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INTRODUCTION

The research project which culminated in the writing of this dissertation began with the purpose of studying the concept of the family in colonial America. Based upon the experience of historians who have probed the roots of other American ideas and institutions and upon the fact that American colonials came from Europe, it first seemed reasonable to look into European sources. Yet there were also the accounts of the historians who told of American colonials finding that the conditions in America required modification of the ideas and institutions which they had attempted to transfer to America from Europe. If the concept of the family had been changed in America, a study of that concept should delve into American sources. Logic suggested and historians argued that the family, being a fundamental institution of social, economic, and political significance, had been affected by the transit to, and establishment in America. Bernard Bailyn, for one, has mentioned changes which occurred in the American family and has cited the need for new studies.¹

Many questions came to mind. Were American colonials aware of the changes which later historians described? If
they did recognize these changes, what was their attitude toward changes which were then occurring or had occurred? Did they regard changes as an improvement, or did they view changes as threats to personal happiness and to the future of civilization? Furthermore, was there a clear pattern of change in the concept of the family in America (both a possible cause and result of change in the institution) in the course of the eighteenth century when colonial society underwent a process of maturation? In order to begin to answer such questions the personal papers of one colonial family—the Pembertons of the colony of Pennsylvania—came to be selected for study.

In the course of studying the source material and the background readings which were expected to aid in the interpretation of ideas found in the sources, it became evident that rather than focusing upon questions relevant to change in a concept of the family, the questions which first had to be asked and answered were questions about the concept of the family itself.

There will be those who will argue that there was not a single colonial American concept of the family; rather, there were only many individual conceptions of the family—indeed, many which did not even have the clarity to warrant being identified as "concepts." The value of such a view lies in
the fact that the argument directs attention to the distortion involved in rigid, indefensibly broad generalizations. The study of the Pembertons here presented is a beginning in the study of the concept of the family in colonial America. This should be made clear. It does not presume to set forth "the" colonial American conception, "the" eighteenth-century conception, "the" Philadelphia conception, "the" Protestant conception, or "the" Quaker conception of the family. However, comparisons and contrasts (beyond the scope of this paper) of the ideas about the family distilled from the Pemberton Papers with the ideas of other men and women may reveal striking similarities of thought among American colonials.

One respected American historian, Curtis Nettels, regards the family as the most important component of colonial society. Another scholar, Max Savelis, states that "... in practical affairs the family, and respect for family connections, was a powerful force in American life and thought. It was the great aristocratic families, for example, who dominated, if they did not actually control colonial politics as well as colonial society." At the beginning of the twentieth century Arthur Calhoun recognized the significance of the family and wrote a multivolume work in which he attempted to set forth the "forces" which had shaped American family institutions. He thought the American family should be studied "... as a social
institution in relation to other social institutions and to "the social forces." Calhoun, like sociologist Meyer Nimkoff, understood society as a social system in which all social institutions are correlated. Hence, change in one part of the system has an impact on the other parts. The family changes because of changes in political and economic institutions, for example. On the other hand, a change in the family affects government, and agriculture, trade, and industry.

Based upon extensive research, Calhoun wrote a survey account of the history of the American family in which he presented the colonial family "... as a property institution dominated by middle class standards, and operating as an agency of social control in the midst of a social order governed by the interests of a forceful aristocracy which shaped religion, education, politics, and all else to its own profit." Calhoun provided a general history; it raised many questions about colonial family life and thought. Yet research lagged; it was as if Calhoun had said all of what needed to be said. Willystine Goodsell pointed out that the study of the family lagged behind the study of other social institutions despite the fact "... it has justly been reckoned the basis and starting point of social research by the historian and the sociologist."

In the 1960's sociologist William Kenkel could say
quite correctly that "information concerning the colonial family is sketchy and impressionistic . . . . From the sundry records available we can reconstruct a reasonably accurate picture of the colonial family, but it necessarily will lack specificity and detail." Part of the reason for the "sketchy" portrait of the colonial family lies in the lack of revealing source material; part of the reason lies in the incomplete use of available materials. On the basis of the research done in preparing this dissertation, it is apparent that there is much to be learned of the colonial ideas about the family. Max Savelle suggests the importance of such studies when he states that the family " . . . was of great importance to the mind of the American in the eighteenth century. For it was generally accepted as a basic unit of society, and it had been and still was a powerful force in politics." The research for this dissertation proceeded on the assumption stated by Alan Heimert in the following manner:

An understanding of the significance of any idea, or of a constellation of ideas, requires an awareness of the context of institutions and events out of which thought emerged, and with which it strove to come to terms. But full apprehension depends finally on reading, not between the lines but, as it were, through and beyond them.

Also shaping the study was the conviction that intellectual history not only must examine the ideas of intellectuals, but
also must attempt to discover and to understand the ideas of other people. Ideas are important in the lives of common people as well as in the lives of professional thinkers. For ideas are important as sources of motivation and awareness of opportunity for action as well as stimulation for further thought.

John Lukacs persuasively argues that it is essential to avoid an unreasonable and unrealistic separation of ideas from life; on the other hand, the significance of certain categorical ideas should not be exaggerated. According to Lukacs, disagreement over the importance of ideas arises due to unclear conceptions of the word "idea":

Many people think of life as a dark stream of blood and sweat, of emotion and excrement, above which hovers the brighter, fragile, immaterial sphere of ideas, above which, in turn, stand certain theories, the constructions of Great Minds, systems of ideas which have been stuck together by them. Life, Ideas, Theories—three stages of an ascending hierarchy. But this is all wrong, of course; ideas are inseparable from human life, since man is the only living creature who knows that he lives while he lives. Lukacs maintains that the conception of ideas must be broadened:

"... when I insist upon the intrusion of ideas in the making of events, I mean all kinds of ideas, mental constructs in the possibly widest (and deepest) sense of the word." Since "mental constructs" are inseparable from historical life, it is as "foolish" to ignore the effect of ideas on historical
events and institutions as it is to ignore the effect of events and institutions on ideas. Because ideas are so significant, ideas of each historical period regarding fundamental areas of human interest and activity ought to be investigated in depth.

No Pemberton wrote a treatise on the concept of the family, but all were concerned with the family and frequently expressed their ideas about the family in their letters. The founders of the American branch of the Pemberton family of Pennsylvania arrived in America in 1682. Hundreds of their letters written from the early period of settlement through the colonial period have been preserved and are now in the manuscript collection of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Most of the letters used in this study were written between 1740 and the end of the War for Independence. An extensive, but limited, knowledge of the ideas with which the Pembertons were familiar and regarded as significant can be gleaned from a careful scrutiny of their extent letters.

The extent letters provide a revealing, but incomplete record of Pemberton thought. Colonials did not save all the letters exchanged in a lifetime. Some were lost; other letters were discarded. Quite conceivably, notes and letters which the historian of ideas about the family would find most valuable were not saved--letters which contained little more than family
news. Family members parted with such letters, but retained many with religious messages, political observations, and business information. Fortunately, many letters mentioned family matters along with religion, politics, and/or business. Some people wrote but a few letters because they disliked letter-writing. In the case of those people, there is little or no indication of what they thought about the family. In another type of situation the writer intentionally left out certain thoughts because of the fear that someone other than the intended reader would examine the letter. The unreliability of the post meant that while in transit a letter might change hands many times before it reached the addressee; thus, the danger arose of the letter being opened and read by a curious or malicious carrier. It should also be noted that eighteenth-century stylization in letter-writing inhibited the free and individualistic expression of ideas. Furthermore, many colonials were not accustomed to disclosing their inner thoughts even in other types of writing or speech. Nevertheless, despite such limitations, the personal letters of Pemberton family members and friends provided a wealth of information pertinent to the study of the concept of the family.

The branches of the Pemberton family at the center of this study are those of Israel, the Younger, James, and John--the sons of Israel Pemberton, the Elder. The sons
assumed leadership of family affairs during the 1750's—a leadership they maintained throughout the Revolution. Phineas and Phebe Pemberton, the founders of the American branch of the Pemberton family, came to America in 1682 and established their home in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Israel (their one son to reach manhood) was sent to Philadelphia where he was apprenticed to a leading merchant, Samuel Carpenter. In 1710 he married Rachel Read. As a merchant in Philadelphia Israel prospered. Israel and Rachel had ten children. The three sons who lived to maturity were Israel, the Younger, James, and John. They lived in Philadelphia and engaged in trade as had their father. The Pembertons numbered among the great Quaker trading families of colonial Philadelphia.

Israel, the Younger, James, and John became influential men in Philadelphia not only because they were the sons of an influential man and had become successful merchants, but also because of their other activities in Philadelphia. In political affairs, the Society of Friends, humanitarian projects, and civic improvement organizations, Israel and James accepted responsibilities and exercised power. John devoted himself largely to service in the Society and became well-known as a Quaker minister.

In order to present an interpretation of a concept of the family in colonial America the study has been organized
in the following manner. Part One focuses upon the thought of the Pembertons and their friends which pertains to the family as a small group within the society-at-large. While several scholars have studied the structure of the colonial family, they have neglected or given but marginal consideration to what colonials thought about that structure and the roles of the various family members within the family. This is precisely the central issue in Part One.

Chapter One has to do with the heads of families. Men and women became heads of families through marriage. Hence, the first subject to study is the Pemberton idea of the steps leading to marriage—i.e., courtship. If and when a couple proceeded with marital plans, what expectations did they have regarding marriage? After their marriage, a new relationship developed—the relationship between husband and wife. How did they conceive of the roles of husband and wife? Lastly, what ideas did they express about widows and widowers?

Chapter Two inquires into the idea of the place of offspring in family life. Did the Pembertons and their friends place a high value on children? What was the ideal relationship between parents and their children? What was their conception of motherhood?—of fatherhood? Which parent was to have the responsibility for child-rearing? Or, were both parents to
share child-rearing duties? They thought parents had to devote much time, thought, and energy to raising their children. Why? What did they think were the fundamental requirements of caring for their offspring in infancy, childhood, and youth? What methods did they consider to be desirable and effective? Did they have any idea of child development?

According to the Pemberton thinking, parents and offspring were but the nucleus of a family. The Chapter Three discussion—of the relations and other people not related by blood or marriage who completed the family—makes clear that the Pembertons thought of their family in terms of what is often called the "extended" family or "kinship" group. It might be described as an "inclusive" concept, rather than an "exclusive" or narrow concept (e.g., the "nuclear" family composed of parents and offspring). Sections of the chapter present material from various letters which reveals how the Pembertons and their friends conceived of the place of in-laws, grandparents, grandchildren, aunts, uncles, nieces, nephews, cousins, step-relations, apprentices, and servants in the family.

The Pemberton correspondence suggests that despite marked diversity among the many family members in age, personality, interest, experience, and duties, the Pembertons valued family unity. However, they seldom mentioned unity
per se. The work of R. M. MacIver and several other twentieth-century sociologists is used in the study of Pemberton correspondence in order to identify evidence of the unity people thought should and did characterize family relations.

While the Pemberton letters are rich with material for a discussion of the Pemberton thought on the topic of interpersonal relations within the family as a small group, on the broader subject of the place of the family in the community (Part Two), the letters are far less explicit. The fact of primary importance for a study of the thought of the Pembertons is that the Pembertons were Quakers. Furthermore, they were not merely nominal Quakers, but active, influential leaders in the Society of Friends. In order to formulate an idea of the Pembertons' conception of the family's place in the wider community, it is necessary to utilize sources which molded and/or reflected the Quaker consensus of opinion along with the Pemberton letters and information about Pemberton activities which manifested awareness and acceptance of those ideas. The sources which both influenced and expressed Quaker ideas included journals, epistles to the various Meetings, pamphlets, essays written by Quaker ministers, advices from the Meetings, and books considered by prominent Friends to be particularly valuable for members of the Society to read and to understand. The assumption is that Quaker views were the
Pemberton views (unless a contradictory or modified view appears in the correspondence).

The Pemberton letters do show that they conceived of the family as having religious, educational, economic and social functions in the community. However, in the Pemberton mind, the relationship of the family to religion, learning, the economy, and the society as a whole, was not considered in terms of specific family "functions." The questions posed in the chapters of Part Two on aspects of the conception of the family which pertain to religion, learning, economic affairs, and social participation attempt to manifest the complexity of the conceived relationships rather than attempting to fit the interrelated ideas into a rigid analytical framework.

Chapter Five asks how the Society of Friends influenced the concept of the family held by the Pembertons and others because the Pembertons did not think of themselves as having the right—nor did they give evidence of desiring the opportunity—to formulate a concept of the family according to their own personalities, needs, desires, talents, resources, fears, and whims. On the contrary, they assumed the true conception of the family was to be formulated under divine guidance. They looked to the Society to help them perceive and understand the implications of divine intelligence. An understanding of the ways the Society influenced the Pemberton concept of
the family prepares the way for a deeper comprehension of their ideas about the place of a family in the community. A second part of the chapter deals with the question of ways the family was expected to support the work of the Society—i.e., the "religious function" of the family in the community. For the Pemberton concept of the family called upon the family to actively support their religious organization.

The sources show that the Quaker concept of learning—which conditioned and reflected Pemberton thought—placed the burden of responsibility for educating children squarely upon the shoulders of the adult members of the family. Chapter Six first considers the Quaker concept of learning because with an understanding of the concept of learning it is possible to understand how this concept influenced the concept of the family. In turn, it is possible to see how the concept of the family held by people like the Pembertons influenced the concept of learning. The Pemberton concept of the family incorporated so-called "educational functions" of the family.

The Pembertons did not think of the family as an economic institution, but they did not deny or overlook the close relationship between the family and the economy. Chapter Seven makes clear that Friends did not think of the
economic role of the family in isolation. The first relationship to be explored is the one between religious ideas of Quaker families and their economic thought and activity. Then it is instructive to go on to answer the question of what Quakers like the Pembertons thought to be the correct relationship between a Friend's family life and his business affairs. Finally, since the Pembertons and their friends thought parents ought to prepare their children for the economic responsibilities they were to assume at maturity, how did they think such a preparation might be accomplished?

The final chapter of Part Two, Chapter Eight, raises the question of what the Pembertons and other Friends thought about the family's social role in general. Given the Quaker opposition to idleness and gossip, and their preoccupation with living useful lives, did they think families should be sociable? Or, did they think Friends should foster family privacy in order to see that all family members did not waste time? The second section of the chapter deals with the issue of whether or not families were thought to be obligated to contribute to the good order and improvement of the community.

The concluding remarks of the dissertation in Part Three are set forth in two chapters that attempt to place the concept of the family in perspective. Chapter Nine focuses upon the Pemberton awareness of continuity and change with
respect to the place of the family in society. The question arises as to how the Pemberton view was similar to, or different from, views of latter-day scholars. In the final analysis, did the Pembertons stress either elements of continuity or elements of change? Chapter Ten concludes with a discussion of the reaction of the Pembertons to the discrepancies between their concept of the ideal family and their concept of the real family.
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6 Calhoun, Colonial Period, p. 10.


9. See the following article for suggestions regarding other topics which require further research: David J. Rathman, "A Note on the Study of the Colonial Family," William and Mary Quarterly XXIII (1966), pp. 627-634.


12. John Higham describes the disagreement among historians over the proper definition of intellectual history. One group argues intellectual history is the history of intellectuals. Another group maintains it is the history of ideas. A third group would include every type and level of mental activity. See: John Higham, "The Rise of American Intellectual History," American Historical Review LVI (1951), p. 453.


15. In Charles M. Andrews' Colonial Folkways the author states that perhaps the greatest omission from the book was the failure to discuss the colonials' mental attitudes and opinions. One of the reasons for the failure was the difficulty of finding sources which would reveal such information. He quite correctly refers both to the importance of penetrating the colonial mind and to the difficulty of learning about colonial ideas in contrast to learning about government, trade, industry, agriculture, and social customs. See: Charles M. Andrews, Colonial Folkways: A Chronicle of American Life in the Reign of the Georoes, Vol. IX of The Chronicles of America Series, ed. by Allen Johnson (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919), pp. 231-237. Hereafter cited: Colonial Folkways.

16. The following statement shows that sociologists, as well as historians, recognize the value of personal documents: "Life histories and other human documents [personal letters] reveal the attitudes, desires, and values of family members that are difficult to perceive in the external behavior of the family or from reports of outsiders." Ernest W. Burgess and Harvey J. Locke, The Family: From Institution to

17Israel Pemberton, the Younger: B. 1715; D. 1779; M. 1737, Sarah Kirkbride, 1747, Mary Stanbury Jordon.
   James Pemberton: B. 1723; D. 1809; M. 1751, Hannah Lloyd, 1768, Sarah Smith, 1775, Phoebe Lewis Norton.
   John Pemberton: B. 1727; D. 1795; M. 1765, Hannah Zane.

18Epistles were letters which included spiritual and practical advice written from one Meeting to other Meetings—e.g., from a Yearly Meeting to its constituent Quarterly and Monthly Meetings. Advices were chronological compilations of the opinions and observations of Yearly Meetings on such topics as marriage, trading, worship, charity, and dress.
PART ONE

A FAMILY AS A SMALL GROUP
CHAPTER I

HEADS OF FAMILIES

The Society of Friends to which the Pemberton family belonged thought of heads of families as important people. Numerous epistles of advice and exhortation from Yearly, Quarterly, and Monthly Meetings addressed to the heads of families reflected this fact. Who did they consider to be the heads of families? Apparently, that depended upon the state of each particular family and upon the context in which the term was used.

A marriage created both a new branch of an old family and the beginning of a new family. The first of Israel Pemberton the Elder's sons to marry, Israel Pemberton, the Younger, married Sarah Kirkbride in 1737. Israel Pemberton, the Elder, maintained his position of headship of the Pemberton family which included two brothers of Israel, the Younger, James and John. Israel, the Younger, assumed the headship of a new family. However, the heads of families were not always men. A wife might act as the head of a family during the absence of her husband. Due to the demands of business and the problems of
transportation and communication, such an absence might be prolonged. The wife might also be called upon to assume the headship position in the time of an illness of her husband. In contrast to both of these situations in which the woman might regard herself as a temporary substitute, rather than the permanent head, the death of the husband made his widow the head of the family. Female heads of families were to be accorded respect and to assume responsibilities comparable to those of male heads of families.

While some epistles addressed parents and heads of families separately, other epistles addressed all parents as heads of families. The latter implied that in relation to their children both parents were to be considered heads of a family. For example, an epistle from the London Yearly Meeting called attention to the ill effects of a particular course of action "... both on the heads and younger branches of the families..."—that is, the parents and the children. Further evidence of this concept is found in Advices to Friends which warn against the destruction of "... the proper & joint Authority of the Heads of Families and abating of Love between themselves and duty from their Children." Therefore, in certain contexts members of the Society of Friends recognized both a male head and a female head of a family. Such a conception both reflected and
reinforced a semipatriarchal family structure. The Pembertons and many of their friends in both England and America thought of the family as a semipatriarchal group, though the term belongs to modern scholars. Within the Friends' families, both man and wife carried out tasks and made decisions looked upon as essential to family welfare. In particular, they emphasized time and again the co-responsibility of the mother and the father for their children. Thus, both young men and women could hope to become heads of families. First came the adventure and task of choosing a marriage partner.

Courtship did not only mean the process of choosing a wife. It also meant the process of choosing a husband. Though taken seriously, the months or years of courting could be enjoyed. William Kenkel states that a feeling of duty to society is no longer a factor in promoting courtship and marriage in twentieth-century America. The implication is that it was true before. One might conclude on the basis of the work of the well-known historian of the American family Arthur Calhoun that the conception of marriage as a duty to society constituted a major factor in colonial Quaker courtship. In his discussion of courtship and marriage among New England Puritans Calhoun argues that community interests took precedence over private interests. Previously, he had described the Quakers as a species of "Super-Puritans." Yet the
Pemberton letters do not support the conclusion that Quakers undertook courtship with the community interest uppermost in their minds.

Young men and women contemplating marriage for the first time and older widows or widowers planning a second or third marriage, who were the individuals most intimately involved in courtship, expressed a much more personal idea. The man initiated the relationship by making "overtures" to a woman. He did not think of this as a matter to be, or to have been, dictated by his parents. In other words, though he doubtlessly recognized many factors which influenced his decision, he still thought of the decision to pursue a female as his to make. He believed that if his decision was based on pure motives and prudent conduct his parents should and would support it.

Quaker teachings discouraged associations between unmarried men and women simply for the value of the entertainment. Rather than separately defined periods of dating and courtship, the Friends thought in terms of phases of getting to know one another. During this period of getting to know each other, acquaintances were to learn about personalities, attitudes, and background for the purpose of determining whether or not they could consider each other suitable marriage prospects. They thought of marriage, rather than of just being together for the pleasure of association, as the end of
courtship; however, they did not think the serious purpose of courtship necessarily would or should preclude enjoyment.

Eighteenth-century Pembertons upheld the view of an early Quaker counsel to the effect that it "... [is] unbecoming those who profess the Truth to go from one Woman to another and keep Company, and sit together especially in the Night Season, spending their Precious time in Idle discourse, and drawing the Affections one of another, many times when there is no reality in it..." Furthermore, a man was not to show an interest in a second woman before being clear of a first. Both actions were opposed on the grounds of being against the "Moving" of God. The latter principle of conduct manifested a degree of realism regarding courtship affairs—namely, that after courting a girl for some time, a man might have doubts as to his initial feelings and want to turn his attentions elsewhere. Samuel Elen, a friend of John Pemberton, took pains to explain to his friend how he had not treated a certain girl badly when he took leave of her. He claimed he had acted candidly and ingenuously, wished her the best in life, and said she had given him full "discharge."

Before allowing himself to focus his attentions on one woman, a Friend was to wait upon God for direction from the Light within. One of the published Quaker journals which
set forth the ideal approach of a Friend recorded the life of John Woolman. In the journal he recalled a time in 1749 when "... believing it good for me to settle, and thinking seriously about a Companion, my Heart was turned to the Lord with Desires that he would give me the Wisdom to proceed therein agreeable to his Will and he was pleased to give me a well-inclined Damsel ...". Early generations of Quakers, including the parents of Israel Pemberton, the Elder, emphasized the necessity of reliance upon divine instruction in the affairs of courting. The precept conditioned the outlook of Israel, James, and John though the relative influence on them compared to the earlier Friends is difficult to assess. The ideal certainly had not been forgotten or rejected by the mid-eighteenth century. In 1766 Israel, the Younger, reminded his son Joseph that:

The intelligence convey'd immediately [sic] to the mind of those who humbly reveredly & sincerely apply & wait for divine direction is I am assur'd the most certain & unerring ... Make use therefore of every Rational means of enabling thee to judge rightly & make Such a Choice [of a wife] as will promote thy future happiness in Life.  

James' reference to his courtship and marriage plans did not explicitly reject a waiting on the Lord for direction. Neither did he leave any written record of following such a procedure. Yet he did acknowledge his examination of conscience which
left him with the hope of "... a pleasing prospect of happiness being conscious of the justness & uprightness of my motives ..." and of "the blessing of Heaven." As a Friend engaged in the ministry, John Pemberton repeatedly exhorted Friends to wait patiently for the counsel of the Holy Spirit on all important questions; the choice of a partner for life would certainly have fallen in that category.

With regard to the process of choosing a wife, Therese Benedek discusses two types of societies. In one society the man is free—the choice being a free choice. In the other society he is not free—the choice being a function of tradition which neglects individual preference. In general contrast to the society of modern America, the social institutions of colonial America would be characterized as traditional. Therefore, one might suppose that individual taste and opinion were of minor significance in the matching of young Quaker men and women. In reality, neither of the Benedek types adequately describes the situation of Friends in colonial America. The Quaker tradition itself allowed for individual preference and individual interpretation of the will of God—within rather reasonably broad limits. Ultimately, a Friend might choose to exercise greater freedom than the teachings and discipline of the Society allowed. He thereby risked being expelled, but no sanction inflicting
greater loss, pain, or suffering could be applied by the Society.

Friends opposed a hurried courtship and a hasty marriage. They thought such an important affair ought to be accomplished with appropriately serious thought and conduct. The letters of youthful Friends did not indicate they regarded the prevailing sentiment as an unreasonable restraint. As to the age of eligibility for marriage, the Friends accepted a considerable variation. Charles M. Andrews points out that colonial Americans might marry at fourteen, but it would be a mistake to assume that early marriages were either the ideal or the rule. Most of the Pembertons married in their twenties. Israel married at twenty-one years of age. His son Joseph married at age twenty-two. Israel's father had married in his twenty-sixth year while Israel's brother James married when he was twenty-eight. Exceptions to the Pemberton pattern of marriage in the twenties included brother John who married at age thirty-nine. Brother Israel thought Hannah Lloyd to be very young for marriage; James married the seventeen-year-old Hannah in 1751.

Young men were to consider their financial capabilities before contemplating marriage. The man was to be able to support a family—providing at least the necessities of life. Because of the industry of their father and his foresight
in providing them with knowledge and resources for business, Israel, James, and John did not have to delay their marriages due to inability to support families of their own.

Depending on the personality and the situation of each person involved, the preliminaries to marriage could take a long time. Friends agreed the process should not be hurried, but apparently, definitions of "to hurry" differed. When John Pemberton finally married in his thirty-ninth year, a friend remarked that he thought Hannah Zane and John had loved each other for a long time and that it was "high Time" they completed a "much deliberated Scheme." Some ten years before, the same friend had been encouraging John to marry. Friends often alluded to the loneliness of bachelorhood; but while his mother Rachel was living, and he stayed with her in the family home, John did not suffer from loneliness. Perhaps, his timidity with eligible women and his involvement in the service of the Society of Friends contributed to the delay of John's marriage. However, soon after the death of Rachel Pemberton (1765), John married.

In the latter half of the twentieth century many Americans have not considered marriage as being necessary for the comfortable life. In contrast to that attitude, eighteenth-century Americans generally considered marriage as being very important, if not absolutely necessary, for a
comfortable adulthood. The Pembertons did not express contrary views. Even John Pemberton finally crowned courtship with marriage.

Courtship might be undertaken and carried on quietly without drawing the disapproval of Friends. Indeed, John learned about the "Considerable Progress" his brother James had made in courtship from letters of friends in Philadelphia, rather than from James himself. Since James did not write to his own brother concerning that affair, he could hardly have been expected to have told much about his plans to friends. One friend observed that in a letter to him, James discussed several pieces of commonly known information while maintaining a silence about his marriage.

The Pemberton young men and their friends expressed a high degree of consensus concerning the virtues, qualities, knowledge, and skills they considered desirable in a future wife. Differences in their ideas of an attractive prospect were mainly differences in emphasis or priority and in perception as to what constituted a particular quality. In writing, the fellows concentrated on descriptions of personality and virtue. They evidently considered courtship as a quest for a lifelong companion—the happiness of marriage largely to be determined by the compatibility of the heads of a family. Qualities which made a girl worthy of regard and affection
included: sweetness, naturalness, charity, piety, innocence, goodness, honesty, loveliness, grace, ease, sprightliness, and hospitality. Generally, young men assumed girls had been taught to keep house, and they wrote more about a female's sentiments and conduct which they thought indicated certain valuable qualities.

Ideally, though the economic particulars of a girl's family certainly were not to be ignored, they were not to be a major factor when a man searched for a wife. Israel Pemberton advised his son that "neither Riches Beauty nor any gratification merely Temporal Should determine thee therein . . . ." In a succeeding letter Israel asserted that only God's blessing makes men truly rich and told Joseph that he was pleased with the way his son had proceeded. It is difficult to decide whether these two parts of Israel's letters meant that he was subtly warning Joseph against a tendency to over-value material goods or that he was pleased with his son's procedure because the father did not have any reason to think his son might be contradicting the principle in practice. Joseph assured his father that he understood and accepted Israel's advice:

... and I hope, as it's my earnest desire to be guided by the unerring Spirit of Truth, I shall steadily pursue such Methods as will be a means of affording true Comfort to thee, being convinced that my Views in fixing my affections here, are well grounded, and that altho Providence has been pleased to bless my
Dear Friend [future wife] with a plentiful Estate, which if rightly used may perhaps add something to felicity, yet do I think it far from being necessary to constitute real Happiness, and I can truly say, that it hath not excited in me any anxious Wishes.26

Later, he wrote to his father extolling Nancy Galloway's (his "Dear" friend's) virtues. He thought the "sweetness" and "ease" of her conduct, though "easier to feel than to describe," made all her virtues "doubly agreeable." At the same time he explicitly denied he wanted to be "connected with" Nancy "... merely to gratify any sensual Views ... ."27

A young man's decision that a certain young lady should be his wife did not make marriage the inevitable result. A hope of a favorable result as a reward for perseverance in a good cause stimulated many young men to summon their powers of persuasion. On the other hand, there were numerous examples of "vanquished" young fellows who had failed in their quest. Indeed, one might be turned down more than once.

A young woman might respond to the attentions and/or proposals of a young man in one of three ways. First, she might be agreeable and receive them favorably. Second, she might be uncertain and ask for time to think about the matter. Third, she might reject his "overtures." Many girls shared the view that the tasks of a wife were "Solidly pleasing."28 However, despite the fact that most girls assumed they would
marry, who they would marry was not a prearranged, foregone conclusion.

In making up her mind how to respond to an interested male, a young woman was to consider carefully his personality, intentions, and abilities; for she too thought in terms of marriage for life. A friend of Rachel Pemberton thought many young people married in spite of the fact that they were totally ignorant of the nature of the married state. Her amazement at this practice grew out of her view of marriage as "... a matter of so great importance, that we cannot too thoroughly Search into the qualities [sic] of the person to whom we give our hand, & heart, and to whom we promise Obedience; for life to." 29 Rachel herself set forth a similar point of view in a letter to another friend. She said it surprised her how many people rushed "headlong" into marriage with no clear idea of what it involved. She also believed many never even once contemplated "... the risque [sic] they run. a state wherein their future happiness, or misery entirely [sic] depends. heedless, un-thinking ..." 30 A girl not pleased with the prospect presented by an attentive male might console herself when she rejected his attentions with the thought that no marriage was better than an unhappy one.

It is highly probable that most girls were more interested in finding a good husband than in anything else. Yet
Hannah Smith thought Rachel Pemberton demonstrated "Humble desires" in only wanting a good husband. Hannah admitted she thought a husband would be helpful in later years of life. Other lines in the letter suggest that her claiming to think of finding a husband as only one of many desires could be explained by her youth. She conceived of herself as having just entered upon the stage of life, and she had no intention of rushing into marriage. In fact, she lamented the deeds of girls who did hurry into marriage unthinkingly.

Evidently, young women Friends thought of the qualifications of a suitable companion before any proposals were made. However, they were anxious not to reveal "an impression" of a young man before he expressed his feelings. Letters repeatedly referred to certain qualities of a good husband—a repetition which suggests a similar consensus to that of the young men regarding the qualities to be sought in a prospective wife. First the young man should possess good sense and sound judgment. He also should be religious, knowledgeable, unaffected, understanding, polite, affable, and instructive. The younger generations of Pemberton girls and their friends appreciated refined and genteel men. On the other hand, they criticized young men for superfluous discourse and using money to avoid confronting unpleasant realities. They seem to have been more aware than earlier generations of the intrigue and strategy involved in
courtship. No doubt their education and the increasingly attractive and magnetic Philadelphia social life influenced their attitudes.

Despite the central importance of the young man and woman in courtship and marriage, the parents of the couple also had a legitimate and significant role to play. In addition to the indirect influence they exerted through the long process of teaching relevant principles and attitudes while the children were growing up, their immediate involvement in courtship and marriage planning was threefold.

Initially, parents were to be informed of intentions, and later, of progress in courtship toward marriage. Many young people seem to have accepted this custom without opposition, but their letters do suggest variations in how closely they adhered to it. Hannah Pemberton confided in her brother-in-law before telling her father of a proposal; nevertheless, she was anxious to tell her father before he heard the news from an outside source. Not only her brother-in-law, but also a few of her friends knew much of the affair before Hannah told her father.

In addition to being the recipients of information about the doings of their children—from their children—parents were to advise young men and women who were contemplating marriage. The advice given by William Penn to his children served as one
model for parents when they faced the responsibility of giving wise advice to their offspring. Basically, Penn admonished his children to take their time when choosing a spouse; to be serious in the search; to follow the directions of the Lord; to choose among Friends; and to remember that once married, they must keep the marriage covenant. Letters of advice from Pemberton fathers to their children paralleled this advice. A reasonableness of tone characterized the letters. They did not set forth dogmatic instructions justified by a "because I say so and I am your parent" approach or a simple "because it's good for you" rationale. Instead, they explained or implied that their advices grew out of their own personal experiences, understanding of Christian teachings, and the genuine good will of a parent for the welfare and happiness of his offspring.

Israel Pemberton's advice to his son Joseph even mentioned suggestions for conduct the father thought would help in his son's endeavor to win the favor of Nancy Galloway and her parents. Finally, Friends regarded parental approval or disapproval of their children's intentions and proposals as a parental right. John Pemberton was among those to whom John Griffith wrote: "... I do fully resign my right as parent of consenting; advising and Directing in this Important affair of marriage [sic] ..." He turned over this right to three other men to exercise because of the impossibility of
effectively making use of the prerogative himself when his daughters lived thousands of miles away from him. Both young and old Friends accepted the parental consent requirement as quite natural "... for what Man or parent, if it please God to give them Children, would have their Childs' Affection drawn away without their Knowledge or Consent." The proposals by and to Pemberton children noted in the extant letters were settled to the mutual satisfaction of parents and children. Letters from both Israel and Mary Pemberton to Nancy Galloway revealed how highly they approved of their son Joseph’s choice of a spouse. They eagerly invited her to visit Philadelphia and to make their house her home during her stay. Israel had met Nancy before and had been impressed by her conduct and disposition.

Friends’ teachings did not require young people to tell their parents only of their interests or intentions without explanation. In other words, a young person did not have to stand by helplessly or passively while parents made up their minds. Young people were encouraged to explain their motives and conduct which gave them an opportunity to argue their case as persuasively as their capabilities allowed. Having this opportunity to influence their parents’ decision appears to have contributed to the acceptance by young people of a requirement of parental consent. Furthermore, a young
person might conceive a scheme to behave in such a manner as
to gain the approval of the parents involved. A friend of
Rachel Pemberton Parke's husband wrote:

The accounts I had heard of the Rigidity of the
old Folks [the parents of two sisters with whom
he wanted to spend time], triply fortified me
against too domesticating a Behaviour [sic]--I
put on the appearance of Gravity & Distance—if
I sat at their Table I got between the Father &
the Mother—for the world I would not look at
their Daughters. I talked of Fr’d Walker &
Fr’d Leaver--look’d grave serious & solemn--nor
were the Girls who are of an excellent intriguing
Genius, in the least displeas’d with my
Behaviour [sic] . . . 39

Friends and relatives also had a part in courtship and
marriage proceedings. Often they too offered advice, encourage-
ment, and counsel. They had no direct veto power over a
prospective match; nevertheless, their ideas merited recognition.
Young people valued community opinion and hoped for approval.
Many letters dealing primarily with business matters, political
topics, or affairs of the Society of Friends reserved at
least a paragraph for family matters—including news of
courtships and marriage proposals among branches of the
family and friends. These paragraphs indicated a breadth of
curiosity and involvement. Approval of a match brought all sorts
of congratulatory messages wishing blessings and happiness
for the couple.40 On the other hand, disapproval of marriage
arrangements might well result in a feud.41
There were individuals in the Pemberton family, as well as friends of the family, who put off marriage for months or years and a few who never married. Diverse reasons explained the delay or failure to marry. A friend of John Pemberton thought the long delay of John's marriage had been a matter of Providence. When the Lord finally opened the way, John had been married.42

The Pembertons and their friends also thought of more mundane obstacles in the way of marriage: financial problems; the failure to meet a suitable prospect; the fear of a bad marriage; family obligations, for example, taking care of an aged parent; the lack of a choice of eligible single men and women—particularly a problem for those who lived in the rural areas; poor health—certainly a major factor for Phineas Pemberton, James' son; and other interests such as business or the Society of Friends. Closely related to this last matter of interest in the affairs of the Society was a conception articulated by Israel Pemberton to the effect that marriage might interfere with or divert attention away from a religious calling. During a religious visit made by John to Europe, Israel wrote to him about news of marriages in the community, but then he said: "I hope thou wilt not meet with any Temtations [sic] of this kind, for Such I believe they often prove . . . " to be for people in John's situation.43
But what did those couples who either faced no major obstacles, or who managed to overcome them and marry, expect from marriage? Most of the Pembertons seem to have had a positive family experience. The children assumed that one day they would have families of their own and only occasionally did they or their friends mention how they would like to have their new family experience be different from the family of their own childhood. One girl thought it would be ideal for the female head of the household to see that at the end of every day, the entire family pause quietly to consider their state in life. To her friend Hannah Pemberton she suggested: "... let us my Dear if ever we have the charge of family endeavors to get this practice; I believe it would be blest with the spreading of that sobriety & calmness of disposition throughout, that would more than any thing tend to assisting the mistress in the due regulation & good order of her household..."[^44] Such ideas demanded no major changes in the conception or functioning of the family.

Incidentally, Hannah, one of James' daughters did reveal a divergent reaction to the Pemberton home experience. She hinted that for her, marriage would be desirable because it would permit her to escape an unpleasant family situation—living with her father, stepmother, and other offspring. Even Hannah appeared to think of her case as exceptional—indeed, peculiarly tragic. There she was—in her late twenties—living
with numerous younger brothers and sisters and a stepmother who was only in her thirties. In her unhappiness, however, she did not develop and record specifically how she thought she could or would insure happiness in her new situation. In reality, rather than demanding an altered or new concept of the family, she seems to have wanted a family experience that more closely approximated her ideal. After thinking the matter through, Hannah decided she could not accept a proposal of marriage merely because she wanted to get away from her home environment. To do so would jeopardize her chances for a fulfilling marriage. She thought it to be absolutely necessary that a woman feel a special affection for a man in order to achieve enduring happiness in marriage.45

That was the great hope and expectation of young people for their marriage—enduring happiness. The Friends distinguished between true and superficial happiness. In order to experience true happiness, a couple had to receive the blessings of the Lord.46 Pure motives preceding marriage would enhance the possibility of receiving these blessings. Thomas Chalkley set forth the Quaker view that the fundamental motive for marriage should be "pure and true love."47 During the process of a young man or woman becoming "acquainted with the secret thoughts" of a dear friend, this pure love could develop.48
To understand the relationship of the concept of love to the concept and experience of courtship in the thought of Friends is difficult. Jerry Frost thinks Edmund Morgan's argument with regard to the New England Puritans that love was non-essential until after marriage holds true for the Quakers until about the middle of the eighteenth century. During courtship, religious considerations came first—followed by financial matters. Not that people were to marry for money, but they did have to make adequate provision for family support. However, by the 1740's Frost identifies an increasing interest in romantic love among Quakers. By 1776 he asserts that there were two distinct American Quaker ideals of courtship: one a religious ideal set forth by the Society which had its origins in the seventeenth century; and, the second, an ideal glorifying love. Even though the Society continued to discuss courtship in religious terms, Frost perceives a new popular preoccupation with romantic aspects of courting. He bases his observations upon his study of what he calls "the actual narratives of courting." Frost maintains:

Diaries and letters written after 1740 prove that love had become the prime requisite for marriage. School-girls dreamed about beaux and engaged in coquetry. Parents wanted their children to be happily married and thought to ensure this by encouraging romantic affection between boy and girl. Fathers, worrying about the dominance of emotion over reason, hoped their daughter's love would not be totally blind. The
attitude toward engaged persons also changed. Lovers were assumed to live in a world of dreams where romance conquered all. Matrimony was still a serious affair, but the preliminaries were no longer directed by the advice of the meeting. Where Friends once believed that God chose mates, they now assumed that Cupid shot arrows. 

This passage is important and merits discussion.

The letters of the Pemberton family and their friends substantiate the point that after 1740 many Friends thought of love as a prerequisite for marriage. But they do not suggest that love had not been so considered before 1740. One reason why many Friends failed to mention or avoid attempts to express their love in writing during courtship or after marriage may have been suggested by Israel Pemberton. In writing to his wife after many years of marriage, he said he thought words simply could not express his true love and affection for Mary; still he sensed she could feel that love. Given the fact that most early American Quakers had a limited education, meager practice in composition, and little time to write letters (particularly love letters, much less philosophical reflections on love), it is not surprising little was said about love.

That parents before 1740 did want their children to be happily married is certain. Furthermore, it is doubtful that prior to 1740 parents overlooked or disregarded the importance of a bond of affection between a boy and a girl.
contemplating marriage. Among the prominent members of the Society to focus attention on this matter was William Penn. His exemplary advice to his children included the following counsel:

• • • marry your inclination rather than your interest; I mean what you love, rather than what is rich. But love for virtue, temper, education, and person before wealth or quality and be sure you are beloved again; In all which, be not hasty, but serious; lay it before the Lord, proceed in his fear, and be you well advised.53

This is a critical and enlightening passage because it emphasized the compatibility of love in courtship and a religious ideal of courtship.

The Pembertons do not seem to have differentiated the two ideals of courtship identified by Frost. If it were necessary to classify the Pembertons according to the two types Frost discusses, they would fall in with those adhering to the religious ideal. Yet much of the correspondence reflects the "school-girl" sort of gossip and chatter Frost associates with the romantic ideal. Granted, both young men and women often told stories and slipped remarks into their letters which manifest a perception of social engagements between the sexes as a delightful game; still, it is significant to note they do not demonstrate a matching awareness of their ways and attitudes being different from their parents' ways and attitudes (when their parents were the same age). Neither
do they mention their parents telling them how things "used
to be"; nor do the extant letters of parents reveal the use
of this approach.

To further complicate the issue, some letters contain­
ing so-called romantic ideas also show a religious awareness
and/or pious concern of the writer. And then there was the
letter of Israel Pemberton--certainly no religious modernist or
romantic--which contended: "... it hath often happened
that persons both virtuous & religious have fail'd of y® hap­
piness attainable in a married state for want of a just and
well grounded affection, [thus] it is essentially necessary to
feel that to be well fix'd [before marriage] . . . ."54 He
evidently expected his son Joseph to feel a strong bond of
affection toward his prospective wife Nancy, but he did not
address his son in a manner indicating he had resigned himself
to the younger Pemberton's living "in a world of dreams where
romance conquered all."55 As to the role of "Cupid" in mate
selection, to which Jerry Frost refers, it would seem
that young Pembertons and their friends did not see them­selves as having their mates chosen by "Cupid." The
open recognition of the importance of affection and love
did not necessarily diminish the seriousness of matrimonial
affairs.

Apparently, for younger generations of American
Quakers, religious teachings were modified under the influence of secular literature and a wider social life than that of their parents and grandparents. Word usage changed. The link between the ideas of the older generation and the younger Friends were the closely related concepts of mutual respect, affection, and love. During the first half of the eighteenth century, Friends habitually referred to the importance of fostering mutual respect and affection in courtship to describe a spiritual-emotional relationship between young people. They tended to speak of the spiritual-emotional relationship between a husband and a wife as one of love. Nevertheless, they did not condemn love of a spiritual-emotional nature between an engaged couple. Furthermore, in the writings of noteworthy Friends were to be found evidence of the existence and value of affection and love in courtship. For example, Thomas Ellwood, an early Quaker, remembered when he had decided to get married in 1669 that he: "... began to feel [a "judicious" affection] at work in by breast." He continued on to say he and his prospective wife "... entertained each other with affectionate Kindness in order to marriage."56 As was previously mentioned, William Penn specifically advised his children to make love a reason for, not solely a fulfillment of, marriage. John Churchman, a Quaker minister, said he loved his wife-to-be as a sister for several
years before their marriage (because he thought she loved religion). A final example is to be found in the writings of Thomas Chalkley who recalled that during his courtship his and his prospective wife's "... love to each other was very great, and being well and honourably grounded, it was not easily shaken." Thus, the way was prepared for an increased discussion and preoccupation with love during courtship which did not necessarily undermine, contradict, or threaten religious principles.

When courtship culminated in marriage, a couple began a new relationship as husband and wife. Their conceptions of marriage influenced, paralleled, and reflected their conceptions of the roles of husband and wife. To marry meant "to be connected with." A priest or magistrate did not connect the couple. When a couple took each other as husband and wife in an appointed meeting, Quaker theology determined the form of the ceremony. William Penn explained the Friends' theology of marriage in a simple way by saying they thought "... that Marriage is an Ordinance of God, and that God only can rightly, join Man and Woman in Marriage." According to the marriage certificate, after having stated their intentions to marry "with each other," the man and woman solemnly made promises to be loving and faithful unto one another.

Once when he was carried away with the pleasing
prospect of his son Joseph's marriage, Israel Pemberton favored his son with a highly optimistic view of the predictability of happiness in marriage. He said few people, if any, failed or were "disappointed" in marriage if they began with the correct attitude. Generally, the Quakers—Israel included—subscribed to a far more realistic conception of married life than this; they knew that good marriages did not inevitably result from the idealism of young couples.

The Friends recognized the existence of bad as well as good marriages. Bad marriages demonstrated gross failures of the people involved to live up to the ideals of marriage. Friends considered an individual married as long as his spouse lived; therefore, the continued existence of a marriage did not necessarily indicate a happy marriage.

Dishonesty with self or the Society regarding motivation for marriage foreshadowed marital distress. If a person married to satisfy "carnal Inclinations," "Lucrative Desires," or "ambitious Views," problems—the consequences of such a mistake—could be predicted. William Penn deplored extravagance in clothes, wigs, and cosmetics because he thought they contributed to marital unhappiness: "The end of all this [extravagance] is, too often, to excite unlawful love, which I call lust, and draw one another into as miserable as evil circumstances. In single persons it is of ill consequence;
for if it does not awaken unchaste desires, it lays no foundation for solid and lasting union; the want of which helps to make so many unhappy marriages." Such extravagant display in married people was, to Penn, even more culpable due to its lamentable effects on family life—for example, causing discontent which might end in separation. For in spite of the precautions which might be taken to ensure suitable matches, men and women might make mistakes both before and in marriage which precluded the development or continuance of a good marriage.

Unlike bad marriages, good marriages brought happiness and a sense of fulfillment to the married couple. In addition, both people directly and indirectly fostered the happiness of their family and friends. In the opinion of family members and friends, Israel and Rachel Pemberton, the parents of Israel, the Younger, James, and John, exemplified the happily married couple. A good marriage was not without its problems and sorrows as well as its happiness and joy. But the element of sharing between the husband and wife diminished sorrow and intensified joy. Various terms and phrases referring to a good marriage recognized and emphasized aspects of marital partnership, shared responsibility, and mutual respect, rather than stressing variations of a domination/submission marital arrangement. The Pembertons and their friends used such terms as the following for marriage: an "alliance";
"our Joynt Endeavour"; "Yoak'd"—meant to each other, not merely the woman to the man or vice versa; a "happy Pair"; a "well formed Union"; when they "first joined hands"; and a "union of minds." They thought marriage changed the "condition" of both the man and the woman; by their marriage they entered a different situation of life together.

A husband and wife who cooperated to create and maintain a good marriage kept in mind the ideals of marriage and continuously endeavored to make their own marriage more closely resemble the ideal. In other words, marital happiness did not become an assumption in Quaker thought. They did not expect happiness just to happen; instead, it was an ideal for which to strive both actively and continuously.

Ideally, marriage was a blessing of God, "that State [of] being the most happy," and "the greatest of all earthly Enjoyments." A couple were "weighted [sic] in the nearest & dearest manner" in order to strengthen each other in ability and determination to do the will of the Lord—to live a Christian life. Liberty and serenity attended the minds of the husband and wife—minds united in love and respect. The ideal of marriage did not envision an experiment, a temporary arrangement, a joke, or an absurdity. Marriage, this "great concernment" meant settling for life. It was to be taken seriously; symbolically, the Meeting in which the couple married with each
other was to be regarded as a solemn occasion. According to the ideals of marriage, a lasting and fulfilling relationship would be built on a solid foundation of “durable felicity,” “similarity of Sentiment,” “suitableness of disposition,” “mutual confidence,” and “mutual love.” Finally, according to the law of love, the marriage partners were to bear each other’s burdens.

Fundamentally, the Quaker ideal of marriage enjoined the husband to be God-fearing, industrious in the execution of his duties, and loving toward his wife and family. A fear of the Lord—taken to be the beginning of wisdom—might be manifest in numerous ways. The Quaker husband should make Christian principles the basis of a code of conduct for his relations with his wife, as well as other members of the family and community. He should support (preferably, actively) the Society of Friends—by going to Meetings, taking his wife to Meetings and encouraging her to be pious, and obeying the Advices of the Society and conforming to its Discipline. Moreover, he should be alert to the movings of Divine Love within himself and follow these movings—for example, to go on religious visits to other Meetings in the cause of Truth even though it meant leaving his wife and family. Also, he should implement the teachings and rules of the Society in family relationships and affairs in the home.
A husband's industrious behavior made possible the provision of the necessities of life for his wife, as well as the rest of the family, and provided an example for her for the organization of her time and energies. Industry continued to be a rule of conduct even when economic position seemed secure. For example, Isarel Pemberton certainly did not become lethargic when he officially retired from active trade. The colonial Quaker placed a high value on time. The prevailing view considered time to be precious and not to be wasted. Early in his life experience a man learned to make good use of time. Beyond taking care of his own wife and family the Quaker might feel an obligation for "doing good" in the community. Incidentally, community service contributed to his and his family's reputation in the community. To have time, energy, and resources for such service required ingenuity and industry.

The ideal husband evidenced loving and thoughtful concern for his wife and family; this aspect of the husband ideal received the greatest emphasis in letters written by Pemberton women and their friends to and about husbands. While they occasionally praised a husband for his pious attitudes or conduct and once in a while expressed gratitude and admiration for his industry, women frequently stressed how much they revered and respected a loving husband. Even if they agreed with Sarah Pemberton who believed a wife had the greatest right
to her husband's affection,\textsuperscript{73} this did not lead to their taking men's affection for granted.

A loving husband, who shared hopes, joys, fears, and sorrows with his wife, was thought to be a true helpmate.\textsuperscript{74} Being sympathetic, he could sense his wife's feelings and give advice in time of need. Moreover, he derived great pleasure from being attentive to his wife's needs and feelings and promoting her happiness. Terms frequently used by wives appropriately addressed to, or descriptive of, a loving husband included: "nearest friend"; "partner of my life"; "nearest temporal comfort"; one whose company is "precious" and "valuable" and "the second Cause of my Present Happiness"—the first cause being the Lord; "the Nearest to me on Earth" and the man of her affection; one who was as dear to his wife as life itself. Mary Pemberton, Israel's wife, repeatedly wrote of her love and duty to her husband. She expressed the feelings of a woman who, after many years of marriage and countless trials, believed true love and friendship still subsisted between her and her husband\textsuperscript{75}—in large part due to the qualities and conduct of a loving husband.

The Pemberton husbands and their correspondents seldom wrote about their own concept of their role as husbands, much less about a concept of an ideal husband. However, their general remarks with relation to the family and their own
duties and responsibilities indicate a desire to be loved and respected by their wives and to be recognized by their friends as good husbands. Generally, they seem to have accepted the conventional ideas with regard to what qualities characterized a good husband. The husbands in the Pemberton family and their friends did not differentiate their ideas, authority, or functions as husbands from those of husbands belonging to other Protestant denominations, regions, or classes. This is not to say that there were no differences, but merely to point out that the Pembertons did not leave evidence to show their perception or understanding of such differences if they did exist. Finally, the evidence does not suggest any significant difference between husbands and wives in their perception of the husband's role in general.

The Quaker ideal of marriage also called upon a wife to be God-fearing, industrious, and loving. The God-fearing wife waited upon and heeded the Light within, attended Meetings, read the Bible and religious literature, entertained visiting Friends, and gave inspiration and encouragement to her husband to do his Christian duty. Piety in life and conversation characterized the best of wives.76

The industrious wife accepted and carried out her responsibilities of household management and care. She maintained the household in good order. Although she did not
necessarily have to do all the housework herself, she had to see that it was done well. In the Pemberton homes it was possible, perfectly acceptable, and indeed, necessary to have servants to help with the "rougher part of the House Business." That is, it was possible for the Pembertons to have servants in the sense that they could afford to have help. On the other hand, many letters bemoaned the problem of finding suitable, trustworthy housekeepers. Yet even with servants the mistress of the house did not think she could leave the work to be done by them alone. Her objectives included getting the work done in such good time as would allow her to be with her family when they needed and wanted her. But in Mary Pemberton's experience, for example, in more than one instance her housework prevented her from being with her husband even though they both wanted to be together. Marriage required sacrifices from both wife and husband; the Pembertons and their friends expected and made these sacrifices with few written complaints.

By treating her husband in a loving way, a wife fulfilled a sense of duty conditioned by her conception of the ideal wife and, at the same time, hoped to gain the approval of her spouse. The Pemberton letters make clear that men approved and valued wives who demonstrated genuine sympathy and understanding; unselfishness; patience; calmness; an interest in encouraging their husbands in their work and
religious duties; their affection and duty toward their husbands (for example, by writing letters), and; their ability to create "festive scenes of prime delight & tranquil joy" in the home. A woman possessing these qualities could truly be called: "a beloved Companion for Life"; "amiable"; a source of joy; the "beloved object & partner of my felicity"; "the most affectionate tender & dearest partner of my life." 

In the Pemberton manuscripts there is no indication of general disillusionment with the role of the wife as it was then constituted. Several young women of a marriageable age wondered at their contemporaries because they seemed to rush into marriage with little notion of what their new role would entail. The young ladies believed a girl should think carefully about marriage and about the qualifications of any man who might propose marriage to her. By being observant and using her good judgment she could discriminate between meritorious and undeserving candidates. Once she made her decision, accepted a proposal, and married, she must recognize that from then on his concerns and problems would be hers also. In case of conflicting goals and plans she would be required to defer to his position. Yet if she chose her husband wisely, there would be few occasions for disagreement and conflict. Generally, wives did not articulate a sense of oppression; nor did they clearly state, or even imply, an
awareness of being more free than other women—such as women of an earlier generation or of a different class, geographical area, or religious group. In fact, they neither had a tendency to compare their condition to that of other women, nor to that of men. The political inequality (also the related inferior political knowledge and the subordination of political opinions) of women did not trouble the Pemberton wives and their married female friends—at least not in a way that impelled them to communicate their feelings in letters. That they were not totally unaware or uninterested in politics is shown by the fact they mentioned political affairs in some letters in which they encouraged their husbands to do what they thought to be right. However, the women themselves showed no desire to participate actively in political affairs—except in extraordinary circumstances. For example, during the fall and winter of 1777-78, Israel, James, and John, together with several other Philadelphians were exiled in Virginia—far away from their homes and families. During that period of time, the wives of the men concerned addressed various political officials on behalf of their husbands and families. A number of them even journeyed to York to negotiate the release of the exiled men. Ordinarily, though, household affairs kept wives near their homes. Only occasionally, they might be called away for an extended
period of time due to religious or family obligations. Notwithstanding the fact that the responsibilities of a wife, combined with the condition of being a woman, restricted her freedom of movement, the situation did not arouse in wives a conscious resentment of their confinement to be communicated to oppressed sisters.

Similarly, wives did not openly resent their position of economic dependency. Indeed, they did not even show they perceived that they occupied such a position. The division of labor received general acceptance from the wives as being legitimate. Apparently, they devoted little thought to alternatives for past, present, or future. They did not view their economic interests separately from their husbands' interests; nor did they express any knowledge of women who did so. In fact, their letters do not show any evidence of preoccupation with economic affairs on the part of wives.

Letters written by the Pembertons and their friends suggest a rather comfortable relationship of wives with their husbands—women far more often referring to their husbands as helpmates than as masters of guardians. Wives seem to have valued their husbands particularly for their companionship and to have been lonely, though not alone, when their husbands had to be away from home.85

A discussion of heads of families would be incomplete
without mention of widows and widowers. Although the death of a husband or a wife was a common occurrence, it was no less tragic or burdensome merely because it was not unusual. Many women died in, or shortly after, childbirth. However, a wide range of epidemics, isolated illnesses, and ailments also took their toll of the lives of both colonial men and women. No doubt the treatments or remedies of the day frequently hastened the death of an ailing man or woman—bloodletting, for example.

In addition to the grief borne by a surviving spouse, he or she had a considerable burden to assume—particularly if a family of children needed care together with the business and household affairs. In the case of a widow, she frequently had to take over her husband's business affairs. Elisabeth Dexter found little evidence of a socio-economic code of behavior which caused and/or reflected prejudice against women working to provide for the needs of themselves and their families when circumstances required such an effort. She also found that far from being helpless or incompetent in business affairs, many colonial women proved to be quite capable. However, the adjustment was not uniformly easy. For example, when Joseph Pemberton died his wife Nancy was expecting a baby, had seven small children at home in Maryland, and needed to go to Philadelphia in order to settle the estate. She also had to decide whether to stay in Maryland or move her family to Philadelphia.
In the case of a widower, the weight of the burden of loneliness might seem greater than the weight of additional responsibilities for the oversight of household affairs which previously had been taken care of by his wife. The loneliness a man suffered depended on his age and where he lived. Robert Pleasants lived on a plantation. After he sent his children away to secure what he considered to be a satisfactory education, he missed their company. Particularly on a plantation, entertainment depended heavily on family activities.

Remarriage was not unusual, and it was socially accepted. Indeed, prominent Quakers remarried. After the death of his wife Gulielma, William Penn had married Hannah Callowhill. Anne Wharton observes that, although Penn had reached late middle age, his letters to Hannah during their engagement "... glow with all the warmth and ardor of youthful affection, while as befits a man of his years and position, they contain wise reflections on life, and passages marked by the prudence, the forethought, and the practical grasp that come with riper age; and always they are deeply and sincerely religious." It seems Penn's loyalty to his first wife did not interfere with plans for a second marriage. Actually, Friends, in general, did not think loyalty to a former spouse should be a serious obstacle to
remarriage. In fact, they seemed to assume that if a widow or widower had a suitable opportunity to remarry, she or he would do so. While Israel Pemberton remarried only once (incidentally, he married a widow), James remarried twice. Catherine Smith, a single girl, commented on the great interest of widows in remarriage. In her opinion, widows were "worse" than single girls "by half"—worse in that they were more anxious to get married than girls who had never been married. 90

Whether or not a widow or widower wanted to remarry, friends counseled the individual to bear the loss of her or his spouse with patience and resignation, and not to brood over "the greatest temporal affliction." For, as Sally Pemberton Rhoads pointed out in a letter of consolation and advice to her brother's widow Nancy Pemberton, brooding over past affections undermined health, happiness, and social ties. 91
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CHAPTER II

OFFSPRING

"Shall be pleased to hear ... [of] an Increase of family, which probably may also produce an Improvement therein," wrote a friend to John Pemberton soon after receiving news of John's marriage. The Pembertons and other Friends shared this view of the importance of children for family life. The birth of the first child added new dimensions to the family experience. In the first place, the man and woman who before had related to each other only as husband and wife began to relate to one another also as father and mother. With the birth of later offspring the parents continued to develop their conceptions and understanding of the meaning of parenthood.

The Pembertons and their friends discussed no ideal set number of children. A friend of John Pemberton rather matter-of-factly mentioned the birth of his sister's twentieth child. This is not to say that women usually bore twenty children, but rather to point out that whether the number were a high one or a low one, the number itself, as a rule
did not receive special attention. Another friend of the family did say that he hoped his wife would wait for awhile before having any more children, but he did not say he hoped the family size would be limited to three children—the number they had at the time he wrote the letter.  

William Penn, for one, approved large families. Thinking in broad social, political, and economic terms, Penn concluded an increasing population benefited a country. He said the increasing population in the colonies increased their value for England. Edward Beatty thinks that Penn's approval of large families also had a religious foundation. Willystine Goodsell correlates the divin commandment to be fruitful and multiply with the welcome which characterized the usual response given by American colonials to their newborn offspring. The letters of the Pembertons and their friends, however, do not provide substantial evidence to show that they believed they were fulfilling God's will by having numerous children.

But they did have many children. Phineas and Phebe Pemberton, the founders of the American branch of the Pemberton family had nine children. Israel, the Elder, one of their sons, and Rachel had ten children. Israel, the Younger, one of Israel and Rachel's children, and his first wife Sarah had seven children. His second wife Mary bore him one son. One of Israel the Younger's sons, Joseph, died leaving a
young family of seven children and an unborn infant. There are many other examples.

Arthur Calhoun argues that it is partially correct to infer from the record of high fecundity in the American colonies that people held children in great esteem. With reference to reasons for this esteem he brushes over the religious factors quickly. Even in New England where, in his words, lived "a people soaked in Hebraism," people thought of children as "providential accidents." Rather than being valued specifically because they represented the obedience of the Lord's people to His will, children were valued quite instinctively. The evidence suggests the Pembertons and their correspondents held a similar view.

Alice Morse Earle maintains the work children did, as well as their potential economic contribution to the family, constituted their primary worth to colonial parents. She discusses and emphasizes the diligence of children in carrying out numerous simple tasks like sowing seeds, weeding, spinning. Furthermore, she argues colonial parents thought children should be seen and not heard; children were of little significance in domestic, ethical, and social relations. Parents thought it unwise for children to be given any idea of their own value. The Pemberton letters do not substantiate this interpretation. Indeed, as will be shown in this chapter, both parents and
children evinced an awareness of value accorded children for reasons other than their economic worth.

The fact that a couple had many children did not necessarily mean they wanted to raise a family of numerous children. But they had to live with the reality that many children did not survive infancy—not to mention childhood. Seldom did all the children of one mother and father live to maturity. For example, of the ten children born to Rachel and Israel Pemberton, the Elder, three daughters died at a young age, as did four sons. Israel, James, and John were the three sons who lived to manhood. The history of many families in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries showed that if parents wished to have heirs to continue the family name and estate, many children had to be born. In view of the size of families and the attention given to their welfare, what has been said of the Quaker theologian Robert Barclay might well have been said about others, viz., "A good case can be made for the proposition that in spite of his writings, Robert Barclay's most valuable production was his family."9

When Mary Pemberton wrote to her husband Israel that she thought of children as blessings committed to the parental trust, she expressed a view reiterated or implied by other members of the family in addition to a number of their friends.10 This meant they did not think of children as possessions—
resources to be used for the parents' welfare and pleasure or as pawns to be manipulated at will. Parents had their offspring under their care and tuition for a period of time—the length of which no human being knew with absolute certainty. A child might be called to leave his parents through an early death. In John Pemberton's case, his parents believed the Lord had engaged their son in His service and called John away on a religious visit. Israel, the Elder, articulated the ideal parental attitude toward such times when he said both parents "... were freely resign'd, in our minds to give Thee up ...". Ultimately, as life was a blessing given by God, life might also be taken away by Him or used by Him according to His design.

Though the Pembertons and their friends idealized children as blessings in trust to parents, they did not conceive of them as unmixed blessings. At one point Frost states: "The impression one receives from letters and poetry written in the late colonial period is that raising children was a pure delight." Realistically, child-rearing could not have been a "pure delight" in the late colonial era—any more than in an earlier colonial period or in mid-twentieth century America. It is quite clear the Pembertons and other parents of early generations, in addition to those who followed, held a rather more realistic point of view. In response to the news
of the birth of a child, the reminder that the event
"... must necessarily bring with it an additional weight of
parental care, which may be accompanied by an anxious solicitude
for their [the new born child and his siblings] most important
welfare ... " balanced the joy and congratulations. 13 Love and
friendship characterized the ideal relationship between parents
and offspring. 14 However, ideals are seldom attained, and when
attained, even less frequently preserved at the height of
attainment for any long period of time. Even though, through
their efforts and ingenuity they hoped to minimize and overcome
difficulties, families expected problems and adversity in
child-rearing.

Motherhood considerably changed the life of a colonial
woman. Although the child-bearing function of women was taken
for granted by both men and women, childbirth in a day of
primitive medical knowledge and practice repeatedly proved to
be a traumatic experience and an extreme physical hardship.
In fact, many infants and women died, while others barely
survived. Thus, the birth of a healthy child brought great
rejoicing, and the relatively smooth recovery of the mother
occasioned thanksgiving.

Additional children increased the housework to be done;
household organization and management became increasingly
important. Mothers had to be at home in order to see that all
the household tasks received proper attention. Especially when she had a baby and/or small children, a mother had few opportunities to leave her home. Mary Pemberton Pleasants and her husband, Samuel, both showed a desire to visit the widow of Mary's brother in Maryland in 1782. In spite of this desire they had to take into consideration the fact that they had many children at home which did not permit their both leaving home at the same time. Mary could not leave because she had a child who had yet to be weaned. The baby could not be taken away from home, and it was not the time for weaning. The mother had little choice but to remain at home. Yet even at home her children limited a mother's time for personal activities. For example, when she tried to write a letter to her family or friends she might find herself interrupted by the confusion her children created—a minor, but indicative circumstance. Mothers like Hannah Pemberton, who suffered poor health, worried about not being able to take proper care of their children. Therefore, they searched for trustworthy housekeepers who could help with governing the children in addition to doing regular household duties.

Colonial Americans like the Pembertons did not place mothers or motherhood on a pedestal. Still they regarded maternal care as invaluable and the loss of a mother of incalculable significance to her children. Rachel Pemberton Parke
well expressed a common feeling when she said that by the death of a mother her children were "... depriv'd of that maternal care and attention, so necessary to form their tender minds, and lead their infant steps in the paths of virtue."  

Apparently, Friends conceived of the ideal mother and motherhood in large part as an idealization of the good qualities of their own mothers. Seldom did an individual compare his own mother to other mothers. Generally, people thought mothers ought to be fond of children. James Pemberton's daughter Hannah romanticized this idea when she defined fondness for children as a "... tenderness, without whose elegant polish, no female character can be completely amiable."  

People also ordinarily expected a mother to promote the true welfare of her husband and children. She should bear adversity and trials with patience and resignation. In essence, children looked to mothers for "a pattern of piety and virtue."  

Fatherhood never became a sentimental theme in the Pemberton letters. However, a friend of the family, Robert Barclay, once disclosed he considered fatherhood an honor and told of his ambitions to have "... a connection that would add much to the comfort of my days--...". In other words, he looked forward to the time when he and his wife would have a child. In contrast to Barclay's explicit,
anxious anticipation, many Pemberton letters made no mention of expected fatherhood—for the first time or otherwise.

If the Pemberton men did not rhapsodize on fatherhood, neither did they conceal their pleasure and pride in being fathers. Fundamentally, they considered fatherhood a task to be undertaken seriously. When their letters mention the birth of a new baby, they record relief and thankfulness for the safe delivery of the infant and the recovery of the mother.

The letters do not provide evidence that fathers saw their children basically in economic terms—in other words, that they thought of their children in terms of being economic liabilities or assets or that they valued one sex more than the other for its potential economic value.

In a letter of response to her father's correspondence, written in her verbose style, Hannah Pemberton left an idea of her conception of what qualities she felt were important in a good father. She insisted her pen could but inadequately make clear: "... the pleasing sensations of my bosom experienced on perusing those ever dear lines, penn'd in all the tenderness and warmth of Parental fondness, and breathing forth, every ardent wish for the welfare and protection of thy Children, whose fervent prayer is, that they may ever conduct themselves in such a manner, as may render them worthy [of] the affection of one of the kindest, and most
indulgent parents; from whose wise example and instructive counsels, they derive numberless advantages . . . ."22 In summary form, to Hannah, a father ought to be tender, warm, concerned for the well-being and safety of his children, kind, indulgent, exemplary in behavior, and instructive in his advice to them. In another context a relative of John Pemberton mentioned three roles which, perhaps, best synthesize the various elements of the ideal father for most of the Pemberton men, women, and children. Such a man would be a father, friend, and companion to his children.23 In all three roles he would be "an example of Christian Virtue & Piety."24

Apparently, most people considered child-rearing to be a joint affair—one to be shared by the mother and father in the home. The Pembertons and their correspondents manifested this view many times; furthermore, they set forth no indication that they thought their view differed significantly from the popular opinion of the day. They did recognize, however, that one parent might have a greater influence than the other from time to time depending on such facts as: the age of the children; the health of the parents; the occupation of the father; the sex of the child; and, the personalities of the children involved.

Conscientious thought and effort marked the history of Pemberton child-rearing. Other families approached child-rearing in a similar way. In learning about goals in
raising children and appropriate methods for attaining those
goals the Pembertons largely relied upon the exchange of ideas
among family and friends. There is no evidence they referred
to special guidebooks on the topic of raising children. Since
few were available, it is not surprising the Pembertons did not
depend upon them. Other books containing information relevant
to specific problems, such as health, were more readily avail­
able and used to aid in caring for offspring. But, in the
meanwhile, parents expected to raise children in much the same way as
they had been raised—with few exceptions. When their memory
failed or a method proved inadequate they might consult a
relative or friend for advice.

People like the Pembertons thought that parents should be extremely conscientious in raising children. Jerry Frost argues a primary motive behind careful child care practices was fear. A trend toward secularization, together with an expanding population in which the proportion of Quakers to the other religious denominations was steadily diminishing, aroused a fear among Friends that the Society, one day, might disappear. In order to prevent such an occurrence they would have to attend carefully to preparing their children to live as dedicated and exemplary Friends in the way of Truth.

Another type of fear related to their religious experience; the fear of God no doubt influenced attitudes and
beliefs about child care just as it influenced other aspects of living. On the occasion of his departure from England on his way to America, William Penn left advice for his wife in case he did not return. The first advice instructed her to fear the Lord and work zealously for His glory; otherwise, God might not fulfill His plans for the good of His people. The concept of fear implied here is much like the concept of fear which appears in the context of the Pemberton letters. Rather than connoting horror, anxiety, fright, terror, or consternation before the Lord, its usage suggests awe and respect.

Friends like the Pembertons did not stress the angry, wrathful, vengeful qualities of an all-powerful God; instead, they emphasized His mercy and kindness, as well as His rewards to worthy men. If one did the right thing—in this case, raise his child with prudence and piety—one might assume God would reward him. Penn based his advice to his wife on the belief, widely held among Friends, that God cares for His people in a loving way. The Friends believed He chastises His people when they disobey Him but only to teach obedience to Him. Israel Pemberton called his son Joseph's illness "a dispensation of merciful Chastisement" and urged Joseph to make it the occasion of his improvement. In order to ensure improvement, his son would have to have a well-disposed mind, make "good
resolutions" and then retain those resolutions following his recovery. When Friends admonished each other to carry out such duties as child-rearing in the fear of God, they usually seem to have thought of the advantages to be gained from such behavior (before or instead of thinking about possible retributive justice to be administered by an angry, offended God). It is in this peculiar sense that their fear is to be understood.

Curtis Nettels implies that strict and careful training of children was a social and economic necessity in the American colonies: "Numerous children in crowded quarters, busy parents, and natural distaste of youth for steady work made obedience a cardinal virtue." Nettels refers to Poor Richard's lesson that if parents taught their children obedience, they could proceed to teach them anything. Even though the Pemberton family did not live in crowded living conditions comparable to those of many poor or less well-to-do families, and certainly had more time than the poor had which they might choose to devote to their children, they too probably felt the pressure of social and economic factors. Still, they tended to view the problems of raising children in other terms.

To parents, William Penn said of children: "As they are instructed, so they are likely to be qualified, and your posterity by their precepts and examples which they receive
from yours. The Pembertons often reiterated or alluded to this idea; it seems to have been at the very root of their concept of, and their attitude toward, child care. Dorothy Fisher, in an introduction to an historical study of American children by Monica Kiefer, observes that until quite recently intellectuals did not consider children of sufficient importance to merit serious study. She assumes, therefore, that people did not recognize how the children of one generation (since they become parents, political leaders, ministers, teachers, businessmen, etc.) determine the history of the next generation. But now in the twentieth century, she informs the reader, we have modern psychologists to tell us:

... that children are the future of the race. Longer ago than mere centuries every mother intuitively felt it. But only of late years have real scientists, real educators, lent the weight of their prestige to such a feeling.

She continues on to say: "It is now an axiom that the way the children of any generation are treated deeply colors the life of the next generation."

Evidently, neither William Penn nor the Pembertons and other Friends needed "real scientists" or "real educators" to tell them how important children were for future history. Fisher falsely assumes, because in the past intellectuals did not consider children of sufficient importance for academic
studies, that everyone was unaware of the crucial importance of children for the next generation. She also implies that, historically, only women came close to recognizing the significance of children—they "intuitively felt it."
Pemberton women did more than feel it. They thought about children's significance and endeavored to act in accord with their ideas and ideals. Furthermore, intuitive perceptions growing out of their personal contact with their own offspring did not constitute the only source of their ideas. As has been shown, William Penn was one of the men who recognized and taught that parents must realize the relationship of their children to the future, and also that the future welfare of the child himself depended upon the quality of parental care and instruction he received while still at home. In contrast to statements cited from Fisher, the following observation by Margaret Mead contributes to an understanding of the colonial American context in which the Pembertons raised their children: "Traditionally, societies have depended upon reproducing their orderly forms of family life by rearing children within families, who will regard that form of family life within which they were reared as normal, natural, and desirable."

The Pembertons thought that if children learned virtue and diligence at home they would become virtuous and diligent adults. At the very least, such a background would
have a better chance of forming a worthy adult than the neglect-
ing of the children or teaching them evil habits. They hoped
for excellent results from careful child care, but the letters
of the Pembertons and people who wrote to them do not sound
overly idealistic or naively optimistic. From Antigua

James Birket wrote to Israel Pemberton:

I have often thought it a great Pitty \[sic\] that any of our friends \[sic\] Children Should
ever by Sent into these parts, as they are
greatly Hurt by it, & I am very much afraid
many Irrecoverably lost . . . . Even those
who of my own knowledge have been favoured with
true religious Parents & who I am fully Con-
vinced have used their Utmost endeavors to In-
still into their Tender minds the principles of
true religion \[sic\], yet has proved by being too
Soon left to them selves \[sic\] in the West Indies
as Water Spilt upon a Rock, I do most Sincerely
wish our friends might resolve upon Some other
Employment for their Children for the Sake of
their future Happiness . . . .

Therein he recognized that children did deviate from the paths
of righteousness upon which their parents had set them early in
life. This passage contains an implicit warning to parents
not to end a close watch over their children too soon. One

Jonah Thompson seemed cognizant of such a danger because he
asked Israel Pemberton and other Friends to watch over his
son who was on his way to Philadelphia to serve as the master
of a school there. To Pemberton, Mr. Thompson said: "Thou
art sensible of the anxious Concern of an affectionate parent
for the welfare of his Offspring, from his Childhood to this
Time he has given me very little uneasiness but he is now entered into the most dangerous time of human life our Prayers will be for his preservation and growth in Virtue. . . ."33

He obviously hesitated to rely on prayers alone and prudently asked for the assistance of Friends.

Mary Pleasants told John Pemberton, her uncle, of her hope that her children would remember to conduct themselves in such a way as to honor the Lord and their parents. She went on to reveal: "my mind is much engaged for them particularly the four Eldest, they are now at a time of Life which I have observ'd, to be attended with great danger & often productive of such a turn of mind as hath a lasting effect on their future Conduct."34 Mrs. Pleasants acknowledged the possibility of happenings in the early period of a person's life that might affect his future approach to, and conduct in, life. She used the term "often" rather than "always." She talked of a "turn of mind"; whereas, if she had been less realistic and perceptive, she might have suggested that development in youth predetermined the course of the life of the adult.

In 1783 Robert Morton, the son of Phebe Pemberton, set off on a visit to his elderly grandfather and other relations in Ireland. Although his mother thought such a trip to be a great undertaking, she did her best to inform him of
"... the dangers that Young men may be liable too [sic] in Traveling auspitably [especially] one of his lively disposition." John Pemberton was on a religious visit in England at the time. Phebe wrote to John to ask him to advise Robert if they chanced to meet while abroad; she left it to John's discretion to determine the type of advice to be given. Phebe hoped her son would gratefully accept John's advice. Several Friends had had a conference with Robert and seemed to be satisfied that appropriate advice had been given, and also, that it had been suitably received. Of the advice, Phebe commented, "I hope If it may not now produce the desired affect [sic] It may not be lost, but as bread cast on the Water which may be found after many days . . . ." With such an attitude a parent did not have to lose hope for their offspring regardless of their age when they erred. Behavior might be changed at any age. If the change were for the worse, proper advice and encouragement might promote reform. Furthermore, as Phebe suggested, worthy advice given at some earlier time might be remembered by a person guilty of misconduct and serve to motivate a change in conduct. Thus no parental advice could be deemed worthless merely because it did not produce desirable attitudes and behavior immediately.

In addition to the hope of parents that their children would eventually become worthy men and women, parents derived
satisfaction from the very process of doing their best and from reflecting upon having done their best. James Pemberton mentioned to his daughters Hannah and Sally: "... it has been often a pleasure to me to observe the just sentiments you have formed ..."36 Parents might also take pride in favorable reports of their offspring's conduct when abroad sent to parents from Friends who had observed the behavior and attitudes of the individual in question. Elias Bland wrote Israel Pemberton when son James returned to Philadelphia from London. Bland claimed he was sorry to part with James. According to Bland, James had behaved in a "Circumspect" and "Prudent" manner.37

Then again, if a child went wrong a conscientious parent had the consolation that at least he had done all he could possibly have done to set his offspring upon a right course. In spite of this consolation, disobedience and misconduct caused parents great distress. With regard to the worry which Joseph Jordan caused his mother, John Pleasants asserted:

I can witness from a degree of experience such tryales [sic] as disobediant [sic] children brings on tender patience [parents] greatly affects them both body and mind. But when we Can witness in ourselves, we have don our part, in advising & so far as of the duty incumbent [sic] on patience to there tender of spring. I say when that is witnessed it helps to liten the affliction which disorderd children many times brings on there patience ...38
Israel Pemberton alluded to the distress he had experienced in the course of raising his son Joseph. After Joseph had reached maturity, his father wrote a letter to him asserting that every time he heard Joseph had deviated from his principles, "... the painful scenes of affliction I have pass'd thro' on thy Account are reviv'd, yet I do not despair of thee ... ."

Father Israel went on to plead with his son to live according to the principles he had long ago accepted.

The discussion of concepts related to the conscientious attitude toward child-rearing in evidence in the Pemberton letters suggests the Pembertons, their friends, and a number of prominent Quakers who had their views published in pamphlets, letters and journals, had an idea of child development. Studies of the history of dress have shown that in the colonial period small children, youth, and adults all wore the same style of clothes. Dress did not differentiate people according to their ages. This fact has been used as evidence to substantiate the thesis that adults considered children to be merely miniature adults. George Boas maintains Rousseau made a great discovery: the child is not a man (albeit of small size), and the child is not an animal. Rousseau revealed the child is a child.

The Pembertons would not have agreed with Rousseau in his assertion that children have a unique nature and should be allowed to develop according to this nature. However,
generations of Pembertrons seemed to understand that their children were children—certainly not animals. They did praise precocious children, and they did attempt to teach a standard of behavior which, perhaps, seems incredibly inappropriate to a twentieth-century educator, psychologist, or parent. Yet they taught adult standards of conduct to their offspring to habituate them to responsible behavior. Rather than mistaking their children for small adults, they viewed them as potential adults (adults-to-be). They thought that the best way to prepare their offspring for adult life was to begin teaching adult modes of conduct and conversation at an early age. Both continuity and change characterize the personality development pattern of a person's life. The Pembertrons stressed continuity; they thought of the early years (childhood though youth) as being crucial in the formation of the character of the man. This emphasis becomes evident in the course of the following discussion of the process of child-rearing during infancy, childhood, and youth. Although the Pembertrons and their contemporaries spoke of infants, children, and youth, it should be stressed that they were not preoccupied with defining or delimiting three phases in the early life of their offspring.

Considering the importance of religion in the lives of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century colonial Americans, a
group of people who believed infants were born in sin might have been expected to have a different set of beliefs as to the requirements of child-rearing than that of those people who believed infants were born as basically good by nature. Early Quakers like Robert Barclay had been so zealous in attacking the doctrines and practices of other religious groups that they failed to make a positive statement of the Quaker position on the nature of a newborn child. Despite the fact that Quaker theologians and writers gave no uniform answer to the question of an infant's status at birth, their work taken together suggested a belief in the innocence of a newborn baby. When the infant reached the age of reason—the age when he could distinguish between right and wrong—he inevitably sinned as a result of evil choices. When he did reach the age at which he was capable of making distinctions in simple situations between right and wrong, he had entered childhood.

Thus, during infancy parents did not begin to teach principles of right and wrong. The major preoccupation of parents was the health of their offspring. They did all they could do to strengthen the constitution of the baby. A friend of the Pembertons told how they attempted to increase the strength of their little Elizabeth "... as much as is prudent, by washing her in cold water every morning & sending
her out every day when the weather will permit . . . .\textsuperscript{44}

When the mother's health did not permit her to nurse the baby, the parents searched for a suitable nurse. The nurse might come to the family home to live and look after her charge, or the baby might be placed out--sent to the nurse's home. Israel Pemberton's second wife, Mary, revealed that "... after much fatigue with nurses, have plac'd our little boy abroad, with a honest Reputable woman, In an airy [sic] part of the town, much to our satisfaction, and he thrives well."\textsuperscript{45} The parents did take care to see that the nurse had a respectable reputation; they preferred to secure a Quaker woman since it was easier to evaluate her qualifications. There seems to have been widespread acceptance of the practice of having an infant nursed by a woman other than his own mother. Indeed, one woman said she was glad to hear her niece had engaged a good nurse.\textsuperscript{46}

Seldom did individuals devote more than passing mention to infants in their letters. Mothers, who spent more time with babies than fathers did, were no doubt very busy with taking care of the child's needs in addition to their routine housework. They might have the additional tasks related to making provision for a nurse. These activities gave a mother several valid excuses for not writing lengthy descriptions of the new addition to the family. Fathers frequently mentioned the birth or the state of health of an infant--but
little more. Among the letters which have been preserved, those of Robert Barclay contain more about infants than the letters of any of the Pemberton men or their other friends. Evidently, infants delighted him, and he enjoyed writing about their appearance, antics, and development. Barclay's own baby Elizabeth seems to have been, in his estimation, the ideal baby. While he was writing one of his letters, his wife played with their six-month-old daughter on the carpet before him—thereby providing him with very pleasant entertainment. He admired the baby's astonishing growth, her rosy cheeks, and her firm skin. Her happy, cheerful—even merry—disposition pleased him greatly. Being the father of this lively infant brought to him "a new source of inconceivable delight." Indeed, the letters in which he talked about Elizabeth generally affirmed his friend Thomas Parke's sentiment that a child contributed to making complete the domestic happiness of a husband and wife.47

News of the birth of a little son or daughter brought congratulations to the new parents. In sending his congratulations to Thomas and Rachel Parke, their friend Barclay acclaimed the birth of a child an "auspicious event" which "crown'd" their love.48 In the letters of the Pembertons and their friends there is no hint of preference for the birth of a boy rather than a girl (or vice versa)—no expression
of particular pleasure or disappointment regarding the sex of the baby.

As the baby grew he might attract attention in the immediate neighborhood and gain the admiration of neighbors and friends. Hannah Pemberton asked Hannah Lloyd to tell Thomas and Rachel Parke: "... that the engaging qualities of their dear little Boy, seem to be well known about the neighborhood where he now resides,—A friend told Cousin S. Rhoads that he was a fine fat little fellow; sweet Innocent. I want much to see him."49

It is interesting to note, lest the impression be left that all the Pembertons and their friends adored babies equally or that they thought everyone, actually (as well as ideally) idolized infants, the case of the misunderstanding between Hannah Pemberton and her brother-in-law Thomas Parke. Hannah simply could not understand why Parke thought she did not possess a fondness for infants—his child in particular. So she wrote to him as follows:

I acknowledge with truth that I am not so doatingly fond of very young infants, as some are, I have no idea, of kissing every little dirty mouth, that is held up for notice, and I would quite as leave, indeed shou'd prefer playing with a good large rag Baby, than with a Child of two or three months old, but when the dawn of Reason begins to make its beautiful appearance, and they can take notice; I think them the most engaging little creatures in the world; . . . .50
It is no wonder that (at least in her estimation) brother Parke had misunderstood her attitude. Seemingly, whatever her real feelings toward immature human beings, she would have preferred children to infants.

Who was the child in colonial America? Was a son of one year and eleven months an infant or a child according to the colonial conception? Had a daughter twelve years of age reached her youth or was she still a child? It is difficult to answer these questions definitively in terms of the colonial concept of childhood which did not set precise age limits to distinguish childhood from infancy and youth. When used to designate a general age group, the term "children" referred to anyone from the youngest who had just learned to talk and to understand simple conversations and directions to the eldest who were just entering the period now called adolescence.

While children were small and living at home they were under the more immediate supervision of their mothers, but the role of the father was still thought to be important. Child-rearing was to be a joint effort. Penn advised both parents to love and to treat their children equally. There is evidence in the Pemberton papers that Friends of a later era preserved this standard for parental conduct. John Pemberton, for example, did not think his brother Israel would be justified in leaving his whole family for the benefit of one
child, Rachel. Rachel suffered poor health, and Israel thought of the possibility of improving her health by taking her to England. John recognized "... it is incumbent on a parent to afford what [whatever] Reasonable assistance maybe [sic]..."; therefore, he presented an alternative to taking Rachel to England. John thought Israel might send Rachel to New York with some reliable person instead of going with her himself on the much longer journey.  

On the other hand, there are letters which openly and unashamedly show favoritism on the part of parents toward certain children. Penn had said: "Be not unequal in your love to your children, at least in the appearance of it; it is both unjust and indiscreet; it lessens love to parents, and provokes envy among children." He understood parents might feel a greater sympathy or affection for one child than for another, but he deemed it unwise for parents to demonstrate such feelings. Yet in many letters, a parent separated from the family sent special greetings to one child. In 1751 Mary Pemberton journeyed away from Philadelphia. When she wrote to her husband Israel she asked him to give her love to all their children, but she also singled out her "dear Little Boy" (one of her children) for special attention.  

A letter written by Hannah Pemberton provides a different type of evidence of parental favoritism than does
the correspondence of Mary Pemberton. Hannah, the stepdaughter of Phebe Pemberton, had occasion to write about the illness of Phebe's son, James Morton. Jemmy Morton's father had died of consumption leaving Phebe a widow; she later married James, Hannah's father. Most of Jemmy's friends expected him to die of consumption, too. Of Jemmy, Hannah observed: "... he is the favorite son of his mother, who is much distressed on this occasion, it must be a close tryal [sic] thus to be deprived of a darling child in the bloom of life." Hannah did not seem particularly surprised or indignant that Phebe had a "favorite" son; nor did she explain why she thought Phebe preferred Jemmy. Phebe's special concern for his health may have been both a cause and an effect of her feeling toward him. There may have been other more significant causes.

In the case of little Molly Pemberton, the fact that she was motherless from early babyhood made her the object of special attention from not only her father James, but also from the other children in the family. James had married his second wife, Sarah Smith, in 1768. In 1770 Sarah died shortly after the birth of Molly (a nickname for Mary), their first child. Son Phineas and daughters Rachel, Hannah, and Sarah, from James' first marriage, still lived at home. All four were in their teens and took a special interest
in Molly's welfare. James reported to an aunt that his dear little daughter Molly was growing quickly, was very lively, and:

... Engagingly cheerful [sic], discovers a most agreeable disposition, derived from her dear & amiable mother; the loss of whom I have every day, cause to regret on my own Account as well as the beloved Baby's that She is well taken care of, and every body [sic] in the house affectionately fond of her:-- . . . .

It appears from the preceding examples that the Pembertons did not attempt to conceal special affection or concern for one child as Penn had implied parents should do.

On the other hand, letters of and about children in the Pemberton family do not suggest parents favored an individual son or daughter at the expense of the other children in the family. The parents do not appear to have thought the other children were treated unfairly; nor is there a record showing that the brothers and sisters of a favored child thought they were being treated unfairly. The question arises as to whether parents were insensitive to the feelings of their children and prohibited their offspring from writing letters or diaries which would have shown their unhappiness and grievances, or parents created an emotional atmosphere in which a measure of favoritism to one child would not necessarily disturb the other children.

Monica Kiefer insists that, during an era of "stern
pietism" from the beginning of the eighteenth century to the
Revolution, fear and repression "... dominated every phase
of Colonial childhood..." She argues adults did not
come to the realization coercion is not discipline until the
Revolution; rather, in the colonial period:

Parents and 'superiors' exercised their acknowledged authority and ruled children with a relentless hand. The burning zeal of Colonial adults for a more perfect way of life inspired them to eradicate from childhood all that was judged frivolous and vain by the stringent standards of the times. As a result of this rigid exercise of power the narrow circle of childhood was hedged in by the barriers of much regulation.57

If that were the prevalent condition in colonial home life, one might conclude that cases of arbitrary and unfair treatment were borne by children in silence and in fear of the consequences of any complaint. One might also suppose that parents who did not distinguish between coercion and discipline were unfair, and further, that parents forced children to profess affection for their parents. For, how else could one explain, for example, affectionate letters written by children to their parents? Instead of continuing such speculations, it is important to examine another interpretation of the emotional climate in a colonial home.

Alice Morse Earle is one historian familiar with colonial letters and journals relevant to a study of child life who asserts the sources provide proof "... of tenderness
and affection in the family ... " C. M. Andrews perceptively observes: "Family life in the colonies was full of affection, though the expression of feeling was usually restrained and formal." This statement contains an important insight—namely, affection may be expressed in a restrained and formal manner. Perhaps, Kiefer and others who set forth a similar viewpoint have mistaken formal statements and modest demonstrations of affection for lack of affection or severity. Particularly, in the Quaker family experience there is considerable evidence of tender family relations—not to be confused with sentimentality. In a series of comparative family sketches, Manford Kuhn focuses upon the mutual respect (parents for children and children for parents) evident in Quaker family relations and the consistent firmness which distinguished the Quaker parents' dealings with their children. The following discussion of the opinions and beliefs of the Pembertons and their acquaintances about the requirements which constituted the framework for the process of raising children and the methods thought most effective for fulfilling these requirements yields information sustaining the thesis that parents showed genuine love, concern, and affection for their children. In the course of the discussion, insights into a concept of childhood also emerge.

Fundamentally, the Pembertons and other Friends thought
in terms of two types of parental requirements in raising their offspring—the mundane and the ethical. They hoped to raise useful and righteous children. Mundane requirements related to the basic physical needs of the children committed to their care. First, parents were to provide food, clothing, and shelter for their dependent children. Second, they were to look after the children's health. Although there were some attempts to strengthen a child's resistance to illness, most efforts on the part of parents relative to the health of their children consisted of trying to restore a sick child to fitness. Third, they tried to protect their offspring from physical danger and harm. A child could not be useful in the present or have an opportunity to be useful in the future if these three basic requirements were not met. Finally, parents were to think of the future welfare of their children (and society)—of a time when their parents would not be providing for them. In other words, parents were to begin to teach young sons and daughters basic practical information and skills to prepare them for roles in the community as useful adults.

Ethical requirements pertained to the raising of righteous children. First, parents were to endeavor to protect and strengthen the innocence of little children. Then, they were to begin teaching the principles of right conduct.
The methods by which they proposed to fulfill these requirements did not manifest a belief on the part of parents that boys were more difficult to raise than girls (or vice versa)—difficulties which might have called for special methods of handling particular problems. In fact, the differences in raising boys and girls were not a topic for reflection in the Pemberton letters. On the other hand, occasional reference was made to differences among children in ability, personality, and understanding. Characteristically, the letters discuss one person at a time rather than describing one person's strengths and weaknesses by comparing and contrasting them to another person or group. An example of a minor exception to the general rule was Israel Pemberton's observation about the four daughters of John Pleasants all of whom he approved, but they "... seem'd to excell each other from the eldest to ye [the] youngest, [he] preferring the latter, who seems a hopeful plant, & well worthy of better cultivation than I fear she will meet with."61 This is a rather subtle, though typically vague, reference to individual differences.

James Pemberton wrote an account of his son Phineas' life shortly after the young man's death. In this account James noted that as a little boy Phineas was "... less inclinable than others of his age to play, and such exercise as boys are generally addicted to; tho' of a lively disposition,
and not wholly inactive in innocent amusement, yet avoiding
the company of rude boys, and spending his time at his books,
and getting his lessons--..."62 James had noted also
that Phineas had shown a special aptitude for learning and
had a retentive memory. Herein is a more explicit statement
of an awareness of differences among children.

Some years before, there had been a controversy
about individual differences and abilities of very young
children in which James Pemberton and his friend John Smith
had become interested. At the time, published reports had it
that a number of little children (the youngest was six years
old) had been converted by a ministry and had been convinced
of the Truth. The children had impressed adults with their
convincing testimony about their conversion. To this,
Smith responded:

"Even a Parrott [sic] may be taught to speak some
few words--But he cannot give a rational
account of the cause of those words--Why? Because
he is destitute of the power of reflection and
so incapable of understanding the difference
between causes and their effects.

Smith also recalled he had heard children under six years of
age imitate their elders. A little child might use
"... unexceptionable words, and deliver himself, as if
he was affected with what he said--but I count it no miracle."63

Robert M. MacIver states that during the formative
period consisting of the first seven years of life:

... the physiological and mental aspects of habit, the ways of acting and the ways of thinking, are most thoroughly and most intimately unified. A child may resist the specific commands of his elders, but he cannot resist the system from which they emanate. He knows no other with which to compare it—it fills his whole horizon. And above it, as an atmosphere, there is the language he learns and hears, with its idioms and emotionally charged expressions, so that he cannot speak or think except in terms of the approvals and disapprovals of the group.

Therefore, MacIver argues those first seven years of a person's life are critical because: "Under all conditions, social indoctrination, the inculcation of habits and modes of thought in the young, is surely the most powerful of all regulative and conservative influences." The Pembertons based early childhood training on this assumption; they depended on little children to imitate, accept, and absorb what they saw and heard as the parents trained them. As John Smith observed: "Who does not know that Children of that age, by Example and Tuition are Capable of Imitating almost any thing ... [?]" With due perseverance and patience the little ones could be trained due to their imitative and impressionable nature.

But, in contrast to MacIver, who conceives of childhood as critical due to the implications for society in general, the Pembertons and their friends thought of childhood as much less critical than youth. It was because they thought of little
children as being imitative that parents did not regard that period of life as so critical. Of youth they could not be so certain of their following good examples and principles set forth in their early education. Youth could understand more fully the meaning of words and actions, and they had more opportunities to make choices. The dangers which made the period critical from the point of view of adults grew out of the possibility youth would fail to choose rightly—according to the ideas and principles his parents had tried to teach. One Paul Johnson in advising Israel Pemberton, the Younger, articulated the consensus of adult opinion concerning youth:

"... [the] most Critical Time of life, So Requires great Care and Watchfulness many being the Presentations & Temptations Attending Especially [sic] the time of Youth ... ." 66

Now, specifically, what methods did the Pembertons and their correspondents think could be used effectively in raising useful and righteous children? First, precepts might be stated and explained. Examples would provide valuable reinforcement for precepts. Further, parents might effectively advance learning by explicitly and demonstratively encouraging good conduct and obedience. In addition, they should watch over their children continuously, correct mistakes made by their offspring, and finally, punish the children if and when other methods proved ineffective for correcting misconduct.
and misbehavior.

William Penn's advice to his children, which was printed and distributed among the Friends, served as a model for the precepts to be presented by parents to their children. Penn gave both general and specific advice about ideal thought and conduct. In the category of general advice he urged his children to be humble, meek, patient, merciful, charitable, liberal, just, honorable, thankful, prudent, frugal, and temperant. An example of advice of a specific nature was his telling them to develop a habit of keeping a brief daily journal of their time. They should remember to always allow time for worship, business, and personal activities, such as studying, walking, and visiting.67

Parents usually set forth and explained precepts to children in relevant situations in the home. The language parents used for this instruction may have been more simplified than textbooks and literature read to and by eighteenth-century children would suggest. James Pemberton reminded his second wife that in order to be understood by, and get along with, his children she should use language appropriate to their age and experience. He hoped she would become well acquainted with them "... to which a free unreserved communication and familiar intercourse adapted to their inexperienced age will greatly contribute ..."68 (Italics mine.)
Many letters to their families written by fathers away from their homes on business or religious visits contained a few words to the effect that they hoped there would be a report of their son's and daughter's good conduct when they returned. Occasionally, a man would be more specific and detailed. James Pemberton wrote to his stepson Samuel Morton and included a few words for Samuel's stepsister Molly. James told the children it pleased him to have them spend many hours with his wife which he thought would divert her attention from thinking about her absent husband. He then told them: "I desire that each of you may continue to love and obey her, which will also give her great comfort, as I know She is much concerned for both of you, and thou shouldst be very thankful to the Allmighty [sic] that thou hast so affectionate, & tender a mother." He referred to his feelings of distress which had been caused by the news of her illness and to his relief to hear of her improvement. He continued—now addressing only Samuel:

Thou knows She is very desirous to give thee proper learning, & keeps thee diligently at School when thy health permitts [sic], and as that is a great advantage which many poor boys of thy age are deprived of, I wish thee consider it so, and apply thyself carefully to thy books, and to improve in thy cyphering; . . . . [Thou should not do] anything that is displeasing to thy dear mother, and cheerfully [sic] to obey all her orders, & commands, and when she directs thee to go on an errand, to go willingly without
murmuring, or pouting, and to live in love with Molly, and all others in the family, which will be a great comfort to thy dear mother, and give thee the character of being a Good boy; and when thee lays down at night, endeavor to remember whether thee hast spent the day well, & if thee should have done or said anything that is not right. Thou shouldst pray the Lord to forgive thee when thou rises in the morning, desire him to help thee to avoid anything of the same kind through that day, and to keep thee by his divine Grace to spend it well. At night when thy mother desires thee to read to her, do it with cheerfulness [sic], and read Slow, & distinct ....

In closing, he charged Samuel to: "Be a good Child and it will rejoice [sic] thy dear mother and me, who am interested in what nearly concerns her, as thy well doing— ....."

It is important to note that friends and relatives often reinforced precepts and advices by addressing the children with advices similar to those given to them by their parents. While John Pemberton was journeying through England on a religious visit he wrote a letter to his brother Israel's children. Deeply involved in his religious concerns, his letter concentrated on matters of piety and appropriate thought and deportment for children of a Friend. He closed his letter by saying: "What I have written has Run in Simplicity, & much Love & would not be tedious, or say much more, only Repeat my desire, that you may love God above all. Then I am sure you will be dutiful & Affectionate to your parents & Love each other, but not strife, nor emulation, backbiting nor
evil Surmises be Entertained." Some years later George Mason, one of Israel's friends, addressed part of a letter to Israel's children in which he called upon them to obey their parents because disobedience would disrupt the love and harmony which should prevail in families. He told them that each and every individual had to do his part in order to perfect the love which should subsist in families.

The Pembertons and others in the Society of Friends thought teaching by example to be absolutely essential if children were to learn, to understand, and to apply the precepts they were being taught. Basically, two types of examples might be used—those which children could observe for themselves and those about which they might be told by relations and friends. A great responsibility rested with parents who not only had to teach children the rules of good conduct, for example, but also to serve as models to demonstrate those rules in everyday life. A friend of John Pemberton alluded to the difficulties and problems for the parent of being an example for children to follow. He felt a need for "... an increase of strength and wisdom to direct [him] ... in the presence of a numerous family where observant eyes while they look to us their parents for example, are quick sighted [sic] enough to espy our many fold failures and imperfections ... ."

To help children understand how they might live
according to the precepts their parents taught and to inspire good behavior, parents told their children about virtuous people—people with whom they were familiar either by personal acquaintance or by reading about them in books. Exemplary individuals about whom children might be told included family members such as relatives who had died. After the death of Sarah, the wife of James Pemberton and mother of a newborn baby, an aunt wrote to James. She assumed he would keep alive the memory of her mother in the little girl which the aunt thought would contribute to her developing "those good qualifications" which her mother had possessed. Also, children might be read accounts of dying children who embodied the qualities parents wanted their children to acquire. These accounts discussed admirable qualities and sayings of children without elaborating on less exemplary aspects of each child's life. The stories of exemplary children were drawn both from within the family and from outside sources. Evidently, adults had set the example of his brother before Joseph Pemberton; when his father went to the place in New York where his brother had been buried, Joseph spoke of it as a place "... often brought into my remembrance with anxious desires, that my Life & Conversation may be directed in such manner, as will give me reason to hope, my latter end may be like unto that of my Dear Brother ... ." James wrote an account of the
death of his son Phineas which could have been used by friends, as well as family members, to teach such virtues as patience, resignation, and industry.  

The Pembertons had many ways of encouraging good conduct and obedience on the part of their children. This is not to imply that Pemberton children and those of other Friends—as a result of all the careful methods of educating and training their parents used—were always perfectly obedient. John Pleasants commiserated with Israel and his wife Mary about the worry the misconduct of a child caused his parents: "... I can witness from a degree of experience such trials, as disobedient children brings on tender patience [parents] greatly affects them both body and mind."  

Disobedience, if not of a serious and continuous nature, at least of minor and occasional types, was a common experience in the best of families. Yet the Friends emphasized the positive side of the obedience issue. Rather than harping on the dangers of disobedience and pointing out evil examples of how not to be, they used a variety of arguments to persuade children to obey and to conduct themselves according to virtuous principles. Then, when away from home, a parent frequently mentioned his or her hope to hear a report of each child's good conduct.

The Pembertons seem to have exercised their parental
authority with the confidence of its being founded in a God-given right. Yet they did not interpret this right as allowing them to exploit their children merely for their own benefit or to deal with them arbitrarily. Rather they felt obliged to use their authority in a just manner. Hence, they formulated what they considered to be reasonable demands for their children and directed and judged their behavior by a set of principles suitable for children, youth, and adults—the hope being that principles, learned by boys and girls in their childhood, would be preserved in their youth, and perfected and upheld in adulthood. Pemberton fathers and mothers seem to have recognized the necessity of making very clear to their children what was expected of them. Parents thought they should appeal to a child's developing capacity to reason. Instead of using threats of physical punishment or eternal damnation, or assertions that parents invariably know what is best for their children at all times and in all circumstances, they tried to set forth the best reasons for a particular course of action on the basis of their own greater experience and knowledge. The closing remarks in a letter of advice to his son James from Israel Pemberton, the Elder, reflected this attitude: "What I have here wrote is not only the experiences of others, but what I have experienced in a good degree myself . . . ."
Then parents were prepared, at least in some cases, to take their child’s point of view into consideration in making plans which affected the child. Assuming he would not be offended and might be influenced by her ideas, eleven-year-old Molly Pemberton wrote to her father James Pemberton about his tentative plans to board her in Burlington with one Katy Smith. She plainly objected to that idea and told him: “I do not want to stay here by myself. I have no notion of any such thing. . . . I cannot be contented to stay here all Summer; . . . .” It seems he had thought she wanted to stay for the summer, but he did not force her to stay when she made clear her attitude. Furthermore, parents might alter a decision to accommodate a child’s needs, thoughts, and feelings. For example, years before the above-mentioned incident occurred, James had been deeply concerned about the poor health of his son Phineas. He had decided, on the basis of a doctor’s advice, to send Phineas away, hopefully, to benefit from a change of climate. However, Phineas did not want to go so far away from home; so James changed his mind and sent Phineas to their country estate, Plantation, with his nurse.

When children simply failed to obey their parents or did not live up to high standards of conduct, parents did not lose faith in their children’s ability to repent, to reform, and to improve. They stressed the good possibilities for
their offspring's future whether or not they were well-behaved and virtuous in the present. They encouraged a child to think of his future from two viewpoints. First, they used the illustration of dead or dying children to show that the length of a person's life is uncertain. In a realistic, not a morbid manner Quaker parents told their children they might live a short life; and, if they were to hope to enjoy eternal peace, then as children they would have to think and to act in a worthy manner. On the other hand, they might be permitted to reach adulthood. In order to live upright, virtuous adult lives, they would need to learn fundamental principles and to acquire useful skills and habits as children.

Parents also did not pretend that obedience and virtuous living had been, or was then, easy for them. Adults did not indicate in their letters that they thought honest admission of their own mistakes or shortcomings undermined their influence on their children. Indeed, they sometimes used references to their own mistakes and reforms to motivate their children to behave more satisfactorily—by showing children that mistakes could be corrected and weaknesses overcome. Furthermore, they reminded children of God's willingness and ability to help them.

Finally, the Pembertons' approach made being an exemplary child look attractive to children; this gave
boys and girls an additional incentive for behaving well because that was the way to become exemplary children. Also, adults made being good appear to be important—a way to honor God and parents. They told their children of the rewards boys and girls might hope to enjoy if they behaved in a praiseworthy way. Parents emphasized the love and respect to be gained as being the most valuable rewards. There is no evidence that parents condoned the use of bribery in the sense of using simple bribes to get children to heed parental instructions. For example, while a boy might respond well to being told he would receive a marble for promptly doing all the chores his mother outlined for him, the Pembertons would not have considered the marble to have been a true or worthy reward.

The Pembertons, and the Society of Friends in general, believed in the efficacy of keeping a close watch over children—the objective of this supervision being to see that children behaved well and were not lured into misconduct by evil or rude companions. Basically, these people thought in terms of suggestion and persuasion rather than some form of external compulsion to ensure children's obedience and rectitude. They recognized—perhaps, even exaggerated—the deleterious effects, particularly on children, of associating with people whose precepts and practices they did not consider
to be grounded in Truth. That the Pembertons thought in terms of teaching piety and virtue, and thereby, of necessity, restricted the activities and associations of their children, did not mean they grievously repressed their children. A mother gladly reported to her traveling husband that their children were active and lively. Looking back on his childhood John Pemberton remembered thinking when he was a child that his parents were too strict. Since then, he had come to the conclusion they had been correct because to have overlooked small errors would have been to risk the growth of greater evils as a result. He felt for that reason he should be thankful his parents had been strict.

Close parental supervision of children's activities neither precluded, nor was it meant to preclude, children having fun or parents demonstrating their affection for their children (or vice versa). Letters matter-of-factly referred to children's play; they did not express disgust, horror, indignation or other comparable negative attitudes. Several of the boys particularly liked marbles. Fishing and ice-skating, in their respective seasons, engaged the attention of some. Joseph Pemberton proposed to bring great delight to the children where he was staying by having a special treat for them—gingerbread.

Friends generally revealed an admiration for the
indulgent parent; whereas, the overly indulgent parent received less respect, if not censure. Philippe Ariès discusses two concepts of childhood closely related to the way people have treated children. According to Ariès, one group of people conceived of children as "charming toys" and tended to pamper them. On the other hand, a second group of people viewed children as "...fragile creatures of God who needed to be both safeguarded and reformed." With this serious task in mind, they could not justify pampering or coddling. Reference to the Friends' concept of childhood in contrast and comparison to these two concepts helps to understand why Friends distinguished between indulgent and overly indulgent parents, and why they approved of the former, but did not approve of the latter.

The concept of children held by eighteenth-century Friends incorporated aspects of both concepts. They did not conceive of children as toys, but as trusts. Still, even though they constantly reminded each other of the rigorous demands upon parents to raise righteous children, many of the Pembertons and their friends showed in their letters that they enjoyed the company of children and appreciated them for adding a new dimension to family happiness. Hannah Pemberton had to be away from her husband and children on account of her health. During her absence she composed
a letter to her husband James which testified to her affection for her children:

It gave me unspeakable pleasure to hear that thou and my Dear little children were well, in health which I hope it will please the great Author of our being still to continue them I long to Embrace those dear little creatures in my arms tis a pleasure I often indulge myself in now I am here retired from all the Noises and hurry of the town to think of those engaging little creatures how glad I shall be to see them well at my Return . . . .

What Friends opposed were not such things as children’s play or overt demonstrations of affection. Rather, they opposed allowing children an excess of play activity and allowing them to engage in activities which could not be described as innocent amusements. An innocent amusement did not undermine ethical and religious principles or interfere with skills training and practice. It was understood among adults that what might be an innocent amusement in one setting might not be an innocent amusement in another setting. For example, while Joseph Pemberton stayed with Benjamin Lightfoot, Lightfoot prohibited his going ice-skating. He admitted that skating was common in many places, but that it was "... attended with worse consequences here and about Town [in Reading]..." Therefore, he thought it his duty to prohibit skating for Joseph while he stayed at Reading.

The Pembertons and their friends also did not approve
of what they implied might be described as a form of false affection, such as permitting children to take part in any activity they liked regardless of its nature. With respect to the way a parent should decide which children's activities to permit and which to prohibit, friends insisted that parents could demonstrate true affection only by directing children's behavior in the Light of Truth. They should keep in mind the true interest of their children and not give in to childish whims ascribing their action to an affectionate desire to make their children happy. Nothing could be more chimerical.

Closely related to the careful supervision of children was the correction of misconduct—both thoughtless mistakes and willful disobedience. Though parents regarded the latter as far more serious, both required attention. It is not surprising that the specifics of correction were seldom mentioned in letters. To be most effective such correction had to be administered, especially to small children, very soon after the child misbehaved. Parents no doubt consulted adults close at hand if they had trouble, but did not consider such matters worthy of discussion in letters which had to be brief and contain pieces of news still important after the weeks or months the letter spent en route to its destination.

Finally, if all other methods failed to bring about
desirable behavior or testimony of good intentions, parents might be forced to punish children. However, there is no preoccupation with punishment in evidence in the Pemberton letters. The letters suggest that the Pembertons and their friends did not consider punishment to be a very important aspect or problem in raising their children. This is not to say they thought they had, or even thought they should have, total control of their children's thoughts and actions. There is fragmentary evidence to suggest that the Pembertons opposed physical punishment—e.g., the account of Israel, the Elder, being withdrawn from a school by his father because the schoolmaster whipped the child. This may or may not have set a rather binding precedent in the Pemberton family. In effect, in most cases the most severe form of punishment in the Pemberton family assumed the form of parental (and sibling) disapproval and disappointment caused by an errant child; in other words, a moral sanction rather than a physical or economic sanction usually constituted the most severe type of punishment.

As the Pembertons and other Friends endeavored to raise useful and righteous children, so did they attempt to raise useful and righteous youth. The methods considered effective and appropriate for teaching youth differed little from those they thought practical and desirable for teaching
children. There was a striking continuity in the way parents handled their offspring from childhood through youth. Even though occasionally youth might be called children and children might be called youth, the Pembertons and their contemporaries distinguished between these two groups of offspring. Youth were thought to differ from children primarily insofar as they were considered to be passing through a dangerous, critical period in their lives. Most adults thought youth were prone to vanity and folly and for that reason might easily succumb to temptations of evil. Yet, an underlying tension marked their conception of youth. For, though they recognized the foolishness and irrationality of youth and feared its consequences, they also saw in youth the hope of future generations.

When teaching youth, parents seem to have laid a greater emphasis on persuasion and appeals to reason than when instructing younger offspring. Given the developing capacity of young people to comprehend reasoned arguments, the emphasis was a logical one. Furthermore, as with their children, parents had no illusions of having absolute control over their youth. Thus, in tendering advice and direction they repeatedly assured their sons and daughters of parental good will. James Pemberton wrote in this vein to his daughters Hannah and Sally:

My desires dear Girls, are daily for your real prosperity, & happiness here, and hereafter;
much depends on yourselves for securing it, and I hope it is not necessary for me to use many arguments to excite your endeavors for so valuable a purpose; 'Seek first the Kingdom of Christ, and the righteousness thereof' and things necessary will be added; a great deal of instruction, is comprehended in this Divine precept & promise.90

The following are representative of the types of appeals used by elders to persuade youth to try to live by the precepts first laid before them in their childhood. Parents attempted to show that their advice and strict rules were grounded in Truth. John Pemberton remarked that in England, where he was visiting, adults "... having too much winked at, what is by too many called small things, & thereby greater Evils have got head in their families, & in the Church, & they lost their authority by not dwelling in the Virtue, & power of Truth,"91 (Italics mine.) Parents entreated youth to attend to the Light within. They earnestly believed that if youth did so, they would be given new insights and reasons for good thought and conduct and, thereby, motivated to behave in a manner consistent with the parental conception of Truth. Considering the fact that the youth's conscience had been formed largely under parental guidance and supervision, they had good reason for such a belief.

Parents also could appeal to a sense of responsibility which they tried to develop in young people and to concepts
of self-importance by holding out to youth the possibility of their making a significant contribution to the life of the community if they upheld the values and customs of their parents. Sarah Morris repeated this argument to James Pemberton as it had been set forth by an old friend of hers: "If says he, thou and the young people amongst friends who are favoured with a sense of Truth keep your places, you may be Instrumental to do as much good, as we By all our Preaching. This I thought an Argument of great Humility in Him, who was Eminent qualified for Publick [sic] Service as a Minister."92 A final example of the ways used to persuade youth to behave respectably was the parental portrayal of obedience and virtuous behavior as an important way to please parents and demonstrate love. Israel Pemberton, the Elder, expressed this idea in a letter to his son James:

I hope thou will be careful of thyself both as to Body & Mind & that thou will often retire in thy Mind to the unerring Principle of Truth which it hath pleas'd God to place in thee, for a Director & Guide thro' thy Pilgrimage here & as thou art obedient to its Dictates it will conduct thee Safely to a happy Eternity, with Satisfaction of Mind whilst here & if this be thy Care & Concern it will greatly contribute to the Comfort and Satisfaction of thy Parents, whose concern & Care are for thy Preservation & Growth in the Blessed Truth."93 (Italics mine.)

In addition to specific expressions of pleasure derived from the obedience of youth, parents acknowledged the good
behavior and prudence of their sons and daughters by entrusting them with greater responsibility. Thus, while exiled during the winter of 1777-78, James Pemberton wrote to his son Phineas asking him to look after his stepmother (James' wife) during James' absence. James worried about his wife and feared she would not take proper precautions to protect her health. Although he had advised and implored her to take care of herself, he asked Phineas to repeat the council and watch over her.94

It was more common for parents to place youth out, than to place children out for care by other people—to send them to live in another family for instruction and service. Various types of apprenticeship allowed some parents to secure a better education for their offspring than they could provide at home. A few may have relied upon apprenticeship at least partially because they lacked confidence in their ability to deal with young people and thought their son or daughter would be more likely to obey an outsider or stranger than a parent. Other parents turned to apprenticeship in order to prepare their offspring for a different occupation than the one in which their parent were engaged. Still other families may have needed to place children outside the home due to the fact that they had so many children at home that they were overcrowded.
The Pembertons seem to have approved of the system in a general way. Thus, they took in sons and daughters of friends. For their own young people they did not rely solely on apprenticeship. Israel, the Younger, placed out both his son Issey and his son Joseph. But he intended Joseph's stay at Benjamin Lightfoot's in Reading to be temporary; Israel planned to have Joseph work with him at home—a plan to which Joseph gladly agreed. On his part, James stressed his conviction that his offspring needed the personal, careful instruction and supervision of their father. Although he appreciated the attention of another person (especially so near a relation as his mother-in-law) for his children, he seemed to be convinced there was no adequate substitute for parental care—his own presence and attention. In sharp contrast to the Pemberton attitude, John Rossington wrote to James about a son of his for whom he planned a mercantile career. He wanted James to take the lad as an apprentice. In a manner and tone at once impatient, impersonal and abrupt, he said of his son:

He has a Good Education and is now learning mathemastics [sic], By the accounts I have of him he is a Sober mild, plain Led, he is now in his fifteenth year, and if you are willing I will Bind him to you for four years—Be Pleased to Give me, your answer as soon as possible, that I may order him out, if it is agreeable to you, or Dispose of him otherwise.
Parents often allowed youth to travel as a part of their education. Because they usually did not travel with their parents, young people were preceded by and carried letters of recommendation and requests to friends to watch over these young people on their journeys far away from home. Youth were encouraged to associate with people of good character—particularly adults whose company would be instructive as well as interesting. Customarily, observers wrote back reports of a youth's conduct to his parents which served as an additional incentive or force for promoting or ensuring his good behavior. No doubt the report of son James' conduct in England in 1746-49 pleased his parents, Israel and Rachel Pemberton. Hunt Greenleaf said James frequently called upon his family while in England and more of James' company would have been very agreeable. James had not fallen victim to the temptations of London. Greenleaf believed James would retain the "good Impressions" he had received from his family experience and religious development.

It is important to note with regard to youth that many letters written by youth to or about their parents reiterated a desire of sons and daughters to gain the approval and respect of their parents. Hence, the idea of youth valuing the opinions and attitudes of their parents was more than an ideal conceived and nurtured in the minds of adults.
Although the Pemberton family could not have been described accurately as baby-centered, child-centered, or youth-centered, parents valued their offspring and took into consideration their needs, feelings, and attitudes when planning family affairs. In her own way Mary Pemberton touched on many of the most important ideas and ideals concerning offspring and their relationship to their parents in a brief paragraph of a letter to her husband—these lines provide an appropriate ending for a discussion of concepts of the place of offspring in a family:

... May the Fountain of all mercy who has hither to [sic] signalized us by his blessings, be graciously pleas'd to Preserve us in a state of true humility and thankfullness [sic], care and watchfulness for the benefit of each other, and those tender and Pleasant Plants [their children] committed to our care, that in due time by the blessing of divine Providence they may grow up trees of Righteousness, Producing the fruits of the Spirit, thereby, be usefull [sic] Ornaments of Society, and Pledges of our mutual Love, and Lasting Friendship, when we may be seperated [sic], is what I much desire.
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CHAPTER III

RELATIONS AND OTHERS

Few family members, friends, or acquaintances would have defined the Pemberton family as a Pemberton, his wife, and their children. Even in a branch of the family, the parents and offspring constituted only the nucleus of that particular family group. Relations and other people not related by blood or marriage completed a family. While some of the relatives and others considered to be part of a family lived in the same house, others did not. A branch of the family might contain various combinations of in-laws, grandfathers, grandmothers, grandchildren, uncles, aunts, nephews, nieces, cousins, stepparents, stepchildren, nurses, servants, and apprentices—even a visiting friend might be treated like one of the family.

The Pembertons seldom distinguished, explicitly, between a branch of the family and the family as a whole. They did not talk about the "clan" or use a similar term to differentiate the whole from its constituent parts. Rather than thinking of the family, or a particular branch of it,
as a discrete entity composed of a neatly defined, distinct group of people, they recognized that the branches of the Pemberton family overlapped branches of other families, as well as each other. Neither strict logic, nor rigid custom determined which relation would become an integral part of the life or thought of a family group. The following discussion of ideas and experiences of the Pembertons and their friends with respect to the relations and other people a person considered to be part of his family suggests that, for the Pembertons, the concept of the family was rather an inclusive one—in contrast to an exclusive one.

An outstanding fact with regard to the Pemberton concept of in-laws was that the Pembertons did not call in-laws, "in-laws." When a man and woman married, the man's father became the girl's father-in-law. But she did not write to him or about him as her father-in-law. He became a father to her. Thus, when Joseph Pemberton married Nancy Galloway, she proceeded to address Israel Pemberton as father. In the same way, the woman who was, in fact, the new husband's mother-in-law came to be thought of, and addressed, as mother. People referred to their brothers and sisters—not to their brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law.

The Pembertons thought in terms of developing more than one new relationship after a marriage. In addition to a man
and a woman becoming husband and wife, each of them became a son and/or a brother and a daughter and/or a sister, respectively. The new relationships were not thought to be dependent upon—though obviously they owed the connection to—a third person. For example, despite the fact that Hannah Lloyd became James Pemberton's mother when he married her daughter Hannah, he still considered her to be his mother, and she continued to treat him as a son, after the death of her daughter. Similarly, other relations by marriage did not sever their connections immediately upon the death of the spouse through whom the connection had first been made. After the death of Joseph Pemberton, his sisters continued to regard Nancy Galloway Pemberton as their sister.

In-laws seldom lived in the same house as a married couple—though there were exceptions. How often in-laws visited depended upon how far away they lived and how compatible and interested in each other they were. For in-laws who lived in the same neighborhood, visits to dine were thought to be a pleasant and appropriate form of getting together. Other times they drank tea or rode out together. For those who lived in another county, a visit to the family might be combined with business or religious affairs. For still others a great distance separated them from their in-laws. A special visit might last a week or two—even a month or more.
Ideally, in-laws—whether fathers, mothers, brothers, or sisters—offered advice and assistance when a couple needed help. Parents of married couples were not to make the decisions for their children's families. However, adult offspring with families of their own were to take into consideration the ideas and opinions of their parents. Furthermore, they were to aid their parents when they needed help. Thus, after Joseph Pemberton's marriage to Nancy at West River, the illness of his mother-in-law delayed their departure to Philadelphia for some time. Similarly, James Pemberton's father-in-law suffered an illness—albeit more prolonged than the illness of Joseph's mother-in-law—when James and Sarah Smith were first married. As a result, the newly married couple were separated for months. Sarah felt obligated to care for her father. At the same time, James felt obliged to allow her to fulfill her filial duty.

In the early days of getting to know her new mother, Mary Pemberton, Nancy Galloway Pemberton humbly and tactfully asked for the advice and counsel of the older woman. In Nancy's opinion the advice of one who had experienced similar problems would be valuable for her at the time of her "first setting out in the world." Samuel Fothergill would have approved of her approach to getting acquainted with her mother-in-law. In the interests of a comfortable and harmonious marriage, Friend
Fothergill advised a woman to: "Let thy Husbands [sic] relations become dear to thee it is a Connection of tender affinity, cultivate every sentiment of Friendship & affection for them, especially his Mother with every of whose anxieties a Son must surely sympathize." On her part Mary Pemberton proceeded diplomatically and helpfully—seeming also to regard the relationship with her new daughter as particularly important. Although she seemed anxious to help the newlyweds, she tried to assure them she did not want to be meddlesome, but only to help. In concluding a letter in which she mentioned the provisions she had made for their housekeeping in Philadelphia, she said that she had written more than she had intended and hoped that it would not be "construed in an unfavourable Light." In turn, as the years passed by, Nancy repeatedly made explicit her felt need and appreciation for Mary's help and advice. When they lived near to each other, Mary was able to assist Nancy in many ways. In 1769 Mary helped Nancy at the time of the birth of a child; Nancy's own mother was unable to come to Philadelphia on account of a smallpox epidemic there at the time.

Hannah Lloyd, James Pemberton's mother-in-law, became intimately involved with James' children. Apparently, she had always been anxiously concerned about her near connections, but after the death of her daughter her role in caring for
James' children changed from a relatively passive to an active interest. She came to manage James' household and to assume a large share of the responsibility for taking care of his children. She virtually acted as a mother for the children which complicated the adjustment of Sarah Smith Pemberton, James' second wife. Not only did it complicate Sarah's life, but Mother Lloyd's place in his family also placed James in a difficult position. He appreciated her care and attention for the children and expressed no intention of encouraging her to leave after his remarriage. In this case, the circumstances surrounding the death of the spouse who had originally been responsible for making the connection (Hannah Lloyd Pemberton) between a mother-in-law and son-in-law had worked to cement, rather than disrupt or end, the relationship.

In the role of father-in-law James gained the respect of Thomas Parke who had married James' daughter Rachel. In one instance, Parke told of his regret that the letters he had written to his father had miscarried because he did not want to seem "inattentive" or "thoughtless." Rather, he said, "I deem my self [sic] bound by duty & Respect to the best of Parents ... ." Parke further demonstrated his sense of duty and loyalty to his father by visiting him while the exile of James in 1777-78 kept him away from his home and family. James valued the visit and even thanked his daughter for parting with her husband so that
he could journey so far away from home.\textsuperscript{9} 

Nancy Pemberton developed a very close relationship with her father-in-law Israel Pemberton. Their letters evince a mutual regard. Even before she had married his son Joseph, Israel made clear his admiration for her. After the marriage, Nancy carefully assured her father-in-law of her respect for, and intention to, carry out his excellent advice. She described his cautions as "affectionate." Israel eventually went so far as to criticize—at least, quite openly to show a lack of confidence in his son in a letter to his daughter-in-law. He said he had heard that most of the Friends in Joseph's neighborhood had taken the Test (and oath) and that he would be:

\[\ldots\text{really sorry to hear Josey [Joseph] hath—}\]
\[\ldots\text{I can tell you from experience, I know that no temporal enjoyment affords so much real satisfaction as the Evidence in my own Mind that I have not been ashamed or afraid [sic] to confess Christ before men \ldots\text{Think on this, read the New Testament often with Thy Mind turn'd to the Light of Christ to direct thee to improve thereby. Love the Appearance of his Truth within, tho [sic] it be to reprove for error & to lead into Self Denial & even into Suffering & then thou may'st be a true helpmeet to thy too unthinking husband, a good instructor & Example to thy dear innocent Children \ldots\text{10 (Italics mine.)}}\]

Later he wrote to his son praising Nancy's "prudent Conduct."\textsuperscript{11}

The correspondence between Israel and John Pleasants reveals an interesting relationship between fathers-in-law. John Pleasants's son, Samuel, married Israel's daughter, Mary.
Israel thought that both John and he should be very thankful for the hopeful prospect presented by Samuel and Mary.

Several months later John Pleasants wrote a letter to Israel in which he showed that he considered the marriage of their children had initiated a near connection between the two older men—whereby, they became brothers. Despite disagreement over business and financial affairs, they recognized a source of mutual happiness in the birth and growth of grandchildren.¹²

Sisters-in-law in the Pemberton family considered themselves qualified and in a legitimate position to give a variety of advice, assistance, and encouragement to their relations. James Pemberton's sister-in-law, Mary Pemberton, began one set of remarks with due humility by insisting that notwithstanding the fact her letters might contain little of either an instructive or entertaining nature, her words grew out of a deep concern for his preservation, especially in religion. Her letter contained advice, thinly disguised in the form of the hope "...that amidst the hurries and cumbers of the world, which are to [sic] apt to Ingress [sic] a Large Share of our time and thoughts, we may not forget [sic] the one thing Needfull [sic] viz. a frequent Retirement from all visibles, where the Divine Remembrance that sees the Inmost Recesses of the Soul, is Pleas'd to visit his depending Children ..." She went on to remind him that from the
Lord only could they hope to receive: "... a Sufficient Support In all the Straights [sic] and Difficulties, that are Necessarily Annexed to a Christian Life, and finally Inable [sic] us, to lay up in Store a good Foundation, against the time to Come." Two years later sister Mary wrote to John in a similar vein hoping the Lord would preserve him from dangerous "temptations" and "snares," and in His time return John to his family "the same Religious Exemplary [sic] Person as when thou left us."  

In her letters to John, Mary also indicated her desire to strengthen the bond of friendship with her brother—friendship being a bond between relations, as well as between non-relations. In those letters she not only gave advice, but also encouragement to her brother. For instance, she told him that he should not be discouraged; for, eventually, by his pious example he would bring honor both to God and to his family. 

On the other hand, sisters-in-law also received assistance of various kinds from their relations. Thus, while her husband was away, Israel Pemberton watched over his sister-in-law, Hannah. In a different type of situation, John Pemberton tried to help his sister-in-law Sarah solve the problems she had in fitting in with her husband James' children and mother-in-law (the mother of James' first wife).
Then, when their husbands were away, sisters-in-law sometimes helped each other—at least gave each other moral support. Brothers-in-law gave and received assistance in much the same manner as sisters-in-law. They seemed to think they should treat their new sisters and brothers much as they had become accustomed to treating their own brothers and sisters. They rather matter-of-factly accepted the additional responsibility without giving much thought to any idea of a new kind of relationship. Hannah Pemberton held her brother-in-law Thomas Parke in high esteem—even to the point of confiding in him on the important subject of a marriage proposal before she confided in her father. She acknowledged appreciatively the fact that he had readily offered advice whenever she needed it. Thereby, she thought he had shown a true brother's "tenderness." Whereas in Hannah's case the request for a brother's advice came directly from his sister-in-law for advice on her own personal affairs, John Pemberton's sister-in-law, Phebe Pemberton, addressed John on behalf of her son who was going to Europe. She hoped that her brother-in-law would be able to give the lad "suitable" advice. In some circumstances—e.g., the exile—relations depended upon brothers-in-law for honest accounts of the health of relations and for doing what they could to look after sick relations. Hannah Pemberton could derive some peace and satisfaction from the knowledge that
her brother-in-law Israel had been "exceedingly tender" of her husband John. 17

The Pembertons and their friends regarded the relationship between grandparents and grandchildren as an important one. According to Jerry Frost, in the colonial American Quaker family, the parents raised and disciplined the children while grandparents had only to enjoy the diverting qualities of these their grandchildren. 18 The Pembertons and their friends did think that parents ought to have the primary responsibility for raising their children; yet they seemed to think that grandparents could and should give valuable assistance whenever parents needed help with the grandchildren—not only in emergency situations. This is not to say the Pembertons or their friends contradicted the idea that grandparents could and should enjoy the company of their grandchildren. On the other hand, parents, too, were to be able to enjoy their children without neglecting their teaching, counseling, and disciplinary duties.

Letters to and by Israel Pemberton bespeak both a fatherly care for the welfare of his grandchildren and a sincere pleasure growing out of their company and the thought of their future prospects. Indeed, after his wife died he asserted that his grandchildren became his only source of joy. Before
she died though, he had also taken an active interest in the grandchildren. In fact, he and his wife had even been raising one little grandchild themselves. Little Mary Pemberton, the daughter of Charles and Esther Pemberton (Charles was the son of Israel and Mary), had been orphaned, and her grandparents had undertaken the responsibility of raising her. Molly's father had died when his daughter was only about a year old, and her mother died some four years later. Thus, Molly was but a small child when her grandparents became fully responsible for her. When away from home, Israel frequently asked his wife to remind little Molly to be a good girl and to give the child a kiss for him. He gave Molly an incentive for good behavior by telling her he would love her dearly for minding her grandmother in his absence. Israel was in exile at the time of Molly's seventh birthday, but he did not forget the occasion and affectionately encouraged her to be seven times as good the next year as she had been the past year. Grandmother Mary relayed information back to her husband to the effect that little Molly was going to try to be as good as she could be. Of Mary, her daughter Sarah said: "... her little Granddaughter, Divirts [sic], and amuses, her ..." No doubt little Molly was a great comfort and diversion to Mary during that long winter of separation from her husband, who had been exiled. Not long after Israel's return from exile, his wife died.
before she died she told of her special desire to live in
order to take care of little Molly. 21

Both Mary and Israel took very seriously their respon-
sibility for raising little Molly. However, Israel's interests
and fatherly care for his grandchildren neither began, nor
ended, with little Molly. His daughters Mary Pleasants and
Sarah Rhoads both had children as did his son Joseph Pemberton.
He certainly did not neglect them. During his exile, Israel
not only sent regards to little Molly, but also acknowledged
his other grandchildren and asked that they each be kissed
in his name. He desired them to stay near their home and pay
strict attention to both their grandmother's and their mother's
advices and directions. He even went so far as to tend to such
mundane details as sending worsted stockings for his grand-
children and cloth for their clothing. A great and grave con-
cern to Israel grew out of his grandson (Joseph's son) Issey's
poor health. Since the family had moved far away from Philadel-
phia, Israel suggested that Issey might come and stay with
him in Philadelphia in order to get the best available medical
treatment. He took pains to assure Joseph and Nancy that he
would take good care of Issey if the boy still wanted to come
to Philadelphia to stay with him. As a result, Nancy took
Issey (and a daughter, Sally) to Philadelphia for a visit. When
they were about to leave, Israel wrote a letter to Joseph in
which he manifested an additional interest in his grandchildren, viz., a concern for their education. 22

Other grandparents, besides Israel and Mary Pemberton, showed a similar broad range of interests in the welfare of their grandchildren, as well as simple pleasure from a relationship in which they did not, as a rule, bear the major burden of responsibility. Since they thought they could and should offer advice and assistance at opportune times, James Pemberton wrote to his daughter Rachel Parke about her son: "... I hope as he grows in years, a truly pious concern will prevail in his tender mother to devote him to the Lord his Creator from whom she will daily consider that she received him. Give him a kiss for me." 23 And a man named Richard Partridge wrote to Israel Pemberton on behalf of his grandson in order to make arrangements for an apprenticeship; the grandfather was willing and prepared to pay the necessary costs. 24

The Pembertons also thought of their aunts, uncles, nieces, nephews, and cousins as important members of their family. Many times did they express their concern and regard for each other in letters—letters which reveal a mutually supportive attitude and relationship. Although they valued and enjoyed these relations for their company, families also could expect to have nieces, nephews, and cousins benefit from the admonitions and useful suggestions of an interested
aunt or uncle. For instance, the children of Israel Pemberton received a long letter from their uncle John Pemberton, who began his letter "in much love and affection." He set forth a lengthy argument in vivid, persuasive language to warn them against the "snares" of the "Enemy"—the Devil. John maintained the enemy was seeking particularly to deceive young people by using "... Gilded baits, but, there is Inclosed [sic] therein, a poisonous pill, which many have found by woful [sic] Experience ...." He urged them to reject evil temptations and to embrace the way of the Lord. "I am sure," he said, "You cannot learn Religion to [sic] soon." Then he shared with them his own experience in order to help them understand what he meant:

I have with bitterness & Sorrow of Soul at times to mourn, that I did not Embrace the Lord, in his Early appearance to my poor Soul, who Shew [sic] me that a name barely would not suffice, but I was unwilling to Bow, putting off, from one time to another, saying that when I arrived to Such or Such an age, I would more nearly Join, & follow in the Cross, but this I find was a delusion of the Enemy. Therefore, desire you Dear Children to Submitt [sic] unto the Cross ....

The entire letter, as well as the conclusion, which specifically mentioned obedience and affection for parents, fit in suitably with the ideas of the children's parents. In effect, the letter lent force to the parents' efforts to teach children the same ideas—though, perhaps, phrased differently.
Uncles and aunts thought they could and should give advice and counsel not only to children, but also to adult nephews and nieces. After the death of his father, Joseph Pemberton received impassioned advices from his uncles to live up to the principles his father had taught to him. Not only did his uncle, John Pemberton, express solicitude for Joseph, but also for Joseph's children. After Joseph died, the uncles, John and James, continued to show an interest in Nancy, his wife, and their children. James encouraged her to move to Philadelphia. He acknowledged the fact that it probably cost less to live in Maryland than in Philadelphia, but he believed "the greater ease & comfort" to be enjoyed by living near family and friends would compensate for the extra cost. 26

Extant letters do not indicate that nieces and nephews resented the advice which their aunts and uncles gave them. They did not expect to receive advice from this source, but they were not surprised. In contrast to parents, aunts and uncles (and other relatives) did not have the responsibility of giving regular advice and admonitions. Thus a letter of advice, or containing advice, to a niece or nephew from an aunt or uncle represented special attention. Not that the only form of attention aunts and uncles gave was serious counsel. Indeed, there is evidence they sent little gifts to their nieces and nephews, such as marbles and gloves. However, the
point is that children could be quite pleased with a letter of serious tone and content because they were taught to respect worthy advice, and they were responding to this advice as a sign of a relation's sincere interest in them. In fact, young Issey wrote to his uncle John Pemberton to ask him to write a long letter to him and the other children in the family. On his part, Issey said he had written to his uncle before, but unfortunately his father did not judge the letters "fit to send." After telling about the health of family and friends, he closed saying his sisters and brothers sent to him their love and respect also. 27

Sometimes children could answer letters from relations themselves. Other times, their parents read the letters to the children and answered the message directed to their offspring on the children's behalf. John did write the letter Issey had requested. Fourteen-year-old Mary Pemberton tried to answer that letter herself. She said she and her brothers and sisters had received his agreeable letter containing "a great deal of good advice" which she hoped they would heed. Then she asked to be excused for not writing more often on the grounds she knew herself to be a "poor Scribe." She said it was very difficult to answer his letter as it deserved to be answered; thus, she finished the letter with news of the family. In other words, even though she thought she could understand his counsel and was
eager to show her appreciation for the effort her uncle had made, she found it difficult to answer the advice which had been given in a very adult manner. Mary's sister Rachel also wrote to their uncle John in response to his letter. She was glad that her uncle did not seem to favor the idea of her being taken to England for her health because she did not want to go. Instead of discussing the advice in his letter which pertained to her, she focused on his advice to Issey. She approved of it; in her opinion, Issey ought to take careful note of the meaning of the advice. 28

Evidently, nieces and nephews did not think it necessary to wait for attention from their relations before writing a letter. Hannah and Sarah Pemberton both wrote to their uncle John letters of news and encouragement when he left home for a religious visit to England. 29 Yet most letters were letters written in direct response to a remembrance or admonition from a relative. Although children tended to follow a pattern in their letters to the effect that they hoped to apply the advice given them in their interest, an adult niece or nephew had the freedom and ability to evaluate advice more critically. Joseph Pemberton did not resent his uncles giving him advice. But when they administered reproof to him in an affair which he believed they misunderstood, he voiced his objections. He did not question their right to give advice and to criticize
him. Still he reacted indignantly to what he regarded as an injustice and did not hesitate to tell his uncles why he thought they had been unfair to him.  

The Pembertons and their friends recognized various ways an aunt, uncle, or cousin might become more intimately involved in family affairs than merely talking to, or writing to, their nieces, nephews, and cousins. Since Friends often traveled (and even moved) from England to America, colony to colony, or country to city, relatives helped a new person or family get acquainted with new people and surroundings. Or a boy might be placed out under the care of an uncle in a place at some distance from his home—the uncle being the best known and most trustworthy person the lad's parents knew to watch over their son. In a different type of situation a maiden aunt might go to take care of her nephews, and nieces in the event of the illness or death of their mother—to live with the family permanently unless she decided to marry.  

In the case of stepparents and stepchildren, they usually did live in the same household. In everyday life the stepparent—being the spouse of a child’s parent after the death of the other parent—assumed the role and responsibilities of the deceased parent. Ideally, the stepchild was to treat and obey a stepparent as if he or she were the child’s own parent. Customarily, the child did not change his name to that of the
stepfather. For example, Phebe Morton's sons, James and Samuel Morton, did not have their names changed to Pemberton when their mother married James Pemberton. Similarly, Joseph Jordan continued to go by the surname Jordan after his mother, Mary Jordan, married Israel Pemberton. Notwithstanding the preservation of surname, a stepchild did not refer to his stepparent as "stepmother" or "stepfather." Rather, James and Samuel Morton called James Pemberton "father," and Joseph Jordan addressed Israel as "father." On their parts, stepparents made reference to their stepchildren as their "sons" and "daughters." Among the children themselves, stepsisters and stepbrothers, did not mention "stepbrothers" and "stepsisters." They talked to and about "brothers" and "sisters." By not distinguishing their steprelations from other members of the family in ordinary speech the Pembertons demonstrated in a small way their goal and intention to create or to re-create a closely knit, harmonious family.

The letters to stepchildren concerning their relations with stepparents indicate, though, that Pemberton parents and friends recognized the difficulties for children in adjusting to a new person who ostensibly was to take the place of an affectionately remembered deceased parent. In these letters and others pertaining to the problems of adjustment to stepparents, adults did not dwell on the likelihood of children
being jealous of a new parent because he or she might seem to compete with the children for the attention, care, and affection of their own parent—generally to diminish their standing with the surviving parent. Instead, these letters emphasize the positive ways of getting children to behave in the desired manner—in other words, to accept, respect, and obey the new parent. James Pemberton chose to stress the point that his children could please him by maintaining "the most free intercourse" with their mother (actually, their stepmother). He also reminded and assured them of his confidence that "... she will be studious to do all she can for your comfort."32 Thus, they were given two reasons to trust and to obey their stepmother. In a later letter, he did not feel compelled to remind them to do whatever they could do for their ailing brother Phineas, but he said he could not "... omit earnestly desiring your steady regard to the assistance, & comfort of your dear mother ... ." He then reiterated how such commendable behavior would provide a "very pleasing proof" of their love and "filial regard" for him.33

Then again, the Pembertons realized not all the problems involved in the relations between stepparents and stepchildren belonged to the children. Sarah Pemberton felt quite insecure in her position as mother to James Pemberton's
offspring. She had a difficult time in getting to know the children, and James tried to advise her in order to improve the situation. However, the fact that they were separated during much of their first year of marriage—with Sarah taking care of her father at his home and James in Philadelphia attending to his family and affairs—complicated the situation. In one of those rare revealing letters which evince deep emotions and concerns, James Pemberton came to express his impatience with his wife and his dissatisfaction with their separation. At the same time, he left insights with regard to the nature of the misunderstanding between him and his wife concerning his mother-in-law to whom he had delegated a large share of responsibility for supervising his children.

In this letter James tried to explain why he had left the children with Mother Lloyd so much of the time. His reasons included the unfortunate separation of James and Sarah which had interfered with a more settled family experience. Mother Lloyd had been available to help when he needed her; furthermore, she possessed an outstanding capability in caring for children and a genuine interest in the children's "improvement in all respects." Apparently referring to Sarah's difficulties with her relationship to his children, he, in effect, relieved the children of blame by saying: "Children are not immediately brought to be familiar with their Superiors
in Age when there has been little previous acquaintance, or
none . . . ." He claimed the family had been more "unsettled"
of late than he could ever remember; that his son had been
in very poor health and had had to go to the country had been
but one of the problems. Seemingly, he thought Sarah had
insinuated that he acted more on the basis of Mother Lloyd's
opinions and desires than on the basis of his own or his
wife's judgments and feelings. This inflamed him, if it did
not infuriate him, for he said to his wife: "I have sometimes
flattered myself that time may produce some agreeable change
[so that Sarah and the children would live together in good
harmony], & that more acquaintance may bring you to be more
sociable . . . ." He insisted that in order to promote
good relations with the children she would have to be on
good terms with Mother Lloyd since her " . . . tender care
for them will ever prompt her to give advice & assistance
in their education as occasion requires . . . ." He implied
jealousy and fear might be influencing Sarah and warned her
that they would " . . . render thy task less agreeable, as also
my ease and satisfaction." He then came down hard on Sarah
beginning with a series of searing questions:

Why Should thee have been fearful of Speaking
thy mind, in respect to any plan for their em-
ployment, on mother Lloyd's account? Has she
thwarted thee in any proposal for their Good?
or has thee proposed any to me? and in what
She disobliged thee?—I must confess my apprehensions that thy fears proceed from some disadvantageous impressions too early received, and perhaps since repeated by evil advisors who are true friends to neither of us. & regardless of the peace of families;—I have formerly endeavoured to caution thee against the evil suggestions of such busybodies, whose conduct disgraces their station, & profession; who may insinuate themselves under the disguise of love and friendship, of such I desire each of us may beware.

Sarah's letters indicate she thought or wanted James to believe she thought his judgments—as expressed in the letter discussed above—grew out of misinformation. She said what she could say to assure him of her interest in the children. In retrospect, the incident clearly shows that in the case of second (or third, etc.) marriages, the Pembertons became aware of the significance of the relationship between stepparents and stepchildren to a harmonious family life. The experience of difficulties and/or failures to achieve harmony, however, did not result in their questioning of, or dispensing with, their ideals and their efforts to bring about closer relations between stepparents and children.

Then again, there were cases in which steprelations adjusted to each other quite smoothly. Samuel Morton reported to his stepfather James Pemberton that he got along well with his stepsister Mary. He hoped his mother would have a good account of his behavior. Evidently, he was anxious to
gain James' approval. He also told of his desire for more letters from his father—even better would be his father's return to their home very soon. Several weeks later Samuel's brother, James Morton, wrote to his stepfather thanking him for the "kind Admonition & Counsel" which he hoped he would "... always remember, & carefully endeavor to pursue." A final illustration of a situation in which stepparents and stepchildren were able to foster and enjoy a bond of mutual regard comes from the life of Mary Jordan. Mary Jordan wrote to her stepfather Israel Pemberton in a letter virtually indistinguishable from those of his own daughters except when she said: "I should be unworthy of that Paternal regard which I have ever been happy in the Experience of since under thy care ... ." (Italics mine.) Therein, she alluded to the fact she had not always been under his care. She articulated her attitude toward Israel as a father in the following manner:

I think I need not tell thee how sensible we are of the loss of thy good company, which we esteem as a great blessing, but hope, tho' we are deprived of it for a Season, it will terminate to our lasting advantage by impressing on our Minds, how highly we are favour'd above many others, with Parents, who are capable of Instructing and advising us in that which is most for our benifit [sic] and true Happiness, of which we are, yet not able to Judge for ourselves.

In return for all thy goodness I can only wish, that the same Divine Providence, that has
hitherto been with thee, may long continue thee, a blessing to the family, preserve thee thro [sic] this difficult Journey, & in due time, conduct thee safe to us again—which will be a particular pleasure, to thy dutifull [sic] Daughter, Mary Jordan. 37

There remain two members of the households of the Pembertons and their friends yet to be mentioned—the apprentice and the servant. It is certain that the Pembertons and others considered apprentices and servants a part of the family as long as they stayed in the household. Actually, however, it is very difficult to discuss in any detail their concepts of the role of, and relationship to other family members of, apprentices and servants. There is no evidence to suggest that they dissented from the position of the Society of Friends which held that heads of families should attend carefully to the needs of all those under their care—including apprentices and servants. Considering both servants and apprentices as dependent persons, they thought these persons should be treated much as other dependent members of the family. The reluctance of the Pembertons and their friends to take anyone—either a servant or apprentice—into their homes unless he or she had references testifying to good character showed their concern for family harmony, safety, and improvement. They thought of the potential influence—particularly on their children—of an apprentice or servant. While an apprentice
incidentally might set a good or poor example for children by his everyday conversation and association with them, a servant might have a more direct and crucial influence on them if she were taken in specifically to look after the children in addition to ordinary household duties.

On the other side of the relationship, it is equally difficult to determine the attitude of apprentices and servants toward the Pembertons as masters and mistresses. What they thought characterized an ideal master—if, indeed, they had any such conception—remains a mystery. One might suppose an ideal master possessed the qualities and qualifications of an ideal father—an ideal mistress those of an ideal mother. Sam Emlen, who served a term of apprenticeship under James Pemberton, did indicate that the bond of friendship developed during his term of service with his master was not severed when the term ended. There is no evidence that he thought the Pembertons were unfair with him with regard to work or punishment, or, on the other hand, that they had given him undue freedom. One John Rossington thought that a Pemberton would be the best of masters. But that does not tell us what his son, who was about to be apprenticed, thought of the idea of a Pemberton as a master. Ezekiel Edwards did become an apprentice in the Pemberton family and, while serving James, became good friends with his master's son.
Phineas. Though he did not address Phineas as a brother, he evinced a brotherly affection in his letters to his friend. With respect to his master, Edwards did say he wanted to retain his master's respect for him and that he continued to be sensible of his obligations to James for his attention. 40

F. Musgrove argues "... it was the great achievement of the eighteenth century to rescue middle- and upper-class youth from the world of their social inferiors." Rather than allowing them to continue associating with such inferiors, young people were, according to Musgrove, more intimately drawn into the family circle. 41 The Pembertons did not hint that this was the intent or the reality in their households. Moreover, they continued to include so-called "social inferiors" in the family. But they did not write in terms of social inferiors. Furthermore, they did not notice youth becoming more intimately incorporated in family life than in the past. On the other hand, they desired and idealized a harmonious family (a group including parents, offspring, relations, servants and apprentices) living according to Christian principles of thought and conduct. They thought people should be discriminating when taking outsiders—servants and apprentices, who from a twentieth-century vantage point, for example, might clearly appear to have been social inferiors—into the family. However, the criteria the Pembertons thought to be legitimate
did not focus on a socio-economic status. Rather, they thought people should be evaluated in terms of their religious principles, industry, character, and intentions. What is particularly significant here is that the "family circle" into which Musgrove argues youth were being intimately drawn, in the Pemberton experience, included some of the very social inferiors from whose association youth were supposedly being restricted. As has been shown, there are evidences of a close association of servants and apprentices with offspring—both children and youth—within the family. The Pembertons did conceive of the family in inclusive, rather than exclusive, terms.
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CHAPTER IV

UNITY

The Pembertons conceived of the family as being a group which included husband, wife, offspring, in-laws, grandparents, grandchildren, aunts, uncles, cousins, nieces, nephews, stepparents, stepchildren, apprentices, and servants. The question arises as to whether or not such a group—with significant differences in age, experience, ability, personality, opinions, beliefs, goals—could be unified. Did the Pembertons, in fact, think family unity to be important? They did. However, they seldom explicitly referred to family unity. Relevant studies by several twentieth-century sociologists aid in the interpretation of Pemberton correspondence which implicitly referred to family unity.

Unity is both, and often at once, a state of being, or condition, and a spirit or feeling. The word unity connotes oneness. There are degrees of unity. An idea of the extent of unity prevailing in a particular situation may be formed by thinking in terms of a continuum with unity and disunity at opposite poles. Unity is not, however, a condition or
feeling to be precisely defined and/or measured. The manifestations of unity vary as do people’s interpretations of those manifestations. Unity is elusive both in conception and in everyday life. Conceptions of unity vary not only with the people involved, but also with changes in the time and place. This chapter will discuss Pemberton attitudes which imply they valued family unity.

William Kenkel defines a group of people as a number of individuals who are in "reciprocal communication," and "the network of communication that binds the group members to group members gives rise, to some degree, to a mutual sense of belonging together so that the interacting individuals can be thought of a unity or a whole."¹ The Pembertons constituted such a group. With his definition of a social group Kenkel confirms R. M. MacIver’s point that social relationships are not merely (or identical to) physical relationships. In a social relationship—family relationships are but one type of social relationship—there is a mutual awareness and sense of belonging together. A social relationship "... exists where social beings conduct themselves, or 'behave' towards one another in ways determined by their recognition of one another."² Communication—though forms and frequency may differ—has long been essential to family groups, as well as other groups.
The Pembertons recognized the very great importance of communication—as evidenced, for example, by the numerous letters exchanged with an absent family member. Indeed, in many instances, their great desires to hear from loved ones very nearly led them to abandon their ideals of patience and resignation; for, in the eighteenth century (particularly during the winter and in times of war) the slowness of transportation and the unreliability of those who agreed to carry letters frustrated even the most patient correspondents.

Though letters were but one form of communication utilized by the Pembertons, those letters (the letters themselves—quite aside from the contents) reveal the Pembertons valued family unity.

Values are "... the mental and emotional sets which aid persons in judging the relative worth or importance of things, ideas, or events." Pertinent to a study of the Pemberton value of family unity is Florence Kluckhohn’s assertion that basic values should not be thought of as "superficial phenomena." The fact that the Pembertons did not write about family unity per se and but infrequently mentioned unity in the family context does not necessarily mean the Pembertons did not value unity. That this could be so is explained succinctly by Kluckhohn. She maintains "value orientations" are "deeply rooted," "mainly unconscious,"
and "pervasive"—so pervasive that they markedly affect the patterns of behavior and thought of a people in all areas of activity." This suggests that in order to understand, even to identify, a basic value orientation, it may well be necessary to approach the subject indirectly. Since the major interest in this paper is the thought of the people studied, rather than their behavior (except to consider their behavior in relation to thought), it will be relevant to examine ideas which reflected or fostered unity without, perhaps, mentioning it specifically.

Many thoughts expressed to and about relatives in the Pemberton correspondence indicate the existence of attitudes pertinent to family unity. R. M. MacIver offers one classification schema for attitudes which helps interpret the meaning of Pemberton attitudes with respect to family unity. First, before discussing the Pemberton ideas in terms of MacIver's schema, several of his crucial observations with regard to attitudes must be presented.

Attitudes assume complex and individual forms; indeed, when one attitude is named to describe a state of mind, there is a good possibility that the attitude so named may be only the dominant or most obvious aspect of a complex set of attitudes. Thus, when a Pemberton wife said she loved her husband her attitude might also have contained elements of
deference and awe. Though love, deference, and awe are closely related to each other, they are not the same. Love may be, but is not necessarily accompanied by awe and deference. Psychological realities usually are, and have been in the past, inadequately represented by the words used to name particular attitudes (i.e., the words used to distinguish one attitude from another). Granted, too, attitudes change. An attitude is defined perceptively by MacIver as "... a definite state or quality of consciousness, involving a tendency to act in a characteristic way whenever an object or occasion which stimulates it is presented." The change is the result of the close dependence of attitudes on such factors as education, experience, health—even weather, social crises, or personal conflicts. These are but a few of the most important reasons why attitudes are difficult to study, and why they can and must be viewed from many perspectives.

MacIver bases his schema for the classification of attitudes on the fact that an attitude may imply a sense of inferiority, superiority, or no felt difference (equality) in plane or status of the subject in relation to the object of his attitude. Attitudes, he argues, have social significance insofar as particular attitudes cause, promote, or contribute to solidarity and unity; on the other hand, some attitudes result in (at least, do little to prevent) social disruption.
Thus, there are attitudes in each of these groups which may indicate associative, restrictive, or dissociative tendencies. While "associative" attitudes cause, promote, or contribute to unity, "dissociative" attitudes cause, promote, or contribute to disunity. "Restrictive" attitudes neither result in a high degree of solidarity nor prevent social disruption.

Even though a person feels inferior to another, he may feel close to him and reveal this feeling in an associative attitude of: gratitude, emulation, imitativeness, or hero-worship. Restrictive attitudes indicating a sense of inferiority in a subject with relation to the object of the attitude include awe, subservience, modesty, submissiveness, humility, and devotion. Dissociative attitudes include fear, terror, bashfulness, and dread. In the Pemberton letters, children and older offspring often wrote as though they felt inferior to their parents. They repeatedly assured parents of their gratitude for their parents' care and affection—and even for their instructions and reproofs. Sally Pemberton related to her father James that her letter to her beloved parent had been prompted by a filial affection "... as a grateful return for the many obligations I am under, to a good Parent, whose ever watchful care and tenderness, has excited in my breast the warmest assurance of Friendship and Regard, which will never be extinguished whilst I retain one spark of
sensibility." The Friends urged parents to set good examples for children both to emulate and to imitate—so encouraging the development of associative attitudes in children and youth. Offspring often wrote in a manner expressing devotion, humility, and modesty. Sometimes there appeared a suggestion of awe on the part of offspring toward their parent or parents. In the case of Friends—at least the Pembertons—expressions of humility and modesty might more correctly be classified with associative attitudes. Humility and modesty constituted ideals which all Friends were supposed to try to attain. The most respected people were expected to be humble and modest. One way to identify with a person who expressed these attitudes would have been to express them, also. Seldom did any Pemberton or one of their correspondents give evidence of dissociative attitudes like dread or fear, much less terror, with respect to another person.

In contrast to those attitudes which indicate a sense of inferiority on the part of one person toward another, there are attitudes which reveal a sense of superiority on the part of the subject toward the object of the attitude. Pity and protectiveness are two associative attitudes which imply superiority on the part of the subject. Although they did not hesitate to show compassion and genuine sorrow, the Pembertons shunned pity. The Revolution gave Pemberton adults many good
reasons to assume a protective attitude toward their families. In their husbands' absences, occasioned by the exile of 1777-78, Pemberton wives and mothers did what they could do to protect their children and other dependents. But little Molly Pemberton wrote to her father James telling him how she had been badly frightened by the roar of cannon. While her mother had sent someone to find out where the firing was, she had tried to reassure the little girl by telling her not to be frightened and to stay in bed. Molly was quite sure that if her father had been present that none of them—her mother, her sisters, or herself—would have been so alarmed. Therein, she implied she had learned to expect that her father would assume a protective attitude when necessary. However, in most cases the Pembertons seem to have relied on the Lord for protection; fathers affirmed and reaffirmed their dependence upon the Lord for protection and called upon their wives, children, and the other relations to do the same.

Pride, patronage, tolerance, and forbearance fall in the category MacIver designates as restrictive attitudes implying a feeling of superiority in the subject. Few Pemberton letters were patronizing. Occasionally, a parent showed a sense of satisfaction with, and pride in, the development of a child—evidently, feeling that as a parent he was at least partially responsible for the pleasing
prospect of his offspring. Tolerance and forbearance were far more common themes in Pemberton writings. Children and youth made mistakes; adult offspring erred. Yet, instead of setting forth biting criticism or withdrawing their interest and affection from their offspring, parents continued their endeavors to help the younger generation follow a more prudent and correct course. Dissociative attitudes towards family members like disgust, abhorrence, scorn, disdain, intolerance, and arrogance are not in evidence in extant letters.

Lastly, there are a group of attitudes (associative, restrictive, and dissociative) which do not necessarily imply a difference in plane between subject and object: associative—trust, kindliness, sympathy, courtesy, helpfulness, friendliness, affection, and love; restrictive—rivalry, competitiveness, and jealousy; dissociative—hate, dislike, aversion, distrust, suspicion, spitefulness, malice, and cruelty. Here again, the associative attitudes implying equality—at least, failing to stress inequality—between family members stand out in the Pemberton letters. In striking contrast, the dissociative attitudes are not boldly set forth in the extant letters—nor are the restrictive attitudes. There are numerous examples of each associative attitude; however, only a few examples have been selected in order to show the context in which these attitudes found expression.
Periodically, the Pemberton men left their families to go on religious visits and/or to take care of business affairs. Those who remained at home wrote faithfully to the absent relative without pointedly questioning his activities to see that he tended strictly to religion and/or business. They did encourage him in his efforts to reach the objectives he formulated for his journey, but they did not question his integrity by revealing doubts as to whether or not he was conscientious in such efforts. Even when Israel Pemberton, the Elder, neared death, he trusted his son John who had been away from home longer than had been expected. He might have accused his son of delaying his return unnecessarily and demanded his return immediately, but he did not. Nor did he demonstrate impatience. John's brother James wrote to the effect that, indeed, both of their parents had set a good example of resignation—evidently believing that John would return home when free to do so. In turn, John assured them that he was not staying away from home merely because he traveled to satisfy his curiosity (or out of some other worldly motive). He made it clear that he missed his parents and being at home. The freedom in which he wrote his letters describing his personal trials and anxieties to his family showed his trust in them. Characteristically, he reported in one letter "... [I] have not been able to give up &
fully Resigned to his [the Lord's] Will, as I am sensible I ought to be, for which he has in his mercy been pleased to Chastise me, many ways...

In writing to relatives the Pembertons often purposely tried to compose letters which would be pleasing and agreeable to the recipient—thereby evincing a kindly attitude. Niece Hannah Pemberton told John Pemberton that she had delayed writing a letter to him because of the difficulty she had in thinking of anything to say which would give him a sense of satisfaction. She clearly wished to please him. In order to please their relations, the Pembertons thoughtfully included in their letters news which they knew the relations would appreciate receiving. In addition to letters themselves, various favors to family members (which often were an important topic in the letters) both were motivated by, and received with, a kindly attitude. While Israel, James, or John was away, his brothers made an effort to visit his wife and invite her to visit them in their homes both for the purpose of seeing that she had the things she needed and to keep her from being lonely. The absent brother returned kind words of acknowledgment.

Perhaps the greatest cause for sympathy both then and now was and is the death of a loved one. Hearing of the death of her brother Joseph, Mary Pleasants wrote to
his wife Nancy Pemberton saying: "... my Sympathy, and feeling for thee on this Moveing [sic] event I have not Language to express ..." Mary's sister Sarah Rhoads wrote to Nancy:

There are seasons in Affliction, when Nature must be left to herself,—At such a time the Consolations of friendship by their Infectious Tenderness, only serve to encrease [sic], the sensibility of the Sufferer,—there are also Seasons, when the Consolations of friendship are Usefull [sic],—I wish I knew that Time, that I might administer any thing [sic], that would Assuage thy Grief,—and Encourage, to a patient Acquiescence, with the Dispensations of Infinite Wisdom ... She mourned not for her departed brother, but for those whom he had left behind who were deprived of his "Tender Care."

Concluding her letter sympathetically and consolingly, she said: "... by his Death, you are no doubt, deprived of many Comforts,—but a Reflection, on the Sublime Felicity, he is in Possession off [sic], will I hope in some Degree, Eleviate [sic] thy Sorrow." Other events and situations also elicited sympathetic attitudes. While away from his wife on a religious visit, John Pemberton mentioned being attended by "a heavy weight," i.e., he felt depressed. He linked this depressed mental state with his great concern for his wife's welfare: "I much desire thy Support & preservation. I have been ready to think the weight that attends me is in part Sympathy
with thee. for indeed my love & care for thee is great.\textsuperscript{14}

Various expressions of courtesy are found throughout the letters. Furthermore, the general tone of extant letters to family members is courteous. The Pembertons did not single out courtesy as a desirable and admirable attitude and/or way of behaving. Rather, other attitudes seemingly resulted in expressions exemplifying courtesy. Following congratulatory remarks to his brother on his forthcoming marriage, James asked John to present his "best respects" to John's prospective bride and her mother.\textsuperscript{15} In another letter to John, his nephew Issey wrote to send love from his brothers and sisters, as well as himself, and to tell him of the health of family and friends. Then there were the polite letters of children to their parents telling them how much they were missed.\textsuperscript{16}

As to helpfulness, the Pembertons occasionally sounded somewhat frustrated in their letters because they thought they could be of so little help to each other when separated by considerable distances. Yet they said what they could; they made suggestions about how their relatives might make themselves more comfortable, maintain or improve their health, and raise their spirits. Wives and husbands—being designated in Quaker thought as helpmates—made special efforts to demonstrate helpful attitudes in letters to each other.
Hannah Pemberton repeatedly made known her concern about her husband's health. While he was away on a religious visit, her husband John became ill; when she heard of his illness, she wrote to him about his condition. Worried about his "poor weak breast," she said: "...[I] would have thee get 3 under wais coats [sic] of thick soft flannel thee has been useed [sic] to wear them ... ." She also urged him to get three pairs of worsted stockings which she thought to be necessary for him in order to keep warm in the cold weather of late fall and winter.\(^\text{17}\)

Equally important to the suggestions from helpmates pertaining to the mundane details of daily living, if not more important from the Pembertons' point of view, were the helpful reassurances which were meant to contribute to peace of mind. Mary Pemberton reassuringly told her husband Israel when he was away on a religious visit: "... I am favor'd with Ease and Satisfaction of mind with thy Present undertaking beleiveing [sic] as we are truly desirous to Improve the Dispensations which to be sure is attended with some tryal [sic] of Patience & will terminate to our mutual advantage and Peace of mind ... ."\(^\text{18}\)

The Pembertons and other Friends did not think of friendliness as an attitude to be confined to non-family members. A member of one's own family might be his nearest
friend. Ideally, family members lived in true friendship—supporting each other in times of trouble and sharing in the joys of fulfillment and blessings. Thus, Israel Pemberton gave an account of his wife Mary saying (near the time of her death) that she and her husband had lived through many trials together; yet, there continued between them a "true friendship—true Love." Therein, she suggested the close association between love and friendship in their minds.

The Pembertons mentioned or alluded to friendship, affection, and love repeatedly when corresponding with relations. They made no effort to distinguish explicitly between their friendship and affection or between love and friendship—or for that matter, between affection and love. They meant their letters to be at once demonstrations of their friendship, affection, and love. As an individual did not restrict friendship to non-family members or distant relations, he did not reserve expressions of affection and love for members of his own particular branch of the family. Thus, Sarah Pemberton wrote to her uncle John Pemberton as a proof of her affection for him; similarly, John Pemberton expressed his love for his brother Israel's children. He signed the letter as a loving and affectionate friend and uncle.

Israel Pemberton acknowledged a gilt letter he had received from his wife Mary and said that since it had given
him so much pleasure he was returning one with a fine edging; "... for the finery of both we are indebted to others; but the true love & affection which makes them mutually valuable & desirable we have the satisfaction of knowing the spring of in ourselves ... [and he desired] that we may be capable of thankfully acknowledging it is by the bounty of the Author of every blessing we are thus highly favored."

Some years later he wrote to her: "... I again salute thee in the renewings of that endeared affection, which the worst attempts [sic] of our adversaries can neither diminish nor interrupt, & which I trust is founded in that union, which is not subject to be dissolved by the vicissitudes of this life ..." He meant that the love of God through Christ provided the first cause and support of true love between mortals. Ideally, love endured despite separation, trials, and deliberate assaults—if it were true love.

To one of the Pemberton's friends, fulfilling the "Law of Love" required bearing each other's burdens. He might have added that it also called for one to strengthen another so that the weight of the burden would not strain the bearer beyond his capacity. Perhaps he meant that. What is important about this viewpoint is that the Pembertons evidently shared it. Seemingly the ideal of true, enduring love which called upon those who loved to sacrifice, as well as to
celebrate and to enjoy the blessings of love, influenced, if it did not determine, the attitudes pertaining to love of all the Pembertons. Relatives affirmed and reaffirmed the existence of a bond of love which did not weaken even when loved ones had to endure a long separation. In a letter to John Pemberton, Hannah Logan reflected upon these lasting ties: "... to feel something of this uniting love. Oh how far does it seem to exceed that of outward relationships, and my dear cousin I have a word of encouragement to thee..." 24

The Pembertons did not think of spiritual and rational testimonies of love to be the only possible demonstrations of a loving attitude. They valued being together, and they did not hesitate to mention a kiss as being a pleasing way to show affection and love for the children in the family. However, they maintained a silence with regard to displays of affection between adults; in extant letters, they neither detailed acceptable behavior, nor set down strict, rigid proscriptions.

Thus in each of the three categories of relationships (inferior to superior, superior to inferior, and indifference as to plane) which MacIver presents, the Pemberton letters express predominately associative attitudes—attitudes which tended to draw people together. With these attitudes in mind, consider the following statements:
The traditional conception of the family holds that the father is head of the house, that the mother is entrusted with the care of the house and of the children, and that in return for the unselfish devotion of the parents to their duties, the children owe their parents honor and obedience. Today, these values are being discarded by those who are creating developmental families, based on inter-personal relations of mutual affection, companionship, and understanding, with a recognition of individual capabilities, desires and needs for the development of each member of the family, be he father, mother or child. 25

What Rachel Elder seems to be saying here is that until the mid-twentieth century, mutual affection, companionship, and understanding did not become central values in family life. The Pemberton letters do not sustain this thesis. On the contrary, family unity developed from thought and action based on a genuine respect for, and a belief in, the worth of mutual affection, companionship, and understanding. Nor did the Pembertons neglect the desires and needs of various family members—though they did not talk in terms of individual development or developmental families. Understandably, they did not evaluate these desires and needs in the same way as would a twentieth-century American, but that must not obscure the fact that they perceived and distinguished individual differences and attempted to provide appropriately for those differences. 26 However, the Pembertons considered an individual, not in isolation, but as part of an interdependent
family group. This did not necessarily mean that the individual interests had to be sacrificed for the interests of the family group, but that the two had to be considered together.

Then there is this oversimplification which, if "yesterday" is read as the American family pre-1952, provides an even greater distortion of the thought and experience of early America than Elder's statement:

The American family of yesterday was male-dominated, duty-bound, parent-centered, and fertile. It was made sturdy by the rigorous demands of an unrelenting work world . . . . It was unified in the mutual struggle for economic necessities. It gave little place to such values as happiness, personal expression, self-development, and individual rights. Life was family-centered, not individual-centered.27

The Pembertons did not think of their family in these terms, and their ideas appear to have more closely approximated the reality of the situation than those of Paul Landis. The most inadequate and misleading notion in this particular statement by Landis is that it was economic factors which unified the family. Granted, economic factors could and did influence family unity. However, they could have a divisive, as well as a unifying, effect on the family—a fact which he fails to consider. Furthermore, he avoids consideration of other unifying factors and implies family life was devoid of affection and love by saying people valued happiness in but an insignificant way.
According to Ernest Burgess and Harvey Locke, mutual affection, emotional interdependence, sympathetic understanding, temperamental compatibility, and a consensus of values and objectives all contribute to family unity. The Pembertons thought such conditions ought to (and, in varying degrees, did) characterize the relations between family members. They endeavored to attain unity by persuasion rather than by coercion. Unity in the family did not mean or require absolute uniformity of personality and behavior. Unity was to be manifested in harmony; harmony, in turn was to be rooted in love and understanding. Their letters suggest that they intuitively knew of, and respected, what Gerald Handel calls the "psychosocial interior" of their family. Handel defines the psychosocial interior of a family:

The psychosocial interior is that region of the universe where the members of the family meet and make a life together. It is a region of the mind, that 'place' where there is a meeting of minds primarily in the sense of individual selves confronting, engaging, and being struck off from one another, rather than in the usual sense of reaching agreement through discussion.

He goes on to say it is also "... a region where there is a meeting of bodies and of body and mind." As the psychosocial interior of the family contributed to family unity in the Pemberton experience, so family unity helped create and preserve a type of psychosocial interior conducive
to family unity.

Burgess and Locke also mention family events, celebrations, ceremonies, interdependence of family roles, and pressures from the environing society as factors which may contribute to family unity. While formal ceremonies were not a part of the Quaker experience, family events and celebrations did bring family members together for special occasions. Two main reasons probably largely explain why these occasions seldom received detailed attention in letters. First, many relations were present at the time; therefore, in their case, no description or discussion needed to be written down for their information. Second, since those who had been away at the time had been present for and/or participated in similar affairs before (and would be present for such events in the future), in most cases, no long account was deemed necessary; rather, a simple mentioning was judged sufficient. While births and deaths constituted major family events, marriages and visitations of relations and friends provided an occasion for a celebration. The Pembertons and their friends thought of a birth of a baby in one branch of the family as increasing the entire family; thus, Hannah Smith mentioned the news that James’ wife was expecting a baby to James’ brother John. Israel Pemberton did write home to his wife in some detail about their son.
Joseph's marriage because Mary's health had not allowed her to journey so far away from home to where Joseph's new wife lived. Israel furnished few details of the celebration after the Meeting in which Joseph and Nancy had become husband and wife, but he did say that about one hundred and twenty people dined together and enjoyed each other's company.

The Pembertons thought in terms of a definite interdependence of family roles. Their conception extended interdependence beyond mundane affairs, such as housekeeping, to a group effort to create and to nurture family harmony. They agreed with Friend George Mason who once reminded Israel Pemberton's children that harmony could not prevail in a family unless every individual in the family did his part.

It is not within the scope of this chapter to discuss the social pressures which promoted Pemberton family unity. Suffice it to say in conclusion that, even without external social pressures, the many internal factors which have been discussed would have promoted and preserved a unified family—both in conception and reality.
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PART TWO

A FAMILY IN COMMUNITY
The Pembertons thought of active participation in a church as an important concern and obligation of a family. The Pemberton concept of the family was influenced by the family involvement in the Society of Friends. The Society of Friends, in turn, was affected by the involvement of families like the Pemberton family whose participation in the Society and understanding of its teachings were shaped by their conception of the family.

The Society of Friends influenced the concept of the family held by the Pembertons in several ways. One way was through specific teachings based explicitly or implicitly on passages from the Bible which pertained to family relationships or experiences. Second, Friends addressed advices and counsels to important problems of family life. Such counsels were sometimes set forth in compilations of advices or epistles to Yearly, Quarterly, or Monthly Meetings, and other times in private correspondence between Friends. Third, the rules to be enforced by the Society which pertained to
family groups were based on the Quaker understanding of the implications of Truth and were both a cause and an effect of the advices formulated by the Society and reiterated or paraphrased by individual Friends. Fourth, the aid and consolation extended by individual Friends, as well as groups of Friends, to families influenced the conception of the family. Fifth, several Quaker traditions had a particularly significant impact on the concept of the family.

According to the theology of the Society of Friends, in the True Church were gathered together by the Spirit of God a group of people whose understandings were informed by Truth and whose purpose in life was to serve, to worship, and to bear testimony for Truth. Through this fellowship the people were thought to become "as one family" in "certain respects" in that they were to "... watch over, teach, instruct, and care for one another, according to their several measures and attainments." The Friends modeled their Society on this conception of the True Church. Friends were to consider themselves as children of God and brothers and sisters in Christ. For, as Thomas Chalkley reminded Friends, Christ taught: "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Matthew 21:50). As Sydney James observes: "They [the Friends] thought of the church as Christ's 'Family of Love,' and tried
to behave as members of one family ought to behave toward each other, 'taking due Care one of another for their Preservation from all Uncleanness, Disorder, Snares, and Entanglements that are in the World.'

However, the Pembertons did not think of themselves as being members of two distinct families—the Pemberton family and the church family. Though the child did become the responsibility of two groups at the time of his birth—the family of his parents and the Society of Friends—the Pembertons did not distinguish between the two groups as being two separate families. Perhaps an understanding of their conception of the family can be enhanced by calling to mind an image of one large circle made up of many concentric circles. The large circle represents a particular person's family with that person in the center—the inner ring being composed of the individual's nearest relations (parents, spouse, children), the middle rings made up of more distant relations, and finally, Friends completing the circle in the outer rings. Since everyone (ideally, at least) in the family was a Quaker, the entire circle could be of one color and the lines distinguishing one ring from another might be but vaguely defined. The point is that Friends—members of a society composed of many families—considered themselves as part of one large family. Customarily, the Friends used the family metaphor to
convey a sense of unity and brotherhood among Friends—a usage which no doubt contributed to the inclusive nature of the Pembertons' concept of the family (inclusive in the sense that a person considered a number of people in addition to close relations as members of his family).

Within a family, scriptural teachings were to be the basis of right thought and conduct. Quaker leaders urged Friends to read the Bible in order to become aware of, or to review, and to understand Christ's teachings. "But to commend them [Christ's teachings] only is but little, or to read them, or hear them: the keeping and doing of them is the main thing; the thing that is needful . . . ." 5

Georgia Harkness focuses attention on the paradoxical nature of the teachings of Jesus which pertain to the family. For example, she cites Matthew (19:4,5) wherein there is evidence of an assumption that marriage is not only a legitimate and natural institution, but also that it is a divinely ordained institution. Yet also in Matthew (19:12) there is the recognition that some people may have to renounce marriage for the purpose of devoting a lifetime to the service of God. And although Jesus stressed the importance of respect for women and children, He maintained man's duty is to God even before family. For there is the ultimate test of loyalty to Christ—the willingness to sever family connections to
follow Him (Matt. 19:29,30; Luke 9:57-62). Furthermore, He called men to cast out evil, but not to treat a sinner like a social outcast (John 8:11, Matt. 5:27-32)—such an injunction might apply to one's own relations. Willystine Goodsell quotes from 1 Corinthians to call attention to the kind of biblical passage which shows St. Paul regarded marriage "... as a substitute for a worse state—that of illicit sexual intercourse." Yet there is no evidence that the Pembertons agonized over the paradoxes inherent in Christian teachings. They accepted apparent contradictions—usually, perhaps, without perceiving them as such—and went about their everyday affairs trying to live according to the spirit as well as the letter of the Law. To say that they were concerned with learning basic truths and principles of thought and action from the Bible is not to say that they gave equal weight to the various books in the Bible or to the many commentators who, through the centuries, had sought to interpret the scriptures to believers. Rather they, as other Christian groups had done before them and were to continue to do, selected those passages and commentators which they believed to be most essential and meaningful. Thus, for example, they emphasized the importance of the Sermon on the Mount.

As Ernest Groves maintains, Christianity:
cannot be handled as if it were something fixed, a consistent system. It also has a history of change. Occasionally it has been interpreted, especially by its critics, as a final dogma without recognition that even when there is a prevailing consistency of doctrine at a definite time and place, there are nearly always variations and departures from the main teaching and that always, from time to time, there are differences of emphasis as well as considerable shifting in the authoritative doctrines carried forward by the Church.\textsuperscript{8}

Manford Kuhn identifies Christianity as having been one of the self-contradictory influences on the American family—in contrast to those which have been comparatively simple, direct, and representative of converging trends.\textsuperscript{9} Panos Bardis argues that the Christian model of family life influenced the American family more extensively than did the Hebrew, Greek, and Roman models of family life which have also influenced the history of the family in the western world. He cites the following aspects of the Christian model as evidence to substantiate his assertion: emphasis on the importance of specialized family institutions; God's fatherhood and man's brotherhood; monogamy; marriage as a sacrament; ecclesiastical control of the wedding ceremony; loyalty of both husband and wife; spiritual equality of women; concern for the spiritual and physical welfare of children; indissolubility of marriage; condemnation of sex; glorification of celibacy and monasticism.\textsuperscript{10}
It would be highly misleading to assume or to suggest that the Society of Friends supported or practiced all these traditions. In reality, for example, they denied the sacramental nature of marriage, and though the Meeting regulated the general procedure preceding a wedding, Friends did not think in terms of ecclesiastical control. They rejected formal ceremony and expected a man and woman to take each other in marriage before God in a simple way directed by the Light within them—in the presence of, but not according to a ceremonial program determined by, Friends. More than most Christian groups the Quakers emphasized the equality of women. On the other hand, they neither condemned sex, nor exalted celibacy or monasticism. Essentially, the Friends called upon Christians to rid themselves of commentaries upon commentaries upon commentaries, as well as layers of ceremonial traditions, in order to get back to the simplicity, love, and peace of Christ and primitive Christianity which these accretions had obscured. They emphasized Jesus’ teachings (and also certain lessons in the Old Testament—particularly those which they believed Jesus either fulfilled or affirmed).

The scriptural verses to which the Friends made reference influenced their conception of the family by contributing to a climate of opinion which conditioned the social framework in which family life was lived. John Fry was but
one among many who directed the attention of Friends to Jesus' instruction to men to seek after the Kingdom of God before all other endeavors. A summary of Quaker beliefs reminded Friends
Deuteronomy 6:7 said God required Israel to teach that the Lord their God is one Lord and that His people are to love their Lord with all their heart, soul, and might. "And thou shalt teach them [the lessons of God] diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." (Deut. 6:7) Fry thought that if people, in obedience to this lesson, could remember God in the days of their youth "... they would thereby, be fully furnished, unto every good Word and Work. This would likewise preserve the Youth in innocent Conversation, and direct them, even in the Management of the Affairs of this Life ... ."

The point is that the first love, obedience, loyalty, respect, and devotion were to be to God—not to father or mother, brother or sister, husband or wife, or some other relation.

The eighteenth-century Quakers generally assumed that love and loyalty to relations would not conflict with love and loyalty to God—yet they had before them the examples of early Quakers, such as Thomas Ellwood, who had had to break with their families in order to do God's will as they had understood it. Ellwood recalled both how he had had to
disobey his father in order to go to religious meetings of
Friends and his thoughts upon the occasion: "I considered
thereupon the Extent of Paternal Power; which I found was not
wholly arbitrary and unlimited, but had Bounds set unto it.
So that as in civil Matters, it was restrained to Things
lawful; so in spiritual and religious Cases, it had not a
compulsory Power over Conscience; which ought to be subject to
the heavenly Father." The very founding and development of
the Society of Friends had been accomplished by many individuals
who rejected the religious practices of their own families. Thus,
the fundamental command upon the Friend--to love and to
obey God before any man--might threaten family unity in the
event of conflict in interpretations between or among members
of a family over the determination of God's will and the im-
plications of His will for His people. It was as William Penn
wrote: "It is the doctrine he teaches us in these words:
'He that loveth father or mother, son or daughter, more than
me, is not worthy of me.'"

In addition to scriptural lessons which affected the
conception of the family in an indirect way, there were
scriptural lessons which had a direct effect on the concept
of the family--scriptural verses which were to guide the
thought and conduct of individuals in their respective roles
within the family. For example, instructive verses touched
on the relationships between husbands and wives, and parents and children. The following biblical verses illustrate the types of verses cited and commented upon by Friends. In his remarks about the Sermon on the Mount, Thomas Chalkley discussed Matthew 5:31-32 in which it is recorded that Jesus said:

"It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: But I say unto you That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." Here follows Chalkley's thought, which accorded with and/or influenced the ideas of many Friends, with respect to the meaning of these verses for married couples:

The great Husband of souls [Christ] here plainly sheweth that husbands should be tender to their wives . . . . Men and their wives ought to live together in love, and be good examples to their children and servants, and not part from one another, except for the cause of fornication; and that should be proved; for some men are only jealous of their wives, and some without cause; and where there is cause, as a man may think, it ought to be clearly proved before they part from one another; a man ought to be tender to his wife as of his own body, 'For they two are one flesh.' Men and their wives are often too apt to magnify one another's faults, and put the worst constructions upon each other's words and actions, when they differ, which widens breaches instead of healing them; whereas the best and not the worst of construction on things, would chase away wrath, strife and hatred; and though Moses gave the Jews that permission of divorcement for the hardness of their hearts, yet Christians ought to live so, that there should be no need of it among them.
For lessons on marriage, Robert Barclay referred to Ephesians 5:22-25, 28, 31, 33; Colossians 3:19; I Peter 3:1, 2, 7. The twenty-second verse of the fifth chapter of Ephesians begins the selection: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord." The twenty-third and twenty-fourth verses provide reasons for the wife's submissive behavior: "For the husband is the head of the Church: and he is the savior of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing." But Friend Barclay did not end the reading there. He included the twenty-fifth verse, as well as three others, which made it clear that the wife's adapting and submitting herself to her husband was neither to be a one-sided sacrifice nor a threat to her dignity as a person. For these latter verses commended husbands to love their wives as Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for that Church. "So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself." (Eph. 5:28.) The requirement for mutual respect was made clear in verse thirty-three: "... let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself: and the wife see that she reverence her husband." The verses from Colossians and I Peter provided similar lessons.

Friends recognized and stressed biblical injunctions
which required children to obey the authority of their parents.

John Griffith insisted that the honor and obedience "in the Lord" due to parents from children was commanded in the Bible and by the very nature of things was a lasting and indispensable obligation. He told people to read: Matthew 15:4; Mark 7:10; Luke 18:20; Ephesians 6:2, 3. Love and obedience ought not be merely a matter of yielding to a command but also be a matter of sincere respect and esteem coming from the heart. He referred them to: Deuteronomy 27:16; Proverbs 30:17; Proverbs 23:22; Proverbs 28:24.

On the other hand, as Robert Barclay and a section entitled "Ancient Testimony" in the Christian and Brotherly Advices (1762) made very clear through the use of biblical citations, children and parents had responsibilities toward each other: there was not to be a one-sided relationship in which the parents enjoyed all the benefits while the children yielded honor and obedience. For the Bible said: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honour thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth." (Eph. 6:1-3.) Yet it also said: "And ye father, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Eph. 6:4.) And a similar passage said: "Children, obey your parents in all things: for this is
well pleasing unto the Lord. Fathers, provoke not your children
to anger lest they be discouraged." (Col. 3:20-21.) John
Griffith called upon parents to remember the primary obligation
of parents to teach their children to know and to love God
as was required in Deuteronomy (6:4-7) and explained in
Proverbs (22:6).  

The epistles of the London Yearly Meeting contained
advices to Friends which were among the most influential in
the Society. These epistles were part of a "... systematic
and constant transatlantic interchange of correspondence
modeled quite consciously upon the epistles which had helped
shape and nourish the Christian community of the Mediterranean
world in the first century." Epistles which were regularly
exchanged between the various Yearly Meetings, set forth
spiritual and practical advices that supplemented the work of
ministers. Taken as a group, the epistles written in the
latter years of the seventeenth century through those composed
in the eighteenth century were highly repetitive. The epistles
influenced the concept of the family not by a neat delineation
of a model Christian family, but-by-specific exhortations to
family members about family relations. The following are
eamples of the ways epistles advised Friends on the important
matters of the responsibility of parents for their children.
In addition, there are mentioned a number of advices given in
other sources which are either similar to, or develop in greater
detail, the ideas presented in the epistles of the London Yearly
Meeting.

In the words of one epistle: "... next to our own
souls, our children and offspring are the most immediate objects
of our care and concern ... ." Thus, parents were to take
care to see that their offspring were brought "to a sense of
God" very early in their lives. As the capacity of the child­
ren to learn increased, parents were to see that the young ones
were accustomed to regular readings of the Bible--"... and
also, to instruct them in the great Love of God, through
Jesus Christ, and the work of salvation by him, and of
sanctification through his blessed Spirit ... ." 25 The
epistle argued that children should be taught God's ways
when young so that they might not ignore or forget them when
old. It suggested waiting upon the Lord in family groups in
order to make the parental efforts in instructing their off­
spring more effective.

In addition to teaching God's ways to children, parents
were to keep their offspring from following vain fashions of
the world such as extravagances of color and fashion in
clothing. Parents had to recognize and accept their responsi­
bility to see children dressed decently and plainly in order
"... that the sin of the children may not lie upon their
parents; nor they be exposed to ruin by their parents' neglect." In other words, parents were to be held responsible for the behavior of their offspring. On the other hand, as John Griffith implied, conscientious, prudent Quaker parents who did their duty toward their children could not be held accountable for rebellion and evil conduct on the part of those children. Still, he emphasized that in order for parents to be free of guilt in the case of errant children, they must not neglect or over-indulge their offspring, which not only would be detrimental to the children, but also would be a loss to the Society by constituting an obstacle to the progress of Truth.

The London Meeting pointed out that in order to be effective, parental supervision had to be rightly directed (rooted in Truth) and continuous: "For this we are sensible of, that the miscarriage of youth have very much proceeded from their being imprudently indulged, or left to themselves ..." The London Friends insisted that parents had to be properly qualified to exercise the right and to carry out the duties of their due authority over their children. What this meant according to Friends was that parents had to "... be fully given up in faithful obedience to the manifestations of light and grace received, whereby they will be enabled to advise and reprove with proper authority ..." They warned
parents not to undermine or misuse their authority—the authority given to them by the Lord for the purpose of preserving children in Truth. They should not allow themselves "in the fondness of affection" to be overly indulgent. When necessary parents were to restrain their offspring from action which would hurt either themselves or others—"inwardly" or "outwardly." 30

One particular "natural right" of parents which the London Friends acknowledged was their right to approve or to disapprove of and to consent or not to consent to the marriage plans of their offspring. They urged young people to consult with their parents in these affairs long before their minds and affections were set. The London Meeting emphasized that to live in obedience to God's Holy Spirit a person was not allowed to marry a person of another religion for the following reason:

Marriage, being a divine ordinance, and a solemn engagement for term of life, is of great importance to our peace and well being in this world, and may prove of no small consequence respecting our state in that which is to come; yet it is often too inconsiderately entered into, upon motives inconsistent with the evident intention of that unerring Wisdom by which it was primarily ordained; which was for the mutual assistance and comfort of both sexes, that they might be meet-helpers to each other, both in spirituals and temporels, and that their endeavours might be united for the pious and proper education of their children, in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and for suitably qualifying them to
discharge their duty in their various allotments in the world.

According to the view of the Quakers: "Marriage implies union and concurrence, as well in spiritual as temporal concerns." Therefore:

Whilst the parties differ in religion, they stand disunited in the main point; even that which should increase and confirm their mutual happiness, and render them meet-helps and blessings to each other—Where it is otherwise, the reciprocal obligation they have entered into becomes their burden, and the more so, as it may not be of a short and transient duration; whatever felicity they might expect or flatter themselves with in the beginning, they have found themselves disappointed of, but the daily uneasiness accompanying their minds and imbittering [sic] their enjoyments.

Furthermore, they stressed the consequences of a mixed marriage for the children involved as providing another cause for avoiding such marriages:

The perplexed situation of offspring of such alliances is likewise to be lamented. Attached by nature to both parents, the confusion they are in often renders them unfixed in principle and unsettled in practice . . .

Although the Friends upheld the right of parents to decide whether or not to consent to the marriage of an offspring, the Friends also expected parents to be prudent and fair in this important matter. Parents were not to act out of selfishness or whimsy, but rather to think and to act with the welfare of their offspring in mind. Thomas Chalkley
reminded parents that with regard to marriage arrangements young people must make the basic decisions according to which their lives would be lived, and that over-advising on the part of parents could lead to the ruination of offspring. Parents should remember that love is essential to a good marriage—something which parents could not arrange. They could and should give advice and consent with this in mind. Then, once they had given consent to young people's seeing each other in the serious way of courtship, parents were not to retract their consent "upon any worldly account."

While most of the advices concerning the relations between parents and children in the epistles of the London Yearly Meeting were addressed to parents (and, appropriately, discussed parental responsibilities toward offspring), a few advices were addressed to offspring—as were many advices in pamphlets and letters of Friends. William Penn reminded Quakers that it was not enough to be born of parents who were people of God: "The Father cannot save or answer for the Child, or the Child for the Father . . . ." However, a child born to religious parents, Penn thought, had a better chance to come to a knowledge and understanding of God's ways than children whose parents did not endeavor to live righteous lives. He even argued it would add weight to the scale against them if they ignored God's ways since they had the advantage
of help from godly parents. Furthermore, they should be thank­ful that they could be true to the Inner Light without suffering the frowns, blows, and being disinherited and/or forsaken by their own families, which had been a great cause of suffering among early Friends. Similarly, John Churchman warned:

"Although the descendants and children of Friends who were as bright stars in their day, may value themselves on the worthiness of their parents, yet if they do not love and serve God of their fathers with a perfect heart and an up­right mind, He will not own them with his heavenly presence, but they will be as unsavory salt."

The London Yearly Meeting did ask the youth among Friends who were "favoured with pious and exemplary parents":

... to pay all dutiful regard to their in­struction and example; and that they may be very cautious of bringing grief and dishonour upon them by departing from the safe and commendable simplicity of the Truth, the moderation and plainness it leads to, both in dress and address, and in every part of their conduct and behavior.

The epistle argued that those who rejected the counsel of godly parents and failed to take seriously parental example and authority brought dishonor to their parents and forfeited "their own title to the holy promise of God." In Quaker thought, parents were always obliged to exercise their au­thority according to the dictates and insights of the Inner Light. On their part, Quaker offspring were always expected
to obey and respect the "just" instructions, commands, and
diges given to them by their parents. With a high degree
of mutual concern and regard parents and children might create
and sustain an harmonious family experience which would be
to the glory of God.

Jack Marietta has studied the disciplinary records of
colonial Pennsylvania Monthly Meetings of Friends and has
written of the conduct prohibited by the Society and the way
Friends disciplined members who erred. Marietta observes that
the "... Friends had many peculiar religious practices
that identified for them the true church of Christ. There were
no articles of theology, but the articles of discipline were
numerous and pervasive." Jerry Frost argues a basic reason
why the Quakers survived (while many of the sects which came
into existence during the Commonwealth period did not) was
that the Quakers "... managed to combine the liberty of
personal authoritative revelation with a strong system of
discipline and church control." Briefly, what the ordinary
procedures of discipline entailed were the following. Upon
the observance of an infraction of, or questionable behavior
with respect to, Society rules by a Quaker, a Friend in his
Meeting would point out his error to him and urge him to correct
his conduct. He might be contacted by several Friends. The
matter might be dropped if the person reformed or made clear
his intention to do so. However, an individual might be required to acknowledge his error before the Meeting. If he did not acknowledge his error when asked to do so, he might be disowned—expelled from the Society of Friends.

Marietta learned that nearly one half of the colonial Pennsylvania Quaker disciplinary actions arose over problems of courtship and marriage arrangements in which individuals transgressed the rules of the Society. Basically, the Society concentrated its efforts on ensuring an orderly courtship and marriage that would have a good chance of developing into a harmonious and enduring union which would be a credit to the Society by its respect for, and nurture of, Truth. The great care taken with respect to marriages, Marietta argues, reflected the great concern of the Society for the family. Through the Society rules and their enforcement, the Society influenced the concept of the family particularly by cementing the close relationship between the family and the Society. "The family was the medium by which the Society's values were transmitted and if the family assisted the transgression of the values, both the family and the Society might suffer." 41

There were six major Quaker rules with regard to the preliminaries to marriage. First, Friends were not to plan to marry non-Quakers. If a Friend terminated the courtship of a non-Friend before marriage, the Society did not require
an acknowledgment to the Meeting. Second, the Society did not permit a Friend to marry a closely related Friend. Third, offspring were to request permission from their parents to marry. However, if the parents failed to give a good reason for not consenting to a marriage plan, the Society itself might override the parents' decision and allow the couple to proceed with their plans. An arbitrary refusal to give their consent might undermine the good standing of the parents in the Society. Fourth, if one party had been married before, he or she was required to furnish proof of freedom to remarry. A widower or widow might be disowned if the remarriage occurred too soon after the death of the spouse. Fifth, if one or both parties changed their minds about marriage (decided not to marry) after the Meeting had approved the marriage plans, the party or parties had to acknowledge their error or be disowned. Finally, a Friend's complicity in an irregular marriage—whether or not the Friend were related to the couple—was regarded as a breach of the discipline.42

The nature of surveillance of a married couple differed from that of a couple preparing for marriage. The Meeting assumed that if the Society had done its work thoroughly in seeing that the marriage were well-conceived, the married couple would require little supervision. The Society's surveillance of a couple preparing for marriage was more
intensive and continuous than its surveillance of a husband
and his wife. Nevertheless, the newly married couple did not
enter a private world of the home considered to be a place
where they had total freedom of thought and action. All
families were under the constant surveillance of the Meeting.
The reputation of the Society depended on the virtuous conduct
of all Friends—whether married or single. Friends admonished
each other "... carefully to guard against being drawn
into any Measures which may minister Occasion to any to
represent us as a People departing from the Principles we
profess ... ." 43

In the event that conflicts arose between the husband
and wife which broke into the open, Friends were free to advise
and to exhort the individuals in order to establish or to
restore harmony in the home. In the matter of disciplining
children, the Meeting rarely intervened directly in the family
affairs. The Society stressed parental responsibility for
disciplining offspring. It often admonished parents when
Friends thought they were neglecting their duties or misusing
their authority, but is seldom interfered by intervening
directly. 44

The Pembertons and other Friends did not conceive
of the family as an isolated, totally independent unit.
Acceptance of, or the giving of aid was not thought to
undermine family solidarity. Instead, aid was given or received by families through the Society in order to promote family unity. A Meeting might undertake to carry out the duties of caring for the family of a poor, infirm, or missing husband when his relations were unable to assume the full burden. Meetings—including the Meeting in Philadelphia in which the Pembertons actively participated—cared for widows, orphans, sick people, apprentices, and the aged. Various forms of aid were given by the Meeting to prevent the disintegration of families and the attendant suffering. For example, the Meeting might advise a widow on business affairs—affairs for which her husband previously had had the primary responsibility. The Meeting might urge relations of a family having problems to go to their aid. If relations failed to help, the Society might provide some form of material assistance such as clothing or funds. The Meeting also might relieve a widow by finding foster homes or places of apprenticeship for her children. In some cases the Meeting acted as a legal parent for orphans. 45

Friends also consoled family members in the event of family problems or family tragedy. Thus, for example, Samuel Fothergill, a Quaker minister, wrote to Israel Pemberton a letter of consolation after the death of one of Israel's daughters. Fothergill's way of consoling Israel was to recall
the admirable qualities of the girl which were likely to assure her of Eternal Peace. In his estimation: "An early acquaintance with the Lord of all power and goodness, who drew her by the engaging virtue of his love, and taught her to love his judgments, subjected her will seasoned her spirit, and sanctified all to her. An humble, submissive, meek spirit rendered her acceptable, and preserved her in righteousness."\textsuperscript{46}

In another instance, Rachel Pemberton, whose husband had died, acknowledged a Friend's expressions of sympathy for her. But, she said, "... as it hath been thro' ye great kindness of Divine Providence that such a blessing [her husband] was continued to me so long so I am sensible it is my Duty to Submitt [sic] to his Divine Will ... desiring that this gracious assistance may be afforded to support me thro' the vicissitudes of Life, that in the End, I may partake of ye rewards of the righteous with there is no doubt my dear spouse hath now attain'd ..."\textsuperscript{47}

There were also traditions of the Society of Friends which influenced the concept of the family held by the Quakers. Two examples were the traditional family visits and the traditional recognition of the equality of women in the Society. Family visits were conducted by worthy and "weighty" Friends who went to the family homes of Friends to wait upon the Lord with the family and, if necessary, to advise and to
exhort the family members. Frequently, traveling ministers
conducted family visits in the company of a local Friend or
friends. When the Friends arrived at the home, all the family
members, including servants and apprentices, would gather
together and wait in silence. Eventually the visitor would
speak. Frequently, the visitors spoke on matters related
to the importance of a harmonious, pious family life.

John Churchman recalled the first time he had been
asked to go on family visits:

But notwithstanding I saw at times the states of
families and particulars, yet not in so clear a
manner as I thought necessary to make it my duty
to open my mouth in the service, save now and
then, in a private way to particulars, of which
none knew except those to whom I spoke.

Of a later visit he said that, at times, he:

... felt the opening of Truth in the love of
it, and a few words to speak to the states of
some, though in great fear, lest I should put
my hand to that weighty work without the real
requiring of duty. At one family, I thought
it would be better for the whole family, in a
religious sense if the heads of it were more
zealous in attending meetings. I saw the ne-
cessary of being examples to children and ser-
vants, by a careful attendance of meetings for
worship on the First, and other days of the
week ... .

The freedom in which he wrote to a total stranger after another
family visit bespoke his increased confidence in his ability
to understand family situations and to convey meaningful
counsel and exhortation: "I have had an exercise on my mind
ever since I came first into your house, to visit your family... I came an entire stranger, free from any information from man concerning you; but as soon as I came into the house, I felt the innocent life of Truth and pure seed of the kingdom oppressed in you.  

John Pemberton served the Society as a traveling minister and made family visits. He made a special effort to visit widows, fatherless, and families whose homes were situated in remote places. In visiting families he believed "... the Lord is with us opening Council & Instruction & favouring us with Peace." After one series of family visits by John, a Friend wrote to John's wife Hannah to tell her that he had been of good service there by the advice, encouragement, and admonitions he had given in the course of the visits. Visiting Friends strengthened families troubled by loneliness and isolation by carrying news from other families and communities; for traveling ministers provided a link between widely separated communities and often spent weeks in an area visiting the homes of the majority of Quaker families. Through the support of such visits the Society promoted a conception of the family which considered the family properly to be the concern of individuals outside the family group itself. Moreover, the Friends who visited family homes stressed the religious functions of the family and, by waiting upon the Lord
in a Quaker way in a family setting, demonstrated one way religious duties were to be fulfilled.

What was the meaning with regard to the concept of the family of the traditional Quaker insistence upon the spiritual equality of men and women? Jerry Frost argues that the only place a woman Friend had more freedom than other women was in the Meeting. Otherwise, she occupied a subordinate position to her husband. She had to be content with the everyday drudgery of housework, and she usually lost control of property when she married. "Although some husbands treated their wives as equals and consulted them on all matters of importance, most Quakers believed that a woman gained influence by being submissive." On the other hand, Ernest Groves says of the Quakers: "Their family life, which was exceptionally high in quality, was based upon the notion of equality of husband and wife." It is possible that these two interpretations can be used together to deepen the understanding of the Quaker conception of the family.

Perhaps, the most highly respected Friends in the Society were the Quaker ministers—though there was no paid clergy for the Society, there were Friends who were recognized as having special abilities to understand and to communicate the Truth. Based upon the belief in the spiritual equality
of men and women, women not only participated in Society affairs in behind-the-scenes work, but also served as ministers. Meetings went so far as to approve and to support their travels in the Service of Truth. A number of Quaker women came to America as traveling ministers and were welcomed in Pemberton homes. The impact on the attitudes of Friends of the presence and activities of these highly respected women cannot be precisely documented; yet it should not be underestimated. It could hardly have been restricted only to people's attitudes when sitting in religious meetings.

William Penn told Friends: "... the apostle Peter advised men, 'to honour their wives'; that is, to love, value, cherish, countenance and esteem them, for their fidelity and affection for their husbands; for their tenderness and care over their children, and for their diligence and circumspection in their families. No ceremonious behavior, or gaudy titles, are requisite to express this honour." Penn did not speak of their inequality or their inferiority as providing a natural justification for the strict subordination of females. Rather, he made it clear that reputation, wisdom, and virtue had not been limited to men. On the contrary, there had been women who "... honoured their sex by great examples of meekness, prudence, and chastity, and which I do the rather mention, that the honor history yields to their
virtuous conduct may raise an allowable emulation in those of their own sex, at least to equal the noble character given them by antiquity. Famous and extraordinary women aside, ordinary women in ordinary Quaker families exercised authority jointly with their husbands in the important tasks of raising children. Friends urged both parents to apply for divine assistance in order to exercise their authority in a just and prudent manner.

Friends did not think of spiritual equality as being compromised by certain political, social, and economic inequalities which now seem very obvious. On the other hand, friends did not argue women were entitled only to spiritual equality—equality before God. It seems that the Pemberton men and women, for example, considered each other equal in their humanity (albeit as children of God—which was closely related to the idea of spiritual equality). Equality, however, in their view did not require a man to spend part of his day in the kitchen—nor the woman to spend part of her day in the countinghouse. Women did not perceive housework as demeaning, and many took pride in their work. In many cases the work done by the man in the family entailed drudgery of a sort not too different from household tasks. Then in the case of a well-to-do man like Israel Pemberton, he could afford to alleviate his wife's burden through the employment of servants.
The point is that perfect equality is an abstraction which few Friends had time (or took time) to ponder as to its applications in their own married lives. Pemberton letters sound as though husbands and wives thought of each other as sharing roughly equally in the tasks of family life—equally, but not identically. They did not expect or desire identical behavior, duties, rights, or attitudes of both men and women. The women do not seem to have thought a submissive tone and deportment necessarily compromised equality. Actually, the letters of the Pembertons and their friends suggest that Friends thought a woman should be respectful and humble before her husband—such behavior being the ideal for all Friends toward other people and being emphasized instead of mere submissiveness. Furthermore, the letters of the Pemberton women and their female friends suggest that they did not think that their equality with their husbands meant that they had to be consulted on "all matters of importance." What this means is that they had their own peculiar conception of the meaning of equality. And in the estimation of Friends, most of the lives of eighteenth-century Quaker men and women viv-à-vis each other did not represent a violation of their testimony on behalf of equality.

In summary, the Society of Friends influenced a Quaker's conception of the family as a small group and as
a unit in the community. One of the reasons families like the Pembertons thought involvement in the Society to be so necessary was that they depended on the Society to teach and to reinforce family teachings about worthy family life. What then was the possible influence of the Quaker family itself on the Society as a whole— from the Pemberton point of view?

In addition to the Christian ideals which stimulated an interest and an involvement on the part of the Society of Friends in family affairs, there were practical factors which necessitated the Society's reaching out to family groups. The Society depended on families to support the teachings and customs of the Society— for churches, then as now, needed members. Belonging to a religious organization was largely a matter of voluntary association. A person might belong to any one of a number of denominations in Philadelphia, for example. In the eighteenth century the Society of Friends relied heavily upon the cooperation of family groups to maintain the membership. The Pembertons thought a family such as theirs could support the Society through efforts in the home, Meeting, and community. This support is relevant to a study of the concept of the family because family participation both reflected and influenced a conception of the family.
In their own home a family might support the work of the Society in various ways. The letters from home to traveling relations usually called to mind the teachings of the Society on love, patience, and resignation which would help sustain the hope and the confidence of the separated one. Traveling relations returned letters expressing similar ideas—both sides being interested in their relations being preserved in Truth and free from the anxiety of loneliness (though seldom alone). These letters substantiate Bradley Chapin's observation that:

It is a generalization of long standing that religion dominated the seventeenth century and politics the eighteenth. Tested by the American experience of the six decades after 1700, the generalization fails. During those years when the American extended his mental activity beyond mundane matters, his thoughts and words were very apt to be about religion and be colored by it.  

The letters of the Pembertons and their Friends reflect the fact that they conceived of the family as an instrument through which they might, and did, receive divine blessings. One blessing for which they expressed gratitude was the encouragement and instruction in the ways of righteousness and virtue they received from relations. John Pemberton told his brother Israel how much he appreciated the advice and counsel which Israel had written in a letter. However, he did not think the substance of the letter could be attributed
merely to Israel's own store of knowledge, high intelligence, or personal interest in his brother's welfare . . . but that thou [Israel] was assisted, & directed therein, by Our Gracious Benefactor to whom I desire to be kept in an Humble thankfulness . . . "61

The following letters are examples of one way a family reinforced the Society's teachings. A letter from James Pemberton to son Phineas told of his satisfaction that his son had been supported in resignation: "Such is the kindness of the all merciful father that strength is given to sustain equal to the tryals [sic] he is pleased to permit to attend us . . . My mind is preserved in tranquility with ardent desires for the preservation of you . . . "62 In line with the Quaker teachings he explained his son's commendable attitude and good behavior in terms of divine support the boy received rather than in terms of the boy's own personality and determination to please his father. In turn, Phineas showed his awareness of the part relations were to play in support of the teachings of the Society by telling his father that it pleased the son to hear his father enjoyed peace of a divine nature and "Composure of Mind" which would work to relieve the elder Pemberton of the affliction to be endured during his exile.63 Hannah Pemberton wrote to her husband John when he too was in exile assuring him that
she had good reason to thank God. She believed He could be called good because He sustained His people in their times of trouble. She hoped that they would have a "steady" reliance on Him; He was able to deliver those who trusted in Him. Appropriately for a Quaker wife, she wrote: "May his Liveing Presence still Continue to be With thee in thy exiled State . . . ."64

Mary Pemberton also wrote to her husband while he was in exile. Her plea to him not to be anxious about "temporal" affairs at home grew out of her conviction and trust that, as husband and wife, they were one under God. With God's help they could endure " . . . and in due time we may be favour'd to meet once more in Mutability, and if not, in those Blessed Mansions, never more to be separated, and where all Tears will be wiped away." She prayed he would not lose his "firmness of Resolution & a Christian Fortitude"—a fortitude which would allow him to transmit a name to posterity "with Reputation and Honor."65

Some years before, Mary Pemberton had written to Israel: "I am more solitious [sic] for thy Advantage and Experience in the Attainment of divine wisdom and knowledge than about any temporal Concernment whatever and that A blessing from heaven may rest upon our Joynt [sic] Endeavor for the good of those whom it hath pleas'd divine Providence
She thereby reflected and reinforced the teachings of the Society which influenced members to think of their children as trusts committed by God to their care. The Society exhorted parents to begin to teach children about God as soon as they could begin to understand simple lessons.

John Pemberton reiterated the Quaker thought that the Lord often "was pleased to Visit" the souls of His children when they were very young. Thus, children were given a capacity to understand religious truths at a tender age. Children were to be taught, and youth were to be retaught or reminded, that people depend on God for all blessings. They were to learn that it is "Divine providence with whom all things are possible." Even such virtues as patience and resignation were to be understood as "not [at] our own command," but instead "... we must look for assistance in attaining them to him only who is the fullness of all good." By precept and example parents were to use the opportunities of their continuous interaction with their offspring to teach religious truths and behavior consistent with those truths. As the Pembertons recognized, children could not inherit the quality of being religious. Parents could only hope that, if they promoted the cause of religion sincerely, actively, and persuasively (particularly in the home), their offspring would respond positively—in other words, to make the religious
ways of their parents, their own.

John Pemberton thought that, in general, Friends were not careful enough about guiding and supervising their children in the ways of religion. In a letter to Israel Pemberton, Samuel Neale expressed a sentiment shared by the Pembertons when he said he believed "... a religious family to live in & be instructed by, is laying a foundation for a right Building." John Pemberton had implicitly distinguished between the nominally and actively religious families within the Society. To be actively religious, parents had to conscientiously endeavor to teach principles of Truth to their children and to restrain them from being diverted by the lures of Satan. A practical and, indeed, necessary way to accomplish the latter objective was thought to be keeping them busy at useful work and closely supervising them to see that they were not allowed to associate with bad company.

To his son Joseph, Israel Pemberton stressed the fact that "Every event that hath a prospect of thy being engag'd in attention to the infinite benefits of becoming truly Religious affords me greater pleasure than thy obtaining any Temporal Goods ..." He said that he was aware that nothing could be done for one man (by another man—e.g., a father for a son) to ensure that he would receive the "durable riches"—divine blessings of Truth. Rather, the reward
would depend on how reverent, fervent, and constant the man was in following the dictates of Divine Grace.  

Joseph understood his father's concern. He had previously assured Israel that "... my prayers are, that I may be truly concerned, to receive & Join in with the merciful Visitations of Divine Grace, from time to time afforded [sic] to me, & then have I no doubt but thy heart will be made glad on my account."  

The Pembertons and other Friends thought families could and should support the purposes and work of the Society not only in the home, but also in the Meeting. They could go to the various Meetings as a family group; this meant adults should take children and youth with them. In the Meeting, they could contribute to the good order of the assembly by waiting quietly upon the Lord—but not so passively as to allow themselves to go to sleep. Also, they could teach their children how to behave in the Meeting—partially through their own good example and partially by explaining and enforcing good behavior. John Pemberton appealed to his nephew Issey to be an example to the younger children in the family by willingly going to Meetings: "... when there Sit quietly, do not look or gaze too much about nor yet fall asleep, but Sit as becomes, a little Friend ... ."  

John thought parents should see that their offspring went to religious meetings at a young age. Recalling his younger days he said he had
"... often Repented that I did not begin earlier to attend them..." Evidently, Thomas Chalkley thought an exemplary child would willingly—even, enthusiastically—go to religious gatherings.

Friends were to take seriously the advices and rules of the Society and follow them in their own lives—for example, by marrying and disciplining their children according to the Quaker way. Both men and woman had many opportunities to assume responsibilities in the Meeting which family members were to encourage each other to do and then support them in their tasks. Friends not only thought they should attend their own religious meetings regularly, but they also thought they should not attend the religious affairs of other groups or allow their children to go to functions of those groups, such as weddings and funerals.

Besides being active in the Society in their own area in the ways for which they were qualified and needed, Friends might be called to travel to other areas to serve the Society—perhaps, as a traveling minister or to accompany a traveling minister. Israel, James, and John Pemberton all traveled in service of the Society—John's travels as a minister being the most extensive. Travel required sacrifices on the part of the family at home, which, if made willingly, would be their way of serving the Society in those circumstances.
Wherever visiting Friends traveled they were welcomed into the homes of Friends in the area—an other way of serving the Meeting.

The Pembertons and other Friends considered each Quaker family to be under an obligation to cooperate with other families to uphold the reputation of the Society. They were to watch over the actions of other Friends to see that their conduct was consistent with the testimonies of the Society. Early Friends stressed that a man's awareness of, and obedience to, the Inner Light would be reflected in virtuous, exemplary conduct. As the years passed, however, it seems the Friends came to give more attention to the members' conduct per se than to their motivation and inner spiritual life. According to Edwin Bronner, William Penn expected the colonials in Pennsylvania to be moved by a deep spirit of dedication to doing the will of God. However, Bronner argues, "the intangible uplifting quality which had been manifest among harassed Quakers in England was all too often missing where they lived in freedom in Pennsylvania." Other historians have argued this decline in religious zeal could largely be attributed to a material prosperity which allowed colonials to indulge in luxuries and leisure activities that diverted their attention from strict religious observances. Thus, Louis Wright, for example, focuses upon the 1720's
and 1730's, rather than the first years of colonization as Bronner does, when he discusses a crucial decline in religious zeal in colonial history. Whatever the beginning date, such interpretations hold that a decline in religious zeal took place. After the decline of the initial Quaker religious zeal, what may have happened was that despite the concern and efforts of the more idealistic Friends: "... morality for most of them had become more vital than radical obedience to the Spirit." This development affected thinking about the family; for the family was to be active in the struggle to maintain high moral standards.
Notes - Chapter V


236

13. [Fry], An Essay on Conduct and Education, p. iv.

14. Ellwood, Life, p. 46. See also p. 37.


24. Ibid., pp. 16-17.

26 Ibid., p. 114.
29 Ibid., p. 331.
30 Ibid., p. 133.
31 Ibid., pp. 417-418.
32 Chalkley, "Youth Persuaded to Obedience, Gratitude and Honour to God and their Parents," in Works, p. 578.
35 Churchman, Account, p. 127.
37 See for example: [Fry], An Essay on Conduct and Education, p. 20; Rachel Wilson, A Discourse Delivered on Saturday the 10th Day of August 1769, (Newport, Rhode Island: Solomon Southwick, 1769), p. 4. Hereafter cited: Discourse.
42 Ibid., pp. 22-30.

43 Society of Friends, From our Meeting for Sufferings held at Philadelphia, for Pennsylvania and New Jersey . . . To Our Friends and Brethren in these and Adjacent Provinces (Philadelphia: n.p., 1769), p. 3.


45 James, A People Among Peoples, pp. 34, 51-54.


47 Rachel Pemberton [to Grace Lloyd?], March, 1754, IX, p. 158.


49 Churchman, Account, pp. 23, 27, 173.

50 John Pemberton to Hannah Pemberton, October 17, 1782, XXXVII, p. 67.

51 John Pemberton to James Pemberton, November 9, 1782, XXXVII, p. 91.

52 Hannah Haydock to Hannah Pemberton, December 12, 1782, XXXVII, p. 116.


55 Groves, The American Woman, pp. 48-49.

56 Penn, No Cross, No Crown, pp. 113, 320.

57 Sophia Hume, A Caution . . . [and] An Address to Magistrates, Parents, Masters of Families, etc. (5th ed.; Newport: Solomon Southwick, 1771), pp. 24, 30; Sophia Hume, Extract From Divers Ancient Testimonies of Friends and Others, Corresponding With the Doctrines of Christianity, Recommended to the Consideration, First of Ministers. Secondly, Elders. Thirdly, to Every Member Who Takes a Plain Outward Appearance
58 See Chapter IV concerning the discussion of attitudes expressed in the Pemberton letters which suggests that most of them implied a sense of equality on the part of the writers with respect to their spouses.

59 According to Frederick Tolles there were four basic Quaker testimonies: equality, peace, simplicity, and community. These testimonies were conceived of as being outward manifestations of the Inner Light—not a set of precisely defined beliefs. Tolles, Atlantic Culture, pp. 1-3.


61 John Pemberton to Israel Pemberton, October 7, 1751, VII, p. 134.

62 James Pemberton to Phineas Pemberton, September 17, 1777, XXX, p. 126.

63 Phineas Pemberton to James Pemberton, September 23, 1777, XXX, p. 142.

64 Hannah Pemberton to John Pemberton, October 5, 1777, XXX, p. 161.

65 Mary Pemberton to Israel Pemberton, October 3, 1777, XXX, p. 156.

66 Mary Pemberton to Israel Pemberton, December 21, 1754, X, p. 60.

67 John Pemberton to Israel Pemberton, December 14, 1752, VII, p. 106.

68 James Pemberton to Phineas Pemberton, June 17, 1773, XXV, p. 28.

69 John Pemberton to Israel Pemberton, December 14, 1752, VIII, p. 106.

70 Samuel Neale to Israel Pemberton, April 2, 1754, IX, p. 159.
241

71 Israel Pemberton to Joseph Pemberton, October 18, 1769, XXI, p. 80.

72 Joseph Pemberton to Israel Pemberton, February 2, 1767, XIX, p. 44.

73 John Pemberton to Issey Pemberton, August 11, 1752, VIII, p. 63.

74 John Pemberton to Israel Pemberton December 14, 1752, VIII, p. 106.


CHAPTER VI

INTEREST IN LEARNING

The Pembertons took an active interest in learning. They conceived of the family as having great responsibilities for education in the community. Their conception of the family actually held parents responsible for educating their children; if the children's parents were not living, other adult family members substituted for the parents. Whether they taught their offspring themselves, or they delegated the task to other members of the family or to someone outside the family, parents still were the ones to be held responsible. The Quaker concept of learning had a definite, though rather subtle, influence on this important aspect of the Pemberton concept of the family. In turn, the evidence suggests that the concept of the family influenced the conception of learning.

The Quaker conception of learning to which reference is made in this paper is defined as a composite of ideas about learning set forth by prominent Quakers whose ideas influenced the thought and behavior of many Quaker families. Herein,
reference to a Quaker conception of learning is not meant to imply the Quakers had a unique concept of learning. It might be concluded after a contrast and comparison with other early American conceptions of learning (a project outside the scope of this paper) that the Quaker concept had more in common with the conceptions held by other groups than it had to distinguish it from them.

In order to understand the nature of the colonial Quaker idea of learning, one must not begin by assuming the colonial expected most learning to occur in schools. Many Quakers objected to the schools of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries which were institutions primarily concerned with the training of the clergy. Criticizing rote-learning required in the course of studying languages, philosophy, and school-divinity, they insisted Christians must concern themselves more with the spirit of Truth than with the letter of accumulated writings. The early Friends stressed that since every man had the Inner Light within himself to guide thought and conduct, even an illiterate man with no schooling could comprehend the message of the Gospel without the aid of a school-trained clergyman. The Quakers accused the schoolmen of obscuring, rather than opening, for laymen the meanings of both texts and events. The arguments which the Friends used to show school-learning
to be nonessential to learning and understanding spiritual truths have been interpreted to mean they rejected education. They did not reject education; nor did they reject the idea of a school—a topic which will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter—as a legitimate institution for the promotion of formal learning.

The Pembertons and other Friends valued learning because they believed that meaning and purpose were given to a man's life commensurate with his knowledge of Truth. According to the Friends, a man's "natural understanding" was insufficient to bring him to a knowledge of Truth. In other words, his innate intelligence alone was not thought to be sufficient to provide him with the essential Truth. Natural abilities were to be rightly improved; improvement could be made by learning to heed divine favor. Through divine favor "... God, who as he seeth meet doth communicate and make known to man the more full, evident and perfect knowledge of his everlasting truth, hath been pleased to reserve the more full discovery ..." for the present.

Learning was conceived of as both an experience and the knowledge obtained as the result of the experience. Quakers professed Christ to be their most important teacher from whom all Friends were to learn throughout their lives.
Friends believed in the existence of the Spirit of Christ in every man; wisdom was to be sought by attending to the message of the Holy Spirit. They were to recognize that the Holy Spirit continues to reveal Truth to men in the same manner as it had inspired the writers of Scripture. Logically, if one believed the Lord continued to reveal Truth to man, rather than believing all Truth had been revealed and recorded in the past to be studied and assimilated by present and future generations, then learning had to be thought of as an experience continuing throughout one's lifetime. While the friends did hold this view, they also placed emphasis on the early years of life—virtually, as a time of learning to learn.

Apparently, most friends shared the view that reflection on the nature of human understanding led not only to a recognition of its serious limitations and imperfections, but also to a deep admiration of the Creator for the extent and power of this understanding. With divine guidance and assistance, men could learn to distinguish between good and evil and between truth and falsehood; moreover, they would be able to choose the former and reject the latter in each case. Such was the Quaker faith and hope, but interpretations of Truth differed and provoked continued controversies particularly over moral questions. Friends
explained such controversies in terms of their belief that the wisdom of God lies far beyond human understanding:
"... no divine truths are contrary to natural reason; yet, as they far transcend it, they are not comprehensible by it ... ."7 Thus, they were back to realities and implications of imperfect human understanding which required renewed determination to seek after Truth in the way of the Lord.

So far the discussion of the Quaker concept of learning has focused upon the interest in Truth—that which in twentieth-century terminology would be called "religious" knowledge. Given the Quaker belief in the efficacy of the teachings of the Inner Light, which was to be supplemented by Scripture and devotional literature, it might be assumed that the Quaker concept of learning began and ended with "religious" subjects. However, the seventeenth- or eighteenth-century Quaker did not draw a line of demarcation between religious life and social life, religious considerations and economic considerations, religious affairs and political affairs, religion and culture—i.e., between the "religious" and the mundane. Life for the Quaker was of one piece. Not only was a person called upon to put what he learned by meditation, reading, listening, and observation into practice, but he was also expected to learn
from the practice itself. In addition, he might learn from the experiences of other people. Since people could benefit from the experiences of others, he was to share meaningful experiences of his own with relatives and friends if he thought the information would serve the purpose of edification. In that way, members of the older generations could be particularly helpful to the younger generations. The Friends regarded the experience of life—the actual living—as being very important. People were to glorify God not merely by knowing the Truth, but also by living it—living virtuous and useful lives. Therefore, the Friends did not conceive of learning in narrowly "religious" terms.

The Quaker ideal called for universal elementary education—to teach fundamental reading, writing, and arithmetical skills. Early Friends advocated the founding of schools under the supervision of the Society for that purpose in order to avoid sending their children to schools "... where they are taught the corrupt ways, manners, fashions, and language of the world, and of the Heathen in their authors, and names of the heathenish gods and goddesses; tending greatly to corrupt and alienate the minds of children into an averseness or opposition against the truth, and the simplicity of it ... ." The Friends did not expect men to advance in the knowledge and life of Truth without
book-learning. What they did demand was that men renounce the use of books in such a way as they would serve as a barrier in the way of living a Christian life.

Friends thought that if people were not careful and discriminating, books could become obstacles rather than aids in the search for Truth. They believed that too much reading might have an oppressive effect. William Penn argued that if a man read indiscriminately and voraciously, quite likely he would become confused. The mass of seemingly unrelated details would obscure the essential simplicity of Truth. They also believed certain types of books had the effect of diverting man's attention away from, rather than focusing it upon, Truth. The Friends thought that although there were worldly manifestations of Truth, there were also worldly manifestations of the Devil. Penn, among others, urged Friends to be selective in their choice of outstanding passages from these books. Such passages were to become the objects of further thought and reflection and/or inspiration for action.⁹

Of course the Friends approved of the Bible and various journals, letters, and pamphlets written by Quakers—considering these to be worthwhile reading matter. The Society recognized the value of the printing press for furthering the aims of the Society with regard to moral and spiritual training.
To that end, the Society itself sponsored the publication and distribution of pamphlets and books. One particularly useful genre was the Quaker journal with its usual earnest and explicit purpose of edifying the author's survivors. Like other writers of published journals, George Whitehead testified to his love of Bible-reading, but he reminded Friends that mere reading of the Bible was not sufficient—a man also had to have faith. Most of the Meetings had libraries which the elders and ministers of the Meeting urged Friends to use. 10

Yet the Friends did not confine themselves to "religious" works. As long as a book did not divert a man's attention away from his intention and ability to serve God—preferably it strengthened his intention and ability—reading of the book might not only be permitted, but also encouraged. Penn himself set an example for Friends by his wide reading. Many Philadelphia Friends followed his example; their private and public libraries contained books which hardly fell within the "religious" category. Indeed, there were titles representing the fields of politics and law, philosophy and conduct, science, medicine, practical arts, history, biography, travel, and even belles-lettres. 11 This is not to say that all Friends read widely, but only to point out that Friends did not feel constrained by a strait
jacket of rigid proscriptions to avoid any reading but that of a "religious" nature. Edward Beatty asserts William Penn thought education should aim at helping a person understand both the world and himself in order to be able to serve others, as well as himself. Therefore, he called upon Friends to read and to study outside the field of religion.  

The Pembertons' reading interests extended beyond religion. Israel Pemberton's own library contained mostly religious works, but the libraries supported by the family, and also, their friends' libraries to which they had access, held many works of varied types. Newspapers and pamphlets also provided the Pembertons and their friends with information. Israel's younger brother Charles had shown great interest in science, as had James' son Phineas.

The Friends advocated what they considered to be practical learning. However, it must be made clear that they did not equate practical and vocational learning, and they did not rule out (in practice, at least) all classical learning. What they opposed was learning for learning's sake alone. The subject matter of elementary learning about reading, writing, and ciphering was not of a strictly vocational nature; yet it certainly was practical. From the Quaker point of view it was practical for two reasons. First, it facilitated a person's spiritual development by
by opening new ways of learning about Truth and of communicating knowledge and insights to others. Second, it allowed people to acquire knowledge necessary to carry on and/or improve their occupational practices and skills.

Although the early Friends' enthusiasm for, and advocacy of, elementary schools established under the supervision of local Meetings did not result in the founding of such a school by most Monthly Meetings in the first half of the eighteenth century, a number of schools were established in the more populous areas. Thus, for example, in 1689 the Monthly Meeting of Philadelphia founded an elementary school under Thomas Makin (the schoolmaster). Furthermore, the Friends in Philadelphia supported not only elementary schools, but also secondary schools. Howard Brinton argues that in these schools children received a religiously guarded education—not a guarded religious education. What he means is that the Friends did not insist that children be taught only religion, but they did want their children protected from corrupt company and activities, as well as from corrupt books. Basically, a book might corrupt a child or young person the same way a book might corrupt an adult—by diverting his attention away from God and turning it toward the Devil. Brinton wished to end the perpetuation of the idea that colonial schools merely taught religion and to emphasize
that the curriculum in Quaker schools did not focus on religion. In reality, the Friends did not think school the most appropriate place to teach religion. Instead, they thought of the Meeting for Worship as the primary setting for group religious education.  

Still, it cannot be denied that, in practice, the Friends did not entirely remove religion from the curriculum. As Monica Kiefer correctly points out, religious and moral lessons permeated the texts used in Quaker schools—e.g., spelling lessons. What Friends were trying to do was to provide an education which would not corrupt the "tender" minds of children and youth. The Friends well understood that: "In every sound system of morals and religion the motives of virtue become more powerful the more the mind is concentrated upon them. It is when they are lost sight of, when they are obscured by passion, unrealised or forgotten, that they cease to operate." So they used textbooks which incorporated morals in ordinary spelling, writing, and reading lessons—textbooks whose writers shared Isaac Watts' philosophy that children and youth could best learn moral principles not by rote-memorization, but by frequent repetition. For example, writing lessons similar to this one in Fisher's text directed the student to copy such lines as the following:

A virtuous minded Youth, will ever love the Truth.  
Add to your Faith Virtue, and to Virtue Knowledge.
Carl and Jessica Bridenbaugh argue that the Friends' indifference to higher education resulted in the Quakers being left out of the leadership in early American education. It is true that the Friends did not found a college comparable to ones founded by the Puritans or other groups. Lest it be assumed that the Friends despised learning above the secondary level, it should be pointed out that they did not. In the main, however, they considered formal schooling beyond the secondary level unnecessary. Howard Erinton interprets Quaker attitudes to mean that they regarded higher learning as education in the school of the Holy Spirit, rather than education through an academic routine at a conventional institution. Moreover, education in the school of the Holy Spirit did not restrict a Friend to inward thought and reflection; for a person might need the help of others' insights and knowledge to understand the Inner Light.

Given the fundamentals of literacy acquired in elementary (and secondary) schools, the Friends thought a man did not need more schooling. On the other hand, they did not pretend that he necessarily knew all he needed to know or that he had perfected the skills which he had been taught. William Penn, for one, thought of education as a lifelong process. What Friends expected was that a man with serious questions and a desire for deeper knowledge
would pursue a course of self-education. While reading to answer his questions and extend his knowledge—and thinking, and perhaps, writing about what he had read—a man would be practicing and perfecting the skills he had learned in school.

The process of learning with which the Pembertons and their contemporaries were familiar (and which was both a cause and effect of their concept of learning) is clearly related to the twentieth-century concept of socialization. The eighteenth-century concept of learning did not confine education to the schools. Bernard Bailyn recognizes this fact and calls for a revision of the history of education in colonial America to correct the distortion created as a result of writing the history of education primarily as the history of the growth of the American school system. He maintains that in order to understand the colonial history of education, the historian should define education “as the entire process by which a culture transmits itself across the generations.”

In effect, this is how colonials thought of education. Colonists worked from the first years of colonization to prevent the struggle for survival in America from resulting in a degeneration to barbarism; for this reason they did their best to preserve and to transmit the cultural heritage of their European past intact to their heirs.
Philippe Aries thinks Europeans of an earlier period "... confused education with culture, spreading education over the whole span of human life, without giving a special value to childhood or youth." If the term "culture" is used in the broad sense in which Bailyn uses it, this statement might be applied to the eighteenth-century American Quakers. Yet they did not think of themselves as being "confused." Indeed, on the basis of their concepts of education, Aries and other twentieth-century scholars might be charged with mistaking the schooling of the younger generation for education. Furthermore, in contrast to the schoolmen and humanists to whom Aries refers, the colonial Quakers did give special attention to the formal education through schooling and/or tutoring for children and youth. On the other hand, their ideal, and to some extent their practice, spread education "over the whole span of human life." They did not think people could learn only in their childhood and youth—nor should they confine learning to their younger days. Actually, it is a matter of two different, though related, concepts of education—not of one group being "confused."

The twentieth-century concept of socialization quite aptly describes the process of learning as it was conceived by the colonial Quaker. According to Talcott Parsons,
"... the central focus of the process of socialization lies in the internalization of the culture of the society into which the child is born." This is exactly what Quakers focused upon in the education of the younger generation. That is not to say the Quakers thought they had a perfect society to be preserved unchanged by their offspring. However, the Friends did think that their culture had within it a possibility for perfection. Basically, they thought if people endeavored both more conscientiously and consistently to live the message of the religion which had become a part of their cultural heritage, then their society could be perfected. Though they, of course, did not speak of "internalization," they did promote internalization of, for example, their interpretation of the Gospel.

Socialization begins when a person is but an infant. Essentially, according to William Kenkel, socialization means:

... the process through which an infant is prepared eventually to take his place in the group into which he was born. Socialization is the process of learning the group's mores and standards and learning to conform to them, of learning the group's traditions, of becoming imbued with a sense of oneness with the group, and of doing all of this to a degree sufficient to command at least the tolerance of one's fellow men. A socialized being has acquired, furthermore, a myriad of physical, mental and social skills that take their form and content from the culture in which they are found.

Kenkel says that actually socialization is education in its
broadest sense. It includes formal and informal, and conscious and unconscious learning. As Ely Chinoy points out, individuals learn values, attitudes, and beliefs not merely by explicit precepts and related overt rewards and punishments, but also through example, suggestion, and implication. The goal of socialization is the development of an adult character and personality compatible with the demands and expectations of the society in which a person lives. Through socialization the individual both learns the specifics which he needs to know and learns how to learn what he will need to know in the future.

Because the colonial Quaker conceived of learning in such broad terms, their concept of learning had a significant effect on their conception of the family. They recognized, as do twentieth-century social scientists, that historically, the family has had and continues to have an important part in the socialization process. In fact, the socialization of the newborn individual begins in the family. Talcott Parsons argues that one of the irreducible functions of the nuclear family is the primary socialization of children. Generally, the Friends thought in terms of responsibilities rather than functions. And while they did not think in terms of objective analysis of the nature of the function of the family in the socialization process, they did become very concerned when
a family or families in the Society failed to fulfill the responsibilities of parenthood which the Society both idealized and assumed would be understood and fulfilled. For, essentially, the Quaker concept of learning affected the concept of the family through the overriding responsibility it placed upon parents to teach their children—and to see that parental teachings were supplemented and reinforced by people in the community whether in school, Meeting, or occupational preparation.

The Friends valued ideas and learning—but not all ideas, nor all learning. The Society taught the value of godly ideas and learning relevant to virtuous thought and action. Since the colonial Friends did not conceive of learning as a specialized task to be accomplished primarily or exclusively in and by the schools, they thought it could be carried on appropriately and effectively in a family setting. That they considered the parents as in large measure responsible for the supervision of the learning of their offspring had the effect of dignifying the family by making the home a center—perhaps, the most crucial center—of the learning which they regarded so highly. It also had the effect of reinforcing the idea of family unity; family members were to look to each other for guidance in, and inspiration for, learning, rather than relying primarily on an
individual outside the family such as a schoolmaster.

The second topic to consider in this chapter concerns the influence of a concept of the family on the concept of learning. Doubtlessly, the family experience itself influenced the concept of learning through the lessons learned by family members about the importance of learning by observing, listening, and doing, as well as by reading and writing. However, for the Pembertons and some of their correspondents, the concept of the family also had an appreciable influence on the concept of learning. The Pembertons thought of the family as a rather inclusive, though unified, group. In spite of the fact that rights and duties were not identical (in ideal or reality), the equality of individual family members was to be recognized and respected. Finally, family members—adults, youth, and children—all had family duties and responsibilities to promote family welfare and harmony. Each of these aspects of the Pemberton concept of the family had an effect on their concept of learning.

Since the Pembertons thought of the family in inclusive terms, they did not draw a distinct line in their minds between family and society so that a person could say (or, for that matter, would even ordinarily want to say) where one ended and the other began. Pemberton hospitality became well known. Through the years they entertained many people
in the Pemberton homes. Guests stayed for dinner, for a day, or for longer. Visiting Friends contributed significantly to the edification of the family--one reason why they were welcomed and appreciated. William Logan told Israel Pemberton how valuable he thought visitors were in Pemberton home life: "... I have Sometimes thought that no person has had Greater Advantages from their Youth up than thou hast, By the frequent private sittings with Friends in Your Family, which often prove the best of Meetings, I can say by Experience . . . ."27 Visiting Friends were to be welcomed into the home, treated with a fatherly or motherly (or sisterly or brotherly) concern for their welfare, and respected for their worthy conduct and ideas.

The Pembertons seem to have lived quite comfortably with the paradoxical assumption of the interdependence of independent families. A fatherly concern for the education of one's own children quite naturally led, for example, to a concern for, and involvement in, the education of children belonging to other families. Thus, Israel Pemberton and other men with a fatherly concern for the education of children worked together in the organization and direction of a school where children would be taught in an atmosphere which would reinforce, rather than undermine, the precepts and practices of a Christian home. According to Israel and
his friends, the creation and maintenance of such an atmosphere for school-learning depended upon the careful selection and supervision of a schoolmaster. Israel, for one, preferred to hire a friend to teach in the school. He agreed with John Woolman:

Children at an Age fit for Schools, are in a Time of Life which requires the patient attention of pious People, and if we commit them to the Tuition of such, whose Minds we believe are not rightly prepared to train them up in the Nurture and Admonition of the Lord, we are in Danger of not acting the Part of faithful Parents toward them; for our Heavenly Father doth not require us to do Evil, that Good may come of it; and it is needful that we deeply examine ourselves, lest we get entangled in the Wisdom of this World, and through wrong Apprehensions, take such Methods in Education, as may prove a great Injury to the Minds of our Children.28

However, finding schoolmasters proved to be a difficult task. The failure to find a suitable master sometimes delayed the opening, or forced the closing, of schools. The overseers of the school often wrote to friends in England to ask them to find a suitable person to teach in the school. Israel, the Elder, had written to John Hunt who succeeded in finding a man but said: "... if the outward appearance of the Man was a true Index of his Mind I Confess shoud [sic] have put the negative upon his going, but we sometimes find a plain & homely Building well furnished within ..." He said he hoped the man would turn out better than expected.
After all: "Tis very difficult to meet with a person every
way Qualified. We have been at no small pains to get such
an one but hitherto have not been able." He closed saying
that if the fellow did not prove himself to be acceptable,
Hunt might perhaps find someone who would be "less liable
to exception." However, he could not do so on short notice.
It would require "a few years."^2^9 (Italics mine.)
John Fothergill wrote at the same time about the schoolmaster.
He hoped although the young man did not meet the highest
standard that "... under prudent directions of the managers,
will in time give satisfaction."^3^0 (Italics mine.)

Schoolmasters were not to be left to themselves
to deal with their pupils solely according to their own
discretion. In sending a child to school a parent merely
was delegating a part of his responsibility for his child to
the schoolmaster. The parent thought he could intervene
legitimately if the master failed to carry out the delegated
responsibility prudently. If a parent could not intervene, or
for some reason did not choose to do so, in the event of his
displeasure with the school environment, he might withdraw
his offspring. Phineas Pemberton withdrew his son Israel
from Thomas Makin's school because of the harsh punishment
administered by Makin's assistant.^3^1 Israel the Younger's
son, Joseph, served as a trustee and visitor for a school
according to a typical plan whereby Friends were to visit
the school regularly to see that the master behaved exemplarily
and taught satisfactorily. The trustees and visitors
not only were to find qualified masters for the school, but
also to discharge masters if and when it became evident that
they could not, or would not, perform their duties in a manner
consistent with the principles and goals of Christian parents.
Learning in the schools was to be related to (or an extension
of), rather than a departure from, learning at home.

The time and energy expended in tending to the affairs
of a school by such men as Israel and Joseph Pemberton were
not thought of as being taken away from the time and energy
to be devoted to family affairs. The Pembertons, among others,
assumed that the quality of family life was dependent upon
the quality of community life. They knew family members would
associate with people outside the immediate family circle;
therefore, it was important to see that these associations
were beneficial. While fostering beneficial associations
among children and youth under adult supervision, a school
also could prepare young people for their future roles as
worthy adult members of the community. Apprenticeship
arrangements reflected a similar concern of parents for the
learning of their children to be consistent with family
values.
Because the Pembertons thought of themselves as being a unified group, family members encouraged each other in such matters as learning. Thus, when Abigail, the sister of Israel Pemberton, the Elder, was a young woman she wrote to her brother to find out how their little sister Prisila liked school and whether or not she was likely to do well. Abigail instructed Prisila to be a good girl and "larn well"—then Abigail would love her. Years later, Israel, the Younger, wrote to his brother John to encourage "a faithful improvement of thy [John's] Talent." In turn, John wrote to Israel's son Issey advising him to: "Love to go to School & be diligent at thy Books . . . ."34 The Pembertons did not think of learning as being solely an individual matter—something which a person should have complete freedom to pursue in any direction he might choose or to neglect because of apathy, laziness, or other interests. What any family member thought and did (e.g., with respect to learning) was considered to be a family matter. This is not to say family members had no freedom or private life; it is only to point out that people thought family members could offer their advice, encouragement, and opinions, or administer exhortation when circumstances warranted it without being accused of undue interference.

Family unity did not require that family members
restrict their learning experience to the homes, Meetings, and schools in the immediate vicinity. The Pembertons seem to have shared the view of one William Coleman who wrote to James Pemberton about his preference for home—a preference which did not lead him to argue that other people should share his view without first having had similar experiences: "As far as my Experience goes the greatest Happiness arises, not so much from new Scenes & Entertainments, as from a Steady quiet Mind & the Consciousness of doing right, and this Sort of Happiness a Man may find at home; and yet I believe it proper that a young man should see the World to be better convinced of the little it affords." 35 Israel, James, and John all traveled abroad when they were young men. When John was in London, his father encouraged him to stay abroad longer if a more extended stay would contribute to the legitimate ends of the travel experience—"... the attaining true knowledge and experience in the great End & purpose of Living ... " 36

Not only men and boys, but also women and girls, were thought to be able to, and indeed, obliged to learn. The assumption of equality of male and female family members, however, did not lead to the conclusion that women needed to learn everything men needed to learn or vice versa. Both were to learn to glorify God. Both were to learn such basic
skills as reading and writing. However, other subjects were to be taught to whichever sex would need the information and skill—for example, sewing to girls and women, and surveying to boys and men. Such differences were regarded not as being contrary to the idea of equality, but as being a practical reflection of the nonidentical, but complementary tasks, carried out by men and women.

Furthermore, parents, without denying the fundamental equality, identified and made provision for their children's individual differences if it were possible. Pemberton parents did not think of learning in rigid, standardized terms. For example, James Pemberton recognized in his son Phineas an unusual capacity to learn. James proceeded to give special attention to Phineas' education so that his son could improve his talents. Before Phineas had reached his seventh birthday, his father had placed him under the tutelage of Robert Proud, who became a well known schoolmaster. Proud had just recently arrived in Philadelphia—with high recommendation. He came for the purpose of teaching a few boys "... for which purpose I [James] accommodated [sic] him with a convenient room contiguous to my own dwelling, and a residence in my family ..." Phineas' progress pleased his father. An illness interrupted, but did not curtail, his studies; nor did the illness result in James withdrawing his
interest and support from his son's studies. James admired his son not only for his store of knowledge and sound judgment, but also for his aversion to proud display of his accomplishments. Though the Pembertons admired an offspring like Phineas for his outstanding learning abilities and achievements, they did not indicate in their letters that they expected identical abilities in, and achievements from, the other Pemberton sons and daughters.

The Pembertons thought that as family members, every person had certain duties and responsibilities both within and outside the immediate family. Such responsibilities were time-consuming, if not always difficult. Thus, they thought formal or semi-formal learning should be practical and be accomplished in a minimum of time. Practical learning prepared a person to assume new responsibilities in a family or enabled the individual to better fulfill old responsibilities. Because the Pembertons thought of basic family duties as virtually unchanging—generation to generation—they placed a high value on experience. Hence one generation passed along their concept of learning to the next generation. Parents instructed, reasoned with, and disciplined their children on the basis of their own experiences in the family setting. In turn, the fact that parental authority was rooted in experience constituted
one reason why children respected their parents.

It is a moot question whether Quaker ideas concerning learning had a greater influence on ideas about the family, or the reverse was true. What is important to note is the fact that there was a significant interrelationship among these ideas which was manifest in Quaker thought and action during the colonial period—the Quaker Pembertons included.
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CHAPTER VII

PRODUCTIVE LIVES

The economic history of colonial America shows Philadelphia attained a position of commercial supremacy only after considerable experimentation. In the mid-1720's Philadelphia evidenced neither great wealth, nor great poverty. Most people lived in solid, though simple comfort. When trade began to yield steady profits, some merchant families accumulated great wealth. So it was with the Pemberton family. Israel Pemberton, the Elder, died a wealthy man. He had become one of Philadelphia's leading merchants—specializing in English cloth. Although his sons Israel, the Younger, and James became well known for their political and philanthropic activities, and John gained recognition for his work as a Quaker minister, all three were also merchants.

As a group the merchants of colonial America made a great contribution to the economic growth and development of the colonies through their leadership in, and support for, farming, mining, and manufacturing, as well as
trade. Historians have long recognized the importance for economic expansion of family connections and alliances. Families involved in the process of early American economic development certainly recognized the importance of family cooperation, also. Partnerships and single proprietorships constituted the major forms of business organization. Due to the provisions of unlimited liability for a company's commitments, a partner ran a high risk of being ruined by an imprudent partner. A merchant, for example, wanted to know, to approve, and to trust the character, objectives, and motives of a potential partner before making a partnership agreement. Thus, men tended to rely on trusted family members whenever possible. For instance, in 1749, James Pemberton considered entering into a partnership with his brother John.2

The effect, though not the explicit intention, of the cumulative efforts of the colonial merchants was American economic development. Colonial merchants like Israel Pemberton, the Elder, and Israel Pemberton, the Younger, led productive lives. The answers to three fundamental questions pertaining to economic matters provide valuable insights into the Pemberton concept of the relationship between the family and economic thought and action. First, what was the relationship between the religious ideas of Quaker families
like the Pembertons and economic thought and activity?
Second, what was thought to be the correct relationship
between a man's business and his family life? Third, how
were parents to prepare their offspring to assume the
economic responsibilities of maturity?

What was the relationship between Quaker religious
ideas and economic thought and activity? The Society of
Friends repeatedly warned people against the "inordinate"
pursuit of worldly goods and treasures. The Society opposed
a preoccupation with economic affairs which they insisted
led to the mind being "... Carried away with the Love
and care of these things [which] then become (even to those
who do not transgress the bounds of Justice) a Clogg [sic]
& Hindrance to its Attendance on the Duties of Religion . . . ." 3
Reflecting this idea, John Pemberton called upon his brother
James to: "... Suffer not the multiplicity of business
& the Cumbering things of this life [to] divert thy mind
from this Exercise [waiting upon the Lord for guidance]
for the Soul cannot Sustains in Health without receiving the
Holy food day by day which comes down from God out of
Heaven . . . ." John pointed out that the tumult of every-
day affairs made meditation difficult, but not impossible,
for one determined to accomplish his religious duties. 4
Edward Stabler wrote to John that he understood the danger
posed by the "hurry of outward Concerns" for religious concerns and reported he was trying to bring his "... affairs into a narrow Compass & have less Incumbrance [sic], if I may be favour'd to accomplish it."\(^5\)

Women, as well as men, might become involved in worldly affairs to the exclusion of religious concerns. They had important duties to perform particularly with regard to the household economy. Hence, the Meeting exhorted women to attend to the worship of God: "Let not the trifling Occurrences of Life prevent your assembling for that purpose both on the first & other Days of the Week nor from keeping to the appointed time for Meeting a Neglect which manifests a want of Love to him unto whom we are indebted for all ... ."\(^6\)

The Society reminded Friends of the scriptural teaching which identified a love of money, not money itself, as the root of all evil.\(^7\) Worldly goods to be purchased with that money were to be thought of as uncertain at best; for worldly goods could be, and often were, ruined, lost, or destroyed. Not only were the goods of the world thought to be uncertain, but the uncertainty of life itself was emphasized. A man and wife should work together "... not so much to get wealth or honor in this world, as to Lay up treasure in heaven ... ."\(^8\) People should rely on the Spirit of Truth
to guide them through this "Uncertain World." If they carefully obeyed the Spirit they could hope for the lasting 
"... Comfort & Peace of mind to an endless Eternity of Bliss."^9 To be truly obedient to the Spirit would be to be pursuing one's real interests. Israel Pemberton urged his son Joseph steadfastly to pursue his "real" interests. Israel worried about his son's becoming confused, diverted, or forgetful of the fact that the blessing of the Lord alone could make a man truly rich.10

However, according to the Quakers, a man or a family could not expect to be blessed by God for doing nothing. Neither could they expect to earn a virtuous reputation among Friends through inactivity. Friends learned from the Gospel that men would be known by their "fruits." (Matt. 7:20.) They thought of each individual's talents as God-given and as requiring improvement. Israel Pemberton advised his brother John to maintain "... a situation of Life & a Disposition of Mind, to render thee ready & capable of improving the Skills & Talents given thee to thy eternal advantage & Honour of the Giver ..."11 People were to be industrious, as well as temperate, moderate, frugal, prudent, honest, just, humble, charitable, and benevolent.12 John Pemberton merely expressed a Quaker consensus when he argued men should not be slothful or indolent.13 Friends were to waste neither
time, nor talents and resources; for Friends were "... to render an account how we employ those precious Hours which he [the Lord] has given us to work out our Salvation in." Due to the uncertainties of Life, one could not know how much time he would be given; he could not afford to waste any time. Besides, the Friends thought idleness usually led to evil activities which definitely should be avoided. An obvious way to avoid the evils of idleness would be to engage in useful activities.

It is not surprising that the Pembertons read from the works of Matthew Hale who, although he was not a Quaker, clearly presented ideas attuned with Quaker thinking. Hale maintained that a man had no time to waste in this life. He laid down a concise set of rules for ordering everyday affairs to the best advantage. The thought and action of many Friends reflected the acceptance of these rules as criteria for judging the merit of conduct. Hale's rules called upon a person: 1) to avoid involvement in sinful activities; 2) to avoid idleness; 3) to avoid unnecessary sleeping, eating, visiting, studying, and relaxing; 4) to see that all studies worked to uphold the cause of the Lord; 5) to work at one's own calling as an act of duty to the Lord; 6) to observe special times set aside for tending to religious duties; 7) to reserve time for prayer,
meditation and reading of God's Word. The Society taught that covetousness, pride, self-interest, and "inordinate" pursuit of worldly treasures would obstruct a man's or a family's growth in Truth. People could develop and apply the virtues which both grew out of, and led to, Truth and, at the same time, overcome or avoid the bad qualities and evil habits which were the obstacles to Truth, through diligent employment in life's necessary affairs. Although the Friends did not equate or identify business interests and real interests, for example, they did think that the two might be pursued simultaneously. They thought that if and when material goods were "... sought in due Bounds for the comfortable Support of ourselves and Families, and for the Relief of others in Necessity, [it] is not only lawful but Commendable ..." (Italics mine.) Men received the freedom to work for necessary food, clothing, and shelter. The Quaker teaching by no means required men to renounce all worldly possessions. On the contrary, men were to work for the "lawful" things—in other words, the necessities of daily life. Friends did not think of the acquisition of lawful things as a "contemptible concern." The Quaker teachings upheld the legitimacy of hard work to provide the necessities of life for the family—the necessities, not the extravagances of life. Pious Quakers
warned that the flesh loves ease; therefore, it was quite natural for men to desire luxury and unnecessary comforts. Quakers were exhorted to beware of this natural disposition and to overcome temptations. Men should "... labor to content themselves with such a plain Way and manner of Living as is most agreeable to the Self denying Principles of Truth ... "

John Pemberton argued a man could be industriously engaged in necessary economic activity and still have his mind fixed and centered on things above, but he also perceived that worldly successes often resulted in the mind being "... by degrees drawn off from its proper Center ... "

In the history of Quaker merchants, the conscientious attempt to lead a virtuous life by trying to be frugal, honest, punctual, prudent, etc., resulted in substantial economic success. The Quakers attributed such economic success to the blessing of the Lord on earthly endeavors. Matthew Hale expressed what seems to have been the Quaker idea of a commendable attitude toward wealth:

I did not esteem myself the richer at all for my multitude of riches; I esteemed no more given me than what was in a reasonable manner proportional to my necessities, to my charge and dependence, and to the station I had in the world; all the rest I looked upon as none of mine but my Master's; it was rather my burden than my possession; the more I had, the more was my care, and the greater the charge that I had under my
hands, and the more was my solicitude of my Master; but my part was the least that was in it: indeed I rejoiced in this, that my Master esteemed me wise and faithful, committing the dispensation hereof to my trust; but I thought it no more mine, than the lord's baily or the merchant's cash-keeper, thinks his master's rents or money his.22

Although few Friends would have disputed the validity or worthiness of the testimony of simplicity, in practice many compromised where the principles of simplicity were concerned. With increases in family wealth, the definitions of simplicity changed perceptibly. What had once been defined as an extravagance came to be regarded as a necessity—for example, a larger house, a carriage, additional furniture, expensive yard goods. Despite the fact that Quaker ladies wore dresses devoid of superfluous ornamentation such as buttons, buckles, and ribbons, they had dresses cut from fine, costly fabric. As Frederick Tolles points out, a change in the spirit of Quakerism accompanied the growth in wealth.23 Because Quakers ultimately attributed their successes to the blessing of the Lord, they thought a man should be thankful for, rather than feel guilty about, successes.

On the other hand, Friends did not think poverty constituted a crime, a disgrace, or a punishment which necessarily indicated God's displeasure due to its being a
way He chastised wrongdoers. In this, their attitude toward poverty, the Friends differed from the Puritans. The Society of Friends called upon people to have respect for the poor. The poor were to be considered as the children of God and treated accordingly; they were not to be considered to be a burden. The London Meeting reminded Friends: "... where our poor are well provided for, and walk orderly, they are an ornament to our society; and the rich should consider, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive'; and that he who gives to the poor, lends to the Lord, who will repay it again." They said: "... the poor (both parents and children) are of our family, and ought not to be turned off to any others, to be either supported or educated." Men were not to become discouraged and acquire self-defeating attitudes as a result of setbacks or failures in business. With the advice, encouragement, and help of friends, they could hope to benefit from their mistakes.

The second question to consider in this chapter concerns what was thought to be the correct relationship between a man's business and his family life. Scholars who discuss the family as an economic institution focus upon, for example, the family as a custodian of property (marriage portions, dowries, inheritances) and as a unit of production and consumption. The Pembertons and their contemporaries did
not think of the family as an economic institution even though they did understand the important role of their own families in the economy.

The male head of the family assumed the primary responsibility for the economic affairs of the family in matters involving contacts with the community. The economic activity of the female head of the family centered in the home. The necessary and legitimate economic role of the man in the community was to be twofold. First, he was to provide the necessities of life for the family. Second, he was to use surplus funds, if any, to help people in distress—both relations and non-relations. William Penn recommended Friends cast up their income and live on one half or it—one third of it, if possible. They were to reserve the rest of it to spend for emergencies and unforeseen expenses, charities, and portions.  

Basically, a man’s business affairs were to be considered as a means to an end—as a means to earn a living. Friends warned against losing sight of the objective of economic activity. If a man became so involved in his business dealings that he forgot or ignored his family’s welfare, he would be advancing along a self-defeating course—from the point of view of the Society of Friends. Isarel Pemberton occasionally reflected upon how easy it was to become so
involved in, and burdened by, the encumbrances of business that to extricate oneself proved to be difficult. He suggested his brother John avoid getting involved in the first place because Israel thought it was easier to avoid initial involvement than to withdraw after once getting involved.29

A man's business was to be organized and operated for the welfare of his family. He was not to manipulate his family to suit his business interests. The Pemberton letters and other Quaker writings did not idealize business itself; however, Quaker ideals did encompass economic goals and the spirit in which activities were to be carried on. Thus, the Quakers did not urge people to have many children in order to have many family workers to help in amassing a family fortune. And, on the other hand, the Friends did urge parents to work hard to ensure the economic welfare of offspring. Chalkley went so far as to say a man who did not care for his family was worse than an infidel.30 Parents who provided well for their children gained respect and admiration for their prudence. In colonial Philadelphia, a business failure which undermined the economic security of a family was "... a cause of general and deep regret."31 Such a failure might seriously undermine a family's reputation in the community. Since, in turn, the reputation of the Society of Friends depended upon the reputation of the
families belonging to the Society, it concerned itself with both the welfare of all family members and the business ethics of the heads of families.

Friends thought the Society should act to prevent deprivation of Friends suffering temporary financial set­backs, as well as of the impoverished whose economic difficulties extended over longer periods of time. Apparently, Quakers like Israel Pemberton did not think that charitable assistance would sap the recipients' desire or willingness to work. The Friends thought that along with administering outright material aid, they had a right and duty to exhort and to advise poor Friends in order to assist or encourage them to try to do better in the future. In the case of dire financial circumstances, the Society might take the offspring away from the parents for the purpose of protecting the children and youth from the sufferings of severe deprivation. The reason for taking the children away from their parents was a concern for the welfare of the children; it was not considered to be a way to punish the parents.32

With respect to business ethics the Society instructed its members to keep their word in all business dealings. Early Friends served as models for their honesty and uprightness in their business affairs. The Society counseled Friends—for the love of the Lord and their own good—to: 
"... keep to such Lawful and honest Employments as they will understand and are able to manage for a necessary Support of themselves and Families..." 33 Men were to recognize that when the terms of a business agreement were unfulfilled, unnecessary but serious hardships might be brought upon an innocent party whose family would also suffer as a result. Business affairs were to be undertaken with the interests of the families (who always were indirectly involved) in mind. Men should trade only within their abilities; they should not overextend themselves financially. Debts were to be paid promptly and in full, regardless of whether the creditor was rich or poor. Furthermore, Friends were admonished against taking advantage of the sympathy and good will of Friends. Whenever a man found himself in unexpected difficulties, he was to do all he could to solve the problems quickly.

If Friends suspected a family's fortunes had been declining, they could visit the family to advise on courses of action to reverse the trend. If the family did not take the Friends' advice, the Society was to deal with them. 34 Isaac Sharpless argues that the articles of discipline of the Society preserved the Quakers' reputation for honesty, prudence, and shrewdness in business. While the Society succeeded in reforming some delinquents, it expelled others. 35 A man
might be disciplined for bankruptcy; ultimately, if he failed to reform, he might be expelled. Only after his death did Friends discover that John Kinsey, a prominent Friend, had misappropriated some three thousand pounds for his own purposes while acting as a trustee of the General Loan Office. Kinsey had been Clerk of the Yearly Meeting as well as Chief Justice, Attorney General, and Speaker of the Assembly in Pennsylvania. Too late to discipline Kinsey in order to preserve the reputation of the Society, the executors of his will did what they could to preserve the Kinsey name by clearing his debt. Their letters indicate the Pembertons assented to the formal positions and actions of the Society when they did not participate actively in the formulation of those positions and in the decisions about appropriate courses of action.

Young Friends were not to judge prospective mates on the basis of their accumulated wealth; yet they were to be practical insofar as they were to marry a partner who would be industrious, frugal, and prudent. John Woolman, for one, claimed poor laborers, as well as other people, could live comfortably with their families by a moderate industry and frugality. Although he expected parents to provide a suitable education for their children, he warned them against too much labor which would result in their
being too tired to respond to the needs of their offspring. Even a person of inherited wealth might not be able to support a family adequately; if he did not manage his affairs with sound judgment, he might waste his fortune without saving enough to care for his family. On the other hand, as Israel Pemberton reminded his brother John, with "a very moderate care & industry [the family fortune] will be sufficient [to live on] little more being necessary than to keep from wasting what is already provided for us." Israel himself had not followed such a course—concentration on mere careful management and use of the family wealth. Instead, he engaged actively in trade and became quite caught up in business affairs. During the 1740's he accumulated a fortune in his own right through shrewd management of his trading ventures.

Theodore Thayer postulates that Israel Pemberton, the Younger, began his own business about the time of his first marriage. Fathers often established their sons in business upon the occasion of marriage. When a young man begun his own family, it was necessary and fitting that he undertake the steady employment of business affairs. Such family life and occupational endeavors were regarded as a "means of his [a young man's] becoming a useful member of Society . . . ." Therefore, Pemberton parents willingly
helped their children get started. They did not think in terms of building "rugged individualists" by forcing them to leave the family home of their parents and begin a family home of their own without assistance.

Heads of families might legitimately leave their families upon occasion to attend to business affairs, but they were to make provisions for the care of the family during the time of their absence. On their part, family members left at home were to bear the separation in patience.

Ideally, then, the correct relationship of a man's business to his family life was a supportive one—business activities were to be planned and executed for the support of the man's family. The final question to discuss is how parents were to prepare their offspring to assume the economic responsibilities of maturity.

First, the Friends thought parents should develop proper attitudes in their children. Children and youth were to be taught respect for industry, frugality, order, prudence, etc. The French observer Jean Pierre Brissot de Warville attributed the Quakers' skillful management of their economic affairs to: "... the order which the Quakers are accustomed from childhood to apply to the distribution of their tasks, their thought, and every moment
of their lives. They carry this spirit everywhere . . . it economizes time, activity and money. 45

Parents were not to lavish worldly goods upon their children which would tend to promote pride and vanity. On the contrary, they were to teach true humility to their children and guide them in the rejection and avoidance of superfluous activities and material goods. John Woolman argued persuasively for the plain and simple life by pointing out that less exertion would suffice to satisfy a simple lifestyle than an extravagant one. More importantly, he believed, when people contented themselves with a plain style of life, a true peace and coherence subsisted. Ideally, the Friends maintained it was more important to leave children with a love and understanding of Truth, than with money. 46

Second, Quaker parents were not to set out to earn a great deal of money so that their children would never have to work. Thomas Chalkley, among others, asserted that young people would probably waste what their parents gave them anyway. 47 Parents would do better to plan to use their savings for such things as providing for themselves in old age so that they would not be a burden on other people.

The colonial Quaker mind placed no stigma on work; it did place a stigma on idleness. The Friends thought of this world as being God's world—a world in which God called
upon men to accept the responsibility for certain tasks. The Friends respected people who carried out their tasks in good faith. Because they thought of tasks as being God-given, they had little patience with people who avoided work. They associated idleness with vice and vanity. Friends thought it would be a dangerous disservice to young people if they grew up never having to do any work. The experience of honest work taught the invaluable lessons of self-discipline, frugality, and humility. Quakers thought of learning to work as being a part of character development. Many Quaker teachings impressed upon individuals the uncertainty of worldly riches. A parental estate might be destroyed or substantially diminished as a result of human mismanagement, miscalculation, or extravagance, or the fluctuations of the economy. In that event, offspring would be left without sufficient resources for family support. What was thought to be even more critical was the fact that an untrained and inexperienced person would be left without the capacity to extricate himself from his straitened circumstances.

The Quakers, therefore, emphasized that people should prepare themselves and their offspring for contingencies. The Society urged all Friends—rich or poor or of the middling sort—to train their children "in some useful and necessary employments." Training might be given in the family
business, or in the business of a friend or stranger through the system of apprenticeship. If training were to center in the home, a young person might naturally work through progressively greater responsibilities rather rapidly since he had the advantage of growing up with the business. However, Israel Pemberton, the Younger, for one, opposed rushing a young man into the responsibilities of business affairs. For example, when a young person traveled, Israel thought he should have as his principal objective "... By acquaintances with wise & good men to gain Instruction & experience, which enlarges our understandings & excites our Inclinations to pursue a course of Life in which we may be really Serviceable & Helpful to those among whom we live." Israel remembered his own stay in Britain as a young man and thought he had been too involved in business affairs to benefit from conversations with good people whose company he believed could have afforded satisfaction, friendship, and self-improvement.50

The Pembertons and their correspondents approved of the idea of apprenticeship for both rich and poor youth for the purpose of training them. The Pembertons and others conceived of apprenticeship as an extension of the family experience. That this was so was reflected in both the attitudes of those interested in placing their offspring
out in the home of another and in the attitudes of those who considered taking an apprentice into their home and business. A man, for example, who wanted to apprentice his son to a merchant in order to have the merchant introduce the young man to the intricacies of trade, looked not only for a shrewd, successful merchant, but also for a man capable of both exercising the authority of a firm father, and advising and directing the youth in matters of religion and morals. For the master was to act not only as a teacher, but also as a father. For that reason, Friends preferred to apprentice their offspring to Quaker masters. In fact, the Society advised Friends to apprentice youth to members of the Society whenever possible. Friends wanted to place their offspring in a good Christian family which would be a good influence on the young person during the formative years.

On the other side of the agreement, the master wanted a dependable young person who could be expected to respect and to conform to family traditions and rules—a person who would not undermine family unity and harmony. Ideally, an apprentice was to fit into the family group and be treated as a family member.

The Pembertons and their correspondents did not suggest in their letters that they thought the apprenticeship
system weakened families—either the families of apprentices or the families of the masters. Since the Pembertons were active and prominent in the Society of Friends, were considered to be members of a leading merchant family, and were willing to perform various favors for Friends, they often received requests from Friends outside, as well as from within, Philadelphia to help in finding suitable places for apprentices. For example, Richard Partridge wrote to Israel Pemberton on behalf of his grandson, Richard Wells. Partridge asked Israel to make arrangements for the apprenticeship of Wells to a "sober and Solid Friend." He wanted steady employment for the sixteen-year-old lad for a period of five years. Partridge recommended Wells for his sober and orderly behavior—unusual, he thought, for a fellow of Well's age. To Pemberton's discretion Partridge left the decision to whom Richard would be bound. He also asked Pemberton to give advice and exhortation to Wells when needed for the purpose of seeing that the young fellow keep to the habits and speech of the Friends and attend Meetings regularly. In another instance, Edmund Peckover wrote to John Pemberton to ask John to find a person who would:

... be willing to take the proper [sic] Care of a Youth for four or 5 Years Apprenticeship in almost any branch of suitable
Business where an Industrious & religious attention would be agreeably devoted towards him & you should think it an eligible Situation to place our Son Joseph at ... [Peckover had a] strong desire of placing him out where he may be industriously employed, judiciously improved, & his conduct & morals religiously attended to, wh tho' earnestly our wish to have exercised towards him at home yet ... I am sensible [sic] that a further restraint & management over him is necessary beyond wh I can consistently give not that I think him intractable or y' least viciously disposed but an active & spirited cast wh wants to be tempered with more Solidity & application.52

The system of apprenticeship not only furnished the master with labor and the apprentice with training, but also frequently established the basis for a future business arrangement—either between the apprentice and the master or between the apprentice and relations or friends of the master. For example, Israel Pemberton, the Elder, had been an apprentice of Samuel Carpenter. As a reward for satisfactory service, Pemberton received a share in Carpenter's business. After being an apprentice in the Pemberton family, Ezekiel Edwards became a partner in a business with James Pemberton.53

Although the Pembertons cooperated with parents in finding apprenticeship arrangements to prepare young people for the work they were to do as adults, they did not state clearly in their letters exactly what role they thought parents ought to have in the determination of the
careers to be followed by their sons. In their trading ventures, Israel, James, and John followed the same career as their father. Whether the sons merely accepted both a parental assumption that the sons would engage in trade and parental guidance and assistance, or there was a discussion in which other alternatives received consideration, was not made clear in their extant letters; but the letters did not allude to any major disagreements or reconciliations that would have indicated debates on the subject occurred. Seemingly, none of Israel Pemberton the Elder's sons faced a dilemma comparable to one confronted by Isaac Foster, Jr., a friend of John Pemberton. According to Isaac, his father planned to place Isaac in the shop of a retail linen draper, "...but I find I am by no means cut out for such a business, to serve behind a Counter..." Isaac did not say his father would force him to accept the position; he merely said in closing that it remained to be decided where he would be settled. 54

The matter of making wills constituted another parental responsibility for the future economic well-being of offspring. The settlement of a family estate provides one example of an economic matter which might divide, rather than unite, a family. The awareness of the possibility, even probability of discord arising over the division of an estate resulted
in the Society of Friends urging members to make their wills long before they expected to have them go into effect. The Society reminded people that death might come at any time and that preparation of a will might prevent needless contention and ill-feeling.

Israel Pemberton, the Younger, died without leaving a will. According to his son Joseph, he had had two wills, but during the illness which ended in his death Israel had canceled both. Although his relations and friends had pleaded with him to make clear his intentions as to the disposition of his estate, he had refused. They explained his refusal in terms of his losing his ability to reason during the course of the illness. After his father's death, Joseph asserted his determination to avoid conflict with his sisters. He also claimed both to be "deeply affected at the Disposition" which they had shown regarding the matter of who would take custody of Israel's granddaughter Molly, and to "... Wish it may not have lain the foundation of uneasiness that will take much time to obliterate." He had been trying to help settle the matter between the two sisters. It was such family disputes the Society tried to help prevent. Over a month later, Joseph wrote to his wife Nancy to tell her that no agreement had been reached on the way to divide real estate, and he expected it to be a difficult problem which would
take considerable time to solve.55

Although the Pembertons did not conceive of the family as being fundamentally an economic institution, they did not deny, or overlook, the close relationship between the family and the economy. They did not think of an individual family member's economic role or function in total isolation or strictly in terms of the economy--apart from other aspects of his own life or of society. Rather, they simply thought families should help people to live productive lives in the community.
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CHAPTER VIII

SOCIALIZING AND SOCIAL ORDER

In discussing the Pemberton idea of the place of the family in the community, it is instructive to consider the social role of the family in broad terms. The Pembertons and their friends thought a family should be sociable. They did not think a family should avoid all social contacts but those which directly related to religious duties, educational development, and business affairs. Moreover, the Pembertons thought a family should show an interest in, and contribute to, the good order and improvement of the community in ways other than through the organized activities of the Meeting, school, and business.

The thought of the Pembertons and their friends contributed to the maintenance of an equilibrium between family and society. The Pembertons thought neither that a person should turn his attention to his family to the exclusion of active and knowledgeable participation in the affairs of the community, nor that he should become involved in social affairs to an extent resulting in neglect of his
family responsibilities. Contacts with people in the community did not have to be confined to people engaged in the same church, school, and business activities. Rather, the Pembertons thought people should be friendly and pleasant in their many informal conversations and associations, as well as in more formal situations; in other words, they should be sociable. They approved of socializing not only between individuals or individuals and other families, but also between families. For the Pembertons, a vacuum between family and society did not exist; at least they did not perceive such a vacuum. Even though Friends warned each other to avoid evil company and evil activities, such as evil forms of recreation, they did not classify all non-Friends as evil—nor did they mean to suggest Friends should shun all recreational activities.

Virtuous thought and conduct characterized a person thought by Friends to qualify as "good" company. John Pemberton once said good company was both very instructive and agreeable.¹ Such an observation suggests he understood and accepted the fact that an individual might be pious, knowledgeable, and industrious; yet, he might also be disagreeable—i.e., incompatible. Hence, he could not be called good company. On the other hand, a "merry," compatible person of unworthy character might lead his companions to unprofitable chat and associations marked only by frivolity.²
Such individuals certainly could not be considered good company. A person should strive to be both virtuous and affable and to choose his companions on the basis of their virtue and affability. In other words, he should try to be a "good" companion and to associate with "good" companions.

Quaker parents were both to encourage their children to talk to, and to play with, virtuous companions and to restrain their offspring from playing with "rude" children. If impressionable children had "rude" companions, adults could expect that the younger generation would learn bad habits which would, in turn, probably lead to greater evils. Friends knew that as their offspring grew up contacts with rude people—both immature and adult—would become unavoidable. Friends urged young people and adults to uphold Quaker ideals in social situations where they had to associate with people whose moral codes and everyday thought and conduct differed markedly from those of the Friends. Friends, thereby, would be giving testimony for the way of Truth with the hope of being an influence for good.³

The segment of the Philadelphia community with which the Pembertons maintained their closest contacts was the Quaker segment. Partial explanation for the absence of a void separating the Pemberton family from the community at large lies in the fact that the Society of Friends defined
itself in terms of the community—though the perceived relationship between the Society and society did not remain static throughout the colonial period. In the early years of Quaker history, their common experience of divine presence and of persecution had given rise to a strong sense of community within the Society in the Old World. The founding of Pennsylvania gave the Friends an opportunity to worship without persecution (preserving that privilege constituted a major interest in government with respect to their religion). Friends, particularly in the early years, maintained a sense of community even though they no longer suffered persecution. Quakers constituted a large proportion of the population, and they were drawn together by the problems and hardships of building the colony and by a spirit of thankfulness for the blessings of freedom and opportunity. Through the years the non-Quaker population of Pennsylvania increased and the colony prospered. The complexion of the colony changed.

During the first half of the eighteenth century the Pennsylvania Society of Friends did not concentrate on convincing non-Quakers that the Quaker way was the way of Truth. Despite the fact that the Society was primarily concerned with teaching, strengthening, and disciplining Friends, it never withdrew completely into itself. The
Society, as a whole, focused on the affairs of the Society during these years. Although the Friends continued to try to teach the Truth as they understood it by example, rather than by relying on the precepts of a people determined to proselytize, theirs was not the militant example of the early Friends. The Society called for individual perfection of Friends through strict self-discipline and self-denial of worldly ways and goods. With the increasing availability of worldly goods and time to enjoy worldly ways, the self-discipline of many Friends weakened. In fact, many Friends born and raised in America, who never suffered economic, social, or political persecution for their religious beliefs as had their forefathers, simply never developed a strict self-discipline. Quaker ministers addressed themselves to the task of teaching self-denying ways to such individuals in the Society. Many of those who did not reform had to be disciplined.

According to Sydney James, a change in the focus of the Society occurred in the mid-1750's. After a Pennsylvania political crisis occasioned by the events of the French and Indian War, James argues that the outlook of the Society of Friends changed from a preoccupation with their own community to an interest in the total society. In an effort to defend themselves against the charges of lacking concern for the
defense and welfare of Pennsylvanians and of being unpatriotic, the Friends undertook social action to make the Society a direct moral force for good in the community. In that way they could prove their concern for people other than themselves.®

The Society of Friends was also a society of friends. To the Quaker mind, the bonds of close friendship might approach in strength the bonds between family members.® Writing to her friend Sally Fisher, Hannah Pemberton referred to the "unreserved" conversation which could take place between close, trusted friends.® The idea of the relationship between friends being similar to the relationship between members of a family contributed to the bridge of ideas, attitudes, and customs between family and society.® For it was but one example where the ideal relationship between family members served as the basis of, and/or influenced, the ideal conception of certain social relationships.

The Quarterly and Yearly Meetings, as well as the Monthly Meetings, provided opportunities for socializing—in addition to the regular worship and church business. Friends particularly looked forward to the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. Not only was it an occasion to renew old friendships and to visit relations, but it also was a time of meeting new acquaintances. During the interval between
Yearly Meetings, new people came into the area. At the Yearly Meeting they met some Friends for the first time. While many children came to the Meeting with their parents from the outlying areas, others did not attend for the first time until their youth. Thus, young people had an opportunity to make new friends even among those who had lived in the region for some time. Eligible young people regarded the Yearly Meeting as a valuable opportunity to meet a suitable marriage prospect. After all, the Society admonished Friends to avoid mixed marriages and to avoid social situations which might result in such marriages. The social situation at the Yearly Meeting constituted the reverse; it facilitated acquaintances leading to approved marriages. Meetings were social, as well as religious events.

C. M. Andrews lists among the diversions which colonial Americans enjoyed: card playing; tobacco smoking; fishing, hunting, trapping, and fowling; horse racing; cock fighting and fox hunting; fairs (occasions for both sporting events and trade); balls and assemblies; music; drama. However, as Carl Bridenbaugh points out, in the early days of colonization villagers were so busy with the daily tasks of maintaining home and family in the New World, that they had no time for elaborate amusements. The church provided what
little entertainment the colonials enjoyed outside their families. That the Pennsylvania Assembly, beginning in 1700, passed legislation (which the English government disallowed) prohibiting stage plays, masks, revels, and riotous sports, revealed their apprehension that people's attention might stray—or, in some cases, had been diverted already—from work and religion. However, up to the 1720's most citizens of Philadelphia were satisfied with the diversion of church activities. After 1720 an increased interest in secular amusements led pious men and women to associate that trend with a decline in interest in the principles and practices of organized religion.

The Quaker influence in Philadelphia limited, but did not prevent, the expansion of recreational activities in and near the city. Friends worked both within and outside the Meeting to restrict amusements. In the Meeting, Quaker leaders repeatedly warned against the deleterious effects of such amusements as plays, games, lotteries, music, and dancing. Outside the Meeting, under the leadership and influence of friends, political officials passed laws against stage plays, fireworks, and gambling. Yet men circumvented the legislative prohibitions; such activities "sprang up" outside Philadelphia. For example, Society Hill, just to the south of Philadelphia, became a sight of gambling
and of bull baiting.¹¹

The Society of Friends opposed such pastimes as horse racing, foot races, games, lotteries, dancing and stage plays because they thought such activities were a deplorable waste of precious time.¹² The Pembertons raised their children with these teachings in mind. Joseph Pemberton, for one, knew that to earn his father's respect he would have to avoid objectionable pastimes.¹³ Not only did they think certain entertainments were a waste of time, but Quakers also thought plays, for example, would subvert the proper order, morals, and prosperity of their city.¹⁴ The Philadelphia Friends may well have been influenced by a remonstrance composed by Bristol Friends which called for the suppression of the theater. The Friends in Bristol considered the plays to be "pernicious" entertainment, and the theater to be a scene of vanity and disorder because the plays excited vanity, folly, and lewdness in the spectators. The plays introduced to the audience various forms of intemperance, debauchery, and wildness. Bristol friends pointed out that while trade supported their city, frugality and industry provided the foundation for thriving trade. Plays, they argued, encouraged idleness and dissipation. Moreover, the actors could be considered merely as dead weights in the community. Therefore, the Bristol
Friends advocated a ban on plays.  

As to the matter of proper diversions, Friends thought men ought to take delight in obeying the law of the Lord and carrying out the will of the Lord. Friends were to teach their children to love to do the work of the Lord and not to love to play too much. John Churchman recalled the experiences of his own childhood; he said that as a boy his great desire to play had moved him away from a careful and circumspect path. Hence, he cautioned boys not to be diverted from the way of virtue and Truth by a similar love of play.

In John Woolman's estimation labor constituted "an innocent pleasure." He urged people not to go to extremes with respect to activities of labor or ways of rest, but he did call attention to the value of labor as a preparation for an individual's appreciation of rest. In his opinion an idle man became a burden to himself, his family, and his community.

Years before Woolman wrote about the pleasure of labor, William Penn had maintained doing good constituted the most preferable form of recreation. Other commendable and related forms of recreation included attending to one's vocation, being just, and exercising according to the principles of "gravity," "temperance," and "virtue." He claimed
that in his time the term "recreation" had been applied to
the worst and most meaningless follies of mankind. He be-
moaned the unworthiness of many recreational forms chosen
by men. Penn marveled:

... that man who is endued with understanding
fit to contemplate immortality, and made a com-
panion to angels should mind a little dust, a
few shameful rag; inventions of mere pride and
luxury; toys so apish and fantastic; entertain-
ments so dull and earthly, that a rattle, a baby,
a hobby-horse, a top, are by no means so foolish
in a simple child, nor unworthy of his thoughts
as are such inventions of the care and pleasure
of men. It is a mark of great stupidity, that
such vanities should exercise the noble mind of
man, the image of the Great Creator of heaven
and earth.\(^{19}\)

He argued foolish diversions like plays and balls not only
resulted in men and women neglecting to do good while they
were engaging in these activities, but also actually pre-
pared the way for their doing evil. Grave consequences for
the quality of family life might result from the neglect
of vocations and the reduction of estates due to the ex-
penses of the activities. Other consequences Penn foresaw
included: "... young women deluded; the marriage-bed
invaded; contentions and family animosities begotten; partings
of man and wife; disinheriting of children; dismissing of
servants. On the other hand, servants made slaves, children
disregarded, wives despised, and shamefully abused, through
the intemperance of their husbands: which either puts them
upon the same extravagance, or laying such cruel injustice to heart, they pine their days in grief and misery." Thus, he urged people to accept doing good as the best form of recreation.

In order to do good, Penn told Friends they should: follow their callings diligently; go to meetings regularly; visit "sober" neighbors to learn from them and/or teach them, depending upon the situation; instruct their children; provide a worthy example for their servants; provide relief for needy people; visit the sick and imprisoned in order to minister to their needs; to work for peace; to study "commendable and profitable arts" such as navigation, geometry, husbandry, gardening, and medicine. Women should spin, sew, knit, weave, garden, preserve foods, etc., and help others who were in need. Lastly, both men and women were to pause regularly to withdraw from worldly affairs in order to enjoy the Lord. Penn's ideas both reflected and influenced the Quaker mind. What is important to note is the fact that Friends did not oppose all recreation per se. What they opposed were activities which they thought had been misnamed "recreations" by their contemporaries and which diverted men from, rather than supported them in, the way of Truth.

The Quaker emphasis on family life influenced the
proscriptions on certain types of entertainments. Because they idealized the unified and harmonious family and enjoyed the companionship of the individuals in the family, they opposed a family member's involvement in outside activities which would undermine unity and harmony, and/or diminish the time the person spent in family activities. In turn, the Quaker proscriptions on certain outside activities tended to promote close family relations—to force family members to depend on each other and Friends for entertainment since they did not have so many types of diversions from which to choose as did the people belonging to other denominations or the unchurched.²² The Friends stressed the idea that family stability depended upon the cooperation of all family members. They expected young people to become increasingly serious and responsible—not to shun all enjoyments, but to partake only of enjoyments which did not undermine family unity and harmony. Ideally, young people were to learn to distinguish between "transitory" and "more certain & permanent " enjoyments.²³

The Pemberton family homes, like other Quaker homes, did not exist as family fortresses to protect, defend, and isolate the family from the world. The homes allowed both for privacy and for society. A person might withdraw to the home for rest and renewal after experiencing the pressures
and hurries of outside affairs, but he also might meet the world in his own home. Philadelphia Quakers gained a reputation for their hospitality. The Pembertons continuously welcomed visitors to their homes—not only visitors from Philadelphia, but also people from other parts of Pennsylvania, distant colonies, and Europe. The Pembertons had homes both in the city and in the country—three country homes in the Philadelphia vicinity, which they used primarily in the summer. 24.

Yet, even when the Pembertons did have company in their homes they did not surrender all their privacy. For the Pemberton homes were large. Many specialized rooms in those homes meant that both family and guests could retain a measure of privacy for such activities as sleeping, reading, and talking. Unlike the homes of medieval families and some of the poorer people of their own times, the Pemberton's homes had separate rooms for cooking, eating, sleeping, reading, talking, etc. Some rooms were suitable either for privacy or society. For example, a dining room provided privacy for the family when there were no guests in the home—a privacy from the eyes and ears of the outside world which allowed them freedom of thought and conversation. On the other hand, the dining room provided also for society when there were guests. A favorite and customary Quaker
form of entertainment consisted of having guests for dinner. Philadelphia markets and private gardens made available a great variety of meat, poultry, vegetables, fruit, and foreign delicacies of high quality. Philadelphians acquired a reputation for their feasts.25

The Pembertons did not view their social contacts strictly apart from affairs of religion, education, and business. On the contrary, common religious, intellectual, and economic interests served as bases of many an informal association and living friendship. Family and friendship, religion and profession, education and recreation—all were part of a unified private and collective life. Such were thought of, and dealt with, as they related to each other, rather than as separate aspects of a man's life. The Pembertons, for example, did business with men who not only worshiped with them in the Meeting and shared some of their reading interests (e.g., Hale, Sewel, or Chalkley), but who also accepted invitations to dine with the family in their home. Friends who lived outside Philadelphia often stayed with the Pembertons when they came to the city to attend to religious and/or business activities. The Yearly Meeting attracted many Friends to Philadelphia. While only the male head of certain families attended the Meeting, both the husband and wife represented other families. Still
other families came en masse. The whole Logan family was
one which moved to Philadelphia for the week of the Yearly
Meeting. For the young people, particularly, it was a time
of great excitement—an opportunity to see cousins and
friends. In addition to going to the religious meetings
and visiting friends and relations, rural Friends had an
excellent chance to transact business in the city.

The Pembertons did not discuss in their letters the
desirability of isolating their children from their guests.
On the contrary, the Pembertons seem to have thought the
home to be an appropriate setting for the introduction of
children to non-family members—i.e., to society. Not
only could the children be supervised in the home as they
made their first contacts with society, but they also would
be meeting people their parents considered to be exemplary
representatives of that society instead of having their first
associations with people either unknown or disapproved of
by their parents.

The Pembertons thought children could learn about
society, first through their parents and visitors in the
home, and second, by going out into society with relations
and then with friends. The Pembertons were a sociable and
hospitable family. Letter after letter in the Pemberton
Papers expresses appreciation for Pemberton hospitality.
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effort, and substance to humanitarian endeavors—to allocate "favors" of Providence to social, as well as personal uses. Of course the Meeting supported thoughts and acts of good will on the part of a family member toward one of his relations, but the Meeting also called upon Friends to extend their charity to other children of God. Thomas Chalkley pointed out that for those who argued charity begins at home, charity consequently usually both began and ended there. He cautioned against such an attitude. He argued that abundance might become a curse, rather than a blessing to a family. However, if a family shared its abundant favors with others, everyone involved stood to gain.

The Quaker teachings on charity promoted Quaker leadership in, and support for, such projects as the founding of a hospital and schools. The teachings also furnished reasons for the formation of such a group as the Meeting for Sufferings within the Society of Friends to administer aid to needy. More pertinent to this discussion, however, if the fact that Quaker teachings on charity also influenced wealthy Quaker families in their decisions to help needy individuals and families.

A Quaker's concern for the welfare, harmony, and unity of his own family did not preclude interest in other families and individuals. Indeed, it may have intensified
the sympathetic concern of pious Quakers for the problems and sufferings of other families. Israel Pemberton, for one, became well known for his generous aid to people in need of assistance. Soon after Israel's death a memorialist recalled the fact that Israel had been both generous and liberal in his distribution of aid to all sorts of poor people; thus, he had become "a real friend" to the poor. City and country people, rich and poor, and Friends and non-Friends attended his burial.31 "The vast Concourse of People that attended his funeral plainly evinced in what Esteem he was, such a Number having been never known to assemble on a like Occasion."32 Yet, during the Revolution, hardships had visited the Pembertons, as well as others. In a letter to her husband Israel, Mary Pemberton had noted that it was a difficult and sad time for many of the poor who had come to depend on Israel's assistance. She had simply stated that the Pembertons could not minister to the needs of the poor as they had been accustomed to doing in the past.33

The support of the Monthly Meetings for schools lagged far behind the needs of poor teachers, as well as poor children. That this was so, was illustrated in the case of one Martha Petel of Boston whom Israel helped by paying her to teach several poor children.34 This arrangement
was consistent with the Quaker ideal of charity as a means of enabling people to help themselves. Rather than aiding only Martha Petel, Pemberton's assistance benefited both the teacher and her pupils by creating a salaried position for her and giving the children the benefit of learning fundamental skills—reading, writing, and ciphering.

In the Quakers' estimation, charity improved the society at large by encouraging the industry, frugality, and humility of the teacher and facilitating the self-improvement of the children in the future. It also helped the families of the children who might have been forced to make extraordinary sacrifices to permit their children to receive a rudimentary education or, more likely, would have failed altogether to give the children such an education.

According to the Quaker concept, charity did not mean only beneficent giving of various forms of material assistance. The Friends conceived of charity as fundamentally an expression of the love of God. Thus, charity also entailed advice, exhortation, and guidance to help people live according to the way of Truth. Many people looked to the Pembertons, as leading merchants in Philadelphia, for advice and guidance in finding employment for themselves or friends. One Joseph Atkinson explicitly acknowledged Israel Pemberton's reputation for having a desire to be
serviceable to deserving people. Atkinson told of a man named Thomas Barrow, a soap-boiler and tallow-chandler, who, though ingenious at his trade and eminent as a tradesmen in the city, had suffered financial misfortune: "... his heart is still above a dependence upon his nominal friends & chuses [sic] to seek in preference a livelihood by industry abroad." Since Barrow would be arriving from London in Philadelphia as a stranger to America, Atkinson asked Pemberton to advise him of employment opportunities.

The Pemberton correspondence evidences the fact that the Pembertons took an active interest in the people they aided. They expected material assistance to be used prudently. They did not assist people merely to salve their own consciences or grudgingly to fulfill religious obligations. For example, Israel Pemberton lectured one John Richardson on his imprudent behavior. Apparently, Pemberton had helped him when he was ill. Since then Richardson had recovered. Pemberton told Richardson that since the illness he could have earned enough to pay for his cure if he had been industrious and careful. Plainly, in Pemberton's opinion, he had been neither industrious, nor careful. Annoyed by such behavior, Pemberton asked for information about Richardson's future employment. In a very different type of case, Pemberton worked clandestinely through a third
party to aid a needy family he knew would be embarrassed if they knew he was aware of their plight. He thought the family had been prudent and cautious in their conduct; through no fault of their own they suffered a setback. Therefore, he wrote to one who lived near the family:

. . . being informed by our worthy Friend Samuel Fothergill of the difficult Circumstances of our good Friend Comfort Hoeg's husband & family, I immediately determined to contribute something toward their Assistance, & after Consideration in what means to do it so as to answer my purpose most effectually without its being known either to them or others . . . I therefore concluded it best to Lodge a small sum of mony [sic] in thy hands . . . .38

Through their charitable activities the Pembertons made a significant contribution to the social order of colonial America—primarily in Philadelphia. The important thing to note about the preceding examples of Pemberton family charity is that they were an outgrowth of Pemberton involvement in the religious, educational, and economic affairs of the community. The Pembertons thought of the family as being an integral part of society.
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PART THREE

A CONCEPT OF THE FAMILY IN PERSPECTIVE
CHAPTER IX
CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

The work of men and women interested in the history of the family is relevant to this dissertation on a concept of the family in early America because it lends perspective both with regard to the concept itself, and to the place of the study of the concept in the context of other studies. Scholars who have examined the history of the family have been impressed both by the continuities and the discontinuities which have characterized the family through the ages. Since both continuity and change have been characteristic of the history of the family, Carle Zimmerman believes that to understand the American family it is necessary to study the history of the western family system—the family system of "that cultural aggregate around the Mediterranean and the Atlantic which came into historical continuity and prominence with the Greeks." On the basis of such a study, he concludes that over the centuries, the organization known as the family has been stable over long periods of time. During short periods, however, there have been significant changes.
Zimmerman asks whether the family has been a force for change in civilization, or it has been civilization which has brought about changes in the family. Because the family has been an integral part of civilization, there are significant possibilities for learning more about the process of social, economic, and even political change through studies of changes in the family. This is one important reason for focusing attention on the family.

According to Charles Thwing, while the family constituted the basis of the social order of the ancient world, the individual has become the basis of the social order of the modern world. Philippe Ariès says that for years people took this position. They assumed the family had been the basis of the social order since ancient times. Then beginning in the eighteenth century—so these people believed—the rise of liberal individualism seriously weakened the family. They discussed the history of the family in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as a period of decadence, breakdown, and decline. They stressed the weakening of parental authority and the increasing frequency of divorce. Ariès has not been alone in taking exception to this interpretation.

Rather than discussing decline in the family, men like Stuart Queen and John Adams discuss changes in the
institution of the family; they write in terms of change—not in terms of the weakening or the strengthening of the family. They call attention to the fact that the family in modern urban society has merely ceased to perform many of the functions it once performed. Whereas, the family in simple societies performs most of the functions necessary for survival (in other words, it actually produces needed food, makes cloth for clothing, and builds a shelter for the family), the family in complex modern societies does not.

Similarly, Margaret Mead asserts that from an anthropologist's point of view the American family is merely one of the many forms the family has assumed in the long course of human history. Everywhere relationships between parents and children have been, and are, patterned and regulated. In periods of major social change, migration, war, or disaster, the patterns may break down—to be followed eventually by a re-patterning of those relationships. Mead has concluded that the single universal family function is child-rearing.

Edward Westermarck takes the position that divorce may save the institution of marriage. He states that although a divorce may be a painful experience, it must be seen as a solution to a problem "... and a means of preserving
the dignity of marriage by putting an end to unions that are a disgrace to its name."^6

Clearly, the approaches to continuity and change in the history of the family are diverse. On the basis of such studies, some scholars advocate the need for change in the future. H. Kent Geiger argues that for some centuries society has been becoming more complex, rapidly changing, and highly organized; at the same time, the family has been becoming more specialized. In the process a vacuum has developed between the family and the social system. He maintains that the family itself has caused alienation: "... by channeling the resources of individuals into the intimacies and satisfactions of marital, parental, and filial love, the source of energy for larger community formations has been tapped and depleted."^7

Margaret Mead is also critical of the contemporary American family. She deems it "one of the worst ever invented" and looks forward to further changes resulting in the founding of a new type of family life. The "cluster families" of the future which she envisions would consist of twenty or more people including single adults, elderly people, and young people with children. Hence would be overcome the segregation of age groups and the consequent loneliness and alienation of both young and old now
prevalent in modern society. Still, advocates of future change are aware, as R. M. MacIver states, that although the family is capable of endless variation, it is also characterized by a remarkable continuity. Philippe Ariès even wonders if, perhaps, in the history of the human race the historical differences within the two great family types— monogamous and polygamous— are of minor importance in comparison to that which has remained unchanged. Yet he recognizes that "the great demographic revolution," which occurred from the eighteenth century into the twentieth century, has shown "... considerable possibilities of change in structures hitherto believed to be invariable because they were biological." He refers to the contraceptive measures which have resulted in quantitative and qualitative changes in families. Because Ariès is not so much concerned with the reality of the family as he is with "the family as an idea," his work is particularly relevant to a study of the Pemberton concept of the family. As he says:

True, men and women will always go on loving one another, will always go on having children, whether they limit their numbers or give free rein to instinct, and will always go on guiding the first steps of those children. That is not the question at issue. The point is that ideas entertained about these relations may be dissimilar at moments separated by lengthy periods of time.
Ariès argues that until the beginning of the modern era, the family merely fulfilled such functions as the transmission of life, property, and names. It did not penetrate deeply into human consciousness as it has in the modern era. Ariès maintains that only recently in the history of man has the family become "... a value, a theme of expression, an occasion of emotion." Until the latter part of the seventeenth century the lack of privacy retarded the formation of a concept of the family. Ariès' study of iconographic documents revealed that medieval men, women, and children lived their lives in public. People lived amidst a crowd of numerous, though not unknown, people. Until the end of the seventeenth century people were seldom alone; the high density of social life made isolation virtually impossible. Ariès' thesis is that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries "a new emotional relationship" ("or at least a newly conceived relationship") developed between parents and children. In the eighteenth century the family began to attempt to hold society at a distance. According to Ariès, the increasing interest of the family in privacy gradually, but not immediately, destroyed the sociability among peoples which had characterized the Middle Ages. Within some families were combined the traditional sociability and the new awareness of the family.
From his point of view in the twentieth century, Ariès points out that such an equilibrium was not to survive.

He views modern man as being:

* * * divided between a professional life and a family life which are often in competition with each other, and all the rest is regarded as of secondary importance: religious and cultural activities, and even more so rest and amusement; meetings with friends for a meal or drinks are considered as mere relaxation, necessary to the organism like food which can be hurriedly swallowed but not to be counted as part of the serious business of living, which a man does not neglect, true, but whose importance he does not admit though he is not actually ashamed of it. But in the Middle Ages all these social activities, which are today individualized and repressed, occupied an essential position in collective life.  

Since then the elements of social life—friendship, religion, profession—have been divorced from each other. Friendship and religion have become less important, and the family, which was only of secondary importance in the Middle Ages, has become much more important. In the modern era, the family cuts itself off from the world; the parents and children live together in a type of isolation in that the whole group works to help the children rise (as individuals since the group is devoid of collective ambition).  

According to the history of the concept of the family which Ariès outlines, the Pemberton conception of the family occupied a transitional position—partially due to the fact that
in their family experience they were able to maintain an equilibrium between sociability and private family life.

Also particularly pertinent to a study of the Pemberton conception of the family is the work of Bernard Bailyn. Bailyn emphasizes the changes which have occurred in the history of the family in America and focuses upon the colonial period as being an era marked by the radical transformation of the institution of the family as it had been known in traditional European society. In England the family, church, and community had served as "... the greater part of the mechanism by which English culture transferred itself across the generations"--the family being the most important of the three. Dramatic changes, Bailyn insists, took place in America during the course of which "... the family's traditional role as the primary agency of cultural transfer was jeopardized, reduced, and partly superceded."14 If indeed the Pemberton family did live through a period of radical transformation in the institution of the family, they might be expected to have expressed their ideas about such changes.

According to Bailyn, the conditions of life in the New World undermined the authority of the older generation. The problems and possibilities of developing new lands and new towns placed a premium on the willingness to learn new
ways and on the vigor and strength of youth as opposed to the traditionalism and the knowledge and experience of old ideas and ways of the middle-aged and elderly. Rather than continuing to live in a single household with a large kin group, which Bailyn says was customary in England, young people struck out on their own and established their own households. By the mid-eighteenth century isolated conjugal units and relationships based on achievement rather than on ascription became the rule. The status of women rose, and marriage came to be regarded as a contract between equals. A sharper line came to be drawn between the family and society: "... the passage of the child from family to society became abrupt, deliberate, and decisive: open to question, concern, and decision." Bailyn thinks people came to view society in a new way—from without rather than from within ("... from an unfixed position not organically or unalterably secured"). The continuity between generations came to be broken repeatedly because the experience of one generation was found wanting with respect to the solution of problems of the next.15

The questions arise as to how the Pembertons' view of continuity and change compares and/or contrasts to the views of such scholars and to what a knowledge of Pemberton thought contributes to the scholars' interpretations.
First, with regard to continuity and change within the family, the Pembertons perceived both continuity and change. Extant letters do not reveal that they recognized serious discontinuities between the generations of the family who had participated in the development of colonial Pennsylvania. The history of the family had been one of parents helping their offspring prepare for, and actually embark upon, the careers of their adult lives; it had not been a history of offspring having to rebel and to disrupt family relations in order to establish families and styles of life and work which they considered to be necessary and desirable. That the Pembertons evidently considered the family to be the primary agency responsible for what is now called the "socialization" of offspring contributed to the preservation of continuity between the generations. A family was to initiate children into both the ways of the family and the ways of society. According to Pemberton thought, children were to learn the roles of such family members as sons and daughters, husbands and wives, uncles and aunts, grandparents, and in-laws within the context of the family itself. Children were to learn that family members had roles in the community, as well as in the home. They also were to learn that family members were to be relied upon for assistance when needed—whether it be as a helpless infant, a sick adult, or a dependent old person.
Though not all of the people considered to be members of the Pemberton family lived in a single household, they did not isolate themselves from each other. Even when separated by considerable geographical distances they maintained contacts through letters and mutual friends. Communication preserved continuity between the generations, as well as between members of the same generation whose living experiences differed.

The Pembertons did not think of the family as being a setting in which children could or should be isolated from society—adult society or society, in general. Instead, they thought the family should provide opportunities for offspring and parents to associate with instructive, good company—young and old, including non-family members. This served as a means of introducing children and young people to society.

Bailyn, among others, refers to the rising status of women and the weakening of parental authority as having been two changes important in the history of the American family. In the Pemberton correspondence neither men nor women noted in their letters a rise in the status of women in their own families—either to deplore the change as a threat to the ways of the past or to praise the change as an advance in living according to the Quaker testimony concerning
human equality. Nor did they indicate that they thought parental authority had been undermined by the conditions in America. For the Pembertons, parental authority was both a matter of ascription (according to Biblical teachings) and performance. In other words, parents were expected to exercise authority over their children—but wisely, not arbitrarily. In turn, children were to heed the wise counsels and prudent, just commands of their parents. Extant letters indicate both that Pemberton sons and daughters respected their parents and their authority, and that a mutual affection subsisted between many parents and children. Clearly, the Pembertons did not think in terms of a family in which continuity was preserved only through the transmission of life, property, and names. Family members seem to have thought there were more similarities than differences among the values, ideas, and goals which, though not identical, they shared. The fact that the Pembertons did not conceive of the transitions from infancy to childhood to youth to young adulthood to middle age, and, finally, to old age as being abrupt changes—defined in terms of specific chronological ages—promoted an underlying sense of continuity in family life. Given the fact that the Pembertons seem to have seen the structure of family life generally in terms of
continuity, what kind of change did they perceive? The peace and tranquility of families of bygone days can easily be exaggerated. Such events as a birth, an illness, a death, or a separation were regarded by colonial peoples like the Pembertons as changes in the family of the greatest importance; sometimes they resulted in a major change in family life. For the young married couple the birth of a child made them a mother and father—a man and a woman with new responsibilities to each other and to their infant. A prolonged illness or death could result in great hardship to a family. Accidents—in which, for example, a person might be hurt, a horse injured, a house burned, a ship lost, or property damaged in war—also could result in considerable family hardship. Such occurrences (external events) could cause another type of change within the family—a change in the spirit of the family by giving rise to anxiety, fear, and sorrow which would undermine or destroy family peace and harmony.

The Pembertons hoped for, and welcomed, changes that righted an unfavorable situation. Yet a basic assumption for the Pembertons was the uncertainty of the world; thus, they did not expect all changes to be for the better (in the short term, at least) or to be predictable. In times of trouble, family members were to be patient and resigned,
and to trust in the Lord. In reality, changes could promote solidarity and continuity in the family; for family members—young and old—shared in the experiences of change. They did not consider that even the ultimate change, death, for example, should be hidden from children. Indeed, children were to be impressed with the significance of death. They were to understand that death might and did come to young people, as well as to old people. Since one could never know when he would die, he was to be prepared for death at any time by always living a righteous life.

There is little evidence in the Pemberton letters to suggest they thought that, in comparison with either the European family or the American family of an earlier period, the American family as they knew it differed significantly due to marked or thoroughgoing changes made in response to American conditions. In their correspondence with European Friends the Pembertons did not indicate they thought Americans had failed in an attempt to transfer the institution of the family to America. Neither the Pembertons, nor their friends, emphasized differences between the family in Europe and the family in America. That is not to say that there were no substantive differences, but that the Pembertons did not express a clear awareness of them if they did exist. Even if the American forms were in the midst of a process of evolving
away from the European forms, a perception of those changes and the expression of that perception may have been delayed on account of the fact that changes had not moved to the point where common terms had been rendered obsolete. In that case, Americans and Europeans might have used some terms with very different meanings intended.

Since both European and American Friends visited abroad quite regularly, visitors and their families (including the Pembertons) were in a good position to be cognizant of such changes in the family as a decline in the effectiveness of parents in socializing their children—due to the weakening of parental authority. They did not identify such a decline.

The family as a unit may have been increasing in its importance within the Society of Friends. The Pembertons did not make it clear in their letters that they thought this to have been occurring.

Actually, in general, the Pembertons did not have a tendency to compare and to contrast the place of the family in society as they knew it with the place of the family in society in either Europe or the America of an earlier period. Instead, they simply identified with Friends of the past or of the present who shared the goal and hope to purify their thoughts and actions in order to conform to the Quaker
teachings. They interpreted those teachings to require a close relationship between the family and the wider community for the purpose of preserving peace and harmony in both family and community. The Pemberton concept of the family allowed both for sociability and for privacy; they seem to have maintained a balance between family and society. In the Pemberton letters correspondents did not leave evidence of a pervasive or continuous sense of frustration at not being able to cope with changes within the family or with changes in the place of the family in society. Although they valued the desired changes in the direction of perfection, they tended to stress and to think in terms of continuity with the past.
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On the basis of what has been said about the Pemberton concept of the family—as a small group and as a unit in the community—what can be said about the Pemberton ideal of the family? How might one characterize their vision of what a family could and should be? Essentially, the Pembertons regarded the family as a framework within which to prepare individuals for, and to support them in, leading Christian lives. The goal of striving to lead Christian lives should not be considered as being narrowly religious in nature. The Friends did not make clear or, to their way of thinking, artificial, distinctions between the religious and the mundane. Practicality and idealism were thoroughly entwined throughout their thought and action.

Though the family was to be valued, it was not to be glorified. In keeping with the idea of helping people lead Christian lives, families were to strive to attain the following characteristics. Taken as a group these characteristics constituted the Pemberton ideal of the family.
According to the Pembertons an ideal family would be distinguished by harmony. Members were not to argue and to bicker among themselves. Children and youth were to respect adults and to obey their commands and give attention to their counsels. This meant respect for all adults in the family—not merely for their parents. In turn, adults were to treat children and young people with respect and interest. The younger generation was to be carefully prepared for adult life; thus, advice and commands were to be formulated with the interest of the young people, as well as the adults, in mind. All members of the family were responsible for helping to establish and preserve harmonious relations in the family.

An ideal family would also have unity—unity of purpose being of great importance. Members of the family would be drawn together in thought and action by unity of purpose which, in turn, would contribute to unity in, for example, attitude and work. All Quaker families were to accept as their purpose—in both their individual and their collective lives—the doing of the will of the Lord. Ideally, a family would wait upon the Lord for divine guidance in their homes, as well as in Meetings. Family visits encouraged this practice—at which time a respected Friend visited the home and sat in silence for a time with family members.
Visiting Friends encouraged families to gather in a like manner in their homes when there were no visitors. That was but one way they could hope to come to a deeper understanding of religious principles—an understanding which would enable them to live lives more consistent with their principles. Family members were to express Christian love for each other through word and deed. In general, religious principles and ideas were to govern the relations between individuals in the family.

Persons in an ideal family would do all they could to assist each other—materially and spiritually. In times of hardship or crisis they were to be resigned to sacrifice. Patience and resignation on the part of one person would have a calming and comforting effect on other members of the family—young or old. That was but one example of a situation in which an individual was to try to set a good example for other members of the family. Since family members influenced each other—often quite inadvertently—individuals were to attempt to act in ways that would inspire righteous thought and conduct. They were to work to strengthen each other in avoiding temptation and in doing good.

All the members of an ideal family would willingly accept responsibilities for the welfare and harmony of the family. They would be industrious in carrying out
daily tasks both at home and outside of the home. They would be eager to learn from experience (both their own experience and the experience of others).

In an ideal family, parents, children, grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins—everyone—would provide companionship for each other. They would share in the joys and sorrows of life's vicissitudes. They would share in the hardships of work, and they would share in the enjoyments of proper diversions.

Lastly, the ideal family would be hospitable to men, women, and children outside the family. As a group, family members would strive to be a force for good in the wider community. For instance, they would encourage members of the family and their friends to uphold religious principles in community relations, such as by being honest in their business dealings.

Of what significance was the ideal family as conceived by the Pembertons? How did their conception of the ideal family relate to their perception of their own family life and the family life of their friends—their conception of the real family? The Pembertons were practical people; they were not given to idle theorizing. To the Pembertons, ideals constituted a part of life and were not to be separated from life in thought or in action.
Given the fact that families certainly were unable to live up to their highest ideals, the question arises as to whether or not the Pembertons reacted to the inconsistencies between the ideal and the real with worry, anxiety, frustration, impatience, or anger. Generally, they tried not to react in such ways. The Pembertons believed that upon reaching the age of being able to distinguish between good and evil, an individual would inevitably choose evil. They did not think that he would always choose evil, but that due to human weakness and to the human propensity to sin, there would be times when he would make evil choices; sometimes he would decide upon a sinful course of action. Yet with divine guidance and assistance, and with encouragement from relations and friends, a person might be brought to an awareness of his error and moved to repent, to reform, and to resolve to be more careful in the future.

Dissension within the family, disobedience on the part of children, failure of parents to teach to their children the principles of religion, and impatience of the young and strong with the old and infirm members of the family were but four ways a family might diverge from their conception of an ideal family. The Pembertons explained such divergences in terms of the human inclination to sin. The explanation and understanding of failings was only the first step. The Pembertons lived in the constant hope, belief,
and expectation that men could and would, with divine assistance, be better. They thought life was to be a day-by-day attempt to live by highest principles. They recognized that there would be failures, but they thought that impatience and anger at their failures would merely compound the failures. Instead, people were to be patient and persistent in learning to live by their ideals and in helping other people—particularly members of their family—to understand and to live by those ideals.

The Pembertons thought it to be absolutely essential that families not overlook, ignore, or deny their failures. They were to think over family experience and compare it to the ideal. To admit shortcomings was not to be regarded as a sign of weakness, but as a sign of strength and hope. Basically, they portrayed the real family as a family imperfectly representing, rather than wholly deviating from, the ideal family. They did not see their own (the real) family as the direct opposite of the ideal family.

In the Pemberton view, a dichotomy did not place mundane family affairs in opposition to the realization of family ideals. Indeed, everyday tasks, conversations, and activities provided people with an opportunity to live according to their ideals. The Pembertons believed that essentially what was required for improvement and perfection
of the family experience was the choice by family members of good (of virtuous ways) rather than evil (or sinful ways). To the extent that it was possible people were not to be coerced. Friends were to be allowed to choose, rather than to be forced, to follow the ways of virtue.

In the continuing effort to inspire and to persuade people to choose rightly, ideals were important. Frequent repetition of, or allusion to, ideals appeared in the letters between family members and between family members and friends. Persuasive arguments for virtuous behavior, although predicated on the principle that it was the responsibility of each individual to make his own choices, reflected the knowledge that another person might have a substantial influence on an individual's decisions. The Pembertons believed in the power and efficacy of persuasion to reduce the divergence between the ideal family and the real family.
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