

# Hannah Barnard's Story

Os Cresson<sup>1</sup>  
June 23, 2006

*Am I therefore become your enemy because I tell you the Truth ?*

Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, 4:16  
(epigraph, Hannah Barnard's *Dialogues...*)

## Contents

	Page
<b>Introduction</b>	2
<b>Appearance</b>	3
<b>Early Years</b>	4
Ancestry	4
Father	5
Baptist background	5
Education	5
Marriage	5
Acceptance in Hudson	6
Children	6
Descendents	6
Her sister	7
Her general characteristics	7
Hannah Barnard and the written word	7
Eloquence	8
Honesty	8
Tenacity	8
Emotions	8
Humor	9
Hannah Barnard and social class	10
<b>Quaker Ministry</b>	10
Travels in the ministry	10
Timeline of events	11
Religious views	12
Influences on her religious views	14
Treatment during the hearings	17
Sexism and the hearings	17
Her reaction	17
Why didn't she appeal her disownment?	18
Her motives	18
Quaker reaction	19

<b>Later Years</b>	20
Her comments on her experience	20
Did she become a Unitarian?	21
New interests?	21
Young people	22
Pacifism	22
Abolition	23
Close of her life	23
<b>Hannah Barnard's <i>Dialogues</i>...</b>	23
Domestic science	24
Religion and philosophy	26
Organization of society	27
Women's place in society	28
Relations of teacher and student	29
Design of the pamphlet	30
<i>Dialogues</i> ... as autobiography	31
<b>Lucretia Mott and Hannah Barnard</b>	32
<b>Publications about Hannah Barnard</b>	33
<b>Testimonials</b>	35
<b>References</b>	36
<b>Endnotes</b>	39

## Introduction

Hannah Jenkins (1755-1825) was born in Nantucket MA and lived in Dover, Dutchess Co., and Hudson, Columbia Co. NY. Her family was poor and she received little formal education. Born a Baptist, she became a Quaker at 18. In 1779 she married Peter Barnard and they had three children. Hannah Barnard was an eloquent speaker and became a recognized Quaker minister. She held modern views, questioning parts of the Bible and emphasizing the place of human reason. While visiting meetings in Great Britain these views were opposed by some Friends. The Elders of London Yearly Meeting interviewed her and decided she must go home and all her appeals were denied. On returning to Hudson, her home meeting first silenced her ministry and then disowned her. Hannah Barnard continued living in Hudson, running a Sunday School program and an anti-war group. An interest dear to her heart was the condition of young farmwives. She wrote and published an instructional booklet on homemaking skills. Finally, in 1825, she died. She was in her 71<sup>st</sup> year.

In 1921 Rufus Jones wrote about Hannah Barnard, "One is impressed with her honest, sincere, brave and straightforward manner. She does not cover up her real beliefs and she frankly admits that she diverges, and has for many years diverged, in view from the generally accepted beliefs of the Friends of her time. She reveals a restrained rationalistic temper of mind, and she shows a much keener ethical analysis than that exhibited by the Friends who challenged her. She was a gentle forerunner of our time, but she had the mis-

fortune to live in a period that could not allow deviation in thought...She was...an honest soul trying in a difficult crisis of religious transition to find her way through from a belief which her spirit had outgrown to a faith which satisfied her deepest awakened nature.<sup>»Jones 1921 302-303</sup>

Hannah Barnard was in the tradition of her contemporaries Job Scott, Abraham Shackleton and Elias Hicks. Rufus Jones called her “the leading champion in the first years of the nineteenth century of a freer type of thought in the Society.” (1921, p. 283) Others in this tradition have included Lucretia Mott, Henry Cadbury, the Progressive Friends of the mid-1800s, and many of the Friends at the Manchester Conference in 1895 and the first Gathering of Friends General Conference in 1900.

Hannah Barnard was a pioneer of liberty and reason in religion 26 years before American Quakerism divided on those issues. She was a passionate and tenacious debater and a woman who did not hesitate to assert herself when conscience demanded. She was a feminist 28 years before the Seneca Falls Convention launched the campaign for the rights of women. She was a pacifist and this led her to reject portions of the Old Testament that sanctioned war and it was 45 years before another Quaker took a similar public stand. She was a self educated scholar who worked to extend education to the poor. Her treatise on domestic science was published 41 years before Mrs. Beeton’s book, often called the first in its field. She was an advocate for the underclass in society and there is a hint she may have aided slaves. She comforted the ill and afflicted. She had a loving relationship with her husband for 46 years and raised at least three children. And she liked to laugh.

Fifty-five years after HB’s death, Lucretia Mott (1793-1880) wrote: “I have always regretted that so little has been published of the sad experience of that remarkable woman, Hannah Barnard.” (From a letter to Phebe Earle Gibbons thought to be dated September 1880.)

Unfortunately, most of what has been written about Hannah Barnard has focused on only one aspect of her long and busy life: her silencing and disownment for holding heretical views. She left very few writings to keep her memory alive. Many Quakers of her time and subsequently wished she were forgotten or they were drawn to write about even more dramatic events that occurred soon after she died.

The information we have about Hannah Barnard (HB) is scattered – any one publication mentions very little. That is why I put together this overview of what we know about her.<sup>2</sup>

## **Appearance**

James Jenkins described her as she appeared in 1802: “She was about the middle size, with that slenderness of make, and form of body, which seldom obtains the epithet of comeliness – her walk was by no means graceful – she stooped a little, so that in meeting her, there was nothing prepossessing; I observed in following her, her left foot formed a

curvature in reaching the ground. It was when sitting that she displayed a presence highly interesting, and pleasing – her eyes were at once brilliant, and penetrating, and often lighted up a countenance full of mind, and that mind ardent, and animated – her complexion was that of her Country, where the roses, and the lilies prematurely fade, and with them almost all that constitute the softness, and attraction of female beauty.”<sup>J 380</sup> (James Jenkins knew HB in London and kept a diary that seems to be a sensitive, complete and balanced account of her trials.)

Luke Howard, one of her judges, wrote: “Hannah Barnard was a woman of superior parts and considerable shrewdness; she had the oval face and high cheek-bones of the ‘North American Indian,’ with great presence of mind, and a natural eloquence, commanding the attention and respect of large audiences.”<sup>3</sup>, <sup>Howard 1836 28</sup>

From a history of Columbia County NY, published in 1878: “Hannah Barnard [was] a person of importance among the members of the sect. She was a woman of medium height and slender form, with a pleasant countenance and eyes black, keen, and penetrating. Possessing an inquisitive and thoughtful mind, and being remarkably gifted in the use of language, she evolved ideas and principles in advance of her day, and was not backward in making them known to the world.”<sup>Ellis 1878 182</sup>

Mrs. William L. Stone, wife of Hudson newspaper editor, wrote in or after 1818: “dignified in appearance and manners, a tall spare person with slim features and lively intelligent dark eyes.”<sup>N 89</sup>

Elias Hicks after visiting her in 1824: “Both Hannah and Peter seemed ‘lively and smart for people of their age, Hannah particularly so.’ Hicks added, ‘I did not discover that her memory or discerning faculties were any abated.’”<sup>M 84</sup>

## Early Years

Ancestry: Hannah Jenkins was born c. 1755 in Nantucket.<sup>4</sup>, <sup>F 1804 9, Mott 1855</sup> Her parents were Valentine (born 2/14/1730) and Mercy Jenkins.<sup>M 70-71, 1</sup> We don't know who Mercy's parents were. Valentine and Mercy moved from RI to Dover in “The Oblong” in Dutchess Co.. A sliver along the border with CT, it was in dispute between the two states until 1731 and consequently developed a tradition of being a lawless area.<sup>5</sup> From various sources on the internet we find that Valentine's parents were Jedidiah Jenkins and Hannah Long (married 2/9/1725). Hannah was the daughter of Philip Long Jr. and Susanna. Jedidiah's parents were Zachariah Jenkins (born 7/7/1651 in Sandwich MA, died 1/10/1722 in North Kingston RI) and Abiah Allen (born 12/10/1666 in Sandwich MA, married 12/11/1686 in Sandwich MA, died 4/11/1712 in East Greenwich RI). Zachariah Jenkins of Barnstable MA bought a farm from Thomas and Sarah Langford of East Greenwich RI on 3/13/1707-8 and his family presented a certificate to Greenwich Monthly Meeting (MM) on 6/16/1708.<sup>1</sup> Abiah's Jenkins' parents were Francis Allen (will signed on 2/18/1695-6, probated on 3/19/1697-8) and Mary Besse who married on 20 July 1662 (Mary later married George Barlow, Sheriff of Sandwich MA). Zachariah's parents were John Jenkins (born 1626 in Wales) and Susanna Cooke (born 1628 in Boston).

Father: Valentine Jenkins was disowned by Oblong MM 12/14/1789<sup>M 71</sup> because of not attending meeting, not paying debts, and moving away without permission. The meeting held his children accountable for his debts.<sup>M 72</sup> Several daughters were disowned for not attending meeting and/or marrying inappropriately.<sup>M 72, 1</sup> Elias Hicks later recalled having stayed with this family during his journeys which could have been in Dutchess Co. or after they had moved to Saratoga NY and St. Albans VT. (Hicks visited the Hudson River Valley and the area around Lake Champlain several times.) In *Dialogues...* (as I call HB's 1820 treatise) a character described what may have been the Jenkins family: "Pa has run away, to keep out of jail, and his farm is soon to be sold on a mortgage, and Ma and I are left to shift for ourselves."<sup>HB 1820 5</sup>

Baptist background: HB stated repeatedly that she was born a Baptist and became a convinced Friend at 18 (i.e. c. 1773, some years before her marriage).<sup>F 1804 ix</sup> Her uncle, Philip Jenkins, was an Elder of the First Baptist Church in Exeter RI (originally part of North Kingston) and later Pastor of the Baptist Church in East Greenwich, Kent Co. RI.<sup>1</sup> This supports the report that her family had been Baptists. That they were Quakers before becoming Baptists is shown by the minute of Zachariah Jenkins family in the records of Greenwich MM.

Education: HB is said to have been illiterate until she reached maturity<sup>N</sup>, but Thomas Foster<sup>6</sup> simply wrote of her "having nearly attained mature age, before she knew how to use a pen."<sup>F 1804</sup> She may have been reading before that. Luke Howard quoted her as having decided to use her own judgment "before I arrived at the age of seventeen years; [despite] the general current of surrounding opinion, the importunity of imbibed prejudices, and fear of heretical deception". (<sup>Howard 1836 23</sup>) This is consistent with the her family's apparent poverty, the lack of schools especially in the backwater of Oblong Township in Dutchess Co., and the common view that girls did not need to be educated.

Marriage: Peter Barnard<sup>7</sup> and Hannah Jenkins were married in Oblong MM between 9/15 and 10/20/1779. Hannah was about 25 and PB about 33; it may have been his second marriage.<sup>M 71</sup> PB and HB moved from Oblong to Creek MM in June 1784 with Seth, Paul, Rebecca and Elizabeth (the record is ambiguous as can whether the last was a daughter or their apprentice.)<sup>M 71, 1</sup> Unfortunately, the early records of Creek MM have been lost.

PB is reported to have been pleasant and supportive; the affection between them is clear in a letter.<sup>HB to SW 1802</sup> "Totally devoted to his wife whose intellectual superiority he not only accepted but proclaimed, Peter Barnard was everyone's favorite: 'He was one of the kindest hearted, best tempered and happiest men that ever lived. Though poor and earning his bread by the sweat of his brow, no prince was richer and no king ever sat more contentedly on his throne than Peter sat upon his truck.'"<sup>M 78</sup> PB was a carter and they built the first house on Main Street in Hudson. He was not listed as one of the 33 proprietors who settled Hudson in 1783 and he was not on the 1787 tax list (58 people with estates of at least 200£).<sup>Ellis 1878 155, 161</sup> PB died on 3/11/1830 at the age of 81 yr., 11 mo..<sup>Hinshaw</sup> He was buried by the Hicksite meeting in Hudson.

Acceptance in Hudson: Hudson was founded by wealthy Quakers from Nantucket. When HB arrived she was from a Baptist background (previously lapsed Quakers), unschooled, from a poor family, and her father had been disowned. She was also an outspoken woman. Her husband, although personally popular, was of from a poor branch of Barnard family. She may have advocated for the poor and against profiting from wars (as we see her doing later).

Children: There are sources that list an earlier marriage of PB and Rebecca Hussey.<sup>1</sup> When they moved in 1784, after less than five years of marriage, they had Seth, Paul, Rebecca and Elizabeth (who was an older daughter or an apprentice depending on how you interpret the record).<sup>M 71, 1</sup> Hannah and Peter Barnard had three children, two of whom were living in 1804 according to Thomas Foster.<sup>8, F 1804 9</sup> In 1802 HB wrote of her son and daughter. In 1820 next door to PB was Christopher Barnard (who had been disowned by Hudson MM on 9/26/1809). During the Hudson MM hearings the church attendance of the Barnard's daughter was brought up and HB replied, "I had known my daughter to go a few times, to the church, which, as a free agent, I considered she had a right to do...and I had not found it my duty, to attempt any restraint, or discouragement, in the case...I had so freely conversed with her, respecting different opinions, and modes of worship, that I believed she knew my sentiments, and I wished her, and every one else, to examine, and judge for themselves...But she was of age, and consequently not under my controul; I therefore wished them to speak to her about the matter, when, I did not doubt, but she would be candid with them."<sup>F 1804 60, M 66</sup> Jenkins wrote in his diary that HB's disownment was in part because she consented to her daughter's marrying someone who was not a Friend.<sup>J 380</sup>

Descendents: The census records for HB and PB and their descendents in Hudson are listed in a footnote.<sup>9</sup> The number of people in the house on Main St. decreased from 11 in 1790 to 8 in 1800, 6 in 1810, and 2 in 1820. In 1820 son Christopher Barnard was next door with a girl and a boy. In a letter, HB reported that CB, "my only surviving son," died on 12/23/1824 at the age of 37 leaving a widow and three children.<sup>HB to JM 1825</sup> In the 1830 census Hannah, Peter and Christopher were absent and Christopher's widow Elizabeth was in the house with three children (later records list them as Mary, Robert and Jane Barnard). Elizabeth was at the same location in 1840 and 1850. In 1850 she was living with her own children and a son-in-law, Francis Blanchard, a music teacher, and a granddaughter, Mary. In 1860 the same household was together. By 1870 Elizabeth Barnard was no longer there. By 1880 Francis Blanchard was absent and his widow, Jane, was living with her brother Robert, sister Mary, son-in-law Richard Graves and two grandchildren, William and Francis Graves. The 1890 census was destroyed in a fire. By 1900 Jane Blanchard, Richard Graves and Francis Graves were missing and Mary Graves was living with two sons, William and Robert. Mary was an organist, carrying on the family's musical tradition. This same household was together in 1910. In 1920 William was next door with wife Bertha and her sister Harriet Rote. William and Bertha were in their 40's and no children were listed. In 1930, the last census I have access to, William, Bertha and Harriet are together but his mother, Mary, and brother, Robert, were not there.

Thus we know of three grandchildren (2 girls and a boy), one great-granddaughter, and two great-great-grandsons.

HB and PB's daughter, Rebecca married William McKinstry for which she was disowned on 1/22/1805. This was an old Columbia County family.<sup>10</sup> For instance, Robert McKinstry (c. 1794-1870) was born in Columbia Co., arrived in Hudson as a boy, and became mayor, county treasurer and state assemblyman. Interestingly, he was a trustee of the Universalist Church in Hudson for 52 years.<sup>Ellis 1878 186-187, 216-217</sup> Internet sources list two sons of William and Rebecca Barnard McKinstry: Daniel P. (b. 1805) and William C. (b. 1807).<sup>1</sup> The 1830 census had William C. McKinstry in Catskill, just across the river from Hudson with 15 other adults and three children in the household. This is the only census record of HB and PB's McKinstry grandchildren that I know of.

Her sister: HB helped arrange the marriage of her sister Marcia, who had entered her thirties unmarried, to Samuel Preston of Stockport PA (on the Delaware River near the NY-PA border). HB had visited SP in September, 1793 while on a trip in the ministry. On 5/28/1795 HB wrote to Samuel Preston's friend, Henry Drinker, in Philadelphia thanking him for a present. Marcia visited SP in June of that year and in September they married in a private ceremony before witnesses but without minister, magistrate or Quaker permission. Marcia Preston was disowned for marrying in disorderly manner (Hudson MM 4/28/1796) and the same happened to Samuel Preston (Philadelphia MM 1/27/1797).<sup>M 70-72</sup>

Her general characteristics: Lucretia Mott wrote to Elizabeth Cady Stanton, "Hannah Barnard of Hudson, a native of Nantucket, of the last century, was regarded one of the greatest ministers in the Society."<sup>Mott 1855</sup> Jenkins wrote, "At our first interview...I said to [my friend] 'this is an extraordinary woman,' – 'Yes, (he answered) indeed is she – she is a clever, very clever fellow."<sup>J 341</sup> She impressed one non-Quaker in London with "the frankness of her manner...the affection for her husband and two daughters she had left behind her...a fine imagination...a most uncommon memory...a divine philosophy of the mind, in which everything was to be decided by...private conviction and feeling."<sup>M 74</sup> Samuel Preston, her brother-in-law, described her as "a prudent wise woman."<sup>M 72</sup>

Theophilus Lindsey, the Unitarian pioneer who met HB in 1801, wrote: "Her manners are so gentle, her eloquence so persuasive and her knowledge so extraordinary for her rank and situation, with an irreproachable life and conduct, that whatever may be her fate with the vehement and excited body of elders, she has set an inquiry on foot that must be highly useful...You are at first struck and much pleased with the frankness of her manner, and the ease and good sense with which she enters into conversation...The deep seriousness of her conversation affects you exceedingly, and being possessed of a fine imagination, a most uncommon memory, and having read many of our best moral and religious books, and all our poets, Dr. Young in particular, and quoting these occasionally and the Scripture continually, gives her great command of the passions and affections of those about her."<sup>Ditchfield 1970 211</sup>

There were other views, of course. Her Hudson neighbors in 1802 said she had ““a Caving, Contentious disposition of mind””<sup>M 67, F 1804 64</sup> A sympathetic observer in 1798 wrote, “I enjoyed not a little the war of words, in which H. B. was often engaged with the Patriots of the day. [However] I have often thought that she was driven by injudicious praise on the one hand, and by a too fiery zeal on the other, much beyond the limit which her sober judgment approved.”<sup>Metford 1928 39</sup>

HB had reason to be proud of her intellectual skills, not having had the benefits of the education of many of her opponents. She was also operating in a purely male environment and a highly charged one at that. The circumstances made it difficult to balance assertion and Quaker humility.

Hannah Barnard and the written word: HB had a great respect for books and was well read. She made careful records during her hearings and when challenged later in Hudson she replied, “I know I am right for I keep minutes of these things, as correctly as I am able.”<sup>F 1804 38</sup> Unfortunately, these did not impress others as much as they did her: her interminable reading from the record of the London proceedings made it difficult for the Hudson MM to reach a different conclusion from that of the august London YM.<sup>F 71, M 66</sup> Correspondence by letters was important to her and she worried that tardiness might be taken as a lack of concern. She collected writings, too: in 1802 she wrote to Samuel Wetherill that she regretted missing him during his recent visit to Hudson because “I could have shown you about as singular a collection of books and M<sup>ss</sup> as...you ever perused some of which I think due to the public [should be made available] as well as to myself and friends and nothing hinders but want of leisure and ability.”<sup>HB to SW 1802</sup>

Eloquence: William Dillwyn, a critic in London wrote that she was “remarkably voluble and eloquent in Delivery”<sup>M 65</sup> Thomas Foster wrote, “Her ministry was clear, pertinent, and instructive, and her delivery peculiarly eloquent and impressive.”<sup>F 1804 ix-x</sup> Joseph Woods of Britain wrote to a friend in 1799, “An American woman friend of the name of Hannah Barnard is much admired here as an eloquent Preacher....She speaks with great propriety and even an elegant assortment of words. She appears to be a woman who has both read and thought.” Curiously, the friend was William Matthews (1755-c.1808) who later joined the pamphlet wars on HB’s side.<sup>Woods 1925</sup>

Honesty: HB valued intellectual and personal honesty. Thomas Foster wrote, “Possessing an open and ingenuous temper, and actuated by a sincere love of truth, it never occurred to her mind to practise reserve or concealment, and least of all, with respect to any of her religious opinions.”<sup>F xiii</sup> She was usually plainspoken in her answers to queries about her views. For instance, during her hearings she called the idea of Christ’s sacrificial atonement an “inconsistent, unintelligible motley of absurdity.” She went on, “I am fully of the mind that the generally supported doctrines of imputed sin, and imputed righteousness, with other absurd appendages which have been attaché d to the Christian religion, have disgraced it more in the eyes of men, in some degree disposed to thoughtful investigation, than all the malicious efforts of its openly avowed enemies.” (Howard, 1836, p. 23 & 24) However, she probably hid her views sometimes. Several writers have wondered how she gained the approval of Ireland YM a year before they disowned Abraham Shackleton for

holding similar views. Jenkins suggested that her enthusiasm for Alexander Geddes implied more radical views than she was admitting<sup>J 357</sup> (see below).

Tenacity: She could be passionate and tenacious. Jenkins wrote “She told me, her maiden name was Jenkins, & referred me to Tho. Story’s Journal, for some account of her grandfather, & once intimated to me that if she was tenacious, it might be attributed to the unconquerable spirit of the Jenkins.”<sup>11, J 341</sup> Jenkins also wrote, “With respect to impertinence that probably referred to the firmness with which she defended every thing which she undertook to defend – in this, she was truly American; she had before her the example of her visiting Countrymen, who have always appeared to me, to be of all men, the most tenacious.”<sup>J 356</sup>

Emotions: Although she sometimes spoke sharply this does not mean she became angry. Jenkins described an argument between two men about Hannah’s views: “In a short time, they became very warm, and (as Gibbon would have said) in their holy anger, they hurled at each other, texts of Scripture ‘as thick as hail’ and with great celerity. At about the height of the conflict, Hannah looked at me, and with a smile said softly, ‘only see how angry they are, but, that is not the way for either of them to convince the other; thou, and I don’t dispute in this manner’ – nor did we.”<sup>J 352-353</sup> At one point, while sitting with her interrogators in Hudson, she said, “I think it would be much better, to exercise a little more charity; and taking each other by the hand, jog on amicably together, as brethren, and sisters in religious profession, out to do.”<sup>F 1804 61</sup>

HB irritated people because she deftly pointed out faults in reasoning or in Quaker process. She repeatedly asked to see or copy minutes people didn’t have or didn’t want to show her. She seemed to have a quick comeback to any criticism. This was unusual, particularly from a woman. Jenkins wrote, “On her return [to Hudson], a weighty member of her meeting remarked that he had sadly found in her a disposition which he had observed before, of being ready to challenge an opponent of whatever stature and to justify herself against all objections. To that rebuke she registered no strong protest, saying rather that she did not hesitate ‘to meet any person, or even the whole world, while I felt conscious innocence.’”<sup>M 63, 66</sup> Jenkins also wrote: “[Jonathon Wells of Shipstone on Stour] saw her at the Inn there, upon her return from Ireland, and could not but observe the consequential air with which she walked along the passage to her room, from which he inferred, that she had returned from Ireland in a state of mind less humble, than the one in which she went thither.”<sup>J 341-432</sup>

Humor: HB enjoyed humor: repeatedly we see evidence of her lively spirit, even in times of adversity (as in the Matthew and Wetherill letters described below). Here is a bit of poetry she sent her sister on the birth of Marcia’s first child.<sup>M 72</sup> It probably draws on both her experience raising children and her use of humor to help ride through difficult times:

Poor Dirty noisy heedless thing  
When pleas’d, he’ll laugh and play.  
When vex’d, he’ll make the kitchen ring

And toss his top away.  
He eats and slobbers, choaks and gags  
Begins to talk and lisp  
He tears his tunick all to rags  
And burns his coat to crisp.

Her treatise, *Dialogues...*, was a lively affair, essentially an instructional a soap opera. In the Preface she anticipated the accusation that the writing was too humorous: “Now, should I ask them, why they use spice, pepper or mustard, as culinary ingredients? they would doubtless say, because they afford an agreeable relish. I have only to observe, that if I have made too free use of any pungent, or what I consider palatable seasoning, in any dish, to suit their taste, they may leave that to those who are more fond of it.”<sup>iv, M<sup>81</sup></sup> (She used a similar metaphor in a letter when she described “the increasing Implicit reception of [William Law’s] visionary notions without pepper, salt, or mastication on the subjects therein refered to.”<sup>HB to WM 1802</sup>)

Hannah Barnard and social class: HB was sympathetic to youth, the poor and the under-classes.<sup>WM 121, J 340-341</sup> Her *Dialogues...* was designed to assist poor rural families. Lucretia Mott wrote, “She and her husband and family lived comfortably together in Hudson. She was well known as a friend to the poor and afflicted.”<sup>Mott 1880?</sup> According to Jenkins, “The writings of the French republicans had filled her head with their political nonsense about Liberty and Equality, and these notions were reduced to practice when, in Ireland; at her public meetings, she frequently disturbed the arrangements made by friends of the place, by calling to the upper end of the meeting, and there mingling up, rich, and poor, clean, and dirty promiscuously together, and in visiting families at Bristol and other places refusing to visit such as objected to sit with their own servants, during the time of such visit. From what I have heard her express, and from what others have informed me, I believe that she also imbibed from the Revolutionists of France, (who were then Republicans,) the utter dislike of kings, and priests, wishing the downfall of Hierarchical power, whilst she was herself of that very order, and to retain her station in which, was the purport of her subsequent Appeals to the Quarterly, and Yearly Meetings.”<sup>J 340-341</sup> In her confrontation with the Quaker hierarchy, I think HB saw herself as a rural peasant sent to instruct the Quaker monarchs.<sup>12</sup>

## **Quaker Ministry**

Travels in the ministry: This began in the 1780’s according to Foster but the first records are trips to Genesee, western CT and the Lake Champlain Valley (approved 5/15/1793), and New England 5/24/1794 and 4/28/1796.<sup>M 61-62</sup> (Earlier records of Creek MM have been lost.) Eight times she was a representative to Nine Partners QM beginning in 1786 (that quarter covered the Hudson Valley north of Millbrook). She was a representative to NYYM in 1793, ’94 & ’96. She served on the Nine Partners (now Oakwood) Boarding School Committee (where she would have met Elias Hicks who helped start the school was much involved for many years).<sup>N</sup>

During the Hudson hearings HB emphasized that she had made her views known before receiving the traveling minute from Hudson MM in 1797.<sup>F 1804 38-9</sup> Thomas Foster described an example of this early outspokenness: “These [religious opinions] were explicitly, and repeatedly declared in the course of her public ministry, without producing the slightest animadversion from the Society in her native land. In particular, after the Yearly Meeting at Newport in Rhode Island, some years before she embarked for England, a public meeting was appointed by her desire, which many Friends staid purposely to attend, and at which a large number of the inhabitants, who were not members of the Society, were also present. On this occasion her sentiments were declared very fully, with respect to several points, which she did not hesitate to pronounce to be ‘absurd appendages, which had been attached to the doctrines of pure Christianity, by ignorance, or worse design;’ and her Friends expressed great satisfaction with what she then declared.”<sup>F 1804 xiii-xiv</sup>

Timeline of events: The story of HB’s trials in London and Hudson will not be repeated here. They are summarized in several short biographical notes and longer chapters, articles and pamphlets (see References, below). Here is a timeline:

- Fall 1796 HB asked Hudson MM to support a religious visit to Great Britain and Ireland.<sup>N</sup>
- 10/26/1797 Hudson MM certificate,<sup>13</sup> later approved by Nine Partners QM and NYYM<sup>M 62</sup>; signing HB’s YM certificate were John Murray, James Parsons and James Mott Sr.;<sup>14</sup> Elizabeth Coggeshall (1770-1857)<sup>15</sup> approved to travel with HB.
- 5/26/1798 NYYM approved minutes for HB and EC<sup>M 62, H 118</sup> A yellow fever outbreak in New York City that summer caused panic and delays.
- 6/26/1798 Left New York harbor.
- 7/20/1798 Arrived in Falmouth, England, after a passage of 25 days; over the next three years HB and EC traveled 2300 miles and visited 320 families in England, Ireland, Wales, Scotland and the Scilly Isles. They were in Glastonbury and Wales in late autumn, 1798.<sup>Metford 1928</sup> HB spoke to thousands (mostly Methodists) in Cornwall before 5/10/1799.<sup>M 62</sup>
- 5/1799 At London YM in dispute over the use of meetinghouses by outside groups.<sup>J 310-312</sup>
- 8/1-2/1799 Visited Ackworth Friends School; met and spoke with Elizabeth Gurney.<sup>16</sup>
- May 1800 Visited Ireland, attended Ireland YM and received minute of support.
- aft. 5/1800 Returned to England, attended London YM, asked for certificate to travel on Continent, Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders refused her request, told her to go home, and referred the matter to Devonshire MM.
- 11/14/1800 Devonshire MM affirmed the decision of the Elders.
- bef. 1/9/01 London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting affirmed the decision.
- 4/28/1801 Back in Ireland for their YM.
- 5/20/1801 At London YM which affirmed the decision. They offered to pay her way home which she refused. They sent the decision to Hudson MM. The three

Elders in NY who had signed her certificate requested that she return.<sup>Mott 1880?</sup>

- 8/30/1801 Left England. Many supporters accompanied her to port and worshiped on board before she departed.
- 9/22/1801 Charges acknowledged by Hudson MM
- 11/1/1801 Arrived in New York after an exhausting 63 days, “harassed and travel-worn”.<sup>N</sup>
- 11/24/1801 Attended meeting at Hudson MM. Later met with the Elders six times.
- 1/26/1802 Ordered by Hudson MM to stop ministry.
- 6/22/1802 Disowned by Hudson MM.
- later 1802 Her appeal of the order to stop her ministry denied by the Quarter and she was instructed not appeal to the YM.

Religious views: Please note that I am not competent to clearly describe HB’s views and contrast them with those of others. The speakers and writers of that time made subtle distinctions that I miss. What follows is a sketch of some of the issues involved.

HB challenged the literalist interpretation of the Bible regarding wars, miracles, the divinity of Jesus, atonement, revelation, and truth. (I don’t mean she rejected all these, but her position on them was anathema to some). She emphasized human reason, Inner Light, human conscience, and freedom of conscience. She also published without permission and challenged the role of Elders and their procedures, especially when they decided matters in private meetings, and without women present. She encouraged women and young people to think for themselves and to speak up. She was not deferential in some situations where others expected it. She advocated opening meetinghouses to use by nonQuakers in London and Hudson.<sup>J, M</sup> She found support in the writings of Fox, Penington, Penn and Barclay and quoted the Elders of Balby, as Friends do today: “[Ours is] a society too, that has been honourably distinguished, for insisting with peculiar energy, on that text, ‘The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life.’”<sup>F 1801 202</sup>

She wrote to Thomas Foster, “I thought it highly necessary to examine the grounds of the credibility of any writings, whenever an implicit and full belief in the whole of them was insisted on, as the measure and condition of Christian communion....It was on that account, that I had called, and still continued to call on them, and the Society at large, to make the same enquiry.”<sup>F 1804 56</sup> She wrote in her defense, “[N]othing is revealed truth to me, as doctrine, until it is sealed as such on the mind, through the illumination of that uncreated word of God, or divine light, and intelligence, to which the Scriptures, as well as the writings of many other enlightened authors, of different ages, bear plentiful testimony....I therefore do not attach the idea or title of divine infallibility to any society as such, or to any book, or books, in the world; but to the great source of eternal truth only.”<sup>F 1801 122-123</sup>

The Unitarian, Theophilus Lindsey wrote in 1801: “I could perceive from her own conversation and that of her friends along with her, that religion was nothing but a divine philosophy of the mind, in which everything was to be decided by their own private con-

viction and feeling.”<sup>Ditchfield 1970 212-213</sup> Later he wrote, “Her religion is certainly nothing more or less than a more pious deism.”<sup>Ditchfield 1970 215</sup>

When questioned sharply HB sometimes simply said the answer had not been revealed to her: “I do not find myself authorized to enter into conjectures, or determinations respecting the different kinds of miracles, related in the New Testament. I do not call them in question, but I confess my ignorance, as to their positive and literal certainty, which I could only be assured of, by immediate revelation.”<sup>F 1801 113</sup> This was agnosticism approximately 70 years before Thomas Huxley invented the term while presenting a naturalistic alternative to literal Biblical accounts of creation. HB questioned but did not explicitly reject many parts of Scripture. For instance, Theophilus Lindsey wrote: “Upon being pressed home with the facts of the divine interposition in the Mosaic history, with much acuteness and civility towards those that might differ from her, she kept aloof and evaded a direct reply.”<sup>Ditchfield 1970 213</sup>

The Quaker peace testimony was at the core of HB’s approach: “I had long ago found myself reduced to the alternative, - of either believing that the Almighty’s nature, and will, was changeable, like that of a finite man; or that it never was his positive good will and pleasure, for his rational creatures, to destroy one another’s lives in any age of the world; and that the belief of those finite creatures, who had believed it was, could only originate in their mistakes, or in other words their ignorance, which I believed God graciously winked at...I attributed those expressions of positive command, and authority for war, recorded in the Old Testament, to the same cause as above; and that the credulity with which those records had been stamped with divine infallibility, had been, as it were, the grindstone on which swords had been ground for many ages among professing Christians. And under these views I had believed it my indispensable duty to erect this standard in the face of day, That war is, in my full belief, a moral evil, which man has created for himself, by the misapplication of his powers, or, in other words, by the abuse of his free agency; and that it will continue to plague mankind, until they view it in the same light, and resist those lusts from whence it originates.”<sup>F 1801 116</sup> Here HB was simultaneously challenging the place of the Bible in Quaker belief, the support of war by Quakers, the role of the Elders in the Religious Society of Friends (RSoF), and the place of women in the Society.

For HB, religion and ethics combined. She was passionate about improving the conditions people live in and willing to tolerate differences in religious expression. HB, like Lucretia Mott and Henry Cadbury, was more concerned with ethics than theology. As Cadbury put it, “To call the set of a man’s life his religion no doubt seems a great come-down – when you are used to finding it in beliefs or distinctively religious experience. But when a man deals religiously with issues that others settle in other ways, in fact takes seriously the religious implications of behavior both individual and collective, tries to practice fully the standards that conventional religion officially endorses, and to make his whole life consistent if not conscious, he is in my opinion practicing religion as much as the one who skillfully builds the dialectic structure of a well rounded theology or as the man who through public and private devotion lives in that mystical drama of the religious imagination.”<sup>Cadbury 1936/2000 28-29</sup>

HB loved our ability to reason, calling it “that valuable gift of Heaven”<sup>F vii</sup> and an “ines-  
timable blessing [for which] I reverently return thanks.”<sup>HB to SW 1802</sup> Jenkins wrote, “She  
used to relate, that a Friend once spoke sharply on the subject of some article of her dis-  
belief – ‘my mind is open to conviction (said she) and wishes to believe every thing  
which is consistent with reason to believe’ Oh! then (he replied) if reason is thy guide, I  
have done with thee – to which she answered, ‘if thou wants me to believe that, to which  
my reason is opposed, I have also done with thee.’ I think the word opposed, is here a  
happy one – she could not mean that we do not believe in much that is not within the  
province of reason, at the same time not inconsistent with it. such are many of our pro-  
pensities, and enjoyments.”<sup>J 354</sup>

She held that people can be in agreement on larger issues even as they speak about them  
differently: “So that, at last, the whole accusation centres, in *seeming*, not to agree with  
Friends in sentiment, upon some points. Which is no uncommon circumstance to happen,  
between persons, whose *real* sentiments, are remarkably accordant.”<sup>F 202</sup> There are people  
who have a kindly way that allows them to say radical things without causing trouble –  
Henry Cadbury was famous for this. HB may have had a manner that set off people who  
were ready to object to her. She helped set-off the schism that Cadbury helped heal.

HB saw that religion changes with successive generations: we are “in a state of progres-  
sive improvement, and useful probation.”<sup>HB 1820 36</sup> Every family in *Dialogues...* that was  
in trouble later improved. As Elias Hicks put it: “Every generation must have more light  
than the proceeding one, otherwise they must sit down at ease, in the labours and works  
of their predecessors.”<sup>H 254</sup> HB also believed in people’s inherent innocence and perfecti-  
bility.<sup>HB 1820 36</sup>

Influences on her religious views: HB knew Elias Hicks (1748-1830). He later recalled  
staying in her parents’ home during his journeys.<sup>M 85</sup> In 1774 EH traveled from family to  
family raising money for the Nine Partners Meetinghouse in Dutchess Co..<sup>H 25</sup> There  
were many opportunities for them to cross paths during Hicks’ 64 journeys as a minister  
among Friends between 1779 and 1829, about 20 of them before HB went to Britain.<sup>H 81,</sup>  
<sup>290-291</sup> They served together on the Nine Partners Friends School Committee<sup>N</sup> which EH  
helped start beginning in 1793. Classes for 70 boys and 30 girls started in Dec. 1796.<sup>H 93</sup>  
and he assisted in preparing her NYYM traveling minute.<sup>H 118</sup> Some of his views were  
very like HB’s as this in 1801: “[W]e must know of going deeper than tradition, as tradi-  
tional religion is no real worth without we have added to it that of our own experience  
and judgment, and that is only found by living our daily experience in that injunction of  
our dear Lord.”<sup>H 115</sup> He was troubled to hear of HB’s treatment by British Friends.<sup>17, H</sup>  
<sup>118</sup> As EH’ biographer put it, “Not claiming infallibility herself, Hannah Barnard was  
condemned because she could not grant infallibility to others. With her position, Elias  
Hicks agreed.”<sup>H 121</sup> He knew HB had not denied anything in the NYYM Disciplines that  
he helped write. (In the 1783 Discipline that was in effect when HB left the country, the  
only mention of the Bible was a query asking if Friends were careful to read the Scrip-  
tures frequently.)<sup>H 120</sup>

The issues that were a problem for HB later caused trouble for Elias Hicks. “Henry Tuke’s insistence that all portions of the Bible were given by revelation undermined the real value of the Scriptures, Elias thought, and did more damage than ‘all the wit, sophism, and infidelity of Thomas Paine.’”<sup>H 141</sup> [Tuke had been one of HB’s judges.] “[EH] stood against all external authorities which would curb new revelations of truth, whether in the form of creed, sacred Scripture, or hierarchy.”<sup>H 176</sup> In mid 1819 EH was rebuked by the Philadelphia Elders.

And then, in the winter of 1819, seventeen years after HB was disowned, EH spoke in the Hudson meetinghouse and HB was there. Afterwards she remarked that he was proclaiming the views for which she had been disowned.<sup>18, H 185</sup> They did not meet on that occasion but in 1824, the year before she died, HB wrote to EH and that summer Elias Hicks and his wife and daughter visited Hannah and Peter Barnard in their home in Hudson. Little is known about that day but EH later described her as “lively and smart” with no loss of “memory or discerning faculties.”<sup>M 84</sup> He was 76 and she was about 70.

With the schism of 1827 and 1828 Elias Hicks became widely known as a champion of individual conscience and a skeptic about creedal barriers. He wrote, “There is scarcely anything so baneful to the present and future happiness and welfare of mankind, as a submission to traditional and popular opinion, I have therefore been led to see the necessity of investigating for myself all customs and doctrines...either verbally or historically communicated...and not to sit down satisfied with any thing but the plain, clear, demonstrative testimony of the spirit and word of life and light in my heart and conscience.”<sup>H 182</sup> Hicks emphasized the inward action of the Spirit rather than human effort or learning, but he saw a place for human reason. He called on us to turn to “the light in our own consciences,...the reason of things,...the precepts and example of our Lord Jesus Christ, (and) the golden rule.”<sup>H 196</sup>

Another influence was Job Scott (c.1751-1793). HB may have met him early since he was born in Providence RI, and as a youth attended both Quaker and Baptist services, becoming a member in 1771. By 1774 he was a teacher in Providence. Later HB could have met Scott was when he visited Friends in the Hudson River Valley in 1784. Unfortunately, while on a religious journey in Ireland he became ill with small pox and died in Ballitore in 1793 at the age of 42. NEYM refused to publish his *Journal* but, at the urging of EH, NYYM did so in 1797, the year before HB went to Britain.<sup>H 113</sup> Thomas Foster reported that during the inquiry into HB’s views in 1801, “she stated her accordance with the printed testimonies published by the society, and in particular those of William Penn and Job Scott.”<sup>F 117</sup> Scott wrote, “The true doctrine has ever been, in all ages, Christ in man the hope of glory, a real union of the life of God in the life of man.”<sup>H 67</sup> And: “Religion centers in the one word ‘Emmanuel,’ that is, God with man. And until something of this union is livingly known, there is nothing known of true religion.”<sup>H 68</sup> He wrote, “We must, through the divine workings of God by his grace and spirit in us, work out our own salvation.” This sounds like HB rejecting “schemes of salvation”. Barbour and Frost wrote, “Job Scott was the most creative Quaker theologian in eighteenth century America....Scott was a quietist who saw all outward means – including the Bible, reason, learning – as either irrelevant or a hindrance to salvation....Creeds stood in the way of God.

Like Elias Hicks, Scott made the Inward Light the entire substance of faith. During his lifetime there was no opposition to Scott's beliefs, but his frank statements in his *Journal* (1797) brought opposition from evangelicals."<sup>1988 366</sup> [In this report I do not distinguish between evangelical and conservative Quakerism. They both emphasized strict Christian doctrine and they agreed on their opposition to HB. Other sources, such as Barbour and Frost, will help the reader distinguish between these Quaker varieties.]

HB was also influenced by the New Lights she met in Ireland. One of their leaders was Abraham Shackleton (1752-1818), a school master in Ballitore, Ireland. He questioned the Bible (including its wars), emphasized the experience of the Inner Light and objected to the growing practice of disownment. A supporter of the French Revolution, he assisted HB in her defense in 1801 and was himself disowned by Carlow MM the same year. Other Friends who supported him later withdrew from Ireland YM.<sup>Jones 1921 294-298; Barbour & Frost 1988 170</sup>

The influence of HB and the Irish New Lights probably ran both ways. Job Scott's views may have influenced both of them, as the French revolution probably did. HB's views may have begun as early as the age of 18<sup>HB 1820 35</sup> or early in her ministry.<sup>F 1804 38-39</sup> She did become more outspoken after her visit with the New Lights in Ireland in 1800. The New Lights began to present a problem for Friends in Ireland before HB's visit: Abraham Shackleton's disagreement with his home meeting began as early as 1797; William Savery was upset by him in January 1798. Jenkins wrote, "What a pity it seems to be, that (in Society phrase) such a man [as Abraham Shackleton] did not keep his place, but that he, learned, wise and useful, should have become the dupe, and the tool of the Irish New-lights, and afterwards, the willing disciple of Hannah Barnard."<sup>J 570</sup>

There probably was some relationship with Unitarians before HB's journey across the Atlantic. Jenkins reports that she said she was influenced by a Unitarian doctor who was her neighbor in Hudson.<sup>19, J 339-40</sup> In London she went to see Theophilus Lindsey, a well known Unitarian who established the first Unitarian chapel in London. He wasn't at home and, undeterred, she pursued him to his summer retreat. His report of the visit is positive although she seemed to rely too much on individual convictions.<sup>M 73-74</sup> HB's relationship with Unitarians was explored by Grayson M. Ditchfield (1970).

HB was interested in German Biblical scholarship, as was EH.<sup>H 175-176</sup> In London one such scholar came to visit her. He was Alexander Geddes (1737-1802), a Scottish theologian and poet who denied the divine authority of Scripture, rejected miracles, and stated that he disbelieved anything that was incompatible with reason. He was a pioneer of Biblical criticism and published translations of the Bible and commentary. She "was so much pleased with his company, and his sentiments, as to declare, that he was 'a man who had taken away the Crown from us all.'"<sup>J 357</sup>

New Light Baptists, from which HB came, were rebels in First Great Awakening. Rhode Island College was started to train New Light Baptist ministers in 1764 and may be where her RI uncle, the minister, studied.

HB told Samuel Wetherill (1736-1816) that she knew of his group, the Free Quakers, but didn't know details and she asked him to send them.<sup>20</sup>

In her trials and in *Dialogues...* HB repeatedly cited William Penn with respect and perhaps affection. She also cited John Woolman, many of whose chief concerns she shared, such as peace, simple living, condemnation of follies, concern for servants, and the importance of applying one's religious principles in daily life.

There were many others who were combining rationalism and religion that HB might have heard about but since there is no evidence I'll confine them to a footnote.<sup>21</sup>

Treatment during the hearings: HB was roughly handled during some of the debates. There were even Friends who accused her of atheism and bribery. She later said she was treated "with rudeness, and personal incivility – with passion, and with petulance."<sup>J 378</sup> Jenkins gives us a very personal example: "About this time she complained to me with considerable emotion, that a woman friend had sent an account to America which had made her husband extremely uneasy; for, he had been informed, that it was highly needful for him to send for her home, since, she had here been convicted of Blasphemy, Lies, and Impertinence. Upon mentioning the three last words she was much affected – and I clearly saw that the mingled feelings of grief, and anger at that moment agitated her bosom 'What shall I do (said she) in the matter, ought not this friend to be exposed for her calumny, and misrepresentation?' – I told her, that I was sorry to hear of such illiberal conduct on the part of my Country-woman, who ought not to have so interfered, and added, that if she could not be easy to let it pass by her 'as the idle wind' to proceed precisely as laid down in the Book of Extracts on the subject of Defamation, because the least informality on her part, would be eagerly pleaded in excuse, for quashing at once her indictment. How the matter ended I know not, but apprehend that the calumniator condemning her [own] conduct, and Hannah's forgiving her, superseded the necessity of harsher treatment."<sup>J 356</sup>

Sexism and the hearings: The Women's Meeting in London had been formed only 16 years before and they did not participate in Hannah's case.<sup>22</sup> One of her judges later wrote, "She chose to plead her cause unassisted, even in the Yearly Meeting; though the usage of our Society allows females a Friend, in such cases, to manage it for them; and even an appellant of our own sex, an assistant."<sup>Howard 1836 28</sup> In Hudson MM women were on some of the committees that interviewed her but the trials were in the Men's Meeting and HB was not allowed to bring in a female friend, Mary Macy, despite her strenuous objections.<sup>F 1804 47-48; Howard 1836 72</sup> (See below for more on HB and women's rights.)

Her reaction: She objected tenaciously to her treatment in England and later in Hudson because she could conscientiously do nothing else. When people urged her to return home from England, "She replied 'that as she claimed no infallibility herself, she could not allow it to others, and was not convinced that she was wrong, and could not follow implicitly the advice of the Society, for she believed it might be the duty even of an individual to be rightly called to make a stand against assumed power, unfounded judgment, and irregular proceedings; that it was to our own Master we must individually stand, or

fall, and that if she had rightly apprehended her duty as a Gospel ambassador, it was faithfulness without fear, and plainness without asperity.”<sup>J 358</sup> Elias Hicks took the same approach.<sup>23, H 182</sup>

HB may have begun thinking for herself at an early age: in *Dialogues*... her alter ego, Lady Homespun, tells of her distress in her eighteenth year “till I had the courage to exercise my own natural right to examine and judge for myself.” (The occasion was reading Milton’s demeaning description of women.)<sup>HB 1820 35</sup>

There were many contradictions in her position: she was a rationalist but not a deist; she was in sympathy with the Unitarians but did not use a literal Biblical interpretation to support it; she was outspoken and ready to debate but also a humble, quiet Quaker; she was a woman challenging men, and a self educated person challenging graduates of fine schools. As Jenkins put it, “Her mind indeed at this time was a repertory of strange admixtures. She was at once the public Quaker-preacher, and private teacher of principles at variance with Quakerism, -- a public, and frequent declaimer against all war...and yet rejoicing at every account announced by the public prints, of Republican victories.”<sup>J 340</sup>

Why didn’t she appeal her disownment? In about 1803 she wrote to Thomas Foster, “I am too fully convinced by the evidence of experience, of the prevailing temper of the ruling party in the Society, that it is in vain to expect justice, or impartiality, and therefore utterly useless, and trifling, to attempt any further appeals among them. This incontrovertible statement of real fact I pen with regret for their sakes, but as to myself, I feel rather a release from bonds, than any sensible present, or apprehension of future loss, by their unfounded, and unjust suspension. While at the same time, I feel myself, as much as ever bound, to the substance of the original doctrines of the early Friends, and the eternal principles of the Gospel of Peace.”<sup>F 1804 84</sup>

The hierarchy of NYYM was probably quite conservative: several of the leaders went to the Orthodox YM after the schism in 1828.<sup>24</sup> Further appeal would have divided the YM, forcing her friends to stand against each other (in London she did not have longstanding friendships). EH would have helped at the Yearly Meeting level but she may have known that he did not share her views on some of the issues.<sup>M 84, H 119</sup> Perhaps her friends’ entreaties had an affect and perhaps she recognized the paradox of trying to be accepted by a hierarchy that she opposed. Also, she must have been tired after more than two years of debate and official rejection. Her views were on record and perhaps there was little more to gain. In her letters to Foster, Matthews and Wetherill, she wrote of the relief of releasing a four year burden. She remained optimistic about the future generations of Quakers.<sup>HB to SW 1802, HB to WM 1802</sup>

Her motives: She wrote to Thomas Foster, “But as my motive was not a victory, of so unimportant a kind [as winning an appeal], but the excitement of general enquiry, amongst the rising generation, and others of independent minds, many of whom in this land, and especially in our society, very evidently to me, needed something to awaken their attention, and call forth their faculties, to real usefulness to themselves, and others; for I believe scarce anything of an instrumental nature would have given a greater moral

electric shock, throughout our poor diminished society, as well as among others in this nation, that could have happened among us.”<sup>F 1801 227-228</sup> She described similar sentiments to William Matthews and Samuel Wetherill in the fall of 1802 (see below).

Quaker reaction: Elias Hicks recognized HB as an early proponent of his views.<sup>H 118-122</sup> In the opinion of Luke Howard (1772-1864), one of her judges, “The case of [Hannah Barnard] was, I believe, one of the first occasions of calling the attention of our Society, more closely than at any former period, to the doctrines preached among us; and to the Scriptural proofs of Christian doctrine in general. *In this respect (we may say) it did us good.*”<sup>Howard 1836 28</sup> Nicholas Waln, a prominent Philadelphia Quaker, wrote on 3/9/1802, “...neither the Devil, Dr. Priestly, Hannah Barnard, the Irish Apostates, nor Tom Paine, shall, or will, ever prevail”.<sup>F 74, M 75</sup> From Lucretia Mott we learn, “Some of the liberal Friends in Chester County were much disturbed by the dealings with Hannah Barnard, and expressed themselves freely. Soon after, there was a revision of our Discipline in the early part of this century, and Jonathan Evans and some others had that clause added which makes it a disownable offense to deny the Divinity of Christ, and the authenticity of the Scriptures.”<sup>Mott 1880?</sup> (This change took place in both Philadelphia and Baltimore YMs in 1806.)

Jenkins states that she had few disciples and most Quakers in Britain ignored the issues she raised.<sup>J 380</sup> Her supporters included Mary Townsend Compton, Thomas Compton (1749-1817), Samuel Southall (1760-1818) and Thomas Foster (c. 1759-1834).<sup>J 342</sup> Some, such as Southall, later recanted. Her counselors during her appeal to the YM were John Bewley, Abraham Shackleton, William Matthews and Henry Finch.

William Matthews gives us a picture of the reaction of Quakers in London to HB in 1801: “She was enjoined silence as a minister, and the rumour of her heterodoxy spread far and wide....Opinions were imputed to her which she never held: calumny was encouraged among the superficial and ignorant: and those of her own sex who could neither fathom her understanding, nor approach her excellencies, were in the common habit of avoiding her as deluded, as dangerous, and as fallen from almost every thing that was good! The youth, to whom her benevolence strongly attached her, were taught to refrain from her company! But, what was most unpleasant, in public meetings which she attended for silent worship, the galleries of London sounded with innuendos of judgment and reproach....This account may be considered hereafter as exaggerated, but there are at present sufficient witnesses of the truth of the statement: and I give it as a warning proof of the effects of narrowness and bigotry of mind, which are ever to be expected from similar occasions, unless those who succeed to activity in the present and future generations, be more careful to guard against the spirit of prejudice, and its consequent errors.”<sup>WM 121-122</sup>

From c. 1801 to 1828 there were New Light Quakers in Rhode Island and Massachusetts. Mary Newhall and others emphasized reason, the Inner Light, and progressive improvement in religion. They challenged the interpretation of Scripture and the role of Elders. A critic called this “Deism at root, under the form of Godliness”.<sup>H 208-210, 283; Barbour et al 1995 104-105; Tolles 1959</sup> We don’t know of any links to HB but they must have known of her.

An indication of an enduring memory is that 36 years after her disownment Joseph John Gurney, the English Quaker evangelist, made a special detour to Hudson to preach against the views of “the heretical Hannah Barnard” in her home town to her old friends and the Hicksites there.<sup>M 79</sup>

## Later Years

Her comments on her experience: Soon after being disowned HB wrote about her reactions in two letters. To her defender in Britain, William Matthews, she wrote on 9/6/1802: “I feel much obliged by thy brotherly attention to, and Solicitude for me in the peculiar situation into which faithfulness (I trust) on my part and Dark Superstition on the part of some others has placed me; at which however I am not at all dismayed: for having endeavoured to act with conscientious uprightness and readiness to give the hand of Christian fellowship with what I considered true Christian liberality, I conceive the woe to attack to the givers and Causeless takers of offenses; and furthermore under my views of the present state of the Society I can with humble reverent thankfulness rejoice in the consideration that I was made the Instrument of bringing their Darkness to light, and calling forth the Latent powers of thought and pen which have been employed on the occasion.... Insomuch that the hopes I fondly entertained of seeing an improvement and reformation take place, (which was as it were a kind of main motive to my public exertions in this as well as your land, amongst the scattered remains of the Society) have all vanished and it appears to me that the Desolation thereof is Inevitable! which while I deplore I am glad to find that the steps and means which have led and are Daily leading to it are Recorded and Recording for the instruction and warning of the present and future generations.”<sup>HB to WM 1802</sup>

A few weeks later, on 10/25/1802, she wrote to Samuel Wetherill, founding clerk of the Free Quakers in Philadelphia: “I also heartily acknowledge thy brotherly kindness and sympathy yet for thy satisfaction as I doubt not it will be so I can assure thee I have been happily preserved through the whole of this singular trial in much tranquility; feeling well satisfied in having openly made a stand against the presumptuous clamors for infallibility of a poor degenerated and Diminished Society...I reverently rejoice at times in a persuasion that the present is the most important Era of my life! wherein it has been providently put into my power to give superstition the greatest shock by existing the most extensive inquiry and independent investigation I have ever yet been able to do. My God if he please render it usefull through his blessing to the present and succeeding generations!”<sup>HB to SW 1802</sup>

In January 1803 she sent her friend, Thomas Foster, this revealing insight: “On the 3d ult. I was reduced to a sick chamber, where I was confined by a sore and prevailing fever. During which distressing season, I was favoured, I believe, with the use of my reason, that valuable gift of Heaven, as clear as at any time of my life. Here, my friend, was an opportunity for calm reflection, on past scenes, under the solemn prospect, of a speedy dissolution, of the precious ties, and acquaintances of this probationary state! And with reverent thankfulness I can assure thee, that ‘*one self-approving hour,*’ at such a time, from a consciousness that I had not shrunk from an open, and what I considered a neces-

sary avowal of my sentiments, appeared too precious to be brought for a moment in competition with any paper commendation, the Morning, or Select Yearly Meeting ever wrote.”<sup>F 1804 vii-viii</sup>

Several of her comments about leaving the RSoF were recorded: “[I]n answer to a Friend from Ohio who inquired whether her breach with the Society was irreparable, she said that whenever the Monthly Meeting was convinced that ‘they had accused me wrongfully, they had only to confess it, and I could freely forgive them.’”<sup>M 79</sup> On another occasion, “Some traveling Friends paid a religious visit to her, advising her to ‘return, repent, and live.’ Before they left, she addressed them thus: ‘Friends, your preaching does not apply to me.’”<sup>Mott, 1880?</sup> Once she said, “‘I tell thee, Richard, thy *ipse dixit* <sup>26</sup> doesn’t pass for law with me.’”<sup>M 78-9</sup>

Her letters show that she was supported by friends in Hudson and in England. Although no longer a Friend she occasionally attended events in their meetinghouse and she kept up on the changes in the Society. Lucretia Mott wrote, “She lived to witness our Separation, and said that she had lived to see the Society divided on the ground on which she was disowned”<sup>Mott 1880?</sup>

Did she become a Unitarian? She was accused of Unitarian sympathies and she did share some of their views. She is known to have visited a leading Unitarian in London<sup>Ditchfield 1970</sup> and Jenkins claimed she mentioned the influence of a neighbor who was a doctor and a Unitarian (see above). Jenkins also wrote that later in life she joined a Unitarian church in Hudson and others have repeated this.<sup>J 380, H 120, Ingle 1998 10</sup> David Maxey reports that he could not find any evidence to support this.<sup>M 73-74</sup> He points out that she was not likely to accept any organizational boundaries and Unitarian membership was not mentioned in her obituaries, some of which noted the accusation of Unitarianism. Theophilus Lindsey wrote in 1801 that she intended to visit Joseph Priestly on her return to New York, but no record of such a visit exists (he died in early 1804).<sup>Ditchfield 1970 215</sup> In any case, many Unitarians were Biblical literalists and not impressed by the Quaker emphasis on individual religious experience. Her daughter apparently married a relative of a leading Hudson Universalist (see above). Perhaps HB attended services without becoming a member.

New interests? In October 1802, HB hinted to Samuel Wetherill that she had embarked on an important new project: “I reverently rejoice at times in a persuasion that the present is the most important Era of my life! wherein it has been providently put into my power to give superstition the greatest shock by existing the most extensive inquiry and independent investigation I have ever yet been able to do. My God if he please render it useful through his blessing to the present and succeeding generations!”<sup>HB to SW 1802</sup> She may have been writing about her trials: Foster later wrote that this was delayed by her illness in December 1802.<sup>F vii</sup> But was this narrative “the most extensive inquiry and independent investigation I have ever yet been able to do”? It is tempting to think that she was going in a new direction, perhaps toward a free religious society like the one Lucretia Mott helped establish in 1867.<sup>27</sup> The next line in the letter, after the words quoted above, is: “I shall be much obliged for an out<sup>t</sup> of the general plan of the Society of which thou art a

member. For tho I have heard of such an association I have never had any particular information respecting their principles, Worship, &<sup>c</sup>.”

Young people: HB frequently showed her sympathy for young people.<sup>WM 121, HB 1810 6-8</sup> Previously she had been involved with Friends schools and now she became the elected leader of an interdenominational Sunday School.<sup>28</sup> Her major endeavor at the end of her life focused on young rural homemakers (see *Dialogues...*, below).

Pacifism: HB’s position on the Bible was partially a result of her commitment to pacifism. God didn’t command the Jews to fight wars but permitted it, a distinction that threatened the Biblical justification of war. The Elders saw this as the beginning of the acceptance of all sorts of heretical interpretations of the Bible which would lead to personal excess and Ranterism. All sides saw that Quakerism needed reform; the choices were an emphasis on an individual’s Inner Light or on evangelical Christian doctrine. The first of these was also, for some, an emphasis on individual conscience and reason. Elias Hicks and Job Scott sometimes expressed skepticism about reason,<sup>H 192</sup> even as they relied on it.<sup>H 196, 231</sup> The only reference to light in HB’s *Dialogues...* was in the sense of the light of reason.

Throughout HB’s life there were wars in America or Europe.<sup>29</sup> Repeatedly she was in the difficult situation of supporting people who were rebelling but not the war they were fighting. She organized a peace society associated with Noah Worcester during the War of 1812. Hudson MM refused to let her use their building for these meetings, another instance of the problem of cooperation with nonQuakers in movements for social change which has divided Quakers many times.<sup>M 80-81</sup>

HB was passionate about her pacifism. She described the effects of the recent war in a letter to Thomas Foster in 1815: “Incalculable multitudes have by the *war* and its baneful precursors, embargoes, nonintercourses, and such like *nonsenses*, been thrown out of business to live as they could, and *if* the could. And this has not been all. Its demoralizing effects have been deplorably great! The multitude of idlers which such a state of things produces have, as might be expected, produced effects in public manners, which have been and still are, a source of sorrow, and even of terror, to the thinking and better part of the community.”<sup>M 80</sup>

Abolition: In the scant record we have of HB’s life, there is almost nothing about her position on slavery. There is an intriguing hint: in the 1800 census Peter Barnard’s household in Hudson included one free nonwhite person and one slave. None of the other six Barnard families in Hudson included any blacks, and nor did PB in earlier or later years. She was outspoken in support of servants’ rights like John Woolman whose writings she recommended to others. Owning slaves would be inconsistent with what we know of HB and PB and with Friends’ practice in NYYM at the time.<sup>30</sup> Were the Barnards providing aid to an escaped slave in 1800? Perhaps they could not lie to the census taker about the condition of the black people in their household or the situation might have been well known in the community making it difficult to hide. There were slaves in the area at this

time: a 3-year-old slave in adjacent Ulster county in 1800 later became well known as Sojourner Truth.

Close of her life: In January and May of 1825 HB wrote to Dr. James Mease<sup>31</sup> of Philadelphia. He had asked for information on the Board Bridge, apparently a particularly well built structure in Hudson. The letters are a lively blend of science, religion and autobiography. Details of the bridge's construction were given and then she commented on the lack of education of workers, blaming this on "the alarming ascendancy which Priestcraft has attained, and is in danger of further attaining, in our boasted land of civil and religious liberty. It is because the great bulk of our population are too much like the honest, Ignorant old woman in London; who believed Joseph Gurney Bevan was a wise man, and knew what was right, and she believed as he did. I have never forgot some sentiments expressed by an eminent writer I read more than thirty years ago; that 'Mankind are naturally religious, that they are also naturally credulous; and there have always been, so far as history bears us back an enterprising designing few, who have taken advantage, for selfish purposes, of these two propensities of human nature; and have formed an Engine out of the religion of human nature, and excited it on its credulity, calculated to play upon, and extinguish the light of reason, which was given as a guard to the one, and a kind companion to the other.'" She offered to provide further information as she is able, explaining, "The amelioration and improvement of human nature being a favorite object with me." After asking for his opinions on "the printed Document"<sup>32</sup> that she had sent previously, she wrote: "I have been sick since the middle of March more so than I have been in fourteen years. First with the prevailing Influenza and since with a vernal intermittent; but am now some better."<sup>HB to JM 5/24/1825</sup>

That fall, some weeks before her final illness, HB visited NY City. "She was received, a eulogist recorded, 'with the greatest cordiality' by Friends of her old acquaintance, and she experienced 'uncommon pleasure' in confirming 'the increasing spirit of inquiry, as well as the tolerant feelings, prevailing in the society to which she formerly belonged.'"<sup>M 85</sup>

"She died peacefully in her sleep on Sunday, November 27, 1825, with her husband and daughter at her bedside, the victim of inflammation of the lungs which had stayed with her, off and on, since her return from England."<sup>M 85</sup>

### **Hannah Barnard's *Dialogues*...**<sup>33</sup>

Near the end of her life, when she was 65, HB published a pamphlet that addressed a critical social need and served as a summary of her life. It is the only extended essay of hers that we have, aside from what she wrote about her hearings. The title is *Dialogues on Domestic and Rural Economy, and Fashionable Follies of the World. Interspersed with Occasional Observations on Some Popular Opinions. To Which is Added an Appendix, on Burns, etc. with their Treatment*. It is 84 small pages (7¾" x 4¾"), printed on rough, untrimmed paper by Samuel W. Clark in Hudson in 1820.<sup>34</sup>

The bulk of the pamphlet is a dialogue between 12 neighbors in a farm community near Hudson NY. Lady Homespun (LH) takes on the education of a young woman, Jenny Prinks. They talk about the skills a farmwife needs, the problems she will face, and a wide range of religious and political issues. Neighbors and family members drop in and they talk about events in their community, mentioning 67 people living nearby. This takes place in 16 scenes over a period of nine months. The dialogue occupies 67 pages, about 28,000 words (the font is small – between 9 and 10 points). The rest of the booklet is a two page preface, one page conclusion, and 12 page appendix.

This is essentially the script of a little play. It is entertaining and instructive. HB presents her vision of life as it could be, her utopia. She teaches the principles and practice of a good life, never losing sight of her designated audience, the farm wives around her. We will consider her comments on domestic science, religion and philosophy, organization of society, and women's place in society. Then we will look at her educational methods in the context of relations of teacher and student and the design of the pamphlet. We will end this section with comments on the *Dialogues* as autobiography.

Domestic science: HB calls her approach domestic science, domestic management, and rational economics. This is reason, observation, experiment and common sense applied to the multitude of tasks of a rural homemaker. “And when you have learnt to cook, wash, spin, weave, knit and sew, as well as [my three daughters], and read as much geography, history, useful biography, and other good books, and understand writing, arithmetic, etc. as well, I think it is very probable you will yet be as well married, and as respectably settled in the world as they are.”<sup>6</sup>

There are lectures on cooking calf's head and feet<sup>38</sup> and fish tongues and sounds (air bladders),<sup>62</sup> which is food that is often wasted. Other lectures cover feather washing,<sup>47</sup> candle making,<sup>58-59</sup> and the maintenance of crockery.<sup>60-61</sup> The author also briefly mentions ironing; baking; making cheese, sausage, bread, and soap; pot washing; gardening; weaving; sewing; bonnet making; painting floors and walls; various types of farming; and the treatment of several medical conditions.

HB calls for “the science of plain, wholesome, economical cookery”<sup>37-38</sup> and for cook-books based on “rational principles”.<sup>39</sup> For instance, she extols the “scientific dairy woman”<sup>25</sup>.

Of course, this sort of work by an educated woman might not be popular: she promises “to instruct you, not only in the general outlines of domestic economy, but in all its minutia. And let them sneer and look at their delicate hands, who have been brought up (if it may be called so) with the ridiculous, and pernicious expectation of being maintained by their husbands, if every they are married, like cripples in a hospital, only at a hundred or even a thousand fold more expence.”<sup>35</sup> 18, also see: 30, 18, 39

This science is based on “age, experience, and critical observation”<sup>30</sup> and “common sense”<sup>51, 62</sup>. She considers life an experiment and tells of being sickened by exposure to clouds of dirty feathers, and then, after recovering, doing it again to confirm the result!<sup>47</sup>

LH's husband is called "such an excellent experimentalist"<sup>68</sup> referring to his farming method. This requires a facility with numbers and measurement, so throughout the text we read of specific dates, times, distances, sizes, prices and quantities. This was not just in recipes, for instance: "you have heard of Mr. Spendthrift's severe illness; about fifteen months after he settled in this neighbourhood, for it was in August, which he brought on himself...at a wedding six miles off; and riding home at four in the morning against a sudden turn of cool N. W. wind...after the previous sultry heat of six days continuance. I was sent for three days later."<sup>19</sup> Here is another example: "Three years ago he asked me what I thought of his buying Mr. Slack's colt, five months old;...I replied...put it in the clover field and welcome, have some of your Indian corn ground fine, give it at least a quart a day till June...that will be the finest colt of its age within ten miles...This fall he took one hundred dollars for his colt!"<sup>67-68</sup> She is teaching her readers to attend to numbers and other details.

An important feature of HB's work are her repeated attacks on "the Fashionable Follies of the World"<sup>title</sup>. For instance in cooking, "I shall give you no directions for...how to make puff paste, floating islands, figuring rolls of butter, cut in two, into the appearance of pineapples, not to eat, but fantastically to ornament a table; potatoe carret or nutmeg pudding, unmeaningly named after the smallest ingredient in the composition, or tricking off calf's foot jelly, or yellow flummery, with caraway comfits, etc. with fifty or a hundred more things, of the same tribe, which in my independent, and as I think, appropriate manner of affixing names, I call domestic follies."<sup>39</sup>

She quotes William Penn on food: "Have few dishes, well cooked, the plainer the better."<sup>65</sup> At one point LH said to her guests, "(W)e are not going to make any pompous parade, only just prepare a rural repast of wholesome viands, for necessary refreshment",<sup>64</sup> but they sat down to boiled turkey, ham, veal cutlet, gravy, bread, beer, cheese, and probably garden vegetables and apple pie. Obviously the wise, healthy meal could still be a parade.

Among follies HB included novels. Uncle Thrifty says, "you must never again take another novel out of the library, nor indeed look into one at your peril! They are enough to turn the heads, and make romantic fools of half the young women from Maine to New-Orleans. If ever any set of persons, in modern times were busied in filling Pandora's box and raising it aloft, to burst and shed its infernal mischiefs down upon the earth, it is in my opinion the herd of novel writers."<sup>9</sup> The problem was not just the time lost in reading them but the example they set for young women. This was consistent with the Quaker aversion to many kinds of entertainment, as when John Woolman's warned against watching a juggler. To the objection that novels can teach appropriate moral values the author replies simply points out that we rarely see this and frequently see the opposite. Uncle Thrifty likens including morals in a novel to throwing a handful of glass beads into a mudhole with one gold one among them.<sup>9</sup>

HB hated follies because she saw that they help keep people in poverty. "I have often observed with regret, that the poor are guilty of as much egregious folly, in imitating the

extravagance of the rich, as they are in prodigally spending their time and property.”<sup>51</sup> She was convinced that the world could support all of us in comfort if we would just use our resources wisely.<sup>51, 62</sup> (A century and a half later Buckminster Fuller made this a central point of his approach.)

What is unusual in this manuscript is not the skills but the application of reason to the skills, the methods of teaching them, and the relation of all this to religion and ethics.

Religion and philosophy: HB gives us a tight synthesis of religion and ethics and science. For instance, LH advocates “making the following great summary of Christianity...your motive and rule of action, viz. Wherefore all things, whatsoever ye would that *men* should do to you, do ye even so to them, for by the help of God, to make this my rule in my conduct towards you; as I would wish another to do by a daughter or son of mine”<sup>37</sup> (This is a variant of the Golden Rule: do to the children of others as you would have them do unto your children. And she permits no exception for servants.<sup>54</sup>) She goes on to say it is her religious duty to speak of the treatment of servants, relating her personal experiences in homes where they were mistreated.<sup>44, 66-68</sup> She explains, “I have long laboured for that expansion of thought, which would enable me to estimate what would most likely tend to promote in the best manner, *the good of the whole*.”<sup>44</sup> Dr. Healall puts this in the form of a benediction: “So God bless you and your worthy husband; and your mutual, and able efforts, for your own comfort and happiness, and the good of all around you, as well as the substantial benefit of mankind.”<sup>37</sup> Note that she asks us to balance commitment to the whole and to ourselves as when she writes, “be faithful to your friends and yourselves”.<sup>55</sup>

HB is optimistic about human perfectibility: she knows how much can be learned if the methods and motivation are there: “It has led me to consider, what progress the human mind is capable of making in youth, under proper instructors, in the acquisition of useful knowledge, when duly impressed with the solemn import of the concise expression of Christ, viz. ‘Blessed are your eyes for they see, and your ears for they hear.’”<sup>36, 70</sup> This is a story of progress: all of the families presented as negative examples later see the light and improve. As well as people being saved, there are swamps drained to produce meadows, abandoned apple orchards recovered, run down houses made livable, and animals lives saved.

HB’s purpose is to “lead your attention to every thing which concerns your present and future welfare”<sup>37</sup> and her method is to apply science to human behavior. Her religion involves commitment to ethics, reason, and community: “I fully believe if mankind were truly wise, and they would be, if they made a proper use of their reason, they would soon be convinced, that they would be much more happy by amicably living one among another, than they ever can, by laying aside their reason, and letting their passions impel them on to imitate the mute legions of the deep, by living one upon another!”<sup>45</sup>

The words reason, reasoning, and reasonable appear time and again in this booklet, as well as the word rational, paired with economy, plan, cookbooks, sentiments and creature. LH promises Jenny Prinks, “I don’t despair of soon making you a rational crea-

ture”,<sup>6</sup> and at the end of the tale a reformed Mrs. Noble says, “I am now a rational creature”.<sup>57</sup> She looked forward to “neat, rational simplicity completely taking the place of costly, pompous parade”<sup>44</sup> She called on us “to aid the early openings of reason”<sup>46</sup> When asked how she came to her commitment to seat her servants at the family table, she replied “Reason, and a proper estimate of rational republican principles, inspired it!”<sup>65</sup>

She warns us not to be distracted by the views of others, saying cryptically, “The fountain does not rise above the source.” This single line captures her lifetime struggle to show the importance of direct contact with whatever is highest in our lives instead of relying on the interpretations of others.<sup>37</sup>

HB follows John Woolman in seeking a conscientious approach to daily life: “I...only wish you and I may duly regard all our duties of a more important nature”.<sup>63</sup> She writes, “I have long accustomed myself to draw useful moral inferences from even trifling incidents; like the bee that can extract honey from the flower, of even, a bitter plant.” She then uses an arithmetic problem to teach attention to details.<sup>63</sup>

A danger of religion is discussed by Harriet Prinks and Uncle Trusty: “**H**....don’t you think superstition and religious fanaticism have done as much mischief in the world as novels? **T**. Yes I do, and much more; for the latter is in reality, nothing but a mischievous infant, with tottering step; compared with the grim-visaged, grey-headed bigotry waving his flaming brand!”<sup>11</sup>

The emphasis on reason does not prevent a sincere belief in a deity and an afterlife. She calls on Christians to be “doers, of the will of their Father”<sup>54</sup> but immediately goes on to explain that this means living by the Golden Rule. There is no other mention of God’s will and no call to sit and wait for divine instruction. We already have the instruction and it is the Golden Rule. To help us find the way to do this she offers observation, experiment, reason, common sense and sound moral principals.

There is also mention of something else often described in supernatural terms: near the end of the story, when JP had learned many of LH’s secrets, the wise woman surprisingly begins to anticipate the thinking of others. This occurs nowhere else in the treatise and then it happens three times in three pages.<sup>59-61</sup> It seems to me to be modeled on a gathered meeting for worship: when fully centered, people can seemingly read each others minds. Typically, this is slipped into the narrative without fanfare – let those with eyes see and ears hear.

Organization of society: HB has a lot to say about how we live with each other.<sup>16</sup> Her touchstone is the good of the whole which, as I have said, is at the center of her religion. Wryly she acknowledges that the world may not be ready for this approach: “However, I am not vain enough to indulge the expectation that I shall ever reform the world. Yet I think it very allowable, thus to express the result of my own general observations on the various, and what I consider, the devious pursuits of many of the general family of those, who, among all the inhabitants of the earth are alone endowed with reasoning powers.”<sup>45</sup>

We see many clear statements of the need for balance in the relation of servants and masters.<sup>42, 44, 65-68</sup> She extends this to orphans who have her passionate support.<sup>53-54</sup> The charge of being an “absurd leveling anarchist” is rejected.<sup>67</sup> She seems to accept social classes in that the marriages she describes are between people in similar situations (servants marrying servants, etc.)<sup>71-72</sup> She also calls for balance in the relations between the farm wives and their husbands (see below).

Plain speaking helps maintain community health and many characters are notable for this (for instance, LH, Uncle Trusty, Dr. Healall, Judge Homespun, William, and Alethea).

Again and again HB points to the role of consequences in teaching and maintaining behavior: hunger makes mice hunt; sickness from dirty feathers teaches LH to keep them clean; families who lose their farms by pursuing follies helps neighbors moderate their behavior; criticism improves a students’ writing; and sharing the writing with others encourages the student to do more of it.<sup>20, 33, 48, 57, 58, 62, 64</sup> Scripture is quoted in support: “‘be not weary in well doing; for in due time ye shall reap, if ye faint not;’ and ‘cast they bread upon the waters, for it shall be gathered after many days.’”<sup>56</sup> HB looked at the behavior around her and reported what she saw. (A century later B. F. Skinner took a similar naturalistic approach and identified consequences as a central element in human behavior.)

HB also stressed the effect of neighbors modeling good or bad behavior for each other. She points out that “nothing teaches like example”<sup>19</sup> and then provides a catalog of them, both negative and positive. Lady Noble remarks, “Jenny and I have been over most parts of the house which has been an excellent school for me.”<sup>68</sup> Poor and rich alike imitate the follies of others, but this is an optimistic tale and consistently those who err are brought to reform their behavior with the help of their neighbors. The last line of the treatise extols LH and her husband, “the worthy old people, whose Christian example and precepts have so wonderfully diffused their benign influence over a large neighbourhood.”<sup>72</sup> (Elias Hicks also expressed this view.<sup>H 192</sup>)

HB points out the advantages of life in a home instead of a public institution for the indigent and ill. She asserts that poverty is an unnecessary state resulting from waste,<sup>41, 53</sup> and she gives a repeated and dramatic examples and all manner of instruction in avoiding such waste. Conservator laws designed to prevent financial ruin are recommended for public benefit. The objection that this violates individual liberty is dismissed because of the cost to everyone of supporting those who use their liberty to pursue their ruin.<sup>27-28</sup> Government is not trusted on taxes,<sup>67</sup> war,<sup>63</sup> and individual liberty.<sup>35</sup> In her enthusiasm for the American alternative in government with its protection of the common people she sounds like Tom Paine.<sup>65, 66</sup> In HB’s utopia people’s problems are addressed within families and between neighboring families. The government is a distant, sometimes threatening, but essentially good force.

Women’s place in society: The function of this treatise was to empower women, particularly rural farm wives. HB spent her life contesting in male dominated arenas. In her utopia gender roles are more in balance. “It will not be my fault, if you are not a help-meet

instead of a help *eat* merely to a husband.”<sup>18</sup> As Judge Homespun says, “Every family ought to have a head; but that head ought frequently to commune with the heart which belongs to it, in order to ascertain whether what it directs and enjoins, will bear an impartial comparison with the golden Christian standard.”<sup>67</sup> (That is, the husband and wife treat each other as they would be treated.) In her usual manner she doesn’t say she is advocating a revolution but simply builds the skills that will inevitably bring it about. For instance, Uncle Thrifty says, “men ought to do their duty, in rendering every thing as convenient for their wives as possible.”<sup>14</sup> It is the man’s responsibility to help set the conditions for the woman’s success.

LH’s advice sounds modern to our ears: “never commit your character to any person’s keeping but your own. Take care Jenny, to set a good honourable price upon yourself! never be in haste to change your single life, till some one of the other sex comes forward who is capable of estimating your merit, and is, in the opinion of you and your real friends worth enough, in point of real merit, to pay the full price.”

HB levels a barrage of complaints at the demeaning of women in literature and religion, using Milton’s poetry as her target.<sup>33-35</sup> She addresses the problem of “licentious advances,” advising a “dignified response” and “appalling frown”.<sup>67, 71</sup> Lucy Aikin’s poetry for women is quoted and recommended.<sup>38, 52-3, 63</sup>

HB even notices the problem of the male pronoun when she quotes the Golden Rule: “‘Wherefore *all things, whatsoever* ye would that *men (men, mind the comprehensive expression!) should do to you, do ye *even so to them*’”<sup>54</sup> Americans took about 150 years to begin to address that problem.*

This booklet is a practical contribution to the feminist literature that was beginning to emerge in her day (e.g. Mary Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication of the Rights of Women* was published in 1792). HB had a vision of rural homemaking as a difficult and vital profession that women could be proud of. She boldly outlined a scientific approach in which observation, common sense, reason, experiment, clear moral principles produces a smoothly functioning family within a network of local families. No woman had written about domestic science before, and few men.<sup>Jensen 1986 124-126</sup> Thirty years later it was apparent that appeals to individual women were insufficient and organizations would be needed to unite their voices and bring the reform HB dreamed of.

Relations of teacher and student: HB applied her approach to the question of how to impart these skills to young rural women. The students listen to a lecture and take notes. Then they write it up and the teacher corrects both the students’ and her own work. (This is an ancient method that was used before printing as a way for the students to get their own copies of the text.) This could be combined with teaching by example although this is not emphasized here, perhaps because the pamphlet was meant for people who do not have a teacher nearby.

An important additional component is for the student to teach others, which happens several times in this narrative. This not only helps the student but it spreads the skills in the

culture. (Frank Laubach, the literacy pioneer, had each student promise to teach ten others; their motto was, “Each one teach one.”)

HB may have preferred home schooling. This is suggested by the fact that LH educated her own children<sup>7</sup> and by the name HB gave the local schoolteacher: Experience Pain.<sup>10</sup>

Design of the pamphlet: HB also applied her reasonable approach to the question of how to present all this to the readers of her pamphlet. Numbers are included to encourage the reader to learn to handle them. The reader is even given the data needed for calculations: “Now Jenny, William has brought up the mare and saddled her; haste away at the rate of six miles an hour! and as you have but three to go, you will of course be there in half an hour after starting.”<sup>61</sup> Estimating the time of arrival was an important skill for the domestic manager. HB is teaching academic skills in a practical setting.

This pamphlet rewards the reader. It provides useful information, is easy to read and entertaining, and is optimistic with many examples of successful learning. There is also a lot of humor. Almost all the characters have names that suggest something of their behavior: there is Lady Homespun, Dr. Healall, the hired men William Worthy and Ben Trusty, and, of course, the teacher Experience Pain. The man who tries to squeeze money out of his neighbors is Mr. Scrapeall and the children’s nurse is Sukey (which I didn’t understand until I pronounced it “suckey”). There are many light hearted moments such as the exaggerated example of carelessness when Dr. Healall recalls, “I went down into the kitchen, to prepare a medicine for the sick man; the table stood in the way; Betty gave it a shove, when down went the leaf, with a waiter [tray] and dinner set of china, she had been washing! she made a fruitless effort to save it, and with her elbow, knocked off a large, elegant tureen, you know we had soup in for dinner. At that instant, Sukey was coming down stairs, with a waiter of tumblers, and wine glasses, who started at the crash, dropped and broke them all!”<sup>24</sup> HB knew her young readers would find this memorable.

The writing is brisk and positive. The paragraphs are dense with information and philosophical asides. There are maxims, “my mother used to say, no young woman was fit to enter on housekeeping, for only herself and husband, till she knew how to economise enough to starve a cat and make her catch mice for a living.”<sup>64</sup> And, “it is much easier to spoil and break, than it is to buy.”<sup>60</sup> There are many colorful sayings such as, “I..wish I knew half as much about it, as people say a pig does of longitude!”<sup>38</sup> and, “quite as plain and smooth, as the cataract of Niagara!”<sup>22</sup> Parents are advised to “teach the young idea how to shoot”<sup>46</sup> Her metaphors can be complex. During the discussion of laws to prevent financial ruin she complains of people “using their civic privileges as a hog does his legs, to help him in and out of one mudhole after another, parading along in all the pomp of swinish independence, brushing his smeared sides against every passenger he happens to meet”<sup>28</sup> If a neighbor does not use reason and common sense “she will cut much such another figure, in my opinion, as a monkey would, in managing a carding machine, washing feathers, or making mince pies!”<sup>51</sup> She describes desperate economic conditions as “the cry of hard times, or the crack of bankruptcies, equal to that of trees in a forest, writhing and snapping under the awful impetus of a hurricane”<sup>21</sup>

HB had broad educational goals, as is shown by the books she recommended:<sup>12, 52-53, 54, 63, 66</sup> This included chapters from the New Testament, works by William Penn and John Woolman, and books on economy, English, arithmetic, geography, and women's poetry.<sup>39</sup>

Sequencing of tasks is recommended for instructional effect. For instance, LH read a selection of poetry and Jenny said, "I am delighted with your quotation; have you the book you took it from?" LH replied, "Yes; but I have purposely kept it out of your hands, and shall, till you get through your alternate evening lessons in arithmetic, and Morse's Geography, you have made such fine progress in".<sup>53</sup>

The philosophical or religious points, and a lot of practical suggestions, are only briefly mentioned. The readers who want to find them will.

In this little drama, this series of parables, HB presents her vision of a utopia in which reason defeats chaos. It is packaged specifically for her audience, as a chapbook to be distributed from farm to farm by peddlers. (She mentioned such peddlers on page 6.)

*Dialogues... as autobiography:* Part of the fascination of this writing is that it is so clearly autobiographical. Jenny Prinks' father falls into debt and has to leave his family which is what happened to HB.<sup>40, 5, 27</sup> LH was not raised Quaker<sup>12</sup>, emphasizes note taking, defends servants,<sup>44, 66-68</sup> and recalls a particular debate<sup>35-36</sup> – all of which we recognize. HB's plain speaking is notable in the characters of LH and Dr. Healall. Judge Homespun is remarkably like Peter Barnard according to the few descriptions we have of that man in his open manner, immoderate laugh, and teasing way with young women.<sup>41, 24, 29</sup> The drama is set in the Hudson area: the only place name is Claverack which is four miles east of Hudson.<sup>46</sup>

Many other features are less certainly but still quite possibly autobiographical. The name Jenny Prinks is an acronym of Jenkins. Many characters stand in for HB, including LH, Jenny Prinks, Dr. Healall, Judge Homespun, Uncle Thrifty and Thomas Jenkins.<sup>42</sup> LH particularly represents HB's religious views, her emphasis on reason, her domestic skills and her general optimism.

Once we see that HB is salting in her own experiences, we look at everything for hints about her history. One wonders if HB had three daughters<sup>6</sup> whom she taught at home (this could include step-daughters), and if the youngest married two years before the pamphlet was written.<sup>43, 7</sup> It seems likely to me that HB taught homemaking skills to many young women. The reference to LH's complexion<sup>29</sup> fits with reports we have about HB. Was Dr. Healall the Unitarian neighbor doctor who HB cited to James Jenkins? There is an authentic ring to LH's story of encountering Milton at 18 and thus learning to form her own opinions.<sup>44, 35</sup>

In summary, this isn't great literature but it is entertaining and informative and potentially useful. She had a general approach could be applied to any human behavior and she pointed it at a problem that she recognized as critical to society's future: that of young

women on farms. She generated a wide array of practical suggestions and wove in her personal views and autobiographical details. And through it all she was laughing with us and encouraging us.

### Lucretia Mott and Hannah Barnard

Lucretia Mott and HB were both outspoken Quaker women from Nantucket with similar doctrinal and social views. Mott refused to be controlled by her meeting but she also refused to leave it. She loved being a skeptic: “I hold that skepticism is a religious duty. Men should question their theology and doubt more in order that they might believe more.”<sup>»Schreiner 1955 184</sup> In 1849 Mott said, “I confess to you, my friends, that I am a worshipper after the way called heresy, a believer after the manner many deem infidel. While at the same time my faith is firm in the blessed, the eternal doctrine preached by Jesus and by every child of God since the creation of the world, especially the great truth that God is the teacher of his people himself; the doctrine that Jesus most emphatically taught, that the kingdom is with man, that there is his sacred and divine temple.”<sup>»Bacon 1980/1999 136-137</sup>

Like Barnard, Mott was a rationalist: “The miraculous she rejected completely, using the word *superstition* to include this as well as any other uncritical acceptance of scriptural tradition or psychic phenomena. She referred to many an evil as springing from a *superstitious* rather than a *rational* nature, and noted when recommending Woolman’s *Journal* to a friend that she could not defend ‘the visionary part and ever thought the early Quakers too superstitious.’ The words *visionary* and *superstitious* were thus coupled together and contrasted with *rational*, which elsewhere was made synonymous with truth. This comes close to the heart of her heresy, for it seems at times to involve a rejection of the mystical hypothesis itself. The expression ‘the Light Within’ was often upon her lips, but analysis reveals that ‘Divine Light of Reason’ was more nearly what she meant by it.”<sup>»Schreiner 1955 184</sup> We hear echoes of HB in the views of Lucretia Mott.

When Elizabeth Cady Stanton was writing a history of leading women she asked Mott who else had come from the island of Nantucket. Mott cited HB and wrote, “She traveled in England, & was there *deposed* by the ruling powers ^in the Society of course,^ for daring to express doubts of the Divine authority of the Jewish Wars – as well as ~~far~~ more openly than Friends were wont, to deny the atonement & scheme of Salvation. She returned home to Hudson & was much respected thro’ a long life for her good works”<sup>45</sup>,<sup>Mott 1855</sup> On another occasion Mott wrote to a friend, “Her letter in reply to the Elders was an excellent production, stating her own case clearly, and the injustice of the treatment which she had received, saying, that when she had preached against war, as never having been prosecuted by the command of the Divinity, she had been accused of denying the authenticity of the Scriptures; and whereas Jesus had faith in Moses, therefore she denied Jesus, and was an infidel.”<sup>»Mott 1880?</sup>

Mott had a collection of HB’s papers that were important to her: “The papers were sent to us by our mother Mott, with the certificate and other papers. I valued them highly, and often sent them to our Friends, John Comly and others; but at length they disappeared and

no search could restore them; so that I have sometimes feared a pious fraud had been practiced. Among the papers was Hannah Barnard's creed, opposed to any 'scheme of salvation.'"<sup>Mott 1880?</sup> My guess is these were papers James Mott, Sr. and his wife Anna Mott accumulated during HB's trials, rather than a collection received from HB's estate.

### **Publications about Hannah Barnard**

A brief pamphlet war followed her judgment between her critics, "Christicola" (John Bevans Jr.) and "Vindex" (Joseph Gurney Bevan), and her supporters, "Amicus" (William Matthews), "Verax" (John Evans) and Thomas Foster (who was disowned for holding Barnardian views in 1814) (Jones, 1921, p. 306). We will always be in debt to the chroniclers of HB's time who saw the importance of setting down full accounts of what had transpired, particularly Hannah Barnard herself (1800), Thomas Foster (with assistance from HB, 1801 and 1804), William Matthews (1802-03) and James Jenkins (written in 1822, published by Frost in 1984). There was a review of Foster's pamphlets in *Gentleman's Magazine* (1805, vol. 24, p. 734) and Foster published letters from HB in the *Monthly Repository* (1815, vol. 10, pp. 321-322 and 484-486).<sup>Ditchfield 1970 214</sup>

Soon after the schism in Philadelphia, the orthodox Quaker journal, *The Friend*, published William Savery's 1801 letter associating HB with Joseph Priestly and Elias Hicks.<sup>S.R. 1827</sup> In 1835 an admirer pirated the portion of HB's fictional *Dialogues... on Milton's poetry* and published it as the transcript of an actual conversation between HB and a doctor, supposedly recorded in Hudson the year before HB died! Probably few readers knew of the 1820 pamphlet from which this came. In Britain, Luke Howard reprinted much of Foster's 1801 and 1804 pamphlets in his newspaper, *The Yorkshireman*, in 1836. There were occasional references to her disownment through the rest of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>46</sup>

There was a change in how HB was portrayed soon after the birth of modern Quakerism in Britain in 1895 and America in 1900. In 1902 Edward Grubb made her the subject of the first chapter in his series, "Pictures of the Past," in *The British Friend*. After describing her case and the reactions it caused and quoting from original materials, he concluded: "For more than half a century the name of Hannah Barnard was associated in the minds of most Friends in England with that of Tom Paine, as a sort of impersonation of evil. To us it is clear that in some of her opinions, specifically those concerning the Old Testament, she did but anticipate, when the church was unprepared to receive it, much that is now as certain as that the earth revolves on its axis. Some extravagance there no doubt was, some danger to weak and unstable souls in her defiance of authority. It would be folly to claim for her an all-round vision of the truth of God, but we may well regret that she was not treated with more loving patience. On both sides there were faults of temper; the letting loose of strife drove the combatants, as it always does, further apart. If each party had been willing to wait, and to devote themselves in humility to setting forth what was inwardly revealed to them, without attacking what was not, they would probably have found, ere long, that on fundamentals they were sufficiently at one. But patience and wise tolerance is a virtue we are slow to learn."<sup>47</sup> Grubb 1902 260

This new perspective continued with Rufus Jones' full account of the Barnardian controversy in *The Later Periods of Quakerism* in 1921, already quoted.<sup>Jones 299-311</sup> James Jenkins' useful recollections of events were published in a condensed version in 1930.<sup>Penny 1930</sup>

More recently, HB was barely mentioned in many Quaker histories.<sup>48</sup> An article about her is in the biographical dictionary, *Notable American Women 1607-1950* (1971; entry by T. D. Seymour Bassett, a Quaker historian).<sup>49</sup> Barbour & Frost barely mentioned her in the main text of *The Quakers* but there is a short biography in the back of the book (1988, pp. 170, 289-90). Margaret Hope Bacon gave her scant attention in *Mothers of Feminism: The Story of Quaker Women in America*, perhaps because HB's feminist writing had not been described in print at that time and it is unclear how many people read it in the first place.<sup>Bacon 1986 40-41, 91</sup> HB was little noted in Larry Ingle's *Quakers in Conflict*,<sup>1998 9-10, 12, 14</sup> but he did contribute an entry in *American National Biography*.<sup>1999</sup>

Recently, the situation has been improving. In 1956 Bliss Forbush looked closely at the relations between HB and Elias Hicks.<sup>H 112, 118-122, 141, 185, 208, 216, 280, 311</sup> James Jenkins' journal was published by J. William Frost in 1984, and, in 1989, David Maxey shed new light on HB's life after she left Quakers. In 1996 Chuck Fager published a summary of what we know in *Friends Journal*. Two letters published in response show us some of the reactions HB evokes today. One contrasted her combativeness with John Woolman's ability to melt hearts and questioned the relevance of a 200-year-old schism to relations among Friends today.<sup>Bassett, 1996</sup> (the writer had published a biographical essay on HB, above). The other letter rejected both sides of the controversy ("anything-goes Rant-erism" and Quakerism "indistinguishable from mainstream Protestantism"), warned against the "posthumous baptism" of heroes, and criticized HB for making her forgiveness conditional on her accusers' repentance.<sup>Thompson, 1996</sup>

Part of the problem has been how little HB published: just two pamphlets of her own (1800 and 1820) and the two she co-authored with Thomas Foster (1801 and 1804). If she wrote a journal it is apparently lost. She was demonized and then almost forgotten. She left the Religious Society of Friends, unlike Lucretia Mott who stayed despite the conflicts, partly for the sake of the young people.<sup>Bacon 1980/1999 166</sup> Historians were more interested in the dramatic events that soon followed. Most descriptions of HB today focus on one issue, her disownment, as Quaker historian Emma Lapsanski-Werner recently told me, waving a hand in frustration.

In my view, HB's story can help us address issues that are important today. She was willing to suffer, to be guided by her conscience, even when the personal cost was great. She looked ahead to a time when religion is held accountable by reason, when Quakers unite in loving each other and healing the world even as they differ, when women participate as men do, and leaders follow as well as lead. HB was an independent woman of conscience who had a vision for the Religious Society of Friends, and for society in general, that was far ahead of her time – and to an important degree, ahead of our time, too.

## Testimonials

From a note by William Matthews, added to a letter from HB sometime before his death c. 1808: “This letter is from Hannah Barnard of Hudson in the province of New York. She was an extraordinary woman for understanding and the Gift of Eloquence as a public speaker. She traveled in that Character among the People called Quakers, and sometimes had Meetings with mixed Congregations in the open air. But her Excellencies excited jealousy among her own people who soon found occasion to impeach her of what they called unsound Faith, and after giving her much Trouble both here and in America accomplished her Excommunication from their Church. She afterwards betook herself to useful domestic Pursuits & became the chosen Head of mixed Sunday Schools around her. She was an Honour to the Quakers; but of whom they were not worthy.”<sup>HB to WM 1802</sup>

From the preface of Thomas Foster’s *Narrative...* (1804): “She once held a distinguished place in the estimation of the Society; her active virtues, and the amiable qualities of her character, procured her a large acquaintance; and, amongst these, she *seemed* to have many warm friends. From the sunshine of general esteem and approbation, as a minister, she is now retired to the shade of private life, and her character has become the subject of much obloquy. A correspondent change has taken place in the feelings and conduct of several of her former friends; but there yet remain some, whose favorable opinion of her integrity and worth, has been confirmed by the manner in which she has acquitted herself, under circumstances of peculiar difficulty and trial; and from the continued friendship of these, she will probably derive some consolation and support.”<sup>F 1804 xv-xvi</sup>

From an anonymous obituary copied on the back page of the copy of Foster’s 1804 pamphlet in Haverford College: “Hannah Barnard. This ancient & venerable female, who for many years past has justly supported the character of a practical preacher of righteousness, has now ceased from her labours of love, & quietly, without a sigh or a groan, closed her eventful life on the morning of the 27<sup>th</sup> ultimo, at her residence in the City of Hudson, state of New York — she having been a sojourner on this earth for more than three score & ten years; during which period she has travelled through England, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, & the Scilly Isles. She followed the example & promulgated the peaceful precept of Jesus, by going about doing good, not only to the Souls, but bodies of the sons of tribulation, & daughters of affliction.

“She visited the sick, & administered to their medical. She poured the wine & oil of consolation into the wounded mind, & sympathized with them in the hour of affliction. She bore a pointed testimony against the popular delusions of the day, & strove boldly to tear asunder the veil of hypocrisy, & to expose the sad effects of Ecclesiastical Tyranny, Intolerance & Superstition in all its deformities — her noble mind was enriched with wisdom, & stored with useful knowledge, which operating upon the reasonable faculties of her soul produced the united virtues of piety, benevolence, fortitude & integrity — Yet notwithstanding all these christian virtues & real marks of discipleship, she was calumniated & persecuted (by formal degenerated professors) as all the righteous who have gone to rest before her have suffered.

“The person who traced these lines from an intimate acquaintance with her, deems them but a humble & just tribute, due to her useful & memorable life — her works of mercy & labours of love, are at an end — her tranquil spirit which long animated an enfeebled tenement, has returned to Him who gave it & we are firm in the belief, sweetly reposed ‘where trouble ceaseth, & the weary Soul is at rest’ — Go gentle reader & emulate her virtues. 12 m<sup>o</sup> 9<sup>th</sup> 1825”<sup>F 1804 back cover</sup>

From a message by Lucretia Mott during a meeting for worship in 1849: “This generation is indebted to...Hannah Barnard who came forth amid the darkness and error that prevailed and, in this country as well as in England, bore a noble testimony to truth as opposed to superstition and tradition. She exposed the benighted reliance on Jewish authority which led the people to find sanction for war and other evils and abuses, rebuking them for their sin and great wrongs sustained by an unwarrantable use of the Scriptures. Her name was cast out as evil and trampled upon by those high in authority, both in England and in this country. But she lived to see the spread of true principles in the ministry of Elias Hicks and others, and could say ‘now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace.’ In view of these and other laborers in the vineyard of truth, we may well say that, ‘Mighty powers are at work in the world, and who shall stay them?’”<sup>50</sup>

## REFERENCES

- American National Biography, Vol. 2* (1999). “Barnard, Hannah Jenkins” by H. Larry Ingle. NY: Oxford University Press, 177-178
- Anonymous (1825). “Hannah Barnard” (obituary) (unknown newspaper). Copy on back of Thomas Foster (1804) at Haverford College.
- Bacon, Margaret Hope (1980). *Valiant Friend: The Life of Lucretia Mott*. NY: Walker and Company. Reprinted in 1999, Philadelphia PA: Friends General Conference
- Bacon, Margaret Hope (1986). *Mothers of Feminism: The Story of Quaker Women in America*. Philadelphia PA: Friends General Conference
- Bacon, Margaret Hope (1988). “Quaker Women in Overseas Ministry” *Quaker History* 77(2) 93-?
- Bacon, Margaret Hope (1994). “The Establishment of London Women’s Yearly Meeting: A Transatlantic Concern. *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 57(1), incl. 161
- Barbour, Hugh and J. William Frost (1988). *The Quakers*. Richmond IN: Friends United Press
- Barbour, Hugh, Christopher Densmore, Elizabeth H. Moger, Nancy C. Sorel, Alson D. Van Wagner, and Arthur J. Worrall (1995). *Quaker Crosscurrents: Three Hundred Years of Friends in the New York Yearly Meetings* Syracuse NY: Syracuse University Press
- Barnard, Hannah (1795). *Letter to Henry Drinker, May 28, 1795*. In "George Vaux Collection of Correspondence and Documents, 1659-1914," MSS # 1167, at Special Collections, Haverford College
- Barnard, Hannah (1800). *A Summary of Christian Faith*. Also in Howard pp. 21-22; Jenkins, pp. 343-344; Matthews pp. 115-119

- Barnard, Hannah (1802). *Letter to William Matthews, September 6, 1802*. In "Letters of American Friends," MSS # 851 Box 1, at Special Collections, Haverford College
- Barnard, Hannah (1802). *Letter to Samuel Wetherill, October 25, 1802*. In "Samuel Wetherill Correspondence," RG-257, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College
- Barnard, Hannah (1803). *Letter to Samuel Wetherill, January 3, 1803*. In "Samuel Wetherill Correspondence," RG-257, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College
- Barnard, Hannah (1820). *Dialogues on Domestic and Rural Economy, and Fashionable Follies of the World. Interspersed with Occasional Observations on Some Popular Opinions. To Which is Added an Appendix, on Burns, etc. with their Treatment*. Hudson NY: (Samuel W. Clark)
- Barnard, Hannah (1825). *Letter to Dr. James Mease, January 10, 1825*. In "Philadelphia Society for Promoting Agriculture," Ms.Coll.92, Folder 8, at the Rare Book and Manuscript Library of the University of Pennsylvania.
- Barnard, Hannah (1825). *Letter to Dr. James Mease, May 24, 1825*. In "Philadelphia Society for Promoting Agriculture," Ms.Coll.92, Folder 8, at the Rare Book and Manuscript Library of the University of Pennsylvania.
- Bassett, Thomas (1996). "Hannah Barnard" (letter to the editor) *Friends Journal* 42(5) 4-5
- Brinton, Howard H. (1965). *Friends for 300 Years*. Wallingford PA: Pendle Hill Publications. Also published as *Friends for 350 Years*. Wallingford PA: Pendle Hill Publications (2002)
- Brock, Peter (1868). *Pioneers of the Peaceable Kingdom*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Coggeshall, Elizabeth (1908). *Love, Faith and Service*. Philadelphia: Wm. H. Pile's Sons
- Ditchfield, G. M. (1970). "A Quaker-Unitarian Encounter in 1801" *Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society*, 14(4) pp. 209-217
- Ellis, Franklin (1878). *History of Columbia County, New York*. Philadelphia: Everts & Ensign
- Fager, Chuck (1996). "Hannah Barnard – A Liberal Quaker Hero" *Friends Journal* 42(1) 11-12
- Fager, Chuck (1996). *Without Apology: The Heroes, the Heritage and the Hope of Liberal Quakerism*. Bellefonte PA: Kimo Press
- Forbush, Bliss (1956). *Elias Hicks: Quaker Liberal*. NY: Columbia University Press
- Foster, Thomas (1801). *An Appeal to the Society of Friends on the Primitive Simplicity of their Christian Principles and Church Discipline; and on Some Recent Proceedings in the Said Society*. London, J. Johnson
- Foster, Thomas (1804). *A Narrative of the Proceedings in America, of the Society Called Quakers, in the Case of Hannah Barnard...* London: J. Johnson
- Frost, J. William (1984). *The Records and Recollections of James Jenkins*. Texts and Studies in Religion, Vol. 18. NY: Edwin Mellen Press (pp. 339-380)
- Fry, Katharine and Rachel Elizabeth Cresswell (Eds.) (1974). *Memoir of the Life of Elizabeth Fry with Extracts from Her Journal and Letters*. Montclair NJ: Patterson Smith
- Greene, Dana (Ed.) (1980). *Lucretia Mott: Her Complete Speeches and Sermons*. NY: Edwin Mellen Press
- Grubb, Edward (1902). "Pictures of the Past. I. Hannah Barnard" *The British Friend* 11(11), 257-260

- Hallowell, Anna Davis (1884). *James and Lucretia Mott. Life and Letters*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co.
- Hinshaw, William Wade (1936-1950). *Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy*. 6 vols. Ann Arbor MI: Edwards Brothers
- Hodgson, William (1875). *The Society of Friends in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I*. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co.
- Howard, Luke (1936). "A Chronological Summary of events and circumstances connected with the origin and progress of the doctrine and practices of the Quakers" *The Yorkshireman* 98, 17-28; "Some Further Account of Hannah Barnard, to the Time of her being disowned by Friends in America" 100, 60-64; "Some further Account of Hannah Barnard, to the time of her being disowned by Friends in America" 101, 70-77
- Hull, Henry (1840). "Journal" *The Friends Library* 4, 247. Also in *The Friend* 34(12), 89
- Hull, Tiddeman and Hannah Jenkins (1905). "Copy of the Testimony of Denial from Hudson Monthly Meeting..." *The Friend* Fourth Month 1, 299
- Hull, Tiddeman and Hannah Jenkins (1905). "Copy of the Testimony of Denial from Hudson Monthly Meeting..." *The Friend* Sixth Month 24, 396
- Janney, Samuel (1867). *History of the Religious Society of Friends from its Rise to the Year 1828*. Philadelphia PA: T. Ellwood Zell
- Jensen, Joan (1986). *Loosening the Bonds: Mid-Atlantic Farm Women, 1750-1850*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Jones, Rufus (1921). *The Later Periods of Quakerism* London: Macmillan
- Ingle, H. Larry (1998). *Quakers in Conflict: The Hicksite Reformation*. Wallingford PA: Pendle Hill Publications
- Matthews, William (1802). *The Recorder*. London: J. Johnson
- Maxey, David W. (1989). "New Light on Hannah Barnard, A Quaker 'Heretic'" *Quaker History* 78(2), 61-86
- Monthly Meeting of New York (1852). *Memorial of the Monthly Meeting of New York Concerning Elizabeth Coggeshall*. NY: James Egbert
- Mott, James Sr. (1814). *Lawfulness of War for Christians Examined*. New York: Samuel Wood
- Mott, Lucretia (1849). *Sermon, September 16, 1849*. In *Lucretia Mott: Her Complete Speeches and Sermons*, ed. Dana Greene. NY: Edwin Mellen Press
- Mott, Lucretia (1880?) *Letter to Phebe Earle Gibbons*. In Anna Davis Hallowell, *James and Lucretia Mott. Life and Letters*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1884, pp. 477-479
- Notable American Women 1607-1950: A Biographical Dictionary Vol. I* (1971). "Barnard, Hannah Jenkins" by T. D. Seymour Bassett, Cambridge MA: Belknap Press/Harvard University Press, 88-90
- Palmer, Beverly Wilson (Ed.) (2002). *Selected Letters of Lucretia Coffin Mott*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press
- Penny, Norman (1930). *Pen Pictures of London Yearly Meeting, 1789-1833*. Philadelphia PA: Friends Historical Society
- Punshon, John. (1984). *Portrait In Grey: A Short History Of The Quakers*, London: Quaker Home Service
- Russell, Elbert (1942). *The History of Quakerism*. NY: Macmillan

- Schreiner, Albert C. (1955). "Lucretia Mott - Quaker Saint or Heretic?" *Friends Journal* Sept. 17, pp. 183-184
- Smith, Joseph (1893). *Supplement to a Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books*. London: Edward Hicks Jr.
- Society of Friends (1919). *London Yearly Meeting During 250 Years*. London: (author)
- S. R. (1827). "Letter to The Friend". *The Friend*. 1 (5), 37-38
- Taylor, Francis R. (1925). *Life of William Savery of Philadelphia 1750-1804*. NY: Macmillan
- Thomas, Allen C. and Richard H. Thomas (1895). *A History of the Society of Friends in America*. Philadelphia: John C. Winston
- Thompson, Paul (1996). "Hannah Barnard" (letter to the editor) *Friends Journal* 42(5) 5-6
- Tolles, Frederick B. Tolles (1959). "The New Light Quakers of Lynn and New Bedford," *New England Quarterly* 22, 291-319
- Vaux, George (1899). "The Beacon Controversy" *The Friend* 72(44) 349-350
- Wetherill, Charles (2002). *History of the Free Quakers*. Washington DC: Ross and Perry Woods, Joseph (1925). "Joseph Woods to William Matthews" *Quaker History* 22, 81-84

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Many people have helped with my research on the progressive tradition among Friends. These include Margaret Hope Bacon, Chuck Fager, David Boulton and others at [www.nontheistfriends.org](http://www.nontheistfriends.org), Chris Densmore and others at Swarthmore College, Ann Upton and others at Haverford College, Rita Varley and others at the PYM library, and Francis Szasz and others at Hudson Monthly Meeting.

<sup>2</sup> References are given in superscripts, some with a letter and page number. <sup>F</sup> refers to Thomas Foster's two pamphlets (see References). <sup>H</sup> is Elias Hicks' biography by Bliss Forbush. <sup>HB</sup> is Hannah Barnard's writings. <sup>I</sup> is internet listings including those on [www.ancestry.com](http://www.ancestry.com) and [www.familysearch.org](http://www.familysearch.org), [www.usgenweb.com](http://www.usgenweb.com), and [www.genforum.genealogy.com](http://www.genforum.genealogy.com). <sup>J</sup> is James Jenkins' diary. <sup>M</sup> is David W. Maxey's article. <sup>N</sup> is *Notable American Women*. <sup>WM</sup> is William Matthew's *The Recorder*.

<sup>3</sup> HB could have had Native American ancestors, as Howard suggested. Her father's family lived in New England for many generations. We are entirely ignorant of HB's mother's background. As well as high cheek bones she had black eyes and a complexion that Jenkins contrasts with that of an Englishwoman (although the reference is obscure). HB mocks her "delicate complexion" in *Dialogues...*: "I am not afraid of tarnishing my delicate complexion, or spoiling kid shoes (which by-the-bye, I never wear) by walking the rounds now and then, to see whether all is going right out doors, as well as in."<sup>HB 1810 29</sup> It might be helpful to look at anything HB had to say about American Indians. For example, she described their resistance to the "missionaries' persuasions" and lauded their belief in a just afterlife.<sup>Howard 1836 23</sup> In *Dialogues...* she mentions "Indian dough" and "Indian corn".<sup>HB 1810 60, 67</sup>

<sup>4</sup> In a letter to Samuel Wetherill HB writes "my frail and often Deeply tried constitution at the advanced age of almost 48 years." The letter is dated "3<sup>rd</sup> of 1 m<sup>o</sup> 1802" but the contents are very similar to a letter from HB to Thomas Foster dated "1<sup>st</sup> mo. 1803"<sup>F vii</sup> The later letter date corresponds to known events and so the date on the Wetherill letter is probably the familiar error of writing last year's date at the beginning of January. This means HB was born not long after January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1755. By the old calendar, in which the new year started on the Ides of March, her birthday would be in late 1754 which might account for some of the confusion.

<sup>5</sup> I am indebted to Francis Szasz of Hudson MM for this and many other nuggets of information. Her enthusiasm for Hannah Barnard and her story has been an very acceptable lift (in the language of the Hannah's day).

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Foster (1759/60-1834) supported HB during her controversy and published pamphlets in 1801 and 1804 giving the most detailed account we have of the proceedings. Hannah Barnard corresponded with him during the preparation of the pamphlets and much of the text is from her letters. In 1814 Thomas Foster was disowned by London YM for his Barnardian views.

<sup>7</sup> Peter Barnard (4/1748-3/11/1830)<sup>Hinshaw</sup> was the son of Peter and Anna Starbuck Barnard. He and Lucretia Coffin Mott were cousins from Nantucket (he was a 2<sup>nd</sup> cousin of her mother, Anne Folger Coffin, and a 3<sup>rd</sup> cousin of her father, Thomas Coffin). Although Hannah Jenkins was born in Nantucket I have found no relation to LCM. Her family had lived in Dartmouth and Sandwich MA and may have been in Nantucket only briefly.

PB was a distant cousin of the man for whom Barnard College was named. That was Frederick A. P. Barnard (1809-1889), educator and mathematician, a deaf person, President of Columbia College 1864-1889. His long tenure ended just as Barnard College was launched and it was named after him. His great-grandfather was PB's third cousin.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>8</sup> According to records on the internet, Peter Barnard Jr. (3/2/1746,7 – 3/7/1830 Hudson) m Rebecca Hussey (b. 9/4/1748) 12/20/1769 Dartmouth Bristol MA. Different records apportion the children differently to the two marriages of PB Jr. The internet gives Seth the dates c. 1770-1/1794, has Rebecca m. William McKinstry, and Christopher m. Sally Little (although the census records suggest our CB's widow was Elizabeth.)

<sup>9</sup> All of the following census records are from the City of Hudson, Columbia Co. NY. When more than one person was in a given age category the number of people is followed by "x" and then the age group. Where no last name is given it is the same as the preceding last name.

1790 Peter Bernard, males: 4 under 16, 2 over 16; females 5.

1800 Peter Bernard, males: 10-16, 2x45 and over; females: 2x16-26, 45 and over; one free black, one slave. [this is the only census that listed blacks in the household; HB was in Europe where she might be found in the 1801 British Census]

1810 Peter Barnard, males 16-26, 26-45, 2x45 and over; females: 16-26, 45 and over.

1820 Peter Bernard, male: 45 and over; female: 45 and over. [next door was the following:]

1820 Christopher Bernard, males: 0-10, 26-45; females: 0-10, 26-45.

1830 Elizabeth Barnard, males: 15-20, 50-60; females: 5-10, 2x15-20, 2x40-50. [with the same neighbors as PB in 1790, 1800 and 1810 (in 1820 the list was alphabetical)]

1840 Elizabeth Barnard, males: 20-30, 50-60; females 15-20, 20-30, 40-50. [Ward 1, similar neighbors to 1830]

1850 Elizabeth Barnard 60 (born in CT, no occupation listed, \$2000 real estate), Mary E. 30 (b. NY, no occupation listed), Robert F. 28 (b. NY, cabinet maker), Francis Blanchard 31 (b. MA, music teacher), Jane 27 (b. NY, no occupation listed), Mary 2 (b. NY). [Ward 1, some of same neighbors as 1840]

1860 Frances A. Blanchard 42 (music teacher), Jane N. 39, Mary R. 12, Betsey R. Barnard 70, Mary C. 48, Robert P. (painter), Mary Flarty 18 (b. NY, servant). [Ward 1, same birth locations as in 1850, different neighbors, I don't know when they moved away from the Main St. house]

1870 Francis A. Blanchard 52 (musician, \$4000), Jane M. 49, Mary R. 22, Mary Barnard 58, Robert 55 (house painter), Rufus Palen 27 (deputy postmaster). [Ward 1]

1880 Jane M. Blanchard 59 (widow, keeping house), Robert P. Barnard 65 (brother, single, house painter, employed 4 months in last year), Mary R. Graves 32 (daughter), Richard 38 (son-in-law, deputy U.S. ? \_\_, born in NY and parents likewise), William H. 2 (grandson), Francis B. 1 (grandson). [1<sup>st</sup> Ward]

1900 Mary Graves 47 (b. Sept. 1852, widow, 2 children born and 2 living, organist, renter), William H. 22 (b. Sept. 1877, clerk), Robert B. 18 (b. Oct. 1881, at school). [Ward 2, Warren St., living in the same building as the family of Clark and Anna Millard]

1910 Mary B. Graves 52 (widow, 4 children born and 2 living, \_\_\_?\_\_\_ teacher in school), William H. 32 (salesman in hardware store), Robert B. 28 (chemist in chemical works). [2<sup>nd</sup> Ward, 136 Warren St.]

1920 Mary B. Graves 72 (widow, renter, no occupation listed), Robert B. 39 (single, soldering in soldering plant). [Ward 4, Prospect St., next door was the following:]

1920 William H. Graves 42 (bookkeeper in bank, renter), Bertha R. 44 (wife, born in NY and parents likewise), Harriet Rote 22 (sister, born in NY and parents likewise).

1930 William H. Graves 54 (teller in bank), Bertha 53 (wife), Harriet Rote 61 (sister-in-law). [District 32]

<sup>10</sup> John McKinstry was the first innkeeper in Hudson and he was listed among the licensees in 1786.<sup>Ellis 1878</sup>  
<sup>159</sup> He was a colonel during the Revolution and represented Columbia Co. in the state Assembly in 1797 and 1799. Charles McKinstry was a county Supervisor from 1791 to '99 and an Assemblyman in 1799 and 1800. Internet sources list two sons of John and Elizabeth Knox McKinstry: William (12/15/1779-12/2/1829) and Robert (b. 10/9/1794).<sup>1</sup> In the census of 1810, '30 and '50 there was a Henry McKinstry in Catskill. One source describes him as a son of John and Elizabeth McKinstry and an elder of Christ Church (Episcopal).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Thomas Story reported that in 1704 he stayed with Zechariah Jenkins and then went on to Scituate and Nantasket (p. 308). This seems to refer to the Jenkins home in Sandwich, MA. The next month Story prayed with Friends at the house of Zachary Jenkins near Dartmouth (p. 349). This is in southern MA near RI. In 1708 the Zachariah Jenkins family moved from Sandwich MA to East Greenwich RI. It seems that when HB was speaking about the Story journal, she was referring to her great-grandfather Zachariah Jenkins.

<sup>12</sup> Something else happened in Ireland that perhaps could be tracked down: this line is in Robert Goodbody's *Account of His Life*: "HB – whose preaching in 1800 was the cause of closing Sycamore Alley Meeting House for a while." (*JFHS*, v. 50(2), p. 56) The closing could have been for a lot of reasons, such as crowd control as well as doctrine. This is an example of how much about HB is probably out there but hidden from us. (Sycamore Alley was in Dublin; the old meetinghouse still stands and is currently occupied by the Irish Film Institute.)<sup>1</sup>

<sup>13</sup> The one year delay between the request for a minute and the granting is unexplained. It may indicate concern about HB's views but there could easily be other explanations including finances, health, and the war between England and France (that ended in the fall of 1797). The finances were tight and after her return friends in England donated money to help the family.<sup>Ditchfield 1970 214</sup>

<sup>14</sup> The names on the certificate are given in Mott's letter to Phebe Earle Gibbons.<sup>Mott 1880?</sup> James Mott Sr. (1742-1823) was the grandfather of Lucretia Mott's husband, James; and the long time superintendent of Nine Partners Friends School. He was Clerk of the Men's Meeting of NYYM from 1790 to 1792. In 1793 he accompanied EH on his long journey throughout NYYM and he was one of three Elders who signed HB's YM travel certificate and later asked her to return from Britain.<sup>Mott 1880?</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Elizabeth Hosier, the daughter of Giles and Elizabeth Hosier, was born in Newport RI on 3/14/1770. Her parents were frequently visited by traveling Friends and Elizabeth loved meeting and waiting on them. In 1793 she married Caleb Coggeshall and they later lived in NY City. At 23 she committed herself to minister to other Friends even though she was extremely shy. She became a minister in 1796 and the next year felt drawn to visit Friends in Europe. Hearing that HB was going, she asked the YM if she could go along as a companion. The YM insisted that she should have her own minute as an accredited minister. They visited many meetings in England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland. When HB got in trouble EC wrote, "This was a close trial to the affectionate part." The tension was so great that she fainted on one occasion as HB walked in to be judged.<sup>Mott 1880?</sup> She did not continue to the Continent even though London YM granted her a minute to do so. She returned to America, separately from HB, on 3/30/1801 and later made a second journey to Europe from 1813 to 1815.<sup>Monthly Meeting of New York 1852; Coggeshall 1908; Jones 1921 300</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Elizabeth Gurney was 19 at this time. She married Joseph Fry one year later. In the previous year she had heard William Savery preach and implored her father to invite him to their home. It changed her life. She began to dress and speak plainly and gave up dancing. Soon she opened a school for poor children in the laundry of their family home (Earlham Hall). Here are her comments when she met HB at a general meeting of London YM near Ackworth Friends School (which was founded to educate poor Quaker children): “*Ackworth, Eighth Month, 1<sup>st</sup>*. – ... At four o’clock, the Women’s Meeting met; I amongst a great number was chosen one of the Committee to examine the children, school and household: Hannah Barnard appeared to me to hold rather too high a hand. After Meeting we examined the bed-rooms, which I thought in good order, and talked a little to Hannah Barnard. *2<sup>nd</sup>*. ... at three o’clock met to hear the report of the Committee;... It was some time before any one would speak; Friends were begging the Committee to say what they thought, but in vain, till I think Hannah Barnard broke the ice, and encouraged the young people to say what they thought; for they had been requested before. As it appeared to me it was delaying the Meeting, I took courage (as I thought it was more right than wrong) to speak...I felt glad I had done it, though I trembled at doing it, not a little....After the Meetings I was encouraged in what I had done, by salutations from the Friends, Hannah Barnard and Elizabeth Coggeshall. After dinner, we met again and heard the report they had written to bring in to the men. I thought the Meeting paid rather too much deference to Hannah Barnard, in delaying the Meeting, because she was not come in....After tea, I had a few interesting minutes with Hannah Barnard, to whom I had longed to speak of my beloved friend William Savery; I met her standing against the wall in the long passage, by Dr. Binn’s door. I went up to her, took hold of her hand and entered into talk with her; I mentioned dear William Savery: we went and sat in the Doctor’s room.”<sup>Fry & Cresswell 1974 81-83</sup>

What an amazing moment! Elizabeth Gurney was 19, a plain Quaker for only a year, daughter of one of the wealthiest families in Britain, great-great-granddaughter of Robert Barclay, educated by private tutors, so nervous that she did not speak in meeting for worship for another ten years. She dedicated her life to improving the conditions of the poor, imprisoned and mentally ill. Hannah Barnard was 44, a Quaker minister for about 15 years, born into poverty, self-educated, and brazen when speaking truth to power. She dedicated her life to helping women, youth, and the poor. HB was latitudinarian in her tolerance of religious diversity, more so than Elizabeth Gurney: the hand she pressed on HB in 1799 she refused to Lucretia Mott in 1840 because of Mott’s “Unitarian” views.<sup>Bacon 1980 106-108</sup>

Elizabeth Gurney probably didn’t know about HB’s views or William Savery’s opinions of them. He was a well known Quaker minister from Philadelphia who traveled in Europe from 1796 to ’98. In January 1798, after a long session with Abraham Shackleton, he wrote, “I could not see eye to eye with him nor unite in his extraordinary expressions and opinions, and I really feel a fear they will produce much hurt.” Later that year he helped convince Ireland Yearly Meeting to disown the New Lights (Ingles, 1998, p. 10). In 1801 WS wrote to a friend, “[N]othing has been more exercising to me than the concern my countrywoman, Hannah Barnard, has occasioned in the church. I look forward to your Yearly Meeting as a time that will require the whole armour of light to be sought for, as much as at almost any preceding period....The longer I live, the more unshaken confidence I think I obtain, that the doctrines laid down by Robert Barclay and our first friends, founded on the New Testament, and still maintained by the society at large, are invulnerable to the efforts of vain philosophy, sophistry, and curious speculation, so long as we retain a belief in that most excellent of Books, and am of the mind, that all such as depart from that foundation, will wither and be confounded.”<sup>Taylor 1925 292-293</sup> In 1827, during the schism in Philadelphia, this letter was remembered and published in the orthodox journal, *The Friend* (vol. 1, no. 5, p. 38).

Dr. Jonathan Binn (1747/8-1812) was a medical doctor and Superintendent of Ackworth School from 1795 to 1804. We may wonder why HB, who often had health problems, was “standing against the wall in the long passage, by Dr. Binn’s door.”

<sup>17</sup> This was a sad time for Elias and Jemima Hicks. Their son, Jonathan, died in the spring of 1802, the third son to die young. Elias Hicks’ *Journal* is blank for the last half of 1801 and all of 1802.<sup>H<sup>118, 311</sup></sup>

<sup>18</sup> EH and son in law Valentine Hicks embarked on 3 mo journey through NY State. EH spoke at two successive meetings on First Day in Hudson. "It was subsequently reported to him that HB and been present at the second meeting on Sunday and that, much moved, she had remarked that the doctrines he put forward were identical to those for which she had been disowned. By then EH had, in spirit and teaching, unquestionably approached HB, toward whom in the past he had, however, shown some reserve. He confessed that H's words brought him pleasure: '...from the information of what she said respecting the meeting, I could not intirely suppress the hope that she might be recovered.' Yet he backed away, even at this late date, from the notion that what he preached she had expounded. '[I]n her best times,' that might have been the case, but he still insisted that his tenets were 'materially different from those that were the cause of her separation.'"<sup>M 83-84, H 185</sup>

<sup>19</sup> "[P]revious to her leaving home, she had become extremely intimate with a gentleman of the medical profession, a sensible, well-inform'd man, and her neighbour at the town of Hudson in the state of New York. This man was by religious profession a strict Unitarian, as they call themselves, or as they are often called by others, Socinians, or modern Deists. I understood (from herself) that she had obtained from him some valuable knowledge of a medical nature, and from him, it appeared, that she had also derived these Unitarian principles which she openly avowed"<sup>J 349-350</sup>

<sup>20</sup> The Free Quakers supported the rebellion against Great Britain and were dissatisfied with the leadership of their Quaker meetings. They called for freedom to follow ones conscience. Some of their literature suggest that they were reading the Paine's pamphlets: "We have no new doctrine to teach, nor any design of promoting schisms in religion. We wish only to be freed from every species of ecclesiastical tyranny, and mean to pay a due regard to the principles of our forefathers, and to their rules and regulations so far as they apply to our circumstances, and hope, thereby, to preserve decency and to secure equal liberty to all." (Samuel Wetherill Jr., *An Address to Those of the People Called Quakers Who Have Been Disowned for Matters Religious or Civil*, April 24, 1781.) Although HB and Samuel Wetherill probably disagreed on participation in the war of rebellion, they may have agreed on ecclesiastical tyranny (a term they both used), latitude in religious views, the hierarchy of Elders, and disownment (which they did not allow.)

There never were many Free Quakers, perhaps 400 at most. After the Revolutionary War many were taken back by their meetings. Attendance diminished until, in 1836, only Betsy Claypoole and one other were worshipping together and they decided to stop. Since then the Free Quakers have been a philanthropic organization. Nowadays they hold one meeting a year in their old meetinghouse which belongs to the U. S. National Park Service. (See Charles Wetherill, 2002)

<sup>21</sup> Writers HB might have encountered include Joseph Priestly, Thomas Paine, Ethan Allen. She might have heard about John Bartram. Some of her views suggest she may have read the work of John Locke. Here are a few comments about these people:

Joseph Priestly (1733-1804) was run out of Birmingham England in 1794 by a mob outraged by his celebrating Bastille Day as well as his Unitarian principles and dark science. He went to Philadelphia and settled in Northumberland in western Pennsylvania. He died there 2/6/1804 and was buried by a Quaker meeting as there were no other convenient burial grounds that would take him. HB spoke to Theophilus Lindsey about him and hoped to be able to arrange a visit. Elias Hicks stated in his journal that he had read some of Priestley's work.

Thomas Paine (1737-1809) was born a Quaker and buried in a Quaker cemetery but he was a stern critic of Quakers. He was a passionate advocate for freedom of conscience and human rights. In 1776 he published *Common Sense* which caused a sensation, and in 1791-2 he published *Rights of Man* and in 1794 *The Age of Reason*. In this book he attacked religious institutions but supported religion that helps people live ethical lives. He was a deist and a universalist, advocating freedom of religion and separation of church and state. HB was a young woman just beginning to read at the time of the American Revolution when Tom Paine's *Common Sense* created a sensation. Later he supported the Republican in France as did HB. While there he wrote on religion from a rationalist perspective. It is possible that she was familiar with his writings.

Ethan Allen (1738-1789) was a well known patriot and leader of the Green Mountain Boys of Vermont. He struggled for independence of VT from NY before the Revolution and then for independence from GB. In 1784 he published *Reason the Only Oracle of Man, or a Compendious system of Natural Religion*. It was not widely circulated and a fire in his publisher's office destroyed many of the copies. He and HB were 4<sup>th</sup> cousins through her great grandmother Abiah Allen Jenkins. He married Frances Montresor Brush Buchanan and they named their only child Ethan Voltare Allen.

John Bartram (1699-1777) was a naturalist with a mystical feeling for the presence of God in nature; he published books on his observations in 1751 and 1767. He supported rationalism and was a friend of Benjamin Franklin. He wrote in a letter: "It is through the telescope I see God in his glory." He wrote to Benjamin Rush: I hope a more diligent search will lead you into the knowledge of more certain truths than all the pretended revelations of our mystery mongers and their inspirations." In about 1758 he was disowned by Darby MM for failing to accept the divinity of Christ. Bartram's defense differed from HB's: he simply refused to answer the charges or to change his views. After disownment he kept attending meeting and when he died they buried him in their graveyard. Three of his sons were founding members of the Free Quakers in Philadelphia. There's no indication that HB knew of John Bartram. More than 200 years later Darby MM took John Bartram back into membership.

John Locke (1632-1704) was a pioneering philosopher whose writings were influential in the fields of government, science, psychology and religion. He knew William Penn and stayed with Quaker Benjamin Furley during his exile in Holland. A skeptic and a rationalist, he wrote, for example: "Let us then suppose the Mind to be, as we say, white Paper, void of all Characters, without any Ideas;... Whence has it all the materials of Reason and Knowledge? To this I answer, in one word, From Experience: In that, all our Knowledge is founded; and from that it ultimately derives it self. Our observation employ'd either about external, sensible Objects; or about the internal Operations of our Minds, perceived and reflected on by ourselves, is that, which supplies our Understandings with all the materials of thinking. These two are the Fountains of Knowledge, from whence all the Ideas we have, or can naturally have, do spring."<sup>22</sup> *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* 1690, quoted in H. Rachlin *Introduction to Modern Behaviorism*, San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1976 p. 11

<sup>22</sup> One of the instigators was Rebecca Jones (1739-1817), a Quaker minister from Philadelphia who was traveling in Britain in 1784 and encouraged the women to request their own meeting. She knew Hannah Barnard (see 1795 letter from HB to Henry Drinker) but after reading of the events in London she wrote, not to defend HB but to urge that London women take part in the decision: "I do hope the right thing will be done and that your women's Yearly Meeting will be owned by the presence of the great Head of the Church, which is composed of females as well as males, who alike have need to move under a sense of their own weakness."<sup>23</sup> Bacon 1994 161

<sup>23</sup> Many people thought she should keep her views to herself. Jenkins wrote, "Hannah Barnard, and her helpers insist much on the right of private judgment, which they way every one ought to be allowed to exercise; very true, but, they should recollect that this is not private but public judgment, when exercised in opposition to general sentiment. If a man cannot help dissenting from some of the doctrines of his own church, and yet is unwilling to leave it, he should keep such dissent from the knowledge of his brethren".<sup>24</sup> J 352

<sup>24</sup> James Mott Sr., the ex-Clerk who signed HB's certificate, had asked her to come home from Britain. Later, in 1814, he published a defense of the literal interpretation of the Jewish Wars in the Old Testament, one of the specific issues for which HB was censored.<sup>25</sup> Brock 1968 250 His wife, Anna Mott, was Clerk of the Women's Meeting for 11 years between 1803 and 1817 and she later was Women's Clerk in the Orthodox NYYM, 1828-1831. The Men's Clerk for five years between 1898 and 1808, Richard Mott (probably a cousin or sibling), also was later clerk of the Orthodox NYYM, 1842-1850. (This assumes these names refer to the same people).<sup>26</sup> Barbour et al 1995 351-352

<sup>25</sup> Static electricity was well known and demonstrating it was a parlor game. Benjamin Franklin did experiments on electrostatics in 1750-51, as did Joseph Priestly in 1767.

<sup>26</sup> “*Ipse dixit*,” Latin for “he himself said it,” refers to an assertion that is made but not proved.

<sup>27</sup> Lucretia Mott was one of the founders of the Free Religious Association in 1867. On that occasion she told them, “I believe that such proving all things, such trying all things, and holding fast only to that which is good, is the great religious duty of our age.”

<sup>28</sup> In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century Sunday Schools were seen as a vital element in the effort to bring basic academic skills and moral values to the poor. The American Sunday School Union was founded in 1790 and the American Bible Society in 1816. Quakers founded the First Day Society.

<sup>29</sup> HB was born as the French and Indian War started and that lasted 8 years. She was 18 and a Quaker in the year of the Boston Tea Party. The American Revolution took place when she was 20 to 28 years old. The French Revolution started when she was about 34 and lasted about 15 years until Napoleon became Emperor in 1804. Britain and France were at war on and off from 1792 to 1814. The War of the United Irishmen took place from 1791 to 1798 (HB visited Ireland in 1800 and 1801). The War of 1812 lasted for two years. All this time Quakers struggled with the morality of profiting, directly or indirectly, from war.

<sup>30</sup> Meetings in the Barnards' area had long been on record against slavery. Oblong MM called for the end of slavery in 1767. In Nine Partners MM slaves were freed between 1775 and 1782. NYM prohibited importation of slaves by Quakers in 1759, the selling of slaves in 1771, and in 1774 ruled that “all slaves had majority” (which I take to mean the rights of free persons). The state of New York was slower to act: in 1817 it freed slave children born after 7/4/1799 and in 1827 adults born before 7/4/1799.<sup>Barbour et al 1995 65-75</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Dr. James Mease (1771-1846) was a Philadelphia physician and a Presbyterian rather than a Quaker. Like HB he was interested many aspects of human progress. He published *Domestic Encyclopedia* (1803-1804), *Geological Account of the United States* (1807), *The Picture of Philadelphia* (1811, giving history, arts, sciences, manufacturing and commerce of that city), *Archives of useful knowledge* (1811-1812), *Letter on the Rearing of Silk Worms* (1828), and *Utility of Public-Loan Offices* (1836), among other titles.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>32</sup> In the letter of January 10, 1825 she mentions sending this Document to Dr. Edwin Atlee who was a homeopathic physician. He was a member of the Philadelphia MM (Hicksite).<sup>Hinshaw</sup> Elias Hicks letter in response to a letter from Altee's in turn prompted a letter from Anna Braithwaite that was published in 1825.<sup>1</sup> HB may have been circulating copies of the *Dialogues...* appendix on the treatment of burns. That little treatise shows her powers of observation and record keeping and her common sense regarding how the body heals burn wounds. In the appendix is a long list of people she sent it to. Perhaps she was still doing that five years later.

<sup>33</sup> In this section superscript numbers refer to pages in HB's *Dialogues...*, unless they are in bold in which case they are footnotes. Quoted statements are made by Lady Homespun (LH) unless otherwise indicated.

I know of just two articles about *Dialogues...*: those of Joan Jensen (1986) and David Maxey (1989).

<sup>34</sup> The printer was identified in an ad in the *Hudson Bee* on February 1, 1820 stating that the book is “ready for the press, and will soon be published”.<sup>RLG Eureka entry</sup> A newspaper notice pasted in the copy at Haverford College shows that Peter Barnard deposited the title with the Clerk of the Southern District of NY on March 15, 1820 (Hannah Barnard was identified as the author). Samuel W. Clark's dates are given as 1779-1832 in the entry in the RLG Union Catalog, but according to Quaker records Samuel Clark (1784-1851), son of Thomas Clark and Catharine Hull, was given a certificate from New York MM to visit Hudson MM in 1829 and was disowned by Hudson MM (Orthodox) in 1830.<sup>Hinshaw</sup> RLG lists copies of *Dialogues...* in three libraries (AQM, MWA, EAI) but does not list the one at Haverford. Pamphlets often are not listed in databases so it is hard to know how many copies exist today. A microform copy is available at the Library of Congress and, surprisingly, at the Pentagon Library in Arlington VA.

<sup>35</sup> Another example of her response to public censure is: “And I am compensated a hundred fold for all the sneering remarks of those, who feel themselves above such employments. Indeed it is all clear gain and satisfaction, for I don’t regard them at all.”<sup>30</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Typically, HB has given us a line packed with meaning. The main point is that the education of children is important and we can be optimistic about human improvement, but there is more. For HB knowledge came from observation and from reading and listening – by using our eyes and ears.<sup>e.g. 30, 62</sup> This sounds like John Locke’s view that knowledge is based on the senses (see above). The phrase about eyes and ears is used repeatedly by Jesus at the end of his parables and it appears elsewhere in the New Testament (e.g. Mark 8:18, Matthew 11:15 and 13:9). In some forms, the phrase implies the speaker has done everything possible and the rest is up to the listener as in this example from the Gospel of Thomas: “Whoever has ears to hear let him hear.”<sup>logion 8; see also 21, 24, 63, 65, 96</sup> LH makes that point several times<sup>18, 22, 54</sup> and it is in HB’s letters in which she seems content to leave the evidence of her life for future generations to learn from (see below).

<sup>37</sup> This line came from Robert Barclay’s *Apology for the True Christian Divinity* (1676), Proposition III, section ii. It also is a naturalistic observation based on the flow of water from a spring or through a tube. The line was quoted by Mary Newhall in a sermon in 1823 (Tolles, 1959, p. 315).

<sup>38</sup> Lucy Aikin, 1781-1864, was the niece of poet Laetitia Aikin Barbauld; her father and aunt were friends of the Unitarian scientist Joseph Priestly and his wife and she corresponded extensively with the Unitarian minister William Ellery Channing. She published the classics *Pilgrim’s Progress*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and *Swiss Family Robinson* in one syllable words for easy reading.

<sup>39</sup> (1) Matthew 5, 6 & 7 in the New Testament. (2) Robert Dodsley’s *The Economy of Human Life* (various editions were published in London 1750 to 1774). (3) William Penn’s *Some Fruits of Solitude, in Reflections and Maxims Relating to the Conditions of Human Life* (London, 1693 and subsequently). (4) John Woolman’s *A Word of Remembrance and Caution to the Rich* (Dublin 1793, London 1794, available as appendix to his *Journal*). (4) Lindley Murray’s *The English Reader* (various editions in America after 1815). (5) George Fisher’s *Arithmetic* (various editions from 1744 to 1762 in London and 1800 in Wilmington DE). (6) John Bigland’s *A Geography and Historical View of the World* (Boston 1811). (7) Jedidiah Morse’s *Geography Made Easy* (various editions between 1784 and 1822 in New Haven and Boston). (8) *Epistles on the Character and Condition of Women* by Lucy Aikin (Boston, 1810).

<sup>40</sup> “**J.** Why, to tell you the truth, Pa has run away, to keep out of jail, and his farm is soon to be sold on a mortgage, and Ma and I are left to shift for ourselves.”<sup>HB 1820 5</sup>

<sup>41</sup> Consider the following excerpt from *Dialogues...*: “**Mr. H.** [on first meeting Jenny Prinks] You are welcome here Jenny ; nay twice welcome! for being such an easy convert to my wife’s good precepts....And I feel a confidence you will lose nothing valuable by it. And probably may acquire, what will be of incalculable advantage, viz. The qualifications for making some worthy man, a few years hence, an equally worthy companion. **L.H.** Jenny, you will soon become familiarized with my husband’s free manner of expression. It is his mode of address. And you will not be so confused, and blush so at it, when you come to be better acquainted with him.”<sup>24</sup>

Now compare this with this description of Peter Barnard: “A young bride in Hudson in 1818 was startled when an elderly looking man under a broadbrimmed hat drove up to the door and seized her hand in both of his ‘while he absolutely kissed me.’ Her landlady presently explained that she had received a visit from ‘Uncle Peter,’ who regularly availed himself of the privilege of kissing the bride even if she had never laid eyes on him before.”<sup>M 78</sup>

It is pleasant to see that HB gave PB the role of a judge and assemblyman in her play. She seems to be telling us that she saw her husband as a wise man who would have done well in those jobs.

<sup>42</sup> There is wry humor in the name “Thomas Prinks” that HB gave Jenny Prinks’ insolvent father who represents HB’s own father, Valentine Jenkins: Thomas Jenkins was the wealthiest of the original Quaker settlers of Hudson NY.

<sup>43</sup> There still was a young woman in the household in 1810 who disappears between ’10 and ’20; I doubt this was written in 2 years after Rebecca Barnard’s marriage in 1805 (Aikin published in 1810, would be 13 years before published)

<sup>44</sup> “I read it, I believe in my eighteenth year. It snarled up my ideas, that it almost cracked my cranium. Thou knowest, that deference which youth pays to age, and long established opinions, has its use, and also its dangers. I was sadly puzzled but could not untangle my mind, till I had the courage to exercise my own natural right to examine and judge for myself. The relief I felt in the liberation of my own mind, fully determined me, if ever I had children of my own, or other youth under my superintendance, never to let one of them read that book if I could help it, without first giving them my candid opinion of it and my reasons for it.”<sup>HB 1820 35</sup> HB may have encountered Milton in the same year she joined Quakers and learned to read – no wonder it was an emotional experience. Her solution to the personal crisis it created served her well throughout her life.

<sup>45</sup> In 1847 a Philadelphia Hicksite leader, John Jackson, wrote a pamphlet on the Quaker peace testimony in which he denied that God sanctioned war as claimed in the Old Testament. This caused a sensation but was forgotten when the war with Mexico ended. Jackson was not disciplined for questioning Scripture in this way.<sup>Brock 1968 254</sup>

<sup>46</sup> HB was described in three highly critical paragraphs in the journal of Henry Hull (one of her judges in Hudson) that was appeared repeatedly during the 19<sup>th</sup> century (e.g. *The Friends Library*, 1840, v. 4, p. 247 and *The Friend*, 1860, v. 34 (12), p. 89). She was mentioned in one line in two other journals in *The Friends Library* (v. III, p. 362; v. XII, p. 35) and two published in John and Isaac Comly’s *Friends Miscellany* (v. 4, p. 147; v. 11, p. 202).

In 1867 Joseph Smith included her 1800 pamphlet in *A Descriptive Catalogue of Friends’ Books*, giving the reason for her disownment, the authors who engaged in the pamphlet war, and Luke Howard’s *Yorkshireman* reference. Her disownment was described in a few pages in Samuel Janney’s *History of the Religious Society of Friends from its Rise to the Year 1828* (1867) and in William Hodgson’s *The Society of Friends in the Nineteenth Century* (1875). In 1893 Joseph Smith’s *Supplement to a Descriptive Catalogue of Friends’ Books* cited the earlier catalog and added a paragraph of biography and the reference for HB’s 1820 pamphlet for young farm wives.

An orthodox Philadelphia Quaker described her as an early advocate of Elias Hicks’ views and gave four paragraphs to her case in 1899 (Vaux, *The Friend*, v. 72, no. 44, pp. 349-350). That journal published her minute of disownment twice, in April and June of 1905.<sup>Hull & Jenkins 1905 299, 396</sup> (Why two times in three months?! Comparing the minute with the copy in Foster 1801, two erroneous words were corrected in the second version, and a reference to the 1899 article was added. There were about 50 changes in spelling or punctuation between the two versions, only about half of which conformed to the 1801 version.)

HB was not mentioned in the early editions of A. C. Thomas & R. H. Thomas’ *A History of the Society of Friends in America* (e.g. the 2<sup>nd</sup> in 1895) but did receive three paragraphs in later editions (titled *History of the Friends in America*, e.g. the 4<sup>th</sup> in 1905 and the 5<sup>th</sup> in 1919). In 1913 an account of the public recantation of a Barnardian disciple was published in *JFHS* (v. 10, p. 180). In 1919 HB had a page in *London Yearly Meeting During 250 Years* (Society of Friends, 1919, p. 61). The *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* published footnotes explaining who she was in 1917, p.13; 1923, p. 50; 1924, p. 52; and 1928, p. 48. In 1925 in that journal there was a paragraph from a letter by a contemporary supporter (p. 83).

<sup>47</sup> Edward Grubb (1854-1938) opposed the Richmond Declaration in 1888 and was a leading young Friend at the 1895 Manchester Conference. He was the first secretary of the summer school that preceded Woodbrooke, and became editor of *The British Friend*.

<sup>48</sup> These include *The History of Quakerism* (Elbert Russell, 1942), *Friends for 300 Years* (Howard Brinton, 1965) or the subsequent edition titled *Friends for 350 Years*, 2002), *Pioneers of the Peaceable Kingdom* (Peter Brock, 1968, pp. 255-258), *A Procession of Friends: Quakers in America* (Newman, 1972, p. 90), *Portrait in Grey: A Short History of Quakers* (John Punshon, 1984, pp. 161, 171, 210), and *Quaker Cross-currents* (Barbour et. al, 1995, pp. 62, 102-103, 168).

<sup>49</sup> Thomas Day Seymour Bassett (1913-2001) was a Quaker historian who taught at Princeton, Earlham and the University of California, Riverside. He lived in Vermont and studied that state's history.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>50</sup> Lucretia Mott's message is in Dana Greene's collection of Mott sermons (with punctuation edited for modern readers).<sup>1980 105-106</sup> The final quotation is from William Ellery Channing (1780-1842), the Unitarian leader. The meeting for worship was at Cherry Street Meetinghouse in Philadelphia on Sunday, September 16, 1849. Two weeks later Lucretia Mott began her sermon with words taken from William Penn that Hannah Barnard would have thrilled to: "It is time that Christians were judged more by their likeness to Christ than their notions of Christ."