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The enthusiasm of Edward Cummings for a Shaker life was a passing thing, but his decision to bring his family to Enfield, New Hampshire, in 1844 profoundly affected the character of the Enfield Shaker community for the next eighty years. From our vantage point, the contributions of his children John, Henry, Enoch, Rosetta and Ann cannot be fully measured. But their creativity, business acumen, and leadership abilities, their intellects and distinctive personalities shine brightly in the record of the community.

Though John Cummings had a period of doubt about having chosen a Shaker life, he and his sisters Rosetta and Ann remained faithful to
John Cummings, who along with his sisters, Rosetta and Ann, remained with the Shakers, despite the fact that his brothers, Henry and Enoch, departed. (Courtesy of Mary Ann Haagen)
the covenant that they made with the Enfield Shakers. Their stories are distinctive among those of hundreds of other lifelong Believers only in the specific skills they brought to their work and the particular challenges they faced as participants in Shakerism’s unfolding drama. In their daily lives each of them expressed the total commitment of a truly faithful follower of Mother Ann Lee.

Shaker life was not a lasting choice for other members of the family. This article explores the complex relationship that the parents and two of their sons, Enoch and Henry, had with Shakerism and with each other.

**Edward Taylor Cummings (1800-1875)**

Edward Cummings seemed a promising candidate for a Shaker life. He was an intelligent man of some property and a spiritual seeker who had been engaged in preaching the Millerite message to Adventist believers in New Hampshire. In March 1844 he caught the attention of Enfield’s North Family elder, John Lyon. Elder John encouraged Edward to move beyond his Adventist millennial expectation and, under the elder’s guidance, to begin living “the second coming” as a Shaker. In October 1844 Edward brought his family with him to Enfield and set out in the Shaker way. He made a bold start as a Believer. After three years in the novitiate order he was appointed associate elder with his mentor, Elder John Lyon. According to the assessment of the Ministry, “He has done well ever since he embraced the testimony and one whom we have confidence as being honest and true.” Within a year of this appointment, however, Edward was impatient to “be his own lead.” His faith remained strong but he was determined to be in charge of his own evangelizing agenda. The Ministry recorded these developments with resignation.

We found in coming to this place that Edward Cummings who had been living with Elder John Lyon had gone out, which we were not surprised at. He was one of the sort of people greatly led by the spirit, and felt called upon to go abroad to open the testimony. We could not feel much gift about it; but consented as he felt such a drawing out and such dissatisfied feelings, to have him go a few days and see what he could do, hoping by this he would become satisfied and return and be quiet. License or not he would have gone because the Lord called him. On account of his children who are amongst us, we gave that liberty and by it he is gone,
preaching our testimony to be the only foundation that will stand.²

We know Edward only through the accounts of others—references in the correspondence of the New Hampshire ministry, the affidavits of his wife Mary McGrath, the testimony of Caleb Dyer at the New Hampshire legislative hearings of 1848, and the letters of his second wife, Julia Cummings. It appears, however, that after September 1848, Edward returned to Enfield only for brief stays. He was never again given a position of trust in the Society.

**Mary McGrath Cummings (1808-1850)**

In Mary Cummings’ opinion, Shakerism was only the latest way station on her husband’s irresponsible spiritual journey. But in her mind it was a particularly alarming dalliance. Her experience of Shakerism corroborated every negative rumor abroad about the devastating impact of this faith on families. Her life, and her relationship to her children and to her husband, would be forever changed by his conversion.

Mary mentions two different religious enthusiasms that preceded Edward’s encounter with Shakerism. He was at one time under the sway of the Osgoodites, a religious society centered in Warner and Canterbury New Hampshire.³ He then became a disciple of William Miller and the more widespread Adventist movement. Although there is no detailed chronicle of his involvement with these groups, the timing of Edward’s move to Shakerism (March 1844) suggests that he was coming off the first “Great Disappointment”—Miller’s expectation that the world would end March 21, 1844. Although the Adventists quickly recalculated the end times to October 1844, Edward was already on a new spiritual path. For Mary the more significant fact about his timing was that in March 1844 she gave birth for the eighth time. Her daughter Mary Ann, her fifth living child, was barely delivered before Edward began pressuring Mary to indulge yet another religious scheme that had caught his fancy. We see in her affidavit that Mary was in a state of post-partum confusion and despair.

I entreated with the Shakers to let me have my dear babes, my dear little girls; but no, they said it was my husband’s choice to have the Shakers take the care of them. My disappointment and sorrow cannot be expressed. I staid about four weeks longer, and
found my trouble would overcome my reason if I continued there any longer. In this time, my husband sold his farm, and drove his stock, and carried all our property to the Shakers. They wanted me to sign the deed for the farm; but I was not willing, and reasoned with my husband and the Shakers against signing; but Lyon, the leader of that family said, “my signing was for my safety, and the only way I could have my thirds secured”. (My thirds they called six hundred dollars.) I was doubtful of his word, and continued to reason against them for hours, my heart big with grief, feeling as though they intended to make me destitute. They stood over me, threatened and flattered until I seemed to lose the power of my mind. I took the pen and signed my christian name, and felt so, I laid down the pen, and threw the deed upon the floor, and said, “I know it ain’t right for me to sign; it is the devil that is deceiving me.” My husband picked up the deed, and they continued to urge me until I had no power of mind only to do as they said, and signed the deed.4

Mary McGrath’s plight did not go unnoticed in the outside world. Indeed her experience became exploitable fresh goods for Enfield Shaker apostate Mary Dyer. Shaker scholar Elizabeth De Wolfe’s definitive study, *Shaking...*
the Faith: Women, Family, and Mary Marshall Dyer’s Anti-Shaker Campaign, 1815–1867, fully documents the fact that Mary Marshall Dyer was the most effective, persistent, impassioned apostate the Shakers ever had to deal with. When the Cummings family joined the Shakers, Mary Dyer was living relatively quietly in Enfield, New Hampshire. Her own experience thirty-five years before had many similarities with Mary Cummings’ plight. An important difference was that, although she soon regretted her decision, Mary Dyer had come willingly to the Shakers. Dyer saw opportunity in Mary Cummings tragedy. In the 1840s she was being pressed by relatives to make good on loans they had made to her in the past. She needed the income a re-invigorated campaign against the Shakers might provide. In 1847 the New Hampshire ministry wrote,

We understand Mary Dyer is reprinting her book in Concord. It is supposed there is a good deal of matter added. Strange that old false and corrupt Engine should be resuscitated & set in motion after so many years comparative silence, but I suppose the devil has nothing better to save him at present.

Dyer included Mary Cummings’ account of her experiences in her 1847 publication, and probably encouraged her to testify at the New Hampshire legislative hearings against the Shakers in 1848. In her testimony for Dyer’s book Mary Cummings insists: “I told them and my husband that I wanted nothing to do with Shakerism; but if my husband was determined to go, he might go. I could take care of my family if they would let me and the property alone.”

Despite her impassioned pleas, Mary McGrath Cummings, like Mary Marshall Dyer before her, found the legislature and the public sympathetic, but ultimately unwilling to challenge the property rights of men in New Hampshire. Despite Shaker assertions that they had strict rules about the terms under which married couples could be accepted into the faith, the reality in this case seems to be that the Shakers took full advantage of “the World’s” legal structure. The husband being the willing convert, the wife was offered a “take it or leave it” proposition. If it had been the wife who had converted to Shakerism she could not have been protected within the Society against the authority of an unwilling spouse. In the Shakers’ estimation Edward Cummings was a most worthwhile convert in his own right. The fact that he was also prepared to commit his five children to a Shaker life made him an invaluable asset to the community at Enfield.
The sentiments of a distraught unbelieving spouse were without weight or measure in their eyes. Mary McGrath died in 1850 believing that she had lost her five children to Shakerism.

**Enoch Page Cummings (1837-1901)**

Our impression of Edward and Mary’s son Enoch Cummings’ attitude toward Shakerism comes primarily through a series of letters he wrote to his brother John between 1871 and 1874. In them Enoch gives voice to his contempt for Shaker life, and decries the certain “dead-end” fate of all capable men who cannot break free of it. He abuses his brother verbally for being unable to get clear of Shakerism.

I cannot imagine what earthly object you can have in staying there, and probably you have none, only you cannot get away. A more complete slave never existed down south than you—though they were held physically and you are mentally, which is far worse—as they had some domestic rites and privileges. But we have given up all hopes of your ever leaving. Don’t believe you have pluck enough left in you to get away, and hardly believe they can kick you away. I know they have lost all respect for you and only prize you for your labor the same as they do their horses. You have become notorious among them and a laughing stock.

Enoch’s hostility and bitterness is hard to square with what seems to have been his experience of growing up at Enfield Shaker Village. Enoch was the youngest son and middle child of Edward and Mary. Being seven years old when the family came, he received eight or nine years of Shaker schooling, several of them with a most capable Shaker teacher, James Hervey Elkins. As a young man Enoch seems to have been tracked for a Shaker medical career, for he served as Enfield’s medicinal gardener, and was chosen to receive training in dentistry at Canterbury. His abilities were recognized, he was engaged in meaningful work, and he had the benefit of a sound practical education. At age twenty-one he freely signed the Church Family covenant. When he decided to leave the Shakers in 1863, at age twenty-five, his skills and experience allowed him to become an associate of Lebanon, New Hampshire, dentist Dr. Mowe. Two years later he established himself in a dental practice in Grand Haven, Michigan. In this profession he was able to support himself and his family,
and as his stepmother attests, “to mingle with what is called the first Class of People.” Nonetheless both Enoch and his wife, former Enfield Shaker Juliette Walker, were bitter about their Shaker experience and hostile to the community at Enfield. Enoch’s stepmother suggests that their anger was the result of how they were treated by the Shakers when they chose to leave.\(^\text{11}\) Certainly in the 1860s the United Society was still holding a firm line against “turnbacks” who rejected their privilege of a consecrated Shaker life. Enoch and Juliette were not only a disappointment to the community that was counting on their faithfulness and service, but they were a threat to other believers who might be wavering in their commitment to a Shaker life. Male membership was already being adversely affected by the call of the Civil War. The society could not afford to indulge the complaints or the expectations of apostates.

Enoch’s deepest resentment centered in Shakerism’s inherent, systematic thwarting of personal ambition and “rightful” compensation for work done. He was completely frustrated that John could not see how much more lucrative and self-affirming a life outside the Shaker Society would be. It is probably only because John had the freedom of movement allowed a deacon doing business for the Society that he was able to receive and keep the family letters urging him to leave the Shakers.\(^\text{12}\) Whatever food for thought they provided, they did not persuade John to apostatize.

In his article “The Hard Choices of Brother John Cumings” in the journal *Historical New Hampshire* Rob Emlen shares many excerpts from six of eight letters John saved. But he does not discuss two letters that deal extensively with financial issues involving John and Enoch. With only Enoch’s side of the correspondence available it is hard to make sense of the problem but it clearly involved financial embarrassment and loss.

Now John I can’t blame you, being situated as you are, but if you had lived among men and was accustomed to doing business I should blame you—for no Brother outside would buy a note against his brother, at any rate without first writing to him. And if I refused you could not collect a cent of the money for they are not negotiable notes payable only to Keniston nor to his or her order or to bearer. John you must be sharper than that. Now I don’t want to cheat you out of your money, neither do I Keniston but he is meaner than parsley and of course got you to buy them to try and cheat me out of the note I have against him.\(^\text{13}\)
The only information I have found in Shaker records that seems to relate to an 1872 financial problem involving John comes from Otis Sawyer of Sabbathday Lake, Maine. John was on a business trip to Quebec Province and Vermont, probably collecting the receipts for the sale of seeds and other Shaker products left on consignment. In a letter to the Mt. Lebanon Ministry Sawyer wrote, “We read with much sorrow a notice in the papers recently that Brother John Cummings of the Church Enfield had been robbed while stopping at a house in Vermont of Checks & currency to the amount of one thousand dollars, we hoped and prayed that it might not prove to be so bad, but if so, that the thief might be ferreted out and the lost money recovered.”

In a second letter by Sawyer the cause of the loss seems to be less certain. “At Enfield NH the Society are losers, by robbery (or otherwise) of many hundreds of dollars, and in their pecuniary straitness the loss must feel very distressing to them. The Evil One has tried every artifice to rob Zion of her virtue and virginity, and to give impulse to his evil designs seems now to employ with greater craft than ever that terrible ally destruction, to weaken and dishearten if possible those whom he has vainly endeavored to seduce by his artifice.”

A second letter of Enoch’s continues the diatribe about John’s involvement with the Keniston notes. “I sent the note to Brooks as you suggested. So you can leave the money with him and he can forward it to me. I have no use for it just now but will venture to give you 6 % and the notes of Kennistons if he settles it for if I beat him and secure myself on his mortgage I shall pay you. But don’t you ever buy another note against me without consulting me.”

Enoch presents himself as the aggrieved one but it is in a letter written to Enoch by Henry Cummings in 1876 that we get a clearer indication that brother Enoch had misused John and thereby the Shakers. The occasion for Henry’s letter was the death of their father.

In his will Edward Cummings apparently left his entire estate to his second wife, Julia Cummings, for her lifetime use. At her death the estate would go to Enoch and his heirs, and the other four children were to receive $1.00 each. Whatever their father’s motivations, Enoch was apparently anxious to share the news of their disinherittance. He forwarded $1.00 to each of his siblings shortly after their father’s death. Henry wrote to him challenging his actions and the will itself.
Respected Friend & Brother,
Some time since we each received a letter from you enclosing a check for $1.00 each which we accept as a token & measure of your generosity since it is not in accordance with the provisions of our Fathers will, or at least of the copy you were so kind as to furnish us with. That instrument gives neither you nor us any claim to any of Fathers property until the decease of our stepmother Julia A. and as she has only a life interest in it she can not arrange or dispose of it in any way contrary to the provisions of said will. Any action you may take in the matter will be liable to a looking up when the right time comes. If we could believe that our honored father could of his own will and choice execute such an unjust instrument as that we should have very much less respect for him than we now entertain.

And then this sentence linking us back to Enoch’s 1872 letters:

Once we would hardly have thought you capable of such a villainous scheme but since this scrape into which you & Simeon Brooks led John, & then left him to get out as best he could, without one word from you, when that word would have confirmed his statement we think you quite capable of it.

With due respect,
Your brother
Henry Cumings

It does not seem too much of a stretch to imagine that John’s encounter with “real world” finance at the hands of his brother Enoch may well have played a role in his decision to remain within the confines, the financial security, and the emotional safety of a Shaker community.

In 1880 Enoch and his wife had another opportunity to express their contempt for the Shakers. For several years in the late 1870s, Nellie Wier, daughter of Thomas Wier, circulated petitions seeking a compassionate release of her father from a lifetime prison sentence for the murder of Enfield Shaker elder and trustee Caleb M. Dyer. Enoch and Juliette Cummings were both members of the Enfield Shaker Society when Dyer was killed so they were fully aware of the circumstances surrounding the murder and its devastating impact on the community. Although the Shakers objected to Wier’s release, Enoch and Juliette advocated for a pardon.
We the undersigned residents of the state of Michigan, formally residents of the state of New Hampshire and members of the Society of Shakers at Enfield in said State, at the time of the death of Caleb M. Dyer, and knowing Thomas Wier who caused the death of said Dyer and the circumstances of the same, and knowing now what we did not then know—Parental affection, and looking at our own dear children and placing us in the position Wier then stood and knowing how he was treated by Dyer, we feel that Wier has been punished sufficiently and wish to join our petition with others to Your Honor for his pardon.

Enoch P. Cumings, Juliet W Cummings, Geo W Aiken. 18

In July 1880, to the great distress of the Enfield Shaker Community, Thomas Wier was released from prison and pardoned for the murder of Elder Caleb.

**Henry Cummings (1834-1913)**

In the person of Henry Cummings we find a man who was able to fully embrace his Shaker life, decide to change course in midlife, and live happily and without regret or bitterness in “the World.”

Henry was thirteen when his family came to Enfield in October 1844. He removed from the North Family to the Boys Order in 1845. He attended the Shaker school, and was instructed by James Hervey Elkins. Hervey left the Society in 1852 but remained in contact with Henry for many years. Henry absorbed his teacher’s passion for education in general and history in particular. At the age of sixteen Cummings was made associate caretaker of the boys. In 1853 he took over as teacher of the boys at the Church and North families. He continued to teach school until 1856.

When the Shaker leadership noticed young people of particular promise, those individuals were given assignments that matched them with other promising Believers. In 1854 Henry was chosen to go to Maine to teach winter school at Sabbathday Lake. He went in the company of Henry Blinn (future minister of the New Hampshire communities) Hester Ann Adams (future minister of the Maine communities), and Asenath Stickney (future leader at Canterbury). When he returned to Enfield he was almost immediately named associate elder of the Church Family with Elder Orville Dyer. He was twenty-two years old.
Sometimes assignments were made that did not seem to be promotions. They were motivated, instead, by the Society’s need for good leadership in a particular place. In 1859 Henry was made associate elder of the North Family. John Lyon (who was responsible for bringing the Cummings family to Enfield) had attempted to retire from his forty-three years of service as first elder there. But the replacements had not worked out. John reluctantly returned to the North Family at age seventy-eight, but with the support of a young and capable associate, Henry Cummings. When Elder John died in 1862 the Ministry was uncertain whether Henry was mature enough to take full responsibility for the family. In an unusual move they appointed Trustee Caleb Dyer first elder. Caleb had demonstrated remarkable abilities in the temporal line, but had not had responsibility for the spiritual well-being of young converts. He had little chance to prove himself however, as he was murdered in July 1863. Henry succeeded him as first elder of the North Family.

During the 1860s the Enfield Society, like all Shaker communities, suffered the loss of many young Believers through apostasy. With the leadership pool seriously depleted, it became necessary to assign Henry the job of first trustee as well as first elder. His primary challenge was to retire the North Family debt, occasioned by the unscrupulous dealings of former trustee Austin Bronson. He accomplished this by retooling and re-invigorating the North Family bucket and pail business. The debt was finally fully retired in 1877. During this decade Henry was also the public face of Shakerism at Enfield. He conducted Sunday services to which “the World’s people” were invited. He was the contact for all persons making
inquiry about entering the Society. He gave history lectures in surrounding
towns. He wrote for the Shaker publication, *The Manifesto*, and he preached
at camp meetings and at “outreach” services in New Hampshire. His high
visibility as public spokesperson for the Enfield Shaker Society made his
apostasy in 1881 a particularly devastating blow to the community. Perhaps
because they refused to see the signs, perhaps because Henry remained
fully engaged in the life of the Society until the moment of his departure,
the shock to the community must have been overwhelming. He left in May
1881, and almost immediately married a Shaker sister, Arabella Churchill,
also a member of the North Family at Enfield. Henry was willing to be
interviewed by the local paper about his decision to renounce Shakerism.
He said that he believed the movement was running out, that the Society
was unable to attract and retain individuals with ability and spiritual
commitment to Shaker principles. He was anxious to leave before the
movement collapsed. He considered himself young enough to make a life
for himself and his new wife in “the World.”

In one of his letters Enoch had assured his brother John that if he
would leave the Shakers he would have Enoch’s full support in establishing
a new life in “the World.” Enoch never had an opportunity to make good
on that promise to John, but when Henry decided to leave the Shakers,
Enoch apparently extended a welcoming, helping hand. After several
months’ adjustment to married life in Enfield, Henry and Arabella
Churchill Cummings ventured out to Grand Haven, Michigan, to become
fruit farmers. Within a year they relocated to the nearby town of Spring
Lake, and after four years they were headed home to New Hampshire.

Henry and Arabella quickly became active, respected citizens of
Enfield. Their lives were closely followed in the “Local Happenings”
section of the *Enfield Advocate*, and their contributions to the community
were publicly appreciated. As the Shaker Society at Enfield dwindled,
Henry’s assessment of its future seemed justified, but it also stimulated his
desire to record as honestly and completely as possible many aspects of
the Shaker life he had known and continued to respect. Though Henry
had chosen to “go to the World,” he valued his Shaker heritage. He wrote
accounts that were at once personal and factual. His continued access
to the community’s historic documents allowed him to supplement his
recollections with written records of the Society. His articles published
in the *Enfield Advocate* between 1904 and 1913 comprise one of our most
valuable records of the Enfield New Hampshire Shakers.
Summary

The conversion of Edward Cummings to Shakerism in 1844 set a life course for the rest of his family. His wife Mary experienced it as a devastation. His son Enoch nursed a life-long resentment of the Society, and believed himself obligated to free his siblings from its thrall. Henry was nurtured by his Shaker experience, but respectfully declined to make it his life-long commitment. John, Rosetta and Ann accepted the faith their father had chosen for them, and as they matured, made it their vocation.

It was not until 1897 that all the Cummings siblings reconnected in Enfield. Enoch and Juliette spent a week in the home of Henry and Arabella, and a week at Enfield Shaker Village. The photograph the family had taken at the time suggests that they were able to achieve some level of rapport and perhaps even respect for one another’s life choices. We can only hope so.
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