Lloyd Wharton (1764-1799).[31] The couple's second child Kearney Wharton (1765-1848) continued the practice, naming children Thomas Lloyd Wharton (b. 1799) and Lloyd Wharton (1801-1855). The second Lloyd Wharton took the surname Bickley, and named a child Lloyd Wharton Bickley, who married Hannah Miller in 1864, and, in turn, bestowed the name Lloyd Wharton Bickley

[29] The genealogy of this branch of the Willing and Francis families can be found in Charles P. Keith, *The Provincial Councillors of Pennsylvania*, 106-107.
[30] "Genealogical Table of the Younger Branch of the Lloyd Family," Norris Family Papers, 1742-1860 (collection no. 454), HSP.
[31] Jordan, *Colonial Families of Philadelphia*, vol. 1, 43.

(d. 1868).[32] Perpetuating the surname of Lloyd as a first name recalled an old Welsh family and advertised respectability through a connection to one of Pennsylvania's aristocratic Quaker set. Richard Gibbs, who migrated from England in 1746, left a 1795 will that mentioned four of his grandchildren, including one named Gibbs Rodman.[33] The name of the grandchild Gibbs was underlined wherever it appeared, perhaps to avoid confusion with the surname, but also underscoring a grandfather's pleasure at having his last name continue on as a forename. Bible entries recorded the years of Paschall Say, who received his given name from his migrant grandfather's last name. He "was born 24th of 10ber 1703" in Pennsylvania and "departed this life at Jamaica the 22nd of Oct. 1726" of an unspecified cause.[34] Paschall Say's grandfather was Thomas Paschall (1634-1718), a pewterer from Bristol, England and First Purchaser of 500 acres of Pennsylvania land, who arrived at Chester in December 1681 on the ship *Bristol Factor*, the first vessel bound for the new colony.[35] Mary Paschall Say (d. 1732) chose a distinguishing patronym for her son, derived from her family name, indicating descent and honoring the migrant ancestor.

Some family members drew names from the kin network who had a profound and lasting influence on their lives in the colony and the Atlantic world. Intentionally picking an individual's name reinforced connections within the kinship network. Samuel Coates (1748-1830) named his son John Reynell Coates (1777-1842) as a sign of his respect for

[32] Keith, *The Provincial Councillors of Pennsylvania*, 25-26.
[33] Bucks County Wills, Book No. 5, p. 454.
[34] "Genealogical Records from the Bible of Thomas Say," *PMHB* 29 (1905): 216-217.
[35] Ship Bristoll Factor (under craftsmen), List of those Arriving at Chester, December 11, 1681, on the Ship Bristoll Factor, Capt. Roger Drew, Names of Craftsmen and their Particular Trade Listed, Society Collection, HSP; and"The First Purchasers of Pennsylvania, 1681-1685," in *The Papers of William Penn*, vol. 2: *1680-1684*, ed. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), 650.

his uncle John Reynell, a Quaker merchant of Philadelphia who made his nephew a business partner. The name also brought to mind the exceptional reputation of a well-established merchant, an advantage in commercial undertakings. Brothers John Swift (1720-1802) and Joseph Swift (1731-1806) both named sons after their maternal uncle John White (d. 1767), who had brought his sister's four children to Pennsylvania, educated his two nephews in England, and employed them in Atlantic business ventures. John Swift named his first-born son John White Swift (1749/1750-1818). In a 1751 letter to his uncle John White, then living in Croydon, Surrey County, England, John Swift wrote of how "your little namesake begins to run alone[.]"[36] Joseph Swift, John's younger brother, likewise named sons John White Swift; the first child died in infancy and another son was born in 1767 and named after his father's uncle, living to the advanced age of eighty-five-years. Philadelphia merchant Thomas Willing (1731-1821) named his second son "Thomas Mayne [1767-1822], called after Dorothy Mayne." The elder Thomas Willing inherited "a small estate at Quadring in Lincolnshire which descended to me from my Great Aunt Dorothy Mayne," and was sold for £550 by his father Charles Willing (1710-1754) while he was in England.[37] Willing paid tribute to a generous overseas kinswoman by incorporating her name as his son's middle name. Indebted kindred in the Delaware Valley selected children's names that were derived from a relative living across the Atlantic, joining together the Atlantic kin group and connecting the youth to overseas relations.

[36] John Swift to John White, Philadelphia, May 2, 1751, John Swift Letter Book, 1747-1751, Am .944, HSP.
[37] "Autobiography of Thomas Willing. Philadelphia, Feb[ruar]y the 4th, 1786," in *Willing Letters and Papers*, 124-125.

Some child naming practices in the Delaware Valley drew inspiration from places found throughout the Atlantic world and meaningful to the kin group. One of William Penn's granddaughters, for example, was given the name Philadelphia Hannah Freame, carrying on her grandfather's Atlantic creation in the name she had borne.[38] Generations later, Mary Wister Logan (b. 1847) incorporated family tradition passed down through the kinship networkwhen she named her son Robert Restalrig Logan (b. 1874), referencing their supposed direct line of descent from Robert Logan, seventh (and last) baronet of Restalrig, Scotland. Despite questions surrounding the true ancestry of the Philadelphia branch of the Logan family,[39] the use of Restalrig illustrated an awareness and the perpetuation of Old World heritage over time among one leading family. In these ways, the choice of names served myriad purposes and held special meanings. Selecting certain derivative names, with their denotative meaning, reflected long-term kin affiliation, revealing careful decisions that were made to recollect an Atlantic lineage or achievement and reinforce a sense of family-based identity.

The continuity of names served myriad purposes and held special meanings. Selecting certain names reflected tradition, identification with family, kin affiliation, or other individual reasons. Naming practices revealed careful decisions that were made to strengthen bonds of kinship and called to mind family founders. A family-based naming culture in the Delaware Valley sustained Atlantic bonds with kindred, reflected a

[38] *Proprietary of Pennsylvania his Ancestry and Descendants* [broadside], Philadelphia: Thomas Gilpin, June 1, 1852, Rare#Am1852 Wil50478.O.10, LCP.
[39] For a discussion about the disputed ancestry of James Logan, see Appendix A in Joseph E. Johnson, "A Statesman of Colonial Pennsylvania: A Study of the Private Life and Public Career of James Logan to the Year 1726," (Ph.D. diss.: Harvard University, 1942), 758-762.

consciousness of ancestry, tied descendants born in the colony to migrant ancestors, and visibly demonstrated membership in a social group.

**Preserving the Familial Past: Bible Records, Genealogy, and Written Histories**

Ancestry captivated the imagination of Delaware Valley settlers, serving as a meaningful source of personal and collective familial identity for migrants and their descendants. Records kept in family Bibles, the practice of genealogy, and written histories all oriented families to their Atlantic pasts. Migrants brought family Bibles with them to the Delaware Valley, continuing the tradition of record keeping—cataloging births, deaths, and marriages—while also noting their pasts and marking their beginnings in a new land. For instance, a Bible belonging to the Jones and Thomas families chronicled the travails of a Welsh migrant kin group, documenting deaths and burial at sea of kinfolk en route to the Quaker colony.[40] Daniel Kent noted in a family Bible the names of his parents as well as his birth "in the city of Limerick and Kingdom of Ireland" in 1765. Kent also included his arrival, documenting for his posterity that he "landed in Philadelphia" in 1785, and thereafter settled in Chester County.[41] Bibles provided a useful means to store vital information about the migrant's origins and arrival in the Delaware Valley, preserving essentials of a family's story that linked it to its roots in the Old World and migrant past in the Atlantic world.

Migrant families continued the tradition of Bible record keeping once in the colony, even expanding their collection when it became necessary. For example, a Welsh Bible from 1654 and a 1730 Welsh Bible Concordance both contained Foulke family

[40] Jones Bible Records, 1683-1815, BR Jo, HSP.
[41] "Copied from the Bible of Daniel Kent, now Owned by William Plumley, of Downington, Chester Co., Pa.," in *Letters and Other Papers of Daniel Kent*, 65.

genealogical data.[42] Moreover, the practice of maintaining notes about overseas kindred figuratively related and connected family to increasingly distant branches. The Shippen family in the Delaware Valley kept notes on the overseas branch of the family in their Bible records. Joseph Shippen, son of migrant Edward Shippen, recorded "My relations in England" and entered their notable accomplishments. Working over one-hundred years after Edward Shippen died and his son Joseph's visit with overseas kindred, Hannah Shippen's copy of genealogical data presented a similar interest in making a note of the English branch of the family, particularly the siblings of migrant Edward Shippen. The original Shippen family Bible and Hannah Shippen's transcriptions detailed knowledge of overseas kindred, and were careful to start with the migrant originator of the family line in America: "Edward Shippen [1639-1712] the first of the name who came to America, was the son of William Shippen [1600-1681] of York Co. England." One recurring piece of information was that Edward Shippen was "the first of the name who emigrated [*sic*] to America[.]" Likewise, on a separate sheet of inserted paper was an "Extract from the Family Bible of Thomas Willing." The transcribed entry started with "Edward Shippen the first of the family in Pennsylvania[.]"[43] This form of genealogical recordkeeping documented migrant ancestors for later generations, and

[42] Foulke Family Papers, *ca*. 1654-1999 (bulk, *ca*. 1750-1860), RG5/045, Series 5: Memorabilia, 1684-1889, Box 7, Friends Historical Library of Swarthmore College.

[43] Shippen genealogy can be found in *The Holy Bible,: containing the Old and New Testaments: newly translated out of the original tongues: and with the former translations diligently compared and revised*. (Oxford, England: Printed by the University-Printers, MDCCI [1701]), Rare**A Bib Eng 9260.F (Doak), Library Company of Philadelphia (hereafter cited as LCP). Joseph Shippen's genealogical entries in the family Bible can be found quoted in Thomas Balch, *Letters and Papers Relating Chiefly to the Provincial History of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: Crissy and Markley, 1855), viii. They can also be found in Randolph Shipley Klein, *Portrait of an Early American Family* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975), 37.

descendants gathered the data for their own collections, disseminating information throughout expanding branches of the family.

Migrants taking passage to Penn's colony participated in the quintessential activity of the Atlantic world, and carried written family histories with them on their journey to Pennsylvania that preserved overseas heritage. For example, the manuscript of Welsh migrant John ap Thomas's ancestral history crossed the ocean.[44] Others detailed their family history, genealogical data, and stories of migration in religious documents. For instance, when some Friends deposited their certificates of removal they also produced a circumstantial account of their family in Wales and their migration to Pennsylvania. Extracts from an early eighteenth-century Preparative Meeting highlighted the conscientious attention that Welsh Quakers paid to their personal histories, their migration, and their settlement in the Delaware Valley. In December 1704, the Merion Monthly Meeting took down Rowland Ellis's testimony about his family and their migration, and also indicated that "the rest of Friends are desired to bring in their accounts as soon as conveneently [*sic*] they can." A month later John Roberts "brought in an account to this meeting of his place of abode in his native Country being Llun in Caernarvonshire, convincement and removal to this country, marriage and other remarkable passages of his life, in order to [be] entered upon Record." In February 1704/5 Edward Rees presented an account "of his descent, Relations, Convincement, marriage, and other occurrences of his life, in order to be recorded." At the same time, Richard Jones submitted a "like account" about his father's migration from "Llwyn-

[44] James J. Levick, "An Old Welsh Pedigree. A Sequel to John ap Thomas and his Friends," *PMHB* 4, no. 4 (1880): 471-483.

Grevill, in the Parish of Clynn, in the county of Merioneth" Wales. In March 1704/5, William Edward "brought an account of his descent, relations, marriage, convincement, and removall to Pennsilvania, with his wife and children, and the like account concerning his brother John Edward and wife and family, and his brother Evan Edward."[45] Family histories added an Atlantic dimension to the region from the beginning of Pennsylvania colonization, linking settler families to their pasts on the other side of the ocean.

German-speaking migrants maintained a widespread interest in commemorating personal events, such as marriage, birth, and baptism, with hand-illuminated decorated manuscripts known as *fraktur*. These family registers, however, focus on lives in Pennsylvania. Almost all registers failed to record family origins in Europe or accounts of Atlantic migration. They demonstrated little interest in documenting pedigree and illustrious ancestry.[46]

For other groups written histories were indispensable references that collected the ancestry, migration story, and other milestone events in a family's past, and were transmitted through generations of descendants. Welsh Quaker John Roberts migrated to Pennsylvania in 1682 and spent more than forty years in the colony. Sometime before passing away in 1724, Roberts set down a written account of his family in Wales and life in Pennsylvania. It was "left to my posterity" and was intended "for our offspring & others y$^{t}$ desire to know from whence wee came & who wee descended from & when wee came to set[t]le unto this place where we are now abide[.]" In his account, Roberts

[45] James J. Levick, "John ap Thomas and his Friends. A Contribution to the Early History of Merion, near Philadelphia," *PMHB* 4, no. 3 (1880): 324
[46] Corinne Earnest and Russell Earnest, *To the Latest Posterity: Pennsylvania-German Family Registers in the Fraktur Tradition* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004).

was sure to record that his grandfather, Robert Thomas Morris, lived at Cowyn in the parish of Llanengan.[47] This one-page account was preserved in the family's Pennsylvania home through the middle of the twentieth century. Quaker Edward Foulke (1651-1741) migrated from Wales in 1698 and, in 1702, almost three-and-a-half years to the day after his arrival in Philadelphia, wrote an account of his parents and lineage, his children, and a description of his family's migration. At the end of the account it was made clear that the document was "Translated from British into English by Samuel Foulke." That a grandson translated the text suggested the continued use of the Welsh language and also illuminated that the family's history was passed on to later generations. Another of Edward Foulke's grandsons, Joseph Foulke (1786-1863), recorded the family's migration story as it was handed down over time, recalling how he "frequently heard my father relate a tradition concerning Edward and [Eleanor] Foulke before their emigration to Pennsylvania" from Wales.[48] Caspar Wistar (1696-1752) landed in Philadelphia on September 16, 1717, a newcomer from a small village near Heidelberg, and wrote a draft of his autobiography ("A Short Report") twenty-five years later, sometime between 1743 and his death in 1752.[49] Working on family history provided migrants and their descendants a sense of continuity and connection to a genealogical past that spanned the Atlantic.

---

[47] John Roberts's "Own Account" can be found in David Loth, *Pencoyd and the Roberts Family* (New York: n.p., [1961]). A photocopy facsimile of the original account can be found on p. 12, and p. 13 has a transcribed printed version of the account. It can also be found as "Short Account of John Roberts," in *Colonial and Revolutionary Families of Pennsylvania* (New York: Lewis Publishing Co., 1911), 453.
[48] The translated account of Edward Foulke can be found in John W. Jordan, ed., *Colonial Families of Philadelphia* vol. 2 (New York: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1911), 930- 931.
[49] Rosalind Beiler, *Immigrant and Entrepreneur: The Atlantic World of Caspar Wistar, 1650-1750* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008).

James Logan's autobiography recounted his early life and events leading to his migration. The narrative, though, began with a brief account of his parents, Patrick Logan and Isabel Hume Logan, and his maternal grandparents, James Hume and Bethia Dundas Hume. Logan outlined that his grandfather was "a younger Brother of the House of St[.] Leonards" and "was Manager of the Estate of the Earl of Murray[.]" This leading Philadelphia figure was also sure to mention that his grandmother was the "Sister of the Laird of Dundas, of Didiston," which he characterized as "a fine seat," adding that his grandmother was also "nearly related to the Earl of Panmat [Panmure] &c."[50] Moreover, female members of the Logan family shared in preserving their history; Hannah Logan (1719/20-1761) transcribed her father's autobiographical account of his family and early life. On the back of the sheet, she revealed her hand in helping save the family's migration story: "James Logans Acco[un].[t] of his Parentage &c—Copied by his daughter Hannah Logan."[51] Thus, such tasks were a way of instructing children of the family's history and migration story, showing one way that Atlantic heritage was learned and preserved.

Well after migration to Pennsylvania, kin-keepers wrote down narratives of family history that highlighted illustrious ancestors and centered on the family's Atlantic

[50] [James Logan,] "Notes on his early life leaving England, etc. Notes on Children of Isaac Norris 1st And on his own brothers and sisters," Logan Papers, vol. 2, p. 104, HSP. James Logan's account can be found in Albert Cook Myers, *Immigration of the Irish Quakers into Pennsylvania, 1682-1750. With their Early History in Ireland* (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1969; reprint, Swarthmore, 1902), 238-40 (page citations are to the reprint edition). Quotes on p. 238.

[51] James Logan, "His account of his Parentage etc., education and services to the Proprietor," vol. 2, p. 103, Logan Family Papers (collection no. 379), HSP. See also "Notes on his early life leaving England, etc. Notes on Children of Isaac Norris 1st And on his own brothers and sisters," vol. 2, p. 104, Logan Family Papers (collection no. 379), HSP. James Logan's account can be found in Albert Cook Myers, *Immigration of the Irish Quakers into Pennsylvania, 1682-1750. With their Early History in Ireland* (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1969; reprint, Swarthmore, 1902), 238-40 (page citations are to the reprint edition). Quotes on p. 238.

travels. In 1786, at the age of fifty-five, successful Philadelphia merchant Thomas Willing took it upon himself to "transmit to my Posterity, for their satisfaction and information, the following account of the family and stock from which I am descended," relying on "old family Bibles and such other authorities" for his composition. In fact, he explained that "the Genealogical account" used for compilation was "in the handwriting of my Great Grandfather Joseph, whose family was originally from Wales." It was this forebear, Willing recorded in his history, who "settled in Gloucestershire near Bristol," thereby establishing the family's connection with that locality. His account was informed and made possible by another source that was handed on through the kinship network, noting that an "old family Bible was presented [to] me, by Mary Syme Willing [second daughter of his great Uncle Richard] now living at Temple-Cloud, in Somersetshire. It was brought from England last summer, by my sister Margaret Hare."[52] This was a highly valued Atlantic genealogical heirloom preserved in the Pennsylvania family with lasting meaning for the kin group. In April 1854, seventy-nine-year-old Richard Willing, "the only surviving son of Thomas Willing," replied to a letter from a possible relative in Liverpool, England, confirming that his father "received the family bible, printed 1614 in the year 1785" and indicating that he still possessed "a copy of my father's geneological history of his family intended for his children."[53] An inherited written family history continued to be utilized as a reference, accomplishing its purpose of instructing progeny about their place in a family line that reached across the Atlantic.

---

[52] Autobiography of Thomas Willing, Philadelphia, February 4, 1786, in *Willing Letters and Papers Edited with a Biographical Essay of Thomas Willing of Philadelphia (1731-1821)*, ed. Thomas Willing Balch (Philadelphia: Allen, Lane, and Scott, 1922), 115-117.

[53] Richard Willing to W. W. Willink Esq., April 1854, Miscellaneous Papers of the Willing Family, Wallace Papers (collection no. 686), vol. 4, p.198, HSP

Work on family trees marked a concerted attempt by settlers and their descendants to preserve lineages and form linkages to a genealogical past that stretched back across the Atlantic. Genealogical information was exchanged within the kinship network, expanding the migrant's understanding of family history and solidified Atlantic bonds of kinship. In March 1706-1707, George Claypoole, migrant James Claypoole's son, received a letter from his "affectionate uncle" Benjamin Claypoole in London, which detailed their common lineage; Benjamin was the youngest brother of James. "To requite your compliance with my curiosity in writing me a particular account of your family," the uncle wrote his nephew in Philadelphia, "I here send you an account of ours." Benjamin Claypoole had requested information about the Claypoole family in Philadelphia, and reciprocated the favor by duly sending a description of the family's history in England. Quite early in the Atlantic bifurcation, members of the family circle drew together their increasingly expanding and diverging family branches through genealogical work. Migrants underscored their shared line of ancestral descent with overseas kin. Benjamin Claypoole, for instance, listed a succession of well-connected English predecessors, beginning with the explanation that "My grandfather and your great-grandfather was a knight." He was sure to include family links to the court of king Charles I and a Claypoole marriage to one of Oliver Cromwell's children.[54] The exchange between the uncle and nephew occurred almost twenty-five years after James Claypoole's family migrated from England in July 1683, and therefore within living memory for family members on both sides of the Atlantic.

[54] Benjamin Claypoole to George Claypoole, London, March 22, 1706/1707, *PMHB* 10, no. 3 (October 1886): 354-355. The letter was reprinted with a different spelling; for the sake of consistency I have spelled the surname as Claypoole.

In the summer of 1734, part of James Logan's extensive communication with his brother William Logan in Bristol, England included work on the family history of their mother, Isabel Hume Logan. "Pray fail not to Send me a Copy of the genealogy of our Mothers family [I] Sent thee," James Logan requested.[55] The brothers, furthermore, had contact with a father and son in Scotland, sharing the name George Logan. The Atlantic and transgenerational acquaintanceships provided an opportunity to exchange information about Logan family history, genealogy, and blazonry.[56] The material acquired by William Logan in 1753, including "An Historical account of the Antient and Honourable Family of Logan of Restalrig" and "a Seal of the Crest of the Arms of Restalrig," ended up in the possession of the Logans of Philadelphia, inherited by James Logan's son William after the death of his uncle William, who bequeathed the assembled work on the family, together with other legacies and personal property, to his nephew and namesake.[57] Believing they were kin, Logans from different generations and in three locations of the British Atlantic world worked together in their common purpose of tracing a pedigree. Their cooperative effort, moreover, imparted an identity predicated upon Atlantic family heritage.

Younger generations in the Atlantic family circle sought to learn stories about the family's past from elderly kinfolk. Francis Daniel Pastorius informed his father on the

[55] James Logan to William Logan, Stenton, August 3, 1734, James Logan Letter Book, vol. 4, p. 406, Logan Family Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[56] For William Logan's correspondence with the father and son in Scotland, see George Logan to William Logan, May 1753, vol. 2, p. 106, Logan Family Papers (collection no. 379), HSP; and George Logan to William Logan, Ormiston, Scotland, June 9, 1753, vol. 2, p.105, Logan Family Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[57] For what the uncle left his brother's family in Pennsylvania, see Dr. [William] Logan's Will, Extracted from the Registry of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, Box 2, Folder 18, Logan-Fisher-Fox Collection (collection no. 1960), HSP. "A Copy of Dr. Logan's Will" was also in the same folder.

European continent that his grandsons "compel me to tell them frequently something of the journeys he has made, and of the course of the life he has led, which is however not especially known to me as yet in all respects." Beyond learning about their grandfather's life, Pastorius indicated in his 1699 letter that his sons "are writing herewith to their honored grandfather himself, and would like very much to know the origin of his family."[58] In their own letter, the brothers "earnestly" requested their grandfather "to give us some information regarding thine origin and dear parents" so that they may learn more about the family's history.[59] Migrants could be separated from family sources and the keepers of kin traditions, making it essential to gather genealogical information from the opposite shores of the Atlantic. Drawing on sources within kinship networks, migrants and their descendants reconstructed their lineages to bridge both genealogical and geographic distance.

When Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790) was in England in the late 1750s he visited the ancestral homes of his and his wife Deborah's families, attempted to locate relatives, and conducted genealogical research in local records. In July 1758, Franklin took many a "Ramble thro' a great Part of England," traveling to Northamptonshire and Oxfordshire in search of the burial grounds of the English Franklins. On these excursions, Franklin was accompanied by his son William, the future Royal Governor of New Jersey and Loyalist, who helped copy gravestone inscriptions of Benjamin Franklin's uncle Thomas Franklin, his father's brother, and paternal grandfather Thomas Franklin. During a retreat

[58] [Francis Daniel Pastorius] to Melchior Adam Pastorius, Philadelphia, March 9, 1699, in *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, 445-446.
[59] Johann Samuel and Henricus Pastorius to Melchior Adam Pastorius, Germanto[w]n, March 4, 1699, in *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, 448.

to the English countryside in 1771, Benjamin Franklin set down to write his *Autobiography* for his son William and opened by recounting the family's ancestry, including his grandfather and uncles. Franklin compiled his notes on the Franklin family, dating back to 1561, and in 1758 created a genealogical chart.[60] Beyond his immediate nuclear family, Franklin also shared his genealogical information with his first cousin Mary Franklin Fisher, the daughter of his father's brother living in England. The inimitable Franklin delighted in a quirk he observed while tracing his father's family line. His compiled data, Franklin explained to her, revealed "that I am the youngest Son of the youngest Son of the youngest Son of the youngest Son for five Generations" straight. She complimented his dedicated research of the family's genealogy, writing back kindly, "You have taken more Care to preserve the Memory of our Family, than any other Person that ever belonged to it, tho' the Youngest Son of five Generations."[61] Appreciating that "I am the last of my Fathers House remaining in this Country," Franklin's older English cousin found solace for the family's future in knowing the "fair Hopes of its Continuance in the Younger Branches, in any Part of the World . . . ."[62] As a branch of the Franklin family faced extinction in England, the line would continue on the opposite shores of the Atlantic. She was impressed that her overseas relative took such care in researching the Franklin family, recognizing a new custodian of the kin group's genealogical history.

---

[60] Benjamin Franklin, Franklin Family, Genealogical Chart by Benjamin Franklin, Transferred from Franklin Papers, Oversize no. 18, HSP. The chart was also reproduced in *PMHB* 23, no. 1 (1899), facing p. 4.

[61] Benjamin Franklin to Mary Franklin Fisher, London, July 31, 1758, reprinted in John W. Jordan, "Franklin as a Genealogist," *PMHB* 23, no. 1 (1899): 6. A copy of the original is facing p. 5.

[62] Mary Franklin Fisher to Benjamin Franklin, Wellingborough, Northamptonshire, England, August 14, 1758, reprinted in John W. Jordan, "Franklin as a Genealogist," *PMHB* 23, no. 1 (1899): 7.

While male family members were often embedded in the Atlantic kin network through written correspondence and commercial enterprises, the pursuit of genealogy frequently followed the female line. For instance, Elizabeth Willing Powel (1743-1830), the wife of wealthy Philadelphia merchant Samuel Powel (1738-1793), compiled a genealogy traced "by the female Line" of her family.[63] A daughter of Charles Willing and Ann Shippen Willing, her work followed the Willing and Shippen families, two leading kin groups in Philadelphia.

Nowhere was the significance of genealogical relatedness more apparent than among the descendants of migrant Thomas Lloyd (1640-1694), a Welsh Quaker who came to Pennsylvania in 1683 and the progenitor of an extensive and influential Delaware Valley family. The practice of genealogy, of course, involved choices about which line to follow and which ancestors matter. Isaac Norris, Jr. (1701-1766) actively researched his matrilineal descent, tracing his kinship through his mother Mary Lloyd Norris. The younger Norris worked on the lineage of his maternal grandfather, who "was by birth of them who are called the gentry" and "of an ancient house and estate" that also bestowed a family coat of arms with fifteen quarterings.[64] Thomas Lloyd, Deputy Governor of Pennsylvania (1684-1688 and 1690-1693) was the object of considerable family pride and research, and served as a link for his descendants to overseas relatives.

---

[63] "Genealogy of Mrs. Elizabeth Powel by the female Line [booklet]," n.d., Shippen Family Papers transferred from Society Collection, HSP. For more of Elizabeth Willing Powel, see David W. Maxey, *A Portrait of Elizabeth Willing Powel, 1743–1830* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2006).
[64] Society of Friends, *Collection of Memorials: Concerning Divers Deceased Ministers and Others of the People called Quakers in Pennsylvania, New-Jersey, and Parts adjacent, from nearly the first Settlement thereof to the Year 1787. With some of the last Expressions and Exhortations of many of them.* (Philadelphia: Joseph Crukshank, 1787), p. 22, Rare Am 1787 Fri 12161.O, Library Company of Philadelphia (hereafter cited as LCP).

Charles Lloyd (1613-1657), the father of migrant Thomas Lloyd, served as a common progenitor and link for his descendants to relatives in Great Britain. Indeed, when Norris referred to "this part of the family which is in America"[65] on the pedigree table, it evinced that members of the extended Lloyd family in Pennsylvania saw themselves as thoroughly joined with a Atlantic kin group. There was a ready exchange of information between kindred to compile a full Atlantic genealogy of such "an honourable and An Ancient house"[66] as the Lloyds. In the process of mapping the Lloyd family tree, moreover, the migrant's grandson also created a lively genealogical relationship with overseas kin. Between the summers of 1747 and 1751, Isaac Norris, Jr., tried to complete an accurate Atlantic Lloyd family tree and looked to family locally and abroad for help, circulating his genealogical document among close kin in Pennsylvania before sending it across the Atlantic to his cousins Sampson and Charles Lloyd. Norris signified that women acted as guardians of the family's history, informing a member of the Lloyd kin in England that "the female branches of Our family here are the best geneologists and p[er]haps are so on your side the Water[.]"[67] [68] Norris learned a great deal from his mother Mary Lloyd Norris (1674-1748), Thomas Lloyd's daughter, and the other women of the Lloyd family. As a boy, furthermore, Isaac Norris, Jr. spent a couple

[65] Isaac Norris to Sampson Lloyd, Fairhill, June 1, 1747, Wall-Paper Letter Book, 1735-1755, p. 46, Logan Papers, HSP.
[66] Isaac Norris to Charles Lloyd, Fairhill, March 25, 1748, Wall-Paper Letter Book, 1735-1755, p. 52, Logan Papers, HSP.
[67] Isaac Norris, Jr. to Sampson Lloyd, Fairhill, June 1, 1747, Isaac Norris, Jr. Wall Paper Letterbook, 1735-1755, p. 46, Logan Family Papers (collection no. 379), HSP.
[68] On this written exchange see: Isaac Norris to Sampson Lloyd, Fairhill, June 1, 1747, Wall-Paper Letter Book, 1735-1755, p. 46, Logan Family Papers (collection no. 379), HSP; Sampson Lloyd to Isaac Norris, Birmingham, September 9, 1747, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP; Isaac Norris to Sampson Lloyd, Fairhill, March 15, 1747/8, Wall-Paper Letter Book, 1735-1755, pp. 49-50, Logan Family Papers (collection no. 379), HSP; Isaac Norris to Charles Lloyd, Fairhill, March 25, 1748, Wall-Paper Letter Book, 1735-1755, p. 52, Logan Family Papers (collection no. 379), HSP; Charles Lloyd to Isaac Norris, Bristol, August 12, 1751, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.

of years with his aunt Rachel Lloyd Preston (1667-1716), another daughter of Thomas Lloyd, while his parents were visiting Great Britain. Thus, he spent an extended period of time among female members of the Lloyd kin group, exposed to and absorbing the family's rich history and traditions.

Genealogical identification with the Lloyd family extended over time, reaching well into the early nineteenth century. Over 150 years after Thomas Lloyd migrated from Wales, his great grandchildren continued to correspond with kinfolk in England. Joseph Parker Norris (1763-1841) drafted a letter in 1835 to Francis Lloyd of Great Britain to discuss a "Geneological Tree of the Lloyd family" and introduce his son George Norris, then in Europe studying medicine. The Pennsylvania descendant wanted to arrange for his son "to visit the old Homestead Dolobran in Montgomery Shire, ~~where~~ the Birth place of my G[rea]t G[ran]d. Father T.[homas] Lloyd" while abroad. The father wanted to be sure his son went to the family sites he never did, lamenting that it was "a source of regret to me that I did not visit" the ancestral Lloyd homestead while overseas. In substitution of a missed opportunity, Norris requested "a view of the House, which to me would be an interesting relict" from across the Atlantic of the family's past. Given the history of Dolobran for the Lloyd family, Joseph Parker Norris assumed that "there must be some view of it in the Family" that he could obtain.[69] The search for common ancestors initiated Atlantic written correspondence between kindred, generating protracted contact between members of this extended family.

[69] [Joseph Parker Norris], "Rough Sketch of a Letter to Francis Lloyd," n.p., April 18, 1835, George Washington Norris Collection (collection no. 961), HSP.

Genealogical research, while focused on looking back, was nonetheless an active pursuit of ancestry, leading to the exchange of family history and reconnection of kin groups in an expansive Atlantic world. Claims of relatedness through a common ancestor or a shared surname traversed the Atlantic, bringing Pennsylvania settlers into closer contact with their genealogical past and potential kindred. Thomas Pemberton of Boston wrote a 1749 letter to travelling Quaker minister John Pemberton (1727-1795) in Philadelphia, grandson of migrant Phineas Pemberton, detailing his ancestors "to give you some account of our Family, since by that means you will be able to know whether any relation subsists between us."[70] In 1769, John Reynell, a prominent Quaker merchant who was born in southwest England and migrated to Philadelphia from Jamaica forty-two years earlier, corresponded with a previously unknown kin member across the Atlantic, "the first I have ever met with of the same name" as Reynell. His father Samuel Reynell, the Pennsylvania settler recalled, "often told me if I ever met with any that spelled their name in the same manner he did, I might depend they were of the same family" as them.[71] The pursuit of genealogy and family histories stimulated kin exchanges, generating relationships and further linking the Delaware Valley to the wider Atlantic past and present.

**Heraldry, Family Identity, and Elite Culture**

Colonial elite identities and cultures of gentility were constructed within Atlantic networks of kinship. Class consolidation and the performance of gentility included a

[70] Thomas Pemberton, Jr. to John Pemberton, Boston, July 20, 1749, Pemberton Papers (collection no. 484A), vol. 5, p. 129, HSP.
[71] John Reynell to Rev. W. H. Reynell, Philadelphia, March 5, 1769, in John Austin Stevens, et al, *The Magazine of American History with Notes and Queries*, vol. II (New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, 1878), 493.

profusion of elite social and cultural pursuits.[72] Colonists with aspirations to gentility looked across the Atlantic to Europe for cues of taste and fashion, and it was commonplace among the English gentry to display the trappings of wealth as representations of power and prestige. In imitation, elite Delaware Valley families, especially prominent Philadelphia merchant families, displayed an array of accoutrements and fine household furnishings that demonstrated refined tastes, and some expensive luxuries included possessions incorporating heraldic devices.[73] Whether the owner was legitimately entitled to use armorials, according to the College of Heralds in London, did not matter to members of the region's leading families. In 1713, for instance, Irish-born James Logan, who was in the early stages of tracing his Scottish descent, admitted to using the arms of the "English Logans" in a wax seal but did not "fear a citation to [from]

---

[72] On the constituent practices, leisure activities, and amusements of elite culture, see: Cindy S. Aron, *Working at Play: A History of Vacations in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Carl Bridenbaugh, "Baths and Watering Places of Colonial America," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3, no. 2 (April 1946), 152-181; Barbara G. Carson, "Early American Tourists and the Commercialization of Leisure," *Of Consuming Interests: The Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Cary Carson, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1994); Thomas A. Chambers, *Drinking the Waters: Creating an American Leisure Class at Nineteenth-Century Mineral Springs* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002); Daniel Kilbride, *An American Aristocracy: Southern Planters in Antebellum Philadelphia* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), esp. chap. 6; Charlene M. Boyer Lewis, *Ladies and Gentlemen on Display: Planter Society a the Virginia Springs, 1790-1860* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001); Scott C. Martin, *Killing Time: Leisure and Culture in Southwestern Pennsylvania, 1800-1850* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995). For the British antecedents to American tourism, see especially: Peter Borsay, "Health and Leisure Resorts 1700-1840," in *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain*, Vol. II, *1540-1840*, ed. Peter Clark (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 775-803 and Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

[73] Delaware Valley settlers invested goods with family meaning. Richard Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities*, traced the rise of gentility, respectability, and refinement and connected growing ethos of consumerism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries through material culture, such as architecture, fashion, books, and other elements, including etiquette and cutlery. On the creation of a consumer society in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and the impact of consumption habits, see Cary Carson, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, eds., *Of Consuming Interests: The Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century* (Charlottesville, Va., 1994); John E. Crowley, *The Invention of Comfort: Sensibilities and Design in Early Modern Britain and Early America* (Baltimore: Johns Hokpins University Press, 2001); and T. H. Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).

y[e] Herald Office for my presumption."[74] While admittedly spurious, Logan's armorial seal conveyed dignified bearing and was emblematic of a developing Atlantic familial identification.

Pennsylvania settlers continued to employ arms they carried with them across the Atlantic. Thomas Roberts signed his 1767 will with an "X," but next to his mark affixed the family's armorial seal—bearing a lion rampant—in red wax.[75] Roberts was born in Wales, moved to Ireland, and then sailed for Pennsylvania in or before 1715. One observer believed that the impression was made by a signet ring dating from the first half of the seventeenth century, suggesting an old heirloom that at some point made its way to migrant Thomas Roberts, who transported it to different Atlantic destinations and ultimately to Lower Milford, Bucks County.[76]

Visual representations of family arms exchanged among members of the Atlantic kin group brought aspects of kinship-based Old World heritage to Pennsylvania. In 1706, Benjamin Claypoole, Quaker migrant James Claypoole's youngest brother, sent the blazon of arms to his nephew George Claypoole in Philadelphia. After highlighting their noble English pedigree by citing common forefathers and distinguished kindred, Benjamin Claypoole's letter to George Claypoole provided a written description of the family's coat of arms and enclosed an illustration of their shared heraldic heritage, introducing his nephew on the far side of the Atlantic to "Our predecessors coat of Arms

[74] James Logan to "Cornal George Logan," Philadelphia, November 9, 1713, Letter Book, 1712-1715, p. 158, Logan Papers no. 6, The Logan Family of Stenton, Mfilm Z6616.A2L639, reel 1, HSP.
[75] Philadelphia Wills, Book O, file no. 100, p. 138.
[76] Clarence V. Roberts, *Ancestry of Clarence V. Roberts & Frances A. (Walton) Roberts* (Philadelphia: William F. Fell Co., Printers, Published by the Compiler, 1940), 225, 233.

— The crest a fleur de luce [lis]."[77] The Claypoole coat of arms was three "hurts," or balls, and a chevron, which was surmounted by a crest of a fleur-de-lis, banded by a ducal coronet. Within the mainland colonies, families sharing the same surname exchanged illustrations of heraldic insignia. In 1749, a member of a Pemberton family in Boston sent genealogical data to John Pemberton in Philadelphia, explaining that "You may see also by the inclos[e]d Impression the Coat of Arms of the Family."[78] Armory circulated throughout the Atlantic, spreading a form of family-based identification that was adopted by Delaware Valley kin groups in recognition of Atlantic heritage and as an indication of social status.

Family arms adorning carriages—themselves "a sort of *cachet* of nobility"[79]—certainly set a select few apart from the populace. In 1713, Quaker Isaac Norris, Sr. initially requested that his coach from England be decorated with his family's heraldic coat—describing that "y$^{e}$ Arms [were] 3 falcons head"[80]—but soon had "second thoughts" and wanted to "have only IN in Cypher [and] the rest all plaine[.]"[81] Even though he settled on a monogram, Norris's interest in heraldic ornamentation suggested a culture of Atlantic-oriented familial traditions. The Bickley family carriage was imported from England, with arms emblazoned on the door, by Abraham Bickley III shortly after

---

[77] Benjamin Claypoole to George Claypoole, London, March 22, 1706-1707, *PMHB* 10, no. 3 (October 1886), 354-355.
[78] Thomas Pemberton, Jr. to John Pemberton, Boston, July 20, 1749, Pemberton Papers (collection no. 484A), vol. 5, p. 129, HSP.
[79] Frederick B. Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia, 1682-1763* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1948; reprint, New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1963), 142 (page citation to the reprint edition).
[80] Isaac Norris to John Askew, Philadelphia, May 30, 1713, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 7½, p. 389, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP. Norris scribbled out a small sketch of the coat of arms.
[81] Isaac Norris to John Askew, Philadelphia, July 2, 1713, Isaac Norris Letter Book, vol. 7½, p. 393, Norris Family Papers (collection no. 454), HSP.

his marriage to Mary Shewell in 1758.[82] Coaches with armorial bearings imported from England were symbols of privileged British gentry life that fixed the social eminence of a family in public view.

A family-based identity was also fashioned from material possessions, such as engraved domestic silver. A heraldic mark on domestic silver expressed a pride in rank, establishing the proper image for the affluent, but as a memory practice it was also a symbolic identification with a kin group in the Atlantic world. Domestic silver, referred to as "plate," had intrinsic value and was a considerable investment, and historian Frederick B. Tolles explained that engravings of family arms were a built-in security measure, making valuable pieces "easily identifiable if stolen."[83] Domestic silver marked with heraldic motifs, nevertheless, signaled association with a family and its heritage. A pair of sauceboats made for the influential Pemberton family between 1750 and 1755 was engraved with a boar's head, which was part of their family crest.[84] Among the opulent goods accumulated by Quaker merchant Jonathan Dickinson was a considerable amount of silver plate, including a "Tea pot with family Arms."[85] Engraved silver was used prominently and set out ostentatiously for entertaining. A heraldic mark on precious metals, then, expressed a pride in social rank; however, as a memory practice it displayed a family's lineage that spanned the Atlantic.

---

[82] The Bickley family coach is housed at Pen Ryn, 1601 State Road, Bensalem, Pa. 19020.
[83] Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House*, 129.
[84] Pemberton sauceboat, accession number, 1979-1-1, Philadelphia Museum of Art; it is on view in Gallery 104, American Art, first floor. The sauceboat was made in Philadelphia by American Joseph Richardson, Sr. (1711-1784). An image can be found in Jack L. Lindsey, *Worldly Goods: The Arts of Early Pennsylvania, 1680-1758* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1999), 194.
[85] Philadelphia Wills, Book D, p. 317. The inventory can be found in Harold Gillingham, "Notes and Documents: The Estate of Jonathan Dickinson (1663-1722)," *PMHB* 59, no. 4 (October 1935): 424.

Engraved domestic silver was incorporated into the special events of family life, such as a wedding. William Till (1697-1766), settled about 1720 in Sussex County on the Delaware and served in the Assembly of the Lower Counties,[86] placed an order with a London merchant to obtain pieces of silverware on the occasion of his daughter Mary's marriage to Andrew Hamilton. Till's sister, in England, was to "direct a Coat of Arms to be put on the plate," writing that "my Sister will help you to a Coat of Arms w.$^{ch}$ if ~~it~~ can be had easy, Let it be engraved on the Plate otherwise their names in a Cypher" as "A$^{H}$M" if necessary.[87] As Mary Till prepared to marry, William Till presented his daughter with a lasting symbol of her father's family engraved on silver.

Historical objects passed down through the family linked generations of descendants to some fantastic stories of the Atlantic world. At times, treasured family objects with armorial bearings placed settlers at Pennsylvania's entry into the Atlantic. For instance, the Norris family of Philadelphia cherished a silver dish, made in London around 1685 and featuring "the arms of the family engraved on it," that survived and was recovered after the destruction of 1692 Port Royal earthquake. Deborah Norris Logan's genealogical diary—dedicated "For my Posterity"— set down the story attached to the dish that was handed down the generations.[88] Isaac Norris, Sr. (1671-1735) was born into a Quaker family in Southwark, Surrey, England, and around 1678 his parents, Thomas Norris (d. 1692) and Mary Moore Norris (d. 1685), migrated with their children

[86] *Provincial Councillors of Pennsylvania*, 194; and *Lawmaking and Legislators in Pennsylvania*, 449.
[87] William Till to Lawrence Williams, Philadelphia, October 26, 1741, Letter Book (typewritten copy), p. 86, William Till Letters (collection no. 660); and William Till, "List of 'Plate &c. for my Daughter Mary Till,'" October 26, 1741, Society Collection, HSP.
HSP.
[88] Diary of Deborah Norris Logan, p. 33, manuscript 14720.Q, LCP.

to Port Royal, Jamaica. Most of Isaac Norris's immediate family perished in the wake of the destruction and pestilence caused by the June 7, 1692 earthquake that destroyed the Jamaican city of Port Royal. In 1690, Norris ventured to Philadelphia to view the city in advance preparation of his family's planned resettlement to the Quaker colony. He returned to Jamaica, only to learn that his father Thomas Norris was killed in the earthquake and that his older sister Elizabeth (1657-1692) died a week before he arrived back; his older brother Joseph (1661-1692) passed away a day after he returned to the island. Sailors, family legend held, found a cradle containing the dish and a baby African girl floating in the water near what had been Port Royal. The family heirloom and the tradition surrounding the dish, tied the Pennsylvania family to their migrant ancestor and the past of a larger Atlantic world.[89]

Heraldic designs marked other personal items, such as the use of armorial bookplates. Bookplates identified the owners of books and frequently featured various vignettes, including designs inspired by heraldry. Joseph Shippen (1678/9-1741), son of wealthy Quaker merchant Edward Shippen (1640-1712) originally of Yorkshire, England, took a trip abroad in 1704, met the Shippen kinfolk of England, and received an armorial bookplate from his English cousin Robert Shippen (1675-1745), preserving the heraldic impression in the American branch of the family.[90] The Shippen family of Pennsylvania directly acquired a copy of their coat of arms from overseas kin, intimately tying them to their Atlantic legacy. Transferring their birthright to the colony, the

[89] The Norris dish is part of the collections at Atwater Kent Museum of Philadelphia, 15 South Seventh Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

[90] An illustration of the bookplate can be found in Thomas Willing Balch, "The English Ancestors of the Shippen Family and Edward Shippen, of Philadelphia," *PMHB* 28, no. 4 (1904): 395. An inquiry at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania yielded no success in locating the item in their vast collections.

Shippen family demonstrated that armorial heirship, unofficially shared between kindred, was not curtailed by the waters of the Atlantic.

In the mid-eighteenth century, wealthy Philadelphians were partial toward armorial bookplates with rococo designs. Rococo was the dominant style of decorative arts in America between 1750 and 1775, with a distinctively embellished ornamental appearance. On rococo bookplates featuring family arms, the shield elements were framed within a cartouche or mantling that was asymmetrical and had curving lines, expressing elegance and movement. Some four hundred books in wealthy Philadelphia merchant Isaac Norris, Jr.'s (1701-1766) library contained bookplates with the Norris family arms, obtained probably around 1757 from James Turner (d. 1759), a skilled engraver who spent a few years in Philadelphia.[91] Samuel Powel (b. 1739), from one of Philadelphia's wealthiest families, used a bookplate with the family arms featuring a rampant lion and eight-pointed star in the crest.[92] Francis Hopkinson (1737-1791), a signer of the Declaration of Independence who had done extensive research into his mother's genealogy and heraldry on a 1766 trip to England, also used an armorial bookplate in the rococo style, made by American engraver Henry Dawkins between 1768 and 1770, displaying his paternal arms, a chevron with three diamonds surrounded by

[91] The books of Isaac Norris, with bookplates, are located in the Archives and Special Collections Department, Waidner-Spahr Library, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. For more on this private library collection and an illustration of Norris's bookplate, see Marie Elena Korey, *The Books of Isaac Norris (1701-1766) at Dickinson College* (1976). An image can also be seen in Morrison H. Heckscher and Leslie Greene Bowman, *American Rococo, 1750-1775: Elegance in Ornament* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992), 45.

[92] Powel bookplates are available for viewing upon request at Powel House, located in the Society Hill neighborhood at 244 South Third Street, Philadelphia, Pa. Powel House is a Georgian brick townhouse mansion maintained by The Philadelphia Society for the Preservation of Landmarks.

three stars.[93] William Logan (1718-1776), son of migrant James Logan and who had stayed with his paternal uncle in Bristol, England as a youth, requested in 1769 that 5000 armorial bookplates be pressed in England and "to be pasted on the Inside of every Book" in his father's extensive collection, known as the Loganian Library, which was the forerunner of the Library Company of Philadelphia. He also ordered a similar copper plate cast of the family arms for his own use, specifying "that the Stags head" on the crest be enlarged as a focal point of the print.[94] Among Pennsylvania's German-speaking settlers, there were only a few examples of armorial bookplates from upper-class colonists, especially the educated clergy.[95] Armigerous bookplates were symbols that leading Pennsylvania families used to affirm their position and also identify themselves with an Atlantic past.

Beyond bookplates, heraldic arms were found in other, if more uncommon, ornamental devices. For example, the parlor ceiling at Belmont Mansion, built overlooking the Schuylkill River west of Philadelphia between 1742-1745 by lawyer William Peters, an Anglican migrant from Liverpool, displayed a rare, ornate, molded-stucco ceiling inspired by baroque-classical designs with the family's armorial coat of arms in plaster.[96] In addition, women from Pennsylvania's founding families participated

---

[93] Francis Hopkinson's bookplate can be found in Bookplate Collection, 1750-1850, collection 51, entry 260, Winterthur Library. An image can been seen in Heckscher and Bowman, *American Rococo*, 45.
[94] William Logan to Samuel Clarke, Philadelphia, May 20, 1769, Letter Book, 1768-1776, Box 2, Logan–Fisher–Fox Collection (collection no. 1960), HSP. An picture of the bookplate can be found in Edwin Wolf, *The Library of James Logan of Philadelphia, 1674-1751* (Philadelphia: The Library Company of Philadelphia, 1974), between pp. xl-xli.
[95] Don Yoder, *The Pennsylvania German Broadside: A History and Guide* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005), 142. For an example of a rare but informative bookplate belonging to Dielman Kolb (b. 1691), see Earnest and Earnest, *To the Latest Posterity*, 41-42.
[96] A close-up image of the plaster design can be found in Lindsey, *Worldly Goods*. Belmont mansion is located in the Fairmount Park area of Philadelphia. It is operated as the Underground Railroad Museum at

in heraldic work through sampler stitching. Sisters Ann (1743-1778) and Elizabeth (1742-1781) Flower both completed exquisitely embroidered silk needlework pictures in 1763 and 1765 that displayed the family's coat of arms of the Flower family of Philadelphia.[97] Their family predecessor, Enoch Flower (1635-1684), was from Wiltshire, England and a First Purchaser of land in William Penn's new Quaker colony.[98] The embroidered coat of arms conveyed elegance and beauty, made with expensive materials, worked in silk and gold and silver metallic threads and put in gilt frames. The art of embroidery was a uniquely female realm, making skillful armorial needlework the special province of women in the family. The two embroidered Flower coats of arms were virtually identical, wrought in a rococo style, likely modeled after engraved silver or copied from a printed guide used by craftsmen, suggesting this form of heraldic art was a family pursuit.[99] Similarly, an embroidered Lambert family coat of arms, crafted between 1745 and 1755, was made after Hannah Lambert's 1738 marriage to Thomas Cadwalader, a union of two influential Quaker families.[100] Whether it is in ornamental plaster or silk moiré, armorial devices took different forms with luxurious appearance. Leisure and wealth furnished the wherewithal for some to flaunt the decorative display of coats of arms. For those able to afford such extravagance, heraldic devices connected

---

Belmont Mansion, 2000 Mansion Drive, Philadelphia, PA 19131. More on Belmont can be found in Roger W. Moss, *Historic Houses of Philadelphia: A Tour of the Region's Museum Homes* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), 62-64.

[97] Ann Flower's coat of arms (1763) are part of the collections at Winterthur Museum, 1958.2226. The Elizabeth Flower embroidered coat of arms (1765) was sold in January 2006 by Christie's New York, lot 652/sale 1745. For an illustration, see Morrison H. Heckscher and Leslie Greene Bowman, *American Rococo, 1750-1775: Elegance in Ornament* (New York, 1992), p. 13, fig. 10.

[98] Enoch Flower purchased 2000 acres of Pennsylvania land for £40. See "The First Purchasers of Pennsylvania," *PWP*, vol. 2, 643.

[99] For more on Ann Flower's sketching and embroidery, see Amanda Isaac, "Ann Flower's Sketchbook: Drawing, Needlework, and Women's Artistry in Colonial Philadelphia," *Winterthur Portfolio* 41 (Summer/Autumn 2007): 141-160.

[100] Lindsey, *Worldly Goods*.

elite Delaware Valley families to an identifying symbol of the Atlantic kin group and affirmed social standing.

Given the opportunity, colonists took advantage of travels abroad to obtain images of coats of arms. Francis Hopkinson, during his trip to England in 1766, informed his mother Mary Johnson Hopkinson that a relative "intends to get your Family Arms Quartered with my Father's neatly enameled & sent as a Present to you."[101] This was just over a year after Mary Johnson Hopkinson received genealogical records and heraldic sketches from Benjamin Franklin. The history of the Lloyd family continued to fascinate the branch of the family in the Delaware Valley, and that interest also included armorial devices. In 1780, an extended coat of arms belonging to Charles Lloyd, migrant Thomas Lloyd's father, was taken from a panel at Dolobran, Wales, and in 1826 an engraved copy was sent to by Francis Lloyd, of Birmingham, England to Joseph Parker Norris in Pennsylvania, nearly one-hundred and fifty years after the family's Atlantic migration and settlement.[102] The line of descent represented on this particular coat of arms was valued by the Pennsylvania-branch of the Lloyd kin group because of its marshalling, or arrangement of several coats of arms on one escutcheon as families merged by marriage and combined their respective arms. The lasting fascination with armory continued to symbolize an avid pursuit of family history and origins, helping colonists and later descendants make representative connections to their Atlantic backgrounds.

---

[101] Francis Hopkinson to Mary Hopkinson, Hartlebury Castle, Worcester, England, August 12, 1766, Hopkinson Papers, vol. 2: Letters, 1736-1800, [pp. 78-81], HSP.
[102] *Letters of Doctor Richard Hill and his Children; or the History of a Family as told by themselves*, collected and arranged by John Jay Smith (Philadelphia: Privately Printed, 1854), xxxviii.

The appeal of heraldic insignia was another way that Delaware Valley families showed a sustained interest in their European past, engaging migrants and their descendants alike. Armorial regalia appeared in many forms, including written descriptions and illustrations contained in letters, armorial bookplates, engraved domestic silver, and carriage door adornments. Heraldry was a system of identification, and the predilection for armory in colonial Pennsylvania affirmed social position and a shared kinship identity that stretched across the Atlantic. Indeed, heraldic devices were visual representations of a family identity that spanned both genealogical and geographic distance.

**Delaware Valley Settlements and Country Houses**

Familial Atlantic history and origins were quite literally written on the settlers' new landscape, leaving an indelible and personal footprint in the Delaware Valley. Arriving Europeans named their new settlements and farmsteads after places of origin. Indeed, naming practices revealed a genealogical place attachment, or a "linkage of people and land through the historical identification of place and family,"[103] that maintained and preserved connection with ancestral home grounds. Such a practice sheds light on how migrants attached themselves to their new locales, a process of bonding to new physical settings by invoking old places. As the colony matured, moreover, Quaker elites began emulating their British counterparts by amassing large land holdings and constructing country houses.[104] Many of the country estates were

[103] Setha M. Low, "Symbolic Ties that Bind: Place Attachment in the Plaza," in *Place Attachment*, ed. Irwin Altman and Setha M. Low (New York: Plenum Press, 1992), 167.
[104] Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House*, 114, discussed this trend as one of many aristocratic attributes found among Philadelphia's Quaker mercantile class.

outside of Philadelphia, located along the banks of Delaware River in Bucks County and near Germantown. Among these country houses were examples of structures named after ancestral homes or significant places from a family's past. Naming a country residence after an ancestral place across the Atlantic created the setting for additional social activities. Elite sociability was set against the backdrop of Atlantic family history and a kin group's migrant past.[105]

Some memory practices were place oriented and symbolically associated with specific European lands left behind. Particularly revealing as cases of place memory and place attachment behavior, conceptual tools developed by philosopher Edward Casey and environmental psychologists Setha Low and Irvin Altman,[106] were Delaware Valley farms and country estates named for ancestral homesteads, wistful reminiscences of bucolic landscapes, and grave inscriptions indicating regions of migration. Family-based topophilic feelings—defined by geographer Yi-Fu Tuan as "the affective bond between people and place"[107]—were particularly strong toward home grounds, helping kin groups to reach out into the Atlantic world and bring a sense of connectedness with Old World places to Pennsylvania.

---

[105] On British gardens and extensive grounds that were part of country estates, see Mark Laird, *The Flowering of the Landscape Garden: English Pleasure Grounds, 1720-1800* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), Beth Tobin, *Colonizing Nature: The Tropics in British Arts and Letters, 1760-1820* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Tom Williamson, *Polite Landscapes: Gardens and Society in Eighteenth-Century England* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995).

[106] On place memory, see Edward S. Casey, *Remembering: A Phenomenological Study* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1987). Attachment behavior was surveyed in Setha Low and Irvin Altman, eds., *Place Attachment* (New York: Plenum Press, 1992). For other studies on the human experience and the meaning of place, see Yi-Fu Tuan, "Place: An Experiential Perspective," *Geographical Review* 65 (April 1975): 151-165; idem, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977); Edward Relph, *Place and Placelessness* (London: Pion Limited, 1976); and Dolores Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995).

[107] Yi-Fu Tuan, *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974), 4, 93.

The poignant power of memory and place evident among migrant settlers led to a naming pattern in the Delaware Valley that linked the region to places left behind across the Atlantic. The widespread appellative custom suggested that place elicited remembering and acted as a "medium,"[108] situating memories and serving as a "repository"[109] and "container"[110] of life events. As a family tradition, moreover, a place-oriented naming practice was a form of cultural inheritance that the migrant generation in Pennsylvania passed on to the next generation.

A mnemonic naming pattern was pronounced among Welsh Quakers settling in Pennsylvania. The Welsh Tract, also referred to as the Welsh Barony, was over 40,000 acres of land located to the northwest of Philadelphia. Many places in the so-called "barony" kept the homeland in mind and bore Welsh names, even on an individual level. For instance, thirty-five-year-old John Roberts (1648-1724) settled on a tract of 250 acres in 1683 and called his farm "Pencoid" (later spelled "Pencoyd"). Sometime before his death in 1724, Roberts set down an account of his migration to Pennsylvania, recording that he "settled myself on the place which I afterwards called Pencoid, in the Township of Merion, which was afterwards called so by . . . the first settlers of it."[111] The Delaware Valley site, moreover, received its name from the place of Roberts's nativity, harkening back to the estates of Pencoed (or Penkoed) in Llyn, Caernarvonshire, northern Wales. In another example, Rowland Ellis (1650-1729) built a stone farmhouse in 1704 he named

[108] Low and Altman, "Place Attachment: A Conceptual Inquiry," in *Place Attachment*, 10.
[109] Ibid.
[110] Casey, *Remembering*, 186, 194-95.
[111] John Roberts's "Own Account" can be found in David Loth, *Pencoyd and the Roberts Family* (New York: n.p., [1961]). A photocopy facsimile of the original account can be found on p. 12, and p. 13 has a transcribed printed version of the account. It can also be found as "Short Account of John Roberts," in *Colonial and Revolutionary Families of Pennsylvania* (New York: Lewis Publishing Co., 1911), 453.

"Bryn Mawr" after his old home. The property took its name from an estate near Dolgellau in northern Wales that was Ellis's farm at the time of his 1686 migration.[112] Morris Llewellyn (1645-1730), a Welsh migrant from the parish of Castle Booth, purchased 500 acres of Pennsylvania land from William Penn while still in Wales. He migrated in 1682 with Ann, his wife, and their three children, and shortly after their arrival they built a two and a half story stone dwelling on the farmstead and named it Castle Bith after Morris's Welsh birthplace.[113]

Similarly suggestive examples of naming practices abound in the Delaware Valley. Henry Paxson migrated from Bycot House, parish of Slow, Oxfordshire, England in 1682 and after an Atlantic crossing that claimed his wife, two sons, and brother Thomas, eventually settled in Solebury Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania on a plantation he named "Marsh Gibbon." This name Marsh Gibbon held significance because it was Paxson's natal home in Buckinghamshire, where he was baptized in 1647, was also the point of migration for two of his brothers, William and James (both of whom migrated to Bucks County, Pennsylvania), as well as the place where his parents were married and buried.[114] Meaningful places, such as Marsh Gibbon, were "inseparable"[115] from past experiences, and provided reminders of earlier life, parents, friends, and

[112] "Pedigree of Rowland Ellis, of Bryn Mawr, from his own manuscript, 1697," *PMHB* XIV (1890): 199-200.
[113] Dick Jones, ed., *The First 300: The Amazing and Rich History of Lower Merion* (Ardmore, Pa.: The Lower Merion Historical Society; Collingdale, Pa.: Distributed by Diane Publishing Co., 2000), 27.
[114] Henry Paxson referred to "Marsh Gibbon" in his 1723 will. See Bucks County Wills, Book 1, file no. 212, p. 73. Information on Henry Paxson's English origins and family data gathered from: "A Partial List of the Families who Resided in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Prior to 1687, with the Date of their Arrival," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* IX (1885): 227; Martha Jonet Paxson Grundy, "The Paxson Brothers of Colonial Pennsylvania: Three Generations," *National Genealogical Society Quarterly* 71 (September 1983): 193-216; and Stewart Baldwin, "The Paxson Brothers of Pennsylvania: A Reassessment of the Evidence," *National Genealogical Society Quarterly* 83 (1995): 39-43.
[115] Low and Altman, "Place Attachment: A Conceptual Inquiry," in *Place Attachment*, 10.

ancestors. Migrant William Watson "Left ffarnsfeild my dwelling in the County of Nottingham in ould england the 29 day of the 5 month [July] 1684." Watson also recorded in his diary that he and his family "Sattled a plantation and called the plase ffernsfeild in the township of Nottingham in the County of Borlingtun [Burlington] in the province of west New Jarsey." The significance of Farnsfield to the Watson family was documented by other journal entries recording birth dates, highlighting that the selection of their home village in the northeast Midlands of England as the name of a new Delaware Valley farmstead was all the more meaningful.[116]

The examples of Marsh Gibbon and Farnsfield suggested that these English places were deeply memorable, holding powerful images that resonated across the ocean via memories. Both names incorporated prior associations and significant events within the migrant's family life.[117] These selections demonstrated relationships to home grounds through kinship that spanned time and distance. Place was interwoven with nostalgia, thrusting people back into the places they recalled. Naming practices actively re-linked the settlers to these places, and philosopher Edward Casey explained that "to remember particular places, or to remember by means of them," intensified memorial powers.[118] Place acted as a "carrier of emotionally charged events" and "the locus of memories,"[119] and therefore was a powerful source of Atlantic memory that grounded what was remembered and alleviated anxieties of disorientation and separation.[120] In the

[116] William Watson, Journal, 1684-1827, Am. 181, HSP.
[117] On the role of psychological factors in place attachment, see Altman and Low, "Place Attachment: A Conceptual Inquiry," in *Place Attachment*, 9.
[118] Casey, *Remembering*, 202, 189.
[119] Yi-Fu Tuan, *Topophilia*, 93.
[120] Casey, *Remembering*, 195.

process, settlers brought personal associations of their kin group's Atlantic past to the region.

Migrants continued a place-oriented naming practice throughout the Delaware Valley, recalling homes left behind. In 1707, Abraham Marshall, a native of Derbyshire, in the north midlands of England, settled on a plantation and built "Derbydown" along the west branch of the Brandywine River in West Bradford, Chester County, Pennsylvania.[121] "Bolton" farm, in Bristol Township, Bucks County, was a tract of land settled by the Quaker Pemberton family. Phineas Pemberton (1650-1702), migrated in 1682 with his wife, three children, father, and father-in-law from Bolton, Lancashire, in the northwest of England.[122] "Whitby Hall," located in Kingsessing, west Philadelphia, was built in 1754 by Col. James Coultas, who was born near the town of Whitby on the Yorkshire coast.[123] The designation linked the gray stone Georgian house with brick trims to Coultas's native area in northern England, imbuing the residence with a sentimental connotation that was remindful of a particular locality left behind. Physical structures, such as Bolton and Whitby Hall, imparted Atlantic associations to properties in the Delaware Valley and marked a connection to remembered places across the ocean.

---

[121] The home survives as a private residence in Northbrook, Pa. Derbydown homestead is listed in the National Register of Historic Places (building number 73001609). See J. Smith Futhey and Gilbert Cope, *History of Chester County, Pennsylvania*. *With Genealogical and Biographical Sketches*. (Philadelphia: Louis H. Everts and Co., 1881), 146.

[122] Details of the Pemberton family migration can be found in "A Partial List of the Families who Resided in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Prior to 1687, with the Date of their Arrival" *PMHB* 9, no. 2 (July 1885): 230. For more on the naming of Bolton, see Jordan, *Colonial Families of Philadelphia*, 282. The farmhouse on Bolton farm, built in 1687, is still standing, located at 85 Holly Drive, Levittown, Pa.

[123] For more on Whitby Hall and a picture, see Harold Donaldson Eberleing and Horace Mather Lippincott, *The Colonial Homes of Philadelphia and Its Neighbourhood* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1912), 98, 101.

Place-oriented appellations perhaps reflected an intrinsic character of migrants or something innate, an emotional response to long-distance relocation.

The practice of using European places of origin for naming homes in a new land extended beyond early colonization and was replicated throughout eighteenth-century settlement in Pennsylvania. On the eve of the Revolutionary War, Alexander Thomson established a plantation close to Shippensburg, in the Cumberland Valley, which he named in memory of his father's farm near Glasgow, Scotland. "My plantation which I have called Corkerhill," he indicated, was given "after the name of the farm where my father lived and died, and where I lived so long" before migrating to the province.[124] The selection of "Corkerhill" preserved the migrant's deep-rooted memories of a home ground and familial connections he felt toward that place across the ocean.

James Logan was an Irish-born Quaker of Scottish descent, who in 1699, sailed for Pennsylvania. Logan worked closely with the colony's proprietor, serving as secretary to William Penn, and held many political positions; indeed, he was a prominent early Philadelphian. James Logan built a country house in Germantown between 1723 and 1730, and wrote his brother William in Bristol, England that he named the Georgian-inspired brick mansion "Stenton after the Village in E[ast] Lothian [Scotland] where our father was born . . . ." The Logan family was very peripatetic, leaving Scotland and migrating between Ireland and England. Yet, James Logan selected his father's place of

[124] Alexander Thomson, *News from America. Letter I. From Alexander Thomson, late Tenant at Corkerhill in the Parish of Paisley, now Proprietor of a considerable Estate in Pensilvania. To a Gentleman near Glasgow*. (1774), in *Discoveries of America: Personal Accounts of British Emigrants to North America during the Revolutionary Era*, ed. Barbara De Wolfe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 110 n.49. Quote on p. 112. Thomson's pamphlet was in letter format and was dated from "Corkerhill in Pensilvania, August 16th, 1773."

birth and the paternal family's place of origin. Subsequent generations of Logan family members lived in the plantation house, keeping the Stenton name and preserving its symbolic significance. In 1852, furthermore, descendants added on to the property, referring to the new construction as "Restlerigg Hall," carrying on James Logan's familial-oriented and place-specific naming tradition.[125] Brothers James Logan and William Logan claimed decent from the Logan family of Restalrig, identified in early family histories as a baronet held by the Logans near Edinburgh, Scotland.

A similar practice was evident at other country estates in the colony. "Trevose" was the Growdon family mansion north of Philadelphia, built near the Neshaminy Creek, in Bensalem, Bucks County, and was named after the family homestead in Cornwall, southwestern England. Lawrence and Joseph Growdon, father and son, were both First Purchasers of Pennsylvania land and were wealthy pewterers and merchants in Cornwall; they lived at the family estate, the barton of Trevose, near Padstow and located along St. George's Channel. Joseph Growdon, soon after his arrival in 1683, built a baronial stuccoed stone residence on his large manor in Bensalem Township, Bucks County.[126] There was even a continuum of this practice among close colleagues. Richard Gibbs was born in England in 1723, and in 1746 left for Philadelphia. Gibbs worked as secretary to

---

[125] Logan Family Section, Loose Financial Records and Account Books, 1852-1854, on building Restlerigg Hall on Stenton farm, box 44, Loudon Papers (collection no. 1971), HSP. The box included five folders and two small books of bills and receipts for building costs. It was constructed for Anna Armatt Logan, wife of Gustavus George Logan (1815-1876).

[126] In 1681, Lawrence and Joseph Growdon each purchased 5000 acres of land at £100 apiece. See "The First Purchasers of Pennsylvania," *PWP*, vol. 2, 644. On the origins of the Gorwdons, see ibid; and "Minute Book 'G.' Minutes of Property Commencing Ye 19th 9th ber [November]., 1701. This is Book G in the Secretaries Office. At Session of the Commissioners at Philadelphia, 4th 8mo. [October] 1703. Omnes." *Pennsylvania Archives*, 2nd ser., vol. XIX ed. William H. Egle (Harrisburg: E. K. Meyers, State Printer, 1890), 403. Trevose is still standing, maintained by the local historical society, at 5408 Neshaminy Valley Road, Bensalem, Pa.

Judge Lawrence Growdon, and lived in the west wing of the Growdon mansion, "Trevose," with his wife and four children. In 1770, after Judge Growdon passed away, Richard Gibbs left "Trevose" and built a home of his own on a large tract of land he called "Eddington," after a town in his native England.[127] Recent arrivals continued the naming practice for country residences over the course of the eighteenth century. "Ormiston" was the Burd family country house on the Schuylkill River in Philadelphia County. The Federal style mansion was built in 1798 by lawyer Edward Burd of Scotland, and took its name from his granddaughter's country seat at Orminston Hall near Edinburgh, Scotland.[128]

This naming pattern was also found among country estates outside of Philadelphia. Outward displays of status signaled and reinforced social and political position. Having risen to rank in colonial society, the climb toward gentility included a country estate, which was considered a status marker of the British gentry.[129] Historian Gary B. Nash documented the trend where many sons of the founding commercial elite did not enter business but were successful enough in acquiring land that their male offspring decided to forego mercantile careers, preferring country life. Their sizeable inheritances allowed them to retire to a gentleman farmer's life on country plantations.[130] Some of the successful first-generation Quakers had already withdrawn to the

---

[127] For more on Eddington, see Sara V. Sondesky et al., *Traveling Through Bensalem, 1692-1984* (Historical Society of Bensalem, 1984), 42.
[128] Ormiston, 2000 Reservoir Drive, Philadelphia, Pa., is part of Fairmount Park and maintained by the Royal Heritage Society of the Delaware Valley.
[129] J. V. Beckett, *The Aristocracy in England, 1660-1914* (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1986).
[130] Gary B. Nash, "The Early Merchants of Philadelphia: The Formation and Disintegration of a Founding Elite," in *The World of William Penn*, ed. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 344. For more on the domestic architecture and interior furnishings of Philadelphia's historic houses, see Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House*, 127-29.

countryside, and their residences were grand attempts to imitate the life of the rural English gentry. The migrants and the offspring of upper-class families building these homes turned out into the Atlantic to name their mansions, looking toward British locations meaningful to their families.

Beyond the migrant generation, the eighteenth century witnessed the construction of refined country houses outside of Philadelphia, an attempt at grandeur and a way to escape summer heat and epidemics that plagued the city. The naming of country estates pointed toward the continuance of memory practices over time and across generations, such as the residence known as "Pen Ryn." When migrant Abraham Bickley died in 1726, a 250-acre tract of land located on the Delaware River in Bensalem, Bucks County passed to his son Samuel. After Samuel's death in 1749, the property passed on to his then eighteen-year-old son, Abraham III. It was about 1754 that Abraham III, living as a country gentleman, built a mansion on the land and named it "Pen Ryn," derived from Penrhyn, the birthplace of a Bickley ancestor in Caernarvonshire, northern Wales.[131] In an even later example, "Burholme," in Philadelphia County, was built as an opulent Victorian summer retreat on 85 acres in 1859 by Joseph Waln Ryerss (1803-1868), who named his country estate after the Waln ancestral village in the West Riding of Yorkshire, England. Joseph Waln Ryerss was a great great great grandson of Nicholas Waln (*ca*. 1650-1721/2), one of the original Pennsylvania settlers. Nicholas Waln was born in Burholme, Slaidburn Parish, in the West Riding of Yorkshire, and with his wife Jane Turner Waln (1653-1747) and their three children set sail for Pennsylvania on the

[131] Sara V. Sondesky et al., *Traveling Through Bensalem, 1692-1984* (Historical Society of Bensalem, 1984), 44-45.

ship *Lamb of Liverpool*, arriving in the colony in October 1682.[132] The descendants of migrants were aware of their family's Atlantic history, and kept that legacy alive by drawing inspiration from a family's Old World origins. Generations after a family was established in the region, Pennsylvanian-born family members used their historical roots to name estates. Such naming practices maintained an attachment with a particular family's origins and forebears, as well as impressing a distinctly Atlantic quality to the architecture and land of Pennsylvania.

Beyond names, some of Philadelphia's domestic architecture was physically modeled after Old World family residences, tangibly linking the region to Atlantic dwellings in memory and imagination. The Willing family's home in Philadelphia was physically modeled on the appearance of the family's residence in England, revealing a Atlantic family-oriented transmittance. In the mid-nineteenth century, local antiquarian John F. Watson wrote to ask Charles Willing "to procure a Daguerotype view of the Willing house ere it is torn down," appealing that it "would be barbarous neglect to preserve no vestige of it[.]" "Bear in mind," Watson reminded Willing, "that it was a house, built after the Willing homested in Bristol England[.]" Soon to be leveled, the house was at the center of the family's history in Philadelphia, offering tangible sources for mementos. Materials taken from the structure signified that the dwelling housed Willing family history and memories, where common places "such as wood of the stairs—in which all has set foot" became a well-known and acknowledged site of family life. Watson suggested that Willing "Treat yourself to a Cane from its wood," while each

[132] Today, Burholme is part of Fairmount Park as Ryerss Museum and Library, Burholme Park, 7370 Central Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19111. See Roger W. Moss, *Historic Houses of Philadelphia: A Tour of the Region's Museum Homes* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), 171.

of "the ladies" in the family were to receive a "little Toilet box" [make-up container] made from discarded debris. Salvaged materials from the old house were to go in the residences of family members, such as sections of "any fine place tiles," which Watson recommended "I would preserve them in some of the rooms (chambers) of some of the family houses." Finally, Watson enclosed pieces "of the Wood" to be used "as frames to the pictures of the house."[133] The dwelling in Philadelphia—redolent of the English building—was where the fairly itinerant family made their home in the Delaware Valley. The soon-to-be razed Willing home, at the center of family life in Philadelphia, was celebrated because it was reminiscent of the family's English residence, bringing a recognizable form from across the Atlantic to Pennsylvania. The Willing residence visibly tied together the family's locale in the Old and New World by replicating a recognizable form, and keepsakes taken from the home in Pennsylvania were disseminated to family members, to be kept as tokens of remembrance and continuing to link descendants to the original in Bristol, England.

The Lloyd family seat of Dolobran, in Montgomeryshire, Wales purportedly inspired the Norris mansion known as "Fairhill," completed between 1712 and 1717 and located on the road to Germantown. Isaac Norris married Mary Lloyd, a daughter of migrant Thomas Lloyd, and the two traveled to Great Britain in 1706, including a visit to the Lloyd homestead.[134] Deborah Norris Logan (1761-1839), Isaac and Mary Lloyd Norris's granddaughter, perpetuated family legend by claiming that this Philadelphia

[133] John Fanning Watson to Charles Willing, April 15, [18]56, Miscellaneous Papers of the Willing Family, Wallace Papers (collection no. 686), vol. 4, p. 145, HSP.
[134] Members of the British branch of the extended family remembered this visit from their Pennsylvania relatives decades later. See Sampson Lloyd [Jr.] to Elizabeth Norris, September 15, 1775, Logan Papers, vol. 8, p. 71, HSP.

country house was constructed on the plan of Dolobran.[135] "Fair hill," she recorded in an 1808 diary entry, "was built upon the plan of Dolobran in Wales."[136] An architectural comparison of the two structures, however, suggested that the mansion in Pennsylvania was not constructed after the ancestral Lloyd home.[137] Nevertheless, the case raised issues about the meanings that were attached to family traditions and what sorts of Atlantic connections to place mattered to members of the Lloyd family. Indeed, "Fairhill," destroyed by the British during the Revolutionary War, revealed an imaginative connection with an ancestral home, and highlighted the continuing significance of this particular Welsh place among Thomas Lloyd's descendants more than a century after the family's migration to the Delaware Valley.

**Remembering the Homeland: Reminiscences and Comparisons**

Given to reminiscence, migrants ruminated on lands left behind and the Pennsylvania landscape provided sensory stimuli, lending comparisons with home regions migrants left behind; such harkening back was done in the midst of other kin or

[135] Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House*, 133, discussed the supposed connection between Fairhill and Dolobran. Deborah Norris Logan's description can be found in Charles J. Stille, *The Life and Times of John Dickinson* (Philadelphia, 1891), 311-12. Deborah Norris Logan married George Logan (1753-1821), grandson of James Logan, and she spent 40 years at the Logan mansion "Stenton."

[136] Diary of Deborah Norris Logan, August 1, 1808, [p. 30], manuscript 14720.Q, LCP. Historian Susan M. Stabile, *Memory's Daughters: The Material Culture of Remembrance in Eighteenth-Century America* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004), noted the "distinctively female genealogy of memory" associated with "Fairhill." The mansion was occupied and managed by women for decades, creating, Stabile contended, "a wonderful anomaly in the masculine country house tradition." The mansion was destroyed by the British in 1777, and thereafter was "vividly revived through the collective memories" of the women associated with its history. See chap. 1 for a discussion of women's attachments to country homes and how "a feminine mode of memory" was expressed in their domestic spaces. Quotes on pp. 33, 14.

[137] Mark Reinberger and Elizabeth McLean, "Isaac Norris's Fairhill: Architecture, Landscape, and Quaker Ideals in a Philadelphia Colonial Country Seat," *Winterthur Portfolio* 32, no. 4 (Winter 1997): 251-52. Reinberger and McLean theorized that "Fairhill" was modeled after the Pemberton family house in Birmingham, England. A John Pemberton married an overseas first cousin of Mary Lloyd Norris. Isaac Norris, Sr. and Mary Lloyd Norris visited Birmingham and the Pembertons during their 1707 trip abroad.

shared through the kinship network. "The part of the Countery where I am settled I think resembles Craven," Ambrose Barcroft opined in the early 1720s to his father back in England. He had migrated to the colonies less than three years earlier, and after a brief stint in Maryland, Barcroft drew parallels between his new settlement in Solebury, Bucks County, Pennsylvania to his old recognizable native soil across the Atlantic in Craven, Yorkshire, England. "All the Adjacent countery is Hilly, some Hills as big as Noyna," he continued to describe, referencing the land of his birth in Yorkshire.[138] From this particular recent migrant's perspective, the lay of the new land he occupied was familiar looking. Migrants were not indifferent to their physical setting, and formerly known places of origin and beloved landmarks in the British Isles were a point of reference in a new environment. Drawing comparisons between Atlantic sites closed the distances of an expansive early modern colonial world, bringing an intimacy to faraway places.

Inspired by affinity for the homeland across the Atlantic, cords of memory were transmitted through oral tradition, passing on affective bonds and wistful feelings. A 1725 letter sent from John Jones, the son of Welsh migrants settled in the Delaware Valley, to a relation in Wales was a particularly revealing correspondence that illustrated the evocative impact of reminiscing on descendants of migrants. His parents dwelled nostalgically on memories of their native land, fondly recalling "some man, or hill, house, or rock" to each other's recollection in the company of their son.[139] In the process, the son imbibed his parents' co-reminisces about the people and places.

---

[138] Ambrose Barcroft to Thomas Barcroft, Solebury, March 1, 1722/23, Reference: DDB 61/20, Lancashire Record Office, Preston, England. Extended portions of this letter were edited by Harold B. Hancock, in "Life in Bucks County in 1722/23," *Pennsylvania History* XXVII (October 1960): 397-402. The quotes about Craven and Noyna appeared on p. 400.

[139] John Jones to Hugh Jones, ca. 1725, Myers, ed., *Narratives of Pennsylvania*, 454-455.

Philosopher Edward Casey explained that a listener can be drawn into the wistful reliving of the past and can "imagine the original scene or atmosphere vividly enough to feel that they might have been there" or that "it were his or her own experience," imparting a strong familiarity.[140] Absorbing geographical knowledge of "old Wales," the son was able to rattle off a long list of place names, which gave him "great delight even to think of them" despite never tangibly knowing the "old habitations" in the ancestral homeland.[141] Reminiscent migrants infused descendants with an admiration of the land across the Atlantic they never actually knew.

Daniel Kent migrated from Limerick, Ireland in 1785, and one of his descendants later remembered with familial and ethnic pride that "I have always felt that we Kents have just reason to be proud of our Irish Grandsire."[142] A descendant recalled "the grandson would be called up—'Come, Joseph [Kent], and show me Limerick on the map,' until Joseph at first a little tot, finally became proficient in his geography of Ireland and found there was no surer way to grandfather's heart and pocket."[143] Referencing a map of Ireland, the migrant's grandchildren were able to persuade him to reminisce about his Irish past. Migrants were inclined to engage in reminiscence. The homeland was not far from the thoughts of migrants, whether the new land reminded them of Old World landscapes, they indulged in stirring up memories of old places and people, or were prodded to wax nostalgic. Acts of remembrance by settlers perpetuated a familiarity with lands of native origin among descendants.

---

[140] Casey, *Remembering*, 115.
[141] John Jones to Hugh Jones, ca. 1725, Myers, ed., *Narratives of Pennsylvania*, 454-455.
[142] *Letters and Other Papers of Daniel Kent*, 75.
[143] Ibid, 74.

Migrants demonstrated a willingness to leave their European homes and yet Delaware Valley migrants and their descendants displayed a keen awareness of their families' backgrounds and expressed attachment to places of origin that were passed down through kinship networks. Crossing the Atlantic did not necessarily mean a complete and decisive break with the places where migrants had been born and raised. Part of transplanting roots to the Delaware Valley included self-consciously concentrated acts of remembering, intended to assist the memory of migrants and their offspring and maintain a sense of identification with former places.

## Conclusion

Cords of memory bound Pennsylvania kin groups to the past and contemporary Atlantic world. Memory practices, sometimes suffused with myth, were embedded in the kinship network. Some practices, such as child-naming practices, lionized the legacy of migrant kin. Family histories, flowing through extensive networks of kin, were organized around ancestors and place. Interest in genealogies, descent lines, and common ancestors generated on-going kinship contacts and communications throughout the Atlantic world. Bible records were disseminated through the kinship network, crossing the Atlantic with migrants or obtained later from overseas kin. Autobiographies were written for the author's descendants and preserved family history for the kinship network. Certain memory practices helped shape elite culture in Pennsylvania. Descent define membership in prominent families, coats of arms were symbolic of authority, and country estates were venues for elite social life; all recalled aspects of the Atlantic past for kin groups but familial memory practices functioned to create an elite class and

exclude other social groups. Members of kinship networks were dispersed over the Atlantic; yet, kin groups recognized a shared body of ancestors stretching back generations, and migrants and creoles alike saw themselves as members of an Atlantic lineage group. Reverence for the family's history, genealogy, and record-keeping was implanted in offspring (a form of cultural inheritance); this proclivity would grow obsessively in future generations.

## Conclusion

Pennsylvania was linked to the Atlantic world by kinship ties. This dissertation outlined the role that kinship played in establishing and sustaining connections between the colony and the wider Atlantic community. The chapters showed various activities were significant practically and symbolically in maintaining kin relationships. Kinship relations were a binding force that depended on a wide array of exchanges and communications that, in turn, fostered social and economic intercourse. Families advanced Pennsylvania's Atlanticization through the migration process, the elaboration of long-distance relationships, the formation of commercial connections, and cords of memory.

Kinship played a central role in migration to colonial Pennsylvania. Family migration networks coordinated the movement of people and provided different kinds of assistance. Kin were a means by which prospective migrants acquired knowledge about the Atlantic voyage and the colony as well as received material help and emotional support. Migrants transported kin to colony as indentured servants. Overseas relatives continued supporting migrant kin once they had reached the colony. Already established kin provided a temporary place to stay for new arrivals. Migrant kin encouraged and facilitated the migration of further kin, contributing to the growth and elaboration of family migration networks. Through familial networks, migrants remained connected to places of origin from which they had left. Family chains established linkages between colonial Pennsylvania and sending areas.

Migration brought about the geographical extension of families, but kin relationships were carried on at a distance. Letter writing bridged the distance between family members, helping migrants maintain contact with geographically distant relatives and increasing interactive relationships within the Atlantic. Of course, not all migrants maintained epistolary connections with overseas kin and some correspondence demonstrated unhappy family relationships. For those keeping up with family communication, the cycle of kin correspondence signified the reciprocal trafficking of endeared love, conversation, and obligation over long distances. Language is a complex and shifting medium, but expressions of feeling and attachment captured in letters shed light on articulations of kinship bonds, strong affective ties, and how emotionally close kin felt toward one another from across the Atlantic. Before the influence of British prescriptive literature in the mid-eighteenth century, family letters demonstrated emotional affinity between separated kin. The heartfelt language infusing written correspondence was a form of social commerce that bound kin together throughout the Atlantic. Letter writing also contributed to the continued recognition of kin ties and the creation of new bonds. Epistolary exchanges were vital for the expansion of familial networks and the reproduction of kinship bonds across generations.

The risks of mercantile commerce and the vital interests in a safe trade encouraged the use of family ties in early modern business relationships. Kinship relations were an effective and trusted way to deal with the uncertainties of the Atlantic market economy. Kin rendered many services that advanced and protected the commercial interests of their relations and improved a merchant's competitive advantage.

Kin ties had the capacity to form commercial ventures and entrepreneurial opportunities. Merchants entered business through the kinship structure and marriage resulted in the formation of business partnerships. Relying on kin as part of wider networked approaches, Philadelphia's merchant families built up contacts to different parts of the Atlantic world.

Kinship channeled a shared identity from the familial past and also had cultural functions for the creation of elite identity. Beyond other elements of English genteel culture—formal gardens, libraries, the Grand Tour of Europe, domestic pleasure travel, a seasonal social circuit, conspicuous consumption (furniture, mahogany tea chests, silver and porcelain sets, and fancy dress), and trips to spa resorts in the nineteenth century—various familial memory practices were used by the colony's upper class as markers of social prestige. Elite practices marking social distinction carried all sorts of kinship associations. Some practices of genteel life, such as estate building, had kin-based character in Pennsylvania as when country homes were named after ancestral homelands.

In Pennsylvania's plural society marked by ethnic and religious diversity, elite families attempted to legitimate their social standing by asserting the preeminence of their particular ancestral group and the continuity of discrete elite family lines. Before the blossoming of genealogy in the early nineteenth century, the colony's privileged families saw themselves as members of an Atlantic descent group. The genealogies of Pennsylvania's leading families accented lineage. Tracing lineages was socially significant for elite class formation in colonial Philadelphia, creating generational elites in the province. Descent was dispersed over the Atlantic because of migration; yet, elite

kin groups recognized a shared body of ancestors stretching back across the Atlantic and over generations. Migrants and creoles alike tried to graft the Pennsylvania branches of Atlantic kin groups onto pedigreed lineages. The function of descent was to define membership among upper-rank Philadelphians and shape a person's elite identity based on family. Child-naming customs linked descendants to an esteemed migrant ancestor and also aided in the establishment of a family's class status and social eminence. In these ways, prominent families manipulated cultural representations of kinship to serve their own interests in the construction of upper-class culture.

Kinship interaction was varied and multifaceted. Information, feelings, capital, reputation, goods, and news flowed through kinship relations. Networks of kinship constituted a structure that acted as conduits for different kinds of information, transmitting knowledge about the colony, family updates and history, and business reports. Kinship networks had generational depth and provided a sense of solidarity; intergenerational kin correspondence and familial memory practices generated a sense of relatedness that was carried over time. More than just a set of biological and in-law relations, kinship embraced a collection of socio-cultural functions and symbols.

Expectations of kin behavior were built upon mutual cooperation and emotional attachment. Participation in kinship networks was voluntary; however, performing the obligation to help kin also meant that an individual had the right to expect that at some future time the assistance and services given to others would be returned. Hence, there was reason and motivation to retain connections with overseas kin. This reciprocal relationship reproduced a commitment to kin and reaffirmed the principles of kinship,

binding members of the kin group to one another across space and over time. That is not to say these were absolute obligations. Beyond affirming exchanges, cases of estrangement broke kinship links, severed ties, and restricted the sharing of resources within the family. Migrating to Pennsylvania may have freed individuals from the constraints of family and the mutual responsibilities conferred by kinship.

Nevertheless, kinship involvement made a real difference for Pennsylvania's migrants and their descendants in many ways. In an Atlantic world dependent on personal networks that linked people to one another, ties of kinship were a social resource. Kin were integral contacts that made information readily available. Networks provided a framework to mobilize family resources. Active flows of support made a difference in the migration process, aiding migrant adjustment. The ability to rely on overseas kin was an asset for success in commercial enterprises. Also, kinship was of great consequence for claims to gentility and providing a sense of place within the Atlantic.

Class and distance created limits to participation in the Atlantic world. Wealth factored in the unequal distribution of kinship ties spanning the Atlantic. In particular, elite merchant families were well-positioned and capable of carrying on wider kin relationships from the far side of the Atlantic. Spatial separation certainly could have an erosive effect on familial cohesion, but geographic mobility in the Atlantic world did not necessarily imply rootlessness. Kinship was a durable connective bond and a strong thread interwoven into the web of exchanges within the fabric of the British Atlantic. Kin groups were resourceful and flexible enough to endure the strains and challenges

posed by Atlantic separation. Ties of kinship were a binding force that could be activated into effective relationships when they were needed. By continuing or renewing family ties, widely dispersed kin networks were not static but adapted to circumstances over distance, time, and generations. Networks of kinship were outward looking and integrative. The elaboration of kin activities and reciprocal relations meant that family members may have been geographically scattered but linked at a distance. In the process, the multiple strands of kinship ties added to the wider systems of exchanges and the lattice-work webs of personal contact that shaped Pennsylvania's Atlantic connections.

## Works Cited

### Manuscript Collections


Chester County Historical Society

Abraham Marshall Manuscripts

Taylor, Harris, Roman, Frazer, and Smith Families Papers

William L. Clements Library, The University of Michigan

Humphry and Moses Marshall Papers

Friends Historical Library at Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

Falls Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received)

Foulke Family Papers

Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Certificates of Removal (Received)

Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Brinton Coxe Collection

Bucks County Wills

George Croghan Papers

Campbell Collection

Charles Morton Smith Manuscripts

Etting Manuscripts

Ferdinand J. Dreer Collection

George Bryan Papers

George Washington Norris Collection

Hopkinson Papers

James J. Levick Collection

Coates and Reynell Family Papers

John Swift Letter Book

Jonathan Dickinson Letter Book

Jones Bible Records

Maria Dickinson Logan Collection

Logan Family Papers

Logan-Fisher-Fox Family Papers

Loudon Papers

Norris Family Papers

Pemberton Family Papers

Philadelphia Wills

Powel Family Papers

Shippen Family Papers

Society Collection

William Till Letters

Wallace Papers

William Watson, Journal

Lancashire Record Office, Preston, England

Barcroft Collections

Library Company of Philadelphia

Diary of Deborah Norris Logan

[Elizabeth Ashbridge], *Some account of the early part of the life of Elizabeth Ashbridge, who died, in truth's service, at the house of Robert Lecky, in the county of Carlow, Ireland, the 16th of 5th month, 1755*. Philadelphia: Sold by Benjamin Kite, 1807.

*The Holy Bible,: containing the Old and New Testaments: newly translated out of the original tongues: and with the former translations diligently compared and revised*. Oxford, England: Printed by the University-Printers, MDCCI [1701].

*Proprietary of Pennsylvania his Ancestry and Descendants* [broadside], Philadelphia: Thomas Gilpin, June 1, 1852.

Society of Friends, *Collection of Memorials: Concerning Divers Deceased Ministers and Others of the People called Quakers in Pennsylvania, New-Jersey, and Parts adjacent, from nearly the first Settlement thereof to the Year 1787. With some of the last Expressions and Exhortations of many of them.* Philadelphia: Joseph Crukshank, 1787.

Quaker and Special Collections, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa**.**

Gulielma M. Howland Papers

**Newspaper**

*Pennsylvania Gazette*

**Published Primary Sources**

Balch, Thomas Willing, comp. *Willing Letters and Papers Edited with a Biographical Essay of Thomas Willing of Philadelphia (1731-1821).* Philadelphia: Allen, Lane, and Scott, 1922.

Balderston, Marion, ed. *James Claypoole's Letter Book: London and Philadelphia, 1681-1684*. San Marino, Calif.: The Huntington Library, 1967.

Barnard, Ella K., comp. *Letters and Other Papers of Daniel Kent, Emigrant and Redemptioner, to which have been added a few interesting Hawley and Spackman Papers*. Baltimore: New Era Printing Co., 1904.

Byars, William Vincent, ed. *B. and M. Gratz, Merchants in Philadelphia, 1754-1798: Papers of Interest to their Posterity and their Posterity of their Associates*. Jefferson City, Mo.: Hugh Stephens Printing Co., 1916.

"Benjamin Claypool[e] to George Claypool[e], London, March 22, 1706-1707." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 10, no. 3 (October 1886): 354-355.

"Benjamin Franklin to James Burrow, London, May 10, 1765." In *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*. Vol. 12, ed. Leonard W. Labaree, 126. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1968.

"David Lindsey to Thomas or Andrew Fleming, County Londonderry, March 19, 1758." In *Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan: Letters and Memoirs from Colonial and Revolutionary America, 1675-1815*, ed. Kerby A. Miller and others, 29. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Davies, Alun C., ed. "'As Good a Country as any Man Needs to Dwell in': Letters from a Scotch-Irish Immigrant in Pennsylvania, 1766, 1767, and 1784." *Pennsylvania History* 50, no. 4 (October 1983): 313-22.

Dickson, L. Taylor. "The Sailing of the Ship Submission in the Year 1682 with a True Copy of the Vessel's Log." In *Passengers and Ships Prior to 1684, Volume1 of Penn's Colony: Genealogical and Historical Materials Relating to the Settlement of Pennsylvania*, ed. Walter Lee Sheppard, Jr. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1970.

"Early Letter." *The Pennsylvania Dutchman*. Vol. III, no. 11. Lancaster, Pa., November 1, 1951, p. 1.

"Edward Jones to John ap Thomas, Schuylkill River, August 26, 1682." In *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, ed. Jean R. Soderlund, 177. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.

"The First Purchasers of Pennsylvania, 1681-1685." In *The Papers of William Penn*, Vol. 2: *1680-1684*, ed. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, 630-64. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982.

"Genealogical Records from the Bible of Thomas Say." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 29, no. 2 (1905): 216-23.

Hancock, Harold B., ed. "Life in Bucks County in 1722/23," *Pennsylvania History* 27, no. 4 (October 1960): 397-402.

[Haworth, George]. "Early Letters from Pennsylvania, 1699-1722." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 37, no. 3 (1913): 330-340.

Hocker, Edward G. *Genealogical Data Relating to the German Settlers of Pa. and Adjacent Territory: From Advertisements in German Newspapers Published in Phil. And Germantown, 1743-1800*. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc, 1980.

"Information and Direction to Such Persons as are Inclined to America, More Especially those Related to the Province of Pennsylvania [1682]." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 4, no. 3 (1880): 329-342.

Klepp, Susan E., Farley Grubb, and Anne Pfaelzer de Ortiz, eds. *Souls for Sale: Two German Redemptioners Come to Revolutionary America: The Life Stories of John Frederick Whitehead and Johann Carl Büttner*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006.

"John Reynell to Rev. W. H. Reynell, Philadelphia, March 5, 1769." In *The Magazine of American History with Notes and Queries*, Vol. II, John Austin Stevens, et al, 493. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, 1878.

"Letter from Germantown in Pennsylvania, March 16, 1684." In *Hendrich Pannebecker: Surveyor of Lands for the Penns, 1674-1754*, ed. Samuel W. Pennypacker, 27-31. Philadelphia: Privately Printed, 1894.

"Minutes of the Board of Property of the Province of Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania Archives*. 2nd series, Vol. XIX, ed. William H. Egle. Harrisburg: E. K. Meyers, State Printer, 1890.

Mittelberger, Gottlieb. *Journey to Pennsylvania*, ed. and trans. Oscar Handlin and John Clive. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960.

Myers, Albert Cook, ed.. *Quaker Arrivals at Philadelphia, 1682-1750: Being a List of Certificates of Removal Received at Philadelphia Monthly Meeting of Friends*. Philadelphia: Ferris and Leach, 1902.

_____. *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania, West New Jersey and Delaware, 1630-1707*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912; reprint, New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1959.

"The Old Goschenhoppen Lutheran Burial Register, 1752-1772." In *Rhineland Emigrants: Lists of German Settlers in Colonial America*, ed. Don Yoder and trans. Claude W. Unger, 109-110. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1981.

"A Partial List of the Families who Arrived at Philadelphia between 1682 and 1687." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 8, no. 3 (October 1884): 328-340.

"A Partial List of the Families who Resided in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Prior to 1687, with the Date of their Arrival." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 9, no. 2 (July 1885): 223-233.

"Pedigree of Rowland Ellis, of Bryn Mawr, from his own manuscript, 1697." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biology* 14, no. 2 (1890): 199-200.

Sauer, Christopher and others. "Authentic OPEN LETTER from Pennsylvania in America." In *The Brethren in Colonial America: A Source Book on the Transplantation and Development of the Church of the Brethren in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Donald F. Durnbaugh, 48. Elgin, Ill.: The Brethren Press, 1967.

Scholtze, David. "Reisebeschreibung [Itinerary]." In *The Genealogical Record of the Schwenkfelder Families: Seekers of Religious Liberty who Fled from Silesia and Saxony and then to Pennsylvania in the years 1731 to 1737*, ed. Samuel K. Brecht, 34-36. New York: Rand McNally and Co., 1923.

[Seipt, David]. "An Immigrant's Letter, 1734." *The Pennsylvania-German* IX (January-December 1908): 369-70.

"Short Account of John Roberts." In *Colonial and Revolutionary Families of Pennsylvania*, 452-453. New York: Lewis Publishing Co., 1911.

Smith, John Jay, ed. *Letters of Doctor Richard Hill and His Children: Or, The History of a Family, as Told by Themselves*. Philadelphia: T. K. and P. G. Collins, Printers, 1854.

Soderlund, Jean R., ed. *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania: A Documentary History*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.

Thomson, Alexander. "News from America. Letter I. From Alexander Thomson, late Tenant at Corkerhill in the Parish of Paisley, now Proprietor of a considerable Estate in Pensilvania. To a Gentleman near Glasgow (1774)." In *Discoveries of America: Personal Accounts of British Emigrants to North America during the Revolutionary Era*, ed. Barbara DeWolfe, 108-121. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

## Secondary Sources

### Books

Altman, Ida and James Horn, eds. *"To Make America": European Migration in the Early Modern Period*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Anderson, Michael. *Family Structure in Nineteenth Century Lancashire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Anderson, Virginia DeJohn. *New England's Generation: The Great Migration and the Formation of Society and Culture in the Seventeenth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Andrews, William L., ed. *Journeys in New Worlds: Early American Narratives*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990.

Armitage, David. *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Armitage, David and Michael J. Braddick, eds. *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Bailyn, Bernard. *Atlantic History: Concept and Contours*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005.

_____. *Voyagers to the West: A Passage in the Peopling of America on the Eve of the Revolution*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1986.

_____. *The New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955.

Bailyn, Bernard and Patricia L. Denault, eds. *Soundings in Atlantic History: Latent Structures and Intellectual Currents, 1500-1830*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Balch, Thomas. *Letters and Papers Relating Chiefly to the Provincial History of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: Crissy and Markley, 1855.

Ballard, Roger. "Migration and Kinship: The Differential Effect of Marriage Rules on the Processes of Punjabi Migration to Britain." In *South Asians Overseas: Migration and Ethnicity*, ed. Colin Clarke, Ceri Peach, and Steven Vertovec, 219-249. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Bannet, Eve Tavor. *Empire of Letters: Letter Manuals and Transatlantic Correspondence, 1688 – 1820*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Beales, Ross W. and E. Jennifer Monaghan. "Practices of Reading, Part 1: Literacy and Schoolbooks." In *The History of the Book in America*, Vol. 1: *The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World*, ed. Hugh Amory and David Hall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Beck, Rainer. "Traces of Emotion? Marital Discord in Early Modern Bavaria." In *Family History Revisited: Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Richard Wall, Tamara K. Hareven, and Josef Ehmer, 135-160. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2001.

Beckett, J. V. *The Aristocracy in England, 1660-1914*. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

Beiler, Rosalind J. *Immigrant and Entrepreneur: The Atlantic World of Caspar Wistar, 1650-1750*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008.

_____. "Information Networks and the Dynamics of Migration: Swiss Anabaptist Exiles and Their Host Communities." In *Religious Refugees in Europe, Asia and North America (6th-21st century)*, ed. Susanne Lachenicht, 81-91. Münster, Germany: Lit Verlag, 2007.

_____. "Searching for Prosperity: German Migration to the British American Colonies, 1680-1780." In *The Atlantic World: Essays on Slavery, Migration, and Imagination*, ed. Wim Klooster and Alfred Padula, 91-106. Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2005.

Biddle, Henry Drinker. *The Drinker Family in America, to and including the Eighth Generation*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1893.

Blethen, H. Tyler and Curtis W. Wood, Jr., eds. *Ulster and North America: Transatlantic Perspectives on the Scotch-Irish*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1997.

Brant, Clare. *Eighteenth-Century Letters and British Culture*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Breen, T. H. *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Brown, Richard D. *Knowledge is Power: The Diffusions of Information in Early America, 1700-1865*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Bushman, Richard L. *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities.* New York: Knopf, 1992.

Canny, Nicholas. "English Migration into and across the Atlantic during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." In *Europeans on the Move: Studies on European Migration, 1500-1800,* ed. Nicholas Canny, 39-75. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Carpenter, Edward and Louis Henry Carpenter, comp. *Samuel Carpenter and his Descendants* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1912.

Carson, Cary, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, eds. *Of Consuming Interests: The Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century*. Charlottesville, Va.: University of Virginia Press, 1994.

Casey, Edward S. *Remembering: A Phenomenological Study.* Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Clark, Peter. "The Migrant in Kentish Towns, 1500-1700." In *Crisis and Order in English Towns, 1500-1700: Essays in Urban History,* ed. Peter Clark and Paul Slack, 135-139. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1972.

_____. "Migration in England during the Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries." In *Migration and Society in Early Modern England,* ed. Peter Clark and David Souden, 213-252. London: Hutchinson, 1987.

_____. "Migrants in the City: The Process of Social Adaptation in English Towns, 1500-1800." In *Migration and Society in Early Modern England,* ed. Peter Clark and David Souden, 267-291. London: Hutchinson, 1987.

Clark, Peter and David Souden, ed. *Migration and Society in Early Modern England*. London: Hutchinson, 1987.

Cremin, Lawrence A. *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783.* New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Cressy, David. *Coming Over: Migration and Communication between England and New England in the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

_____. *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Crowley, John E. *The Invention of Comfort: Sensibilities and Design in Early Modern Britain and Early America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Cullen, L. M. "The Irish Diaspora of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." In *Europeans on the Move: Studies on European Migration, 1500-1800*, ed. Nicholas Canny, 113-149. New York: Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, 1995.

Davis, William W. H. *History of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, from the Discovery of the Delaware to the Present Time*, Vol. III, 2d ed. New York: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1905.

Dierks, Konstantin. *In My Power: Letter Writing and Communications in Early America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

_____. "Letter Writing and Social Refinement in America, 1750-1800." In *Letter Writing as a Social Practice*, ed. David Barton and Nigel Hall, 31-41. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2000.

Doerflinger, Thomas M. *A Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise: Merchants and Economic Development in Revolutionary Philadelphia*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Duff, Meaghan N. "Adventurers Across the Atlantic: English Migration to the New World, 1580-1780." In *The Atlantic World: Essays on Slavery, Migration, and Imagination*, ed. Wim Klooster and Alfred Padula, 77-90. Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2005.

Dunn, Richard S. "Penny Wise and Pound Foolish: Penn as a Businessman." In *The World of William Penn*, ed. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, 37-54. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

Dunn, Richard S. and Mary Maples Dunn, eds. *The World of William Penn*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

Earle, Rebecca, ed. *Epistolary Selves: Letters and Letter-Writers, 1600-1945*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.

Eberleing, Harold Donaldson and Horace Mather Lippincott. *The Colonial Homes of Philadelphia and Its Neighbourhood*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1912.

Elliott, Vivien Brodsky. "Single Women in the London Marriage Market: Age, Status and Mobility, 1598-1619." In *Marriage and Society: Studies in the Social History of Marriage*, ed. R. B. Outhwaite, 81-100. London: Europa Publications, 1981.

Erickson, Robert A. *The Language of the Heart, 1600-1750*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.

Eustace, Nicole. *Passion is the Gale: Emotion, Power, and the Coming of the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

Fatherly, Sarah. *Gentlewomen and Learned Ladies: Women and Elite Formation in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia*. Bethlehem, Pa.: Lehigh University Press, 2008.

Fertig, Georg. "Transatlantic Migration from the German-Speaking Parts of Central Europe, 1600-1800: Proportions, Structures, and Explanations." In *Europeans on the Move: Studies on European Migration, 1500-1800*, ed. Nicholas Canny, 192-235. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Fischer, David Hackett. *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

_____. "Forenames and the Family in New England: An Exercise in Historical Onomastics." In *Generations and Change: Genealogical Perspectives in Social History*, ed. Robert M Taylor, Jr. and Ralph J. Crandall, 215-241. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1986.

Fogleman, Aaron Spencer. *Hopeful Journeys: German Immigration, Settlement, and Political Culture in Colonial America, 1717-1775*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996.

Foner, Nancy. *In a New Land: A Comparative View of Immigration*. New York: New York University Press, 2005.

Frost, J. William. *The Quaker Family in Colonial America: A Portrait of the Society of Friends*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973.

Futhey, J. Smith and Gilbert Cope. *History of Chester County, Pennsylvania. With Genealogical and Biographical Sketches*. Philadelphia: Louis H. Everts and Co., 1881.

Games, Alison. *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999.

_____. *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560-1660*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Glover, Lorri. *All Our Relations: Blood Ties and Emotional Bonds among the Early South Carolina Gentry*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

Gragg, Larry. *The Quaker Community on Barbados: Challenging the Culture of the Planter Class*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2009.

_____. *Migration in Early America: The Virginia Quaker Experience*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, 1980.

Grassby, Richard. *The Business Community of Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

_____. *Kinship and Capitalism: Marriage, Family, and Business in the English-Speaking World, 1580-1720*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Green, E. R. R., ed. *Essays in Scotch-Irish History*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.

Greene, Jack D. and Philip D. Morgan, eds. *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Griffin, Patrick. *The People with No Name: Ireland's Ulster Scots, America's Scots Irish, and the Creation of a British Atlantic World, 1689-1764*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Haggerty, Sheryllyne. *The British-Atlantic Trading Community, 1760-1810: Men, Women, and the Distribution of Goods*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2006.

Hall, David D. *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Hanawalt, Barbara A. *The Ties that Bound: Peasant Families in Medieval England.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Hancock, David. *Oceans of Wine: Madeira and the Emergence of American Trade and Taste*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2009.

_____. *Citizens of the World: London Merchants and the Integration of the British Atlantic Economy, 1735-1785*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

_____. "'A revolution in trade': wine distribution and the development of the infrastructure of the Atlantic market economy, 1703-1807." In *The Early Modern Atlantic Economy*, ed. John J. McCusker and Kenneth Morgan, 105-153. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

_____. "Self-Organized Complexity and the Emergence of an Atlantic Market Economy, 1651-1815: The Case of Madeira." In *The Atlantic Economy during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: Organization, Operation, Practice, and Personnel*, ed. Peter A. Coclanis, 30-71. Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2005.

Hannerz, Ulf. *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Hareven, Tamara K. *Families, History, and Social Change: Life-Course & Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Boulder, Col.: Westview Press, 2000.

Hayden, Dolores. *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995.

Hayden, Horace Edwin. *Virginia Genealogies: A Genealogy of the Glassell Family of Scotland and Virginia.* Wilkes-Barre, Pa.: E. B. Yordy, Printer, 1891.

Heckscher, Morrison H. and Leslie Greene Bowman. *American Rococo, 1750-1775: Elegance in Ornament*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992.

Helm, Bennett W. *Love, Friendship, & the Self: Intimacy, Identification, & the Social Nature of Persons*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Hoffman, Ronald. *Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland: A Carroll Saga, 1500-1782*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Horn, James. *Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1994.

_____. "British Diaspora: Emigration from Britain, 1680-1815." In *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, Vol. 2, *The Eighteenth Century*, ed. P. J. Marshall, 28-52. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Houston, R. A. *Literacy in Early Modern Europe: Culture and Education, 1500-1800*. London: Longman, 1988.

Jones, Dick, ed. *The First 300: The Amazing and Rich History of Lower Merion*. Ardmore, Pa.: The Lower Merion Historical Society; Collingdale, Pa.: Distributed by Diane Publishing Co., 2000.

Jordan, John W., ed. *Colonial Families of Philadelphia*. Vol. 2. New York: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1911.

Karras, Alan L. "The Atlantic World as a Unit of Study." In *Atlantic American Societies: From Columbus through Abolitionism, 1492-1888*, ed. Alan L. Karras and J. R. McNeill, 1-15. London: Routledge, 1992.

Keith, Charles P. *The Provincial Councillors of Pennsylvania Who Held Office Between 1733 and 1776, and Those Earlier Councilors Who Were Some Time Chief Magistrates of the Province, and Their Descendants*. Baltimore: Genealogical Publications, 1997.

Klein, Randolph Shipley. *Portrait of an Early American Family*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975.

Knott, Sarah. *Sensibility and the American Revolution.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

Konwiser, Harry M. *Colonial and Revolutionary Posts: A History of the American Postal Systems, Colonial and Revolutionary Periods*. Richmond, Va.: Press of the Dietz Printing Co., 1931.

Landsman, Ned C. *Scotland and Its First American Colony, 1683-1765*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1985.

_____. "William Penn's Scottish Counterparts: The Quakers of 'North Britain' and the Colonization of East New Jersey." In *The World of William Penn*, ed. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, 241-257. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

Lehmann, Hartmut T., Hermann Wellenreuther, and Renate Wilson, eds. *In Search of Peace and Prosperity: New German Settlements in Eighteenth-Century Europe and America*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000.

Levenduski, Cristine Marie. *Peculiar Power: A Quaker Woman Preacher in Eighteenth-Century America*. Washington, D.C: Smithsonian Institution, 1996.

Levy, Barry. *Quakers and the American Family: British Settlement in the Delaware Valley*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Lewis, Jan. *The Pursuit of Happiness: Family and Values in Jefferson's Virginia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Lindsey, Jack L. *Worldly Goods: The Arts of Early Pennsylvania, 1680-1758*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1999.

Linebaugh, Peter and Marcus Rediker. *The Multi-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2000.

Lockridge, Kenneth. *Literacy on Colonial New England: An Enquiry into the Social Context of Literacy in the Early Modern West*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1974.

Loth, David. *Pencoyd and the Roberts Family*. New York: n.p., [1961].

Low, Setha M. "Symbolic Ties that Bind: Place Attachment in the Plaza." In *Place Attachment*, ed. Irwin Altman and Setha M. Low, 167. New York: Plenum Press, 1992.

Low, Setha and Irvin Altman, eds. *Place Attachment*. New York: Plenum Press, 1992.

Macfarlane, Alan. *The Family Life of Ralph Josselin, A Seventeenth-Century Clergyman: An Essay in Historical Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970; Paperback, New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1977.

Mathias, Peter. "Risk, Credit, and Kinship in Early Modern Enterprise." In *The Early Modern Atlantic Economy*, ed. John J. McCusker and Kenneth Morgan, 15-35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Maxey, David W. *A Portrait of Elizabeth Willing Powel, 1743–1830*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2006.

McCusker, John J. and Russell R. Menard. *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1985.

Meinig, D. W. *The Shaping of America: A Geographical Perspective on 500 Years of History. Vol. 1, Atlantic America, 1492-1800*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

Merrell, James H. *Into the American Woods: Negotiations on the Pennsylvania Frontier*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1999.

Miller, Randall M. and William Pencak, eds. *Pennsylvania: A History of the Commonwealth*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.

Mintz, Sidney W. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Viking Penguin, 1985.

Moch, Leslie Page. *Moving Europeans: Migration in Western Europe since 1650*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

Monaghan, E. Jennifer. *Learning to Read and Write in Colonial America*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005.

Morgan, Edmund S. *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England*, rev. ed. New York: Harper and Row, Harper Torchbooks, 1966.

Moss, Roger W. *Historic Houses of Philadelphia: A Tour of the Region's Museum Homes*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998.

Motz, Marilyn Ferris. *True Sisterhood: Michigan Women and their Kin, 1820-1920*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983.

Mullan, John. *Sentiment and Sociability: The Language of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, 1988.

Myers, Albert Cook. *Immigration of the Irish Quakers into Pennsylvania, 1682-1750: With their Early History in Ireland*. Swarthmore, Pa.: printed by author, 1902. Reprint, Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1969.

Nash, Gary B. *Quakers and Politics: Pennsylvania, 1681-1726.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1968.

_____. "The Early Merchants of Philadelphia: The Formation and Disintegration of a Founding Elite." In *The World of William Penn*, ed. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, 337-62. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

Ozment, Steven. *Ancestors: The Loving Family in Old Europe*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.
_____. *When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Europe*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Pearsall, Sarah M. S. *Atlantic Families: Lives and Letters in the Later Eighteenth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Pencak, William A. and Daniel K. Richter, eds. *Friends and Enemies in Penn's Woods: Indians, Colonists, and the Racial Construction of Pennsylvania*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004.

Price, Jacob M. *Capital and Credit in British Overseas Trade: The View from the Chesapeake, 1700-1776*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980.

_____. "The Great Quaker Business Families of Eighteenth-Century London: The Rise and Fall of a Sectarian Patriciate." In *The World of William Penn*, ed. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, 363-99. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

Relph, Edward. *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion Limited, 1976.

Riordan, Liam. *Many Identities, One Nation: The Revolution and Its Legacy in the Mid-Atlantic*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Roeber, A. G. *Palatines, Liberty, and Property: German Lutherans in British Colonial America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Roberts, Clarence V. *Ancestry of Clarence V. Roberts & Frances A. (Walton) Roberts*. Philadelphia: William F. Fell Co., Printers, Published by the Compiler, 1940.

Rutman, Darrett B. and Anita H. Rutman. *A Place in Time*: *Middlesex County, Virginia, 1650-1750*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1984.

_____. "'In Nomine Avi': Child-Naming Patterns in a Chesapeake County, 1650-1750." In *Generations and Change: Genealogical Perspectives in Social History*, eds. Robert M. Taylor, Jr. and Ralph J. Crandall 243-265. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1996.

Salinger, Sharon V. *To Serve Well and Faithfully: Labor and Indentured Servants in Pennsylvania, 1682-1800*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Schiller, Nina Glick. "Transmigrants and Nation-States: Something Old and Something New in the U. S. Immigrant Experience." In *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, ed. Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind, 94-119. New York: Russell Sage, 1999.

Schiller, Nina Glick, Linda Basch, and Cristina Szanton Blanc. *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race, Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism Reconsidered*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1992.

Schwartz, Sally. *"A Mixed Multitude": The Struggle for Toleration in Colonial Pennsylvania*. New York: New York University Press, 1988.

Shecelow, Kathryn. *Women and Print Culture: The Construction of Femininity in the Early Periodical*. New York: Routledge, 1989.

Shields, David. *Civil Tongues and Polite Letters in British America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Smith, Daniel Blake. *Inside the Great House: Planter Family Life in Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake Society*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1980.

Sondesky, Sara V., et al. *Traveling Through Bensalem, 1692-1984*. Bensalem: Historical Society of Bensalem, 1984.

Souden, David. "'Rogues, Whores, and Vagabonds'? Indentured Servant Emigration to North America and the Case of Mid-Seventeenth-Century Bristol." In *Migration and Society in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Clark and David Souden, 150-171. London: Hutchinson, 1987.

Stabile, Susan M. *Memory's Daughters: The Material Culture of Remembrance in Eighteenth-Century America*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Stearns, Carol Z. and Peter N. Stearns, eds. *Emotion and Social Change: Toward a New Psychohistory*. New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1988.

Stearns, Peter N. and Jan Lewis, eds. *An Emotional History of the United States*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.

Steele, Ian K. *The English Atlantic, 1675-1740: An Exploration of Communication and Community*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Stille, Charles J. *The Life and Times of John Dickinson*. Philadelphia: Historical Society of Philadelphia, 1891.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1977.

Tadmor, Naomi. *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship, and Patronage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Thornton, Tamara Plakins. *Handwriting in America: A Cultural History*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1996.

Tolles, Frederick B. *Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia, 1682-1763*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1948; Reprint, New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1963.

_____. *James Logan and the Culture of Provincial America*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1957.

Tomlins, Christopher. "Indentured Servitude in Perspective: European Migration into North America and the Composition of the Early American Labor Force." In *The Economy of Early America: Historical Perspective and New Directions*, ed. Cathy Matson, 146-182. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.

_____. *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.

Waldstreicher, David. *Runaway America: Benjamin Franklin, Slavery, and the American Revolution*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2004.

Wilson, Lisa. *Ye Heart of a Man: The Domestic Life of Men in Colonial New England*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1999.

Wokeck, Marianne S. *Trade in Strangers: The Beginnings of Mass Migration to North America*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Wolf, Edwin. *The Library of James Logan of Philadelphia, 1674-1751*. Philadelphia: The Library Company of Philadelphia, 1974.

Wolf, Stephanie Grauman. *Urban Village: Population, Community, and Family Structure in Germantown, Pennsylvania, 1683-1800*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Yoder, Don. *The Pennsylvania German Broadside: A History and Guide*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005.

Zuckerman, Michael, ed. *Friends and Neighbors: Group Life in America's First Plural Society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982.

## Journal Articles

Alexander, John K. "The Philadelphia Numbers Game: An Analysis of Philadelphia's Eighteenth-Century Population." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 98, no. 3 (July 1974): 314-324.

Auwers, Linda. "Reading the Marks of the Past: Exploring Female Literacy in Colonial Windsor, Connecticut." *Historical Methods* 13 (1980): 204-214.

Bailyn, Bernard. "The Idea of Atlantic History." *Itinerario* 20, no. 1 (1996): 19-44.

Balch, Thomas Willing. "The English Ancestors of the Shippen Family and Edward Shippen, of Philadelphia." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* XXVIII (1904): 395.

Balderston, Marion. "Pennsylvania's 1683 Ships and Some of their Passengers." *Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine* 24 (1964): 69-114.

_____. "William Penn's Twenty-Three Ships, with Notes on Some of their Passengers." *Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine* 23 (1963): 27-67.

Baldwin, Stewart. "The Paxson Brothers of Pennsylvania: A Reassessment of the Evidence," *National Genealogical Society Quarterly* 83 (1995): 39-43.

Beiler, Rosalind J. "Distributing Aid to Believers in Need: The Religious Foundations of Transatlantic Migration." *Pennsylvania History* 64, no. 5 (Summer 1997): 73-87.

Bull, Ida. "Merchant Households and their Networks in Eighteenth-Century Trondheim." *Continuity and Change* 17, no. 2 (2002): 213-31.

Canny, Nicholas. "Writing Atlantic History, or, Reconfiguring the History of Colonial British America." *Journal of American History* 86, no. 3 (December 1999): 1093-1114.

_____. "The British Atlantic World: Working Towards a Definition." *The Historical Journal* 33, no. 2 (June 1990): 479-497.

Coclanis, Peter A. "Atlantic World or Atlantic/World." *William and Mary Quarterly* 63, no. 4 (October 2006): 725-742.

_____. "*Drang Nach Osten*: Bernard Bailyn, the World-Island, and the Idea of Atlantic History." *Journal of World History* 13, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 169-182.

Cressy, David. “Letters Home: Old and New England in the Seventeenth Century.” *History Today* 37, no. 10 (October 1987): 37-41.

_____. “Kinship and Kin Interaction in Early Modern England.” *Past and Present* 113 (November 1986): 38-69.

Dierks, Konstantin. “Letter Writing, Stationary Supplies, and Consumer Modernity in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World,” *Early American Literature* 41, no. 3 (2006): 473-494.

_____. “‘Let Me Chat a Little’: Letter Writing in Rhode Island before the Revolution.” *Rhode Island History* 53, no. 4 (November 1995): 127.

Ditz, Toby L. “Secret Selves, Credible Personas: The Problematics of Trust and Public Display in the Writing of Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia Merchants.” In *Possible Pasts: Becoming Colonial in Early America*, ed. Robert Blair St. George, 219-242. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000.

_____. “Shipwrecked; or, Masculinity Imperiled: Mercantile Representations of Failure and the Gendered Self in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia.” *Journal of American History* 81, no. 1 (June 1994): 51-80.

Frank, John G. and John E. Pomfret. “The German Lutheran Aid Society of 1790.” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 63, no. 1 (January 1939): 60-65.

Games, Alison. “Atlantic History: Definitions, Challenges, and Opportunities.” *American Historical Review* 111, no. 3 (June 2006): 741-757.

Gillingham, Harold. “Notes and Documents: The Estate of Jonathan Dickinson (1663-1722).” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 59 (October 1935): 424.

Grassby, Richard. “Love, Property and Kinship: The Courtship of Philip Williams, Levant Merchant, 1617-50.” *English Historical Review* 113 (April 1998): 335-350.

Grubb, Farley. “Babes in Bondage? Debt Shifting by German Immigrants in Early America,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 37, no. 1 (Summer 2006): 1-34.

_____. “German Immigration to Pennsylvania, 1709 to 1820.” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 20, no. 3 (Winter 1990): 417-436.

_____. “Colonial Immigrant Literacy: An Economic Analysis of Pennsylvania-German Evidence.” *Explorations in Economic History* 24, no. 1 (January 1987): 65-74.

Grundy, Martha Jonet Paxson. "The Paxson Brothers of Colonial Pennsylvania: Three Generations." *National Genealogical Society Quarterly* 71 (September 1983): 193-216.

Haggerty, Sheryllyne. "'Miss Fan can tun her han!' Female traders in eighteenth-century British-American Atlantic port cities." *Atlantic Studies*, vol. 6, no. 1 (April 2009): 29-42.

Hancock, David. "The Trouble with Networks: Managing the Scots' Early-Modern Madeira Trade." *Business History Review* 79, no. 3 (Autumn 2005): 467-491.

Hareven, Tamara K. "The Family as Process: The Historical Study of the Family Cycle." *Journal of Social History* 7, no. 3 (Spring 1974): 322-329.

Isaac, Amanda. "Ann Flower's Sketchbook: Drawing, Needlework, and Women's Artistry in Colonial Philadelphia." *Winterthur Portfolio* 41 (Summer/Autumn 2007): 141-160.

Klepp, Susan. "Demography in Early Philadelphia, 1690-1860." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 133, no. 2 (June 1989): 85-111.

Lee, Everett S. "A Theory of Migration." *Demography* 3, no. 1 (1966): 47-57.

Levick, James J. "John ap Thomas and his Friends. A Contribution to the Early History of Merion, near Philadelphia." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 4, no. 3 (1880): 301-28.

_____. "An Old Welsh Pedigree. A Sequel to John ap Thomas and his Friends." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 4, no. 4 (1880): 471-483.

Levy, Barry. "Quakers, the Delaware Valley, and North Midlands Emigration to America." *William and Mary Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (April 1991): 246-252.

MacDonald, John S. and Leatrice D. MacDonald. "Chain Migration, Ethnic Neighborhood Formation, and Social Networks." *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (January 1964): 82-97.

Main, Gloria L. "An Inquiry into When and Why Women Learned to Write in Colonial New England." *Journal of Social History* 24, no. 3 (Spring 1991): 579-589.

Monaghan, E. Jennifer. "Literacy Instruction and Gender in Colonial New England." *American Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (March 1988): 18-41.

Nash, Gary B. and Billy G. Smith. "The Population of Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 99, no. 3 (July 1975): 362-368.

O'Reilly, William. "Genealogies of Atlantic History." *Atlantic Studies* 1, no. 1 (2004): 66-84.

Perlmann, Joel and Dennis Shirley. "When Did New England Women Acquire Literacy?." *William and Mary Quarterly* 48, no. 1 (January 1991): 50-67.

Reddy, William M. "Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotion." *Current Anthropology* 38, no. 3 (June 1997): 327-351.

Reinberger, Mark and Elizabeth McLean. "Isaac Norris's Fairhill: Architecture, Landscape, and Quaker Ideals in a Philadelphia Colonial Country Seat." *Winterthur Portfolio* 32 (Winter 1997): 251-52.

Risch, Erna. "Immigrant Aid Societies Before 1820." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 60, no. 1 (January 1936): 15-33.

Roach, Hannah Benner. "Philadelphia Business Directory, 1690." *Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine* 23 (1963): 95-129.

Schiller, Nina Glick, Linda Basch, and Cristine Szanton Blanc. "From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration." *Anthropological Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (January 1995): 48-63.

Smith, Billy G. "Death and Life in a Colonial Immigrant City: A Demographic Analysis of Philadelphia." *The Journal of Economic History* 37, no. 4 (December 1977): 863-889.

Smith, Daniel Scott. "Child-Naming Practices, Kinship Ties, and Change in Family Attitudes in Hingham, Massachusetts, 1641 to 1880." *Journal of Social History* 18 (Summer 1985): 541-566.

Stearns, Peter N. and Carol Z. Stearns. "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards." *American Historical Review* 90, vol. 4 (October 1985): 813-836.

Steele, Ian K. "Exploding Colonial American History: Amerindian, Atlantic, and Global Perspectives." *Reviews in American History* 26, no. 1 (March 1998): 70-95.

Sullivan, Aaron. "'The Charity which begins at Home': Ethnic Societies and Benevolence in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 134, no. 4 (October 2010): 305-337.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. "Place: An Experiential Perspective." *Geographical Review* 65 (April 1975): 151-165.

Tully, Alan. "Literacy Levels and Educational Development in Rural Pennsylvania, 1729-1775." *Pennsylvania History* 39, no. 3 (July 1972): 301-312.

Wareing, John. "Migration to London and Transatlantic Emigration of Indentured Servants, 1683-1775." *Journal of Historical Geography* 7, no. 4 (October 1981): 356-378.

Waters, John J. "Naming and Kinship in New England: Guilford Patterns and Usage, 1693-1759." *The New England Historical and Genealogical Register* 138 (July 1984): 161-181.

Zuckerman, Michael. "Farewell to the 'New England Paradigm' of Colonial Development." *Pennsylvania History* 57, no. 1 (January 1990): 66-73.

Zuckerman, Michael. "William Byrd's Family." *Perspectives in American History* XII (1979): 274, 286-90.

**Theses and Dissertations**

Dierks, Konstantin. "Letter Writing, Gender, and Class in America, 1750-1800." Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1999.

Forde, Helen. "Derbyshire Quakers, 1650-1761." Ph.D. diss., University of Leicester, 1977.

Johnson, Joseph E. "A Statesman of Colonial Pennsylvania: A Study of the Private Life and Public Career of James Logan to the Year 1726." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1942.

Larsen, Grace Hutchison. "Profile of a Colonial Merchant: Thomas Clifford of Pre-Revolutionary Philadelphia." Ph.D. diss.: Columbia University, 1955.

Levenduski, Cristine Marie, "Elizabeth Ashbridge's 'Remarkable Experiences': Creating the Self in a Quaker Personal Narrative." Ph.D. diss.: The University of Minnesota, 1989.

Thomas R. Saxton
E-mail address: tr_saxton@yahoo.com

# VITA

**Education:**

| | |
|---|---|
| January, 2002 | M.A. in History<br>Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa. 18015 |
| May, 1999 | B.A. in History, summa cum laude<br>Rider University, Lawrenceville, N.J. 08648 |

**Teaching Experience:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Fall, 2008 –<br>Spring, 2009 | Adjunct Instructor, History 150: World History to1500,<br>Rider University. |
| Fall, 2006 | Holben Teaching Fellowship, Lehigh University.<br>History 104: Themes in History.<br>Course title: "Atlantic Crossings: Migrations to the New World" |
| Fall, 2002 | Teaching Assistant, History 105: Sports in Modern America,<br>Lehigh University. |

**Fellowships, Grants, and Awards:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Fall, 2009 | Robert G. Crist Prize, awarded by the Pennsylvania Historical Association for the best article written by a graduate student in the scholarly journal, *Pennsylvania History*. |
| Summer, 2007 | College of Arts and Sciences Summer Research Fellowship, Lehigh University. |
| 2006 – 2007 | Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Fellowship, Library Company of Philadelphia and Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. |
| Fall, 2004 –<br>Spring, 2005 | Dissertation Fellowship, Lawrence Henry Gipson Institute for Eighteenth-century Studies, Bethlehem, Pa. |

**Publication:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Winter, 2007 | "'In Reduced Circumstances': Aging and Impoverished Revolutionary War Veterans and their Families in the Young Republic." *Pennsylvania History* vol. 74, no. 1 (Winter 2007): 21-73. |

**Employment:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Spring, 1998 –<br>Summer, 2000,<br>Summer, 1997 | Research Assistant, David Library of the American Revolution. |