May We be Strengthened in Times of Trial: Elizabeth Drinker, the American Revolution, and the Feminine Sphere

by Jacob L. Emory

On September 2, 1777, Philadelphian Henry Drinker was working in his office when he heard a knock on the door. A few armed men wanted him to sign a parole. Henry, however, refused to sign anything. In an attempt to intimidate him, the men then took some of Henry's books and papers, demanded that he stay home, and left. Two days later, the men returned and arrested Henry Drinker and took him to the local Masonic Lodge. Along with Henry, twenty-one other men were taken prisoner by the Colonial Army. The reason for their arrest, it was later determined, was due to many of the men being Quakers, thus under suspicion of being Loyalists.

The arrests were an effort by the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania to remove those whose actions may be detrimental to the revolutionary cause. Due to the pacifism of their Quaker faith, these men did not publicly side with either the British or Colonials.[1] The twenty-two men arrested between September 2 and September 4 were quickly banished and transported to Western Virginia. Despite the overzealousness of this event, three weeks later on September 26, the British army entered Philadelphia in earnest.

With Henry Drinker banished and the British occupying Philadelphia, his wife, Elizabeth Drinker, was left alone to fend for herself and their six children. The gender roles of eighteenth-century America did not leave much room for fluidity. A male was expected to be the public figure for his family. His wife, therefore, controlled the private, day to day matters of the household. Indeed, the hierarchical structure of society made shifting between gender roles difficult.[2]

However, during times of war, history has shown that gender roles do become muddled and Elizabeth Drinker perfectly embodied this phenomenon. She continued her motherly duties of tending to her children. She did her best to protect the house from British officers. She conducted business for Henry in his absence. She was also an integral part of the group that secured the release of her husband and the twenty-one other Quaker men. Using her diary it is clear that the British occupation of Philadelphia

---

[1] Catherine S. Crary, *The Price of Loyalty: Tory Writings from the Revolutionary Era* (New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), 24.

[2] Mary Beth Norton, *Liberty's Daughters: The Revolutionary Experience of American Women, 1750-1800* (Boston-Ontario: Little, Brown and Company, 1980), xiii-xvi.

in the winter of 1777-78 allowed her to break societal norms and occupy both the male and female spheres.

Prior to the Revolution, women and men were seen to be in two distinctly different spheres in the community. Mary Beth Norton, in *Separated by their Sex*, examines these spheres. Often referred to as the "fair sex," women's roles in England and the Colonies experienced a shift in cultural norms in the middle of the seventeenth century, assigning the control of household matters to the wife and everything else to the husband.[3] The introduction of this shift not only challenged the cultural understanding of gendered roles in a marriage, but also placed restrictions on those roles. That the wife was expected to stay home and reside in her sphere only bears weight when coupled with the growing sentiment that women must "not 'deviate' from such responsibilities."[4] The shifting meaning of words during the mid-seventeenth to the mid-eighteenth centuries redefined the masculine and feminine and placed them into distinct sections of public and private life.

Despite these views on women pre-revolution, some historians view post-revolutionary America as having gained some ground in the struggle for women's rights. In *Liberty's Daughters*, Norton noticed a world of rigid patriarchy. Female agency mostly resided in the forms of friendships and familial relationships with other women.[5] However, she describes how the revolution helped to change women's status. Because of the war and their husbands' absences, she contends that women during the Revolution were forced by necessity to reach out beyond their spheres into the male dominated public roles in the community.[6] Furthermore, women had greater autonomy in choosing their spouses, in preventing pregnancies, and in education.[7]

Some historians are hesitant to exclaim larger female rights post-revolution. Joan Hoff Wilson did concede in her piece *The Illusion of Change* that many women were integral parts of their home economies. While not viewed as important in a public aspect, privately the wife was a household manager, home manufacturer (spinning and weaving), and gardener.[8] Dominated by women, home production—especially of textiles—was massively important to the American boycotts of the 1760s.[9] But, she also noted that the importance of the female role in the house is negated due to a "division

---

[3] Mary Beth Norton, *Separated by Their Sex, Women in the Public and Private in the Colonial Atlantic World* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011), 4.
[4] Mary Beth Norton, *Separated by Their Sex*, 5.
[5] Mary Beth Norton, *Liberty's Daughters,* 7-8.
[6] Mary Beth Norton, *Liberty's Daughters,* xv.
[7] Mary Beth Norton, *Liberty's Daughters,* 230, 233, 275.
[8] Joan Hoff Wilson, "The Illusion of Change: Women and the American Revolution," *The American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism*, ed. Alfred F. Young (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1976), 394. http://www.library.armstrong.edu/eres/docs/eres/HIST7430-1_HENDRICKS/743029henWomenPart1.PDF
[9] Joan Hoff Wilson, "The Illusion of Change: Women and the American Revolution," 395.

of labor based on sex-role stereotyping."[10] That women were allowed to be outside the home in any capacity was only for the betterment of a male-driven agenda or reliant upon her husband's approval. Moreover, Joan R. Gundersen, in her piece "*Independence, Citizenship, and the American Revolution*," concurs with this assessment. In short, Gundersen explains how Revolutionary rhetoric, coupled with a need to define citizenship, resulted in a "series of social, economic, and political discussions that presumed women to be members of a dependent class."[11] Thus, women were seen as lower than their husbands as well as childlike in their dependence on him to provide for her.

Additionally, unlike Norton, Wilson did not view the revolution as having a positive effect on women. Wilson exclaimed, "In general it appears that the American Revolution retarded those societal conditions that had given colonial women their unique function and status in society."[12] Elaine Foreman Crane and Joan Gunderson also share in this belief. Crane points to the ideas of republican motherhood having roots pre-Revolution while Gunderson argues that female participation in the public sphere declined after the war.[13] Indeed, female agency was dependent upon their husbands, fathers, or brothers. In this, white, land-owning men had the power to control those they felt were beneath them, including women, slaves, the poor, or those of a different racial or ethnic background.

Nonetheless, Quaker views on gender roles did indeed differ from the societal standard. Like her husband, Elizabeth Drinker was a devout Quaker and accustomed to that faith's openness to female equality. As Karin A. Wulf comments in the *Introduction to Milcah Martha Moore's Book*, "Quakers...believed that one of the lessons to be learned from the Edenic experience was that before the Fall, men and women were "helpmeets" or equal partners."[14] The Quakers' adherence to this belief flew in the face of traditional Christian dogma in which Eve was, essentially, too weak to think for herself, thus making women subservient to men throughout Western history. That Quakers conformed to a hierarchical marital structure where husbands controlled economic and political matters places them on par with other colonial Americans.[15] Despite this contradiction in Quaker ideals, Quaker women typically had options that allowed them to become travelling ministers in support of their religion. As these female ministers

---

[10] Joan Hoff Wilson, "The Illusion of Change: Women and the American Revolution," 394.
[11] Joan R. Gundersen, "Independence, Citizenship, and the American Revolution," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 13, no. 1 (Autumn, 1987): 59-77.
[12] Joan Hoff Wilson, "The Illusion of Change: Women and the American Revolution," 430.
[13] Sheila L. Skemp, "Women and Politics in the Era of the American Revolution," 24.
[14] Milcah Martha Moore, Catherine La Courreye Blecki, and Karin A. Wulf. *Milcah Martha Moore's Book* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 10-11.
[15] Milcah Martha Moore, Catherine La Courreye Blecki, and Karin A. Wulf, *Milcah Martha Moore's Book*, 11.

suggest, Quakers did not place motherhood as a necessity to be considered a woman.[16] Using this foundation, studying Quaker women and their views on gender roles does not necessarily translate to other sects throughout the country. The Quaker experience, however, is the perfect example of female agency during and after the war because of the egalitarian beliefs of the Friends.

Starting in 1758 and lasting until just before her death, Elizabeth's diary stands as an extremely valuable source of information regarding both eighteenth-century Philadelphia and the feminine sphere. She was a mother, wife, and friend. As a wife, she sometimes would travel with Henry early in their marriage.[17] But, as Elaine Forman Crane writes in her introduction to *Drinker's Diary*, "this is not to say that she was aware of all of his dealings...they did discuss business matters...and Henry was privy to the servants' transgressions and the children's crises."[18] Likewise, "because she was a female, the stages of Drinker's life...differed greatly from the experiences of her male contemporaries."[19] Though she experienced some gender mobility as a young wife, she remained almost exclusively in her female sphere.

The Drinker marriage straddled the line between an eighteenth-century and Quaker union. Besides accompanying her husband on business ventures, Elizabeth was also exposed to her husband's friends and business partners. While Crane does believe this to have been a modest knowledge of business, the fact that she spent time around these men on numerous occasions is paramount in understanding the minimal ways she entered into the male sphere. Similarly, Henry did not take on the usual male roles. He "did not distance himself from family concerns and activities…[he] took his children and grandchildren fishing and sleigh-riding."[20] That Henry and Elizabeth did not adhere to stereotypical gender roles is yet another example of their combination of Quaker and eighteenth-century gender roles.

Although Elizabeth eventually resided in both male and female spheres during the Revolution, she preferred to remain in the female role. As Crane also points out, "because of Elizabeth's high social standing, gender roles may have been more strictly applied," and, "Drinker knew and did what her class and upbringing prescribed." [21] By adhering to the societal constructs of her gender and class, Elizabeth appears as a woman who remained conservative in her outlooks and actions in life. However, as will be seen, "only in extraordinary circumstances such as wartime did Elizabeth Drinker

---

[16] Jean R. Soderlund, "Women in Eighteenth-Century Pennsylvania: Toward a Model of Diversity." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 115, no. 2 (1991): 173.. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20092603.
[17] Elaine Forman Crane, *The Diary of Elizabeth Drinker: The Life Cycle of an Eighteenth-Century Woman*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press), 2010, xvii.
[18] Ibid, xvii
[19] Ibid, xv.
[20] *Elizabeth Drinker's Diary*, xxiii
[21] Ibid, xxii

transgress her culturally defined boundaries as a woman."[22] That she infringed on the male sphere during the war would have been a foreign concept to her. Nevertheless, she accepted her new role in order to ensure the survival of her family:

> Some time after dinner Harry came...informing me that the waggons were waiting at the Lodge to take our dear Friends away. I quickly went there...and bid my dearest husband farewell...this has been a day of Great Confusion to many in this City; which I have in great measure been kept out of by my constant attension on my sick Child.[23]

Though the British were close and war becoming ever more real, Elizabeth's first instincts were for the wellbeing of her children. The motherly instincts exhibited by Elizabeth show a woman who knew the importance of her role no matter the outside circumstances. Merely two weeks before her husband's arrest, Elizabeth wrote a lengthy entry regarding her son. She comments that he was "ill with a vomiting and disordered bowels...he voided in the course of his sickness...three large worms and vomited one alive...for twelve days he eat nothing...in a very poor way, reduced almost to a skeleton."[24]. The importance she placed on the wellbeing of her son suggests that she was not as interested in the outside world as the one inside her home. In this, Elizabeth embodies the ideal colonial woman.

The gender roles of the time required Elizabeth to care for her children no matter the circumstances. As such, on September 13, Elizabeth noted that her son appeared to be recovering from a sickness a few weeks earlier. On that same date, she remarks at the end of her entry that her husband was being sent to Winchester, Virginia.[25] A week later she wrote, "...Our dear Child has walk'd several times across the Room."[26] This entry suggests that her son's recovery remained more important than her husband's absence. Always the mother first, wife second, this entry particularly embodies that sentiment.

Henry's arrest did leave a rather large hole in the Drinker's day-to-day household. Her letters to her husband when he was first arrested show that she faced a learning curve in dealing with her new role. Fearing that she may lose her house, Elizabeth "ordered [her] Horse, and Cow to be put into the Washhouse."[27] These orders suggest that she moved to the edge of her gender role by attending to the care of the items and animals outside of the confines of her home. A few days later she wrote, "our Stable seller was last Night broak open, and several of Jos. Scotts Barrels of Flour

---

[22] Ibid, xxiii.
[23] Ibid, 61-62
[24] *Elizabeth Drinker's Diary*, 60.
[25] Ibid, 62.
[26] Ibid, 63.
[27] Ibid, 62.

stolen," then she "rote to [her] Henry" to inform him of the events and hardships they were facing in Philadelphia.[28] This entry contradicts the first insomuch that her entry into the outside world was both unfamiliar to her and outside of her realm of understanding. In other words, her care for the animals and washhouse was an important step outside her sphere and was also meant to deter vandals. Once her orders did not do as she had hoped, she retreated back to her sphere and asked for her husband's guidance in the matter. While this shows that she needed her husband in a protector role, it also suggests that she was willing to push the boundaries of her comfort and knowledge to try to protect her family's property.

> Well, here are the English in earnest, about 2 or 3,000, came in...without oppossition or interruption...what a satisfaction it would be to our dear Absent Friends, could they but be inform'd of it…[29]

The battles of the revolution swirling around her and her husband far away, the world of Elizabeth Drinker was no longer the same. The existence of cannon and muskets were neither a new sight nor sound to Elizabeth. However, it would have been much easier to become acquainted with the sounds based on the sheer volume of cannon she heard. On October 6, 1777, Elizabeth wrote, "...The heaviest fireing that I think I ever heard, was the Evening, for upwards of two hours,"[30] A few nights later on October 9, she stated, "fireing last night, and heavy fireing this Morning from 5 o'clock 'till between 6 and 7."[31] The quiet world of a well-to-do woman was, for now, well in the past.

With the British army officially in Philadelphia, Elizabeth endured harassment from a British officer. On November 25 of the same year, she wrote, "We were very much affrighted this Evening before 9 o'clock...in the yard," where she had "discovered a Young Officer with Ann [their servant] coming out from the little house...the Gate was lock'd and he follwd Ann and Sister into the Kitchen, where he swore...and shook his sword."[32] It was in that moment she quickly gathered up the children and locked them in the parlor along with her sister. As she wrote after the event, "our poor dear Children was never so frightened, to have an enrag'd, drunken Man...with a Sword in his Hand swareing about the House."[33] Clearly Elizabeth did what she thought was best by ushering her children away from immediate danger. Indeed, knowing that she was the head of the house while her husband was away, she did more than enough to protect

---

[28] *Elizabeth Drinker's Diary*, 62.
[29] Ibid, 64.
[30] Ibid, 64.
[31] *Elizabeth Drinker's Diary*, 64.
[32] Ibid, 68.
[33] Ibid, 68.

her children. This entry also suggests that she faced a dangerous world where her status and absent husband could no longer ensure her or her children's safety.

Upon seeing that English officer again weeks later, Elizabeth realized that she had to do something to reclaim her servant any way she could. With her servant absent Elizabeth was out an employee and out the wages she had paid for work that was not being completed. Surely, once money was involved, Elizabeth would not allow for this injustice to continue. She wrote on January 4, 1778, "I had a conferance with the officer who took away Ann...I then adres'd him; if thee has no sense of Religion or Virtue, I think that what you Soldiers call Honor would have dictated to thee what was thy duty after thy behavour some time ago in this house."[34] Speaking to him bluntly, Elizabeth set the stage to speak to him as an equal. "I have as yet been carefull of exposeing thee, but if thee dont very soon pay me for my Servants time...I will tell all I meet with...I told him if he did not bring the Money or send it soon h should hear further from me...and away he went seemingly confus'd."[35] That the officer walked away suggests that he was wary of her threats. At the very least, Elizabeth transcending gender roles to speak to a military officer as an equal was the source of his confusion.

This experience, however traumatizing, forced Elizabeth to take on a more masculine role during her husband's absence. After a number of inquiries, Elizabeth finally agreed to allow a different British officer to be quartered with her family. Towards the end of December, 1777, "Major Carmon or Carmant (Crammond), call'd the Afternoon, to for Quarters for some Oiffercer of distinction."[36] Trying to send him away again, Elizabeth initially denied his request, but the Major would not be refused. He insisted that it would be "necessary protiction at these times to have [an officer] in the House."[37] Additionally, Elizabeth noted just before the new year, crime had seemingly gone down and the food supply had increased.[38] Elizabeth's willingness to allow an officer to live in her home was as shrewd as it was remarkable. That the crime rate went down in the neighborhood and food began to fill her pantry suggests that the officer's authoritative male presence ensured protection for the Drinker family. That Elizabeth initially denied and then approved of his habitation suggests that she saw the importance of having a man in the house. Her actions here, yet again, show that she straddled both gender norms by protecting her children in the feminine sphere and by protecting her home in the male.

With the absence of her husband going on four months, Elizabeth also conducted business for her husband on multiple occasions. In doing so, she had merged almost fully into the male gender role. In January 1778, a man by the name of G. James "called

---

[34] *Elizabeth Drinker's Diary*, 71.
[35] Ibid, 71.
[36] Ibid, 69.
[37] Ibid, 69.
[38] Ibid, 69-70.

with a note of hand of my Henrys, to James and Drinker...which I answered with 9 half Joes (Brazillian currency which bore the bust of Johannes V), 2 Dollars. I also parted with 7 half Joes to R. Adams for Pork and Flour."[39] These transactions suggest that her familiarity with her husband's business was much larger than that of a housewife. To this end, it is clear that she used prior knowledge in business dealings to safeguard her family's economic prosperity.

In a similar situation on April 1, Elizabeth "sent for John Burket, who came…[and] demanded the Money which has been so long owing, he promis'd to pay it next seventh Day."[40] A few days later, "John Burket came and paid [her] and paid...£29.15." Later that day she wrote that she "Borrowed of J. Howell 60 dollars (or $160 in Continental currency), which we are to pay in like money."[41] Her diary however, does not offer much more during this period regarding her dealings with her husband's business. The moments where she did entertain the business aspect of life were filled with success. Indeed, the union of Quaker and eighteenth-century values portrayed by the Drinkers suggests that Elizabeth had the opportunity to experience business deals throughout her marriage.

> I had the great Satisfaction this Evening of receiving two Letters from my dearest henry, the first I have received from him since he left...if I can judge of my dear by his Letters, he is in good Spirits, which thought is pleasing to me.[42]

Elizabeth's shift to the male sphere is a testament to her willingness to provide for the welfare of her family. The day-to-day events that she faced alone forced her into this role. The many hours and days spent waiting for a letter from Henry took their toll on Elizabeth. Constantly teased with the thought of him being released sooner, she began to stop seeing the silver lining. In January of 1778, Elizabeth wrote, "I...heard [Richard Wister] tell that he had just parted with Billy Lewis...who assures him that our dear Friends were actually discharg'd" and that she would be "grievously disopointed if it should fall through."[43] With a consistent influx of potential new dates of release, Elizabeth was subjected to the emotional highs and lows of losing her husband and potentially getting him back sooner than expected.

Elizabeth's persistence here shows both a societal and authentic respect. In Henry's absence, she often worried about his wellbeing. At multiple points throughout his incarceration, Elizabeth tells us "the Congress have again offered them their Liberty

---

[39] *Elizabeth Drinker's Diary*, 71.
[40] Ibid, 74.
[41] Ibid, 74.
[42] Ibid, 67.
[43] *Elizabeth Drinker's Diary*, 71.

on taken a Test [oath], which is all a sham, as they know they will not do it."[44] There was a moment where Quakers were asked to pledge their allegiance to the new government, which further showed the farcical reasons for the prison sentences. When the reports came in of sickness and death, Elizabeth was more concerned than ever. Writing on March 27, 1778, her friend confirmed "the account of the death of Thomas Gilpin and the illness of her Husband...and of ye indisposition of several others...They have no medicines, wine, sugar, vinegar, nor many other necessary articles...it is 3 weeks since the date of those letters, and the thought of what may have happened in the interim distresses me much."[45] These two accounts both show a reason for Elizabeth to worry, as well as a sense of how ill prepared the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania was to undertake this endeavor. The authenticity in her concerns suggests that she not only saw Henry as the head of her family, and therefore the protector of her home, but also genuinely cared for her spouse.

Coupled with the stresses of her life without her husband and inhabiting two distinct gender roles, her focus on freeing her husband was also a hope to bring back normalcy. After many false alarms, in late March of 1778, Elizabeth was asked to be one of four women that would go to the American Congress and request the prisoners' release. As she wrote on March 31, "O. Jones came to desire I would meet the rest of the Women concern'd at 5 o'clock...which I did."[46] Elizabeth wondered if she had the "Body and mind for such an undertaking."[47] Her worries were in some way due to her status as a woman, her duties as a mother, and her new found sense of social responsibility in the male sphere.

A few days later, on April 5, Elizabeth, three other women, and a man made their way to George Washington's camp at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania. When the group reached the American Piquet lines and heard of the former's travel to headquarters, they were given two or three guards to guide them along. Upon arriving around 1:30 pm on April 6, Elizabeth wrote:

> We requested an audience with the General - set with his Wife, (a sociable pretty kind of Woman) untill he came in; a number of Officers there, who were very complient...it was not long before GW [George Washington] came and discoarsd with us freely, but not so long as we could have wish'd...he told us, he could do nothing in our busyness further than granting us a pass to Lancaster, which he did…[48]

---

[44] Ibid, 72.
[45] Ibid, 73.
[46] *Elizabeth Drinker's Diary*, 73.
[47] Ibid, 73.
[48] Ibid, 75.

In this meeting, four women conversed with Washington and other officers of the American army in hopes of freeing their husbands. This event, well-mannered as it was, reveals a sense of societal contradiction. Here were four women whose loved ones were locked away because of their pacifist views. The man they spoke with was the leader of the army. That army's war was the reason their husbands were arrested in the first place. In other words, these women would not have had the opportunity to break out of their gendered roles and speak directly with the leader of the American Army had it not been for the Revolutionary War.

After leaving Valley Forge, the women set off to speak with the Supreme Executive Council. Upon arriving, they went directly to the home of Thomas Wharton, the President of Pennsylvania, for a meeting. Though they were granted a measly thirty minutes to speak with him alone, nothing came of their appointment.[49] Elizabeth and her Friends were not to be turned away so easily. On April 10 she wrote, "We...went to Lancaster, several Friends went with us...we were waited on by Thomas Matlack (a councilman), who undertook to advise us, and perhaps with sincerety [and] we paid a visit to 3 Councilors."[50] Their persistence was not to pay off as soon as they hoped. The women were told their Friends would be sent to Shippensburg, Pennsylvania, but this was not to occur.

Nevertheless, the women pushed onwards. On April 21, they had another conference with Thomas Wharton, but it was also not entirely agreeable.[51] On April 24, the women "went to Town...where we met with Bryan and Matlack, going up to Council. We presented our second address, as ye first was not answered to our minds."[52] That these women continued to question the highest courts and politicians of Revolutionary America suggests a devotion to their families. It also suggests how comfortable they were in dealing with matters outside of their realms. And after seven months, on April 27, 1778, the men were released with passes to get them back to Philadelphia.

> On our entrence into the City - [we] found our Families all well, for which favour and Blessing and the restoration of my dear Husband, may I ever be thankful.[53]

With her husband home, Elizabeth comfortably drifted back into the confines of her sphere. This is not to say that she did not continue reading or that she was no longer interested in the outside world. On the contrary, the largest sections of her diary are

---

[49] *Elizabeth Drinker's Diary*, 75.
[50] Ibid, 75.
[51] Ibid, 76.
[52] Ibid, 76.
[53] *Elizabeth Drinker's Diary*, 76.

from the post-revolutionary period. Likewise, she wrote countless entries leading up to elections regarding the news around town and, occasionally, her own opinions.[54] The Elizabeth Drinker after the revolution was not much different than before the war. The only differences, however, were her experiences.

Living as a typical eighteenth-century woman, based on eighteenth-century standards, Elizabeth Drinker did not seek to break the stereotypes. The role she played pre-revolution was that of mother, wife, and Friend. Her roles during the revolution were a combination of mother and father. She nursed her sick children. She protected her family from harm. She confronted officers for different reasons and on different occasions. She conducted business on behalf of her husband. She traveled to Lancaster and Valley Forge. She spoke with generals and heads of court and state. She did these things, reluctantly, but well. She realized that she was forced into a situation she could not expect to get out of while her husband was absent. She was a shining example of the eighteenth-century woman. Similarly, she was a shining example of a revolutionary woman who would not be strapped down by societal gender norms.

In a sense, she embodied everything that Mary Beth Norton found in her research. Elizabeth did experience higher levels of liberty and mobility during the war. However, this only occurred while her husband was incarcerated. And, to a point, Elizabeth is a shining example of Gundersen's statement on women as dependents. As she said on October 13, 1796, "I have no independent future, nor do I wish for one, unless it was in case of necessity, which I trust is not like to be the case."[55] However, the experiences that befell Elizabeth Drinker during the British occupation of Philadelphia in the winter of 1777-78 showed that she could, indeed, be independent in her own terms and when outside variables called on such actions.

---

[54] Susan Branson, "Elizabeth Drinker: Quaker Values and Federalist Support in the 1790s." *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies* 68, no. 4 (2001): 477 and 482. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27774361

[55] *Elizabeth Drinker's Diary*, 170.