

FROM BIRTH TO BREECHING

Childhood in the World of William Penn

Clarissa F. Dillon, Ph.D.

At the Sunday, April 20, 2008 meeting of the Tredyffrin Easttown Historical Society, Clarissa Dillon presented a program on the daily lives of children in early colonial times. Often overlooked in historical records, these young lives were very different from those of today's youths. Even though the stark realities of colonial life may seem quite unpleasant by today's standards, Clarissa did a wonderful job of presenting some of the challenges and responsibilities experienced by boys and girls during their early years. A number of items, both antiques and reproductions, were used to illustrate this fascinating presentation. Following an introduction by Society program chair Denny Leeper, the program commences:

If anyone has questions, raise your hand. Know that I will call on you. If you have questions that you are hesitant to ask in public, come afterwards and ask; anything goes. I'm a first grade teacher inside my skin and they ask anything, so feel free.

Childhood then was very different and we find it difficult, those of us who are adults, to think about childhood the way people in "the world of William Penn" thought about it then. We tend to say half the children born, died. They tended to say that half the children born survived. That's a different way of looking at things.

At the end of the 18th century, a French philosopher gave a very good description of childhood as it was seen at that time and it's somewhat horrific. He said:

"Watch nature carefully, and follow the paths she traces out for you. She gives children continual exercise; she strengthens their constitution by ordeals of every kind; she teaches them early what pain and trouble mean. The cutting of their teeth gives them fever, sharp fits of colic throw them into con-

vulsions, long coughing chokes them, worms torment them, repletion corrupts their blood, different leavens fermenting them cause eruptions. Nearly the whole of infancy is sickness and danger; half the children die before their eighth year. These trials past, the child has gained strength, and as soon as he can use life, its principle becomes more assured."¹

In addition to these problems, there was always danger from periodic epidemics, such as measles, whooping cough, smallpox, diphtheria, and so forth. Benjamin Franklin expressed lifelong grief for the death of his son, Frankie, at the age of four. Frankie took smallpox "in the natural way." The plan had been to inoculate him but he was sick, so they postponed the inoculation with unfortunate results. Charles Wilson Peale painted "Rachel Weeping." It shows his dead daughter, Margaret, who died of smallpox. If you look carefully at the picture you realize that indeed she is a corpse. And some years later Peale added his wife for reasons I do not know. You can see the picture in Philadelphia.

Following birth, babies needed to be fed and the best way to feed a baby was with breast milk. Mothers usually did so, but there were some who couldn't and there were some who didn't want to, lest it spoil their figure. The answer to that problem was the hiring of a wet nurse. This was usually a woman who had lost a baby and therefore had milk to feed someone else's. Wet nurses advertised their availability in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, and sometimes mothers advertised their desire for such a person in the same newspaper. It was often, however, handled through neighborhood connections, what we would call networking. Mothers wanted a healthy, cheerful woman of good moral character. It didn't always work out that way, and you find the ups and downs of this whole arrangement in diaries and correspondence among family members, usually female members.

If a breast was not available, then women who could afford them used pewter nursing bottles. I have a replica of a 17th-century model. An 18th-century model was found during an archeology dig at Independence Hall. It has a rounder, more bulbous base and straighter shaft. Poor mothers probably used pieces of cloth soaked in liquid for the child to suck.

Once a child was ready to be weaned, whether it was from the bottle or the breast, it was common to use a papboat. I have a stoneware replica. They were made of redware, stoneware, and pewter, even a silver one which would have been used by a family with a great deal of money. With a papboat, you put liquid in it (it doesn't have to be milk), then thicken it slightly with breadcrumbs, then put it in the child's mouth gently. As the child becomes accustomed, you add more breadcrumbs until it is more of a solid than a liquid and the child is then ready for porridge or gruel. Next comes the porringer. A spoon and a porringer work well. You hold it to feed the child and when the child is old enough, it can hold it and feed itself. Porringers were useful. The papboat would not be discarded; it would end up in the medicine cabinet to feed those who were sick in bed because if you use a spoon, it dribbles. Using a papboat is much easier. Once a child was weaned, the food tended to be much closer to what parents were eating. For this reason, in addition to the rudimentary sanitary practices, many children did not survive weaning. If a child got diarrhea or, as they called it, dysentery or flux, it led to dehydration and that led to death. Nowadays children with that problem are popped into the hospital and hydrated intravenously.

There were medicines that were specifically prepared to treat children's ailments. Here is violet syrup, which I just made. I have another batch sitting at home. This one was made in a tinned copper saucepan; perhaps that's why it has this greenish tinge to it. In the past, it was always navy blue, so I'm making a second batch to see if it had to do with the cooking utensil. Violet syrup was used as a gentle laxative. It will stop a tickly cough (it really does); and it's also

so sweet, it makes your teeth twitch and was therefore recommended to follow a particularly nasty, bitter medicine. Violet syrup was available, as was peach-blossom syrup. It is an immediate and effective purge. Elizabeth Drinker used to make it almost annually – to purge her children and her grandchildren.



Left to right: Nursing bottle, papboat, and porringer with baby spoon. *All photographs courtesy of the author.*

I have not tried it.

A common affliction of infants and young children was worms. This seems to have occurred as frequently in children as it does today in puppies and kittens. Parents were used to the idea. A number of different medicines were available. Elizabeth Drinker used Carolina pink root. It's difficult to grow here. Peter Kalm recommended wormseed, saying that the plant grew everywhere. I had to grow it in my own yard in order to get the seeds. A self-help book recommended mercury. If anybody has an old thermometer with mercury in it, it will never go into the landfill, I promise. It will go into my little jar. I'm looking for more. Mercury, or quicksilver, was followed by a jalap purge. Jalap was imported. These ingredients are poisonous, making the treatments dangerous as well as unpleasant. Tincture of larkspur was applied to treat head lice. I tried to persuade my sister-in-law to let me use it when her daughter had head lice but I had no such luck.

Newborns were assisted into the world, usually by a midwife, who was cheered on by the laboring woman's family and friends of the female kind. By the end of the 18th century, "man midwives," or physicians, were sometimes involved in the birth. This was viewed with some concern, and it wasn't just because it was a man. The men came with instruments that could not only ease the birth, but could also be used

more drastically.

Once the baby arrived, it was cleaned and then it was clothed. Cleaning, then and now, was much of a child's life but it certainly is a lot easier now. There were social pressures on anyone involved with children. A doctor said:

"Cleanliness is not only agreeable to the eye, but tends greatly to preserve the health of children...No mother or nurse can have any excuse for allowing a child to be dirty. Poverty may oblige her to give it coarse clothes; but if she does not keep them clean, it must be her own fault."²

Clothing was to keep a baby warm. I have a doll with me today. His name is Peter. He is dressed in the clothing of the better sort. When he travels with me in the car, I'm careful to cover the basket completely because he does look real. I don't want anybody to break into the car to save the "child." His clothing was made from patterns drafted from a surviving layette. The most difficult thing I ever sewed in my whole life was this gown. From the skin out, he is wearing a clout, or diaper, which is four layers of twilled linen in a triangle, secured with a straight pin. Look at the pin on the pilch, which covers his diaper. It's scary! The diaper is underneath the pilch, which is well-fulled. It is not waterproof, but it doesn't absorb water the way the diaper does. He has a little shirt made of fine linen that is secured by a band wrapped snugly around his middle; then the edges



"Baby Peter"

are tucked in. At night this would have been replaced by a longer garment tied with tapes. In cold weather, a woolen garment would have been worn as well.

He is also wearing little woolen stockings and two caps to keep his head warm. His gown screams money. It is an imported polished cotton print, with a long skirt. (I'm wearing linen, which I work in.) His is a very expensive garment and was used in families that could afford it. I learned how to do cartridge pleating and this tiny thing is a casing which I redid several times to get it right. When Peter goes to bed, he wears a little bed gown or nightgown with gussets added so that he can move his legs freely. This can be wrapped around and tied in place with the band. This is of hand-spun, hand-woven wool and these are where his armpits fit. As a baby grew older and began to creep and crawl, the gown would be "short-skirted." It meant that you put the baby in a gown, which did not come down to keep his feet warm, like the other one. If you kept a creeping child in a gown like that, he'd crawl right up the inside of the skirt, end up with his knees under his chin, totally immobilized and shrieking with rage. That happened to a friend's baby. That's how I know. Peter's outfit is suitable for boys and for girls.

There are lots of sources of information about children's clothing, not just the patterns and so forth, like the ones for the layette. The "Register of Damages for Chester County" after the Battle of Brandywine shows that the British took firewood, food, and livestock, which are expected, but they also took clothing for women and children because they had women and children with them here. In claims submitted after the war, "a Childs Petticoat and Shift" was valued at 22 shillings by Noah Mendenhall of London Grove, along with "a Childs frock" at 7 shillings. Sampson Davis of Thornbury lost "Childrens Cloths 2 Petticoats and Bed Gown 24/ ... 1 Sett of Baby cloths 45/6 ..."³

Both boys and girls wore shifts and gowns during their early years. This makes sense because you don't have to have separate sets of clothing for each. This blue gown is made from an old petticoat of mine. These gowns were laced or tied in back so a child could not dress or undress itself, a twice-daily reminder of immaturity. It has leading strings attached to the shoulders that can be used to keep a child close, also a badge of childhood. If you look

closely, you can see little tucks. It can be let out. The clothing was adaptable. This one opens down the back because two-year-olds start being housebroken. A child just learning to walk might wear a “pudding” that ties under the chin so if he falls down, his head is protected by the padding. The pudding would be worn over the child’s cap. Both boys and girls wore



Gown for a two-year-old child.

caps.

Boys could get away with taking off the cap, which was a badge of modesty and proper upbringing. Women and girls wore caps from birth. I have found a reference for a young woman who was buried in a cap and winding sheet. Young children of the wealthy or upwardly mobile were frequently put in stays lined with cardboard. Stays were believed to help them grow straight and also trained them to move with the grace expected of those of the better



Cap for a boy or girl.

sort. Theirs were not like mine, which have steel boning. Older children wore stays stiffened with steel or baleen. Boys usually discarded theirs when they were breeched. Girls wore them through adulthood. Here are replica stays made by a friend, patterned from a pair in Williamsburg.

The passage of a boy from childhood to manhood could occur at different times. Poor boys were breeched at an earlier age, as early as four. They could then be expected to work a full man’s day, often accompanying their fathers to work beside them. If the family was wealthy, a boy could be kept in gowns until around seven, at which point pressure could be exerted to breech him. It depended on the status of the family. It was usually a small family ceremony where gown and shift were removed and the men’s clothing put on – shirt, waistcoat, and breeches. Elizabeth Drinker recorded this significant milestone for her son in 1775: “. . . little Henry put on Coat and Britches . . .”⁴

Earlier, she had listed the clothing sent with him when he went to stay with Sally Oatts:⁵

16 Clouts	4 Arm Cloaths (for inoculation)
2 Night Gowns	3 Dimoty Peticoats
3 Frocks	2 Flannel ditto
5 Shirts	1 Pair Worsted Stocking
his Jockey Cap &c	

These are breeches for a four-year-old. They are generous. He could wear these for quite a while. This waistcoat is the favorite garment of all that I’ve



Shirt and waistcoat.

made. It is wool and is lined with linen. Girls wore the shift and gown until puberty, usually between fourteen and seventeen years of age. Here’s a gown

for a four-year-old girl. It says money. It is tied in the back so she still can't undress herself. Courtney, my granddaughter, had leading strings on the brown gown. When she got a new gown, it still went up the back, but had no leading strings. If she came out with me now, she would wear women's clothing, like mine. So these are the clothes of young children. Sometimes rather worn and tattered, they were often old clothes that had been cut down. Families that could afford the apron put their money there.



Boy's breeches, also known as britches.

Unlike other colonies, William Penn had a lot of say in what went on here. One of the laws he wrote was a literacy requirement: both boys and girls were to be able to read and write by the age of twelve. This is interesting because there were very few places where girls were expected to be literate. He felt it was important so that they could read Scripture and so that they had a marketable skill; so that they could be employed, because the last thing that anyone wants is a bunch of layabouts not supporting themselves. If the parents, guardians and overseers were derelict in this, there was a huge fine, five pounds, so people paid attention to this.



Gown for a four-year-old girl.

Debbie Norris of Stenton wrote in a letter that her one-year-old nephew was learning his letters from cardboard squares. They were laid on the table and he would pick out letters for words, like "m" for "mother." Once the alphabet was managed on a horn-book, a child could learn to read. The Lord's Prayer would already be known from memory, so you could teach yourself to read the words. If the family was wealthy, they could encourage learning with imported jigsaw puzzles, like this one from Williamsburg. There are jigsaw puzzles for the alphabet, geography and history. Books for young children were designed to teach moral values and civility. Writing was taught separately, on a slate, with a slate pencil, progressing to paper with ink and a quill pen. In Philadelphia, there were dame schools for the young and in Chester County, members of various Quaker meetings organized, financed, and supplied schools for their children.

Children tended not to have toys like children today. Sometimes they could make toys themselves, as a means of learning. This tow baby was made with linen stuffed with tow. It has no features, no clothes, no legs, and could be made by a little girl. A five-year-old would make herself a tow baby to love and cuddle. When finished making it, she had the basic

stitches for sewing clothing and could start making her own – with help. Boys could use their knives to whittle or cut toys out of wood, learning how to handle various tools.

If a child lived in a wealthy family, it was possible for that child to have what we think of as toys. Toys were actually ways to learn some of the things to which they would be exposed. A rocking horse can teach you to stay on something that's moving, so that when you get on your pony, you don't fall off. Farm children ride fence rails until they ride horses. In portraits of well-to-do families, you see children playing with little carriages and toy tea sets and that sort of thing.

If the infant was in a wealthy family, it might have something like this. This was not an impulse buy. I'd been looking for one of these for ages. This is a coral and bells teether. It's made of silver, which has tarnished over time. The coral is for teething, smooth and hard, and was also supposed to keep a child healthy and



Teether.

protected from infectious diseases. It has bells and it also has a whistle. A very wealthy child could have this literally as a toy. I bought it in London for a price that was extravagant but not unreasonable.

When boys became men (upon breeching), their childhood ended. Girls went into women's clothing when they developed women's bodies, but anyone wearing skirts was deemed to be in need of care, supervision, and instruction, which meant that small

children wore skirts. Grown women also wore skirts and were in need of care, supervision and instruction. This is not necessarily the case today, although some think so. A boy, once he reached manhood, could be apprenticed to a master to learn a craft or trade. Girls were seldom apprenticed. They learned their domestic skills at home within the family and with neighbors. Occasionally, they were apprenticed to milliners or mantua (loose-fitting gowns)-makers, but this was usually done by the Overseers of the Poor. Girls in poor families might be indentured to learn the skills of a domestic servant.

A boy would be apprenticed by his father with the master in whatever trade or craft the father decided was appropriate. The apprenticeship was created in contract, wherein the father essentially paid a tuition. He paid for the boy's lodging, clothing, food, upkeep and training in the "arts and mysteries" of whatever the trade was and in return the master provided all these things. Once this contract was signed by the two, it was binding and the child went to live in the master's house and became part of the master's family. This is hard for people to understand, that a seven-year-old child can be placed in someone else's home and be denied permission to go see his parents. If he went anyway, he would be cried a runaway and was in big trouble.

Occasionally, in diaries you come across things like this. I find this to be haunting. In Elizabeth Drinker's diary, she wrote:

" . . . A well duped Woman of the Name of Mary Scott, with a little tidy girl between 2 and 3 years old, and a little boy of 7 months in her arms, came to desire I would take her Child 'till she was 18 years of age, that she might go to service with her other Child. I told her I had several grand Children and was in years myself, it did not suit me to take so young a Child - she had been recommended here she said . . ." ⁶

This woman was trying to do the best possible thing, going to someone she heard of, which is the equivalent of references. She hoped that Elizabeth Drinker would take the little girl as an indentured servant, which would mean providing her with lodging, food, clothing and training so that when she was 18, she could go out to work as a domestic helper. That way,

the mother could seek employment with only one child; she had to keep the boy because he wasn't walking yet. Elizabeth Drinker did not take the little girl. I do sometimes wonder what happened to her because there were only two other alternatives. One was abandonment, in which case she would be apprenticed out by the Overseers to anyone who would take her, no questions asked. The other alternative is infanticide. You can find examples of those in the *Diary of Elizabeth Drinker*, which is absolutely wonderful; not an easy read and not short, but wonderful.

My investigating into the lives of children has gone on for many years and I'm never going to come to an end because I never know when I'm going to find something that relates to things. The most recent thing is the cardboard letters, which turned up in a book called *Hannah Logan's Courtship*, a historical romance. It's based on fact but I never would have thought to find something there that I could use here. This is what I do, not just for childhood, but for all sorts of other topics as well, and it more or less keeps me out of trouble. Do you have any questions?

Q: Would you tell us about your attire?

This is English work clothing of the time of the American Revolution. If Washington walked into the room, he would know quite a bit about me without my saying a word. He would know I was English because I'm wearing two petticoats. You can see my under-petticoat because it hangs just a little below my over-petticoat. He would also know that I am working because my shoes have the rough side out; they are flat-heeled brogues. If I were a little higher up, I would have smooth leather shoes. I am also wearing a short gown, which is a work garment, usually worn by servants and rural women. My shift comes down slightly below my knee; that's my underwear. I'm wearing stockings with tape garters to keep them up, a handkerchief, an apron, and a cap. Washington would know that I'm doing okay because my petticoats are not boring colors. Reds and pinks involve imported dyes.

Tell us about Elizabeth Drinker's diary.

Elizabeth Drinker's diary has thin pages, small print, and a great index. At the New York Public Library, they sold me a flash drive to take information off the internet. There is a lot of stuff floating around out there in cyberspace.

Please tell us more about violet syrup.

It's labor intensive, so wonderful for kids. You collect the violets when they are in bloom. Hold them tightly and pinch off only the purple part of the five petals and drop those in a container, every single individual violet. Cover what you have with boiling water, cover with a lid, and let it sit overnight. Next day, press the petals and save all the liquid. I add twice the sugar and simmer it just until the sugar dissolves. That's it. If I want the syrup purple, I add lemon. Some people didn't. This time I wanted it blue.

These publications, are they available today?

I work out of their books all the time.

Regarding the little doll, what is tow?

To grow flax, which was grown here, sow the seed thick so it will grow tall. Pull it up by the roots. It is allowed to sit in water in a ditch, if you are English, until the stiff coating on the outside rots. Then you dry it and keep it until it's ready to process. You scutch it, that is, knock the broken, rotten bark off the outside. Then hackle it, that is, comb out any bits that are left. The short pieces that come out with the combing are tow. The long pieces stay and that is line fiber, what you spin into thread. Machines can't handle the long line fiber, so they chop up the linen and that is what the machine spins today.

How many changes of clothing did people have?

It would depend on how much you could afford to have. Elizabeth Drinker sent clothes to the nurse, Sally Oatts, when Henry was off being inoculated. She chose to have that done not at home and she sent with Henry several outfits [see p. 121 for the inventory]. Her family was quite comfortable. Henry Sr., was a prosperous merchant who moved in the best circles of Philadelphia, so this is an appropriate wardrobe for little Henry. On the other hand, Mary Scott's little boy, the 7 month old who is still riding her hip, is not going to have clothing like that. In records of the Overseers of the Poor, you find that a poor woman being supported by the community is allowed fabric for two shifts and two caps and one apron. That means you have a shift on and another in the chest. So if somebody throws up on your shift or

you rip it – if it has a problem - you can take it off and put the other shift on. But there were women who didn't have that safety net and they might only have one shift. In which case, when it had to be removed for mending or cleaning, they were shiftless.

Is the slate pencil that you mentioned chalky?

No. It's slate. Chalk is 19th century. I don't know how they drill them out, but you are writing with slate on slate. There are ads that talk about slates and slate pencils being available from merchants out in country stores. Somebody is back making them again, so you can buy them in places like Williamsburg. You have to be careful because if you press too hard, go too fast, or turn the corner without stopping, it will screech worse than fingernails on a blackboard. That makes it self-checking for children, which is always good.

How did they inoculate for smallpox?

They took pus from an infected person, scratched the skin, and inserted the pus, and hoped it took without killing the patient. Elizabeth Drinker had her children inoculated. I belong to a group called Past Masters in Early Domestic Arts, which publishes a quarterly newsletter. Some years ago when smallpox loomed up in international news, I did two articles on smallpox in 18th century Pennsylvania. Elizabeth Drinker was helpful because she commented in her diary about the use of cowpox as a way of protecting people against smallpox, without making them that sick. Bless her heart, that's why I love her diary, because she tells me things like that; and you can find it in the Index, so you don't have to keep looking and looking.

Smallpox would sweep through communities regularly and there was relatively little you could do once somebody got it – they either got well if they were strong or died if they were not. The portraits do not give you an example of what smallpox does because the artist was tactful and painted his subjects with clean skin. Unless you see photographs of modern victims of smallpox, you have no idea. They talked hopefully about having treatment to prevent pitting, using salves that you could apply with a feather – supposed to help. Smallpox was a matter of great concern. Ships full of sailors and immigrants came to Philadelphia often.

Soldiers too?

Oh, yes. Washington decided that he would have everybody inoculated. There were those - well, there are always those who complain - but there were people who said he was wasting time, he was wasting money, he should concentrate on beating the British and lining his men up in battles. Yet there are scholars who say that his decision to inoculate soldiers won the war because British soldiers were not inoculated. If soldiers are living close together, possibly sharing clothing, there are all sorts of exciting opportunities for contamination

Can you tell us more about your stays?

It was believed they would help one to grow straight; for straightening babies out, because they would be all curled up from the womb. Swaddling also encouraged babies to straighten out. By the 18th century, swaddling, where you wrapped them up like mummies so that you could hang them up out of the way, had pretty much disappeared. That was done to allow children to grow straight and be strong.

Another reason for stays is that one moves differently in stays; I know that I do. It was important, especially here where anyone could become rich. That didn't mean they had old money. People with old money were looking for ways to set themselves apart from the new money. They would raise their children within the rules of civility and gentility – if you put a child in stays, it learns to move properly. When I do a program with children, I teach them how to become rich. First, stand up; then make a V with your heels touching. Slide one foot forward so that the heel is tucked into the other arch. Then roll your shoulders back. Don't raise them, roll them back. Bend your arms at the elbow, but don't lean them on your belly. Turn your palms up and lift your chin. At this point, the moaning and the kvetching that occurs in the classroom is amazing. I make them stay that way for about 15 seconds, then tell them that they can be ordinary now. They fall into their chairs and say, "Oh, I'm so glad I'm not rich. I didn't know it was so hard to be rich."

When I wear my lady's stays (I'm wearing work stays today), the lady stays are half-boned. They are not fully boned, which means all channels filled. Even in my half-boned lady stays, if I drop some-

thing, I can't bend over to pick it up. If I wear a busk, which is a piece of wood laid in between my stays and my shift, which goes right below my bellybutton; if I wear that, once it's in place, I cannot turn my head. So before I get in my car, I remove the busk. I have learned not to put the busk in, because it startles people when I stand next to the car and remove it. You learn, like football players learning to move in all the stuff that they have to wear. You learn how to do what you need to do while you are wearing all of this. My work stays give me back support. Everything in colonial women's work was heavy. Water is heavy, pots are heavy, pots full of water weigh a ton, wood weighs a ton. All my gear must be hauled down to the car and then hauled back. Needless to

say, I only do laundry like that once a year, but need the back support that the stays provide. I am not Scarlett O'Hara. I have to breathe. I'm not going to spend my day just standing around. Actually, standing is more comfortable. There are French cartoons showing a woman hanging on to the bedpost, and a man with his foot in her back tightening her stays. If you went to court to attend royalty, the whole purpose was to stand around and be decorative. That was your job. They would be laced tightly. 19th century stays were very different. There were women who had the floating ribs removed. I don't have to do that.

That concludes my presentation. Feel free to come up and look. You may touch with care.

ENDNOTES

1. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Emile: or, concerning Education (1762), Extracts from Books 1,2,3, trans. by Eleanor Worthington (Boston: D.C. Heath & Co., Publishers, 1883), p. 19.
2. William Buchan, M.D., Domestic Medicine: . . . (1769) New Ed. (Boston: Printed for Joseph Bumstead, 1809), p. 39.
3. "A Register of Damages . . ." (unpublished manuscript/typescript in the Chester County Historical Society, West Chester, PA), p.29 and p.82.
4. The Diary of Elizabeth Drinker, edited by Elaine Forman Crane (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1991), p.210.
5. Ibid., p. 187.
6. Ibid., pp. 1018-1019.

About the Author

Clarissa F. Dillon, Ph.D., has a doctorate in History from Bryn Mawr College. She has been doing 18th century housewifery since 1973 and is a founding member of Past Masters in Early Domestic Arts. This is the first time she is being published in the Tredyffrin Easttown Historical Society Quarterly. We look forward to hearing more from her in future presentations.