QUAKER STUDIES 17/1 (2012) [48–109]
ISSN 1363-013X

MEMBERS AND DESCENDANTS OF THE NEWGARDEN MEETING, COUNTY CARLOW— DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES 1600–1899: PART 1

Peter J.F. Coutts
Former Director of the Victorian Archaeological Survey & Hon. Sen. Research Fellow,
History Dept., LaTrobe University, Victoria, Australia

ABSTRACT

This paper, presented in two separate parts, defines a select number of demographic markers for the population that comprised members of the Newgarden Meeting, County Carlow, Ireland and their descendants 1600–1900. These in turn were compared with those derived by Vann and Eversley (1992) for the Quaker population of Ireland at large with the objectives of identifying consistencies and/or evidence for regional variation within a genetic context. The data used for the study, most of which derived from the registers of births, deaths, and marriages held in the library of the Religious Society of Friends Historical Library, Dublin, were subjected initially to rigorous scrutiny to determine their limitations for this type of analysis. While several problems were identified, the most serious were a suspected and sometimes documented lack of consistency and ambiguities in respect of many family records. These in turn limited the types of analysis that could be undertaken, and sometimes reduced sample numbers to such an extent that the analysis was constrained to identify trends from statistically poor samples.

Despite the shortcomings of the data, it was possible to explore several demographic aspects of the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting through the agency of family reconstitution, including birthplace analysis, occupation, age at marriage, marriage catchment analysis, evidence for delayed marriage, family size, some aspects of age analysis, and birth spacing. It was found, for example, that over time family sizes became smaller, marriages were delayed, lifespan gradually increased, and families were sometimes planned. While many of the results parallel those of Vann and Eversley, there are sufficient differences in several of the demographic markers to suggest that there may have been some variation in rural Ireland from the national trends. In so far as the Newgarden/Carlow population is concerned, and in contrast with results derived from the analysis of the national population, these include a tendency for females to marry earlier and males later, a greater proportion of females marrying under the age of 20, and after 1800 a trend for males to marry much younger women and a trend consistent over time to reduce the sizes of families. These and the other results, then, invite analysis of data from other regions to test this hypothesis.

KEYWORDS

Demography, Newgarden, wills, marriage, occupation, Carlow, Vann and Eversley.

INTRODUCTION

Demographic studies of Irish Quakers are not new. Major studies were initiated by Richard Vann and David Eversley on Irish and English Quaker populations in the 1960s (Eversley 1981: 57). Eversley (1981) first published a synopsis of their research and the major publication detailing the results of their analysis followed in 1992 (Vann and Eversley 1992). Their publication remains the seminal work on the demography of Irish (and British) Quakers.

Vann and Eversley were attracted to the study of Quaker populations because of the body of accurate and reliable birth, death, and marriage data available in their registers. Quakers did not baptize their children and consequently the dates in their registers are actual birth dates, whereas those in Parish registers of the conformist churches were baptismal dates sometimes entered months or even years after birth. Again, inconsistencies, omissions, and errors are common in Parish registers, which means that demographers often need to spend time and effort filtering, interpreting, and correcting such data. The information in Quaker registers tends to be better organized, less prone to errors and omissions, more complete, and more reliable.

Having chosen to work on Quaker data, Vann and Eversley set out to examine a number of broad questions: How representative were the Quaker populations of England and Ireland of their conformist counterparts? Were there differences between the demographics of English and Irish Quakers and if so, why? And how did Quakers manage childbirth, marriages, and disease-related deaths? One aspect they were unable to pursue was a comparison between demographic profiles of the Quakers and conformists in Ireland. While they had access to reliable demographic data for conformist populations in England, no such data were available for their counterparts in Ireland.[1]

The current study is focused on the population that initially made up the membership of the Newgarden Meeting in County Carlow and their descendants. The Meeting was one of the smallest in Ireland and in the first few generations its members were mostly engaged in rural activities. The main task of this study was to define and compare a select number of demographic parameters with those derived by Vann and Eversley for the wider Quaker population of Ireland. The objectives were to determine whether there was evidence of local or regional variations and to identify and explain temporal changes in demographic parameters. This was facilitated by first establishing profiles for sequential time periods of 50-year intervals (abbreviated hereafter TP) starting from 1600.[2] Notably, Vann and Eversley's study covers the period 1650 to 1850 whereas the current study, for reasons explained below terminates at 1900.

Vann and Eversley (2002: 57), in their introductory discussions of the data, recognized that there might be differences between the demographics of, say, rural and urban populations of Friends or populations drawn from the Northern and Southern areas of Ireland, but they argued against subdividing the population on the grounds that it could degrade samples to the point where comparative

studies based on such data would be tenuous. The current study bravely ignores their warning and has proceeded to grapple with the problem of small samples.

It is pertinent at this stage to ask what one might expect to achieve from this type of study. As far as is known, Friends prided themselves on being an exclusive group within Irish society, bound together by a common religious ethos, with rules that governed their behavior in almost all aspects of their lives. At first sight this appears to be a recipe for homogeneity in demographics but in reality factors other than religious fervor and ecclesiastical rules governing behavior can and did affect Friends' demographics. Ireland is comprised of diverse landscapes and environments providing a variety of economic opportunities for those populations that occupy or occupied them, including Quaker communities. Friends were located all over Ireland, often widely dispersed in rural areas, and one would expect to find them adapting to the local environments, conditions, and even customs. Again, Friends who chose to reside in urban areas lived different lives from their compatriots in rural areas, and were exposed to different challenges for survival. For example, rural Friends were more exposed to tithe collectors whose activities affected incomes and these in turn could affect demographics of marriages and births. Increased health risks in urban areas may have affected mortality rates to a greater degree than in rural areas, while better economic opportunities in urban areas may have promoted earlier marriage. The impact of military campaigns, the activities of rapparees, and of other social and economic dislocations on local populations was not uniform across Ireland. Quaker communities were certainly affected though not necessarily in a uniform way.

And then there were a host of social factors that may have influenced local demographics, some marginally, some seriously. Marriage in particular was carefully controlled by parents and their Meetings, but discipline was sometimes breached when children married out and moved out of observation. Illegitimate children were another problem. A Meeting slack on discipline could provide (or not provide) data that produced misleading demographics such as under-registrations of births and marriages.[3] Communication and distances between Friends' settlements, distances from markets, opportunities for social intercourse, relations with local clergy, relationships between children and parents and between parents and the elders of Meetings are all factors that may have affected demographics of Meetings.

At the macro level and addressing the studies that have been published on the demographics of the Irish population at large, the topic of regional variation has been largely avoided for the era before the nineteenth century because of the absence of appropriate population data. This is not the case for much of the nineteenth century; demographers, using census and BDM data, have been able to document significant regional variations from time-to-time and there is every reason to expect that this was the case in previous eras. Cousens (1964: 317-18) showed that there was regional variation in the proportions of single and married women in 1841 and 1871 respectively and considerable regional variation in celibacy over this period. These variations he attributed in part to changes in

agrarian conditions and emigration patterns. Walsh (1970) looked at marriage rates and fertility through the period 1871 to 1911 and posited that in 1871 the lowest marriage rates occurred for the populations in the East of Ireland where there was a shortage of land availability and higher living standards accompanied by relatively high fertility rates. By contrast, he found the highest rates of nuptiality in the West, where land was more readily available, living standards were lower, and fertility rates were among the highest in Ireland. Over the next 40 years the demographics of the two regions saw significant changes so that by 1911 the West had the lowest rates of nuptiality and there were falls in marriage fertility in the East. While Friends cannot be counted as part of the peasant population of Ireland they did live among them and were witness to their social and political journeys. As such one might expect some reflection of this in their demographic profiles.

Various explanations have been offered by a variety of academics for the changes in population dynamics in Ireland. These involve aspects of the land tenure system, the role of the clergy, emigration, inheritance system, famine, plague and public health, diet, agricultural practices, family limitation, abstinence, and inheritance practices.[4] In respect of Friends, the two that are most likely to have affected regional variations in their demographics are land tenure and inheritance.

THE NEWGARDEN MEETING

The Newgarden Meeting, founded sometime before 1670,[5] probably never had more than about 200 members at any time in its history, and with one or two exceptions, its members were mostly of English stock.[6] Membership[7] was at its peak during the first two decades of the eighteenth century, and thereafter it slowly declined until the Meeting was laid down in the early twentieth century. The original membership was drawn mainly from three counties, Carlow, Kildare, and Queen's, and a few from Wicklow. Friends had settled in 27 parishes in County Carlow, 23 in County Kildare, and 8 in Queen's County, but within the counties Friends were thinly spread. Most counties could boast residency within a single Townland and there were but two that had Friends residing in six different Townlands.[8] In other words Friends were dispersed among the wider rural population and as such they were very vulnerable to outsiders, whether in the form of hostile acts or social or commercial intercourse, from neighbors, tithe collectors, villains, or incursions by militia and other armed groups.

The original meeting was located at Newgarden in County Carlow but satellite meetings were established at one time or other at Carlow (County Carlow), Kilconner (County Carlow), Athy (County Kildare), Castledermot (County Kildare), Newtown (County Kildare), and Ballytoher (County Kildare). Around 1716 the Meeting abandoned Newgarden in favor of Carlow which became the mother meeting until its demise. The satellite Meetings fell under the jurisdiction and control of the Newgarden/Carlow Men's Monthly Meeting.

Of the five main physiographic regions of the county,[9] the first generations of Quaker settlers located in all except the elevated region in the South Eastern area known as Blackstairs Mountains. The majority of families resided in the Intermediate Region, characterized by undulating to rolling topography and deep, well-drained soils, and the Burrow Valley, comprising relatively flat areas following the north–south line of the River Barrow from County Kildare, all excellent farming country. Moreover, they were located on the Grey Brown Podzolics and Brown-Earths, which made up around 52% of the total area of County Carlow and are among the richest agricultural lands in the county today. Notably, the same soils have been classified by the National Soil Survey of Ireland as most suitable for mixed farming. The county is well drained by the rivers Barrow, Slaney, and Nore, providing at one time navigable waterways for conducting primary produce to markets and water power to drive mills.

Analysis of the commodities confiscated from Quaker families by tithemongers suggests that all the early Quaker families probably had some acreage regardless of their occupation, but that most were farmers engaged in mixed farming (Coutts 2011c).[10] The emphasis, however, was on raising sheep (for their fleeces and lambs), and on growing corn (barley, oats, rye, and bear), but more particularly oats, and hay. Beans, peas, carrots, potatoes, and parsnips were also cultivated but were probably of little or no direct commercial importance. The analysis of the tithe data, which dealt with the period 1650–1725, suggested that there was a commonality in the type and variety of commodities associated with Friends' farms and little or no change in them throughout the entire period.

The Meeting survived into the early twentieth century but suffered continual loss of membership. The last entry in the birth register is for 1909, but the minutes of the Men's Business Meeting continued until 1912 when the Carlow Meeting merged with Dublin Monthly Meeting. The Meeting was officially 'laid down' in 1920. By that time there were few Friends residing in the original catchment area from which the Newgarden Meeting originally drew its members. While some of their descendants were still around, others widely dispersed, removed to foreign lands (see below), to Dublin and Cork, involved in trade and commerce as well as in the professions such as law and medicine. Descendant's families that had endured through 250 years of conflict, change, and political mayhem included the Watson's, Lecky's, Cooper's, Duckett's, Thompson's, and Whitton's.[11] Members of these families tended to emerge into the nineteenth century as members of the landed gentry abandoning or eventually abandoning their Quaker heritage. Today there is little or no memory of the families among locals.[12]

THE ANALYTICAL APPROACH IN BRIEF

This paper is presented in two parts. In Part 1 the data to be used in the analysis are identified and subjected to critical assessment to identify the extent of their utility and limitations. Next the methodology deployed in the analysis is

summarized followed by a demographic analysis of birthplaces, occupations, and marriages. Several aspects of marriages are explored including spatial analysis of partners, age at marriage, and age differences at marriage.

The more complex demographic aspects of the Meeting are dealt with in Part 2 (to be published in the next issue of this journal) including birth patterns, family sizes, age-specific marital fertility, birth management, and some elements of mortality (limited by the data) followed by a summary and conclusions.

FAMILY RECONSTITUTION IN BRIEF

The foundation of the Vann and Eversley study is family reconstitution (1992: 23). This is a technique used by genealogists whereby families are 'reconstituted' from genealogical records (Wrigley *et al.* 2005: 12ff.). A record may start with the names of a husband and wife together with their dates of births, deaths, and marriages (BDM), and the names of each of their parents. Depending upon the information available, one can work forward or backwards in time or go both ways. Moving forward, their children would be identified together with their dates of BDM. Recording might then proceed to the children's children and so on, gradually establishing a genealogical chart for the family utilizing appropriate demographic data. At each stage the data are qualified and checked for rigor and reliability. As each stage is passed the constituents are said to remain 'in observation' and the process continues until the members of the family pass out of observation.

Family reconstitution was used to recruit and order data for this study. It is not focused on male descendants and incorporates females and their offspring. Moreover, it is not restricted to residents of the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting although its members are the prime focus of this study. The only restriction is that for a person to be included in the database he/she must have a family connection through marriage to a member or descendant of the original membership. Female descendants, for example, often moved away when they married and joined the Meetings of their husbands. Males sometimes moved away to set up in business in other places or migrated to other countries. Whenever they can be tracked they have been incorporated into the analysis. Accordingly the database provides a genetic as well as a geographic fingerprint for the Meeting.

SOURCES OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The major sources used in this study were the registers of births, deaths, and marriages of Quaker families currently housed at the Religious Society of Friends Historical Library, Dublin. Of these the principal foci were the registers for the Newgarden and Carlow Meetings, supplemented with information from those of the Dublin, Cork, Mountmellick, Wicklow, Youghal, Tipperary, and Edinderry Meetings. The data in the registers are, in general, sufficiently complete to enable family reconstitution and demographic analysis to be undertaken, although with

some reservations. Vann and Eversley (1992: 11ff.) have used the same sources and discussed the limitations of the data in considerable detail.[13] Accordingly, the current discussion of data integrity will focus on specific aspects of the Newgarden/Carlow Registers.

The Friends' library in Dublin holds two sets of registers, one commonly called 'The Family Register', the other aptly called the summary or new register. The Family Registers are books that were kept by the Meeting to record details of member families.[14] They are hand written, in fairly good condition, and contain a name index. The entries are very clear and there is little call for interpretation. In general there are two pages for the root of each family, and other pages for the male offspring. The left hand page for each family begins with the name of the original male member, usually with a short account of his origins, and gives his date of birth together with marriage details. Thereafter his children are listed. The right hand page lists the dates of death of family members but those data are rarely complete. The emphasis is on births while entries for marriages and deaths are sporadic. Pages are numbered to facilitate the indexing system. The books also contain post-mortem testimonies for some individuals and these often contain useful genealogical information. It is clear that over the years the library identification system for the books has changed. Originally the registers were given a number but the system of identification changed sometime after 1860. The original registers are not complete, as there are no records for many families who are known to have joined the Society.[15]

Family Registers for Friends' Meetings were eventually abandoned and were replaced by summary registers put together in the 1860s (Webb 1906: 10; Irish Roots 1996: 7). The genealogical data were extracted from the older family registers and recorded alphabetically in separate A3 sized books, one each for marriages, births, and deaths for each Meeting. To enable the source of the information to be identified, for each entry the name of the original family register from which the datum came (e.g. 'BK 1') and page reference are cited. The writing in the new registers is very clear and easy to read. The summary registers contain information on members up to the present time. There is absolutely no ambiguity or need for interpretation; all the entries can be clearly read and understood. Random checks of the Newgarden/Carlow registers suggest that the process of transcribing the data from the Family Registers to the summary registers was reliable, although several errors were identified.

The birth registers usually provide the full names of individuals, their dates and places of birth, the given names of one or both parents, and their places of abode. They do not provide the surnames of mothers. The birth register provides the actual date of birth as opposed to a baptismal date as would be found in conformist church registries.[16] The marriage registers provide the names and places of residence of bride and groom, the given names and places of residence of the parents, the name of the father (the mother's surname is not given), and the date and place of marriage. Occasionally occupations of the bride or groom are specified (e.g. 'Spinster', 'Merchant') but such entries are very rare. Again, in some

instances where the bride was committing to a second or third marriage, there might be an annotation such as 'widow'. The death register contains the names of the individuals, their dates and places of death, dates and places of burial, and annotations of relationships such as 'Son of James and Anne' or 'Wife of Joseph'.

Data from other sources have been used to supplement those from Friends' registers. These include information in other documents held in the Friends Historical Library in Dublin, such as the Books of Sufferings,[17] diaries, civil registers, land memorials held by the Registrar of Deeds, Dublin,[18] family genealogies, and a variety of published sources. There are also reservations associated with their use. For example, several of the Carlow families have entries in Burke's genealogical publications but data from such sources need to be evaluated carefully. The genealogical information in Burke's publications has been provided by the families themselves and is subject therefore to errors, omissions, and genealogical aberrations. In general the data have not been subjected to rigorous evaluation and verification by independent professionals before publication. Typically, in the preface to the 1976 edition of Burke's Irish Family Records the editor was at pains to add a disclaimer that 'Every care was taken to check the information supplied for this edition but the Publisher cannot accept responsibility for mis-statements, omissions, or other inaccuracies which may appear in this work'. It is usually not clear, for example, whether the published birth dates are baptismal or calendar: dates are often given as a year only or omitted altogether. And the emphasis in these genealogies is always on the male lines and female offspring are either omitted or treated off-handedly with little or no detail.

The minutes of the Men's and Women's Monthly Meetings for discipline (dating from 1678 for the Men's Meeting) provide useful demographic information about who were members of the Meeting, removals, admissions, marriages, some occupational data, and the names of those who were subjected to testimonies of disunion. Marriage dates are not specified in the minutes but these data are useful still for cross-checking those contained in the marriage registers. The minutes also contain the names of members who 'married out', that is, members who chose to solemnize their marriages by using priests of the Catholic Church or the Church of Ireland. In some cases the surnames of the spouses of women Friends are listed but there is never any information about non-Quaker spouses such as their places of residence, age, and parents, nor are marriage dates specified. Thus, where such data have been utilized in the demographic analysis the year in which the member was disowned (as extracted from the minutes) has been used as the time marker. At the time the computer analysis was conducted the author had access to minutes only up to 1732 and subsequent disownments through clandestine marriages are not part of this study.

Another useful source for members of the Carlow meeting are the names of persons interred in the burial ground of the Ballitore Meeting (Shackleton 1985/86). However some caution needs to be exercised when using the register as it includes non-related members as well members of other Meetings.

THE NEWGARDEN AND CARLOW REGISTERS

Registration of Quaker births, deaths, and marriages did not become a formality in Ireland until sometime after 1669 when George Fox encouraged all Meetings to do so (Goodbody and Hutton 1967: 4). He had recommended that all Monthly Meetings keep such records and forward copies to the respective Quarterly Meetings for safe-keeping and insurance. Implementation of his plan was not immediate and Meetings encountered problems in persuading members to supply information. When it was supplied, it could be years after the events described and as such prone to error. Moreover, there was a degree of selection in supplying information, as for example when parents or brothers or other relatives were not members. In such cases they could be omitted from the registers or entered with scant information.

Judged on the minutes of the Newgarden Men's Meeting at first sight it would appear that the Meeting was slow in implementing Fox's recommendations. Registration of births and burials, in the form of a Family Register, was underway about 1693 as a note in the minutes suggests:

> Edward Weston hath taken upon himself entering of births and burials and order thereunto friends have put, books for ye purpose into his hands and committed to his care (NGMMM 12.01.1693).

However, the minutes of the Quarterly Meeting indicates otherwise. Those for June 1671 suggest that all Meetings at that time kept some form of books to record births, deaths, and marriages, as the Quarterly Meeting requested copies of their records so that they could be recorded in the Provincial book (MMQM 11.04.1671). Later entries of a similar vein confirm there were books and that initially Henry Rose was the custodian of those belonging to Newgarden[19] but not necessarily the person who made the entries in their official books for recording births, deaths, and marriages. Line items in the minutes of the Newgarden Men's Meeting suggest that the information at one stage was forwarded to Thomas Banks in Dublin[20] who was paid to record it. At a meeting in November 1694 the Meeting approved a payment of 30 shillings to Banks for his services (NGMMM 14.09.1694). Thereafter there are frequent appeals to members to provide information first to Edward Western, and later to Thomas Duckett, who eventually took custody of the books:

> Friends belonging to this meeting that have omitted giving in account of their children's births or burials are desired diligently to make it their business to give a full account in writing into ye hands of Thomas Duckett between now and ye next men's meeting that see they may be orderly recorded and ye Edward Weston do send ye book for that purpose as formerly desired unto Thomas Duckett (NGMMM 07.05.1697).

Despite frequent reminders to provide birth and death information for registration, a decade or so later the Meeting still had problems collecting it:

> There being upon enquiry pretty much omission among friends not having births and burials entered as often desired, its now once more desired that all friends in this meeting may give such accounts as they have to Thomas Duckett to have them recorded in ye book for said purpose (NGMMM 03.06.1709).

Examinations of the way in which family entries have been made in the Newgarden Family Register suggest that many were written at a single sitting. This suggests that some members submitted digests of family information for transcription rather than providing it contemporaneously with birth and burial events. Such a procedure was prone to error. Members could submit selective information, provide erroneous and unsubstantiated anecdotal information, and there was always the possibility of errors being introduced during the process of transcription. For example stillbirths or infant births and deaths may not have been registered, as in the case of a child of Elizabeth and Richard Shackleton. Leadbeater (1822: 30) reported that their only child (presumably their first) died of smallpox sometime in 1757 but in the Friends family records there are entries for the birth of four children, the first in February 1759, four years after their marriage. In practice there is no way of determining how prevalent such omissions may have been. A particularly bizarre example of the haphazard way information could be gathered or in this example not gathered, pertains to John Lowden. He joined the Meeting in 1709 (NGMMM 28.04.1709) and left for Pennsylvania in 1711. In 1724 someone noticed that his children had not been registered and the Meeting tried unsuccessfully to get the missing information through correspondence.[21]

What is clear from reading the minutes is that members did not spontaneously surrender marriage, birth, and death information to be registered and that it was a constant battle to persuade members to do so. The minutes are peppered with requests and exhortations such as:

> Friends are desired to bring in there births and burials and give account to ye next men's meeting (NGMMM 30.08.1723).

Indeed collection of birth and burial data appears to have been a continuing problem throughout the following decades as there are numerous entries in the minutes suggesting that members were slack in providing the information.

As for births and burials, the first indication in the minutes that there was some form of book for recording marriages appears in 1694 when Thomas Banks of Dublin was remunerated for recording them on behalf of the Newgarden Meeting (NGMMM 14.09.1694). Further confirmation that there was a book comes from the minutes of the Meeting held on 29 November 1700. The book was to be made available to Friends for inspection and there was a general call for all those who had not provided copies of their marriage certificates to do so (NGMMM 29.11.1700). At that time it seems the certificates were recorded in a book and copies were sent to Thomas Banks in Dublin where he transcribed them into another book. In 1701, Ephraim Heritage was in charge of the book and was responsible for sending the copies (NGMMM 29.06.1701).

In May 1705 the Newgarden Meeting sent Gregory Russell and John Watson to Dublin to see Thomas Banks, retrieve the marriage register, and pay him for the work he had done on their behalf. Thereafter records of marriage certificates were recorded locally (NGMMM 02.03.1705) and copies sent to Dublin. In 1710 the task of recording them passed to Ephraim Heritage junior (NGMMM 31.11.1710).

USING FRIENDS' REGISTERS OF BDM

In practical terms and in relation to demographic and reconstitution studies it would seem there is a significant probability that some data will be in error and others will be missing from the registers. Some of the early entries, for example, have scant information, perhaps a year or place of birth only, with no records of marriages. Records of death are common for infants and children, as one might expect. The Quaker community tended to be transient and members often disappeared from observation because they were disowned, moved to other Meetings, or simply chose to resign from the Society. Sometimes transient members can be tracked through the records of other Meetings but this becomes very difficult when they resigned from the Society. Again it can be much harder to track married women members once they changed their surnames and almost impossible when they 'married out'.

While the original registers are housed in the Friends' Library in Dublin they are accessible only for about four hours a week making it totally impractical for overseas scholars to study and transcribe them in their entirety. However, the summarized registers have been copied onto microfilm by the Church of the Latter Day Saints (LDS), so that the data are available through Family History Libraries. Most of the data for this study have been transcribed from LDS microfilms. The birth data for the Newgarden and Carlow Meeting have been transcribed directly from the original summary registers and have been verified. Unfortunately the microfilming of the Quaker registers by the LDS is of very poor quality and in some cases items in the film frames are unreadable or require some degree of interpretation. The Wicklow and Tipperary registers are among the worst, but there are several frames in the Carlow registers that are practically unreadable as well. Again the numerals that form the dates can be 'fuzzy' or faded and it is possible to read them incorrectly. For example an '0' can be mistaken for a '9' or an '8' for a '5'. To help interpretation some of these more difficult frames were digitized and blown up on the computer. However, while every effort was made to ensure data integrity, there remains an element of uncertainty with some data that could only be removed by consulting the original registers.

As well as problems associated with the interpretation of individual line elements in the registers, others arose when dealing with the data themselves. For example, there are line items with no entries for deaths or a year only may be cited or a burial date maybe the only entry relating to deaths. Such entries usually signified a stillbirth or death shortly after birth and since the usual practice was to bury the deceased within one or two days after death, the date of burial can

sometimes be used as a substitute for the date of birth. There are many examples where no day of birth is specified and in such instances the day was recorded for the purposes of this study as '15'. For entries in the register where the year only is cited, a mean day and month, 30 June, was used as a substitute. Clearly such data need to be utilized with caution; for example, it would not be appropriate to use a date with no day when calculating infant mortality, or a date with no month when estimating mortality of children. However, providing some allowance is made for error these data can still be deployed for other demographic calculations. In practice all dates were classified into one of three categories: reliable (3), unknown (2), and year only (1) and the demographic data available for each person were classified as good, poor, or unusable.

As Wrigley *et al.* (2005: 11) have noted, reconstitution studies have their limitations and this became more apparent as the current study progressed. A significant number of adults fade from observation making it difficult to calculate reliable mortality rates, degraded by the over-representation of infant and adolescent deaths in the samples. Where males married females from outside the Meeting it is often difficult to find their birth records, and this reduces the sample available for calculating age-specific fertility rates. Then there are many examples of male and female siblings for whom there is either no information or birth dates with no further information. In such instances it is not certain whether the individuals married and moved away for reasons such as apprenticeship, were disowned, stayed put, or died without being registered. Consequently no attempt has been made to analyze the demographics of the unmarried adult population in detail. In calculating periods of observation (see below) it was assumed that such individuals remained in observation until at least the age of 21 years when other members of the family remained in observation.[22] The possibility of under registration, briefly referred to above, is another problem (Vann and Eversley 1992: 21).[23] The results of this study indicate that the birth of the first child normally took place within the first 18 months of marriage and when this period is longer the prospect of under registration is enhanced.[24] Again, extended intergenesic intervals within otherwise regular birth sequences raise the suspicion of under registration but there are no independent ways of verification.

At the opposite end of the scale there are a number of instances where the only registered information about a person is a date of death. If his/her siblings are known and one or more of them have a birth date and/or the person's parents date of marriage is known, then the persons approximate date of birth can be estimated. Fortunately many of the entries in the death register are accompanied by an age of death, usually specified as a year only but sometimes in months or weeks. In such cases a fairly accurate estimate can be made of the date of birth (see Vann and Eversley 1992: 26).

Yet another problem is to determine whether marriages that appear to be childless were really so. One of the problems in using these registers is that they include persons who were not or may never have been members but who were related to current or past members. It became quite common practice to record such information at some Meetings but unfortunately such records may be

selective and incomplete. For the purposes of this study, unless there was independent confirmation that a marriage was sterile, married couples with no offspring were excluded from statistical calculations involving children and no attempt is made to estimate the frequency of such unions.

Again there are many instances where couples appear to have had only one child. Given that the majority of couples had several children, particularly during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, one can be forgiven for suspecting that the birth data in such cases are incomplete. Consequently couples with one child were only included in birth sequence calculations where the dates of death of one or other or both of the parents were known.

The topic of under registration of infants and stillborn children was raised in the foregoing but there are two other registration issues that could affect the demographics of the Meeting. Detailed information pertaining to children born out of wedlock and issue from adulterous relationships, and to marriages of Friends who chose to be wed by priests, together with the issues from those marriages is, in general, not available. In order to gain some idea of the extent of this problem, the minutes of the Men's Meeting for Discipline were consulted for the period 1678 to 1749 and all incidences relating to these issues were extracted. The register of BDM for the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting was then consulted to determine whether the marriages and children from those marriages or bastard children from illicit relationships had been recorded. The results are summarized in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1: No. of Friends who 'married out' together with aggregate information about records of their marriages and children 1678–1750 (includes Quaker couples who married out)

Period	No. of Friends who married out	Cases of the marriage of Friends married out not recorded in BDM	Cases where children of Friends who married out not recorded in BDM	No. of cases where children of Friends who married out were recorded in BDM	Cases of Friends marring out and noted in minutes of Men's Meeting but no records in BDM
1678–1700	9	9	9		6
1701–1724	15	15	15		6
1725–1749	35	35	35	1	16
Totals	55	55	55	1	28

Table 2: Incidences of children born out of wedlock and/or children born in adulterous relationships 1678–1750

	Females			Males		
Period	No. of cases	Cases of a marriage recorded in BDM	No. of cases where children are recorded in BDM	No. of cases	Cases of a marriage recorded in BDM	Cases where children are recorded in BDM
1678–1700						
1701–1724	5			1		
1725–1750	10			6		

The results indicate that none of the 55 marriages were recorded in Quaker records of BDM and likewise their children. The only evidence that there were marriages comes from the minutes themselves. When dealing with small samples omission of the marriage data from an analysis of, say, marriage rates could lead to an understatement of the results. Nor is it possible in 28 of the 55 marriages to calculate the ages at marriage because there are simply no vital records for either brides or grooms. Of the 27 remaining marriages, where age at marriage can be calculated (in 18 cases only), there is quite a wide spread: 32% falling into the 20–24 year range, 21% aged 20 or under, and 47% over the age of 24. There is no really predominant year range which suggests that in spite of the paucity of vital data for clandestine marriages there should be minimal distortion of results derived from such data that are available. Similarly there are no records in the BDM registers of children born out of wedlock but since their numbers are small their omission is unlikely to affect estimates of birth rates.[25]

The foregoing exercise calls into question the general impression abroad that Quaker BDM records are comprehensive. When the partners and families of the 28 persons identified in the foregoing exercise with no BDM records are taken into account they amount to around 160 or more persons (assuming 2 parents and, say, 4 children per family) about whom nothing is known. In addition there are other persons mentioned in the minutes of the Men's Meeting or in the records of sufferings for which there are no records in the Newgarden/Carlow BDMs. Fourteen persons have been identified for the period 1650–1729, only two of whom have records in the registers of other Meetings. Given such omissions it is little wonder that the Men's Meeting was so persistent in calling on its members to submit BDM information. From the demographic point of view it means that profiles erected for the Meeting based solely on the BDM registers are bound to be incomplete, although they hopefully will still reflect the character of the Meeting. On the positive side similar omissions almost certainly occurred in the records of other Quaker Meetings so that their profiles would suffer from the same defects, making it less contentious to use them for comparative purposes.

It needs to be reemphasized here that not every person in the database was a Friend; indeed significant numbers were not. However, all persons are related in some way to Friends: either a sibling of Friends, or through marriage. Moreover as Vann and Eversley (2002: 60) have pointed out, and which is true of the Newgarden/Carlow population, many marriages took place between the children of Friends who never were 'members' (that is 'convinced') of the Society of Friends or who had already been disowned.

Given that one of the major objectives of this study is to identify evidence for regional variation ideally the sample population should be drawn explicitly from the catchment of the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting. In practice this would severely restrict sample sizes and it would require the elimination of a significant numbers of descendants who had moved away from the primary catchment. To get some idea of the repercussions, consider the data available for births and birthplaces (this topic is treated in more detail below). In the following table these data have been sorted into eight categories by time period. The categories include births that

occurred within the primary catchment (Group 2), in essentially rural areas of Ireland (Group 3), cities and semi-industrialized areas (Group 1), England, Scotland, and Wales (Group 5), the colonies and ex-colonies (Groups 4 and 6), Asia (Group 8), and unknown (Group 7).[26] In respect of Ireland itself, the births places have been identified to county only so that a proportion of births relegated to Group 1 should in fact have been classified as rural (birthplaces located outside of the cities themselves), but at this time there is no way of separating them out because of the way the data were encoded. Thus this method of assessing the data has a rough edge. The data in Table 3 show downward trends for both the catchment area (Group 2) and rural areas (Group 3). Likewise the % number of births without associated birthplace jumps dramatically in the 1800–1849 TP and even more so in the following TP. These data document in their own way the dispersal of the Newgarden/Carlow population over time, predominantly to other areas of Ireland during the first four TPs, and to overseas countries during the last TP. In other words while these data cannot be said to be solely representative of a population residing in the catchment area in any of the time periods, a significant proportion of the data from the first four TPs are directly associated with the catchment. Again when combined with data from other rural counties (Group 3) one could describe them as comprising a sample of rural Ireland with a strong sample bias provided by data from the catchment area. That is not to belittle the genetic value of the samples, since this is the glue that strings the data together. So while there is a search going on for regional variation one is really looking for variation tempered by genetic affiliations. This in a sense allows us to take a liberal view of the catchment area.

Having said that, there can be no doubt that the data assembled for the 1850–1899 TP is no longer representative of the original catchment; it is a genetic derivative, the end product of a devolved Meeting and its dispersed population. The high percentage of unknown birthplaces is a reflection of how far descendants had moved away from Friends' fellowship and to a point where they were about to disappear from observation. The TP is also the point of departure of this study from that of Vann and Eversley. Indeed, thereafter, sample populations for later TP's are expected to mirror the demographic characteristics of the wider population.

Table 3: % numbers of births as a function of birthplace by time period

Group	1650–1699	1700–1749	1750–1799	1800–1849	1850–1899
1 [Cork/Dublin/Ulster]	5.0	10.0	14.0	16.0	7.0
2 [Newgarden catchment]	43.0	33.0	33.0	21.0	6.0
3 [Rural counties]	18.0	21.0	23.0	18.0	6.0
4 [US/Canada]		6.0	7.0	0.5	12.0
5 [England/Scot/Wales/ Isle Wight]	5.0	Neg.	Neg.	1.0	10.0
6 [Australia/Pacific/NZ					2.0
7 [Birthplace unknown]	20.0	30.0	24.0	44.0	56.0
8 [Asia]					1.0
Sample no.	858	1518	1074	816	534

Despite the numerous shortcomings of the data, providing they are used prudently for analytical purposes, one can be confident that the results should reflect the more obvious demographic trends.

DATA PROCESSING

Forms not dissimilar to those deployed by Vann and Eversley (1992: 24) were used to record data initially and each datum set was eventually entered into the computer where it could be scrutinized with validation software. All members of each family were recorded regardless of the amount of information available about individual members. The reason for this is that even when no quantitative data are available, the presence of the person in the database is essential for determining completed family sizes. In practice the software is programmed to select the most appropriate data for analysis. Thus if a marriage date was missing the person would not be used to calculate average age of marriage, or in first birth interval analysis and age difference analysis at marriage.

The software for processing the data was written in Dbase6 and included several modules focused first on analyzing data by family in TPs (50-year intervals) and by generation, and secondly analysis of all the data combined by TP. The current study is not concerned with generational studies as they are treated elsewhere.

Initially data were entered by family into a 'family database', a temporary file designed to facilitate family-orientated and generational analysis. To enable universal analysis, all data from the temporary files, once checked and sanitized, were copied into a universal, static database.

All data were subjected to an integrity check using a program written specifically for that purpose. The latter incorporated checking criteria suggested by Wrigley *et al.* (2005: 574–77) with some additional checks tailored to qualify the data further. The data available for each person were assessed during the entry process and graded accordingly. At the completion of this phase a Data Integrity Index (DII) was calculated for each TP. The index is derived by assigning scores to individuals according to the availability of BDM data. For example, for a married person three dates are important: dates of birth, of death, and of marriage. Each date available scores 1, so that the DII for a person with all data would be 3/3 or 1. If the person married twice the index is calculated using a 4-point denominator. The DII for any period is calculated by summing the points scored for each person in the designated period and dividing by the total possible number of points. Ideally the DII should be 1, but in practice it is usually less and its value determines the kind of analysis that can be undertaken and also the quality and reliability of the results.

Other modules were written to estimate the 'period of observation' (PO) for each person, and to calculate a range of demographic markers. The latter included age-specific marriage, fertility, and mortality indexes, average age at marriage for each sex, birth interval analysis and average completed family sizes. At the outset,

it has to be said that this study does not seek to follow all aspects incorporated into the very detailed analyses of Vann and Eversley; it is focused on a limited number of demographic markers (defined by the scope and quality of the data available) for the purposes of comparison. Indeed, while similar methods have been used to derive demographic parameters, a more liberal approach may have been applied in selection of data than was the case with Vann and Eversley e.g. in respect of year only data. This needs to be borne in mind when making direct comparisons between the two data sets.

The PO was calculated for every individual in the database. The term defines the period of each person's life that can be properly documented or reliably estimated. For example, when the dates of birth and death of an individual are known the PO will be equivalent to the person's age at death. Unfortunately, birth and death dates are not available for a significant proportion of the population, which means that more imaginative methods have to be employed to estimate POs. Some examples follow. When the date of birth is known, but there is no date of death and marital status is not known it can be assumed the person would have stayed with his family up until the age of 21 years. Thus his/her PO would be 21.[27] If the same person was married and there was a marriage date the PO would initially be the difference between date of marriage and date of birth. The birth sequence of his/her children would then be examined and the PO extended up to the date of the last birth. Depending upon what data are available about his/her children an additional 21 years might be added to the new PO. In practice the various possible scenarios have been identified taking into account the availability of BDM data for each person (inclusive of first and second marriages) and incorporated into software that is designed to derive the best possible estimate of PO for each person.

Genealogical data were encoded for 5420 individuals, comprising 2785 males and 2635 females. All told there is evidence for 1503 unions of which at least 1413 produced offspring (confirmed through appropriate documentation). Information encoded for each person included an identification number (ID), the ID numbers of his/her partner(s), dates of birth and death, dates of first and second marriages, parents' marriage date, parents' ID numbers, place of birth, and marital status (single, married, unknown). Dates were recorded in the British system (day/month/year) and classified as unknown (2), year only (1), or known (3). Notably only first and second marriages were included for individuals in this study. There were a few cases of third and even fourth marriages, but none produced children and given the enormous amount of additional programming that would have been required to include them in the analysis, third and subsequent marriages were in general excluded from detailed consideration. However, in cases where a person A was marrying for a first or second time to a person B who had already been married two or more times, details of the marriage of A were included in the database.

RESULTS

THE BASIC DATA

Characteristics of the basic data set used in this analysis are summarized in Tables 4-8 below.

Table 4: Basic demographic data for births, deaths, and marriages by TP

TP	% no. of births Year only	% no. of deaths Year only	% no. of marriages Year only	% Total no. Persons in database
1600–1649	3.64	2.23	2.43	1.90
1650–1699	13.64	12.88	12.15	15.83
1700–1749	21.00	20.45	29.91	28.00
1750–1799	16.40	15.40	18.88	19.81
1800–1849	14.09	29.04	16.45	15.01
1850–1899	20.00	14.39	13.46	9.85
1900–1949	5.9	5.30	5.23	5.33
1950–1999	5.45	0.25	1.50	4.19
2000-2050				0.02
Totals	440	396	535	5420

Table 5: Basic demographic data for marriages by TP[28]

TP	% no. 1st marriages M	% no. 1st marriages F	% no. 2nd marriages M	% no. 2nd marriages F	% no. marriages dates unknown M & F	% no. marriages full dates known M & F
1600–1649	3.34	2.82	3.37	6.00	10.10	0.87
1650–1699	18.23	16.86	31.46	40.00	8.42	22.33
1700–1749	27.61	26.91	22.47	18.00	18.18	29.54
1750–1799	14.41	15.76	11.24	8.00	15.82	13.68
1800–1849	14.12	14.59	10.11	6.00	16.16	13.10
1850–1899	12.84	12.73	12.36	10.00	13.80	12.21
1900–1949	6.39	6.88	6.74	2.00	7.58	6.75
1950–1999	3.05	3.44	2.25	10.00	9.93	1.50
Totals	1409	1453	89	50	594	1733

Table 6: Basic demographic data: births and deaths with known dates (excluding year only) by TP

TP	% no. births known M&F[29]	% no. births known M	% no. births known F	% no. deaths known M&F[30]	% no. deaths known M	% no. deaths known F
1600–1649	0.53	0.68	0.37	2.12	1.38	2.00
1650–1699	16.38	17.33	15.35	16.35	16.90	15.71
1700–1749	29.51	29.08	29.97	29.89	29.33	30.55
1750–1799	22.81	21.29	24.46	23.52	22.85	24.31
1800–1849	15.03	14.68	15.41	14.80	14.88	14.71
1850–1899	7.08	8.53	5.50	10.27	10.73	9.73
1900–1949	4.61	4.29	4.95	2.93	2.98	2.87
1950–1999	4.02	4.07	3.98	0.11	0.11	0.12
Totals	3406	1771	1635	1743	941	802

Table 7: Basic demographic data, single persons and persons whose marital status is unknown

TP	% no. single persons M&F	% no. single persons M	% no. single persons F	% no. persons marr. status unknown M&F	% no. persons marr. status unknown M	% no. persons marr. Status unknown F
1600–1649	0.20	0.18	0.22	0.85	0.98	0.69
1650–1699	13.61	15.99	10.70	14.12	14.64	13.54
1700–1749	28.31	27.71	29.03	29.21	30.63	27.62
1750–1799	28.21	27.18	29.48	23.03	21.40	24.86
1800–1849	17.04	17.05	17.03	15.03	13.53	16.71
1850–1899	7.54	6.57	8.73	5.92	6.03	5.80
1900–1949	2.55	3.02	1.97	4.75	4.55	4.97
1950–1999	2.55	2.13	2.84	7.09	8.24	5.80
2000-2049	0.10	0.18				
Totals	1021	563	458	1537	813	724

Table 8: Data Quality Index (DII) and numbers of marriages that produced children by TP

TP	DII	DII (best)	No. of married persons with children M & F
1600–1649	0.36	0.38	79
1650–1699	0.58	0.64	320
1700–1749	0.56	0.62	364
1750–1799	0.57	0.64	192
1800–1849	0.55	0.62	159
1850–1899	0.56	0.60	149
1900–1949	0.49	0.54	107
1950–1999	0.38	0.48	43
Totals			1413

Of the 5420 individuals some 80% fall within the period 1650–1850, but the sampling by TP is very uneven. Thus 28% fall within the 1700–1749 TP correlating with the quantity of data available in Friends records for that period, and as Friends disappeared from the registers and memberships lapsed so the sampling levels diminish with each succeeding TP. Birth dates are known for 63% of the population, and if individuals are included where the birth date is known only by year this figure increases to 72%. The statistics for deaths are worse: 32% are known, and when year only dates are included the figure rises to 40%. About 60% of first marriage dates are known and this increases to around 77% when year only dates are included. As one would expect, representation of BDM dates by TP follows the same pattern as for the corresponding population sample.

Classification of marital status involved making decisions based on documentary evidence. When a marriage record is available classification is straightforward, but how does one classify an individual where a birth is recorded and there is no other information about the person in the registers? Unless there was some other source available aside from Friends' registers, for the purposes of this study the

marital status of all such persons was classified as 'unknown'. This latter category comprised some 28% of the total population while only 19% could be positively classified as 'single'. Moreover the 'single' group comprised mainly infants, adolescents, and young men and is clearly a biased sample.

The marital status classification will of course affect the value of the DII. If it is assumed a person with an 'unknown' classification was married the maximum DII can never exceed 0.66, otherwise if one assumes that he/she was single there is a possibility of a DII of one. In calculating DII the two possibilities have been taken into consideration (Table 8) where the figures under the column entitled DII (best) were derived by assuming all persons with the marital status classification 'unknown' were single. In practice the differences in values between the two data sets is not great. The DII in the worst case scenario is fairly consistent throughout the period 1650 to 1900 (fluctuating between 0.55-0.58) although deteriorating thereafter. Thus for the core period, 1650–1900, for the purposes of this study the quality of the data available for each of the inclusive TPs can be regarded as similar, providing an expectation that reliable comparative analyses can be conducted.

BIRTHPLACE ANALYSIS

Wherever possible the birthplaces of the individuals recruited for the study were identified and recorded. Unfortunately, of the 5430 persons in the database the birthplaces of 1571 of them (785 females and 786 males) could not be established. Nevertheless, there are sufficient birthplace data available to make some general statements about the composition of the Meeting and the descendants of its members. The results of the analysis of the data are summarized in Tables 9 and 10.

Although the sample numbers are very small for the first TP the results suggest that most of the initial membership were of English origin, in keeping with what is already known about the origins of the early Irish Quakers communities (Grubb 1927: 17). From the second TP onwards, however, most of the population was born in Ireland although there is evidence of early but minor dispersal to the USA and in later TP to Australia, England, and Scotland. Initially membership was made up of individuals from County Carlow, County Kildare, and Queen's County and this is reflected in the statistics. In the second TP 41% of the male and 45% of the female populations were born in those three counties and as the table below illustrates, there is a persistent dilution of local births in the three counties over the next few TP as the Meeting drifted towards extinction. Recruitment and exodus to and from the surrounding counties through marriage (see below) and for other reasons is alive and healthy from the second TP, with C. Tipperary, C. Waterford, and C. Cork emerging as favorite places of recruitment and residence during the 1800–1849 TP. The three counties had strong centers of trade and commerce during the nineteenth century, all had Quaker communities members of which were active in those areas.

Table 9: Birthplace analysis for married males,
Newgarden/Carlow members and descendants.

Place of birth	1600–49	1650–99	1700–49	1750–99	1800–49	1850–99	1900–49	1950–99
Australia/NZ						4.00	3.00	7.00
Canada					Y		1.00	
England/Wales	50.00	6.00		Y	1.00	12.00	22.00	4.00
Ireland (loc unid)		2.00		Y	Y			
Continent	2.00							
India							1.00	
Philippines								1.00
USA			7.00	6.00	Y	12.00	18.00	11.00
C. Armagh		1.00						
C. Carlow	5.00	17.00	12.00	15.00	15.00	4.00		
C. Cavan		1.00						
C. Cork	2.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	8.00	6.00		
C. Donegal		Y						
C. Down		Y		4.00				
C. Dublin		2.00	5.00		2.00	1.00	3.00	
C. Fermanagh				1.00				
C. Kildare		12.00	11.00	12.00	3.00			
King's C		3.00	6.00	3.00	2.00			
C. Meath						Y		
Queen's C.		12.00	8.00	5.00	2.00			
C. Tipperary		1.00	3.00	5.00	11.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
C. Waterford			1.00	5.00	7.00			
C. Westmeath		3.00	7.00	7.00	4.00			
C. Wexford		2.00	4.00	5.00	Y	1.00		
C. Wicklow		6.00	3.00	Y				
Unknown	41.00	27.00	30.00	24.00	43.00	56.00	50.00	76.00
Totals	56	466	794	530	405	267	144	122

Y= small no of persons born, too small to register as a percentage

Table 10: Birthplace analysis for married females
Newgarden/Carlow members and escendants.

Place of birth	1600–49	1650–99	1700–49	1750–99	1800–49	1850–99	1900–49	1950–99
Africa							1.00	
Australia/NZ						1.00	6.00	10.00
England/Wales	36.00	3.00	Y	Y	1.00	9.00	15.00	8.00
Ireland (loc unid)		2.00	1.00	Y	Y	1.00		1.00
Continent						Y		
India						1.00	1.00	
Philippines								1.00
USA			6.00	7.00		12.00	20.00	8.00
C. Antrim					Y			
C. Carlow	2.00	22.00	15.00	15.00	15.00	6.00	1.00	
C. Cavan		1.00	Y					
C. Cork		3.00	4.00	4.00	10.00	5.00		
C. Dublin		2.00	6.00	3.00	1.00	1.00		
C. Fermanagh				1.00				
C. Galway						3.00	1.00	
C. Kildare		11.00	12.00	11.00	4.00	Y		
King's C	2.00	2.00	6.00	3.00	1.00		1.00	
Queen's C.		12.00	8.00	5.00	3.00	Y		
C. Limerick				1.00				
C. Tipperary		1.00	2.00	7.00	9.00	1.00		2.00
C. Tyrone						1.00		
C. Waterford			1.00	6.00	7.00			
C. Westmeath		2.00	4.00	6.00	3.00	Y		
C. Wexford	2.00	3.00	3.00	6.00	Y	Y		
C. Wicklow		4.00	3.00		Y			
Unknown	57.00	31.00	29.00	24.00	45.00	56.00	79.00	74.00
Totals	47	392	724	544	411	267	145	105

Y= small no of persons born, too small to register as a percentage

Table 11: % numbers of births in Counties Carlow, Queen's, and Kildare by TP (extracted from Tables 9 and 10)

TP	Male—% no. of births in C. Carlow, Queen's, and Kildare	Female—% no. of births in C. Carlow, Queen's, and Kildare
1650–1699	41	45
1700–1749	31	35
1750–1799	32	31
1800–1849	20	22
1850–1900	4	6

OCCUPATIONS

Unfortunately, information about the occupations of early Members of the Newgarden Meeting is scarce. Indeed, there are virtually no occupational data in the birth, death, and marriage records for individuals until the nineteenth century, and even then the records are far from comprehensive. Consequently other sources need to be consulted to determine occupation. These include the minutes of the Men's Business Meeting where there are odd entries that give the occupations of individuals, correspondence, wills, compilation of sufferings and legal documents such as conveyances. Even so, individuals sometimes changed occupations and titles as their circumstances changed so that occupational data taken at face value can be misleading. Take, for example, the case of John Watson of Kilconner. Originally his father was a 'yeoman' from North West Shropshire. When he moved to Ireland and signed a lease in 1663 for Kilconner he was described as a 'husbandman'. After his death in 1675 John Watson, his heir, who died in 1710, left a will dated 10 January 1709 in which he called himself a 'farmer' (Eustace and Goodbody 1957: 98). His son Samuel was party to a land conveyance just seven years later in which he is described as a 'Gentleman'.[31] This is an example of social mobility, albeit not common. The table of occupations for early members (1650–ca. 1730) of the Meeting (Appendix 1), while far from comprehensive, gives some idea of their range of occupations. Notably the occupations of a few individuals whose parents were members of the Carlow Meeting, but who moved to other Meetings, have been included in the table.

Judged on the descriptions of goods confiscated by tithe farmers, as mentioned above, the majority of the early members, if not farmers, practiced some form of farming for subsistence. However there appears to have been a goodly mix of occupations, including merchants, retailers such as linen drapers and clothiers, trades persons including smiths, weavers, carpenters, and coopers, at least one school teacher, and a miller. Clearly there was occupational depth within the Meeting that could and did work to the advantage of members. When trades were needed they could call on their own, and merchandise and farm produce could be purchased and traded through members. Such transactions could be completed in the expectation that they would be conducted with fairness and honesty in accordance with the tenets of the Society. While this may have been perceived as insular, it gave members an advantage over non-members who had

no choice but to haggle over prices and quality of services. That is not to say Friends did not trade or perform services for non-members. Non-members did business with Friends because of their reputation for fair dealings in business.

Vann (1969a: 49) quite rightly questioned the oft-quoted belief that it was members of the lower classes, the agrarian poor and so called 'mechanics', that provided most of the recruits during the early years of Quakerism. His analysis of the occupations of the 'valiant sixty', men who were at the forefront of the early Quaker movement, and Friends who were early members of Meetings in Buckinghamshire, Norfolk, and Norwich showed quite clearly that this was not the case (1969a: 58ff.). Indeed the initial membership was drawn from a wide range of social classes including the gentry and professionals, but excluding the nobility and the very poor (1969a: 71). The data summarized in Appendix 1 for the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting generally support his findings, although many of the persons listed are what might be called second-generation Friends, a generation removed from those that founded the Meeting. There are a significant number of gentlemen in the list, two professionals, and of course a number of farmers. At the lower end of the social scale there are a number of artisans, carpenters, blacksmiths—the so-called mechanics—but they are far from dominant. There are no laborers or noblemen. Unlike Venn's English sample (1969a: 77), gentlemen are not winnowed out of the Meeting during the course of the eighteenth century, and some representatives from this class were found among its members a century later.

MARRIAGE

Family was an important element of Friends' society (Greaves 1997: 349) and every precaution was taken to ensure that partners were chosen and children were brought up to respect and preserve unity both within the family and the wider Quaker community.[32] Marriage was a serious step and every prospective union had to be carefully scrutinized and approved by the Quaker community through its Men's and Women's Meetings before it could proceed (Mortimer 1957).[33] Quakers viewed the institution of marriage more as a means of creating a religious cocoon rather than a homely love-nest; or as Larson (1999: 170) noted, Quaker marriage was 'based on shared religious values, [and] was essential to create a godly household in which children could experience the Inward Light'. In this section a number of aspects relating to marriage are examined, including the average ages of first and second marriages, the relationship, if any, between seasonality and marriage, age difference between couples at marriage, and evidence for delayed marriages.

CHOOSING MARRIAGE PARTNERS

The rituals associated with marriage and the associated procedures have been described elsewhere (Vann and Eversley 1992: 83-84). It is sufficient to say here that, in theory, the only restrictions in seeking partners during the early period of

Quakerism in Ireland was that bride and groom should be in unity with Friends and that if one or other party had already been married and produced children it was a requirement that appropriate arrangements be made for offspring before a new marriage could be solemnized (Greaves 1997: 347).[34] Thus a Friend seeking a wife could look for a partner, spinster or widow, from among the membership of any Meeting in Ireland.

Where, then, did members of the Carlow Meeting recruit their spouses and what outside communities recruited spouses from them? As mentioned above, the places of birth of many members of the Newgarden population are not known nor are the places of residence just prior to marriage for both brides and grooms. The basic birthplace data are summarized in the table below:[35]

Table 12: Analysis of birthplace data for the married members of the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting 1600–1999 and their descendants

TP	A. Males Birthplace known	B. Males Birthplace unknown	(A+B) = C	D. Both parties birthplace known	% D/C	No. cases Birthplace of husband known, wife unknown
1600–1649	32	18	50	14	(28.0)	18
1650–1699	164	121	285	78	(27.4)	86
1700–1749	214	195	409	100	(24.4)	114
1750–1799	115	98	213	47	(22.1)	68
1800–1849	82	126	208	33	(15.9)	49
1850–1899	76	116	192	50	(26.2)	26
1900–1949	49	47	96	23	(24.0)	26
1950–1999	10	35	45	6	(13.3)	4
Totals	742	756	1498	351	(23.4)	391

These data indicate that birthplaces of both parties are known for only 23% of the married population. There are birthplaces for another 26% of male spouses—but none for their partners. Of the sample where birthplaces are known for both parties, 42% of the couples were born in the same county (see table below). While this may at first appear to be a relatively large figure when distributed among the age TP its significance is much reduced. It appears, then, that there was no pronounced tendency for persons to find partners from within their own county. Of the 147 persons that found partners from the same county 19% were from County Carlow itself, another 155 grooms (21% of all married males whose birthplace is known) were from County Carlow, but found partners from elsewhere. These data suggest that most partners were recruited from outside the birth county.

Table 13: Analysis of birthplace data for married members of the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting and their descendants

TP	Birthplaces of bride & groom same County %	A: Birthplace of bride & groom: C. Carlow %	B: Birthplace of groom C. Carlow: of bride unknown	Total A + B%
1600–1649	8	1	5	3
1650–1699	19	13	54	37
1700–1749	32	5	51	31
1750–1799	21	5	21	14
1800–1849	10	3	19	12
1850–1899	37	1	5	3
1900–1949	15			
1950–1999	5			
Totals	147	28	155	183

Spatial analysis of marriage partners through birthplace data has limitations, given the mobility of many early Quaker families. Sons could leave home to take up apprenticeships, start businesses or new farms, and in so doing change residences. Thus a more reliable way of approaching this type of analysis is through residence just prior to marriage, when it is known. Like birthplace data, however, the data are not complete, as the table below shows:

Table 14: Number of couples where places of residence just prior to marriage are known and unknown

TP	1600–49	1650–99	1700–49	1750–99	1800–49	1850–99	1900–49	1950–99
Known %	44	70	69	63	45	25	20	23
Unknown %	56	30	31	37	55	75	80	77
Total sample no.	45	277	393	238	215	186	101	48

In order to look at the spatial aspects of spouse recruitment in more detail, the pre-marriage residency data were classified according to the number of counties that separated each party. Thus if bride and groom were resident in the same county prior to marriage they were given a score of one, in adjacent counties two and so on. If one of the partners was recruited from outside of Ireland, from England, Scotland, or Wales, the couple scored 6,[36] from the United States a 7[37], and if both partners were residing outside Ireland at the time of marriage an 8. The results, summarized below, indicate that for the period between 1650 and 1899 most partners were resident in the same county or no further than two counties from the county of residence of one of the partners. The samples for the subsequent TPs reflect the dispersion of members around the world but are too

small to be reliable. Likewise the sample for the first TP is poor although it suggests what has already been established, namely that many early Friends married in England before arriving in Ireland.

Table 15: Spatial separation (by county or country) of partners prior to marriage (%)

No. Counties between partners	1600–49	1650–99	1700–49	1750–99	1800–49	1850–99	1900–49	1950–99
Same	10	36	24	26	29	7	5	18
Next	20	29	27	28	21	7		
2	5	16	23	19	26		9	
3	10	14	7	8	7			
4		2	3	6	3			
5	5	1		6	5	2		
6 England	10	2	2	2	8	20	5	9
7 USA		1				2		9
8 Both OS						4		
Totals	20	193	273	149	97	46	20	11

Key: 6. One partner resident (before marriage) in Ireland the other in England, Scotland, Wales, and the Isle of Wight. 7. One partner resident in Ireland the other in the US. 8. Both partners resident outside Ireland.

Table 16: Spatial separation (by county or country) of partners prior to marriage (%) for one partner resident in County Carlow, Queen's County or County Kildare.

No. Counties Between Partners	1600-49	1650-99	1700-49	1750-99	1800-49	1850-99	1900-49	1950-99
Same	25	29	18	25	23	33	100	
Next	38	37	39	32	23	33		
2	13	17	31	30	41			100
3	25	14	8	7	7			
4		1	1	1				
5			1	1				
6 England		2	2	3	7	17		
7 USA		1				17		
Totals	8	125	153	71	44	6	1	1

Key: 6. One partner resident (before marriage) in Ireland the other in England, Scotland, Wales, and the Isle of Wight. 7. One partner resident in Ireland the other in the USA.

Table 16 shows the same data reworked to include cases where at least one partner was resident in one of the three counties from which the Newgarden/ Carlow Meeting recruited its members. The results are similar to those in the preceding table, as one might expect.

SEASONALITY AND MARRIAGE

The question of whether there were preferred times of the year for weddings is next to be examined. The original Meeting was situated in the context of a rural economy raising the possibility that wedding dates may have been chosen to coincide with events in the agricultural calendar. The % distribution of wedding months by age TP is summarized in Table 17. These data show a fairly even distribution of weddings throughout the year for each TP with some possible preferences. During the 1650–1699 TP weddings took place more frequently in the first half of the year, during 1700–1749 there was a slight preference for Spring weddings and during the 1800–1849 to 1900–1949 TP there was a slight shift in preferences to Summer/Autumn. Overall there appears to be a perceptible drift of preference from Winter/Spring to Summer/Autumn weddings through the TP from 1650 onwards. The Anglican custom of avoiding marriages during Lent and Advent is not apparent from these data (see Vann and Eversley 1992: 84),[38] although December was not a popular month for marriages and the figures for the 1650–1699 TP could possibly be construed as a residual reflection of the Anglican custom. When these data are reworked for couples resident in County Carlow, Queen's County, and County Kildare, the drift is even more pronounced and there is no doubt that the Anglican tradition of avoidance at Lent was ignored, since 11% of all marriages were celebrated during the month of March between 1700 and 1799. Overall it can be concluded that there were no sacrosanct times of the year when marriage was avoided, but there may have been preferred months and these appear to have changed over time.

Table 17: % distribution of wedding months by age TP

Month	1600–49	1650–99	1700–49	1750–99	1800–49	1850–99	1900–49	1950–99
January	17	12	5	6	8	8		
February	33	12	8	5	7	7	2	23
March		6	11	11	8	1	7	
April		12	13	10	5	9	9	23
May	17	8	11	7	7	11	2	8
June	17	14	10	7	14	10	5	15
July		5	6	9	13	9	19	8
August		7	6	8	9	11	7	
September		8	7	7	8	13	26	15
October		8	7	13	11	8	9	8
November		6	9	6	6	4	4	
December		3	7	10	4	7	11	
Totals	6	191	247	128	114	98	57	13

AGE AT MARRIAGE

Average age at first and second marriages for males and females is summarized in Table 18 together with those estimated by Vann and Eversley (1992, Tables 3.2 and 3.3) for the Quaker population of Ireland. Ignoring the first TP where sample numbers are very small, an increase in the average age of marriage of both men and women is apparent from 1650 to 1899. The men's average age of marriage

keeps rising until the end of the nineteenth century and thereafter it may have dropped off. There is a slight dip in average age of marriage of women in the 1800–1849 TP and thereafter a rise to the end of the nineteenth century. It is notable that average age of marriage for women in the 1800–1849 year range about mirrors the average for Irish woman at large for 1811–1841; in Leinster Province it was 24.5 years (O Grada 1989: 119).[39] Sample numbers are small for second marriages, but as one would expect the average ages at marriage are higher than those for first marriages.

Table 18: Average age at first and second marriage (sample numbers in brackets)

TP	Av. age at 1st marriage M	Av. age at 1st marriage F	Av. age at 2nd marriage M	Av. age at 2nd marriage M	Av. age at 1st Marriage NDB M	Av. age at 1st Marriage NDB F
1600–1649	28.30 (11)	27.33 (6)	43.92 (2)			
1650–1699	27.67 (135)	23.36 (128)	40.23 (22)	39.71 (14)	27.02 (158)	23.09 (131)
1700–1749	28.367(183)	23.85 (211	40.05 (12)	29.71 (4)	27.91 (231)	23.95 (237)
1750–1799	30.05 (89)	25.89 (133)	52.16 (6)		28.87(111)	25.18 (119)
1800–1849	30.50 (88)	24.85 (96)	55.68 (4)	29.00 (1)	29.19 (63)	25.39 (53)
1850–1899	33.39(89)	27.937(66)	44.85 (9)	49.97 (1)		
1900–1949	29.42(48)	25.98 (50)	51.91 (4)	36.24 (1)		
1950–1999	25.64 (7)	25.29(14)	67.37 (1)	35.92(1)		

Contrasting these results with those of Vann and Eversley, one sees a similar pattern for both males and females, although in the case of the NDB there is no reduction in the average age of marriage for females in the 1800–1849 TP. Again, while the averages for females in the two data sets are similar, those for the males differ slightly, the averages for Newgarden/Carlow being a little higher although well within one standard deviation of each other.

When the data are arranged to show the husband's age at marriage by wife's age at marriage (Table 19) it seems that for the period 1650–1749 more than 75% of men married under the age of 29, almost none in the under 20 range, and most within the 25-29 year age range. What is interesting is the huge drop during 1750–1799 when the number of men marrying under 29 falls to around 55% with the rest marrying in later age ranges. Although the sample is small this trend towards delayed marriage appears to continue during 1800–1849. Turning now to the women the picture is quite different. During the first two TPs around 27% of women married under the age of 20, but this figure drops to less than 10% during the 1800–1849 TP. Some 82% married before the age of 25 during 1650–1699, 77% during the following TP, then 55% during the subsequent TP and 53% during 1800–1849. Thus there is a documented trend away from early marriage from the 1650–1699 TP with a very sharp increase in delay during 1750–1799, following the pattern for men's marriages. The data for the last TP suggest that the trend to delay marriages may have been checked to some degree, accounting for a slight fall in the average age of marriage of females for that TP.

Table 19: Husband's age at marriage by wife's age at marriage (%)

Wife's age	Husband's age						
1650–1699							
	<20	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40+	All
<20	1.3	10.1	11.4	3.8	1.3	1.3	29.1
20-24		13.9	26.6	8.9	1.3		50.6
25-29		2.5	8.9	2.5		1.3	15.2
30-34		1.3		1.3	1.3		3.8
35-49				1.3			1.3
All	**1.3**	**27.8**	**46.8**	**17.7**	**3.8**	**2.6**	**79**
1700–1749							
<20		8.2	17.3	2.0	1.0		28.6
20-24	1.0	21.4	20.4	3.1	2.0	2.0	50.0
25-29		3.1	3.1	6.1	2.0	1.0	15.3
30-34			1.0	2.0		1.0	3.1
40+			2.0		1.0		3.1
All	**1.0**	**32.7**	**43.9**	**12.2**	**6.1**	**4.1**	**98**
1750–1799							
<20		4.9	4.9	3.3	1.6		14.8
20-24		14.8	9.8	6.6	4.9	3.2	39.3
25-29		3.3	8.2	8.2	3.3	3.3	26.2
30-34			6.6	6.6	1.6	3.3	18.0
35-49					1.6		1.6
All		**23.0**	**29.5**	**24.6**	**13.1**	**9.8**	**61**
1800–1849							
<20		4.4	2.2		2.2		8.9
20-24		6.7	20.0	17.8	4.4	4.4	53.3
25-29			15.6	6.7	6.7	2.2	31.1
30-34		2.2	2.2	2.2			6.7
All		**13.3**	**40.0**	**26.7**	**13.3**	**6.6**	**45**

Looking at the data within a wider perspective, Table 20 compares the foregoing data with those derived for all Irish Quakers by Vann and Eversley (1992: 92, Table 3.5):

Table 20: Husband's age at marriage by wife's age at marriage (%) under 25 years of age

	Females		Males	
TP	NG	NDB	NG	NDB
1650–1699	79.7	72.6	29.1	40.4
1700–1749	78.6	70.8	33.7	30.0
1750–1799	54.1	58.9	23.0	35.7
1800–1849	62.2	55.5	13.3	18.5
1850–1900	39.4		12.1	

Key: Ng = Newgarden/Carlow data; NDB = Vann and Eversley

While the trends in the two data sets have some similarity, there are also differences. In general females belonging to the Newgarden/Carlow data set tended to marry earlier and males later than their national counterparts, and the national figures show no evidence of a return to early marriages for females in the 1800–1849 TP. Possibly the differences in the two data sets might be explained on the basis of regional or local marriage patterns.

The data in Table 21 explores the differences in age between males and females for first and second marriages. In the case of first marriages, the data suggest that the majority of marriages involved grooms that were older than brides and that males tended marry women between 5 and 11 years younger. Notably, the gap slowly increases from the 1650–1699 TP and there is a significant leap in the age difference between 1850–1899 TP perhaps influenced by the poor sample.

Table 21: Average age difference between partners at first and second marriage

TP	Males older—1st marriage (years)	Females older—1st marriage (years)	Males older—2nd marriage (years)	Females older—2nd marriage (years)
1600–1649	9.88 (4)	9.99 (3)		
1650–1699	6.64 (76)	0.98 (12)	4.18 (6)	6.96 (8)
1700–1749	7.04 (91)	6.62 (21)		14.36 (8)
1750–1799	6.90 (49)	3.89 (8)		13.12 (2)
1800–1849	7.59 (43)	2.92 (8)		9.64 (2)
1850–1899	10.04 (32)	4.65 (9)		24.67 (1)
1900–1949	7.20 (22)	2.96 (6)		18.23 (2)
1950–1999	5.30 (12)	1.26 (4)		

The incidence of older women marrying younger men is of the order 10–20% but the average age difference between the partners tends to be a lot smaller than for men marrying younger women (bearing in mind that the sample numbers for some of the TPs are too small to provide reliable results). Likewise data are lacking for second marriages, although if they are taken at face value they suggest that second marriages usually involved an older woman marrying a younger man and that the age difference between husband and wife was more significant than for first marriages. Vann and Eversley (1992, Table 3.16) got similar results for the wider Irish Quaker population male first marriages, although the percentage numbers of 'males older than females at marriage' for the Newgarden/Carlow

population are all slightly higher per TP (ranging from 81 to 88%; cf. 75 to 82% for the NDB)

There are no obvious explanations for these results and particularly those that suggest increased delay of marriage in the 1750–1799 TP. They may be associated with changes in socio-economic conditions during that period, changes in the political environment or in demography, or attributable to cultural factors. On the political front the last major upheaval occurred during the seventeenth century precipitated by the Williamite Wars, which resulted in the general devastation of the Irish economy and massive confiscation of Friend's properties. The aftermath of the war left Friends with the right to meet in worship but without an acceptable and legal means of taking oaths. The ministers of the official Church and their minions continued to seize Friend's commodities for tithes, and Friend's continued to agitate for their abolition or exemption from them (Greaves 1998: 106–108, 129–30). Despite the setbacks attributable to the war and continued harassment from the Church of Ireland, most Friends were able to rebuild their lives facilitated by the cohesiveness of the Society and the cooperation that members extended to each other, material, physical, and financial (Greaves 1998: 104–105; 1997: 357–58). Possibly it was as a direct result of the hardships suffered during and after the war that Friends implemented a strict regime of discipline during the early eighteenth century, with the expectation that it would promote and encourage members in 'the service of truth' (Grubb 1927: 87). However, Church authorities eventually relaxed their efforts to collect tithes and an accommodation was reached between the Society and the Government on an acceptable procedure for taking oaths (Harrison 2008: 12). In these comparatively favorable circumstances, a growing number of members, particularly 'birth right Friends', were tempted to ignore the restrictions that were imposed upon them by Quaker discipline in order to enjoy the benefits of growing prosperity (Grubb 1927: 124). By the middle of the eighteenth century the Society was at a low ebb and reform was necessary to save it from a slow but certain demise (Larson 1999: 198). Reform came, but it did little to stop the slow and relentless departure of members; neither was there a return to the austere discipline of the previous decades. Late eighteenth-century observers such as William Savery remarked on the worldliness of Quaker families in Ireland that seemed to him to 'live like princes' (in Grubb 1927: 110).

In searching for an explanation for an increase in delayed marriage in the second half of the eighteenth century, political factors can be ruled out. And given the increasing wealth and enhanced social position of many Quaker families during that period one might have expected friends to begin marrying earlier rather than later as there should have been fewer financial impediments. Possibly there was some relationship between social stratification, wealth, and marriage patterns. Others have looked at this aspect (Vann and Eversley 1992: 107) and found that while there was a similar tendency to delay marriage among the British nobility, a relationship between wealth and social position and delayed marriage could not be inferred because the same tendency to delay marriage was found in the general populations belonging to preceding TPs. Another possibility, difficult to explore, is that some women deliberately delayed marriage to avoid childbirth.[40]

It has been suggested that the Quaker marriage discipline itself may have been a contributing factor in delaying marriages, given that the marriage procedures tended to be complex and time consuming (Vann and Eversley 2002: 123). It is difficult to assess such a hypothesis, but what can be said is that providing there were no complications and that parents gave their consent, where a couple resided in the same Meeting, marriages could be finalized within three months, and those from different Meetings three to four months. It is true that marriages solemnized between non-Quakers could be achieved much more readily by paying for a marriage license, normally taken out the day before the wedding. However, the alternative and less expensive procedure was to issue banns over three consecutive Sundays. The marriages would take place subsequently and completed roughly two–three months inside the time it would take Quaker couples to marry: not a lot of difference on a relative time scale, and surely not an oppressive disincentive to marry.

If marriage discipline had an inhibiting dimension contributing to delayed marriage then one would expect to see this reflected in an increasing incidence of clandestine marriages, specifically couples who married on average at an earlier age. If this turned out to be the case and the data for clandestine marriages were omitted from the estimates of average age of marriage (as they have been) then the reworked averages would be less as would the perceived average delays in marriage. One might also expect the numbers of children born out of wedlock to increase but the statistical evidence for this is inconclusive because the recorded incidences are minimal. Fortunately there are some data available for clandestine marriages.

The numbers of friends from the Newgarden/Carlow meeting who married during the period from 1700 to 1799 have been extracted from the minutes of the Men's and Women's monthly Meetings for discipline. They include Quaker couples that married according to the rules of the Society, Quaker couples that chose to marry by going to priests, and Quakers that married clandestinely to persons of other religious persuasions. All told a total of 340 marriages (regular and clandestine combined) are itemized in the minutes, fewer than four a year on average and given the smallness of the sample the results are presented in Table 20 in five-year time intervals.

Before commenting on these results, it is pertinent to make the point that the marriage rules remained relatively static throughout the eighteenth century.[41] The most significant change occurred about 1735 when a decision was made to drop the requirement for couples aspiring to marriage to appear personally or otherwise on two separate occasions before both the Men's and Women's Provincial Committees. Thereafter the clerk of the Men's Monthly Meeting was required only to forward copies of the marriage certificates to the Province Meeting to be recorded in the appropriate Province book. The requirement for the appointment of two overseers for each wedding, to ensure that the marriages were conducted in an orderly fashion, both in the meetinghouses where the marriages took place, and in the houses adjourned to afterwards, remained unchanged.[42]

Table 22: Comparison of the numbers of regular Quaker marriages with clandestine marriages 1701–1799.

Age group	No. of regular Quaker marriages	No. of Quakers that married non-Quakers			No. of Quaker couples that married by priest	Total no. of Marriages
		Males	*Females*	*Total*		
	%	%	%	%	No.	%
1700–1704	**5.0**	0	0	0.0		3.2
1705–1709	**5.4**	0.0	0.0	**0.0**		3.5
1710–1714	**3.6**	0.0	0.0	**0.0**		2.4
1715–1719	**8.6**	0.0	3.4	**3.4**		6.8
1720–1724	**7.2**	0.8	5.1	**5.9**	2	6.8
1725–1729	**5.0**	0.8	0.8	**1.7**		3.8
1730–1734	**8.6**	3.4	0.8	**4.2**	1	7.1
1735–1739	**3.6**	1.7	2.5	**4.2**	1	3.8
1740–1744	**4.1**	0.8	5.1	**5.9**	2	4.7
1745–1749	**4.1**	1.7	3.4	**5.1**	1	4.4
1750–1754	**3.2**	0.0	6.8	**6.8**		4.4
1755–1759	**9.5**	2.5	2.5	**5.1**		7.9
1760–1764	**2.7**	3.4	7.6	**11.0**	1	5.6
1765–1769	**5.4**	1.7	2.5	**4.2**	2	5.0
1770–1774	**6.8**	4.2	1.7	**5.9**	2	6.5
1775–1779	**5.0**	2.5	6.8	**9.3**	1	6.5
1780–1784	**4.5**	0.8	7.6	**8.5**		5.9
1785–1789	**1.4**	0.0	3.4	**3.4**		2.1
1790–1794	**5.0**	0.8	5.1	**5.9**		5.3
1795–1799	**1.8**	3.4	5.9	**9.3**		4.4
Totals	**222.0**	34	84	**118**	13	340

While there is fluctuation in the so-called regular marriage rates through the five-year age groups, with the exception of three small peaks (1715–1719, 1730–1734, 1755–1759), they remain relatively similar throughout the entire century but with a very slight upward tendency in its closing decades. Clandestine marriages between Quakers and non-Quakers start to appear in the records from 1715 and thereafter comprise more than half of all marriages celebrated by Newgarden/Carlow Quakers during the eighteenth century. Interestingly clandestine marriages overtake regular marriages from the 1775–1779 age group.

The change in marriage procedure introduced ca. 1735 does not seem to have had any impact on either regular or clandestine marriage rates; indeed, in the case of regular marriages the rates dropped from a high of 8.6 % during 1730–1735 to less than half of this value in the subsequent four age groups. There is no doubt however that there was an increase in the number of clandestine marriages during the second half of the eighteenth century: more than twice the numbers were registered than for the previous quinquennial. Moreover, when these data are plotted graphically there is an apparent tendency for the % numbers of clandestine marriages to increase through the eighteenth century.

These data provide clear evidence that throughout the eighteenth century, it was mainly women who chose to 'marry out'. Of 118 recorded clandestine marriages, 71% were women. A few were widows when they married, and entries in the minute books suggest that others may have married because they were pregnant or had had a child out of wedlock. There certainly would have been a driving incentive for women in both categories to marry; widows left with children to support were highly vulnerable to poverty while the latter group was vulnerable to community ostracism. A variety of reasons can be invoked to explain why other women chose to 'marry out', including love, desperation, 'gold-digging', and disillusionment with Quaker doctrine. However, unless parental consent for marriage was refused, it is hard to imagine the cumbersome Quaker marriage procedures themselves would have provoked such a response.

A very small number of Quaker couples married clandestinely, for one reason or another. For example Thomas Fuller and Mary Duckett had little choice when they chose to marry as they were first cousins and such marriages were not allowed under the rules of the Society.[43]

Birth, death, and marriage data are generally not available for the spouses of Friends who married out, and there is an inhibiting paucity of such information for many of the Friends themselves. Consequently, it is not possible to conduct a reliable statistical comparison of parameters such as average age at marriage and average age differences between partners for Friends who married Friends and Friends who 'married out'. The information that is available is summarized below:

Table 23: Comparison of average age at first marriages for regular Quaker as opposed to clandestine marriages

Periods	Average age at marriage M (1st marriages only)		Average age at marriage F (1st marriages only)	
	Quaker/Quaker marriages	*Quaker/non-Quaker marriages*	*Quaker/Quaker marriages*	*Quaker/non-Quaker marriages*
1700–1749	28.3	27.9	23.7	22.0
Sample No.	154	8	180	10
1750–1799	30.2	32.1	25.5	24.0
Sample No.	84	14	109	33

The upward trend in the average age of marriage of both males and females from the earlier to the later periods for both groups is apparent and except for a slightly higher average age of marriage for male Friends who 'married out' in the 1750–1799 period, the averages for Quaker/non-Quaker marriages tend to be slightly lower than for their Quaker\Quaker counterparts. Thus while these data might suggest that there was a tendency for partners of clandestine marriages to be slightly younger on average than partners who married in traditional Quaker fashion, the trend towards marrying later in the 1750–1799 period for both groups probably indicates that clandestine marriages themselves were not a major factor in driving up the average age of marriage. Having said that, if the Quaker/non-Quaker age at marriage data are combined with those for Quaker/Quaker marriages, the combined averages for males would be slightly increased, and for females slightly reduced.

Another possible contributing factor to delayed marriage was the way early Quakers viewed the institution of marriage itself. As Damiano (1980: 179ff.) has been at pains to point out, in theory at least, Quakers choose their potential marriage partners with great discernment, drawn not so much by a romantic infatuation, but by their passion for (or potential), dedication to, and faith in God and the associated religious tenets that bound the Society of Friends together. In other words, Quaker marriage was a religious commitment that bonded the marriage partners to the Quaker community as well as to each other. Thus on the one hand, if one accepts that religious commitment in the first instance was a key determinant in choosing marriage partners for fully orthodox members, in a context of a degrading membership, it may have become much more difficult for young people to find suitable partners and hence delayed their progress towards marriage. On the other hand the not-so-orthodox, as described in the foregoing, 'married out'.

In practice this hypothesis is difficult to test. Daniano gives several documented examples of Friends that clearly did not choose their partners on the basis of romantic attraction. It is also well established that many Quaker marriages were arranged by parents and relatives, and potential partners were actively discouraged from fraternizing before marriage which dampened opportunities for pre-marriage romantic liaisons. However, the truth is that there are insufficient data to generalize. Except for a few documented cases of the type described by Daniano, as well as the many documented instances of disownments because of marriage contrary to the rules of the Society and instances of illicit childbirth and co-habitation, almost nothing is known about how the majority of Friends chose their partners. It is very hard to believe, given human nature, which, in modern times at least, appears to promote an intrinsic desire in men and women to seek partners based on romantic whims, that many early Friends did not succumb to such temptations. Moreover, to use modern analogy, it is likely that a proportion of Friends, particularly younger birthright members, paid lip service to their religion and sought partners in unorthodox ways, some based on or coupled with pre-marriage romantic liaisons.

Economic factors are another possible influence that could have affected age at marriage. Throughout the eighteenth century Friends took up new occupations and combined new with old, but in general those that stayed on in rural areas were farmers and/or landlords and/or tradespersons while in the towns they were shopkeepers, weavers, tanners, professionals, and merchants to name but a few occupations (Grubb 1927: 93).[44] In the Carlow, Kildare, and Queen's County districts, intensely rural areas, as the inventories of Sufferings indicate, almost all Friends in the first few decades of the eighteenth century farmed some land regardless of occupation. These counties contained some of the most fertile agricultural lands in the Southern regions of Ireland and were exploited for both pastoral and tillage farming, particularly the latter (Andrews 1986: 244). There were many changes in the rural economy of Ireland during the eighteenth century. From the 1740s potatoes moved from being a garden to a field crop and were used to fatten pigs for commercial purposes and household consumption (Cullen 1981: 104). By the end of the century a vibrant pork trade had developed supplementing the mainstays of the Irish export trade, beef and butter. The linen and woolen industries also expanded, and in 1758 the Irish Parliament introduced a grain bounty to encourage grain growing (Cullen 1972: 69). Other changes in the rural economy were initiated towards the end of the eighteenth century. There was a shift from animal husbandry to commercial cropping in some regions to meet the demands of a vigorous and profitable export trade in wheat and flour that continued into the early nineteenth century.

The foregoing, of course, is an oversimplified view of economic events during the eighteenth century—there were others such as crop failures during 1728–29 and 1740–41 (Cullen 1981: 109), bad harvests in 1782 and 1783 (Cullen 1972: 68), credit squeezes and bank failures Cullen (1986: 151)—but the review is sufficient to put to rest, barring some as yet unidentified local factors, any idea that economic events were in some way directly responsible for encouraging late marriage. Having said that, uncertainties about the future usually accompanied the introduction of changes to the economy and as such may have tempered decisions relating to marriage and investment. For a start the majority of Friends on the land were either landlords and/or farmers that did not get their hands dirty; this was usually left to their laborers. Consequently seasonal activities relating to crops, animal management, and so on probably had minimal influence on decisions relating to social matters such as marriage. And, unlike their laborers who were adversely affected by famine and food shortages, Quakers, because of their relatively comfortable socio-economic status, in general remained well insulated from such disasters.

Apart from the omission of data pertaining to clandestine marriages (see above) yet another possibility is that the evidence for delayed marriages may be attributable to a misleading process of averaging, given that data used by Vann and Eversley are aggregate samples of Friends from both urban and rural areas. However, this is highly unlikely, since the results of the analysis of data from the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting, derived from members of predominantly rural communities (at least in the first few TPs), show the same trends. Imbalance in

the sexes during that period could also have resulted in delayed marriages. This question is not so easy to address as no appropriate census is available for the ambit of the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting or for other areas of Ireland before the nineteenth century. However there was no evidence of a serious sex dysfunction in the Newgarden/Carlow samples: overall 2408 females, 2526 males (ratio of 105:100 M:F), and for the 1750–1799 cohort 495 females and 483 males (96:100 M:F). The overall ratio is what one would expect (Wrigley *et al.* 2005: 298). The ratio for the 1750–1799 cohort favors females, which hardly provides an explanation for delayed marriage for men[45] but might have contributed towards delaying marriage for women.

Cultural factors are another possibility, though difficult to document. Certainly Quaker parents were given an Advice as early as 1701 not to allow children to marry too young whether out of lust or in the pursuit of riches and they were warned that those who countenance such marriages could 'expect to be dealt with as truth shall direct' (MMQM 14.04.1701). Although there is no reliable way to determine how this advice was put into practice, there are no recorded instances in the minutes of the Men's Meeting for Discipline where parents were called to task specifically for allowing their children to marry too young.[46] Vann and Eversley (1992: 107), in pursuing reasons for delayed marriage, came to the conclusion that it may well have been a 'powerful cultural norm' that influenced Quaker men to delay marriage. Before laying this discussion to rest, it might be as well to examine whether there might have been a more practical reason, though culturally entrenched.

The possibility that inheritance customs play a role in determining population dynamics of peasant communities in Europe was raised by Habakkuk (1955: 4). He pointed out that where single heir systems prevailed there was likely to be little inclination for the heir to limit the size of his families. However, his good fortune tended to affect inversely his brothers and sisters: before the brothers could marry they had to either acquire lands of their own, a wife with a hefty dowry, or both. The daughters were even less fortunate as they had to wait until they could find suitors and the father had to provide the suitors with incentives by way of dowry. In summary, this type of inheritance system was a recipe for delayed marriage both for the heir, who sometimes had to wait until his father died before being in a position to marry, and quite possibly even longer delays for his brothers and sisters who had less to bargain with when it came to choosing spouses (McKenna 1974: 689). The other system of inheritance cited by Habakkuk (1955: 6) was one where the father's estate was divided equally between siblings. This situation, he claimed, provided no impediment to marriage (for peasant populations that is), but may have given couples incentive to limit their families in order to reduce further fragmentation of their inherited estates.

Quaker parents reserved the right to regulate the marriages of their children (Vann 1969a: 183) and as we have seen the procedures that needed to be followed prior to marriage were tedious enough. However the parent's power in ensuring that marriages were conducted in accordance with their wishes was not

limited to giving permission for marriages. Sometimes there were added incentives to comply. Children could be threatened with disinheritance if they erred and some wills contain clauses that removed annuities if the heirs behaved 'disorderly' both before and after marriage (Vann 1969a: 184). Again the estates of the deceased were invariably administered by trustees who were authorized to act on behalf of the deceased and who were given instructions to ensure that marriages of those that were single at the time of the fathers' death were married in accordance with Quaker traditions—again on pain of disinheritance of those who disobeyed. Such clauses were a recipe for delayed marriage.

Many Quaker wills have survived and a perusal of these suggests that they preferred the single heir system or variants of it (Eustace 1956; Eustace and Goodbody 1957). The wills usually name a principal, normally the eldest son who inherited the body of the father's estate, provisions are made for the surviving widows, and bequests are made to other children, friends, and servants. In so far as rural estates are concerned, wills were generally constructed to ensure that the estates were entailed so that they remained within the family. Sometimes the deceased estates were given over to trustees whose job it was to see that the estates were not disentailed and sold off by the heir and that the bequests were properly issued. Another important clause attached to many wills was a provision for disinheritance for those who married without the approval of the trustees. One of the common instruments used to convey legacies was an annuity to be paid out of revenues from the deceased estates. The annuities immediately encumbered those estates and were a continuous liability that had to be borne by the heir. The situation may have been far worse for Friends residing in urban areas who were in retail or trades as they probably had less to leave behind, and fewer resources to provide annuities and dowries.

A related but slightly different reason for delayed marriages could possibly be attributed to the need for those Friends who held valuable estates to make appropriate, but cumbersome, legal arrangements to protect them. Under Irish law, when a woman married she lost all her rights under common law to her husband (Wilson 2009: 19). Coverture, as it was called, meant that whatever a bride brought into her marriage by way of portion, unless specifically excluded by legal agreement prior to the marriage, passed to her husband. Consequently there was a very strong incentive on the part of the husband and the husband's father to select a bride with financial substance.[47] However, such potential brides were not readily available and the search for suitable candidates and the subsequent negotiations on the terms and conditions of the marriage could be time consuming. It was also a prerequisite that the permission of the fathers of both bride and groom were required before any marriage could be agreed to and this too could cause delays in making arrangements for marriages (Wilson 2009: 29).

Marriage arrangements were extremely important because they were an instrument which ensured that estates and the wealth that flowed from them were maintained within landed families (as with most families of substance) for the benefit of subsequent heirs. These families used marriage settlements, in conjunction with jointures, annuities, and wills, to protect their estates from being broken

up after their demise. Although wives lost all their rights to own property when they married, unless alternative legal arrangements were made before their husband's death, under Irish common law they became entitled to dower amounting to one third of their husband's estates for life during widowhood (Wilson 2009: 42). In practice dower was construed by most families as undesirable since it effectively entailed and encumbered the estates of the heir while the widow remained alive. Dower was overcome or barred by converting it to jointure and as Wilson (2009: 47) has shown for a select number of landed families, to the ultimate advantage of the heir. Indeed most jointures were a good deal less than 50% of the portions contributed to marriages by brides and a fraction of the value of their husband's estates.

Further protection for the estate of father and groom was achieved by transferring all the property held by the groom into a trust before marriage with instructions to the trustees on how to manage the estate while he was alive and how to dispose of it after his death. The instructions included provisions for the widow and any children[48] from the marriage, usually in the form of jointures and annuities charged against the properties being held in trust. The terms of marriage agreements were confirmed in wills and often supplemented with additional bequests and annuities. It generally became the practice, however, to ensure that real estate ended up in the hands of the heir, while his brothers and sisters were taken care of through bequests. It is important, however, to recognize that in leaving bequests for children, the father had the right to impose such terms and conditions as he saw fit and this in turn enabled him to exercise effective control over the future behavior of his children from the grave (Wilson 2009: 72). This usually included the right of the surviving parent, executors, guardians, or trustees to determine who the children could marry, since their consent was required—as we have seen a potential reason for delayed marriage especially for daughters. The Marquess of Downshire in outlining his reasons for structuring his will recognized the plight of his own daughters: 'My boys will serve their country and have many ways of providing for themselves and as the dear girls [*giving them more than his sons in his will*] have not such opportunities but must patiently wait the caprice of love, or perhaps the avarice of some man to obtain a settlement' (in Wilson 2009: 73).

Marriages between members of the Religious Society of Friends were considered legal under common law and remained aloof from statute intervention until the passage of the Marriage Act in 1844 when such marriages had to be registered (Wilson 2009: 30).[49] Nevertheless, as we have seen, Friends' marriage procedures were somewhat stricter in their requirements than those of the established Church. Consent from both parents was required as well as from the Meetings of bride and groom, and banns were posted by the respective Meetings. Marriage or 'strict' (Wilson 2009: 39) agreements start to appear in the first half of the eighteenth century as do trusts and complex wills. Unfortunately very few such documents have survived, precluding detailed analysis, although clauses in a number of wills that have survived suggest that at least some Friends made settlements prior to marriage. George Baker a clothier from Athy of County Kildare

left a third of his estate to his wife as common law demanded, clearly with no intention of protecting his estate (dated 10 April 1733, Eustace and Goodbody 1957: 5) as did Thomas Rushworth, again of Athy, merchant (dated 26 Aug. 1675; Eustace and Goodbody 1957: 79). However, Thomas Hutton of Carlow, farmer, executed a marriage settlement on 22 May 1705 in what appears to have been a fairly modest estate, bequeathing one third of his estate to his wife as his principal heir.[50] Trustees are cited in the wills of John Watson of Kilconner, farmer (dated 10 Jan. 1709; Eustace and Goodbody 1957: 98) and of Daniel White of Donore, another farmer (dated 15 April 1707; Eustace and Goodbody 1957: 100) both men leaving relatively substantial estates.

One can easily imagine a situation where a relatively humble rural Quaker family gradually increased their property holdings, if not other assets, over time, creating the need to defend their asset by legal means, ensuring that marriage matches were in the best interests of the family and by threatening to disinherit sons and daughters if they did not follow the advice of the family. By the second half of the eighteenth century a number of members of the Newgarden/Carlow population did have substantial rural estates and some did use marriage settlements and elaborate wills to protect them. It was the usual procedure to register the settlements at the registry of Deeds so that abstracts of some of these documents can be accessed (Agnew 1999: 103–104). By way of illustration a number of memorials are cited in Appendix 2 which relate to three prominent families belonging to the Newgarden/Carlow population. Sparse though the data are, the rewards for being judicious in the selection of partners and for converting dower to jointure are readily apparent. The brides tended to bring with them substantial assets while their jointures *in lieu* of dower were modest in comparison to their portions. It is very likely that it became more and more difficult for the family patriarchs to find suitable partners for their sons and daughters within the company of Friends. Consequently when Friends choose to adopt these essentially upper middle class/upper class methods for protecting their estates it likely resulted also in delayed marriages, if not an increase in celibacy, and/or incidences of marriages to persons who were not Friends.

The foregoing discussion has suggested a number of possible contributing explanations for the changing patterns of marriage, at least in rural areas. By the time the 1750–1799 TP is reached, many Quaker and associated families had been settled in the region for several generations, sufficient to encumber their estates and to run up debts that were covered by sureties on their estates (Donnelly 1989: 344–45). As mentioned above, a buoyant economic period prevailed from late eighteenth century through to the end of the Napoleonic War during which there was a vigorous demand for agricultural produce such as wheat, pork, beef, and butter, and rents for short-term leases shot up. These fortuitous circumstances may have helped to moderate estate debt. However, the depression that followed had a dramatic affect on all aspects of Irish agriculture; there was a shift from tillage to pasture requiring capital outlay and reconfiguration of estates (McCartney 1987: 80) and these changes precipitated disturbances among the peasants in rural areas, including Queen's County. This situation was to become infinitely worse

over the following decades, which were marked by political activism and reform, sweeping changes in land tenure, franchise for Catholics, the demise of the Church of Ireland, the end of the ascendency of the landlords, and the Great Famine. Estates stalled and faltered. Following the passage of the Encumbered Estate Act in 1849 a quarter of Irish rural lands change hands (McCartney 1987: 173), including some estates that once belonged to Quaker families from the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting.

The hypothesis ensuing from this discussion is first that during the TP 1750–1799 the age of marriage for men shifted upwards because of inheritance customs which were structured to ensure that estates were kept intact and transferred to heirs as such, more judicious selection of partners, and the ever-increasing financial burdens imposed on deceased estates; secondly, that the upward trend continued in the following two TPs fueled in part by the consequences of the depression that followed the end of the prosperous period 1793–1813, an era that most likely eased the debt burden on estates and increased borrowing capacity (and debt if loans were availed of), and of the Great Famine. Indeed the aftermath of the Great Famine heralded immense socio-economic and political changes in the second half of the nineteenth century resulting in financial pressures on many estates, possibly worse than those experienced during the second half of the eighteenth century. In other words the age of marriage should increase for males and females over time and thus one would expect birth and fertility rates to fall or at least be checked (discussed in Part 2).

It is possible to test some aspects of these hypotheses. For arguments sake assume that eldest sons tended to delay marriage until after their father's death, thereby creating a possible reason for delayed marriage. In making this assumption, it has to be said that there are several documented instances of persons from the Newgarden/Carlow sample where this was not the case, the fathers handing over parcels of land to their heirs well before death to enable them to pursue their own occupations and to marry. Nevertheless, it is a hypothesis that can be tested; indeed it can be extended to include other possibilities such as all sons, eldest daughter, and all daughters. Of course it can only be tested where ages and dates of marriage and the dates of death of the father are known. The results of an analysis are shown below:

Table 24: Hypothesis testing: Did males marry only after the death of the father?

TP	Total sample married males	No. that married after father's death	%
1600–1649	2		
1650–1699	74	29	39.2
1700–1749	132	54	40.9
1750–1799	69	39	56.5
1800–1849	71	31	43.7
1850–1899	68	35	51.5
1900–1949	28	17	60.7
1950–1999	3		

Table 25: Hypothesis testing: Did the eldest males in the family marry only after the death of the father?

TP	Total sample married males	No. that married after father's death	%
1600–1649			
1650–1699	41	12	29.3
1700–1749	71	30	42.3
1750–1799	43	23	53.5
1800–1849	44	17	38.6
1850–1899	35	21	60.0
1900–1949	17	10	58.8
1950–1999	2		

Table 26: Hypothesis testing: Did females marry only after the death of the father?

TP	Total sample married females	No. that married after father's death	%
1600–1649	3		
1650–1699	73	17	22.3
1700–1749	128	48	37.5
1750–1799	86	40	46.5
1800–1849	75	29	38.7
1850–1899	44	17	38.6
1900–1949	21	9	42.9
1950–1999	6	2	33.3

Table 27: Hypothesis testing: Did the eldest females in the family marry only after the death of the father?

TP	Total sample married females (eldest)	No. that married after father's death	%
1600–1649	2		
1650–1699	36	8	22.2
1700–1749	62	21	33.9
1750–1799	43	19	44.2
1800–1849	33	9	28.1
1850–1899	26	9	34.6
1900–1949	12	6	50.0
1950–1999	3	1	33.3

These results indicate that except for the 1750–1799 TP the proportion of males (eldest or others) who married after the father's death are similar for most TPs and the proportions are significant. However there is a sharp rise in the proportions for the 1750–1799 TP for both the eldest son (9%) and for all other males (13%). Relaxation follows with another increase in the 1850–1899 TP. For females the trend is similar but less severe. There is a trend towards increasing delay in marriage until the father's death for all females up to the 1750–1799 TP with some relaxation thereafter, and then another rise in the 1850–1899 TP. However, the peak in the % for the 1750–1799 TP is not as sharp as it is for males. Bearing

in mind that the samples used for this exercise are small, these data tend to support the notion that there was some dynamic consensus that there was a 'right time to marry' and that it was a cultural decision. That is not to say the data provide 'the' explanation for delayed marriage in the 1750–1799 TP, but they do lend support to the idea of a cultural explanation possibly, as argued above, with a financial motive. Returning briefly to Table 22, in the context of these results it is easier to posit an explanation for the very large discrepancy between the numbers of males and females who 'married out': males had a lot more to lose than females if they chose to marry out, so fewer did. Females on the other hand risked less but could well remain spinsters if they simply waited patiently for their parents to provide suitable suitors and did not create or look for other opportunities to marry. The solution for many was to 'marry out'.

As noted, the biggest jump in ages of marriage for both male and female occurs within the 1850–1899 TP, a period that saw major political and economic changes in Ireland, together with the ascendency of the Catholic Church accompanied by the demise of Protestantism. Quakers also were touched by change. A serious theological schism in the first half of the century was followed by a period of evangelical revival in the second half, which led to changes in Friends' theology and rekinded interest in the movement (Grubb 1927: 130ff.). However, by this time many of the local families that had formerly been part of the Quaker movement had moved on to become members of the landed gentry, entered trade and commerce, or emigrated. These were troubled times for the gentry and tenants alike, particularly tenants with small landholdings; the former gradually lost political clout and control of the Irish peasantry, the latter were in danger of losing their estates in a move by landlords to create larger farms from which they hoped to receive more reliable and increased revenues. Some landlords and tenants having suffered reverses during the first few decades of the nineteenth century were heavily in debt and never recovered during the post-famine period forfeiting their lands, frustrated economically by unforeseen events such as the potato famine and outbreaks of disease (Cullen 1972: 113-17, 138). However, all strata of Irish society were affected as the nation moved towards political independence and identity.

There can be little doubt that it was these rapidly changing socio-economic circumstances, creating uncertainties about the future as they did, that were at least in part responsible for encouraging males, if not couples, to delay marriage. Dowry, annuities, and jointures became increasingly difficult to guarantee and parents struggled to maintain their estates let alone provide starting capital for their children.[51] Moreover, there is abundant anecdotal and documentary evidence that intermarriages between many families were carefully orchestrated exercises designed to advantage the families of both parties economically, socially, and sometimes politically. Marriage was delayed, then, for a number of other reasons: the search for suitable partners was often complex, long engagements were the norm, and negotiations between the families prior to the nuptials could be time consuming. Again many of the persons in the Newgarden/Carlow sample from this period had long since abandoned Friends and joined the mainstream of

society adapting to the customs and traditions of the times, class conscious and Victorian in outlook.

After so much reasoned speculation it is appropriate to end this first section of the article with a brief history of a family that first joined Friends ca. 1675 through the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting and produced branches that continued to reside in County Carlow subsequently, some for the more than 200 years. These families experienced the events described in the foregoing, responded to them accordingly, and suffered the consequences. The sequence of heirs together with information of their ages at marriage and those of their brides, dates of marriages compared with dates of deaths of their fathers, and some details of the heirs children are summarized in Table 28.

Table 28: Successive heirs of the main branch of the Watson family whose seat was located at Kilconner, County Carlow.[52]

Name of heir (A)	Date of Marriage Compared with date of death of father (in italics) (B)	Age at marriage (C)		Children (D)			No. children known to have married (E)		No. children who were eligible but stayed single (F)		No. children whose marital status not known (G)	
		H	W	N	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
John Watson 1650–1700	1673/*1675*	23	26	10	4	6	1	3		2	1	
Samuel Watson 1768–1762	1709/*1710*	23	23	10	5	5	3	3	1			
John Watson 1713–1750	1737/*1762*	24	24	10	5	5	2	1		1		
John Watson 1743–1783	1773/*1750*	30	16	7	5	2	2	1	?	?	2	1
John Watson 1774–1845	1800/*1783*	26	19	12	4	8	3	4		1		1
John L. Watson 1803–1870	1836/*1845*	33	20	0								
Rob. L. Watson 1836–1873	1873/*1853*	37	24	3	2	1	1				1	1

The Watson family, English farmers, settled in County Carlow ca. 1660 from the border area of Northwest Shropshire. At first they leased land at Kilconner but over the next century acquired considerable estates in the vicinity of Kilconner as well as in neighboring Queens County. Fifty years after their arrival they were well entrenched members of the landed gentry. Members of the family moved to County Tipperary where they again took up land but diversified into banking, and others to Waterford and Dublin where some entered trades, commerce, and the professions such as law.[53] However, the families gradually drifted away from the Society of Friends, joined the Anglican Church, and re-entered mainstream society. Some members served in the army, some became Ministers of the Church

or magistrates, and others took up sports such as fox-hunting and polo. Money difficulties and poor investments in the context of changing land tenure laws and political landscapes conspired to deplete the fortunes of the family unit but not its formidable reputation. The core families emerged into the twentieth century with social status intact but, in Ireland at least, with tempered local influence. Within Ireland their main seats were Clonbrogan, Ballingarrane, Summerville and Glenconner in County Tipperary, Kilconner, Ballydarton, Rathrush, and Lumclone in County Carlow, Ballyroan in County Dublin, and Bective in County Meath. For the purposes of this exercise attention is focused on Kilconner as it was principal seat of the family.

We take up the story of Kilconner in the mid-eighteenth century, the property having been passed down from John Watson (d. 1710) to his eldest son Samuel who died in 1762 and who was still with Friends at that time. Following Samuel's death all right title and interest in Kilconner passed to his grandson John Watson.[54] Samuel's eldest son, John Watson (b. 24 March 1713) had died on 21 December 1750. John, his son, had married Jane Clibborn and several children came from the union including John Watson born 6 November 1743, who was the oldest surviving grandson at the time of Samuel's death. As John Jr. was a minor at the time of his grandfather's death his mother renewed the lease of Kilconner and Ballyteige.[55] There was a further lease renewal in April 1767. The memorial cleared the Watson's of any obligation for outstanding claims against the estate up to the date of execution of the new Deed, and clarified the financial obligations of William Paul Warren, the landlord.[56]

John Watson Jr. (b. 8 Nov. 1743) married Anne Penrose on 20 April 1773. As part of the marriage arrangements his grandfather, via his will, had left a £600 legacy for the children of the marriage to be charged against a number of Townlands he held by lease, including Kilconner and Ballyteige.[57] John Watson Jr., in turn, provided his intended wife Anne with an annuity of £50, also charged on the same lands. He died on 27 August 1783 and his heir was the son John Watson (b. 24 April 1774, d. 25 Jan. 1845). The latter inherited Kilconner and Ballyteige in trust when he was just 11 years old. In 1800 he married Elizabeth Lecky combining the estates of two old and respected Carlow families.

On 30 June 1800 John Watson renewed the leases on Kilconner and Ballyteige at which time he stood

> Seized and possessed of a Freehold Estate of and in All that And those the said Town and Lands of Kilconner and Ballyteige and their Subdenominations and appurtenances called Cooraling and Killclose for and during the Natural life and Lives of him the said John Watson party hereto and of Samuel Watson and Robert Watson his Younger Brothers and for and during the Natural Lives and life of them and the Survivors of them and for and during the Natural Life and lives of such other person or persons as shall from time to time and forever hereafter be added thereto pursuant to the said Covenant for perpetual Renewal therein contained at and under the Yearly Rent of Sixty Pounds sterling and one Pepper corn Renewal Fine on the fall of each Life as by said original Lease and several Renewals made thereof reference being thereto had may appear…

John Watson died in 1845 but he left a complex will dated 8 March 1840 that apportioned his properties and other assets among his children. Kilconner and Ballyteigelea went to his son John Lecky Watson (b. 23 June 1803, d. 9 Sept. 1870), but in addition he gave legacies of £500 each to Robert and William Penrose Watson, and £1,000 each to daughters Mary, Jane, and Charlotte charged against Kilconner, Ballyteige, Ardriston, and Roundfield Quarter. Robert Watson was paid out in 1848[58] and William Penrose Watson in 1846.[59] In October 1846 John Watson's children collectively executed an indenture conveying the encumbered estates to John Lecky Watson 'discharged from all claims whatsoever' except for the legacies provided by their father.[60] Those not yet paid out were to remain owing but interest free.

John Lecky Watson married his first cousin Sarah Louisa Watson. By agreement they bore no children instead adopting his wife's brother Robert Lecky Watson. John Lecky's father as part of the marriage settlement granted an annuity of £100 to his son on 3 September 1836 for the lives of John Lecky Watson and his wife Sarah to be charged out of the Townlands of Kilconner and Ballyteiglea, Ballycullone, Roundfield Quarter, and the messages and premises in and near to Ballinakill in Queen's County.[61]

In October 1850 a Memorial of a grant in perpetuity was executed between John Lecky Watson and Jane Coleman, then living at Tivoli Terrace, Kingston, County Dublin.[62] It confirmed the lease of Kilconner, Ballyteige, and its sub-denominations Cooraling and Killclose for a rental of £60 a year with the right to cut timber and included a summary of the history of the lease from May 1721. In the same year he was given a loan by the Public Works Commission of £76-01-02 for improvements on the estates of Roundfield, Ballybrommell, Kilmaglin, and Kilconner and required to repay £3-07-00.[63]

The Watson's were in financial trouble, however, and Kilconner and Ballyteige together with other estates were used as sureties to enable them to borrow money. In 1844 John Lecky Watson mortgaged Ballycalloon, Kilconner, Ballyteige, Roundfield Quarter, Ballyknockan, and lands he held near Ballinakill in Queen's County together with the annuity of £100 granted to him by his father in 1836 to William Elliot of Kilmeany County Carlow in return for £400.[64] The mortgage was redeemed in October 1850.[65] At the same time Joshua Strangman and his wife Ann Watson conveyed quit claims and releases for Kilconner, Ballyteigelea, Lumtown, Graigemutton, and Ballynamere in Queen's County to John Lecky Watson.[66] Just prior to settlement in September, John Lecky had borrowed £9,700 at 6% interest from Marcos Seton Synnot and his wife secured against the lands of Kilconner and Ballyteigelea, Roundfield, Ballycullone, Ballybrommell, Kilmagliney together with the head rents of £80 payable out of the lands of Kilmagliney and a rent charge of £100 a year payable against Ballyteige and Roundfield.[67] And just after the settlement in November, Sarah Watson forwent her yearly rent charge of £200 payable out of the income from the same set of estates in return for £400 paid to her husband by Thomas Lindsay at an interest rate of 6%.[68] Lindsay was acting for Alexander Bate and when the former died there was a reconveyance of the mortgage to Bate in

1859.[69] Again in January 1861 Watson took out a five-year loan of £1,500 from John Wakely of King's County and not only were Kilconner, Ballyteige, and other Townlands used as sureties but the same yearly rent charge against the Townlands plus Roundfield was surrendered to Wakely.[70] Burdened with enormous debt by the mid-1860s, this heralded the beginning of the end of the Watson's fortune in County Carlow.

When John Lecky Watson died on 9 September 1870 the Kilconner and Ballyteige estates passed to Robert Lecky Watson (b. 14 Sept. 1836 d. 21 Nov. 1906), his adopted son. Two years after the death of his uncle a balance sheet for his estates clearly indicates the extent of the debt he inherited (Appendix 3).

Robert Watson married Constance Mary Leir in January 1873 and it is clear she married into a financially troubled family. Her fortune at marriage amounted to £7,700 and was settled in trust under which she was entitled to the income with power of Appointment to her children. However, her father advanced part of her fortune to take up mortgages on his Carlow estates which at the date of his will he feared would be lost. By his will he provided a fund of £10,000 which he settled on his daughter Constance and her children, practically on the condition that any claim on amount of the mortgages should be released.[71]

The money provided under her father's will produced one problem after another and became a matter of dispute. The precise details remain obscure, but some can be gleaned from surviving correspondence and notes.[72] It would seem that William Lier had advanced £4,400 of his daughter's legacy as a second mortgage on Kilconner, but the first mortgagor sold the estate and William Lier made no moves to call in his part of the mortgage because the money raised was less than the debts on the estates. According to his will the Trustee General Lier Carleton should have received £7,223 and the arguments revolved around whether the £4,400 should be repaid, despite having been lost, and the remaining £2,777 be seconded from her father's estate to make up the £10,000 promised in her father's will.

Kilconner and Ballyteige passed out of Watson hands when they went into receivership in 1888. An application from the owners at that time, Parker S. Synnot and Richard E. Maunsell, to eject Robert Watson from the estate was made in the Civil Court, County Carlow, in 1888 and on 6 December of that year the Notice of Ejectment was issued. It was served on the 8 December 1888. The action was taken by the owners for non-payment of rent. Robert Watson had failed to pay three years rent and arrears at the rate of £19-12-10 per annum up to and ending 1 May 1888, the total amounting to £68-14-11 plus £1-16-06 taxed costs of the ejectment decree.

In 1870 Kilconner had been valued at £15,000 and an offer for that amount had been made to the Watsons who turned it down. Rentals had remained static for a number of years at £53 an acre, but Thomas Nolan their tenant had been to the land court and managed to get it reduced to £48. At the time of the sale the net annual rental income from the property had been £438 a year but there were liabilities. The first mortgage was £9,700 and there was a penal interest owing of

£500 at 6% per annum. The property was sold off for £8,000 by the mortgagor who received 400 acres of prime land in return. In his notes Robert Lecky Watson complained that the settlement was most unjust given the facts that the first mortgage was more than what it was sold for. It appears other Watson estates or parts thereof were sold off at the same time: Lumclone for £1,900, Ardristan for £930, and part of Kilmagliny for £2,476, making a total of £5,300. Of this amount £1,000 was used to repay a loan leaving £4,300 to reduce the mortgage.

The loss of Kilconner was borne hard and with some bitterness. Writing shortly after the loss, possibly to his wife's solicitors, Watson wrote 'You might be inclined to look into matters for yourself that I suggested you should come down here and learn for yourself the true state of Kilconner affairs. I may mention that seven thousand pounds of my wife's fortune have been lost in the Kilconner estate…'[73] Referring to General Lier in the same letter he reasoned 'I'm sure he'd wish Justice to be done to his sister and her children'.

His ejectment from Kilconner came suddenly and all his possessions were left in the house. Many were later sold but some were redeemed by purchasing them at auction. He appears to have moved to Lumclone, which he had leased from his nephew Henry Forbes Watson but a dispute arose over the condition of the house and the terms of the lease.[74] In 1889 Robert Watson and his wife moved into a small unfurnished house near London where they stayed until around 1900, returning to live at Lumcloon.[75] Robert Lecky was bankrupt. Indeed he had used his wife's money in the fight to keep Kilconner, spending several thousand pounds. And from 1888 onwards he and his dependant children were totally dependent on the income she derived from her trust funds. Still in England in 1900 prior to returning to Ireland and writing to his son Fielding he lamented 'We are offered Lumclone…but as the gentleman points out people with small fixed incomes like ours have no funds to move furniture about…that is where the difficulty is…and it seems a pity to sell all the nice furniture we have here now…such a lot too. You could not believe all the very nice things I picked up since you left. The house is crammed. It would take 100 pounds to move all over. What I shall do I do not know.'[76]

Anecdotal this story might be but a number of other ex-Quaker families linked with the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting followed much the same path as the Watsons in the nineteenth century.

To be continued…

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Christopher Moriarty, the Curator of the Religious Society of Friends Library Dublin for his persistent and efficient help in providing information from the library and for the help and support provided by the Religious Society of Friends in general. My gratitude to the curator of Altamont House, County Carlow for graciously allowing me access to the Watson archives. A

thank you also to Gail and Joel Anderson of Salt Lake City for their help in obtaining a copy of the Hutton genealogy from the library of the Church of the Latter Day Saints, also to Herbie Whitmore for providing me with a wealth of genealogical data pertaining to nineteenth-century Watson families, to Tom Johnston for access to his genealogical records, and to Miceal Purcell, Carlow historian, for access to his sources, for advice, and for generous assistance. Lastly I would like to thank my colleagues, Drs Laila Hagland and Eleanor Crosby, for spending time and energy on this manuscript and for their much-appreciated editorial and structural comments.

ABBREVIATIONS

BDM	births deaths and marriages
DII	data integrity index
ID	a unique number allocated to an individual to identify them
LDS	Church of the Latter Day Saints
MMQM	Minutes of the Men's Quarterly Meeting, Leinster Province
NGMMM	Minutes of the Newgarden Men's Monthly Meeting
PO	period of observation
TP	time period, unless specified otherwise 50 years.

APPENDIX 1: OCCUPATIONAL DATA AVAILABLE FOR EARLY MEMBERS OF THE NEWGARDEN CARLOW MEETING.

Key: M = married; gen. = genealogical; ca. = circa

Name	**Residence**	**Gen. data**	**Occupation**
Baker, George	Athy, C. Kildare	1691–	Clothier
Balster, James	C. Carlow and Dublin Meetings	No gen. data. Will dated 21 02.1686	Yeoman
Barrett, Jacob	Park, C. Carlow	1678–? Will dated 12.04.1728	Farmer
Boles, John	Ballintrane, C. Carlow, later woodhouse, C. Tipperary	1661–1731	Gentleman/farmer
Brewster, Henry	Labanside, C. Carlow	?–1766, M ca. 1699 & 1724	Farmer
Brewster, Samuel	Labanary C. carlow	1700–	Farmer
Butcher, John	Carlow, C. Carlow	No gen. data, but resident from at least 1669 onwards and beyond 1706	Customs agent
Coates, Thomas	?	1641–	Weaver and comber
Cooper, Edward	Newtown, C. Carlow	1669–ca. 1745	Gentleman
Cooper, William	Ballintrane, C. Carlow	1709–1760	Gentleman
Duckett, John	Newtown, C. Kildare	1688–1739	Gentleman/farmer
Duckett, Thomas	Phillipstown, C. Carlow	1660–1732	Gentleman

Fredd, John	C. Wicklow	ca. 1660–1719(Penn.)	Timber merchant/ cooper
Fuller, Henry	Ballytore, C. Kildare	1692–1740	Gentleman
Harvey, Joseph	Ballyhackett, C. Carlow	M 1681 died ca. 1718	Farmer
Heritage, Ephraim	Newgarden, C. Carlow	Died ca. 1719	Farmer
Howse, William	Carlow, C. Carlow	No gen. data	Carpenter
Hutton, Thomas	? C. Carlow	1657–1736	Farmer
Johnson, Robert	C. Wicklow	ca. 1662–1732	Carpenter/farmer
Lecky, Robert	Staplestown, later Ballykeally C. Carlow	1649–1707	Gentleman/miller
Lecky, James (Son of Robert)	Ballykeally, C. Carlow	1676–	Farmer/yeoman and later gentleman
Lecky, John (Son of Robert)	Kilnock and Kilmeany C. Carlow	1678–1732	Farmer (1712), gentleman (1715)
Lecky, Thomas	Dublin	1685–	Linen draper
Leybourne, Joseph	Ardnehue, C. Carlow	1651–1703	Farmer
Lindley, James	Timolin, c. Wicklow, later Chester c. Penn.	1681–1726	Blacksmith/cutler
Lowden, John	From C. Antrim, moved to Carlow ca. 1703, to Chester C. Penn in 1711	Died 1714 (Penn.)	Weaver
Malone, James (Father Francis)	Ballybrommell, C. Carlow	1697–	Farmer
Malone, James (Father James)	Ballyraggan, C. Kildare	1741–1781	Farmer
Malone, William (Father Francis)	Ballybrommell, C. Carlow	1685–1754	Farmer
Mason, George	Castledermott, C. Kildare	1664–1733	Carpenter
Meador, Joseph	Athy, C. Kildare	1631–1708	Shopkeeper
Parke, Thomas	Ballylean, C. Carlow	1660–1738	Farmer
Rushworth, Thomas	Athy, C. Kildare	No gen. data. Will dated 26 Aug 1675	Merchant
Russell, Gregory	Russellstown, C. Carlow	1650–1730	Farmer
Russell, John (Son of Gregory)	Russellstown, C. Carlow	1688–1764	Farmer
Shackleton, Abraham	Ballytore, C. Kildare	?–1771	Schoolmaster
Shelly, Alexander	Courstown, C.Kildare	No gen. data. Will dated 24 Aug 1734	Farmer
Smallpage, Isaac	Athy, C. Kildare	ca. 1662–	Shopkeeper
Smith, Urian	Hackettstown and later Staplestown, C. Carlow	No gen. data, but resident from before 1669–	Blacksmith
Starr, James	C. Cavan, later C. Carlow and then Chester C. Penn	1676–	Farmer

Taylor, James	Dublin, Carlow	1635–1687	Clothier
Thacker, John	Castledermott, C. Kildare	1648–1714	Carpenter
Thompson, John	Castletown, C.Carlow	ca. 1669–1744	Farmer
Thompson, Richard	Carlow, C. Carlow	1736–1832	Soap boiler and chandler
Tomey, John	Carlow, C. Carlow	1676–	Carpenter/joiner
Watson, John (Son of Jeremiah & Susannah Hawkins)	Clonmacshane, C. Carlow	ca. 1675–1758	Farmer
Watson, John	Kilconner, C. Carlow	1650–1710	Farmer (1710)
Watson, Samuel1 (Brother of John)	Kilconner, C. Carlow, Edinderry Kings C. from ca. 1699	1659–1732	Gentleman/farmer
Watson, Samuel2 (Son of John)	Kilconner, C. Carlow	1686–1762	Gentleman. All subsequent heirs Gentlemen
Watson, Samuel3 (Son of Samuel2)	Stephen's Green, Dublin	1686–1731	Linen draper
Watson, Solomon (Son of Samuel2)	Cashel, C. Tipperary	1682–1758	Gentleman
Watson, Thomas	Derrygannon, King's C.	1699–1761	Farmer
Watson, Oliver (Son of Samuel2)	Edinderry, Kings C.	1699–1759	Merchant
Watson, William (Brother of John)	Athy, C. Kildare	1663–1686	Shopkeeper
Western, Thomas	Athy, C. Kildare	1668–	Linen draper
Weston, Thomas	Athy, C. Kildare	1636–1708	Miller
White, Daniel	Donore, C. Carlow	1642–1707	Farmer
White, Joseph	Carlow, C. Carlow	1652–1702	Shopkeeper
White,Thomas	Donore, C. Carlow	1681–1764	Farmer
Whitton, Benjamin	Shrah, Queen's C.	1698–1780	Blacksmith
Whitton, Daniel	Shrah, Queen's C.	1689–	Blacksmith
Wood, Josiah	Athy, C. Kildare	No gen. data but operating shop in 1684	Shopkeeper

APPENDIX 2: A SELECTION OF MARRIAGE SETTLEMENTS FOR PERSONS FROM THREE NEWGARDEN/CARLOW FAMILIES

Names of bride & groom	**Date of registration of settlement**	**Bride's Portion £ Sterling**	**Jointure(J)/ annuity(A) £ sterling**	**Reference***
Lecky, Robert of Kilnock, CC & Rebecca Arley	3 Nov. 1740		680(J)	69878 Vol. 2 p. 94
Boles, Jonathon of Mogorbane, C. Tipperary & Elizabeth Godfrey	13 May 1743	50	30(J)	76502 Vol. 110 p. 189
Watson, John of Ballydarton, CC & Dinah Deaves	13 Jan. 1779			218330 Vol. 318 p. 439

Watson, John of Kilconner, CC & Anne Penrose	2 April 1779	1500	150(J)	219181 Vol. 325 p. 128
Lecky, John of Ballykeally, CC & Elizabeth Goff	5 Dec. 1780		100(A)	225920 Vol. 336 p. 482
Watson, Samuel of Lumclone, CC & Anne Brewster	29 July 1789	530	200(J)	270137 Vol. 444 p. 66
Watson, John of Kilconner, CC & Elizabeth Lecky	18 July 1800	1000	200(J)	346675 Vol. 628 p. 306
Watson, Henry of Leighton Bridge CC & Emily Maunsell	20 May 1811	1000	200(J)	435898 Vol. 631 p. 528
Watson, Thomas H. of Lumclone CC & Anne Walker	10 April 1816	1000	400(J)	480386 Vol. 700 p. 535
Watson, Robert G. of Ballydarton & Margaret Steele	14 Nov. 1848			1848.20.5
Watson, Samuel H. of Lumclone CC & Sarah S. Roberts	03 Aug. 1854	Land & rents		1863.14.193
Gray, John C. of Upton CC & Sarah L. Watson	04 July 1856			1856.19.36
Brady, Rupert G. of Myshall CC & Mary L. Watson	16 Feb. 1888		200(J)	1887.7.181
Duckett, William of Duckett's Grove CC & Mary Thompson	28 Nov. 1895		1000(J)	1895.68.10

*The items are references to memorials held at the Registry of Deeds Dublin. They are précis of the original documents and therefore sometimes lack specific details of the transactions described.

Note: Blanks in columns 3 and 4 indicate either that the information was not available in concise form in the document or that the amounts were not specified or that these items were specified in the form of property. CC = County Carlow

APPENDIX 3: BALANCE SHEET FOR THE KILCONNER ESTATES FOLLOWING THE DEATH OF JOHN LECKY WATSON IN 1870 (MEMO OF REFERENCE TO THE ESTATE OF MR. WATSON 6 MAY 1872)

[*italics*] = author's note]

£ [Probably rental income]
Ardristan Lady Clonmell 38–17-00
Kilconnor Rep Thos Hickey 74-11-02
Edward Nolan 69-14-00
Reps Edward Nolan 57-08-02
James Lucas 89–16-06
Thomas Nolan 56-12-06
Edward McDonnald 43-00-00
House and Land 175-00-00
Roundfield Brian Nolan 71-15-08
Drimatarill Philip Swaine 35–19-07
Ballinakill William Kennedy 10-10-00

£ 723-04-07

Head Rent and Rt charges Barton 62-04-04 [*subtract liability*]
Stanhope 11-01-09
Rtcharge 20-00-00
‘ 1-00-00
Co Cess & P.R. 30-00-00

£124-06-01

£598–18-06

Interests [*principal loan*] [*interest due*]
Sinnott 7,000-00-00 332-10-00
Wakeley 1,500-00-00 75-00-00
Fitzmaurice 2,000-00-00 120-00-00
‘ 900-00-00 54-00-00
‘ 300-00-00 15-00-00
‘ 120-00-00 6-00-00
Nolan 100-00-00 5-00-00
Arrears due A Fee 240-00-00 12-00-00

12,160-00-00 £619-10-00
Millings 1,500-00-00

£13,660-00-00

NOTES

1. These types of data became available in Ireland following civil registration of non-Catholic marriages from 1845 and births, deaths, and marriages in general from 1864 (Ryan 1997: 10) but were not deployed by Vann and Eversley whose study spans the period 1650–1850 and who utilized records of BDM (for Ireland) held in the archives of the Society of Friends Historical Library, Dublin. The BDM records have been digitized since Vann and Eversley completed their study.

2. Fifty-year intervals were chosen following an assessment of the data available for the study which in turn suggested that this was the minimal interval that could provide reasonable statistical samples for comparative analysis.

3. Vann (1969a: 164), for example, claimed that the BDM registers were kept with increasing carelessness in the eighteenth century (at least in his study area) and demonstrated this from the Quaker records of marriages for Norfolk (1720s and 1730s) and burials for the Upperside Monthly Meeting (1740s and 1750s).

4. E.g. Connell 1950a, 1950b; Clarkson 1981; Walsh 1970; Cullen 1981.

5. Goodbody and Hutton (1967: 31) claim it was operating before 1660, and certainly when Thomas Loe passed through the area in 1657 he identified several Friends (Wight and

Rutty 1800: 105). The Newgarden Meeting is mentioned in the minutes of the Quarterly Meeting as early as May 1670 (MMQM 30.03.1670).

6. The author has completed a detailed analysis of the early membership of the Meeting which is incorporated into an unpublished Ms entitled 'Friends and the Newgarden Monthly Meeting, County Carlow 1678–1900' and hereafter referred to as Coutts 2011a. It is, however, well established that early members of the Quaker movement in Ireland were mainly of English origins (Grubb 1927: 16-17; Vann and Eversley 2002: 59), although Webb (1906: 12-13) has identified a group of families that may be of French or French-related origins, some of whose names appear in the Newgarden/Carlow registers.

7. The term 'membership' is used here in a loose sense, since the question of who were bonafide 'members' as opposed to attendees or persons who had been 'convinced' as opposed to 'converted' is a complex issue and requires discussion (see Vann 1969a: 32ff.). In respect of the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting the issue has been dealt with elsewhere (Coutts 2011a).

8. Fennagh in County Carlow and Kilabban in Queen's County (Coutts 2011c).

9. Barrow Valley, Intermediate, Castlecomer Plateau, Elevated Region, and Blackstairs Mountains (Conry and Ryan 1967).

10. For example Thomas and Edward Weston were millers at Athy, County Kildare, but they had hay taken from them consistently from 1685 and, in this particular year, bear and barley; John Thacker of Castledermott, County Kildare was a carpenter and in 1688 he had hay, barley, fleeces, and lambs taken; George Mason of County Kildare, another carpenter, regularly had hay taken from him (Yearly Meeting National Sufferings 1658–1693 Ms YMG1).

11. Extracted from the birth, death, and marriage registers for the Newgarden Meeting (BDM). Details of the Watson, Lecky, Duckett, and Cooper families are discussed in an unpublished Ms entitled 'Families in Transition: Edward Cooper and the Cooper Families of County Carlow and Queen's County', hereafter referred to as Coutts 2011b.

12. Information provided by local historian Michael Purcell of Carlow, County Carlow.

13. Notably the registers were digitized by the Society sometime after this study was completed. Data for the study were manually extracted from the registers, a time-consuming and error-prone procedure.

14. Vann (1981: 58) calls them 'Family lists'.

15. This can be determined by comparing names in the BDM registers with names that appear in the Sufferings and the minutes of the Men's Business Meeting and those for the Quarterly Meeting.

16. Baptism, an important ritual of the mainstream churches, was rejected by Friends (Vann 1981: 60).

17. E.g. Yearly Meeting National Sufferings 1658–1693, Ms YMG1; Yearly Meeting National Sufferings 1694–1705, Ms YMG2, Religious Society of Friends Historical Library, Dublin.

18. The Registry of Deeds 1993.

19. MMQM 24.03.1673; 13.12.1675; 17.05.1679; 09.06.1679.

20. He was a schoolmaster in Dublin, teaching at the Meath Street Meetinghouse from 1696 (Greaves 1997: 352).

21. NGMMM 23.10.1724. Lowden had at least three children, the eldest born in 1703, but the birth dates of his other children are not known.

22. Following Henry in Wrigley *et al.* (2005: 15).

23. See also Vann 1969a: 160ff.

24. Vann (1969a: 161) was faced with this problem when he analyzed the birth and marriage data for Buckinghamshire, England. He found that 30% of the registered marriages were childless which raised serious doubts about the veracity of the birth register.

25. Vann (1969a: 127), commenting generally on registration issues, reckons that children born less than nine months after marriage were not recorded in Friends registers and that the children of parents who were in discord with their Meetings were not recorded. However in

respect of the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting and Ireland in general there are occasional birth records for children born under nine months.

26. There are no representatives for Groups 1 and 7 (Asia and Europe respectively); these appear in later time periods.

27. This, of course, is a questionable assumption. Children could be apprenticed at a much earlier age. The one redeeming feature is that when apprenticeships were contemplated Friends tried to place their children with other Friends so that in such instances there is a good chance that the child will remain in observation (Vann and Eversley 2002: 189), but not always. Such is the case for John Mayo (son of Henry) who was apprenticed to Thomas Coates in February 1693 for 16 years (NGMMM 22.12.1692/3) and his brother Henry apprenticed to John Frodd for 16 years in September 1693 (NGMMM 24.07.1693). Frodd and Coates were both members of the Newgarden Meeting, yet John and Henry disappear from observation. Joseph Rose (son of Henry) was apprenticed to Tobias Neale of Mountmellick for 16 years in September 1693 (NGMMM 24.07.1693) and a son of Humphrey Mayo was apprenticed to Thomas Devitt of Dublin for 7 years (NGMMM 01.02.1696) and despite the fact that Neale and Devitt were Friends their apprentices pass out of observation. Friends could also apprentice their children to non-Friends though from May 1680 they needed the permission of their Meeting to do so (Greaves 1998: 27). One suspects that in such cases there was an even greater chance of their children disappearing from observation. Again if children married 'out' when under-age they risked being disowned by their respective Meetings and their parents and as such could disappear from observation (Greaves 1998: 167-70; Vann and Eversley 2002: 123; Vann 1981: 60).

28. Ideally the numbers of marriages for men and women should be the same. However, the totals are different because some Friends married twice and a few three times. Spouses are registered only once in the database, but all spouses, primary, secondary, and tertiary, are registered. Thus when second marriages are added to the registered first marriages the total for males amounts to 1498 and for females 1503. There is still a difference of 5 marriages. The latter were third marriages by males and while their spouses have been documented in the database separately with records of whom they married, they have not been registered in the male records because the latter were designed to accommodate two partners only. None of the third marriages produced children.

29. No. of births year only (440) + no. of births dates known (3409) + no. of births date unknown (1571) = 5420.

30. No. of deaths year only (396) + no. of deaths dates known (1743) + no. of deaths dates unknown (3109) + no. of persons still alive (172) = 5420.

31. Memorial No. 9961 Book 19 p. 197 John Tench to Samuel Watson Reg. 14.10.1717.

32. As Vann (1969a: 174) has pointed out this was not the case in the very early years of Quakerism. In fact many families were fragmented because of disputes between members who converted or believed in the dissenting form of Protestantism and those that adhered to the Church of Ireland. However, once beyond the first generation of Friends the main sources of recruitment into the Society were their children. Consequently Quakers paid special attention to the nurturing of the family to make sure they were properly indoctrinated with Quaker values and their contacts with 'outsiders' were minimized. Indeed the family became the prime religious unit (1969a: 179; 1969b).

33. Anon (1905) related that prior to 1790 as part of the marriage procedure, a couple intending to marry had to appear 12 times before various Meetings, each time declaring their intention.

34. In practice many other factors could influence choice of partners. For example parents and relatives could dictate or influence the choice of partners as well as the socio-economic status of potential partners. Then there were hurdles to traverse once a potential partner was chosen. A male suitor could not approach his potential bride directly until he had received the permission of her parents and the approval of his/her Meeting.

35. This analysis excludes many Friends who 'married out' because there is no documentation for them.

36. The records indicate that partners were recruited from 23 counties in England, some (such as Middlesex) more than others. Very few were recruited from Scotland, Wales, and the Isle of Wight.

37. Mostly friends residing in Pennsylvania during the first few decades but thereafter widely scattered throughout the continent.

38. For convenience references to the Vann and Eversley data and are hereafter sometimes cited as NDB.

39. This figure needs to be treated with caution. Most scholars believe that the propensity to marry and the ages at which both males and females married during this period was markedly affected by the ravages of the potato famine as well as other economic and socio-political factors. Mokyr and O Grada (1984: 478) have suggested on the basis of anecdotal information collected during the census that the age at marriage for Irish women increased from 23.82 in 1830 to 24.36 in 1840; but they also questioned the reliability of the census data.

40. There is documentation that suggests some female Quaker preachers deliberately delayed or deferred marriage in order to facilitate their ministries (Larson 1999: 170).

41. Ideally, one would like to be able to consult an eighteenth-century version of the 'Christian Discipline of the Religious Society of Friends for Ireland' but the rules of the Society were not published in a consolidated form until 1811 followed by revised editions in 1840, 1864, 1905, and 1929 (Wigham 1992: 82-83, 112). Unfortunately the present author has only been able to consult the 1929 version (CDRS) which incorporates extensive changes in procedures dictated by evolving attitudes to marriage and legislative requirements, but has had access to earlier related documents published (Extracts 1861; Advice 1864).

42. This requirement was introduced in 1693 (MMQM 23.10.1693) by the Province Meeting after it was reported that some weddings had been conducted with too much merriment and frivolity, contrary to the view that marriage was an ordinance of God and was to be entered on 'in the fear of the Lord' (CDRS 1929: 53).

43. NGMMM 25.02.1791. As a result the couple was disowned by their respective Meetings. This particular rule, introduced in 1698, banning marriages between both first and second cousins (MMQM 25.12.1698), was eventually overturned but such marriages continued to be actively discouraged from taking place in practice (CDRS 1929: 54).

44. King (1997: 29) has listed 24 trades practiced in the town of Carlow during the period 1710–1739 (not necessarily by Quakers). The occupations listed in Appendix 1 give some idea of the diversity of occupations chosen by Quakers belonging to the Newgarden/Carlow Meeting during the first few decades of the eighteenth century.

45. Unless there was a conspiracy among the women to avoid marriage.

46. There are, however, a number of cases where parents were disciplined for giving parental consent to marriages that would not have been agreed to by the Meeting, the most common being marriages to non-Quakers.

47. Such a blatantly targeted procedure was not necessarily in accordance with the rules of the Society. From as early as 1722 parents were advised 'not to make it their first or chief care to obtain for their children large portions or settlements of marriage' but to give priority to personal attributes such as religious piety, disposition, and diligence but without 'unequal yoking of their children' (Extracts 1861: 84; Advice 1864: 117). This latter phrase, which appears to advise Friends to focus on matches where the parties were of equal socio-economic status, would seem to give sufficient license to parents to arrange advantageous matches.

48. Children have a right to a share of their father's estate under Irish common law (Wilson 2009: 71).

49. See Douglas (2009) for a succinct summary of the history of Irish law in relation to Friends' marriages.

50. Mentioned in the will of his wife Rachell (dated 22.11.1736, Eustace and Goodbody 1957: 54) and his own will (dated 20.?.1735; Eustace and Goodbody 1957: 55).

51. Cullen (1972: 113–17) also makes the point that farmers entered marriage with increasing caution, more alert to their financial obligations as they were increasingly burdened with mortgage repayments, dowries, and other legally binding financial commitments.

52. Notes: Column F includes any child that survived to the age of 20 or more. Column G includes children who are named but for which there is no other information. Children who died before the age of 20 are not included in columns F and G. Robert Lecky Watson was adopted by his uncle Robert Lecky Watson who himself had married his first cousin, Robert's sister.

53. The family has maintained its place within the gentry and upper middle classes for more than 250 years. A glance at the published pedigrees suggests that its male members tended to marry well: daughters of ministers, wealthy landowners, relatives of the aristocracy and merchants (Burke 1937: 2709–10; 1976: 1188–93). Their female counterparts were no less fortunate, marrying gentry, lawyers, military officers, and others of station. A tradition of serving in the military grew from the early nineteenth century when Thomas Henry Watson of Lumclone was a Captain in the Carlow militia. Military service was particularly strong among the descendants of the Tipperary branch where Colonels, Lieutenant Colonels, and Majors with a variety of distinctions and decorations were not uncommon.

54. Last will and Testament of Samuel Watson, Kilconner, County Carlow, dated 23 March 1761 National Archives of Ireland, Dublin Ref. T17632.

55. Memorial No. 144985 Vol. 225 pp. 37 Reg. 11 Jan. 1763 Paul Warren to Watson.

56. Memorial No. 166652 Vol. 260 pp. 96 Reg. 30 July 1767 Warren to Watson.

57. Memorial No. 219181 Vol. 325 pp. 128 Reg. 2 April 1779 Watson *et al.* to Penrose *et al.*

58. Memorial No. 1848.9.241 Reg. 3 May 1848 Watson to Watson.

59. Memorial No. 1846.10.239 Reg. 20 June 1846 Watson to Watson.

60. Memorial No. 1846.14.190 Reg. 1 Oct. 1846 Watson to Watson.

61. Memorial No. 1844.5.22 Reg. 15 March 1844 Watson *et al.* to Walker.

62. Memorial No. 1850.15.242 Reg. 25 Oct. 1850 Coleman to Watson.

63. Memorial No. 1850.16.165 Reg. 1 Nov. 1850 Public Works Commission to Watson *et al.*

64. Memorial No. 1844.15.87 Reg. 20 Sept. 1844 Watson *et al.* to Elliot.

65. Memorial No. 1850.16.213 Reg. 4 Nov. 1850 Elliot to Watson.

66. Memorial No. 1850.15.158 Reg. 21 Oct. 1850 Strangman *et al.* to Watson.

67. Memorial No. 1850.14.234 Reg. 4 Oct. 1850 Watson *et al.* to Synnott.

68. Memorial No. 1850.18.155 Reg. ? Watson and wife to Lindsay.

69. Memorial No. 1859.31.12 Reg. 12 Aug. 1859 Watson to Bate.

70. Memorial No. 1861.5.82 Reg. 11 Jan. 1861 Watson *et al.* to Wakely.

71. Henry D. Vaughan to F.M. Lecky-Watson 9 April 1919.

72. Undated handwritten notes, probably by Robert L. Watson, Altamount Collection.

73. Undated, unsigned letter fragment, Altamont Archives.

74. H.F. Watson to Overend no date.

75. Constance Watson nee Leir to Vaughan 30 Dec. 1927.

76. R. Lecky Watson to Fielding Watson 16 Feb. 1900. When they moved to London, they took some furniture with them but most of what had been salvaged from Kilconner was stored in the Friends Meeting House or at the houses of friends and relatives resident in County Carlow.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Advice (abbrev). (1864), *Advice and minutes issued and adopted by the Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, Ireland in relation to Christian doctrine, practice and discipline*, Dublin: Depository of the Society of Friends, 6 Eustace Street, 3rd edn.

Agnew, J. (1999), 'The Registry of Deeds: A Beginner's Guide', in C. Ryan (ed.), *Aspects of Irish Genealogy 3: A Collection of Papers from the Third Irish Genealogical Congress*, Dublin: Irish Genealogical Congress Committee, pp. 103-22.

Andrews, J.H. (1986), 'Land and People, c.1780', in Moody and Vaughan (eds.), *A New History of Ireland*, pp. 236-64.

Anon. (1905), 'Declarations of Marriage', *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 2, pp. 43-44.

Burke, Sir B. (1937), *Irish Supplement to the Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Landed Gentry*, London: Shaw Publication Company in conjunction with Burke Publishing Company.

— (1976), *Burke's Irish Family Records*, London: Burke's Peerage.

Clarkson, L.A. (1981), 'Irish Population Revisited, 1687–1821', in Goldstrom and Clarkson (eds.), *Irish Population*, pp. 13-36.

Connell, K.H. (1950a), 'Land and Population in Ireland, 1750–1845', *Economic History Review*, 2nd series 3/3, pp. 275-86.

— (1950b), *The Population of Ireland, 1750–1845*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Conry, M.J., and Ryan (1967), 'Soils of County Carlow', in *Soil Survey Bulletin no. 17*, Dublin: National Soil Survey of Ireland.

Cousens, S.H. (1964), 'The Regional Variations in Population Changes in Ireland, 1861–1881', *Economic History Review*, 2nd series 17, pp. 301-21.

Coutts, J.F. (2011a), *Friends and the Newgarden Monthly Meeting, County Carlow 1678–1900* (unpublished Ms).

— (2011b), *Families in Transition: Edward Cooper and the Cooper families of County Carlow and Queen's County* (unpublished Ms).

— (2011c), *Evaluation of Tithes as a Source of Ecclesiastical and Economic Information: Analysis of Friends' Records for the Newgarden Meeting, Ireland 1650–1725* (unpublished Ms).

CDRS (abbrev.) (1929), *Christian Discipline of the Religious Society of Friends*, Dublin: University Press.

Cullen, L.M. (1972), *An Economic History of Ireland Since 1660*, London: B.T. Batsford.

— (1981), 'Population Growth and Diet, 1600–1850', in Goldstrom and Clarkson (eds.), *Irish Population*, pp. 89-112.

— (1986), 'Economic Development, 1691–1750', in Moody and Vaughan (eds.), *A New History of Ireland*, pp. 123-58.

Damiano, K.A. (1988), 'On Earth as it Is in Heaven: Eighteenth Century Quakerism as Realized Eschatology,' unpublished PhD thesis, Union of Experimenting Colleges and Universities, Cincinati, Ohio.

Donnelly, J.S. (1989), 'Landlords and Tenants', in Vaughan (eds.), *A New History of Ireland*, V, pp. 332-49.

Douglas, G. (2009), 'Quaker Marriage', *The Friendly Word* 26/1, pp. 13-15.

Eustace, B. (ed.) (1956), *Registry of Deeds, Dublin: Abstract of Wills 1708–1745*, vol. 1, Dublin: Stationary Office for the Irish Manuscripts Commission.

Eustace, B., and Goodbody, O.C. (1957), *Quaker Records Dublin: Abstracts of Wills*. Dublin: Dubin Stationary Office.

Eversley, D.E.C. (1981), 'The Demography of the Irish Quakers, 1650–1850', in Goldstrom and Clarkson (eds.), *Irish Population*, pp. 57-88.

Extracts (abbrev.) (1861), *Extracts from the minutes and epistles of the Yearly Meeting of the Religious society of Friends, held in London from its first institution to the present time, relating to Christian doctrine, practice and discipline*, London: Friends Book Depository, Houndsditch, 4th edn.

Goldstrom, J.M., and Clarkson, L.A. (eds.) (1981), *Irish Population, Economy, and Society: Essays in Honour of the Late K.H.Connell*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goodbody, O.C., and Hutton, B.G. (1967), *Guide to Irish Quaker Records 1654–1860*, Dublin: Dublin Stationary Office for the Irish Manuscripts Commission.

Grubb, I. (1927), *Quakers in Ireland 1654–1900*, London: Swarthmore Press.

Habakkuk, H.J. (1955), 'Family Structure and Economic Change in Nineteenth-century Europe', *Journal of Economic History* 15/1, pp. 1-12.

Harrison, R.S. (2008), *A Biographical Dictionary of Irish Quakers*, Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2nd edn.

Irish Archives No. 19 (1996), 'Dublin Friends Historical Library (DFHL)', *Irish Roots* 3, pp. 6-7. Azsddf67u788765557889.

King, T. (1997), *Carlow: The Manor and Town 1674–1721*, Maynooth Studies in Local History 12, Dublin: Irish Academic Press.

Larson, R. (1999), *Daughters of Light: Quaker Women Preaching and Prophesying in the Colonies and Abroad, 1700–1775*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Leadbeater, M. (1822), *Memoirs and Letters of Richard and Elizabeth Shackleton Late of Ballytore, Ireland*, London: Harvey & Darton.

McCartney, D. (1987), *The Dawning of Democracy: Ireland 1800-1870*, Dublin: Helicon.

McKenna, E.E. (1974), 'Marriage and Fertility in Postfamine Ireland: A Multivariate Analysis', *American Journal of Sociology* 80/3, pp. 688-705.

Moody, T.W., and Vaughan, W.E. (eds.) (1986), *A New History of Ireland: Eighteenth-Century Ireland 1691–1800*, Oxford: Clarendon Press

Mokyr, J., and O Grada, C. (1984), 'New Developments in Irish Population History, 1700–1850', *The Economic History Review* NS 37/4, pp. 473-88.

Mortimer, R.S. (1957), Marriage Discipline in Early Friends: A Study in Church Administration Illustrated from Bristol Records', *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 48/4, pp. 175-95.

O Grada, C. (1989), 'Poverty, Population, and Agriculture, 1801–45', in Vaughan (ed.), *A New History of Ireland*, V, pp. 108-57.

Ryan, J.G. (1997), *Irish Records: Sources for Family and Local History*, Salt Lake City: Ancestry Incorporated.

Shackleton, J. (1985/86), 'An Alphabetical List of those Buried in the Quaker Burial Ground in Ballitore, Co. Kildare', *Journal of the County Kildare Archaeological Society* 16/5, pp. 531-37.

The Registry of Deeds (1993), 'Irish Archives No. 5', *Irish Roots* 2, p. 10.

Vann, R.T. (1969a), *The Social Development of English Quakerism 1655–1755*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

— (1969b), 'Nurture and Conversion in Early Quaker Family', *Journal of Marriages and the Family* 32, pp. 639-43.
— (1981), 'The Demography of Irish Quakers,' in Goldstrom and Clarkson (eds.), *Irish Population*, pp. 57-88.
Vann, R.T., and Eversley, D. (1992), *Friends in Life and Death: The British and Irish Quakers in the Demographic Transition, 1650–1900*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
— (2002), *Friends in Life and Death: The British and Irish Quakers in the Demographic Transition, 1650–1900*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Vaughan, W.E. (eds.) (1989), *A New History of Ireland*. V. *Ireland under the Union, I 1801–70*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Walsh, B.M. (1970), 'Marriage Rates and Population Pressure, Ireland 1871 and 1911', *Economic History Review*, 2nd series 23, pp. 148-62.
Webb, T.H. (1906), 'Irish Quaker Records', *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 3, pp. 9–18, 60-71.
Wigham, M.J. (1992), *The Irish Quakers: A Short History of the Religious Society of Friends in Ireland*, Dublin: Historical Committee of the Religious society of Friends Historical Committee.
Wight, T., and Rutty, J. (1800), *A history of the rise and progress of the people called Quakers, in Ireland, from the year 1653 to 1700: compiled at the request of their national meeting / by Thomas Wight; afterwards revised, enlarged, and continued to the year 1751*, London: William Phillips.
Wilson, D. (2009*), Women, Marriage and Property in Wealthy Landed Families in Ireland, 1750–1850*, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
Wrigley, E.A., Davies, R.S., Oeppen, J.E., and Schofield, R.S. (2005 [first paperback edn 1997]), *English Population History from Family Reconstitution 1580–1837*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS HISTORICAL LIBRARY, DUBLIN

MMQM (abbrev.) Minutes of the Men's Quarterly Meeting, Leinster Province. QM 1A1
NGMMM (abbrev.) Newgarden Men's Meeting Minutes. Ms MM I A1-A7, F1b.
Yearly Meeting National Sufferings 1658–1693 Ms YMG1
Yearly Meeting National Sufferings 1694–1705 Ms YMG2

LAND MEMORIALS REGISTRY OF DEEDS, DUBLIN

Memorial No. 9961 Book 19 p. 197 John Tench to Samuel Watson Reg. 14.Oct.1717
Memorial No. 144985 Vol. 225 pp. 37 Reg. 11 Jan. 1763 Paul Warren to Watson
Memorial No. 166652 Vol. 260 pp. 96 Reg. 30 July 1767 Warren to Watson
Memorial No. 219181 Vol. 325 pp. 128 Reg. 2 April 1779 Watson *et al.* to Penrose *et al.*
Memorial No. 1844.5.22 Reg. 15 March 1844 Watson *et al.* to Walker
Memorial No. 1844.15.87 Reg. 20 Sept. 1844 Watson *et al.* to Elliot
Memorial No. 1846.10.239 Reg. 20 June 1846 Watson to Watson
Memorial No. 1846.14.190 Reg. 1 Oct. 1846 Watson to Watson
Memorial No. 1848.9.241 Reg. 3 May 1848 Watson to Watson.
Memorial No. 1850.14.234 Reg. 4 Oct. 1850 Watson *et al.* to Synnott

Memorial No. 1850.15.242 Reg. 25 Oct. 1850 Coleman to Watson
Memorial No. 1850.15.158 Reg. 21 Oct. 1850 Strangman *et al.* to Watson
Memorial No. 1850.16.165 Reg. 1 Nov. 1850 Public Works Commission to Watson *et al.*
Memorial No. 1850.16.213 Reg. 4 Nov. 1850 Elliot to Watson
Memorial No. 1850.18.155 Reg. ? Watson and wife to Lindsay
Memorial No. 1859.31.12 Reg. 12 August 1859 Watson to Bate
Memorial No. 1861.5.82 Reg. 11 Jan. 1861 Watson *et al.* to Wakely

ALTIMONT COLLECTION, COUNTY CARLOW, IRELAND

Henry D. Vaughan to F.M. Lecky-Watson 9 April 1919
Undated handwritten notes, probably by Robert L. Watson
Undated, unsigned letter fragment
Constance Watson née Leir to Vaughan 30 Dec. 1927
Memo of Reference to the Estate of Mr. Watson 6 May 1872
National Archives of Ireland, Dublin
Last will and Testament of Samuel Watson Kilconner County Carlow dated 23 March 1761 National Archives of Ireland, Dublin Ref. T17632

AUTHOR DETAILS

Peter J.F. Coutts is an Australian archaeologist whose research has focussed on aspects of economic prehistory and historical archaeology variously in Australia, New Zealand, New Guinea and the Philippines. He was the foundation Director of the Victoria Archaeological Survey and when he retired in 1986 Honorary Senior Research Fellow in the History Department, LaTrobe University. Dr Coutts is also a competent computer programmer/analyst and author of a wide variety of publications that deal mainly with archaeological and historical topics. In his retirement he has devoted much of his time and energy to researching the economic and social history of Irish Quakers, inspired by a latent interest in Irish Church history and churches.

Mailing address: 17 Byfield Court, Nerang, Qld, Australia 4211.
Email: pjfc@tpg.com.au.