NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

The Population of Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia

JOHN ALEXANDER'S attempt to construct a population table for eighteenth-century Philadelphia is a valuable contribution to the "Philadelphia numbers game."[1] As historians delve deeper into the city's history, striving to substitute verifiable data for impressionistic evidence, their need for census figures increases. Studies of family size, mortality rates, poor relief, crime, political participation and economic development all require reasonably accurate population figures in order to measure change over time.

Although Alexander's attempt to derive population estimates from the number of houses in the city is a step in the right direction, and although he rightly challenges Sam Bass Warner's use of the unreliable constables' returns of 1775, his analysis is flawed in several respects. First, there is little warrant for assuming that the ratio of people per house at the time of the census of 1790 is applicable to earlier decades of the eighteenth century. Among the factors that may have altered this ratio are changing family size, the decline of slavery and indentured servitude beginning in the late colonial period, and the rise of a free labor system in which large numbers of lower-class artisans and workers rented rooms in tenements, thus living outside the traditional familial arrangement.[2] We are only beginning to understand these trends, and until more information is recovered it is dangerous to assume that the ratio of people per house remained constant over a century. Alexander cites Robert Proud's estimate that at least six, and probably seven, persons on average occupied each house in the city. But only a

1 John K. Alexander, "The Philadelphia Numbers Game: An Analysis of Philadelphia's Eighteenth-Century Population," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography (PMHB)*, CVIII (1974), 314-324.

2 Robert V. Wells, "Quaker Marriage Patterns in a Colonial Perspective," *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Ser., XXIX (1972), 415-442; Gary B. Nash, "Slaves and Slaveholders in Colonial Philadelphia," *ibid.*, XXX (1973), 223-256.

decade or so before, Benjamin Franklin, another amateur demographer, noted that according to "Political Arithmeticians there are 5 souls per house."[3] It is this kind of widely varying contemporary opinion that needs to be discarded in favor of "harder" data.

A second problem with Alexander's figures is that they give only faint indications of Philadelphia's population before mid-eighteenth century. The first house census was in 1749 at a time when the city's population had already reached at least 13,000. But we need to have other reference points for the first half of the century in order to chart the course of Philadelphia's development during the colonial period. Both the 1700 and 1744 estimates of houses in Philadelphia are grossly inaccurate. The 1700 estimate of 700 houses, for which Alexander gives no source, can only be regarded as one of the many figures employed by early Pennsylvania promoters in their efforts to advertise the city as a potential boom town. Such attempts were common. William Penn advertised that the city contained 600 houses as early as 1685, and another promoter claimed that the city had 1,400 houses in 1690.[4] Still another, dizzied perhaps by the pungent air of the city's marshes, put the number of houses in 1698 above 2,000—a level it would not actually reach for another half-century.[5] Similarly, the 1744 house count of 1,500 used by Alexander must be regarded as only a rough estimate. It was made, apparently, by Richard Peters and endorsed by the Common Council. But the city recorder also claimed that the city had a population of "at least 13,000 People," which is 38 per cent higher than Alexander's people-per-house ratio allows.[6]

A more reliable method of calculating population is to use the number of taxables in the city as a basis for population estimates.

[3] *Preface to The Speech of Joseph Galloway ... In Answer to the Speech of John Dickinson ...* (Philadelphia, 1764), xx; Robert Proud, *The History of Pennsylvania, in North America from the Original Institution and Settlement of that Province . . till after the Year 1742* (Philadelphia, 1797–1798), II, 277.

[4] Penn, *A Further Account of the Province of Pennsylvania and Its Improvements ...* [London, 1685], in *PMHB*, IX (1885), 74, *Some Letters and an Abstract of Letters from Pennsylvania, Containing the State and Improvement of that Province* (London, 1691), in *ibid*, IV (1880), 200.

[5] Gabriel Thomas, *An Historical and Geographical Account of the Province and Country of Pensilvania, and of West-New Jersey in America ...* (London, 1698), 32.

[6] John F. Watson, *Annals of Philadelphia, and Pennsylvania, in the Olden Time ...* (Philadelphia, 1881), II, 404; *Minutes of the Common Council of the City of Philadelphia, 1704 to 1776* (Philadelphia, 1847), 441.

Tax lists, like house censuses, are not as frequently available as one might wish. But the survival of the 1693 tax list and the recent acquisition of the city poor tax list for 1709 allow us to establish two benchmarks for Philadelphia's population in the early period of the city's existence.[7] Moreover, we know the number of taxables in the city and county of Philadelphia for 1720, 1734, and 1751, and from these figures we can derive fairly accurate estimates of the city's population. Also available are counts of city taxables in 1741, 1756, and 1760.[8] Beginning in 1767, tax lists are regularly available so that population estimates can be calculated at various points in each decade for the rest of the eighteenth century.[9] Thus, available information on the number of taxables yields seventeen points of reference between 1693 and 1798. After 1709 no more than fourteen years separate any two points.

The major problem for this method of estimating population is the same one that Alexander faced—obtaining a reliable multiplier, in this case an accurate ratio of people-per-taxable inhabitant. Ideally, one could calculate the multiplier at various points in time and thus obtain a people-per-taxable ratio at numerous points in the eighteenth century.

By taking the population of the city reported in the 1790 census and the number of taxable inhabitants on the 1789 tax assessor's reports, adjusted for one year's growth, we obtain a multiplier of

7 The tax list for 1693 is in *PMHB*, VIII (1884), 85–105; the recently acquired 1709 tax list is at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. See Peter J. Parker, "Rich and Poor in Philadelphia, 1709," *ibid.*, XCIX (1975), 3–19.

8 The number of taxables in 1720 and 1751 is given in Report of the State of the Currency, 1752, in *Votes and Proceedings of the House of Representatives, 1751–1752* (Philadelphia, 1752), 51–54. The 1734 total is given in "Report of Landholders in Philadelphia County to Governor Penn, 1734," in *Publications of the Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania*, I (1895) 184; the 1741 total is from Watson, *Annals of Philadelphia*, III, 236; for 1756 from Hannah Benner Roach, comp., "Taxables in the City of Philadelphia, 1756," *The Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine*, XXII (1961), 3–41; for 1760 from Gertrude MacKinney, ed., *Votes and Proceedings of the House of Representatives of the Province of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania Archives*, Eighth Series (Harrisburg, 1931–1935), VI, 5141.

9 Transcripts of the tax assessor's reports for 1767 are at the Van Pelt Library, University of Pennsylvania. The tax lists for 1769 and 1774 are in the Pennsylvania State Archives, Harrisburg. The 1772, 1775, 1780, 1782, and 1789 provincial tax lists are in the Philadelphia City Archives, City Hall. The 1790 figure is from the census of that year, as cited in Alexander, "Numbers Game," and corrected to exclude the small rural part of the Northern Liberties as noted by Alexander in n.5, p. 316.

5.51 persons per taxable inhabitant. A few scattered constables' returns for the pre-Revolutionary years provide some assurance that this is a reliable multiplier as far back as the early 1760s. In 1762 Walnut Ward contained 657 persons according to the constables' return for that year.[10] Since the number of taxables in the ward was 125 in 1756 and 106 in 1767, we can interpolate to obtain 115 taxables in 1762, or 5.71 persons per taxable. Upper Delaware Ward, where 142 taxable persons resided in 1767, had a total population of 805 persons according to a tax assessor's house-by-house census in that year—or 5.67 persons per taxable inhabitant.[11] Eight years later, the constables' returns yielded 1,058 persons, or 5.63 per taxable.[12] These scattered figures indicate that the ratio of people-per-taxable inhabitant may have been declining slightly in the second half of the eighteenth century, but more data must be recovered before we can improve on this point.

The number of persons-per-taxable inhabitant varied, of course, from ward to ward and from year to year. But the general clustering of these figures from different wards both before and after the Revolution suggests that a multiplier of 5.60 should be used in estimating population throughout this period. Whether this ratio was also characteristic of Philadelphia's social structure in the first half of the eighteenth century cannot be determined until further constables' returns have been unearthed.

In applying the multiplier to the number of taxable inhabitants three population figures have been calculated. The first is for the ten wards of the city proper, the second includes Southwark with the city, and the third adds the Northern Liberties. If we wish to include in the population of "urban" Philadelphia all those inhabitants in the suburbs with urban occupations, then almost all of Southwark's taxables should be added to the city from the early decades of the eighteenth century. But about half of the taxables in the Northern Liberties should be excluded during the first half of the eighteenth century. The northern suburbs grew only slowly before 1750 and more of its residents were farmers than urban

10 The constable's returns for Walnut Ward, 1762, is in City Archives, Philadelphia.
11 Tax assessor's returns, Upper Delaware Ward, 1767, Richard Waln Papers, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
12 The 1775 constables' returns are in City Archives, Philadelphia.

workers. It was in the third quarter of the eighteenth century that the Northern Liberties truly became an adjunct of "urban" Philadelphia. The number of houses jumped from less than 200 at mid-century to more than 1,100 by 1775 and the tax lists for the late 1760s and early 1770s reveal that both the eastern and western Northern Liberties were filling up rapidly with urban workers from the lower end of the occupational scale—porters, stocking weavers, laborers, tailors, cordwainers and carpenters. In an era of increasing hardship for the lower classes, these workingmen took up residence on the northern edge of the city because rents were cheaper there and land available at lower cost than in the city. From about 1750 to the end of the century, the Northern Liberties became increasingly urban in complexion and it is safe to include the great majority of its taxables in the population of urban Philadelphia after about 1760.

POPULATION OF PHILADELPHIA
1693-1790

Year	Taxables Phila. City	Popula. Phila. City	Taxables Phila. & Southwark	Popula. Phila. & Southwark	Taxables Phila., Southwark, N. Liberties	Popula. Phila., Southwark, N. Liberties
1693	365	2,044	375	2,100		
1709	420	2,352	440	2,464		
1720	832	4,659	872	4,883		
1734	1,355	7,588	1,420	7,952		
1741	1,621	9,078	1,699	9,514	1,850	10,360
1751	2,272	12,723	2,450	13,720		
1756	2,345	13,132	2,660	14,896		
1760	2,634	14,750	3,047	17,063		
1767	2,834	15,870	3,319	18,586	4,074	22,814
1769	2,918	16,341	3,414	19,118	4,185	23,436
1772	3,273	18,329	3,907	21,879	4,886	27,362
1774	3,334	18,670	4,002	22,411	5,085	28,476
1775	3,625	20,300	4,434	24,830	5,609	31,410
1780	3,459	19,370	4,281	23,974	5,709	31,970
1782	5,074	28,414	6,026	33,746	6,928	38,798
1789	4,726	26,466	6,113	34,233		
1790	[a]	28,522[a]	[a]	34,183[a]	[a]	42,520[b]

[a] 1790 census   [b] 1790 census, as adjusted by Alexander, n. 15

Looking at these figures, it is clear that Philadelphia's population grew very slowly in the first four decades of settlement. Most of the historical literature on early Pennsylvania suggests that the Quaker capital expanded rapidly in the early years and quickly overtook New York in size. Carl Bridenbaugh, for example, provides population estimates indicating that Philadelphia matched New York in population by 1700 and pulled ahead of her northern rival in the next decade.[13] But if the 1693 and 1709 tax lists are reliable, we must cut Bridenbaugh's population estimates by at least half between 1690 and 1730 and admit that it was not until the early 1750s that Philadelphia outstripped New York in population.

This downward adjustment of Philadelphia's population before 1730 makes the sustained growth of the city in the late colonial period more impressive than previously recognized. Bridenbaugh's estimates indicate that Philadelphia grew from about 11,500 to 23,750 between 1730 and 1760. Our estimates show the city expanding from about 7,000 to 23,500 during the same period.

There is general agreement that in the period after 1760 the city entered an era of extraordinarily rapid growth. But whereas our estimates rather closely approximate Alexander's between 1730 and 1760, they indicate that between 1760 and 1780 growth was less pronounced than his figures suggest. Alexander's estimates of a population of 18,616 in 1760, 28,052 in 1769, and 33,482 in 1774 portray a city growing by about 1,000 inhabitants per year during this period—a rate of growth that almost doubles the size of Philadelphia in fourteen years. Our estimates show rapid growth, but at a less spectacular rate. Philadelphia's inhabitants grew from about 19,000 in 1760 to about 28,500 in 1774—an increase of about 678 per year.

The divergence between the two sets of figures in the late colonial period probably results from Alexander's overestimate of the population as derived from the number of persons per house. Two factors seem to cause that overestimation. First, the major areas of construction during the housing boom of the 1760s and 1770s were the suburbs and fringe areas of the city, which were also the regions of

13 Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness, Urban Life in America, 1625-1742* (New York, 1938), 143, 303; *Cities in Revolt, Urban Life in America, 1743-1776* (New York, 1955), 5.

lowest population density and lowest number of persons per dwelling, at least in 1790.[14] Thus, the city-wide 1790-based multiplier of 6.27 persons per dwelling is probably too large when applied to the newly constructed houses of the 1760s and 1770s, creating for that period an artificial inflation of the population estimates based on the number of persons per house. Second, the number of persons per dwelling in Philadelphia, as in Boston, probably increased as the population expanded, making the 1790 multiplier somewhat too large for the entire 1749 to 1775 period.[15]

University of California,   GARY B. NASH
  Los Angeles   BILLY G. SMITH

14 Between 1749 and 1777, 90 percent of the new houses were built in the "fringe" wards of Dock, Mulberry, or North, or in the suburbs of Southwark and the Northern Liberties. In 1790, the ratio of persons to houses in these areas was only 5.96 as compared to the city-wide ratio of 6.27. The bases of these statistics are contained in Watson, *Annals*, II, 404; III, 236; and Benjamin Davies, *Some Account of the City of Philadelphia* . . . (Philadelphia, 1794), 17.

15 John B. Blake, *Public Health in the Town of Boston 1630–1822* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), 248–249. While the person to house ratio remained at 6.3 for Philadelphia's Walnut Ward in 1762 and 1790, it increased dramatically in Upper Delaware Ward from 3.48 in 1767 to 4.30 in 1775, and to 7.5 in 1790. Mulberry Ward experienced a similar increase from 3.78 persons per dwelling in 1770 to 6.10 in 1790.

Marriage and Family Life Among Blacks in Colonial Pennsylvania

THE slave status of blacks brought to the New World involved inherent difficulties in their existence which made meaningful marital and family relationships an impossibility for many of them.[1] Such was the case in colonial Pennsylvania as well as other areas where slavery was practiced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Although relations between whites and blacks both within and outside of marriage were the subject of legislation

1 Melville J. Herskovits, *The New World Negro*, edited by Frances S. Herskovits (Bloomington, Ind., 1966), 365.

in Pennsylvania, there seem to have been no laws regarding morals among blacks. The only concern was when whites were involved.[2]

William Penn had sought to regularize marriage between blacks in legislation considered in 1699 and 1700, but his proposed bill had gone down to defeat by a Quaker-controlled legislature.[3] The marriages of blacks apparently had no legal standing throughout the colonial period. When slaves desired marriage, it was not hindered, but nonmarital relationships were regarded as quite acceptable.[4] The moral standards of the white community were not considered applicable to the black community. Marriages contracted between slaves were for all practical purposes subject to termination at will by the masters, who could sell their slaves anywhere at any time.[5] Generally, when slaves were offered for sale, nothing was said about marital relationships into which they had entered. Children would sometimes be sold with their mother, but it was an extreme rarity when a family group would be offered for sale as a unit.[6]

In spite of obstacles, slaves did contract marriages. They were aided and encouraged in this by religious groups that worked with them. Henry Muhlenberg, a prominent Lutheran clergyman, performed the marriage ceremony for blacks,[7] and the records of Christ Church in Philadelphia contain numerous references to the marriages of slave and free blacks. Very frequently, slaves entering into matrimony were owned by different masters, and one wonders what arrangements were made to enable them to live in a familial situation. The same question might be posed when one of the blacks was a slave and the other free. The number of marriages of both slave

2 A careful review of the relevant sections of James T. Mitchell and Henry Flanders, eds., *The Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania From 1682 to 1801*, illustrates this omission. It has also been noted by Richard R. Wright, Jr., *The Negro in Pennsylvania, A Study in Economic History* (Philadelphia, [1912]; reprinted, New York, 1969), 11–12.

3 Gertrude MacKinney, ed., *Pennsylvania Archives*, Eighth Series, I, 237.

4 Adolph B. Benson, ed., *The America of 1750, Peter Kalm's Travels in North America* (New York, 1966), I, 206.

5 *An Epistle of Caution and Advice, Concerning the Buying and Keeping of Slaves* (Philadelphia, 1754), 5–6.

6 This judgment is based on a reading of the *Pennsylvania Gazette* from 1728 through 1775, as well as extensive reading in other Pennsylvania newspapers of the period.

7 Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein, eds., *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg* (Philadelphia, 1942–1958), III, 213.

and free blacks was definitely on the increase as the period pro-
gressed.[8] Among the ceremonies recorded at Christ Church, the
marriage of William Groves, a slave, and Judith, a free Negro on
February 4, 1773, represents an example of a marriage across the
slave line.[9]

Another instance is that involving Christian Anton, a free Negro.
He had received permission to marry a mulatto slave named Ann
Cherry, whom he contracted to purchase for £50 at 6 per cent
interest. In order to keep her from being re-enslaved, he had to
keep the interest payments current and reduce as much of the
principal as possible. As long as he met these obligations, she and
children born to her were to be considered free, but should he fail
to do so both she and her children would be slaves.[10]

Another poignant instance of marriage across the slave line in-
volved a runaway mulatto. The slave catchers were given a guide
to his whereabouts in an advertisement that stated: "The said
fellow has a free wife, named Peg, and two children which are
supposed to be somewhere in the province of East New Jersey."
He had lived in New Jersey until about six years before, and it
seems logical to assume that the family tie was broken when he
was sold into Pennsylvania.[11]

The situation of slave families was just as vulnerable. Some
masters, however, made an effort to keep families together. When
a young, black woman was offered for sale, it was specified that she
had to be retained within the city so that she could remain in the
vicinity of her husband.[12] Another instance of such consideration
involved the advertising of a Bucks County slave of about twenty-
nine: "He has a wife in West Jersey, about two miles from Yeard-
ley's ferry, and is very desirous of a master in that neighborhood."[13]

These instances were rare and, more often, consideration of
family ties had little to do with a slave's fate. That such was a
situation which blacks fought is attested by newspaper advertise-

8 Records of Christ Church, Philadelphia, Marriages, 1709–1800, 4353 ff, Historical Society
of Pennsylvania.
9 *Ibid.*, 4379.
10 Society Miscellaneous Collection, July 8, 1762, Box 6A, folder 12, Historical Society
of Pennsylvania.
11 *Pennsylvania Gazette*, July 14, 1768.
12 *Ibid.*, June 14, 1770.
13 *Ibid.*, Apr. 26, 1750.

ments. When a slave ran away, the master often first looked for him in the neighborhood of some other family member. Undoubtedly, based on past experience, he knew that the pains of a family separation would be likely to drive a runaway slave to visit a mate or child. For example, a slave who had run away from an iron works was presumed to be found in New Castle County where he had worked before being sold to his present owner. When taken to the iron works of his new master, his wife had been left behind.[14]

Slave families were sometimes widely dispersed. In a letter of June 2, 1719, Jonathan Dickinson, who had emigrated to Philadelphia from Jamaica some years before, wrote John Harriott in Jamaica, including information about some of his slaves so that Harriott could pass on the information to their relatives who still lived in Jamaica.[15] Although the distance was not always that great, the dispersion was often thorough. In the search for a thirty-year-old woman, the possible areas where she might be located were noted as the places to which her daughter had been sold or where her mother and brother served.[16]

The scattering of slave families involved not only the separating of husbands and wives or mothers and mature children, but mothers and very young children. While an advertisement of April 4, 1751, listed an entire family for sale—a man and his wife and child as a unit[17]—in the vast majority of cases each slave was sold separately. Since black women nursed their children until they were about two, those under that age were more likely to be sold with their mothers. Nevertheless, children under two years of age were sometimes parted from their mothers.[18] On at least one occasion, a child who was only a few weeks old was offered for sale either alone or with the mother.[19]

This sundering of black family ties affected not only slave blacks but free blacks as well. Philadelphia's Overseers of the Poor had the responsibility of binding out the children of free blacks, whatever their economic circumstances might be; free blacks were not allowed

---

[14] *Ibid.*, Mar. 11-18, 1730-31.

[15] Letter Book of Jonathan Dickinson, 1715-1721, 252, Library Company of Philadelphia.

[16] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, June 14, 1764.

[17] *Ibid.*, Apr. 4, 1751.

[18] *Ibid.*, Apr. 26-May 3, 1733; William Snelgrave, *A New Account of Guinea and the Slave-Trade* (London, 1754), Introduction.

[19] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, Mar. 2, 1774.

control over the lives of their children. With the assent of at least two justices of the peace, the Overseers would bind out male children until they were twenty-four and female children until they were twenty-one.[20]

Slaves changed hands frequently in eighteenth-century Pennsylvania, finding themselves in many different situations during their lifetimes, with whatever family ties they were able to form sundered several times in the process. One instance will suffice to show the route that slaves could take in the sale and resale which characterized some of their lives. The slave in question was born in Africa in 1715 and was shipped to Charleston, South Carolina, when he was twelve. He was purchased there by a British sea captain, who, in turn, sold him in 1732 to a planter on the island of Montserrat. Still another master brought him to Bucks County, Pennsylvania, to work at the Durham Furnace. This master next hired him to Nathaniel Irish's plantation, where he was married. From there he was sent to an iron works in New Jersey, and after that spent two years in Maryland. Following this, he was taken to the Union Iron Works and from there sold to a firm in Bethlehem. Two years later he was purchased by the Moravian congregation, worked on their farms, and was eventually freed. Meanwhile, his wife had also changed hands several times. The Moravians purchased her and brought her to Bethlehem in 1748, where she was reunited with her husband.[21] While the vicissitudes of the life of this couple were eventually ameliorated, not all slaves were so fortunate.

The materials available for an assessment of black family life in colonial Pennsylvania are rather limited. That material which is available, however, in the legal statutes, church records, and newspaper advertisements suggests that blacks could form only tenuous marital relationships which were not recognized by law. The unofficial marriages of blacks could be severed by fiat if a master decided to sell one or both of the partners, and the ties binding children and parents could be severed in the same arbitrary manner.

Wayne State University   MERLE G. BROUWER

20 Mitchell and Flanders, IV, 62.
21 "Sketches of Several Northampton County, Pennsylvania, Slaves," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, XXII (1898), 503.

George Gray of Gray's Ferry: Quaker or Anglican Revolutionary?

SCHOLARS analyzing the religious, social, and political affilia-
tions of Pennsylvania's Revolutionary leaders have desig-
nated Assemblyman George Gray as a Quaker.[1] This is
understandable, for George Gray (later Speaker of the Pennsylvania
Assembly in 1783–1784) had many ties to the Society of Friends.
His great-grandparents, Alexander and Margaret Beardsley; his
grandparents, George and Mary Beardsley Gray; his wife, Martha
Ibison Gray; his father- and mother-in-law, Robert and Margaret
Ibison; his seventh daughter, Rebecca, and numerous Gray cousins
—all were members of Philadelphia Monthly Meeting at various
times between 1683 and 1799.[2] Thus, it has been easy for historians,
genealogists, and descendants to believe and to write that George
Gray was a Quaker read out of meeting in the midst of the Revolu-
tion for his services on the Pennsylvania Committee of Safety and
the Pennsylvania Board of War.[3] However, extensive research has
turned up not a shred of evidence that George Gray was ever a
member of the Society of Friends, but instead persuasive evidence
is found to the contrary.

[1] Robert Gough's list of the Pennsylvania Revolutionaries of 1776 and their records, on
file under the author's name in the Manuscript Department of the Historical Society of
Pennsylvania (HSP), which were the basis for his "Notes on the Pennsylvania Revolution-
aries of 1776," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography (PMHB)*, XCVI (1972),
91–92; David Hawke, *In the Midst of a Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1961), 153n, 155.

[2] "Minutes of Philadelphia Monthly Meeting of Friends," *Pennsylvania Genealogical
Society Publication*, IV (March, 1910), 143–250; William Wade Hinshaw, ed., *Encyclopedia
of American Quaker Genealogy* (Richmond, Ind., 1936), II, 335, 367–368, 380, 461, 535, 561.

[3] Henry J. Simpson, in preparing his *Lives of Eminent Philadelphians Now Deceased* (Phila-
delphia, 1859), used nearly verbatim information on George Gray supplied to him by a
great-grandson, Thomas Leiper Kane, thus first committing to print this "fact." Thomas L.
Kane to Henry J. Simpson, June 6, 1859, Quaker Collection, Haverford College Library.
In turn, Dr. William Egle relied on Simpson when he wrote sketches of Pennsylvania's
delegates to the 1787 convention to ratify the Federal Constitution, *PMHB*, XI (1887), 78–79.
A reading of the minutes of the Pennsylvania Board of War, *Pa. Archives, Second Series*,
I, 12–75, indicates that, while appointed on March 13, 1777, George Gray was not recorded
present at a single session of this body.

Sometime between February, 1715, and July, 1716, Gray's father married Mary Ewen, widow of Joseph Ewen of Germantown. No record of the marriage of George and Mary Ewen Gray has been found; had they been married under the care of a Friends meeting it would have been minuted at least twice. The Grays subsequently had two children. A daughter, Mary, born March 29, 1717, was baptized at Christ Church on March 8, 1721.[4] George, the future Speaker of the Pennsylvania Assembly, was born "the 26th day of October in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred twenty-five Att the house belonging to Joseph Shippen at the sign of the Roebuck in Germantown (six miles from Philadelphia in Pennsylvania)."[5] The son's name does not appear on Christ Church baptismal records nor is his birth recorded by Friends.

Young George Gray emerged as a public figure on January 1, 1748, when eleven companies of Associators marched through the streets of Philadelphia in a calculated show of armed preparedness.[6] Gray served as lieutenant of Company Nine under the captaincy of his half-sister's husband, James Coultas. Had George Gray been a member of the Society of Friends this activity should have caused eldering or disownment, yet there is no record that any Meeting acted against him.[7]

Clearly, in 1752 George Gray was not a Quaker. "On the 25th of November 1752 in the City of Philadelphia and Province of Pennsylvania, George Gray and Martha Ibbetson [sic] were joined together in the holy Banns of Marriage according to the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England by me William Sturgeon."[8] For marrying "out of unity" Martha had to make satisfaction to Darby Friends before they would give her a certificate to Philadelphia Monthly Meeting in 1755.[9]

    4 Christ Church Baptismal Records, *PMHB*, XVI (1892), 117; *Publications of the Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania*, XIII (1936–1937), 109.

    5 Album, 539, Kane Family Letters (Thomas Leiper Kane), HSP.

    6 Albert Cook Myers, *Hannah Logan's Courtship* (Philadelphia, 1904), 138.

    7 The George Gray disowned by Philadelphia Monthly Meeting in 1757 (Hinshaw, II, 535) was a brewer and cousin of the assemblyman. Successive generations of the Gray family had a fondness for the name George; no less than nine were so named.

    8 Album, 547.

    9 Darby Monthly Meeting (MM), Women's Minutes, I, 135; MM Minutes, I, 395, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College.

In later years two of George's sons, Robert and James, attended the College of Philadelphia, from January, 1773, to July, 1777.[10] James was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania with the class of 1780.[11] At least three of George Gray's daughters were married in Anglican rites by Bishop White at Whitby Hall, Gray's home on the west side of the Schuylkill.[12] A descendant's description of George Gray as "a rich, easy Episcopalian"[13] is the one historians should accept, discarding the more dramatic but erroneous notion, embedded in print for 115 years, that he was a Quaker who suffered disownment for his patriotic activities.

Tempe, Arizona   NORMA ADAMS PRICE

10 "Accounts of Tuition and Fees," Book of Record, 8, University of Pennsylvania Archives.

11 University of Pennsylvania General Alumni Catalogue (Philadelphia, 1917), 20–21.

12 Family Bibles in possession of descendants.

13 Album, 371.