Evangelical Quakerism and the Early American Penitentiary Revisited: The Contributions of Thomas Eddy, Roberts Vaux, John Griscom, Stephen Grellet, Elisha Bates, and Isaac Hopper

Author(s): Christopher Adamson

Source: *Quaker History*, Fall 2001, Vol. 90, No. 2 (Fall 2001), pp. 35-58

Published by: Friends Historical Association

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/41947469

REFERENCES
Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:
https://www.jstor.org/stable/41947469?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents
You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Quaker History*

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Evangelical Quakerism and the Early American Penitentiary Revisited: The Contributions of Thomas Eddy, Roberts Vaux, John Griscom, Stephen Grellet, Elisha Bates, and Isaac Hopper

Christopher Adamson *

Quaker leadership in prison reform has not been central to recent interpretations of the rise of the penitentiary in the United States. There are two reasons for this. First, some scholars have contended that the early state prisons were essentially hard-labor houses, not penitentiaries. Adam J. Hirsch, for example, emphasized that the regime of hard labor in the first American state prisons mirrored the disciplinary and administrative arrangements which existed in the English houses of correction and Continental prison-workhouses of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. According to Hirsch, historians have been wrong to point to the Quaker state's pioneering role in penology, for it was actually "Massachusetts which stood in the vanguard of the penitentiary movement in America, establishing the first statewide program of incarceration following independence."[1]

Second, scholars who acknowledge the role played by Quakers in bringing about prison reform in the early republic focus less on the influence of Quaker philanthropy and theology than on the effects of a general theory of crime causation. David Rothman, in his influential 1971 book, identified what was common to prison reform in Pennsylvania, New York, New England, and Ohio. The state prisons built there during the 1820s, he argued, were the product of an essentially secular theory which attributed crime to the breakdown of community.[2]

While Rothman was correct to argue that prison reformers saw crime as an indicator of social disorganization rather than original sin, he accorded little significance to the fact that many prison reformers were intensely devout men and women for whom social disorganization was the product of the spread of irreligion. In an argument similar to Rothman's, Michael Meranze has shown how fear of social fluidity and disorder led Philadelphia's prison reformers to substitute imprisonment at hard labor for public forced labor, and to embrace the belief that solitary confinement was the *sine qua non* of convict reformation. For Meranze, the fear of society's contaminating influence on the community, and the solitary penitentiary ideal engendered by that fear, derived primarily from secular perceptions, not from the worldview of evangelical Quakerism.[3]

For interpretations which assign importance to the religious origins of the penitentiary, we need to revisit the work of Negley K. Teeters, Harry Elmer

*Christopher Adamson, an historical sociologist, has taught at Hofstra University and York University.

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Barnes, and others. In a variety of books, they described the work of Quakers in ameliorating conditions at the jail on Walnut Street, in building the Eastern State Penitentiary north of Philadelphia, and in formulating the Pennsylvanian system of prison discipline which kept prisoners in solitary confinement both day and night.[4] In their analysis of Quaker attitudes toward punishment, these scholars highlighted the significance of Quaker soteriology. Since salvation was, Quakers believed, available to anyone who would open himself or herself to the Inner Light, there was a real possibility that prisoners could be redeemed. But, important though Quaker soteriology was, there were other reasons why Quakers were drawn to prison reform work. The sources of Quaker prison reform lay not just in doctrines unique to Quakerism, but in evangelicalism more generally. Indeed, it is impossible to understand the role which Quakers played in humanizing punishment without considering the evangelical revitalization of Quakerism.[5]

The American Revolution accelerated a process of reformation already occurring within Quakerism.[6] Evangelical rejuvenation was manifested in a more intense psychological identification with suffering; a growing appreciation of the spiritual risks attached to moneymaking; and the belief that it was more important to convert sinners than to establish the correctness of a doctrine.

Quakers who embraced evangelical norms of piety resurrected the heroic philanthropy of men like Daniel Stanton and John Woolman, who had preached that spiritual renewal came with personal efforts to alleviate the suffering of others. Christ's redeeming work on the cross led Quakers to identify with wounded soldiers, needy families, African slaves, American Indians, and anyone victimized by inhumane treatment in a poorhouse, hospital, or prison.[7] Christ's redeeming work also led Quakers to identify with the condemned. In Philadelphia during the early 1780s, William Savery and Thomas Scattergood jumped up on the tumbrel carrying a number of condemned prisoners to the place of execution. Feeling an inner empathy for the state of mind of the criminals, the two ministers climbed the scaffold and stood by them while they were hanged. Afterwards, Savery and Scattergood urged the crowd to reflect soberly on what they had just witnessed, bringing many to tears.[8]

Spiritual rebirth gave rise not only to a psychological identification with suffering humanity but also to a profound distrust of moneymaking. Because of the spiritual risks involved in toiling after gain, men like John Pemberton and Samuel Emlen turned their backs on business and took up philanthropy full time.[9] Nicolas Waln, following his awakening in 1772, abandoned a successful law practice and all the trappings of bourgeois life, including fine clothes, sumptuous food and wines, and a gaudy yellow

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

carriage. He committed himself to a life of service to God, becoming, in 1789, clerk of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting.[10] The conviction that any money made from business should finance missionary journeys led William Savery and Thomas Scattergood to give up their careers as tanners.

Evangelicalism also affected Quakerism by fostering the conviction that converting sinners was more important than promoting doctrinal orthodoxy.[11] Quakers channeled their zeal for improvement through interdenominational organizations rather than their quarterly meetings. Although not all Quakers were comfortable working with members of other denominations,[12] those Quakers who played a leading role in promoting institutional reform strongly believed in interdenominational cooperation.[13] Philadelphia Quakers, though they accounted for less than one percent of the membership of the pan-Protestant Bible, tract, and Sunday School societies, were typically the largest group in societies dedicated to institutional reform. They were certainly the dominant influence within the Philadelphia Society for the Alleviation of the Miseries of Public Prisons (PSAMPP).

By founding interdenominational organizations whose mandate was public improvement, Quakers demonstrated their republican bona fides. Men who had played no role in the founding of the republic or the drafting of its constitution made the rhetoric of revolutionary republicanism an integral part of their commitment to alleviate suffering.[14] In requesting manumission laws, for example, Quakers "took care to speak not only as a religious sect but also as part of a sovereign people, justifying their demands by appealing to the Declaration of Independence or other official statements of principle."[15] Similarily, Quakers opposed barbaric punishments because they were unrepublican, not just because they were unchristian.

Evangelicalism led Quakers in the new republic to identify strongly with the suffering of the oppressed, to turn away from business to pursue projects of general improvement, and to place the work of reforming a corrupt society above that of establishing the doctrinal purity of Quakerism. Yet evangelicalism by itself was not a sufficient cause of prison reform. For Quakerism provided two key elements without which prison reform would not have been possible. First, as already mentioned, the doctrine of the Inner Light gave rise to the belief that it was possible to awaken the prisoner's conscience and set him on the path to righteousness. Second, Quakerism was the source of a powerful rationalistic experimentalism that was conducive to prison reform.

An experimental cast of mind marked Quakerism from the outset. George Fox concluded his account of his inward discovery of God with the words: "And this I knew *experimentally*." The "Quaker appeal from religious authority and tradition to direct experience," Frederick Tolles observed

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

forty years ago, "was clearly akin to the method of experimentation (which) made possible the advances of modern science."[16] Experimentalism was reflected in an outlook that was essentially religio-medical. That outlook infused the work of the London physician, Dr. John Fothergill, who stressed that he would never be successful in achieving his primary evangelical goal of alleviating human suffering unless he succeeded in achieving his secondary goal of acquiring "knowledge as a sovereign remedy for human error."[17] Fothergill's religio-medical experimentalism was shared by many eminent Quaker physicians in Philadelphia, men like Caspar Wistar, Samuel Powel Griffitts, or Joseph Parrish and his talented sons, Isaac, Joseph, and Edward, whose distrust of abstract reasoning revolutionized the diagnosis and treatment of disease.[18]

Quaker experimentalism fueled rational inquiry into the causes of crime. It was important to gather and analyze statistics on crime rates and the effectiveness of different punishments. Philadelphia's Caleb Lownes referred to the reform of penal laws and introduction of mild prison discipline as "a science hitherto little attended to."[19] If there ever was an experimental social hypothesis, it was surely the idea that solitary penitentiary discipline would deter crime and reform criminals. Its introduction, in different forms at the New York State Prison at Auburn and at the Eastern State Penitentiary in Pennsylvania, was marked by the kind of controversy that is characteristic of scientific experimentation.

Having identified the intertwined effects of evangelicalism and Quakerism on prison reform generally, we may now look specifically at how these systems of belief manifested themselves in the lives of: Thomas Eddy, who established Newgate Prison in New York and subsequently sought to remedy the abuses that plagued it; Roberts Vaux, a vocal opponent of capital punishment and one of the principal founders of the Eastern State Penitentiary; John Griscom, founder of the New York House of Refuge, an institution for juvenile offenders; Stephen Grellet, who advanced the cause of prison reform during his extensive travels throughout Europe; Elisha Bates, who campaigned against capital punishment and whipping in Ohio during the 1820s and sought to bring the harsh discipline in the state prison in line with Quaker principles; and Isaac Hopper, who advanced the cause of prison reform by emphasizing the problems experienced by released convicts in Philadelphia and New York.

Thomas Eddy (1758–1827)

It is unfortunate that not much is known about Caleb Lownes, who oversaw the renovation of the Walnut Street Jail, transforming it from an overcrowded, unsanitary congregate prison into a well-managed, three-

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

storey brick prison fitted with sixteen solitary cells.[20] However, Lownes' efforts came to the attention of Thomas Eddy, about whose life a great deal is known. Eddy's work as a prison reformer in New York was the product of a thorough intermingling of evangelical, Quaker, and republican values. His spiritual awakening occurred during the American Revolution when he was put on the Philadelphia patriots' black list. He and his friend, William Savery, were deeply shaken by witnessing the execution of John Roberts, a Quaker condemned to death for treason.[21]

Eddy was involved in several unsuccessful businesses during the 1780s. In 1791, however, he moved to New York City, and, on the advice of friends, set himself up as an insurance broker. "I pursued this with success for three or four years," he explained. "About 1792, the public debt of the United States was founded; this afforded an opportunity for people to speculate in the public funds. In this business," he added, "I made a good deal of money."[22] Eddy went on to amass more wealth from currency trading and insurance underwriting. Able to retire from business in the mid-1790s, he devoted all his time to philanthropic projects that addressed the needs of slaves, Indians, paupers, lunatics, debtors, and prisoners.[23]

In 1796, Eddy visited Caleb Lownes and learned a great deal about the disciplinary improvements at the Walnut Street Jail, where refractory inmates were being placed in solitary confinement on reduced rations instead of being chained and whipped. Eddy subsequently persuaded New York's legislature to reform its harsh penal code and to build a new prison. The rapprochement of evangelical Quakerism and republicanism is apparent in Eddy's observation that "it was not to be expected that a people enamoured of freedom and a republic should long acquiesce in a system of laws, many of them the product of barbarous usages, corrupt society, and monarchical principles."[24]

Eddy oversaw the construction of Newgate Prison in Greenwich Village, and acted as one of its inspectors and as agent between 1796 and 1803. The position of prison inspector was of course unsalaried, since it was expected that inspectors, in conformity with prevailing philanthropic norms, would seek "no other recompense than those feelings which accompany the exertions of good men for the benefit of society."[25]

Eddy worked closely with people belonging to other denominations, and his efforts to foster reform were helped by his friendships with prominent citizens like General Philip John Schuyler and DeWitt Clinton. He worked for prison reform for over thirty years, and was dubbed the "Howard of America" by his contemporaries.[26] His contribution, however, was not simply to document the deplorable conditions in prisons and jails, but also to promote an experimental system of solitary discipline. He lamented the

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

fact that Newgate Prison contained 54 large, eight-person rooms rather than single cells. "The separation of the criminals from each other during the night is a matter of great importance," he wrote in 1801. "It is desirable that an immediate improvement should be made in this respect."[27] In a letter the following year to London police magistrate Patrick Colquhoun, Eddy stated that "*all* prisons intended for the confinement of convicts for a term of years should be so constructed as that they should lodge in separate rooms."[28] In 1816, he confessed that Newgate "should have contained 500 rooms, 7 feet by 9 feet, in order to keep the prisoners separate at night," and recommended that any new state prison have "a separate room for each convict."[29]

Eddy believed that the reformation of the criminal necessitated solitary confinement. If the prisoner were "detached from vicious companions, from temptation, and from all means of gratifying his depraved appetites," he wrote, "conscience would have time to awaken a sense of guilt and remorse for his past folly and misconduct."[30] Following the War of 1812, Eddy lobbied hard for the introduction of solitary cells at the new state prison being constructed at Auburn. He was rewarded, in 1819, when a wing of solitary cells was added. However, he was never in favor of total solitary confinement. Indeed, he wrote that the plan of his colleagues in Philadelphia of "having the convicts *closely confined in the cells,* to work during the day, is wrong; and I have no doubt they will abandon it in a year or two." Uninterrupted solitary confinement was too much for the typical prisoner to bear. "Let them sleep in their respective cells," Eddy advised, "and work during the day in the yard and shops, attended by a sufficient number of keepers to prevent *all* conversation and improper intercourse."[31]

Eddy's proposal of solitary confinement at night and silent labor in closely supervised workshops during the day came to fruition as the widely adopted Auburn system of prison discipline. However, the implementation of this disciplinary plan necessitated harsh military measures like lockstep marching and whipping which mortified Eddy, since they were so contrary to his gentle Quakerism.

It is possible to argue that the Auburn system's regimentation, its emphasis on strict obedience, and its chaplains' wish that prisoners memorize long passages from the Bible, reflected the militant character of the Puritan struggle against sin more than the Quaker struggle to awaken the Inward Light. However, the essence of Auburn's disciplinary routine—solitary confinement at night and silence during the day—unquestionably derived from a Quaker vision of the process of spiritual regeneration. The partial institutionalization of that vision owed a great deal to Eddy's view of prisoners as sentient beings, his openness to experimentation, and his willingness to work with non-Quakers.

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Roberts Vaux (1786–1836)

Roberts Vaux, one of antebellum Philadelphia's most influential social reformers, was raised by a devout, nervous, and melancholy mother, and educated at the Friends Select Academy.[32] As an apprentice in the dry goods business of John Cook and Caleb Cresson, and then as the proprietor of his own counting house, Vaux was active in many philanthropic organizations, including the PSAMPP. Following his sister's death from tuberculosis in April, 1812, he experienced a spiritual rebirth, and resolved to give up his business career. Already a wealthy man at twenty-six, he saw no point in accumulating further riches, and set out to renew Penn's Holy Experiment by working to ameliorate human suffering.[33]

Vaux's marriage in June, 1814, to prison inspector Thomas Wistar's daughter, Margaret, made it likely that prison reform would be one of his main philanthropic interests.[34] But the issue of capital punishment had already figured prominently in his moral education. In 1803, he first made known his objections to it, and, in 1812, he produced a pamphlet systematizing his argument. Like Eddy, Vaux deemed capital punishment an inappropriate penalty for a young republic. "Systems of terror will better deport with a despotic monarchy exercised over ignorant vassals, than with a republican government of enlightened freemen." He acknowledged that the practice of capital punishment was consistent with the legal norms of the Old Testament, but contended that many of those norms, like the rule that Sabbath-breaking was punishable by death, were patently archaic. None of "the penal laws given to the Israelites," he stated, "are binding on us." "God hath not prescribed any universal rule for the construction of our civil codes any more than for the construction of our houses." In Vaux's opinion, not only were public executions and whippings unrepublican and unchristian, they were also completely lacking in social utility. "The promiscuous assemblage of a great number of spectators to gratify an idle curiosity causes a needless waste of time; and sometimes great disorders and crimes are committed within sight of the gallows."[35]

Vaux followed the Italian rationalist, Cesare Beccaria, in ridiculing the notion that capital punishment deters crime. "The threatening of death would be wholly disregarded by a person in a paroxysm of rage, fortitude, or despair," he asserted. "All our bloody statutes will not restrain the duellist, the assassin, or the desperado, who, in order to obtain the object of his pursuit, will risk his own life, and brave all dangers." Moreover, there was always the possibility of wrongful conviction. Because civil magistrates were fallible, their powers should never be absolute or unlimited. "They have no right to take from a private citizen any thing, which, if the taking should afterwards prove to be wrongful, they could not restore

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

identically." Wrongful convictions were most likely to occur in despotic regimes. It would be a great tragedy, Vaux contended, if the new republic were ever to become the kind of society in which "the cry of heresy, or treason; or only the name of the subjected party in politics," would "prove sufficient to subject thousands of innocent persons to capital punishment."[36]

In the republican, Christian United States, punishment should be consistent with the New Testament—"the christian's constitution." The key element in any humane system of punishment was solitary confinement. Vaux felt that a long period of solitary confinement would deter murder more effectively than the death penalty. Moreover, solitary confinement might even transform the murderer into a useful citizen. A murderer "sorely afflicted with keen remorse for his crime" should be allowed "to make all the reparation in his power to the injured family of the deceased." Surely "there is no human being so bad as to be incapable of doing some good."[37]

Vaux's experimental cast of mind led him to wonder whether a penitentiary system based on solitary confinement would make possible the total abolition of capital punishment.[38] In his report on the work of the PSAMPP, however, he conceded that the public was not yet ready to accept the complete elimination of the gallows. But "if this awful penalty must be retained," he wrote, "it is worthy of serious inquiry, whether it ought not, in every instance, to be visited upon the unhappy culprit within the jail yard." A private execution could "be performed with becoming solemnity, and the public only know that the victim was launched into eternity, by the tolling of the bell of the penitentiary at the moment of sacrifice."[39]

Vaux stressed that a great deal of money would have to be spent to build the kind of penitentiary that would lead the criminal to mend his ways. In 1807, the year he joined the PSAMPP, he emphasized that solitary penitentiary discipline had nowhere been fully implemented. It was certainly not in evidence at the Walnut Street Jail, which was financially strapped and poorly managed by men who failed to provide needy prisoners with warm blankets and bibles.[40] Conditions at the Walnut Street Jail worsened following the War of 1812. Overcrowding and idleness brought about by the collapse of prison industry led to a series of riots between 1817 and 1821.[41] As corresponding secretary of the PSAMPP, Vaux drew attention to the problems in the jail and lobbied for the establishment of penitentiaries constructed to facilitate solitary confinement. In 1818, he wrote the memorial to the General Assembly requesting that a penitentiary be constructed at Pittsburgh, and, in 1821, he wrote the memorial requesting that a penitentiary be built at Philadelphia. As one of the building commissioners of the Eastern State Penitentiary, Vaux secured the site, selected the architect, and presided at the laying of the cornerstone in May, 1823.[42]

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Vaux spent the next thirteen years, until his death in 1836, defending the principle of solitary confinement and thinking about its implementation. "Merely shutting up the prisoner by himself," he wrote, was not enough. "His mind ought thenceforth to be treated with as conscientious a regard to the removal of its disease as if he were affected with a physical malady, requiring for its extirpation the utmost medical skill."[43] Had Vaux not publicized the benefits of solitary discipline and lobbied the legislature, the state of Pennsylvania might well have adopted the Auburn plan. Indeed, a number of Pennsylvanians, like the Irish-Catholic publisher Mathew Carey, dismissed Vaux's penological proposals as fanciful and costly.[44]

However, Vaux was actually a pragmatic reformer. Although initially opposed to the idea that labor should be an element in penitentiary discipline, he supported a recommendation to establish handicrafts labor in the cells of the Eastern State Penitentiary. He was willing to compromise on this issue because he believed his flexibility would please members of the General Assembly, and they would repay him by continuing to stand behind the principle of day-and-night solitary confinement.[45] Vaux also maintained that lengthy periods of complete isolation would be too difficult for youthful offenders to bear, and recommended a regime based on solitary confinement only at night at the house of refuge for juvenile offenders.[46]

During the 1830s, Vaux wondered whether social reform might be achieved more effectively by government than by private voluntary associations. Curiosity on this point, coupled with his idealistic hope that good men could be elected to government, motivated his entry into politics. His alignment with Jackson, whom he regarded as a great warrior against evil, led to conflict with Nicolas Biddle, John Sergeant, and Philadelphia's Whig mercantile elite.[47] It was of course highly ironic that the idealistic Vaux became a Jacksonian, since, as Marvin Meyers once pointed out, Jacksonian Democracy was a reaction against "rootless projects of innovation and reform."[48] Moreover, Democratic parties in the early republic, Charles Sellers has reminded us, typically championed low taxes, frugal administration, and a limited role for government in social policy. Indeed, Democratic prison reformers were, Daniel Walker Howe has noted, "usually concerned with economy, efficiency, and deterrence."[49]

Vaux's approach to the amelioration of human suffering fused evangelical and scientific principles.[50] His religio-medical idealism was apparent in his unwavering belief in the redemptive potential of solitary confinement. In later life, his experimental idealism found expression in the hope that government, because of its legal and fiscal powers, could be an instrument of social regeneration. Needless to say, Vaux's conduct during a very brief political career was guided by the evangelical ethic of disinterested benevolence.

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

John Griscom (1774–1852)

The peculiar ability of Quakers of the post-revolutionary generation to lead lives of extreme piety and still exercise a keen passion for science is perhaps best illustrated by the career of John Griscom. Griscom was one of many Quaker educators and philanthropists who shared a passion for the study of chemistry. His interest in chemistry began around 1800 when he took charge of the Friends' Academy in Burlington, N.J.. He would recall that during these years he "had heard much of chemistry, and felt very desirous to learn something of the nature of a science which unlocked some of the most remarkable secrets of nature." However, the first book he obtained, Dr. Henry's *Epitome of Chemistry*, was so difficult that he concluded that "chemistry was out of my reach." Fortunately, Caleb Lownes, who boarded his two sons at the Friends' Academy, made him try again. Griscom recounted the following:

> We had much interesting conversation.
> "Why had I not studied chemistry?"
> My reply was, "I have tried and can make nothing of it, although I very much desire to become acquainted with it."
> "Strange!—it is the easiest study in the world,—the most delightful."
> "Well, how must I go to work?"
> "Just read,—it is plain as daylight."
> "But I have read, and did not find it so."
> "Never mind, I'll lend thee a book—read that, and then report to me."
> He brought me up, at his next visit, Lavoisier's *Chemistry*, a large 8 vo., with numerous plates, translated by Kerr. I read with the utmost delight, understood everything clearly, and found it the most interesting pursuit I had ever engaged in."

Griscom subsequently delved into the subject in some earnest, obtaining the necessary apparatus for conducting experiments from William Allen in London, then converting the front room of his house into a laboratory. In 1807, he moved to New York City and took up a position as a schoolmaster and chemistry teacher. In 1813, he began lecturing at Columbia. Significantly, Griscom never became an accomplished theoretical chemist, but, rather, devised practical uses for chemical knowledge, informing the public about the medical properties of cod liver oil and the value of iodine in the treatment of goitre.[51]

Griscom believed that the citizens of a republic, especially its young people, should have a rigorous scientific education.[52] He also thought that a scientific attitude should be brought to bear on urban social problems. With Eddy and the Episcopalian philanthropist, John Pintard, he came up with the idea of establishing a society to examine the causes of pauperism. He

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

authored the first report of the New York Society for the Prevention of Pauperism. In that report, he suggested that juvenile crime was caused largely by the fact that young people were incarcerated with adult criminals.[53]

In April, 1818, a few weeks after the report was issued, Griscom left for Europe. He spent over a year studying its literary, scientific, legal and political institutions as well as its manufactories, hospitals, insane asylums, poorhouses, bridewells, orphanages, schools, and prisons.[54] He took a special interest in "institutions devoted to the care and moral training of young people." Back in New York, he lamented that "children from ten to eighteen years of age, who, from neglect of parents, from idleness and misfortune, have never had a sense of morality" were incarcerated with "convicts whose hearts are seared to remorse and penitence."[55] He pressed for a separate institution for the young, and was rewarded on December 19, 1823, when prominent citizens in the city formed the Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents, with a mandate to establish such an institution.

The New York House of Refuge opened on January 1, 1825. Griscom served as an inspector and regular Monday-afternoon visitor until 1832. Besides convicted juveniles, the institution housed impoverished youth who otherwise might have turned to begging and stealing. The prisoners slept in separate cells at night, and worked together at useful labor during the day, as well as being taught reading, writing, arithmetic, and religion.

In 1850, Griscom, now retired to Burlington and partially blind, memorialized the legislature on behalf of a proposal to establish a house of refuge for juveniles in New Jersey.[56] His life-long belief in the need to provide young offenders with humane custodial care derived from his identification with the suffering of abandoned youth, and his willingness to think rationally about the best way to prevent crime. His experimental cast of mind ensured that his intense evangelical piety would leave its mark on the world of juvenile correction.

Stephen Grellet (1773–1855)

The evangelical dimension of the Quaker commitment to prison reform is most evident in the life of Etienne de Grellet du Mabillier. Grellet's father was a French aristocrat, an intimate of Louis XVI, a former comptroller of the mint, and the proprietor of an iron works and porcelain manufactory in Limoges. When his father's estates were confiscated and his parents almost guillotined during the French Revolution, the young Etienne joined the Royalist forces in Germany. He was captured entering France and sentenced to death, but he escaped to Amsterdam, then sailed to Demerara in Dutch Guiana, with his brother, Joseph. There they engaged in mercantile pursuits

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

until 1795, when a false report that the French fleet was approaching the coast caused them to flee to New York.[57]

In 1795, Etienne, or Stephen, as he now called himself, made his home in Newtown, Long Island, and set out to learn English. The first book he read in English, William Penn's *No Cross, No Crown*, had a powerful effect on him. As he wrote in his memoirs:

> The title alone reached to my heart. I proceeded to read it with the help of my dictionary, having to look for the meaning of every word. I read it twice in this manner. I had never met with anything of the kind; neither had I felt the Divine witness in me operating so powerfully before.[58]

While working through *No Cross, No Crown*, Grellet had the occasion to attend a local meeting at which the English Quakers, Deborah Darby and Rebecca Young, were present. They were, as he put it, the instruments through whom "the Gospel's refreshing streams first reached my heart."[59]

In December, 1795, Grellet moved to Philadelphia where he experienced a painful spiritual rebirth. He recalled that "the Lord's presence was so continually upon me that not only my words but my thoughts also were narrowly watched." And he confessed that "I suffered deeply not only for the evil I had done, but also for the good I had omitted to do." After months of prayer, fasting, and troubled self-examination, Grellet applied for membership in the Society of Friends and was received by the North Philadelphia Meeting, whose members included Samuel Emlen, William Savery, Thomas Scattergood, Henry Drinker, and Rebecca Jones.[60]

In March, 1798, Grellet was recorded as a minister in the Society of Friends. That same year, he almost died ministering to yellow fever victims. In 1799, he returned to New York and divided his time between his business (that of a commission merchant) and lengthy missionary journeys. Grellet would later point out that the sole purpose of his involvement in business was to "have the means to defray all needful expenses, should my dear Lord and Master see meet to call me out again in the service of his glorious Gospel."[61]

Grellet's interest in prison reform arose as a result of his missionary travels. From the early 1770s to the early 1830s, it was *de rigueur* for spiritually driven American Quakers to attempt to spark spiritual awakenings among communities of Friends in Britain. Grellet made four trips to Europe. In January, 1813, during his second European trip, he visited London's Newgate Prison and was dismayed by "the effrontery, boldness, and wantonness of expression" on the faces of the female prisoners and the discovery that "several children born in the prison" had no clothes to protect them from the cold. His account of what he had seen so moved his friend,

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Elizabeth Fry, that "on the very next day, she repaired to the prison with a bundle of made-up garments for the naked children. What she then saw of the wretchedness of that prison induced her to devise some plan towards the amelioration of the condition of those poor women."[62]

On his third trip, between 1818 and 1820, and his fourth, between 1831 and 1834, Grellet was joined by the English Quaker, William Allen, founder of London's Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline. Allen was still in a state of emotional travail because of his second wife's death when, on July 22, 1818, Grellet visited him in Plough Court, London, and proposed that Allen join "in the Lord's work among the nations." Four days later, Grellet, Allen, Allen's mother and daughter, and Rebecca Christy "had a season of most solemn silence." Their worship "was broken by dear William, prostrated on his knees, offering up himself to the Lord, to go with me wherever the blessed Master may be pleased to send us, and to drink whatever cup he may prepare for us in the course of that service, be it even unto death."[63]

In Norway, Sweden, Finland, Russia, the Crimea, Greece, Switzerland, Austria, Hungary, Prague, Naples, Rome, Madrid, Valencia, and many towns in France, Holland, and the Germanic states, Grellet and Allen visited poorhouses, hospitals, orphanages, asylums, houses of correction, and prisons. They lobbied emperors, kings, princes and princesses, dukes, counts, popes, cardinals, diplomats, and government ministers to alleviate the suffering of the inhabitants of these places. Grellet never forgot the message of Penn's *No Cross, No Crown*—that it was a Quaker's duty to "relieve the necessitous, see the sick, visit the imprisoned, and administer to their infirmities and indispositions."[64]

Prison visiting was a spiritually distressing calling. Grellet wept bitterly after seeing Russian convicts in chains awaiting the trek to Siberia, and after seeing six thousand men and boys in irons in the shoe-deep mud of the Prison of the Gallerians in Naples.[65] His hope was always that "the light of the glorious Gospel may so break in upon them, and the power of Truth so come over them, that though their bodies should remain many more years in captivity, their souls may be liberated from the bondage of sin and corruption."[66] His hope was, in brief, that prisons could be turned into penitentiaries.

Elisha Bates (1781–1861)

Elisha Bates' life was marked by evangelical zeal and an experimental attitude toward social improvement. In 1802, after studying medicine and working as a land surveyor in tidewater Virginia, Bates passed through a time of spiritual despair. Although he felt the call to become a minister, he

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

instead took charge of the Quaker school in York County and educated himself by reading on his own. Following a visit, in 1816, from the Quaker abolitionist, Charles Osborn, Bates wrote a pamphlet on slavery, *Moral and Political Observations, Addressed to the Enlightened Citizens of Virginia*, and talked of forming an antislavery society in Virginia.[67]

In the spring of 1817, however, he moved to Mount Pleasant in southeastern Ohio. At that time, hundreds of Quaker families were passing through the town on their way westward. Here Bates established himself as a printer and publisher, while regularly serving as clerk of the yearly meeting. In December, 1818, he purchased Osborn's *The Philanthropist*. Although the journal's focus was antislavery, Bates decided to address other topics as well, notably Indian land claims, banking, canals and roads in Ohio, and recent achievements in the world of science.[68]

In 1820, Bates experienced another spiritual crisis which he overcame by resolving to spread the message of the gospel as a recorded minister. He also announced that he would publish a new journal, *The Moral Advocate, A Monthly Publication on War, Duelling, Capital Punishments, and Prison Discipline*.[39] Broader in scope, *The Moral Advocate* included excerpts from pamphlets, books, and government documents, poems on hunting and cock fighting, as well as more extensive editorial comment from Bates himself. A great deal of the New York Society for the Prevention of Pauperism's *Report on the Penitentiary System in the United States* was published in Volume 2. Bits of Griscom's *Year in Europe* appeared in Volume 3.[70]

The Moral Advocate was published at a time when many people in the northern states were questioning the theory and practice of penitentiary confinement. Bates, however, never wavered in his support for solitary confinement. Reporting on a recent visit to the state penitentiary at Columbus, he stated that:

> solitude is the proper condition in which to place criminals, whether we regard it as punishment, to operate as a terror and prevent crimes, or as placing those who have violated the laws of morality and of their country, in the most favorable situation for that kind of retrospection which leads to penitence and reformation.[71]

Bates stressed that he did not mean, by solitary confinement, "what are called the dark cells." The solitary cells or apartments, he wrote, "should be *small*, with a sufficient supply of *light* and *air*, but *without admitting a view beyond the precincts of the prison.*"[72] Quaker penologists had already devoted a great deal of thought to the issue of how to create a solitary environment that would bring about reformation. Bates entered this debate, suggesting, for example, that "blinds constructed with a double set of slats"

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

would block the convict's view from the window of a penitentiary cell "but admit a free circulation of air, & as much light as necessary."[73]

In Ohio, the commercial panic of 1819 was followed by five years of depression which devastated the livelihood of many people and made it difficult for the government to justify spending money on the penitentiary.[74] Fiscally conservative legislators argued that the penitentiary should be entirely self-supporting, and that every effort should be made to turn it into a profitable manufactory. Bates ridiculed these proposals, telling his readers that "our government was instituted, not as a money saving machine, but to secure the great objects of civil liberty and social happiness."[75]

The desire to save money was behind a bill introduced into the legislature recommending that minor offenders be whipped, up to 50 lashes, in the county seat rather than sent to the penitentiary at Columbus. Bates lobbied against the bill, reiterating the Quaker critique of physical punishment. Public whippings, he noted, "always excite a kind of vulgar curiosity, and thus collect a crowd to the spot. The criminal becomes thus hardened to public scorn, and exerts his feelings to show the most consummate fortitude and contempt of shame. The spectators look on. They admire his resolution."[76]

The ideological thrust of *The Moral Advocate* can be defined as evangelical Christian republicanism. In the journal's pages, Bates repeatedly noted that the teachings of the gospel would inspire Christians of all denominations to cooperate in alleviating misery.[77] In later life, Bates embraced the ultra-evangelical position that all denominations belonged together in a universal church of Christ.[78] As he devoted increasing energy to scriptural issues, he paid less attention to dynamics of prison reform. However, it was Bates' active sympathy with the suffering of others, and his belief that Christians must work together in saving souls, that led him to promote the cause of prison reform in the first place.

Isaac T. Hopper (1771–1852)

Though better known for his work in helping runaway slaves, Isaac Hopper also befriended and tried to redeem prisoners. He was above all a hands-on philanthropist who served humanity in the streets, courts, and prison cells. Whereas Thomas Eddy and Roberts Vaux organized humanitarian reform from behind a desk, Isaac Hopper invited suffering souls into his home. Runaway slaves, wayward youth, first-time offenders, and persons falsely accused of crime invariably found their way to his door. It was his genius to provide them with secret hiding places, safe passage to Canada, offers of employment, letters of reference, a pardon, or merely a good word spoken to a judge.

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Hopper was born in a henhouse which his parents had fixed up as their first home on a plot of woodland near Woodbury, West New Jersey. Because his labor was needed on the farm, young Isaac attended school for only the three winter months. His natural curiosity led him to study the behavior of animals, and his fondness for them caused him to speak out against hunting for sport and related practices that caused unnecessary suffering.[79]

At the age of sixteen, Isaac apprenticed as a tailor with his maternal uncle, Joseph Tatem, a Philadelphia Presbyterian, who had "considered it a useful moral lesson to take all his apprentices to witness public executions." After seeing five men hanged simultaneously, the young apprentice became a fervent critic of capital punishment. Soon after arriving in the city, Hopper helped a fugitive slave avoid being returned to Bermuda. Within a few years, he was "known to everybody in Philadelphia as the friend and legal adviser of colored people upon all emergencies."[80] Besides helping runaway slaves, Hopper took an interest in the problems of prisoners. As a Walnut Street Jail inspector, he was required to visit the prison regularly. According to Lydia Maria Child, he was typically gentle and fatherly in his conversations with prisoners, "inquiring into their history and plans, sympathizing with their troubles and temptations, encouraging them to reform, and promising to assist them if they would try to help themselves."[81]

Although he wrote an influential newspaper article objecting to the mixing of young first-time offenders with hardened convicts, Hopper was not a theoretical penologist. His personality was his greatest resource in his prison work, for he was "a shrewd observer of the countenances and manners of men." His originality as a reformer stemmed from his realization that it was crucial to find employment for released prisoners. It angered him that employers dismissed men upon learning they had once been in prison. If a "man has severely atoned for the crime he did commit," Hopper wrote, "his past history ought never to be mentioned against him."[82]

Because of the time he devoted to helping prisoners and runaway slaves, Hopper's tailoring business was not successful. His business sharply deteriorated in 1827 when he sided with the Hicksites, since his wealthiest customers, most of whom were Orthodox, ceased to patronize him.[83] Of course, Hopper did not need a great deal of money; his frugality and dislike of luxurious living were legendary. Nevertheless, financial distress led him, in 1829, to move to New York and open a Hicksite bookstore there.[84]

Hopper's desire to abide by the essential truths of seventeenth-century Quakerism drew him into the Hicksite camp. But he was far from a typical Hicksite. Indeed, his evangelical activism soon got him into trouble with his Hicksite brethren, who feared that his association with Garrison and the interdenominational *National Anti-Slavery Standard* would undermine the

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

unique vision of Quakerism.[85] In 1842, Hopper's local meeting falsely accused him of being the author of an article critical of the anti-abolitionist Quaker minister, George White, and disowned him. The New York Yearly Meeting sanctioned his disownment.[86]

In 1845, at seventy-four, Hopper was appointed agent of the New York Prison Society in recognition of his "peculiar tact in managing wayward characters."[87] As agent, he addressed the problems faced by prisoners while in prison and after their release. A frequent visitor to Sing Sing, he often spoke in the chapel. He criticized wardens who whipped, objected to the cruel treatment of insane prisoners, and complained that black prisoners were treated more harshly than whites.[88] He called for shorter sentences, better educational instruction, and industrial training. He helped released prisoners by paying for their board in respectable rooming houses, getting them free passage home in coaches and steamboats, securing employment for them, and even purchasing tools for those eager to go into business on their own. Like a modern case worker, Hopper kept detailed records on men who reformed as well as men who failed to overcome the lure of crime. He estimated that three-quarters of those whom he tried to help turned out well.[89]

Lydia Maria Child noted that Hopper often witnessed "relapse after relapse into vice, under circumstances which seemed like the most heartless ingratitude to him, but he joyfully hailed the first symptom of repentance, and was always ready to grant a new probation."[90] Hopper's idealism was nourished by his evangelical belief in the possibility of human redemption, and by his Quaker faith that the Inward Light, once awakened, would guide the prisoner into a life of righteousness.

Conclusion

Thomas Eddy, Roberts Vaux, John Griscom, Stephen Grellet, Elisha Bates, and Isaac Hopper deemed the alleviation of misery to be more important than the accumulation of wealth, and felt personally responsible for the suffering of those men and women who languished behind bars. As evangelical Quakers, these men viewed suffering as a sign of humanity's fall, not a mark of individual shame. Suffering brought people together as members of a community, obliterating vain human distinctions between the resourceful and the needy, the healthy and the sick, or the worthy and the shameful. In light of Christ's redeeming work on the cross, moreover, these men saw no reason why they should not work closely with Christians of other denominations in healing the wounds of humanity.

While evangelicalism fueled prison reform, Quakerism shaped it. Quaker soteriology, in positing the potential within each of God's children to

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

experience the Inward Light, was implicit in the theory of convict redemption through solitary confinement. Moreover, the creation of a reformatory or redemptive penitentiary system owed a great deal to the willingness of Quakers to think experimentally. Although insanity could and did result from the operationalization of the Quaker belief in the virtue of silence, this outcome was simply not foreseen. It was certainly never intended, for the experimental imaginations of Eddy, Vaux, Griscom, Grellet, Bates, and Hopper never floated free of their evangelical faith. While they conceived the cellular penitentiary as a laboratory of virtue, they had such enduring faith in the power of the Inward Light that they never relinquished the hope that the penitentiary would bring the wayward soul back into the common fold of humanity.

Notes

[1] Adam J. Hirsch, *The Rise of the Penitentiary: Prisons and Punishment in Early America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), xii.

[2] David J. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1971), 84.

[3] Michael Meranze, *Laboratories of Virtue: Punishment, Revolution, and Authority in Philadelphia, 1760–1835* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

[4] Negley K. Teeters, *They Were in Prison* (Chicago: John C. Winston Co., 1937); *The Cradle of the Penitentiary: The Walnut Street Jail at Philadelphia, 1773–1835* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Prison Society, 1955); Negley K. Teeters and John D. Shearer, *The Prison at Philadelphia, Cherry Hill* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957); Harry E. Barnes, *The Evolution of Penology in Pennsylvania* (1927. Reprint. Montclair, N.J.: Patterson Smith, 1968); *A History of the Penal, Reformatory, and Correctional Institutions of the State of New Jersey* (1918. Reprint. New York: Arno Press, 1974); Orlando F. Lewis, *The Development of American Prisons and Prison Customs, 1776–1845* (1922. Reprint. Montclair, N.J.: Patterson Smith, 1967); Blake McKelvey, *American Prisons: A History of Good Intentions* (1936. Reprint. Montclair, N.J.: Patterson Smith, 1977). Norman Johnston (with Kenneth Finkel and Jeffrey A. Cohen), *Eastern State Penitentiary: Crucible of Good Intentions* (Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1994).

[5] For a definition of evangelicalism, see Mark A. Noll, David W. Bebbington, and George A. Rawlyk, eds., *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700–1990* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 6. On the tension between the evangelical emphasis on the primacy of scripture and the Quaker emphasis on the primacy of the Inward Light, see H. Larry Ingle, *Quakers in Conflict: The Hicksite Reformation* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1986).

[6] Sydney V. James, *A People Among Peoples: Quaker Benevolence in Eigh-*

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

teenth-Century America (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963); Jack D. Marietta, *The Reformation of American Quakerism, 1748–1783* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984).

[7] Arthur J. Mekeel, T*he Quakers and the American Revolution* (York, Eng: Sessions Book Trust, 1996), 343-61. David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770–1823* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975), 213-54. Jean R. Soderlund, *Quakers & Slavery: A Divided Spirit* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985); Gary B. Nash and Jean R. Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees: Emancipation in Pennsylvania and its Aftermath* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

[8] Francis R. Taylor, *Life of William Savery of Philadelphia, 1750–1804* (New York: Macmillan, 1925), 32.

[9] Richard Bauman, *For the Reputation of Truth: Politics, Religion, and Conflict among the Pennsylvania Quakers, 1750–1800* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971), 237.

[10] Rufus M. Jones, "Nicolas Waln, 1742–1813," *DAB* 10:386.

[11] On the crumbling of doctrinal commitments in the face of evangelical activism, see Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

[12] Hicksite Quakers feared that involvement with non-Quaker evangelicals would corrode the purity of Quaker spirituality. They were outnumbered by Orthodox Quakers ten to one in Philadelphia's prison society. Bruce Dorsey, "Friends Becoming Enemies: Philadelphia Benevolence and the Neglected Era of American Quaker History,"*Journal of the Early Republic* 18 (Fall 1998), 395-428, especially 416. There were many exclusively Quaker charities. See Margaret M. Haviland, "Beyond Women's Sphere: Young Quaker Women and the Veil of Charity in Philadelphia, 1790–1810," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 51 (July 1994), 435-6. Friends Asylum, for example, was built to serve Quaker patients. Charles L. Cherry, *A Quiet Haven: Quakers, Moral Treatment, and Asylum Reform* (Rutherford, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1989), 138, 157-8.

[13] In the first half of the eighteenth century, the Quaker Party had derived support from all of Pennsylvania's religious groups. Alan Tully, "Quaker Party and Proprietary Policies: The Dynamics of Politics in Pre-Revolutionary Pennsylvania, 1730–1775," 75-105 in Bruce C. Daniels, ed., *Power and Status: Officeholding in Colonial America* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1986), 82.

[14] Lois Banner aptly described the benevolent societies that sprang up in the early republic as workshops in republicanism. See "Religious Benevolence as Social Control: A Critique of an Interpretation," *Journal of American History* 60 (June 1976), 40.

[15] James, *A People Among Peoples*, 282. Involvement in interdenominational organizations decreased the risk of persecution directed specifically at the Society of Friends. Quakers were pleased whenever an illustrious Anglican or Presbyterian agreed to serve as the president of a benevolent association. William White, chaplain to the Continental Congress, rector of Christ Church, and Episcopal bishop of the diocese of Pennsylvania, served as president of the PSAMPP from 1787 until shortly before his death in 1836. Teeters, *They Were in Prison*, 5-7. In England,

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Elizabeth Fry made the cause of prison reform respectable by persuading "great personages of the nation," such as the Duke and Duchess of Gloucester, the Duchess of Wellington, and Mrs Peel, to support the work of the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline. Robert Alan Cooper, "The English Quakers and Prison Reform, 1809–1823," *Quaker History* 68 (Spring 1979), 9, 16.

[16] Frederick B. Tolles, *Quakers and the Atlantic Culture* (New York: Macmillan, 1960), 65.

[17] R. Hingston Fox, *Dr. John Fothergill and His Friends* (London: Macmillan, 1919), 387.

[18] Milton Rubincam, "The Wistar-Wister Family: A Pennsylvania Family's Contributions Toward American Cultural Development," *Pennsylvania History* 20 (April 1953), especially 147-50, 204-5; George. B. Wood, *A Memoir of the Life and Character of Joseph Parrish, M.D.* (Philadelphia: Lydia R. Bailey, 1840), 15, 21. The synergy between intense religiosity and experimentalism was evident in the career of Dr. Samuel Powel Griffitts (1759–1826), a charter member of the PSAMPP and an advocate of solitary confinement. Griffitts decided to study medicine because it "applied most immediately to the relief of human suffering." His attention was, a biographer noted, "always directed to subjects of practical utility." G. Emerson, "Samuel Powel Griffitts," in J. Thacher, *American Medical Biography,* 1828.

[19] Caleb Lownes, *An Account of the Alteration and Present State of the Penal Laws of Pennsylvania, Containing Also an Account of the Gaol and Penitentiary House of Philadelphia and the Interior Management Thereof* (Boston: Young & Minns, 1799), 3.

[20] Lownes served as the chief inspector of the Walnut Street Jail from 1790 until he resigned in November 1799. The minutes of the jail's board of inspectors over the next few years indicate that he owed money to the prison, prompting one scholar to speculate that Lownes may have borrowed money to establish a manufactory, but then failed to dispose of the prison-made goods. Leroy B. Dupuy, "The Walnut Street Prison: Pennsylvania's First Penitentiary," *Pennsylvania History* 18 (April 1951), 143.

[21] Taylor, *Life of William Savery,* 22.

[22] Knapp, *Life of Thomas Eddy*, 54.

[23] Eddy's friend and an influential prison reformer in his own right, John Murray, Jr. (1758-1819), also turned away from commercial pursuits. Eddy recollected that from the moment Murray's mind fell "under the power of the mild and humanizing principles of the Gospel, he became zealously engaged to promote every measure that would conduce to ameliorate the condition of mankind, without distinction of sect or colour." "How rare it is," he added, "to meet with a person, in the course of a prosperous business, to stop short, and say—I have enough—hereafter I will consider, what Providence has put in my hands, as a trust for the good of my fellow-creatures!" "Memoir of John Murray, Jun," in *Life of Thomas Eddy*, 376. See also Charles Monaghan, *The Murrays of Murray Hill.* (Brooklyn: Urban History Press, 1998), 104-20.

[24] Thomas Eddy, *An Account of the State Prison or Penitentiary House in the City of New York* (New York: Isaac Collins and Son, 1801), 9.

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

[25] Eddy, *Account of the State Prison*, 23.

[26] Knapp, *Life of Thomas Eddy*, 41.

[27] Eddy, *Account of the State Prison*, 38.

[28] Letter to Patrick Colquhoun, June 5, 1802, in *Life of Thomas Eddy*, 180.

[29] Letter to P. A. Jay, Feb 14, 1816, in *Life of Thomas Eddy*, 244.

[30] Eddy, *Life of Thomas Eddy*, 69.

[31] Letter to William Roscoe, in *Life of Thomas Eddy*, 310.

[32] Roderick N. Ryon, *Roberts Vaux: A Biography of a Reformer* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1966), 1-59.

[33] Ryon, *Roberts Vaux,* 31, 51, 60-112; Teeters, *They Were in Prison*, 152-60; Joseph J. McCadden, *Education in Pennsylvania, 1801–1835, and its Debt to Roberts Vaux* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1937); "Roberts Vaux, 1786–1836," *Bulletin of the Friends' Historical Association*, 25 (Spring 1936), 21-32.

[34] Thomas Wistar (1764–1851), a central figure in the management of the Walnut Street Jail, became perhaps the most experienced penologist in Pennsylvania. His father, Richard Wistar (1727–1781), a wealthy glass manufacturer who lived near the old jail at Third and High Streets, had, in 1776, founded the Philadelphia Society for Assisting Distressed Debtors, precursor of the PSAMPP. Teeters, *They Were In Prison*, 117-19. Evidence of Thomas Wistar's asceticism can be found in the biography of his son, also named Thomas. See "Thomas Wistar, 1798–1876," Society of Friends, Quaker biographies, 2nd ser. 5v. 1917.

[35] Philanthropos (Roberts Vaux), *An Appendix to the Essays on Capital Punishments* (Philadelphia: S. Merritt, 1812), 9, 15-16, 30.

[36] *Ibid.,* 26, 28.

[37] *Ibid.*, 26, 29.

[38] Ryon, *Roberts Vaux*, 126.

[39] Roberts Vaux, *Notices of the Original, and Successive Efforts to Improve the Discipline of the Prison at Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: Kimber and Sharpless, 1826), 63.

[40] Teeters, *Cradle of the Penitentiary,* 89-96. Ryon, *Roberts Vaux*, 42.

[41] Teeters, *Cradle of the Penitentiary,* 100-3.

[42] Ryon, *Roberts Vaux*, 121-4.

[43] Vaux, *Notices,* 58.

[44] Ryon, *Roberts Vaux*, 133. See the arguments against the separate system in Mathew Carey, *Thoughts on Penitentiaries and Prison Discipline* (Philadelphia: Clark and Raser, 1831).

[45] Ryon, *Roberts Vaux*, 133, 188. On Vaux's acceptance of labor, see Richard Vaux, *Brief Sketch of the Origin and History of the State Penitentiary for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: McLaughlin, 1872), 87.

[46] Negley K. Teeters, "The Early Days of the Philadelphia House of Refuge," *Pennsylvania History* 27 (April 1960), 165-87.

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

[47] Ryon, *Roberts Vaux,* 184-207.

[48] Marvin Meyers, "The Jacksonian Persuasion," *American Quarterly* 5 (Spring 1953), 6.

[49] Charles Sellers, *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815–1846* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Daniel Walker Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 37. On the commitment of New York's Democrats to frugality, harsh discipline, and profitable prison industries, see W. David Lewis, *From Newgate to Dannemora: The Rise of the Penitentiary in New York, 1796–1848* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965), especially 192-3.

[50] Vaux actually published a paper in natural science—an account of the fall of a meteor. Vaux and Thomas McEuen, "Notice on the Fall of a Meteoric Stone, at Deal, in New Jersey," *Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* Vol. 6. 1830, 11, 181-2.

[51] John Hoskins Griscom, *Memoir of John Griscom, L.L.D.* (New York: Robert Carter, 1859), 48-50.

[52] A good teacher, he wrote, ought to "regard errors of childhood as diseases of the mind, as incidental to human nature, as a constitutional head-ache or a defect of vision." "School Discipline," *Proceedings of the American Lyceum* (Nos. 5 & 6, November and December, 1833), 38.

[53] *Memoir of John Griscom,* 157-64.

[54] John Griscom, *A Year in Europe, comprising A Journal of Observations in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Switzerland, the North of Italy, and Holland in 1818 and 1819* (New York: Collins and Hanway, 1824). Thomas Jefferson praised Griscom's two volumes, saying they had given him "the most satisfactory view of the literary and public institutions of England, and France, and Switzerland, that he ever read." *Memoir of John Griscom*, 152.

[55] *Memoir of John Griscom*, 164, 167.

[56] *Ibid.,* 184-195.

[57] Stephen Grellet, *Memoirs of the Life and Gospel Labours of Stephen Grellet* (Benjamin Seebohm, ed., Philadelphia: Henry Longstreth, 1864), 14-17. See also William Wistar Comfort, *Stephen Grellet, 1773–1855* (New York: Macmillan, 1942); William Guest, *Stephen Grellet* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1880); Harris Elwood Starr, "Stephen Grellet, 1773–1855," *DAB* 4: 606-7.

[58] Grellet, *Memoirs,* Vol. 1, 20.

[59] *Ibid.*, 32.

[60] *Ibid.,* 31, 34-5, 60.

[61] *Ibid.,* 329. In 1804, Grellet married Rebecca Collins, eldest daughter of Isaac Collins, the publisher of Eddy's *An Account of the State Prison.*

[62] *Ibid.*, 223-24.

[63] *Ibid.,* 356-7.

[64] William Penn, *Select Works,* Vol. 2 (London, 1782), 180.

[65] Grellet, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, 55-7. On Allen's emotional reaction to prison visiting, see James Sherman, *Memoir of William Allen* (Philadelphia: Henry

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Longstreth, 1851), *passim*.

[66] Grellet, *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, 211.

[67] Donald G. Good, "Elisha Bates and Social Reform," *Quaker History* 58 (Spring 1969), especially 83-4.

[68] He also published a children's dictionary, a speller, and was briefly involved with the publication of the quarterly magazine *Medical and Botanical Repository.* Good, "Bates and Social Reform," 84-90; Robert J. Leach, "Elisha Bates and the Mt. Pleasant Printing Press 1817–1827," *Bulletin of the Friends' Historical Association* 29 (Spring 1940), 22-6.

[69] Good, "Bates and Social Reform," 88.

[70] Elisha Bates, *The Moral Advocate, A Monthly Publication on War, Duelling, Capital Punishments, and Prison Discipline* Volumes 1-3 (Mt. Pleasant, Ohio, 1821–24).

[71] Bates, "Ohio Penitentiary," *The Moral Advocate*, Vol. 1 No. 6 (December 1821), 100.

[72] *Ibid.*, 100.

[73] Bates, "Comment on the Penitentiary System," *The Moral Advocate* Vol. 1 No. 10 (April 1822), 172.

[74] Andrew R. L. Cayton, *The Frontier Republic: Ideology and Politics in the Ohio Country, 1780–1825* (Kent: Kent State University Press. 1986), 126-8.

[75] Bates, "Penitentiaries," *The Moral Advocate*, Vol. 2 No. 6 (December 1822), 99.

[76] Bates, "The Penitentiary System," *The Moral Advocate,* Vol. 1 No. 8 (February 1822), 122.

[77] Bates, "Address to the Ministers of the Gospel of Every Denomination," *The Moral Advocate*, Vol. 2 No. 6 (December 1822), 97-100.

[78] Bates received water baptism on August 15, 1836, and was disowned by his yearly meeting. In 1839, he joined the Methodists and travelled widely throughout Ohio. In 1845, he launched *The Evangelical Union*, in which he promoted the idea of a national evangelical association that would operate independently of denominational structures. Tentatively named "The Christian Aid Society," its mandate was to bring Christian aid to people living in the republic's growing cities. Donald G. Good, "Elisha Bates and the Beaconite Controversy," *Quaker History* 73 (Spring 1984), 42-7. See also H. Larry Ingle, "Bates, Elisha," *ANB*: 2:330-1.

[79] Lydia Maria Child, *Isaac T. Hopper: A True Life* (Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., 1853), 1-30; Margaret H. Bacon, *Lamb's Warrior: The Life of Isaac T. Hopper* (New York: Crowell, 1970), 5-25; H. Larry Ingle, "Hopper, Isaac Tatem," *ANB*: 11:202-3.

[80] Child, *Hopper*, 383, 33-5, 47, 201-3. Daniel E. Meaders., ed., *Kidnappers in Philadelphia: Isaac Hopper's Tales of Oppression, 1780-1843* (New York: Garland, 1994).

[81] Child, *Hopper*, 241-43. Bacon, *Lamb's Warrior*, 63.

[82] Child, *Hopper*, 239, 227.

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

[83] Hopper and Hicks first met in 1819. Bacon, *Lamb's Warrior*, 86.

[84] Child, *Hopper,* 289-96, 464. He continued to dress in the plain style of William Penn and "dined on humble fare at Christmas as a testimony against the observance of holy days."

[85] In 1838, he brought out the *Friends Intelligencer*, a serial publication that, like Bates' *The Moral Advocate*, addressed issues such as temperance, equality for women, lunatic asylums, slavery, and the customs of the Cherokee Indians. Bacon, *Lamb's Warrior*, 104-6.

[86] *Ibid.*, 126-41.

[87] Child, *Hopper*, 410.

[88] Another Quaker reformer, Enoch Lewis, worried that the criminally insane might be inadvertently executed. See "Observations on Insanity and Crime," *Friends' Review*, July 1848, 651-52; Paul W. Graseck, "Quaker, Teacher, Abolitionist: The Life of Educator-Reformer Enoch Lewis, 1776–1856," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1996), 196-7.

[89] Child, *Hopper*, 413-45; Bacon, *Lamb's Warrior*, 155-8.

[90] Child, *Hopper*, 493.

This content downloaded from
195.252.230.123 on Tue, 24 Mar 2026 03:55:11 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms