Church And State In The Middle Colonies, 1689-1763.

Church and State in the Middle Colonies, 1689-1763

by

Edward James Cody

A Dissertation
Presented to the Graduate Faculty of Lehigh University in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Lehigh University
1970

Approved and recommended for acceptance as a dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

June 29, 1970
(Date)

Lawrence H. Feldman
(Professor in Charge)

Special committee directing the doctoral work by Mr. Edward James Cody

Lawrence H. Feldman

Joseph G. Darlus

John M. Y. Haight

N. Y. Caudill

Table of Contents

An Abstract

of

A Dissertation

Church and State in the Middle Colonies,

1689-1763

by

Edward James Cody

From 1689 to 1763 the colonists of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania shared a group of religious ideas. These the author has termed the "theocentric cosmology" because they dealt with the colonists' view of God's role in the world. Essentially, the "theocentric cosmology" entailed the notions that God controlled the spiritual and material destinies of men, that he rewarded those who followed His will and punished those who violated it. These ideas remained constant throughout the period, but the "theocentric cosmology" did change in the sense of man's interpretation of God's will. How and why these changes occurred and what effect they had on the institutions of church and state are subjects of this study.

In applying this "theocentric cosmology" to the world, the middle colonists encountered difficulty.

In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, they concluded that God willed doctrinal, liturgical and moral purity. He wanted them to belong to the one and only true church and to follow the moral code laid down by that church. On the personal level this proved exceedingly difficult and some men spent their lives in an anguished quest for the true church. Furthermore, the middle colonists could not agree on what constituted the true church. Each group claimed that it alone possessed the truth and that everyone else should be forced to conform to their conception of it. Since no one at this time advocated separation of church and state a succession of combined civil and religious controversies ensued.

Because of the socially destructive nature of these controversies, a rising tide of materialism, and the human tendency to eschew the unattainable, the middle colonists, beginning roughly in 1710, exhibited a marked loss of zeal in the quest for the pure church. They became more tolerant, less certain that they knew the truth, and less willing to use the state to enforce religious orthodoxy. They came to believe that the state could survive with religious diversity. But, they also became guilty. They felt that God would punish them for rejecting the quest for the truth. Their guilt

was reenforced by ministers of all denominations who stressed the sinfulness of the times and the impending onslaught of God's fury.

With the Great Awakening of the late 1730's and early 1740's the middle colonists purged themselves of this guilt. Both revivalism and anti-revivalism altered the "theocentric cosmology" by changing the interpretation of God's will regarding the necessity of the quest for the true church. With the Awakening the individual could fulfill his duty of worshipping God either through the revivalist conversion experience or by membership in one of many anti-revivalist churches. He received assurance that such religious experiences fulfilled God's will, and he was, thereby, freed to devote the bulk of his energies to secular affairs. In these circumstances the possibility arose that secular goals could be equated with God's will. Furthermore, the concepts of toleration and separation of church and state received added impetus.

Despite this impetus, however, the middle colonists did not immediately institutionalize toleration and separation of church and state. It took a church-state controversy of major proportions, the King's College question, to shock them into a true awareness of the necessity and validity of these ideas. From that

point on, however, only Anglicans and some members of the conservative faction of the Dutch Reformed Church advocated the union of church and state.

Finally, though the theocentric cosmology had been altered in the Great Awakening, the ideas that God controlled the spiritual and material destinies of men and demanded strict adherence to his will under pain of severe punishment remained. With the Great War for Empire these ideas were applied to secular goals. Religious men, with the exception of the pacifist Quakers, claimed that God willed a holy war against the irreligion of French Papists. Thus, the war became in part a religious crusade. The same apparently held true for the American Revolution, only then religious men divided essentially along revivalist and anti-revivalist lines in their support or non-support of the war.

Introduction

The following study is an essay in intellectual history, or more precisely an essay in one type of intellectual history. It is a study of the often confused, imprecise, and changing thought of a large heterogeneous group of people on one topic during a period of seventy-four years. As such, it deals primarily with those ideas which were commonly held and the interaction of those ideas with institutions. It is a study of religious thought and church-state relations in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania from 1689 to 1763.

To say that much, however, helps more to raise questions than to describe the study. Why were those three colonies selected? Why was the time period, 1689 to 1763, chosen? Why is religious thought the subject of the study? Why are church-state relations also examined? Why do political, social, economic and other factors receive only minimal attention? Why does this study deal with just commonly held religious ideas? What were these ideas? How did they interact with church and state during the entire period? How will each section of the study contribute to the overall thesis? What response does the author make to

criticisms of his chosen methodology? The list could be endless, but if these are answered the nature, scope, and purpose of this study should become clear.

To begin with, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania were chosen as the locale for this study because they formed a unit during colonial times. Despite much diversity, a number of common ties held them together. New York and New Jersey shared the same governor during part of the period and all three colonies possessed similar political institutions. Philadelphia and New York City served as the end points of an intellectual axis along which ideas were disseminated throughout much of the area. The major religious sects in these colonies, Quakers, Presbyterians, and Anglicans, had organizational structures which kept their adherents in frequent communication. Finally, the three colonies were united by geographical similarity and proximity. They formed, in short, a loosely organized but sufficiently intregated unit in which to examine religious thought and church-state relations.

The period 1689 to 1763 was selected because it spanned the years between the culmination of England's Glorious Revolution and the end of the Great War for Empire. The Glorious Revolution affected the middle colonies religiously and politically. It brought about the end of the Dominion of New England and resulted in the royalization of New York and New Jersey. The passage

of England's Act of Toleration as part of the revolutionary settlement meant that royal governors would begin attempting to establish the Anglican Church in the colonies. Hence, 1689 is a convenient point to begin a study of religious thought and church-state relations. The end of the Great War for Empire saw the beginning of the Revolutionary crisis in America, a period of unsettlement and controversy. By stopping this study on the eve of the crisis it is possible to paint a picture of the nature of religious thought and church-state relations as they had evolved up to that time, and to suggest how they may have influenced the forthcoming Revolutionary crisis.

Religious thought is the subject of this study because it held an important place in the lives of the middle colonists. Certainly, they were vitally concerned with myriad other aspects of life, but religion received a goodly share of their attention. If we can judge by what they read, their spiritual affairs were more interesting to them than they have been to modern historians. Hence, a general examination of their religious attitudes will add to our understanding of the colonial mind.

Furthermore, it will enhance our knowledge of church-state relations in the middle colonies. After all, men do not simply think about religion, they institutionalize it. From 1689 until almost the end of the period, church-

state relations proved troublesome for the middle colonists. By examining the mutual interaction of religious thought with these institutions, therefore, it is possible to gain at least a partial understanding of the dynamics of church-state relations and the eventual development of the concepts of toleration and separation of church and state.

The author is well aware that other factors, political power, economics, social status, to name but a few, also contributed to the church-state controversies of the period and to their eventual resolution. If this study treats them in a very minimal fashion, it is because the author seeks to analyze the interaction of religious thought with church and state as one facet of the problem. He feels that in this way the importance of religious thought in the middle colonies will become clear. He does not rank its importance vis à vis other factors on any scale, he simply contends that it is an important factor which deserves attention.

In dealing with religious thought, the author has sought to discover which ideas were shared by the vast majority of religious men despite sectarian diversity. Dealing with these ideas it is then possible to speak of the religious thought of the middle colonists in general and to say something meaningful about their corporate response to events in light of these ideas. Furthermore,

the author has dealt with technical theological arguments only when necessary for the understanding of religious thought in general or the understanding of a particular controversy. This study does not proport to be a theological treatise.

To discover which religious ideas were commonly held by the middle colonists, the author has examined all books, pamphlets, sermons, broadsides, and newspaper articles dealing with religious subjects published in New York, New Jersey, or Pennsylvania from 1689 to 1763. From these sources, he discovered a shared group of ideas. These he has termed the "theocentric cosmology" because they dealt with God's role in the world. Essentially, the "theocentric cosmology" entailed the notions that God controlled the spiritual and material destinies of men, that he rewarded those who followed His will and punished those who violated it. These ideas remained constant throughout the period, but the "theocentric cosmology" did change in the sense of man's interpretation of God's will. How and why these changes occurred and what effect they had on the institutions of church and state are subjects of this study.

In applying this "theocentric cosmology" to the world, the middle colonists encountered difficulty. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, they concluded that God willed doctrinal, liturgical and moral

purity. He wanted them to belong to the one and only true church and to follow the moral code laid down by that church. On the personal level this proved exceedingly difficult and some men spent their lives in an anguished quest for the true church. Furthermore, the middle colonists could not agree on what constituted the true church. Each group claimed that it alone possessed the truth and that everyone else should be forced to conform to their conception of it. Since no one at this time advocated separation of church and state a succession of combined civil and religious controversies ensued.

Because of the socially destructive nature of these controversies, a rising tide of materialism, and the human tendency to eschew the unattainable, the middle colonists, beginning roughly in 1710, exhibited a marked loss of zeal in the quest for the pure church. They became more tolerant, less certain that they knew the truth, and less willing to use the state to enforce religious orthodoxy. They came to believe that the state could survive with religious diversity. But, they also became guilty. They felt that God would punish them for rejecting the quest for the truth. Their guilt was reenforced by ministers of all denominations who stressed the sinfulness of the times and the impending onslaught of God's fury.

With the Great Awakening of the late 1730's and early 1740's the middle colonists purged themselves of this guilt. Both revivalism and anti-revivalism altered the

"theocentric cosmology" by changing the interpretation of God's will regarding the necessity of the quest for the true church. With the Awakening the individual could fulfill his duty of worshipping God either through the revivalist conversion experience or by membership in one of many anti-revivalist churches. He received assurance that such religious experiences fulfilled God's will, and he was, thereby, freed to devote the bulk of his energies to secular affairs. In these circumstances the possibility aroes that secular goals could be equated with God's will. Furthermore, the concepts of toleration and separation of church and state received added impetus.

Despite this impetus, however, the middle colonists did not immediately institutionalize toleration and separation of church and state. It took a church-state controversy of major proportions, the Kings College question, to shock them into a true awareness of the necessity and validity of these ideas. From that point on, however, only Anglicans and some members of the conservative faction of the Dutch Reformed Church advocated the union of church and state.

Finally, though the "theocentric cosmology" had been altered in the Great Awakening the ideas that God controlled the spiritual and material destinies of men and demanded strict adherence to his will under pain of severe punish-

ment remained. With the Great War for Empire these ideas were applied to secular goals. Religious men, with the exception of the pacifist Quakers, claimed that God willed a holy war against the irreligion of French Papists. Thus, the war became in part a religious crusade. The same apparently held true for the American Revolution, only then religious men divided essentially along revivalist and anti-revivalist lines in their support or non-support of the war.

With the foregoing statement of the scope and purpose of this study and its general thesis now deliniated, some explanation of the organization and content of each chapter and its relationship to the whole now seems in order. To begin with, it should be pointed out that these chapters provide a series of case studies of the problem. They are studies of particular events which serve as illustrations of the overall thesis.

The first chapter, "The Theocentric World of George Keith" begins with a general description of the "theocentric cosmology" explaining the way in which the majority of religious men in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century viewed God's will. They felt compelled to seek purity of worship and moral purity. Then, using the career of George Keith, a religious fanatic even for his day, as a case study, this chapter illustrates the problems for the individual and the community of

attempting to implement God's will in an imperfect world. Keith's ideas and activities were selected for study because they created a great stir in the middle colonies.

Keith, ever convinced that he alone knew the truth, demanded that his fellow Quakers, and everyone else for that matter, conform to his ideas on worship and morality. Naturally, most people refused his views, for they, too, knew the truth. The resulting controversy split the Quaker Church, brought about the persecution of Keith and his followers, and led to Keith's conversion to Anglicanism. In this new religious posture Keith sought to persecute his former brethren. Both he and they justified their intolerance on the grounds that there could be only one truth and that God required all men to adhere to it. In short, this chapter illustrates how the attempt to fulfill God's will in terms of the perfect church and the perfect morality could cause anguish for certain individuals and anguish for the community to which these individuals belonged. At the same time, it presents a picture of the religious intolerance which resulted from this attempt to fulfill God's will.

The second chapter, "The Intolerant World of Edward Cornbury" examined the problem of fulfilling God's will regarding the perfect church from an institutional perspective. Herein, church-state relations in New York, 1688 to 1710,

form the subject for another case study. During this period, and especially during Cornbury's governorship (1702-1709) the executive, directed by the crown to enforce England's Act of Toleration, made a concerted effort to establish the Anglican Church in New York. Since each sect in the colony believed that it constituted the true church and since no one at this time advocated separation of church and state this led to religious and civil controversies. These arguments, which are explored in detail, revealed deep confusion about the powers and functions of church and state. Only the Anglicans knew what they wanted, dominance. Everyone else knew what they did not want, Anglican dominance, but they were confused on how to structure church and state to avoid that possibility.

With the prosecution by Cornbury of the Presbyterian minister, Francis Makemie, non-Anglicans presented a tentative solution to their problem. They suggested that local Assemblies, not the executive or Parliament, possessed the authority to legislate on matters of religion. This served as a first step in the eventual development of the concept of separation of church and state.

The third chapter, "The Uneasy World of Titian Leeds" studies the consequences resulting from a loss of zeal in the pursuit of the perfect church and the perfect morality. This chapter begins with a short case study of the religious attitudes of Daniel Leeds and his

son Titian, which reveals a loss of spiritual zeal, a lack of certitude, a growing tolerance, and a sense of guilt on the part of the younger man. Having rejected the quest for purity of worship, Titian floundered intellectually. He felt that his father was intolerant, uncharitable, and fanatical, but he could never be sure of his own position. A general examination of religious thought in the middle colonies from 1710 to 1730 shows that many of Titian's contemporaries shared this anxiety. Even very religious men became uneasy. They warned of impending doom unless people returned to the spiritual quest and they played down denominational distinctions in an effort to defend religion in general. This led to growing toleration which was defended as being in accord with Christian charity.

This chapter then proceeds to an institutional examination of the consequences of declension. A study of the major church-state controversies of the period reveals an increasing tolerance of divergent religious opinions and a tendency to seek separation of church and state. It was only a tendency, however, not a fully accepted program for the solution to the church-state problem. Though the Presbyterian minister, Jonathan Dickenson clearly articulated the ideas of toleration and separation of church and state, and though none of his contemporaries challenged their validity, the church-

state controversies of the day revealed a gap between theory and practice. Religious men were still ready to use the state for their own advantage though they might object to its involvement in religious affairs on a theoretical level.

Chapter Four, "The Changing World of 'Hell Fire Tennent'" examined the purgation of the guilt created by a loss of zeal in the quest for the pure church and the pure morality. With the Great Awakening of the late 1730's and early 1740's Gilbert Tennent and other revivalist ministers called upon the middle colonists to repent. They tried to convince men of their sinfulness by preaching the terror of the Lord and they asked them to rest their salvation on Christ's mercy. Thousands responded in an emotional frenzy and felt justified before God. With this accomplished, they returned to the secular world assured of their moral rectitude and better able to engage in material activity. On the other hand, those colonists who opposed emotionalism joined the anti-revivalist camp. Anti-revivalists ministers stressed reason, order, authority, and denominationalism. They claimed they were God's representatives on earth and that they could assure men of salvation. Consequently, anti-revivalists could also engage in secular activity and still fulfill the religious quest. They, too, were purged of guilt.

The Awakening altered the "theocentric cosmology" in that God's will was no longer interpreted as requiring the quest for the perfect church. Men could now fulfill their duty to God either through the conversion experience or by membership in one of many religious sects. The vast majority of religious men, however, still believed that God controlled the spiritual and material destinies of men and that His will had to be followed under pain of Divine wrath. Coupled with the freedom to engage in the secular world without guilt this created the possibility that God's will could be interpreted to require support or non-support for secular goals.

Finally, this chapter explores the consequences of the Awakening on church-state relations. The Awakening paved the way for the full acceptance of toleration and separation of church and state. The revivalist stress on personal religion meant that orthodoxy became a personal matter and their challenge to church authority could easily be broadened to include a denial of civil authority in religious affairs. Furthermore, the anti-revivalists were forced to band together in an effort to suppress revivalism. This forced them to be more tolerant of divergent theological opinions. Finally, the splintering of sects in the revival made toleration and separation of church and state practical necessities.

An institutional examination of the consequences of the Awakening on church state relations, however, revealed continuing confusion on the part of non-Anglicans. Though some of them clearly espoused separation of church and state, and none of them denied the validity of this idea, they persisted in seeking to use the state to their own advantage. They still had not fully accepted this concept in terms of actual practice.

Chapter five, "The Tolerant World of William Livingston" examines the King's College controversy which brought non-Anglicans in the middle colonies to an awareness of the discrepancy between their at least tacit acceptance of toleration and separation of church and state, and their failure to fully institutionalize these concepts. In the 1750's, when the Anglicans sought to turn the proposed New York college into a seminary for their church, Livingston undertook a momentous literary campaign to thwart their objective. As a man who understood the full import of the concepts of toleration and separation of church and state more clearly than many of his contemporaries, Livingston was the ideal leader for such a campaign. He argued that religious orthodoxy was a personal thing and that no one could tell another how to think on spiritual affairs. The state, he maintained, must remain totally separate from the church.

His campaign, which receives a detailed analysis in this chapter, succeeded in convincing almost all non-Anglicans to oppose the Anglican scheme. More importantly, Livingston's arguments during the Kings College controversy were published throughout the middle colonies. They helped to make all the middle colonists, not just New Yorkers, aware of the real meaning of the concepts of toleration and separation of church and state--concepts which they had accepted in theory for years. Now, they put them into practice. In the years following the Kings College argument there were no significant denials by dissenters, either in theory or practice, of these concepts.

The sixth chapter, "The Holy World of War" studies the continuing impact of the "theocentric cosmology" on men's actions. With the Awakening, the possibility had arisen that God's will would be interpreted in terms of secular affairs. This chapter shows how that possibility became a reality. During the Great War for Empire, religious men, with the exception of the pacifist Quakers, called for a holy war against France. God they believed commanded all Protestants to oppose the irreligion of the Papists. Furthermore, God allowed the French and the Indians to scourge the colonists because they had sinned. To emerge victorious, they had to repent. Hence, the war became, in part a religious crusade against internal and external vice.

An examination of the historical literature relating to the American Revolution, suggests a tentative hypothesis regarding the religious psychology of that war. The second half of the sixth chapter contains an analysis of this thesis. Quite simply, the author contends that religious men responded to the Revolutionary crisis in much the same way as they did to the Great War for Empire. Only with the Revolution, they divided along revivalist and anti-revivalist lines in their support or non-support of the war. The Revolution was, in part, a religious crusade against British vice and colonial corruption.

By now it should be evident that this study concentrates on the confused, imprecise, changing thought of a very large group of people and makes generalizations about that thought. To some, this is anathema. According to David Fischer, "One problem for an idealist epistemology is the group phenomenon." "Can one rethink the thought of a collectivity," he asks. Then answering his own question, replies, "Only it seems by conjuring up the fiction of a 'corporate mind.'"[1] Since the following chapters talk about the religious thought of the "middle colonists"--clearly a corporate mind--some discussion of this problem appears necessary before proceeding.

---

1. David Fischer, Historians' Fallacies, Toward a Logic of Historical Thought (New York, 1970), p. 197.

Fischer, of course, is correct. No group of people, however small, exhibits exactly homogeneous thought patterns. Every individual responds to ideas and events in light of his unique personal experience. However, every individual exists in society and all groups in society share common experiences and common ideas. If the historian is confined to examining the thought and action of individuals, he is forced into nominalism. He can say nothing about group activity, about the development of social institutions, about the historical process. He can only speak of isolated men, their individual thoughts and their personal actions.

Even if the historian confined himself to such narrow bounds, however, the question would still arise as to how a given individual came to hold particular ideas. Did they materialize in his mind out of nothingness? The answer, it seems to this author, lies in a complex of underlying assumptions, attitudes and physical realities which an individual inherits from the community. He is determined, in a sense, to think and act within the confines of the community's on going intellectual and material experience. Even if he rebels against these inherited determinants, he must deal with them in the very act of rebelling.

What this study does, therefore, is explore one facet of the intellectual configurations which men inherited in the period 1689 to 1763. This complex of ideas, which the

author has termed the "theocentric cosmology" were confused, imprecise, subject to change, and laden with emotion, but they were also determinants in the thought and actions of men. No attempt has been made to explore the philosophical origins of these ideas or to relate them to other sets of ideals. They are treated simply as one factor in the historical process.[2]

Another criticism of this type of intellectual history states that it is naive to accept the published utterances of men as valid descriptions of their motivation. Might not their statements be rationalizations for underlying desires? When, for example, a minister exhorts his congregation to fight in a war because God wills it, could he not really mean that he wills it, because personal political, social, or economic gain would accrue to him or a group to which he belongs?

Such questions are valid, but they are also outside the scope of this study. What concerns this author is the religious ideas that were current between 1689 and 1763, and their impact on institutions. Whether or not a given individual sincerely believed what he said or wrote about God's role in the world does not matter, for in saying it

---

2. For a detailed analysis of the types of intellectual history, their methodology and assumptions see: Rush Welter, "The History of Ideas in America: An Essay in Redefinition," The Journal of American History, LI (March, 1965), 599-614.

he had an impact on his contemporaries. He contributed to a climate of opinion in which decisions were made. It is this climate which will be explored.

One final note should be added. At no time in dealing with the religious and secular opinions of the middle colonists does the author mean to imply a personal belief or disbelief in their opinions. Wherever judgments are made they apply only to the historical actions of individuals or groups, not to the truth or error of their theological and material convictions.

Chapter I

The Theocentric World of George Keith

In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, a large body of theological literature emanated from the presses at New York and Philadelphia. Sermons, doctrinal treatises, catechisms, Bibles, and a profusion of controversial religious literature satisfied the public literary appetite. Such reading fare reflected a common intellectual world shared by settlers of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, who, despite sectarian differences, viewed life from the same theocentric perspective.[1]

---

1. Along with the works referred to in subsequent notes, the description of the theocentric cosmology is based on the following publications: The Christianity of the People Called Quakers (Philadelphia, 1690). George Whitehead, A Christian Epistle (Philadelphia, 1691). John Willsford, A Brief Exhortation (Philadelphia, 1691); Thomas Budd, A Brief Answer (Philadelphia, 1692); Thomas Budd, A Just Rebuke (Philadelphia, 1692); Stephen Crisp, An Epistle of Tender Love (Philadelphia, 1692). Stephen Crisp, A Faithful Warning (Philadelphia, 1692); Thomas Budd and others, An Expostulation (Philadelphia, 1692); Samuel Willard, Some Miscellany Observations (Philadelphia, 1692); Society of Friends, A Confession of Faith (Philadelphia, 1693); Society of Friends, An Exhortation and Caution (New York, 1693); Society of Friends, A Testimony and Caution (Philadelphia, 1693); Benjamin Fletcher, A Proclamation (New York, 1693); Gersham Builele, Some Seasonable Considerations (New York, 1694); William Davis, Jesus the Crucified Man (Philadelphia, 1700); A Seasonable Account (Philadelphia, 1700); Society of Friends, An Epistle to the Quarterly and Monthly Meeting (Philadelphia, 1701); A Letter from a Clergyman (Philadelphia, 1702); Edward Cornbury, A Proclamation (Boston, 1703); Francis Bugg, A Bomb (New York, 1704); John Evans, A Proclamation (Philadelphia, 1704); John Rodgers, An Epistle (New York, 1705); John Rodgers, A Midnight Cry (New York, 1705); John Sharp, A Sermon (New York, 1706).

To begin with, they all agreed on the supreme importance of worshipping God. From the Old and the New Testaments, and the continuing revelations of the Holy Spirit, they learned the essentials of pure worship and the true church. They discovered God's commands concerning sermons, prayers, hymns, sacraments, the Sabbath, church government, selection of ministers, church membership, construction of church buildings, decoration of churches, and myriad other essentials. They knew that each of these commands must be followed to the letter, if they were to please God.

These men also knew that to please God they had to lead a true Christian life. Here too, the Bible and the Spirit provided them with specific divine commands. They found rules governing their vocations, speech, thought, dress, sex life, family relations, eating and drinking habits, financial dealings, conduct toward their neighbors, relationship to the civil government, and just about everything else. If they followed God's will in these matters, He would be pleased.

It behooved men to please God, because God directed the destiny of the world. He controlled everything and everybody. He was always generous to those who followed His will and would provide for those who worshipped Him and led a moral life. God would provide their material wants, prevent the ravages of nature from harming them,

rescue them from their enemies, uplift their souls, and give them eternal salvation.

It further behooved men to please God because He was as jealous as He was generous. Violations of God's law, or the improper worship of God would bring divine vengeance. An individual or a community guilty of disobedience to God or impurities of religion had no way of avoiding punishment. Such people, everyone knew, would be destroyed both materially and spiritually.

Since following God's will was of such supreme importance, it was fortunate that the Bible, the Spirit and men's reason provided them with the truth. To please God, they simply had to live in accordance with that truth. In practice, however, some emphasized the Bible as the final truth, others emphasized the "inner light" of the Spirit and all constructed theological systems of varying complexity to achieve an understanding of God's desires. Hence, men differed as to what constituted religious truth, and yet each man remained certain that he possessed absolute truth.

Furthermore, if God had revealed religious truth to a man, he was impelled under threat of divine wrath to propagate that truth. Hence, religious sects argued about the nature of true religion and moral law. On occasion, an individual, convinced that he alone knew God's will, would start his own religious group.

Such diversity, however, could not be allowed, for it imperiled God's decree that all men should unite under the one true Christian fatih. There could be only one religion and one moral law by His edict; any deviations would anger him. Each man knew this, but each also knew that he posseesed the only truth. This led to continuous conflict between religious sects and between private individuals. Under such circumstances, religious toleration was illusory.

This theocentric world view, though not always articulared in the same fashion and not always consciously present, effectively motivated men in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. The theocentric view served as a framework in which men acted, and as a guide to direct their actions.

Especially was this true of those who sought perfect identification with God. To a greater degree than most, they confronted God directly. For them, belief, fervor, devotion, and a union with God were of paramount importance. A religion without such mystical communion with God should, in their view, be rejected for its imperfection. Religious zealots in a religious age, these men sought to do God's will perfectly and thereby achieve a spiritual oneness with Him.

These zealots, moreover, did not stop with their own perfection. They demanded conformity by everyone to their ideas. In late seventeenth and early eighteenth

century New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, where each man had his own version of religious truth, any religious zealot was sure to create a tumult.

George Keith, religious zealot, raised his voice above the multitude: "Ignorant heathens, stray souls, heretics, Roman ranters." Invective upon invective cascaded from his lips. His Quakers brethren angrily retorted in kind. "Brat of Babylon" spat one; "Pope" taunted another; "Reviler of your Brethren" accused a third. Normally pious, quiet, and discreet Quakers pushed and shoved each other. Keith, livid with rage, shouted all the louder. Impassioned men grabbed him and tried to throw him bodily from the meeting hall, while others pushed him back. Everyone shouted and shoved "so that such great confusion was scarce ever seen."[2] Such was the shambles of the Quaker yearly meeting at Philadelphia in July of 1691.

George Keith, the cause of this disruption, ranked as a leading Quaker theologicn and disputant. Raised in Scotland and trained in Calvinistic Theology, he was originally a member of the Presbyterian church. In his twenties, however, he converted to Quakerism. His keen mind, excellent education, zest for controversy, and

---

2. George Keith and Thomas Budd, The Plea of the Innocent Against the False Judgment of the Guilty (Philadelphia, 1692), pp. 6-8.

intellectual conceit drove him to become a prominent apologist for his newly adopted religion. In public debates and in a torrent of pamphlets and tracts he vindicated the principles of Quaker faith and attacked those of the established Presbyterian church. Since the Scottish authorities could not help but notice such an outspoken critic, Keith was frequently imprisoned and beaten. Yet, he persisted unflaggingly, and his reputation grew among the Quakers. He ranked with his friends, George Fox, Robert Barclay, and William Penn as a pre-eminent Quaker.[3]

In 1684 an opportunity arose for Keith to come to the New World. His friend, Robert Barclay, then governor of East Jersey, invited him to become surveyor-general of the province. Keith readily accepted. Having spent the last twenty years in and out of Scottish jails, he welcomed the change to end that vicious cycle, to practice his religion in peace.

---

3. For brief biographies of Keith see: Rufus M. Jones The Quakers in the American Colonies (London, 1911), pp. 437-458. Nelson R. Burr, The Anglican Church in New Jersey (Philadelphia, 1954), pp. 34-45, 617-618; Wallace N. Jamison, Religion in New Jersey: A Brief History (New York, 1964); pp. 26-29; Charles P. Keith, Chronicles of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1917), I, 210-242; Horace M. Lippincott, "The Keithian Separation," Bulletin of Friends' Historical Association, XVI (1927), 49-58. James A. Muller, "George Keith," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XIV (1914), 94-106; Edgar Legare Pennington, "Keith the Quaker and Keith the Anglican," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church (1951), p. 346-362. For a full length biography see Ethyn Williams Kirby, George Keith, 1638-1716 (New York, 1942).

Unfortunately, opportunities for religious peace always proved ephemeral for George Keith. Religion was his all consuming passion. He mind seldom wandered from theological topics. God was the center of his world, the object of his love and desire. He truly wanted to please God, to fulfill His will to perfection, to unite himself with God. Knowing that "faithfulness in the work and service of God, is that which doth render a man perfect in the sight of God," Keith felt compelled to defend God's religion against any impurities.[4] Alas, impurities abounded and Keith, the zealot, found no peace.

A few years after his arrival in East Jersey he engaged in a theological controversy with Cotton Mather and other New England divines. Keith declared that the New England churches, ministry, and religious practices were "things of man's making and inventing and setting up, a man-made church, a man-made ministry, man-made ordinances, and man-made worship." New Englanders had "no belief of having the Spirit of God inwardly inspiring them, and revealing in them the things of God, and inwardly teaching them the mysteries of the kingdom."[5] Without such "inner light" they naturally fell into error. As the faithful servant of God, Keith both reprimanded them and explained to them the true religion of Quakerism.

---

4. George Keith, The Presbyterian And Independent Visible Churches in New England (Philadelphia, 1689), p. 164.

5. Ibid., p. 44.

Keith knew the truth of Quakerism because God had told him of it. Like all Quakers, he believed that "it is the Holy Spirit opening, or expounding the Scripture unto us, in reading, hearing, meditation, prayer, waiting, obedience to what we already know, that is the Judge of all controversy in matter of doctrine." The Holy Spirit "spoke to the mind and spirit of man" and he had spoken to George Keith. Hence, Keith warned New Englanders to mend their ways lest God punish them for their sins. Like a Prophet of old, he cried that God's voice "hath not ceased to sound, but still doth, and shall, and the sound of it shall not only shake but utterly remove, undo, and destroy all your Babyloneth buildings." Reformation must come quickly, he added, for "the time hasteneth, and blessed shall be he who receiveth warning and harkeneth unto the counsel of the Lord; he who has ears to hear, let him hear."[6]

The New England clergy heard, but they were not impressed, for they were thoroughly convinced of their own righteousness. To them, a belief in the inner light was "nonsense." They asked, "How shall we judge of the Spirit, but by the Scripture?"[7] From the Bible, and from the vast and complicated "federal theology" they had devised

---

6. Ibid., p. 7, 34, 171.

7. James Allin and others, The Principles of the Protestant Religion Maintained (Boston, 1690), p. 39.

the true form of worship and Church organization. They defended their true religion against Quakerism "that great choakweed of the Christian and Protestant religion, taking root on the borders of a country famous for . . . holy religion."[8]

Needless to say, a controversy between two parties, each intensely concerned with religion, each thoroughly convinced it alone had the truth, and each unquestionably commanded by God to defend that truth, did not end amicably. In a succession of books and pamphlets, Keith and the New Englanders lavished invective upon one another. Years passed, and the peaceful enjoyment of religion continued to elude George Keith.

In fact, Keith's intense preoccupation with theological questions, and his feverish desire to maintain doctrinal purity led him into an even greater controversy. He moved to Philadelphia in 1689, giving him an opportunity to observe the religious beliefs and practices of his fellow Quakers. He spent a good part of his time "in reading, meditation, visiting meetings, and answering the conscientious doubts and questions of many people."[9] What he saw at these meetings and heard from these people disturbed him

---

8. Cotton Mather, Little Flocks Guarded Against Grievous Wolves (Boston, 1691), p. 2; For the "Federal Theology" see Perry Miller, The New England Mind, The Seventeenth Century (New York, 1954), especially pp. 365-491.

9. George Keith, New England's Spirit of Persecution Transmitted to Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1693). p. 1.

greatly. As he later explained, he was "deeply afflicted with sorrow to find some so highly pretending to truth, and to the inward and immediate teachings and leadings of the spirit of truth . . . so very ignorant and unfounded in some of the chief and fundamental principles of the Christian faith and doctrine, and so resolute and confident in their ignorance and error."[10]

The most perplexing error, to Keith, was Quaker reliance on the light within to the exclusion of the historical Christ. Though a defender of the Quaker inner light against New Englanders, Keith was certainly aware of its possible overemphasis. In 1691 he accused William Stockdale, "an ancient preacher," of doing just that. Keith claimed that Stockdale perverted the idea of Christ's continuing revelations to man through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit by ignoring the life and works of Christ as a man. Stockdale replied that Keith preached "two Christs because he preached faith in Christ within, and faith in Christ without."[11] Keith retorted that Stockdale was an ignorant heathen, and asked twelve Quaker ministers to pass judgment on him. They refused, thereby setting the stage for that acrimonious scene at the Philadelphia yearly meeting of July 1691.

---

10. George Keith, Some Reasons and Causes of the Late Separation (Philadelphia, 1692), p.1.

11. George Keith and Thomas Budd, Plea of the Innocent, p. 2.

The shouting and jostling that ensued and the aroused passions testify to the intensity with which men approached religion in a theocentric world. The thrust of divine wrath impelled them to seek theological truth and having found it, to cling tenaciously to it. Hence, any questioning of the nature of Christ and revelation led to flaring tempers.

Under such emotional conditions, it took the Philadelphia yearly meeting six sessions to reach a conclusion. It finally blamed Stockdale and declared that Keith's doctrine was true. But that did not settle the matter. At subsequent monthly and quarterly meetings Keith's opponents attacked, accusing him of denying the sufficiency of the light within. Keith asserted that "they exclude the man Christ Jesus from having any part in our salvation."[12] He demanded that all Quakers subscribe to a confession of faith, a confession framed according to his principles. And so they argued back and forth, calling each other heretics.

As the controversy continued, many leading Quakers, including Samuel Jennings, clerk of the quarterly meeting of ministers as well as a civil judge, and Thomas Lloyd, deputy governor, opposed Keith. They disliked his "passion

---

12. George Keith, A Discovery of the Mystery of Iniquity and Hypocrisie (Philadelphia, 1692), p. 2.

and bitterness of spirit" and his willingness "to discover the weakness of friends." They feared that a confession of faith would divide the Holy Commonwealth. Religious zeal could be carried too far, and the holy passion of one man could not be allowed to split a community.[13]

But, how could they stop it? Keith believed that the Holy Spirit directed him. As an instrument of God, he must correct the errors of his fellow Quakers. He must seek perfect conformity to the will of God, and perfect identification with God. Quakers, however, believed that Keith was an instrument of the devil, that he propagated error. Obviously, the two parties could not live together in a Holy Communion.

By March 1692, their "godly zeal" having moved them to "a holy impatience" with the "gross ignorance and unbelief" of their fellow Quakers, Keith and his supporters abandoned the Society of Friends. "We are convinced and persuaded in our consciences," they announced, "that God calleth us to separate from such unbelievers and not to be yoked together in Church-fellowship and discipline with any that we have not proof of by confession of the mouth,

---

13. The reasons for opposition to Keith are set forth in "A Letter from Hugh Roberts to William Penn," Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, XVIII (1895), 205-210.

that they are sound in faith."[14] Keith and his followers then established their own meeting, thereby achieving the logical conclusion of the quest for a pure religion in an impure world.

At the next monthly meeting, the Quakers disowned George Keith. Twenty-eight leading Friends signed the judgment against him. It denounced Keith as "being degenerated from the lowly, meek, and peaceable spirit of Christ Jesus, and grown cool in charity and love towards his breathren." It deprecated his "spirit of enmity, wrath, and self-exhaltation," and further reviled him for accusing the Quakers of heresy and for separating from them.[15] In short, the Quakers were as convinced of their correctness as was Keith of his.

Keith, of course, was not one to let a good controversy die. So, together with Thomas Budd, he published The Plea of the Innocent Against the False Judgment of the Guilty. Along with another restatement of the Keithian theological position and the usual charges of ignorance and heresy against the Quakers, Keith and Budd interjected a new element into the argument. They observed that Samuel Jennings, John Seacock, and Arthur Cooke, as well as other Quakers involved in government "take occasion on that

---

14. George Keith, Some Reasons and Causes of the Late Separation, p. 22.

15. George Keith and Thomas Budd, A True Copy of Three Judgements (Philadelphia, 1692), p. 4.

account to exalt themselves, and lord it over G.K. and his friends, and seek to oppress and run him down, because of their wordly power and greatness."[16] Since Quakerism enjoined men to remain aloof from "worldly power and greatness," this was a telling attack.

Keith made a sharper attack in An Appeal from the Twenty-eight Judges, published soon thereafter. He asked, "Whether there is any example or precedent for it in Scripture, or in Christendom, that ministers should engage in wordly government, as they do here." He noted the "very evil tendency" of such activity and attacked his judges for hiring men to fight, providing Indians with weapons, and passing sentences of death. Keith concluded that his judges had violated Friends' pacifist principles and should condemn themselves rather than him.[17]

The Quaker magistrates reacted quickly and angrily. William Bradford, printer of the Appeal, and John McComb, an inn-keeper who had posted it on his tavern door, were arrested on a warrant signed by Samuel Jennings and Arthur Cooke among others. They were charged with "publishing, uttering, and spreading a malicious and seditious paper tending to the disturbance of the peace and the subversion

---

16. George Keith and Thomas Budd, Plea of the Innocent, p. 9.

17. George Keith, An Appeal from the Twenty-Eight Judges (Philadelphia, 1692), p. 7.

of the present government."[18] The authorities searched Bradford's home and seized his printer's type.

Though Lasse Cock and John Holmes, the only non-Quaker justices, objected that "the matter was a religious difference . . . and did not relate to the government,"[19] the Quaker justices persisted. A proclamation asserted that Keith had publicly vilified Thomas Lloyd by calling him "an impudent man" "unfit to be governor," that he had "traduced and viley misrepresented the industry, care, readiness, and vigilence of some magistrates," and that his pamphlets and speeches tended to "sedition and disturbance of the peace." The Quaker justices claimed that they acted only against his subversiveness, not his "gross railings of our religious society." They announced that they would soon take legal action against Keith and Thomas Budd.[20]

Bradford and McComb, meanwhile, requested a trial at the forthcoming July court session. The Quaker justices refused and held their case for the October session. Furthermore, they revoked John McComb's tavern license because of his "contentious behavior as also his spreading

---

18. George Keith, New England's Spirit of Persecution, p. 4. For another contemporary account of the prosecution of Bradford and McComb see Francis Makemie, An Answer to George Keith's Libel (Boston, 1694), pp. 84-103.

19. George Keith, New England's Spirit of Persecution, p. 4.

20. Ibid., p. 6.

a seditious paper in his house to the disturbance of the peace."[21]

By October, the Philadelphia County grand jury formally indicted Keith and Budd as well as Peter Boss, another Keith supporter. Boss had defended Keith in a letter to Samuel Jennings and accused Jennings of occasionally being drunk and betting on horse races.[22] Hence, when the County Court met there were five defendants--Keith, Budd, Boss, Bradford, and McComb--charged with violating a law of 1682 which forbade "Scandelous and malicious" statements against magistrates and provided that those guilty of this crime should be "severely punished."[23]

When brought before the court, Keith objected, "I think it very unfair that those who are deeply prejudiced against me and my opposite parties and accusers should be my judges."[24] Therefore, he refused to plead. The Quaker judges fined him five pounds. Budd, who actually stood trial, was found guilty and assessed the same fine. However, no immediate attempt was made to collect the money. Boss did not fare as well. Found

---

21. Ibid., p. 10.

22. Ibid., p. 19.

23. Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1852), I, p. 4.

24. George Keith, New England's Spirit of Persecution, p. 25.

guilty and fined six pounds, he was jailed in default of payment. Both Bradford and McComb were acquitted.

It is difficult to determine what happened next. Years later Keith claimed that the Quakers indicted him again in an effort to pass the death sentence against him, but Quaker spokesmen denied that allegation.[25] However, from ensuing events Keith clearly had some reason to fear further prosecution. When, because of reasons unrelated to the Keithian controversy, a royal decree ended the Quaker government in April of 1693, Keith appealed to the new royal governor, Benjamin Fletcher, for a certificate of his good behavior. In support of this request, he presented to the governor's council a letter from four of his chief Quaker opponents, Thomas Lloyd, Samuel Jennings, Arthur Cooke, and John Delaval. This letter, written shortly after Keith's trial, described him as being "crazy, turbulent, a decryer of magistracie, and a notorious evil instrument in church and state."[26] Such hostile expressions evidently led Keith to believe that further action would be taken against him.

---

25. George Keith, The Spirit of Railing Shimei (New York, 1703), pp. 37-44; Caleb Pusey, Proteus Ecclesiasticus (Philadelphia, 1703), p. 40-41.

26. Minutes of the Provincial Council, I, p. 378.

In any event, Governor Fletcher ended the controversy. He issued a certificate of good behavior for Keith, remitted the fines imposed on Keith, Budd, and Boss, released Boss from prison, and returned Bradford's printer's type.[27] Keith and his followers could now freely organize and proselytize. They set up meetings in Philadelphia, Burlington, and Bucks counties.[28] Keith became the leader of his new sect, the Christian Quakers.

To Keith, God had validated his theocentric view through Governor Fletcher. The ever-present God pushed Keith to seek pure religion, always told him what was right, and always delivered him from his enemies. Of course, everybody else felt the same way. Keith's Quaker opponents certainly knew that God detested George Keith for deserting the true faith and understood their duty to defend the Holy Commonwealth against heretical onslaughts. They knew that they must punish Keith lest God punish them for countenancing impurity.

In such a world, men forget that Christian charity demanded toleration of dissenting opinions. Quakers had

---

27. Charles Keith, Chronicles of Pennsylvania, I, p. 234.

28. Rufus Jones, The Quakers, p. 452.

certainly approved when, in happier days, Keith as their spokesman had lauded their "Christian charitable judgment" and deprecated "the narrow spirited party in New England . . . who too unchristianly judge all others who differ from them in some matters of doctrine, to be heretics, imposters, etc."[29] They certainly agreed when Daniel Gould attacked New Englanders for hiding religious persecution behind the guise of punishing civil sedition,[30] yet they prosecuted George Keith and others for sedition and slander in a religious controversy.

The Quakers could be so inconsistent because religion so pervaded their lives and made such conflicting demands that they had real difficulty functionalizing the concept of toleration. In Quaker Pennsylvania, just about everyone said he believed, and just about everyone probably did believe in toleration. There is no reason to doubt, for example, Keith's honesty when he told New Englanders, "we can and do own your sincerity although we cannot but differ from you in matters both of doctrine and practice, wherein we find you to err from the path of truth, and so far as we have together attained and are agreed in all good things of Christian doctrine and practice, let us walk

---

29. George Keith, The Pretended Antidote (Philadelphia, 1690), p. 10, 17.

30. Daniel Gould, A Brief Narration of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers (Philadelphia, 1700), pp. 3-4.

by the same rule, and live in charity one with another."[31] Yet, Keith did not live in charity with his Quaker brethren, because he believed they erred in doctrine. He felt so impelled by divine command to seek religious purity that he had to separate from the Quakers when he realized they were obstinate heretics. His Quaker brethren were equally impelled to do something about him when, in their view, he became heretical. In the process, Christian charity and toleration were easily lost. The conflicting demands of Christian charity and religious purity were not easily reconciled.

How could they be reconciled? The quest for purity of religion by these seventeenth-century colonists subverted their desire to be charitable. They knew that God called for Christian charity and love of neighbor, but His demand to practice pure religion overshadowed all else. When faced with error, New Englanders, Keith, and Quakers all attempted to stamp it out. Each complained of the other's persecution, but each denied persecuting anyone. In fact they believed that punishing heresy was a charitable act, an attempt to save the heretic from damnation. Their zest for purity of religion blinded them to the possibility of expanding charity beyond the confines of a particular sect. In their view, to be

---

31. George Keith, The Pretended Antidote, p. 201.

charitable of error was error itself. Purity of religion was their overwhelming preoccupation.

Keith's quest for religious purity had not ended with the establishment of Christian Quakers. Truth was not a doctrine to be selfishly concealed; it must be made available to all, even if by force. In 1693 George Keith and Thomas Budd presented their case to the London Yearly Meeting, the most authoritative of Quaker bodies. Evidently, Keith still hoped to force his doctrinal position on American Quakers. However, Samuel Jennings, Keith's chief opponent, and Thomas Duckett, another Quaker spokesman, also presented their case to the London meeting. Hence, the London Yearly Meeting of 1694 became the stage for still another acrimonious harangue. After several days of noisy, passionate debate, the meeting censured both Keith, for publishing the differences among Quakers, and the Pennsylvania authorities, for proceeding against Keith through civil courts. Keith was ordered to call in his books or publish something to clear the Quakers. Naturally, he refused, and the Yearly Meeting of 1695 expelled him, not for his doctrinal differences, but because he had "gone from the blessed unity of the peaceable spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, and hath thereby separated himself from the holy fellowship of the Church of Christ."[32]

---

32. Quoted in Rufus Jones, The Quakers, p. 454; Charles Keith, Chronicles of Pennsylvania, pp. 234-235.

Undaunted, Keith hired a hall in London and preached. Though convinced of his righteousness and of God's directions, he did not know where to turn next. Should he continue in exile from existing churches, preaching and worshipping in his own way, or should he seek intimate communion with God in another church? By now he had found both Presbyterianism and Quakers lacking. Where, he undoubtedly wondered, would God lead him next?

For five years, he drifted theologically. He became convinced that the Quaker doctrine of "inner light" was too loose, since it had led many Quakers to deny some fundamental tenets of Christianity. He decided that the only "proper test and touchstone" for judging truth was "God's holy word contained in the holy Scriptures."[33] There he found the essentials of a true Church. As explained later, he concluded that "whatever church holds the fundamentals of Christian religion, and has the word of God duly preached, and the sacraments of Baptism, and the Lords Supper duly administered, such a Church is a true Church of Christ."[34] Looking for a Church that met these requirements, Keith became impressed by the liturgy, learning, doctrine, reasonableness, history, and order of the Anglican Church.

---

33. George Keith, A Reply to Mr. Increase Mather's Printed Remarks (New York, 1703), p. 3.

34. George Keith, The Doctrine of the Holy Apostles and Prophets (Boston, 1702), p. 12.

He decided that the Church of England was a "true Church of Christ" and entered it in 1700.[35]

That same year saw the publication of A Letter from Dr. Bray, to Such as Have Contributed towards the Propagating Christian Knowledge in the Plantations. In this pamphlet, the Anglican missionary, Thomas Bray, who had just returned to London from America, noted that the people of Pennsylvania "earnestly desire to be supplied with several ministers or more." He felt that Anglican missionary activity was particularly promising in Pennsylvania and the neighboring provinces because of the seeds sown by "the excellent Mr. Keith."[36] Bray interested Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, and several other leading churchmen in his missionary plans, and this led directly to formation of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (S.P.G.) which received a royal charter in June of 1701.[37]

"The excellent Mr. Keith" seems to have been in contact with the S.P.G. from its inception. On September

---

35. See: George Keith, A Sermon, Preach'd at Turner-Hall (London, 1700); George Keith, Mr. George Keith's Farewell Sermon (London, 1700); George Keith, Mr. George Keith's Reasons for Renouncing Quakerism (London, 1700).

36. Thomas Bray, A Letter from Dr. Bray (London, 1700), p. 3.

37. Nelson Burr, The Anglican Church, pp. 25-27.

19, 1701, Keith reported to the society the nature and causes of his controversy with the Quakers. He claimed to have established in the Jerseys fifteen meetings of Christian Quakers with a membership of about five hundred souls. He said that he had kept in contact with these people, that many of them had already joined the Church, and that many others were ripe for conversion.

The S.P.G. sent missionaries to three places in New Jersey and planned for missionary activity in ten other colonial locations. Keith, who evidently impressed his hearers, was asked to make a tour of inspection. He readily agreed, having become as zealous for propagating Anglicanism as he once had been for promoting Quakerism. So, on April 28, 1702, the one-time Quaker champion embarked to convert the American Friends.[38]

During Keith's eight years in England, religious controversies had abated but by no means ceased in the colonies. After Keith's "apostacy," other Quaker champions carried on the argument with New England divines. Thomas Maule, for example, characterized Cotton Mather's continuing attacks on Quakers as a "volume of false doctrines, horrid lies, and railing accusations." He warned New Englanders that God would soon "stretch forth his hand" against them for their persecution of Quakers.[39]

---

38. Ibid., p. 37.

39. Thomas Maule, An Abstract of a Letter to Cotton Mather (New York, 1701), pp. 6, 7.

Daniel Gould also answered the controversial publications of the New England divines. Along with a technical theological defense of Quaker doctrines, he too attacked Mather and his associates for persecuting Quakers.[40]

The Quakers, on the other hand, were attacked as "persecutors" by Daniel Leeds, a former Quaker and supporter of Keith who had likewise become an Anglican. Leeds declared that the magistrates in England were "more noble and more Christian" than the Quakers who persecuted George Keith.[41] He specially condemned Samuel Jennings for violating Quaker principles by participating in civil government.[42] Then, evidently unsatisfied with that level of attack, in still another pamphlet he described the "spiritual and carnal whoredoms and adulteries of the Quakers in America." He accused just about every leading Quaker of either fornication, adultery, drunkenness, thievery, blasphemy, homosexuality, or a combination of these vices.[43]

---

40. Daniel Gould, A Brief Narration; Thomas Maule, Truth Held Forth (New York, 1695).

41. Daniel Leeds, News of a Trumpet Sounding in the Wilderness (New York, 1697), p. 83.

42. Daniel Leeds, The Case Put and Decided (New York, 1699), p. 8.

43. Daniel Leeds, News of a Strumpet Cohabitating in the Wilderness (New York, 1701).

Quaker Caleb Pusey denounced Leeds for "dishonesty and gross perversions."[44] While defending Quaker actions in the Keithian controversy, Pusey accused Keith of persecuting the Quakers. He asserted that Keith had attempted to get the authorities in England to suppress Quaker books because of their "pretended errors in doctrine." "And if this does not arise from a spirit of persecution," Pusey declared, "I know not what does."[45]

John Field also spoke for the Quakers. He defended their religious doctrines by showing the inconsistencies in Keith's publications. In his eyes Keith was simply a hypocrite. Field appealed to Keith's followers to "renounce him," telling them "it will be more for your profit and tend more to your inward peace and Christian reputation, to hearken to the voice of Christ in your hearts."[46] That voice would convince them, of course, just as it convinced John Field, that Quakerism was truth.

---

44. Caleb Pusey, Satans Harbinger Encountered (Philadelphia, 1700), p. 8.

45. Ibid., p. 58.

46. John Field, The Christianity of the People Called Quakers (Philadelphia, 1700), p. 8.

These religious controversies pervaded the middle colonies while Keith was in England. When he landed in Boston in June 1702, he surveyed a familiar intellectual world. The Quakers still preached the doctrine of "inner light" fully convinced of their own righteousness. New England clergymen still detested Quakers, and Quakers still attacked New Englanders as persecutors. Men vitally concerned with religion remained convinced that only they knew the truth and demanded that everyone agree or suffer divine wrath. The theocentric world of George Keith remained fundamentally the same, for he had changed religions, not cosmologies.

Keith, in Boston only a few days, renewed his attack on the Quakers. In a sermon preached at Her Majesty's Chapel, he declared that because Quakers held to the doctrine of inner light "they have no other religion, but that justly called natural religion, common to them with more refined heathens and pagans who acknowledge one God, but were wholly ignorant of Christ crucified."[47] A few days later he attacked the New

---

47. George Keith, The Doctrines of the Holy Apostles and Prophets, p. 8.

England clergy for their doctrine of predestination which, he asserted, was a "dangerous and hurtful opinion; because it made God the author of sin."[48] George Keith had returned, and once again religious controversy swirled around him.

Much to the annoyance of both New England clergymen and Pennsylvania Quakers, Keith spent the summer trying to convert them. He entered Quaker meetings and attacked their speakers for uttering an "abundance of falsehoods and impertinencies and gross perversions." He later reported that the Quakers often responded with such "noise and clamor against me, that I could not proceed."[49] Keith characterized this treatment as "abusive." The Quakers, no doubt, felt equally abused.

In September, Keith and his fellow missionary, John Talbot, crossed the Sound to Long Island. There they entered Quaker meetings and harangued Friends on Quaker blasphemy and Anglican truth. Persistently and obnoxiously they attacked the Quakers who often shouted Keith and Talbot down or barred them from their meetings.

---

48. George Keith, A Refutation of a Dangerous and Hurtful Opinion (New York, 1702), p. 5. Also see, C.S. Lewis, "George Keith, the Missionary," Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society, XIII (1865), 38-45.

49. George Keith, A Journal reprinted in Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Vol. 20 (1951), pp. 379-80.

Arriving in New York City, Keith dined with Governor Edward Viscount Cornbury, a staunch Anglican. Keith complained of meeting with "abusive entertainment" from the Quaker meeting at Flushing. Cornbury sympathized and gave Keith a directive to the justices of the peace to permit Keith to speak without interruption at any Quaker meeting.[50] Keith, no doubt, viewed this as his right, but the Quakers saw it as religious persecution.

During the next year and a half, Keith travelled throughout New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania continuing his anti-Quaker crusade. Caleb Pusey, the Quaker spokesman, complained of Keith's "imposing upon us, though in the midst of our worship, his reflecting discourses upon our principles or persons."[51] He accused Keith of being an "apostate" from Quakerism, and he denied that Quakers had ever persecuted Keith. Instead he renewed his earlier charge:

> that George Keith is earnest to stir up the Magistrates to persecute us; though the name of persecution is so odious among men to be sure he is not willing to own it; yet since he is so really and openly for the thing, he must not be peevish if I tell him of it.[52]

---

50. Ibid., p. 411; Hugh Hastings, ed., Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York (Albany, 1902), III, p. 1512.

51. Caleb Pusey, George Keith Once More Brought to the Test (Philadelphia, 1703), p. 1.

52. Caleb Pusey, Proteus Ecclesiasticus, p. 43.

However, Keith did react peevishly and refused the name of persecutor. In a pamphlet, The Spirit of Railing Shimei and of Baal's Four Hundred Lying Prophets Entered into Caleb Pusey and His Quaker-Brethren in Pennsylvania Who Approve of Him, Keith accused the Quakers of "gross falsehoods, lies, calumnies, perversions, and abuses," but he denied any desire to persecute them. He hoped, however, that "their false teachers might be restrained from preaching and printing their vile heresies and blasphemies to the poisoning of men's souls."[53] A restraint upon false teachers would not be persecution. After all, Keith knew the truth, and he knew who preached it and who did not. He admitted that to punish the Quakers for their "heresy" would be persecution, but to restrain their blasphemy was proper and necessary.[54]

Nor was it persecution in Keith's eyes to stop Quakers from "lying" about the Church of England. Their attacks upon the Anglican Church, the true church, must of necessity be lies. Therefore, when the Quakers persisted in attacking the Anglican Church, Keith declared that they:

---

53. George Keith, The Spirit of Railing Shimei (New York, 1703), p. 42.

54. Ibid., p. 47.

> deserve just censure and punishment for these abominable lies and calumnies against the Church of England and all her ministers, so I hope God will put it into the hearts of such Christian Governors and Magistrates in these countries where the Quakers have their meeting to suffer no such things to be said in them.[55]

Like the Quakers before him, Keith could not reconcile Christian charity and toleration with his zeal for truth.

Religious truth, however, was not Keith's private monopoly. He knew the truth, his fellow Anglicans knew the truth, the New England clergy knew the truth, everybody knew the truth, and everybody was ready to defend the truth. Hence, when Keith sailed for England in 1704, he left behind a religious controversy which would drag on and on, to no avail, under Daniel Leeds, Caleb Pusey, and others. He left behind continuing sectarian hatred, religious intolerance, theological arguments, and only a few converts to the Anglican "truth." He left behind the inevitable problems of man's attempt to fulfill God's will to perfection.

While in America, George Keith acted in a more unstable, volatile, and intense fashion than his fellow colonists. His quest for an intimate relationship with God had led him to a paradoxical attitude toward religious forms. To him, doctrine and practice were means to an end and therefore less important than his

---

55. George Keith, The Notes of the True Church (New York, 1704), p. vii.

goal, his desire for mystical communion with God. But, as means, religious forms had paramount importance because they enabled Keith to approach God. Hence, Keith became almost fanatical in his demand that religious doctrine and practice bring him into an intimate relationship with God. When certain forms failed to do this, he denounced them as untrue and sought other doctrines and practices to fulfill his needs.

Since the colonists shared Keith's theocentric cosmology, they could not ignore him. When he differed from Quakers, or Puritans, they viewed him as a heretic, not a zealot, and they rejected him. The resulting mutual intolerance, theological arguments, and religious persecution, were inevitable attributes of the theocentric world.

Chapter II

The Intolerant World of Edward Cornbury

Religious intolerance permeated the theocentric world of late seventeenth-and-early eighteenth-century America. The colonies swarmed with religious zealots each convinced that he knew the truth. Religious sects attacked one another for false worship and blasphemy. Civil governments suppressed heresy and enforced orthodoxy. The universality of belief in the necessity of punishing error was only mitigated by the view that religious toleration was an unfortunate, but sometimes necessary expedient. Most thought the world would be a better place if everyone agreed with their religious views.

Intolerance assumed many forms. On the personal level, members of one religious group occasionally refused to marry, befriend or even associate with members of another sect. Men categorized one another in terms of religion, and polarized themselves from everyone outside their own category. On a group level, sect competed against sect for adherents, money, privilege and political power. Each denomination viewed its own interest as religion's only interest.

Furthermore, everyone expected state support in religious affairs. Separation of church and state was inconceivable. The exact limits of state intervention, however, remained subject to dispute. In colonies where one religious sect predominated, its members usually ran the colony's affairs, provided for the maintenance of "orthodox" ministers and doctrines, and placed restrictions on "unorthodox" or "dissenting" sects. In colonies with a number of competing sects of relatively equal size, the state usually enforced only minimal, agreed-upon standards. In short, relationship of church and state lacked precise definition. Local conditions determined the nature and extent of state involvement in religious affairs.

However, the intensely religious and fiercely intolerant attitude of many colonists made necessary a precise definition of the relationship of church and state. At different times in different colonies, problems arose which forced consideration of this fundamental question. In New York, Governor Edward Hyde, Viscount Cornbury, inflamed smouldering religious and political questions and forced the colonists to begin defining the powers and rights of church and state.

A famous portrait of Edward Viscount Cornbury depicts his unusual character. The edges of his mouth curl upward forming a haughty sardonic smile. His prominent nose imparts an aristocratic masculine appearance to his face. Cornbury's large eyes leer at the viewer. His plump slightly puffed cheeks suggest heavy drinking. Broad shoulders and a sturdy neck convey an impression of strength and power. Conversely, he holds his hands, with their long thin fingers, in a dainty, feminine, sensitive fashion. His hair combed straight back and decorated with tiny bows, also contrasts sharply with masculine features. But more than anything, Cornbury's attire belies his masculinity. Fashionable, tasteful, and probably expensive, it would have been very becoming on his wife, for Cornbury wears women's clothes.[1]

---

1. Reproductions of this portrait can be found in James Grant Wilson, Memorial History of the City of New York and the Hudson River Valley (New York, 1892), II, 86; The New York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin, XI (1918), 98.

Psychologists explain that transvestites usually exhibit feelings of inadequacy, a strong identification with a person of the opposite sex, an unthinking acceptance of the values of that person, and an intolerant attitude toward differing opinions. They attempt to become the other person physically and intellectually. Viscount Cornbury exhibited these traits.[2]

When he arrived in New York as royal governor, in May of 1702, he represented his cousin, Queen Anne. Contemporary accounts report he approached his role as royal representative literally, occasionally dressing as a woman in order to look more like Anne. Cornbury, it seems, fancied that he bore a great physical resemblance to his cousin.[3]

---

2. For a short standard discussion of transvestism see: Norman Cameron, Personality Development and Psychopathology, A Dynamic Approach (Boston, 1963), pp. 669-670. More detailed analysis can be found in A. Harbanel and A. Ellis, eds., The Encyclopedia of Sexual Behavior (New York, 1961), pp. 802-811, 1012-1022.

3. Wilson, Memorial History, p. 86n; "The Commission and Instructions Issued by Queen Anne to Lord Cornbury," The New York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin, XI (1918), 102; Milton Rubincom, "The Formative Years of Lord Cornbury, The First Royal Governor of New York and New Jersey," New York Genealogical and Biographical Record, LXXXI (1940), 106-116. Rubincom stresses that Cornbury was taught from earliest youth to consider Anne the foundation of his fortunes. This would help to explain his unusually strong identification with her.

Furthermore, as representative of the Queen, Cornbury sought to protect royal interests and prerogatives. Identifying himself completely with Anne, he acted as if he were she, as if his will and Anne's were one and the same. Thus anyone who questioned his commands or actions questioned the Queen. On every issue he claimed to speak with the authority of law, while often ignoring the law in his personal conduct. Vain, self-righteous, inflexible, insecure, corrupt, venal, he epitomized the petty tyrant.[4]

In the theocentric world of early eighteenth-century New York and New Jersey, Cornbury's authoritarianism made religious controversy probable, while his personal religious intensity made it inevitable. Cornbury held the same theocentric perspectives as his fellow colonists. Knowing that the world and everyone in it depended upon divine providence, he stressed "God's infinite power and mercy." He believed that God was pleased when men "humbled themselves before Him" and he realized that sin

---

4. For descriptions of Cornbury and his governship see: Wilson, Memorial History, pp. 55-92; William Smith, The History of the Late Province of New York, in Collections of the New York Historical Society IV (1829), 146-169; Charles Worthen Spencer, "The Cornbury Legend," New York State Historical Association Proceedings, XIII (1914), pp. 309-320; John Webb Pratt, Religion, Politics and Diversity, the Church State Theme in New York History (Ithaca, 1967), pp. 49-59; Herbert L. Osgood, The American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century (New York, 1924), II, pp. 61-93.

or false worship inevitably provoked God's "heavy-judgements and feared wrath."[5]

Unlike the majority of New Yorkers or Jerseyites, however, Cornbury zealously espoused Anglicanism as the true religion. As the personification of royal authority in New York and New Jersey, he strove to have the Queen's religion accepted in the colonies as the only true faith. Hence, he became the focus of religious and political controversies which raised fundamental questions about the relationship of Church and State.

These controversies had been brewing for years. England's Glorious Revolution of 1688 had profoundly affected New York, serving as a catalyst for Leisler's rebellion. This uprising became the vortex of swirling political factionalism which continued for years. Under the general banners of Leislerians and anti-Leislerians, ambitious politicians, also influenced by their own desire for power and by political developments in England, fought to control the affairs of the colony. Since most Anglicans supported the anti-Leislerian party, the fortunes of the Anglican Church occasionally intertwined with the complex political

---

5. Edward Cornbury, A Proclamation (New York, 1702).

situation.[6]

The religious settlement stemming from the Glorious Revolution, however, proved more important in creating religious controversy. England's Toleration Act of 1689 permitted Protestant dissenting worship, but maintained the Anglican establishment and continued the civil disabilities for religious dissent.[7] That act, which served a progressive function in England, had a retrogressive effect in New York.

In that colony religious freedom had been firmly established by 1689. The Duke's Laws of 1665 decreed that no Christian could "be molested, fined, or imprisoned for differing in judgement in matters of religion," and permitted the members of each parish to select the minister of their choice.[8] Under these tolerant provisions, New Yorkers enjoyed complete freedom of worship, with no overall establishment and no civil disabilities.

---

6. A short discussion of Leisler's rebellion and its effect on New York politics can be found in Michael G. Hall, Lawrence H. Leder, and Michael G. Kammen, eds., The Glorious Revolution in America (Chapel Hill, 1964), pp. 83-140. For a more detailed analysis see Lawrence H. Leder, Robert Livingston and the Politics of Colonial New York (Chapel Hill, 1961).

7. This act appears at I William and Mary, cap. 18 (1689); 6 Statutes of Realm, 74-76.

8. "The Duke's Laws So Far as They Related to Religion" in E. T. Corwin, ed. Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York (VII vols., Albany, 1901-16), I, 570-572. Hereafter cited as E. R. N. Y.

After 1689, however, royal governors came to New York with instructions to establish the Anglican church and to implement the religious tests for public officials provided by the Toleration Act. Hence, they strove to reduce the extent of religious freedom in the colony.[9] This design provoked much controversy.

When Henry Slaughter arrived in New York in March of 1691 he first concerned himself with ending Leisler's rebellion. He jailed Leisler and many of his followers, tried them for treason and murder, and three months later allowed Leisler and his son-in-law Jacob Milborne to be executed. The political repercussions of these acts occupied most of Slaughter's attention during the remainder of his short governorship.[10]

---

9. The controversy can be followed in Pratt, Religion pp. 34-63; Osgood, American Colonies, II, 14-22. Carl Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities and Politics 1689-1775 (New York, 1962), pp. 116-126; William Livingston, "The Watch Tower," XXI-XXX, The New York Mercury, April 14, 1755 to June 16, 1755. E. Clawes Chorley, "The Beginnings of the Church in the Province of New York," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XIII (1944), 5-25. Many of the issues which later became controversial were originally raised by the Anglican clergyman John Miller, New York Considered and Approved 1695 (Cleveland, 1903), especially pp. 80-82.

10. Leder, Robert Livingston, pp. 57-80.

Slaughter, however, remembered that his instructions commanded him to establish the Church of England, to provide "competent maintenance" for "ministers of each orthodox church," and to supply a house and land for every Anglican minister. Therefore, he asked the Assembly for a bill to settle a minister in each town of forty or more people. The Assembly took his recommendation under consideration but refused to act on it.[11] The only mention they made of religion came in "An Act Declaring What Are the Rights and Previleges of their Majesties Subjects Inhabiting Within Their Province of New York." Here they stated that all persons, except Catholics, could "freely meet at convenient places within the province, and there worship without being hindered or molested." The bill contained no provision for ministerial maintenance.[12] The Assembly, in short, opted for a continuation of a liberal religious policy.

Slaughter's instructions also directed him to require that all officials in New York subscribe to the Test Act.

---

11. "Secret Instructions to Governor Slaughter as They Related to Religion," in E. R. N. Y., II, 191; Journal of the Votes and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Colony of New York (11 vols., New York, 1764-66), I, 7, 12. Hereafter cited as J. A. N. Y.

12. This bill is reprinted in E. R. N. Y., II, 1016.

This bill, enacted in England in 1673, had never been enforced in the colonies. It required that the subscriber deny transubstantiation, the mass, and other Catholic doctrines. Slaughter met no opposition from his Protestant subjects when he introduced this religious test in March of 1691.[13]

In principle, neither the governor nor the colonists denied the state's right to legislate on religious matters. Both the Assembly and the executive agreed to the exclusion of Catholics from the religious and political affairs of the colony. Both felt they could decide religious questions, but neither recognized the other's sole right to do so. Hence, they started to spar with each other over the question of an Anglican establishment. This sparring became more intense in following years as each side warmed to the fight.

Slaughter died in July of 1691 and his successor, Benjamin Fletcher, arrived in New York in August of the following year. Then the contest between Anglicans and dissenters really became heated. A staunch anti-Leislerian, Fletcher was also a zealous Anglican, whose

---

13. "The Test Act" in ibid., pp. 1012-1013.

"bell rang twice a day for prayers."[14] He determined to establish the Anglican church throughout New York even though Dutch Reformed, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Quakers and other sects out-numbered Episcopalians by a ratio of forty to one. One of his first proposals to the New York Assembly suggested that "provision be made for the support and encouragement of an able ministry." Naturally, by able ministers Fletcher meant Anglican ministers.[15]

Just as naturally, the overwhelmingly non-Anglican Assembly concluded that the ministers already in New York were perfectly able, and they ignored Fletcher's recommendations. After two successive Assemblies failed to act on his proposal, Fletcher became more aggressive. Addressing the opening session of the Assembly of 1693, he reprimanded the assemblymen for neglecting their "great and first duty" of supporting proper religion.[16]

---

14. "Letter from Peter De La Noy Relative to Governor Fletcher's Conduct, June 13, 1695," E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York (XV vols., Albany, 1854-1887), IV, 224. Hereafter cited as D. R. C. H.

15. Journal of the Legislative Council of the Colony of New York (II vols., Albany, 1861), I, 25. Hereafter cited as J. L. C. N. Y.

16. "Governor Fletcher's Opening Address," E. R. N.Y., II, 1073-1074.

Fletcher had done his best to see that this Assembly would fulfill its duty to God and the Anglican church, as well as enhance his own fortunes. As one critic complained, he had "used as many sinister tricks as you have ever heard" to insure a favorable majority in the Assembly. Fletcher actually "swore he would shoot any man through the head" who voted against his political followers.[17] Consequently, he addressed a group of political allies in 1693.

Yet, Fletcher's allies were not Anglicans. His co-religionists constituted such a tiny minority in the colony that his strong arm tactics secured election of only one Anglican to the Assembly. The other legislators, though politically subservient to Fletcher, retained their religious independence, defended their religious truth against Episcopalian onslaughts, and consequently rejected the governor's religious policies.

Under extreme pressure from the governor, however, the Assembly passed "An Act for Settling a Ministry and Raising a Maintenance for them in the City of New York, County of Richmond, Westchester, and Queen's County." This bill provided support for "a good and sufficient Protestant minister." It empowered county justices to conduct elections each year for church wardens and

---

17. "Letter from Peter De La Noy," D. R. C. H., 223.

vestrymen, who, together with the justices, would fix the tax rate, call the ministers, and distribute the funds.[18]

Pressed by Fletcher to deal with the relationship of state and church, the Assembly responded with positive action. It never dawned on them to deny the power of the state to direct religious affairs. They circumvented Fletcher's proposed Anglican establishment by creating multiple establishments which reflected the interests of each sect. By their plan, each town could call the minister of its choice. In the normal course of events the locally dominant religious group would obviously provide the local pastor. Though other sects would be forced to contribute to his support, the decentralized nature of the system reduced inequity to a minimum. Orthodoxy demanded that the minister be Protestant, but this, too, reflected the interests of the overwhelming majority.

Fletcher disagreed with the Assembly, not on the nature of the state's power over religion, but on the question of who spoke for the state. He demanded that the Act be amended to give him the power to "approve and collate" ministers.[19] When the Assembly refused,

---

18. "The Ministry Act of 1693," E. R. N. Y., 1076-1079.

19. Ibid., p. 1079n.

he let the bill become law, but claimed appointive rights anyway. As he informed the Assembly, "I have the power of collating or suspending any minister in my government . . . and whilst I stay in the government, I will take care that neither heresy, sedition, schism nor rebellion will be preached amongst you, nor vice and profanity encouraged."[20] In short, only Anglican ministers would be allowed to serve.

Fletcher's attitude prompted the vestries, elected under the Ministry Act, to drag their feet. They realized that he would accept only Anglican ministers and that he would give all tax money to the Episcopal Church. Since few Anglicans served as vestrymen, the dissenters controlled the vestries and sought to thwart the governor's designs. They called dissenting ministers, and Fletcher rejected them. They refused to collect taxes, and he fulminated. They appealed to the Assembly, and he threatened. And so it went for years until the Anglicans obtained a majority in the 1696 vestry election in New York City. The new vestry collected the tax, called William Vesey, an Anglican lay worker, as pastor and quickly sent him to England for ordination. In the

---

20. J. L. C. N. Y., I, 48.

other countries, however, the vestries thwarted Fletcher.[21]

The governor owed his success in New York City to Dutch Reformed Church support. To obtain this Fletcher had begun negotiations in 1695 on the questions of incorporating that religious body.[22] He and the Dutch ministers evidently reached an agreement, for three months after Dutch support gave the Anglicans victory in the 1696 vestry elections, they received a charter from Fletcher which exempted them from the governor's collating power, empowered them to tax their congregations for support of their ministers, and gave them the right to hold property. Though it did not exempt the Dutch from the tax supporting the Anglican Church, it made them a second establishment.[23] Given this privileged position, and their generally conservative outlook, the Dutch became willing allies in what one historian has termed the Anglican "lust for domination."[24]

---

21. "New York City Vestry," "Action of the New York City Vestry," "Decision as to the Meaning of the Ministry Act, by the Assembly," "Second City Vestry Chosen," "Action of the City Vestry," in E. R. N. Y., II 1092-1097, 1112. J. L. C. N. Y., I, 76; J. A. N. Y., I. 53. Morgan Dix, A History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York (IV vols., New York, 1898-1906), I, 83-90.

22. "Church of New York, Resolutions Upon the Business of Incorporation," E. R. N. Y., II, 1116-1117.

23. "The Two Earliest Ecclesiastical Charters in New York, The Dutch Church, 1696," ibid., II, 1136-1165.

24. Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, pp. 116-137.

Fletcher's insistence upon establishing the Anglican church continued unabated after the vestry election of 1696. In the following year, he granted a charter of incorporation to Trinity Church in New York City, which established it under a vestry of Anglican laymen.[25] Thus, Fletcher superseded the elected vestry created by the Ministry Act, thereby eliminating the possibility of dissenters controlling Trinity Church. Furthermore, Fletcher granted the Trinity vestry a lease on thirty acres known as the King's Farm.[26] Thus, he firmly established the Anglican church in New York City. Elsewhere, however, his efforts proved unsuccessful.

In 1698 Richard Coote, Earl of Bellomont, replaced Fletcher as governor. This reversed political and religious fortunes in New York, for Bellomont strove to "reconcile" Leislerian and anti-Leislerian factions. Since the Anglican church was closely associated with the anti-Leislerian party, they failed to elicit enthusiastic support from this "moderate" governor. Furthermore, Bellomont lacked the personal religious zeal for the Episcopalian cause that characterized his predecessor.[27]

---

25. "The Two Earliest Ecclesiastical Charters in New York, The English Church, 1697," E. R. N. Y., II, 1136-1165.

26. "Benjamin Fletcher, to the Board of Trade," D. R. C. H., IV, 448.

27. J. A. N. Y., I, 86, 94; Leder, Robert Livingston, pp. 129-147.

To undo some of the biased legislation of Fletcher's regime, Bellomont began by attacking exhorbitant land grants to anti-Leislerians, including the lease of King's Farm to Trinity Church. He asked the Assembly for a bill revoking that grant, and they responded favorably. Even though Bellomont provided substitute funds, the Anglicans complained that the governor sought their "destruction." The Dutch cried the same tune when Bellomont permitted the Assembly to remove Godfredius Delius, their minister at Albany, from his pastoral office, and when he prevented the calling of an anti-Leislerian minister to the Dutch Church in New York City. Neither group, however, challenged the State's authority to intervene in religious affairs, they simply questioned the wisdom of its specific actions.[28]

The indignant and fearful outcries of Episcopalians and Dutch Reformed ministers, however, were unnecessary, for Bellomont never contemplated rescinding the special

---

28. Bellomont to the Lords of Trade, April 27, 1699, E. R. N. Y., II, 1296-1297; Churchwardens and Vestry of Trinity Church, New York, to Archbishop Tenison, May 22, 1699, ibid., p. 1312. The Colonial Laws of New York (V vols., Albany, 1894-1896), I, 412-417. Hereafter cited as C. L. N. Y. The Consistory of the Dutch Church of New York to the Consistory of the Dutch Church of London, Nov. 19, 1968, E. R. N. Y., II, 1264-1266.

privileges of the Anglican Church and its Dutch allies. This became evident in 1699 when the Assembly passed a bill for the maintenance of dissenting ministers. Bellomont vetoed this measure, explaining it was "contrary to his Majesty's instructions," and noting that "some of the ministers do hold strange erroneous opinions in matters of faith and doctrine." Obviously, the question remained: who spoke for the state?[29]

With Bellomont's death on March 5, 1701, the situation changed significantly. Leislerians, who had become powerful during the last months of the governor's life, attacked anti-Leislerians.[30] They arrested Colonel Nicholas Bayard and Alderman John Hutchins, two leading anti-Leislerians, on a charge of treason and, after a perfunctory trial, sentenced them to death. Leading anti-Leislerians panicked and many fled the colony. William Vesey, pastor of Trinity Church, and numerous Anglicans joined the emigration. For the moment, the future of the Anglican Church looked dark and cloudy.[31]

---

29. Earl of Bellomont to the Lords of Trade, July 22, 1699, D. R. C. H. IV, 536; J. A. N. Y., I, 101-102.

30. Leder, Robert Livingston, pp. 148-160.

31. Ibid., pp. 161-179; Smith, History, II, 149.

But, "like the sun after morning darkness [that] dispels all clouds," Viscount Cornbury's arrival enabled the Anglicans to "raise up hands and hearts." Even while HMS. Jersey lay at anchor in New York harbor, and before Cornbury had set foot on land, William Vesey and other "principal inhabitants" came aboard and complained of "violent and unheard of persecution." They castigated the Leislerians as "dissolute in principle as well as immoral in their lives and conversations," and they pledged themselves to join with Cornbury in supporting and defending correct principles against "all his Majesty's enemy's whosoever and the enemies of the true Protestant interest."[32]

To Cornbury, "the true Protestant interest" meant Anglicanism, and "his Majesty's enemies" meant Leislerians.[33] Once again political and religious fortunes reversed. Securing an Assembly dominated by anti-Leislerians, Cornbury zestfully set about restoring and augmenting Anglican privileges.

---

32. "Address of Welcome to Governor Cornbury by Trinity Church," E. R. N. Y., III, 1490-1491. "Lord Cornbury's Reasons For Suspending Chief Justice Atwood," Ibid., p. 1499.

33. Lord Cornbury to the Lords of Trade, Dec. 12, 1702, D. R. C. H., IV., 1018.

He began by returning Trinity Church's lease to the King's Farm. Then, to ensure permanent Anglican possession of the farm, he successfully petitioned the Queen for a direct grant.[34] In 1703, he secured from the Assembly "An Act for the Better Establishment of the Maintenance of the Minister of the City of New York," which raised the Anglican pastor's salary from £100 under the Ministry Act to £160.[35] This legislation did not entail a recognition of any new power for the Anglican church, and consequently Cornbury's political allies in the Assembly undoubtedly saw no harm in passing it.

In the following year he persuaded the Assembly to assent to a new charter for Trinity Church. Since this document referred to the "Church of England, as by law established," the Assembly clearly acquiesced in the pre-eminent position of the Anglican Church in New York City.[36] This was certainly a matter of principle and should have provoked opposition from an Assembly controlled by dissenters. Yet, the bill passed.

---

34. "Trinity Church and the Kings Farm" E. R. N. Y., III, 1497; "Queen Anne's Grant to Trinity Church, New York, November 23, 1705," ibid., pp. 1597-1598.

35. C. L. N. Y., I, 543-545.

36. Ibid., pp. 564-569.

Cornbury, it seems, achieved this through connivance with the French Church and the Dutch Reformed Church. Elias Neau, an elder in the French Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, arranged a plan for the union of the three Churches. Though this design was never implemented, relations between the three religious groups remained close. Cornbury supported the French minister with public funds and agreed that the French could build a larger church in New York City and raise revenue as they saw fit. Cornbury hoped that the French could be converted to Anglicanism. Significantly he appointed Neau catechist at Trinity Church, and the French minister converted shortly thereafter. The Dutch, with their privileged position, continued to support the Anglican cause. The net result appears to have been the Assembly's agreement to the establishment of the Church of England in New York City.[37] Whatever the reason, neither the governor nor Assembly questioned the state's intervention in religious affairs.

---

37. Ibid., p. 528; "Elias Neau's Effort to Form a General Ministerial Society," "Rev. Peter Peiret's Petition," "Benefactions of Trinity Church of New York," Caleb Heathcote to the Society for Propagating the Gospel June 13, 1709, in E. R. N. Y., II, 1539, 1513, 1552, 1751.

Cornbury did not limit his efforts to the Anglican stronghold of New York City. The Ministry Act of 1693 had also provided for "good and sufficient Protestant ministers" in Richmond, Westchester, and Queens counties, and Cornbury determined to fill those parsonages with Anglican ministers whether their congregations approved or not. Convinced of the truth of the Anglican religion, he believed that his determination followed God's will. In a matter of such transcendent importance, Cornbury, as the royal representative, had no need to scruple about points of law, for he personified the source of all law.

In the summer of 1703 Cornbury moved his family to Jamaica, Long Island, to escape a yellow fever epidemic in New York City. The vast majority in Jamaica belonged to the Presbyterian Church, and they had provided their pastor, John Hobbart, with the "best house in town."[38] Cornbury asked Hobbart for the use of his parsonage, and the minister graciously consented. Ensuing events, however, proved that Cornbury failed to appreciate the favor.

A new church had been erected in Jamaica with town funds, for the use of the Presbyterian majority. The Anglicans, realizing that the town vote for this building

---

38. Smith, History, II, 149.

contained no clause guaranteeing Presbyterian ownership, decided to claim the church for themselves. The Anglican minister, John Bartow, entered the church on a Sunday afternoon and began the Episcopal service. When Hobbart arrived to find his church in use, he started to preach under a tree in the adjoining courtyard. Then, as Bartow relates "we had a shameful disturbance, howling and tugging of seat, shoving one the other off, carrying them out and returning again for more so that I was fain to leave off till the disturbance was over and a separation made by which time I had but about half of the congregation." Bartow finished the service, locked the church and gave the key to the sheriff. The Presbyterians then broke into the church, removed many of the Anglican furnishings, and reasserted their right to possession.[39]

At this point Cornbury intervened, declaring that he would "do the church justice." He summoned Hobbart and forbade him ever to preach from his own pulpit again, claiming that a church built with public funds belonged to the Anglicans. He then threatened to arrest the leading Presbyterians for the "riot" which disturbed divine service. After exacting apologies and a promise of submission, however, he "pardoned" them.[40]

---

39. Reverend Bartow to the Secretary of the Society For Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, Dec. 1, 1707, E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., The Documentary History of the State of New York (IV vols., Albany, 1849-1851), III, 131-132. Hereafter cited as D. H. N. Y.

40. Ibid., "An Order To the Attorney General to Enquire into a Riot at Jamaica," ibid., p. 126.

If this "pardon" led Presbyterians to believe that persecution had ended, they were mistaken. In July of 1704 Cornbury ordered Hobbart to relinquish his parsonage to the Anglican Church. He instructed the high sheriff of Queen's County to remove Hobbart by force if necessary. Then, to complete establishment of the Church of England, Cornbury forced the reluctant vestrymen to levy a tax for support of the Anglican minister.[41] The Presbyterians in Jamaica recognized their inability to continue the struggle and waited until Cornbury's removal from office before reasserting their rights.[42] Though they grumbled about the obvious inequity of the situation, they did not question the state's authority to intervene in religious affairs.

Jamaica was not the only community required to accept and support an Episcopalian minister. Cornbury and William Vesey had convinced the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts to supply New York with six missionaries whom Cornbury forced on an unwilling populace. In 1702 at the request of Colonel Caleb Heathcote, a member of his council,

---

41. Cornbury's actions can be followed in ibid., pp. 128-130.

42. After Cornbury's recall, the Presbyterians repossessed the church and the parsonage, and defended their right to it in a long series of legal battles. This controversy can be followed in ibid., pp. 133-189.

Cornbury sent one missionary to Westchester County. Heathcote had compelled Warren Mather, the local Presbyterian minister, to leave town and now convinced the vestry to accept the S.P.G. missionary. The vestry acted reluctantly, for the new minister referred to his parishioners as "prejudiced, poor, and irreligious people . . . who think it a hardship to pay their dues." Heathcote had to appeal all the way to the Privy Council to secure some land for the Anglican minister, and even then he only obtained a "wilderness" plot. But the Anglican minister was established.[43]

In 1704 Cornbury ordered Thomas Prichard inducted as minister in the towns of Rye and Bedford. Under the leadership of Zachariah Roberts, a justice of the peace, and John Jones, their minister, the dissenting citizens of Bedford refused to admit Prichard to their church or to pay his salary. Roberts and Jones publicly denounced both the Church of England and Cornbury for attempting to establish it. Cornbury arrested them, and the citizens of Bedford, like those of Jamaica and Westchester before them, bowed to superior force.[44]

---

43. Dixon Ryan Fox, Caleb Heathcote Gentlemen Colonist (New York, 1926), pp. 205-209.

44. "Order to Induct Reverend Mr. Pritchard to the Church of Rye," D. H. N. Y., III, 563-564; "Affidavits," ibid., pp. 564-565.

Still, no one questioned the power of the state over religion.

Like other dissenters, Quakers and Presbyterians living in Hempstead parish and Staten Island parish grumbled, but paid the tax to support a newly arrived Anglican minister.[45] By 1705 Cornbury had placed Anglican clergymen in all the counties specified by the Ministry Act of 1693. His high-handed actions had achieved their desired purpose. Faced with power wielded by an unscrupulous and intolerant governor, the dissenting majority could do nothing.

Placing Anglican ministers in the four counties specified by the Ministry Act, however, formed only part of Cornbury's suppression of dissenting religious groups. His instructions from Queen Anne impowered him "to collate any person or persons to any Churches or Chapels, or other ecclesiastical benefices within our said province or dependencies aforesaid, as often as that any of them shall happen to be void."[46] Cornbury interpreted this to mean control of the appointment of ministers to dissenting churches as well as to the established church.

---

45. Colonel Heathcote to the Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, no date, E. R. N. Y., III, 1610.

46. Dix, Trinity Church, I, 136-137.

The Dutch Reformed Church, with its special chartered position, maintained close relations with the administration. As a matter of courtesy they informed the governor when they called a new minister. In 1702, the elders of the Dutch Reformed Churches in King's County reported to Cornbury that they planned to invite the Reverend Bernardus Freeman. Cornbury startled them by announcing that he would give them an answer in a few days. Previous governors had never questioned the selection of a Dutch minister. Informing the governor of a call had always been a courtesy, and his agreement was expected as a matter of course.

Informed of Cornbury's answer, the members of the Dutch Reformed Churches roundly lambasted their elders. They claimed the governor "had nothing to do with it" and asserted "it was their privilege to send for what minister they pleased." Calling a town meeting in Flatbush, they decided to send for Freeman without waiting for Cornbury's answer.[47] The fact that they used a town meeting to register their defiance of Cornbury indicated that the controversy still centered on who would control the state's religious policy, not on whether the state should have such a policy.

---

47. "Petition of the Elders of the Dutch Church in Kings County," ibid., p. 1503.

Cornbury acted swiftly to defend his power. He hauled Johannes Schenck, town clerk of Flatbush, and the elders of the Dutch Reformed Church before his council and threatened them with prosecution. On the following day he announced, since Freeman had "not behaved well in the continuation and encouragement of the dissensions among the people of this province," that he would not approve him. He ordered the Dutch Churches "neither to call nor to receive said Freeman."[48]

In 1705 Cornbury again intervened in the affairs of the Dutch Reformed Church. When the Dutch minister at Kingston returned to Holland, Cornbury sent an Anglican clergymen, Stephen Gracherie, to replace him. Though there were only six English families in the town, Cornbury ordered the residents to pay Gracherie's salary, provide him with a residence, and allow him use of the church. The Dutch complied "for sake of peace," but they also sent to Holland for a new minister.[49]

---

48. "Answer of the Governor," ibid., p. 1507.

49. "Cornbury Authorizes Stephen Gracherie to Read Service at Kingston, N.Y., August 10, 1704," ibid., 1574; "Journal of Dominie Beys," ibid., p. 1617.

The Reverend Henricus Beys arrived in New York City in January of 1706, expecting to become pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church at Kingston. Before journeying to that part of the province, he paid his respects to Cornbury. The governor, however, demanded that Beys take out a license to preach, and threatened to banish him if he assumed his pastorate without it. When Beys protested, Cornbury roundly cursed him, silenced him, and abruptly ended their meeting.

Beys and his fellow ministers realized that acceptance of a license constituted a dangerous precedent, for it placed a minister "at the mere caprice and pleasure" of the governor. They argued that Cornbury's demand opposed "the ancient customs of the Dutch Reformed Church, and the acts of Parliament passed in the time of King William." Furthermore, the Dutch noted that nothing of the kind has been introduced or required by any of the governor's predecessors. In short, they argued custom and legal precedent, but they did not question the state's right to intervene in religious affairs. Cornbury was wrong, not because he had no business regulating religion, but because his manner of doing it so violated English law.[50]

---

50. Ibid., pp. 16, 15-16, 17.

When Cornbury remained obstinate, Beys left New York City and joined his congregation. He ministered to them privately but avoided public ceremonies for fear of angering the governor. Meanwhile, some "principal men in the Province" interceded with Cornbury. Possibly they reminded him of the advantages that Dutch support gave the Anglican cause. In any event, they convinced him to allow Beys to function publicly. Yet, as the Dutch elders ruefully observed, "we have not gained any essential point as far as our real objects are concerned." The Dutch realized that their "whole ministerial service" still remained "dependent on his Excellency's will and pleasure."[51]

Cornbury's "will and pleasure" brought hardship to Quakers as well. Their taxes supported an Anglican minister whenever one was established in their locality. The governor also forced them to open their meetings to Anglican missionaries and sit quietly through demeaning harangues. Furthermore, in New York, Cornbury barred Quakers from holding public office.[52]

---

51. The Church of New York to the Classes of Amsterdam, June 10, 1706, ibid., p. 1667-1668.

52. George Keith to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, Nov. 29, 1702, ibid., p. 1512; William A. Whitehead, ed., Documents Relating to the Colonial History of the State of New Jersey in Archives of the State of New Jersey (Newark, 1880 to 1941), III, p. 229.

In New Jersey, where Quakers formed a large part of the population, Cornbury's instructions prevented him from refusing them public office, so he tried to revoke their civil privileges. He countenanced infringements on Quaker voting rights and sought to bar them from the Assembly. In short, he treated Quakers with the same intolerant disdain and overbearing contempt that he used toward other dissenters.[53]

Yet, the dissenters hardly reacted. They grumbled, denounced Cornbury, on occasion timorously defied him, but they always backed down in a direct confrontation. They retreated because they lacked a clear conception of the relationship of church and state. Religious freedom had evolved as a practical necessity out of the multiplicity of sects in New York and New Jersey. It had been accepted without much thought or rationalization. Now faced with the governor's challenge, the dissenters groped for a defense. They never thought to deny the state's power in religious affairs; that was still unthinkable. They tried instead to muster political power against Cornbury's "illegal" actions. Here, too, they groped. Weak, divided, confused, frustrated, they proved no match for Cornbury's delusions of supreme authority and his zealous espousal of the Anglican cause.

---

53. Ibid., pp. 183, 66, 82, 83, 229, 153, 172.

On the seventeenth of January 1707, Francis Makemie,[54] and John Hampton, Presbyterian ministers, arrived in New York City. Cornbury, evidently believing they were Anglicans, invited them to live with him. When he discovered their religious convictions, however, he suddenly became uncommunicative, and the dinner conversation turned to "indifferent" matters. Makemie and Hampton indicated no intention to preach in New York, and Cornbury made no mention of his attitude toward dissenting ministers. The dinner ended amicably enough.[55]

On the following day, Makemie sought permission from the elders of the Dutch Reformed Church to preach from their pulpit. Evidently fearful of Cornbury, they replied that the governor's permission would be necessary. Makemie applied to the elders of the French Reformed Church, but they too required Cornbury's consent.[56]

---

54. For discussions of Makemie's trial see: Pratt, Religion, pp. 57-58; Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, pp. 121-124; Leonard J. Trinterud, The Forming of An American Tradition (Philadelphia, 1959), pp. 32-33. I. Marshall Page, The Life Story of Francis Makemie (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1938), pp. 150-165; William Thompson Hanzsche, Forgotten Founding Fathers of the American Church and State (Boston, 1954), pp. 28-33; Hovergal Sheppard, "Reverend Francis Makemie," Journal of the American Irish Historical Society, IX (1910), 36-39.

55. Cornbury to the Lords of Trade, Oct. 14, 1706, E. R. N. Y., III, 1669.

56. Ibid., pp. 1669-1670.

Urged on by local Presbyterians, Makemie decided to preach in a private house. William Jackson, a shoemaker, offered his home, and there Makemie preached on January 20th, "in as public a manner as possible, with open doors."[57] His sermon, A Good Conversation, stressed the need for "internal and spiritual" worship of God, and attacked "obscenity, ribaldry and profaneness." It contained no mention of the Church of England, the government, or any other controversial topic.[58]

The next day Cornbury learned of Makemie's sermon and heard that John Hampton had preached at the Meeting House at New-Town, Queens County. Enraged, he ordered their arrest because they had preached "without obtaining my license" and because they intended "to spread their pernicious doctrine and principles, to the great disturbance of the church by law established and the government of the province."[59] Cornbury believed he possessed complete authority over the state and consequently over religion. Hence, by his conception of law and of the extent of political power, any sermon preached without his permission did, in fact, disturb church and state.

---

57. Francis Makemie, A Narrative of a New and Unusual American Imprisonment in Peter Force, ed., Tracts, IV (#4), 7.

58. This sermon is reprinted in Collections of the New York Historical Society (1870), pp. 409-453.

59. Makemie, Narrative, p. 8.

To deny this, Makemie and Hampton must first clarify and organize the dissenters' concept of church-state relations.

Late on the afternoon of the twenty-first, Thomas Cardale, high sheriff of Queens County, served Makemie and Hampton with the warrant and took them into custody. The next day he brought them to Jamaica where he detained them for twenty-four hours. Evidently, Cardale sought to make an example of Makemie and Hampton, lest their fellow Presbyterians forget Cornbury's absolute power, or perhaps he just wanted to rub salt in their already grievous wounds. In any event, Cardale did not bring his prisoners before Cornbury until the twenty-third.[60]

"How dare you take upon you to preach in my government, without a license," Cornbury angrily demanded. Makemie responded that the Act of Toleration "gave us liberty." "The Act of Toleration," Cornbury spat, "does not extend to the plantations by its own intrinsic virtue, or any intention of the legislators, but only by her Majesty's royal instructions signified unto me." Makemie produced certificates from Maryland and Virginia attesting to his and Hampton's compliance with the Act of Toleration. We could not have obtained these, he argued,

---

60. Ibid., pp. 7-9.

"if the Act of Parliament had not extended to the Plantations." Since New York was part of her Majesty's dominions, he continued, the certificates must be valid there. "None shall preach in my government without a license, as the Queen has signified to me by her royal instructions," Cornbury shouted. "You must give bond and security to preach no more in my government," he announced with a tone of finality in his voice. Makemie replied, "we neither can nor dare." "Then you must go to gaol," Cornbury raged.[61]

Makemie and Hampton languished in jail until the March term of the grand jury which, of course, Cornbury packed. For reasons known only to himself, he did not file charges against Hampton, but he made sure of Makemie's prosecution. After a perfunctory hearing, the grand jury, to no one's surprise, bound Makemie over for trial the following June. They charged him with "endeavouring to subvert the supremacy, jurisdiction, and authority of our Lady the Queen in ecclesiastical affairs" by preaching in a private house without a license. This time, at least, Cornbury allowed Makemie to post bail.[62]

---

61. Ibid., pp. 9-13.

62. Ibid., pp. 24-75.

At the June session of the Supreme Court, Makemie pleaded "not guilty of any crime, by preaching a sermon at York." The prosecution opened by introducing the Queen's instructions to Cornbury and by contending that these required all ministers to be licensed by the governor. The prosecution then cited numerous English penal statutes requiring uniformity of worship according to the rites and forms of the Church of England, and forbidding unqualified ministers to officiate at a gathering of more than five persons. Makemie, they charged, had violated all of these laws by preaching in William Jackson's house.[63]

Makemie and his lawyers argued that Cornbury's instructions could not stand as law since they had not been promulgated. Moreover, they asserted, the English penal statutes did not extend to the colonies, and the New York Assembly had passed an act in 1691 guaranteeing freedom of worship to all but Catholics. Since the New York law had not been repealed, they contended, it defined religious privileges in the colony. As Makemie saw it, "all persuasions are upon an equal level, and bottom of liberty."[64]

---

63. Ibid., pp. 25-29.

64. Ibid., pp. 40, 29-40.

After "a long debate and fair pleadings," Chief Justice Roger Mompesson gave the jury latitude in deciding the case, "If you will take upon you to judge of Law you may, or bring in fact specially." He gave the jury such latitude because "this was the first instance of a trial or prosecution of this nature in America." The Jury returned a verdict of not guilty.[65]

Though not found guilty, Makemie had to pay the costs of his trial, a sum of over eighty-one pounds. Perhaps, Cornbury snickered at this but Makemie surely laughed last, for his trial completely discredited the governor. Revealing Cornbury's arbitrary and tyrannical approach to religious questions, the Makemie case aroused fears among all elements of the population. The Anglican Lewis Morris characterized the prosecution of Makemie as "a procedure by no means warrantable, and that alarms all mankind here."[66] Presbyterians, Dutch, and other dissenting groups joined forces. Together with New Yorkers disgusted by Cornbury's corrupt political dealings, they elected an Assembly opposed to him. Leislerian and anti-Leislerian distinctions crumbled in common disgust at the governor's religious and political policies. They sent

---

65. Ibid., p. 44. Pratt says the jury was ordered to return a guilty verdict, but this appears to be incorrect, Religion, Politics and Diversity, p. 57.

66. Quoted in C. W. Baird, "The Civil Status of the Presbyterians in the Province of New York," Magazine of American History, III (1879), p. 605.

petitions to England demanding Cornbury's removal from office. London recalled the governor, but before he could leave New York, his creditors had him thrown into debtors' prison. There, he languished until the death of his father allowed him to succeed to the earldom of Clarendon in 1710.[67]

The significance of the Makemie trial went beyond its contribution to Cornbury's recall. Makemie clearly articulated the dissenters' concept of church-state relations. He never denied state authority in matters of religion, but he narrowed the definition of who spoke for the state by removing the governor from control of religious policy. The arguments at his trial stipulated that Parliament or local colonial assemblies might legislate on matters of religion. The governor was bound by their dictates and could not act in defiance of the law.

This position reflected the situation in New York, where an arbitrary governor challenged religious toleration and forced New Yorkers to seek a defense. They naturally tried to limit gubernatorial authority rather than challenge the authority of the state over religion or argue the theoretical equality of all religions. So, they simply denied the governor's authority. Paradoxically, Cornbury's intolerant persecution helped develop a concept

---

67. E.R.N.Y., III, 1672; Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre pp. 123-124.

of religious toleration, for it spurred men to question the relationship of church and state. The answer given at the Makemie trial was not the final American answer, but it was a first step.

A good indication of the changed nature of church-state relations in New York following Cornbury's removal can be seen in the continuing controversy between the Anglicans and the Presbyterians in Jamaica. In 1710 the town vestry refused to pay the salary of the new Anglican minister, Rev. Thomas Poyer, because he "was not qualified according to the act of Assembly of this Province as minister or incumbent of Jamaica." The town vestry assigned the money to a Presbyterian minister, and repossessed the parsonage and church which Cornbury had seized.[68]

The new governor, Robert Hunter, refused to intervene. Unlike Cornbury, he declined to force Anglicanism on an unwilling population. Though personally sympathetic to Poyer's plight, he advised him that the question was one of property rights, which had to be settled in the courts. The Anglicans screamed in outrage. William Vesey

---

68. E.R.N.Y., III, 1871.

wrote to the Bishop of London that Anglicanism was doomed in all the colonies unless Hunter intervened. Hunter replied that the Anglican Church would be better off without such zealots as Vesey and that there should be less mixing of religion and politics.[69]

The controversy dragged on for years with a constant flow of appeals and counter appeals to England. Hunter, held his ground and refused to intervene. In 1712, however, Cornbury, now back in England, convinced Queen Anne to permit direct appeals to the Privy Council in cases involving the American Anglican Church. Poyer, encouraged by this development, brought suit against the Jamaica vestry for his salary. In 1719, the courts decided in his favor. The townspeople of Jamaica rioted and refused to pay, but Hunter then intervened. He arrested the leaders of the disturbances and an uneasy truce ensued.[70]

The important point is that Hunter acted only to enforce the law as interpreted by the local courts. He refused to act in an arbitrary and extra legal fashion,

---

69. Ibid., pp. 1900-1924, 1926-1927, 1950-1953.

70. Ibid., 1963-1964.

as his predecessor Cornbury had done. The problems of Cornbury's administration would not arise again in New York. The church-state question had not been settled, but some progress was being made.

By 1709, therefore, New Yorkers had been shocked into an awareness of the necessity of defining the powers and perogatives of church and state. Though they had not reached the ultimate concept of separation of church and state, they had taken a step in that direction. Forced by Cornbury's arbitrary actions to examine the power of the executive in religious affairs, they concluded that he was subject to law, preferably locally made law. In a few years they would go further than that and declare that the state as a whole had no business in religious affairs.

Chapter III

The Uneasy World of Titian Leeds

> Dick on the hay doth tumble Nell
> Whereby her belly comes to swell.
>
> Tis good in March to bleed, to bathe,
> to purge.
>
> Fools' must not play with swords, nor
> maids with love,
> For this, may cry, and that great
> belly'd prove.[1]

With such rhymes and admonitions, Titian Leeds enlivened the American Almanack. Just sixteen in 1714, when he assumed authorship of this yearly publication, he strove to please the young reading public. His father, David, condoned Titian's light-hearted style, perhaps because he remembered the frivolous, risqué character of his own youthful writings. After all, in 1688 the Philadelphia Quarterly Meeting suppressed his almanac because he "had added some light, foolish, and unsavory paragraphs." [2] This experience probably helped him to understand his son's ideas.

---

1. Titian Leeds, The American Almanack for the Year of the Christian Account 1714, page for August; ibid. (1715), page for March; ibid. (1716), page for June.

2. Nathan Kite "Antiquarian Researches," The Friend (Phila.), Oct. 7, 1843, p. 13.

Yet, fatherly understanding could not obliterate all intellectual differences between parent and offspring. Daniel Leeds, though a bit rebellious as a youth, settled down to serious interests. A Keithian Quaker turned Anglican, he filled his almanacs with tirades against Quakerism and defenses of Anglicanism. He acted as Anglican spokesman in a series of religious controversies lasting more than a decade. In Daniel's intellectual world, truth and error contrasted starkly. All non-Anglicans subsisted in "heresie, error, and ignorance," and were "neither fit for religious nor civil society." He knew that God demanded religious purity and, consequently, he fought tenaciously for his version of truth. He had to, for in his theocentric world, God punished the slightest deviation from the one and only accepted religion.[3]

---

3. Daniel Leeds, The American Almanack for the Year of the Christian Account 1705 (New York, 1705), p. 30; The Second Part of the Mystery of Fox-Craft (New York, 1705, p. 6; also see the following works by Daniel Leeds: News of a Trumpet Sounding in the Wilderness (New York, 1697), The Case Put and Decided (New York, 1699), A Challenge to Caleb Pusey (New York, 1700), News of a Strumpet (New York, 1701), The Rebuker Rebuked (New York, 1703), The American Almanack for 1704, 1706, 1708, 1711 (New York).

Titian Leeds, upon turning his attention from Nell's belly to religion, viewed the world quite differently. "I am dropt in the world in an age wherein there are so many sorts, sects and sizes of religion-pretenders, and everyone judges himself right and all the rest wrong," he lamented, "I do not wonder if the Indians in their exorcisms think themselves right too." "Indeed," he decided, "the world is grown mad." He characterized religious zealots as "rigid and jealous, positive and grave," and observed that such men possessed "every gift but charity." Their incessant quarrels about religion, he concluded, would be "followed by a curse upon the land." In Titian's world God punished the zealot, not the heretic.[4]

Yet, Daniel the Anglican zealot, and Titian, the advocate of mutual forebearance, still shared all intellectual heritage. Though Titian rejected his father's quest for religious purity as mad and uncharitable, he knew that God's will must be explicitly fulfilled. Like his father, he believed that God's providence controlled the world and everyone in it. It was essential, therefore, to please God by immediate and precise obedience to His commands.

---

4. Titian Leeds, The American Almanack for 1716 (New York, 1716), p. 2-3.

But, what were God's commands? Daniel knew. Rigid, intolerant, fanatical, he had the truth and sought to spread it. Titian, however, possessed no such certitude. He prayed, "who can trace, O God, Thy wonderous ways, who dwellest in an abode exalted far beyond our mortal sight." Titian realized that his interpretation of God's will might be wrong. Yet, all he could do was ask God to "prevent the effects of our ill judging choice." He lived in an uneasy world. In rejecting his father's zeal, he lost his certitude, and so he could never be sure that God approved his life style.[5]

Titian's problem was by no means unique. Rather, it typified the plight of many in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. As prosperity increased and society became more complex, economic and political problems pushed religion into the background. Worldly interests of money, trade, power, and pleasure became motivating factors in many lives. In a society growing richer and more urbane, people grew less and less concerned with God and the quest for religious and moral purity.

---

5. Titian Leeds, The American Almanack for 1731 (New York, 1731), pages for March, and November.

Furthermore, a quest for religious purity demanded a heroic commitment to do God's will, a commitment out of tune with the times. In a society where people could not agree on the truth, such religious intensity proved impossible to maintain. The multiplicity of sects and the destructive consequences of their competition forced reasonable men to seek some accommodation, a process made easier by the growing worldliness of society.

Yet, as men grew more worldly and less inclined zealously to espouse any one religion, they, like Titian Leeds, grew uneasy. The theocentric cosmology lingered on, demanding religious and moral purity and threatening divine wrath. Many people began to feel guilty about their worldliness and their loss of religious zeal. The old and new outlooks confronted men with dissonant demands, resulting in intellectual confusion and a sense of foreboding.

This uncertainty and uneasiness as a changing society collided with an un-changing cosmology found expression in much of the writing of the period. To begin with, many authors complained of the immoral and irreligious character of society. In 1711 Robert Hunter, governor of New York, complained that "profanation of the Lords days, cursing and swearing, blasphemy, drunkenness, lewdness, and all other immoral and disorderly practices . . . have too much obtained in this province." The following year

found the Presbyterian minister, Joseph Morgan, lamenting inattention to sermons, disregard of Sabbath laws, and courting on the Lord's day. Many publications now catered to the economic, political, and social rather than spiritual interests of readers. The quest for religious and moral purity waned.[6]

By 1726 the decline reached such proportions that Jacob Taylor, a Philadelphia almanac writer, noted that some impious souls had become "daring bold with sacred writ" by claiming that the Apostles were "but men" and capable of error. In 1728 the American Weekly Mercury advertised a book entitled A Few Words In Favor of Free Thinking. Seven years later George Gillespie, a Presbyterian minister, claimed "there are many deists and free-thinkers in our parts of the world" aiming at "the overthrow of true Christian religion." Gillespie felt that "all revealed religions" might be destroyed.[7]

---

6. Robert Hunter, A Proclamation (New York, 1711); Joseph Morgan, The Great Concernment of Gospel Ordinances (New York, 1712), pp. 32-35. An examination of Charles Evans, American Bibliography (New York, 15 vols., 1941-1959), Vols. I and II reveals a great increase in secular topics.

7. Jacob Taylor, An Almanack for the Year of our Lord 1720 (Philadelphia, 1720), page for August; American Weekly Mercury, April 4, 1728; George Gillespie, A Treatise Against the Deists or Free Thinkers (Philadelphia, 1735), p. 1. Evans in his American Bibliography states that no copy of A Few Words in Favor of Free Thinking could be found.

Religious writers in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania shared this gloomy assessment. They viewed the second and third decades of the eighteenth century as years of immorality and apostasy, deprecated "the great increase of profaneness and lewdness," warned parents about "the rude behavior and vile language used and propagated among children," admonished businessmen against "unjust dealings," and reminded all that God, not money, was the end of existence. For such writers, society had become totally immoral and completely irreligious.[8]

---

8. Society of Friends, Advice and Caution From Our Monthly Meeting (Philadelphia, 1732), p. 2. For other accounts of the decline of religious fervor see: Thomas Chalkley, A Letter to a Friend (Philadelphia, 1723); James Logan; The Charge Delivered from the Bench (Philadelphia, 1723), pp. 8-9; Society of Friends, An Epistle From Our Yearly Meeting (Philadelphia, 1724), pp. 203; Jacob Taylor, A Complete Ephermeris For the Year of Christ 1726 (Philadelphia, 1725)--actually a forgery by Samuel Keimer; Society of Friends, An Epistle From the Yearly Meeting (Philadelphia, 1727), pp. 1-2; Edward Perry, A Memorable Account of the Christian Experiences (Philadelphia, 1729), preface, p. 24; Joseph Morgan, The Nature of Riches (Philadelphia, 1732), p. 13; James Wetmore, Eleutherius Enervatus (New York, 1733), p. 7; Society of Friends, An Epistle From Our Yearly Meeting (Philadelphia, 1734), pp. 1-3; Ebenezer Pemberton, A Sermon Preached Before the Commission of the Synod (New York, 1735), pp. 3, 11; "Religious Courtship," Pennsylvania Gazette, April 19, 1729; "Letter to the Editor," ibid., April 16, 1724; "Letter From Marcus," ibid., March 23, 1732; "A Discourse on the Principles of Some Modern Infidels," ibid., June 14, 1733.

Furthermore, if the people were not aroused from complacent enjoyment of sinful ways, ministers and religious laymen warned them of God's wrath. "Irreligion, immorality, and profaneness," Robert Hunter declared, "are the causes of misery and destruction." James Logan, Quaker magistrate, castigated Pennsylvanians for "irreligion and profanity," and reminded them that such vices caused "the drawing down of divine vengance on a nation." As the colonists continued in their worldly ways the cries of religious men became more strident. By 1731, the Presbyterian minister, Samuel Cooke, spoke of the impending "inundation of ruin upon a sinful world" and, by 1735, his colleague Ebenezer Pemberton warned, "Jesus, who is now so often reviled and insulted will shortly be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, to take vengence on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of Christ."[9]

---

9. Hunter, Proclamation of 1711; Logan, Charge Delivered from the Bench, p. 8; Samuel Cooke, A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Reverend Mr. John Davenport (New York, 1731), p. 11; Pemberton, Sermon, p. 22. Also see: Morgan, Great Concernment, pp. 31, 32; Friends, Epistle of 1724, p. 1; Friends, Epistle of 1727, p. 2; Thomas Pender, The Divinity of the Scriptures (New York, 1728), p. 32; Moses West, A Treatise Concerning Marriage (Philadelphia, 1730), pp. 26-27; Alexander Arscott, Some Considerations Relating to the Present State of the Christian Religion (Philadelphia, 1731), preface; Society of Friends, Advice and Caution, pp. 2-8; Joseph Morgan, The Nature of Riches (Philadelphia, 1732), p. 13; Isaac Ambrose, Deaths Arrest (New York, 1733); Society of Friends, An Epistle of 1734, pp. 2-3; The Poor Orphans Legacy (Philadelphia, 1734).

Warnings such as these appeared constantly in public prints and were thundered from pulpits. Only the most isolated individual could avoid reading or hearing them, and only the most hardened soul could avoid tinges of fear upon confronting them. After all, Americans had been raised on the concept of a jealous, demanding, vengeful God. They might put Him out of their minds, they might give up the quest for moral and religious purity, but a nagging fear remained that God might punish them for their irreligion and immorality. They lived in a new secular world, but the old religious ideas lingered on, nagging at their consciences. Not until the Great Awakening of the late 1730's, would they purge their souls of uneasiness.

In this uneasy world of the early eighteenth century, colonists of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania continued to deal with problems of religious toleration and church-state relations. To begin with, because they worried about the fate of Christianity in general, most religiously-oriented writers eschewed increasing immorality and sectarian controversy. With questioning of Christianity's fundamental tenets, religious spokesmen found differences in form less important than in previous years. In their defence of morality and religion, they discovered allies where once they could only find enemies.

They ceased attacking each other and decried instead the common enemy of irreligion.

Joseph Morgan exemplified this when he told his readers to avoid sectarian controversy rather than "make a rent and schism and so hinder mutual edification in the more vital part of religion." Titian Leeds warned that "discordant and contrary opinions in religion averts profane persons from the church." "The enemies of religion," another concerned writer declared, take occasion from religious controversy "to represent the thing itself as uncertain." For the good of religion, religious men sought mutual understanding. Irreligious men, of course, did not care.[10]

Understanding among various religious groups received impetus from the multiplicity of sects and the consequent impracticality of intolerance. In New York and New Jersey, Viscount Cornbury's attempt to create

---

10. Joseph Morgan, The Portsmouth Disputation Examined (New York, 1713), preface; Titian Leeds, The American Almanack for the Year of Christian Account 1718 (Philadelphia, 1717); Arscott, Considerations, p. 87. Also see: Gospel Times (Philadelphia, 1712), p. 26; Society of Friends, An Epistle of Caution (Philadelphia, 1722), p. 3; John Meredith, A Short Discourse (Philadelphia, 1729), preface; Alexander Arscott, Some Considerations Relating To The Present State of the Christian Religion Part II (Philadelphia, 1732); Benjamin Holme, A Serious Call in Christian Love (Philadelphia, 1732); p. 74; James Anderson, The Constitution of the Free Masons (Philadelphia, 1734), p. 48.

an Anglican establishment alarmed the dissenting majority and elicited much support for toleration. In Pennsylvania, the influx of non-Quakers forced every religious group to reevaluate its position vis á vis other sects. Almost always, they supported toleration as a practical necessity.

In this vein, the Quaker Thomas Maule argued that church and state should remain separate. "Civil societies have their laws proper and peculier to themselves," he declared, "and the churches have their rules of discipline peculiar to themselves, and far different from each other." To confuse the two, he believed, meant unnecessary and intolerable controversy. Another Quaker, Jacob Taylor argued that intolerance was "madness" for "neither side will e'er a farthing gain." The Anglican pastor Samuel Johnson told dissenters, "I have nothing to say for persecution, I abhor it as much as you do." The Presbyterian minister, Jonathan Dickenson, lamented the fact that "almost every sect and party have in their turns, when they have had the power in their hands, used coercive methods, to bring others to the same profession with themselves; or as it has been commonly phrased, to the profession of the orthodox faith." He thanked God that he lived in an age when liberty of conscience had been defended "against all the claims of tyranny and persecution,"

and when men realized that they could not impose their views on others.[11]

The necessary doctrine of toleration, of course, entailed acceptance of the fact that truth came in more than one version. However, since there was only one truth, this meant toleration of error. But, God, at least the God of old, demanded religious purity. Religious thinkers, therefore, sought some theological rationalization for toleration. They found it in the doctrine of charity.

As David Jamison, chief justice of New Jersey asked, "Why shall moderation and Christian charity be laid aside as useless, anti-christian and heterodox, and envy hatred and malice pass upon us for zeal and religion?" Instead of emphasizing the Jehovah God, who demanded absolute purity of religion, those in the middle colonies now stressed the tolerant spirit of

---

11. Thomas Maule, Tribute to Caesar (Philadelphia, 1712), p. 12; Jacob Taylor, An Ephemesis of the Planetary Motions and Aspects For the Year of Our Lord (Philadelphia, 1722); Samuel Johnson, A Letter from a Minister of the Church of England to his Dissenting Parishoners (New York, 1733), p. 7. Jonathan Dickenson, Remarks Upon a Pamphlet, Entitled, A Letter to a Friend in the Country (Philadelphia, 1735), pp. 1-2; Also see: Francis Makemie, A Narrative of a New and Unusual American Imprisonment (New York, 1707); Thomas Chalkley, Forcing a Maintenance Not Warrentable From the Holy Scripture (Philadelphia, 1714), preface, p. 34.

Christ. Thomas Chalkley expressed this attitude when he declared "once people go to persecute others for their conscientious dissent it is certain they go from the spirit of Christ . . . and doubtless all persecutors are anti-Christs." Sectarian conflict must cease, another writer demanded, because it led "to the destruction of Christian charity, which is the bond of perfection of all goodness." In short, religious spokesmen now claimed that Christ commanded toleration of divergent theological opinions. They subordinated the quest for religious purity to the practice of Christian charity.[12]

In deemphasizing the search for purity of religion, however, these writers succumbed to the increasingly worldly temper of colonial society. Understandable and justifiable as was their search for a more tolerant attitude, it nevertheless represented a compromise with the world. Rather than obstinate insistence on religious purity in a society devoid of spiritual zeal, they pragmatically defended all religion against the onslaughts of irreligion. In so doing, they subtly transformed the

---

12. Answer to What Has Been Offered as Argument Against the Validity and Force of an Act of Assembly (New York, 1716), p. 5; Chalkley, Maintenance, p. 26; Arscott, Considerations, p. 87; Also see: Thomas Godfrey, The Pennsylvania Almanac for the Year of Christian Account 1733 (Philadelphia, 1732); Dickenson, Remarks, p. 11; Pennsylvania Gazette, Feb. 17, 1729.

American religious quest from a sectarian search for doctrinal and liturgical purity into a cooperative evangelization of society. This new religious fervor formed the basis for religious revivalism in the late 1730's and early 1740's.

The early decades of the eighteenth century, then, witnessed some important changes in religious thought and attitudes. As society became increasingly secular, the importance of the quest for religious and moral purity diminished, religious leaders waned of God's imminent punishment, and emphasized cooperation rather than competition. These changes created confusion and uneasiness in the intellectual world. As the stability of the old theocentric cosmology disappeared, men groped for a new concept of God, religion, and the world.

While these changes took place, however, the old pattern of church-state relations continued and forced a redefinition of the relationship of the two institutions. As the old theocentric cosmology weakened and the quest for religious purity slackened, church-state relations assumed a different character. No longer did attention focus on attempts by one sect to subvert the rights of others; rather the pressing questions became the extent of religious freedom within a sect and the state's authority over internal affairs of particular religious groups.

Characteristic of situations which sparked discussion of church-state relationships during this period was the affair of Louis Rou, minister of the French Church in New York City. On Sept. 20, 1724 the Consistory or governing body of his church dismissed him as minister, claiming that he violated his contract with the Church by "broaching innovations amongst us contrary to the said contract and the constitution of our church." Rou characterized the Consistory proceedings as "unjust violent and irregular" and together with a number of parishioners who supported him, petitioned Governor William Burnet to restore him to his ministerial post and salary.[13]

Burnet and his council ordered the Consistory to reply to Rou's petition. The Reverend Jean Moulinaar, writing for the Consistory, announced that the French Protestant Church did not acknowledge "any jurisdiction in any civil court within this Province, in and over the private affairs of our church, merely consistorial, and amongst ourselves." "Our foundation," he continued, "is laid upon freedom and liberty of conscience." By this principle, he argued, Rou and his supporters could establish a separate church if they desired, but the

---

13. "Answer of Mr. Moulinaar," Hugh Hastings, ed., Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York (VII vols., Albany, 1901-1916), III, p. 2239; "Petition of Louis Rou," ibid., pp. 2237-2238.

Consistory, by the same token, could freely dismiss Rou if they felt he had violated his contract. The state had no concern in the internal affairs of the French Protestant Church. Though it might establish a national Church and force all citizens to support it, the state could not intervene in the internal affairs of any dissenting denomination. Furthermore, it had to allow such religious diversity.[14]

Rou argued that all religious freedom and liberty of conscience depended on "the bounty and permission of the government under which we live." He claimed that the Consistory's denial of any civil jurisdiction in the case constituted "a principle capable of throwing us into confusion and disorder." "Here is a maxim," he fumed, "not only very prejudical to God's Church, but likewise very dangerous to the state." The government, he believed, should intervene to preserve his religious freedom and to prevent the Consistory from "persecuting" him.[15]

---

14. "Answer of Mr. Moulinaar" in ibid., pp. 2238-2240.

15. "Short Remarks Upon the Answer to the Gentlemen of the French Consistory," in ibid., pp. 2294-2300; also see: Lewis Rou, A Collection of Papers Concerning Mr. Lewis Rou's Affair (New York, 1725); Lewis Rou, The True State of Mr. Rou's Case (New York, 1726).

Burnet and his council temporized in the face of such conflicting interpretations of the relationship of church and state. They refused to act directly on Rou's petition and ordered, instead, that all parties involved attempt to settle the affair among themselves. If this proved impossible, they suggested that Rou should bring his case before the civil courts. In 1726 Rou announced his intention to do just that, but there is no record of any legal action.[16] The controversy, it appears, ended without further litigation.

The arguments raised during the dispute, however, received wide circulation and clearly counterposed two conflicting views of church-state relations. While not denying the state's authority to establish one religion, Moulinaar claimed that all religious groups possessed the right to conduct their internal affairs without state interference. This constituted a step toward separation of church and state. However, Rou claimed that the state was final arbiter in religious disputes, and that separation of the two institutions would prove dangerous to both. The Rou case provided clearly differing views on the church-state question and demonstrated the prevailing confusion on the issue. It settled nothing, but it undoubtedly set many people thinking and helped determine the direction of their thought.

---

16. Ibid., p. 4.

Those in the middle colonies concerned with this church-state question must have been intrigued by the case of the Rev. Alexander Campbell. In 1732, Campbell, a missionary for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, became embroiled with William Vesey, pastor of Trinity Church and symbol of Anglican intolerance. This conflict made apparent the confusion enveloping the church-state question as men tried to define precisely the nature and power of the two institutions.

The Campbell affair was essentially an internal dispute among S.P.G. members. Having been accused of improprieties while serving in Pennsylvania, he left for New York under a cloud of suspicion. There, the S.P.G. under Vesey's leadership expelled Campbell for drinking excessively and frequenting houses of ill-repute. Campbell responded by calling his fellow missionaries "false and perfidious," by claiming that Vesey extorted evidence against him by bribes and threats, and by charging that those who spoke ill of him were "abandoned prostitutes and Knights of the Post." He admitted only to being guilty of "human frailities."[17]

---

17. Alexander Campbell, A True and Just Vindication (New York, 1732), p. 4, 10; Alexander Campbell, A Supplement to the Vindication (New York, 1732);

On this level, the dispute proved humorous but unimportant. Campbell, however, engaged actively in politics. He criticized the New York Assembly as unrepresentative, called for annual elections, and castigated proposals for a standing army.[18] His political opinions, he alleged, provided the real reason for his "persecution" by the S.P.G. The Anglican clergy disliked him, he claimed, because "I do not embrace some ridiculous absurd doctrines a few ignorant and hot clergymen are fond of viz. Those of passive obedience and non resistance, . . . indefensible succession of Kings, uninterrupted succession of bishops, independent power of the church . . . long parliaments . . . together with a standing army in time of peace." In short, he concluded, he defended religious and civil liberty against "the hands of the cruel and the clutches of ecclesiastical power."[19]

Campbell emphatically questioned a standing army, calling it the chief threat to religious and political freedom. To this assertion, Thomas Noxon responded for the Anglicans: "I am really surprised at your

---

18. Alexander Campbell, Maxima Libertatis Custodia Est (New York, 1732); Alexander Campbell, To F----- H-----Esq. (New York, 1732).

19. Campbell, True and Just Vindication, pp. 11-12.

ignorance, don't you know that the clergy want standing armies to support the power of the church?"[20] "If by the Church," Campbell replied, "he means the religion of the state, supported by a standing army, then I answer, that a standing army will support error as well as truth."[21] Campbell warned that such a union of civil and ecclesiastical power would be detrimental to the freedoms of everyone. In this way Campbell seemed to champion religious and political liberty and to propose separation of church and state. Yet, he did not really believe that the church should be completely independent of the state. He condoned state intervention in religious affairs provided it served his purpose; hence, he talked of using the courts to force the Anglican Church to reinstate him as a missionary. Though he decried a union of civil and ecclesiastical power, he could use the civil power in his ecclesiastical controversy. Confused as his principles were, however, Campbell contributed to efforts to define the relationship of church and state.

---

20. Thomas Noxon, Mr. Noxon's Observations Upon Parson Campbell's Vindication (New York, 1732).

21. Campbell, Supplement, p. 25.

The case of the Rev. Samuel Hemphill also forced consideration of the interaction of church and state.[22] Hemphill, a Presbyterian minister from Ireland, served as assistant to the aging Jedediah Andrews, minister of the congregation in Philadelphia since 1698. After his arrival in 1735, his eloquent sermons aroused the admiration of his flock and his popularity grew quickly. But some of the more well read members of the congregation realized that Hemphill had stolen his sermons from the published works of famous divines and they also noticed that he preached unorthodox doctrines. Consequently, in 1736, Jedediah Andrews and other leading Presbyterians charged Hemphill with heresy, and arranged a trial before a commission of the synod.

At this juncture Benjamin Franklin became involved in the controversy. He organized support for Hemphill and published a number of articles in his favor. Franklin epitomized many of the new attitudes toward religion. "In the present weak state of human nature, surrounded

---

22. For a complete discussion of the controversy from a different point of view than the one taken here see: Merton A. Christensen, "Franklin on the Hemphill Trial: Deism Versus Presbyterian Orthodoxy," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd ser., X (1935), 422-40.

as we are on all sides with ignorance and error," he declared, "it little becomes poor fallible man to be positive and dogmatical in his opinions." Franklin believed, "'tis an uncertainty till we get to heaven what true orthodoxy in all points is." Therefore, he felt all men should "unite . . . in mutual Christian charity." Toleration, he decided, was a practical and Christian necessity.[23]

Franklin, however, took this tolerant attitude further than most. He declared that each religious sect should allow divergent theological opinions among its members. The Presbyterian Synod, therefore, could not justly stop Hemphill from preaching any doctrine. "That is as much," he declared, "as to say, if the majority of preachers be in the wrong, they may justly hinder any man from setting the people right; for a majority may be in the wrong as well as the minority, and frequently are." In short, Franklin denied the church any authority to establish standards of orthodoxy.[24]

---

23. Benjamin Franklin, "Dialogue Between Two Presbyterians," Leonard W. Labaree and Whitfield J. Bell, eds., The Papers of Benjamin Franklin (New Haven, 1960), II, p. 33.

24. Ibid., p. 32.

In Franklin's view, neither state nor church could impose sanctions on anyone for holding any belief. He called on his fellow colonists to join him in his fight for "the glorious cause of Christian Liberty." He warned them of the danger of allowing even the clergy, let alone the state, to decide religious questions. He announced his conviction "that all the persecutions, cruelties, mischiefs and disturbances that ever yet happened in the church took their rise from the usurped power and authority of her lawless sons." "Nothing," he concluded, "can prevent our being a very flourishing and happy people, but our suffering the clergy to get upon our backs and ride us, as they do their horses, where they please."[25]

The anarchistic implications of Franklin's defense of Hemphill engendered responses from Presbyterian clergy and forced them to clarify their position on the authority of Church, state, clergy and laity. Jonathan Dickenson produced the most reasoned defense of the Presbyterian position. In so doing, he clearly articulated a view of Church and state which would eventually be shared by most of his fellow colonists, a view which eliminated much of the confusion found in earlier attempts to deal with this subject.

---

25. Benjamin Franklin, "A Letter to a Friend in the Country," in ibid., p. 87, 66, 67.

Dickenson began by removing the state from religious affairs. "We must premise," he declared, "as an immutable foundation of all just conclusions in the present case, that no methods of force or violence, no temporal injuries of any kind, no prejudices to the estates, honors, or comforts of any man or society of men, are ever lawful, upon account of any difference in mere matters of speculation, or any different sentiments in Articles of faith or principles of religion." The state, in Dickenson's view, had no authority to impose religious belief, or to interfere with religious practices. He thanked God that most men had come to agree with this view.[26]

"But as one extreme commonly begets another," he continued, "there now appears greatest danger, that liberty will be abused to licentiousness, and that to escape imposition, we shall open a door to infidelity." Franklin's denial of all authority to the clergy and church, he argued "shall make shipwreck of the Faith as well as the peace of our churches, by the mixed communions of those most opposite to one another, in the essential and fundamental articles of faith." In Dickenson's view, Franklin's ideas served only to bring "poison into Christ's household."[27]

---

26. Dickenson, Remarks, p. 3.

27. Ibid., p. 2.

Just as all men have liberty to judge for themselves in matters of religion, Dickenson argued, so, too, could a group of men. A religious society could establish whatever standards it desired. While no sect possessed the right to impose itself upon any individual, neither could an individual impose himself upon a sect. "We allow no confession of faith," Dickenson explained, "as a test of orthodoxy for others, but only as a declaration of our own sentiments; nor may this be imposed upon the members of our own society, nor this assent required to anything as a condition of their communion with us; but what we esteem essentially necessary." All those who differed from his views, Dickenson allowed, have "liberty to think for themselves, if they will but allow us the same liberty."[28]

Dickenson's analysis of the power and prerogatives of church and state expressed the sentiments of the majority of inhabitants of the middle colonies. By 1736 very few defended state intervention in religious affairs. The old necessity of uniting the two institutions had clearly given way. Only a few agreed with Franklin that the church possessed no power to enforce orthodoxy. Dickenson's view that a religious sect had the same liberty as an individual to decide theological and liturgical

---

28. Ibid., p. 26.

norms appealed to all but the most radical thinkers. In short, his moderate attitude made Dickenson a good spokesman for his contemporaries.

That such opinions appeared "moderate" in 1736 indicated the extent of the transformation of the old theocentric cosmology. In the late seventeenth century, religious leaders would have rejected Dickenson's dangerous and heretical ideas of toleration and church-state separation. In Dickenson's day, his ideas created no stir. They were the essence of orthodoxy.

The convergence of many forces created this new orthodoxy. As the eighteenth century progressed, men became more worldly and less inclined to pursue religious purity. Ministers and concerned laymen found the battle against irreligion so demanding that inter-sectarian conflict soon ceased. Besides, the multiplicity of religious groups made such antagonisms dangerous. So, toleration grew out of necessity. Theologians then justified it by the concepts of charity and love of Christ.

In an increasingly tolerant climate, the possibility grew of separating church and state, particularly as the varieties of truth increased in number. The state no longer insured the predominance of the Truth. Consequently, the colonists groped to define the functions and prerogatives of church and state. In so doing, they eventually concluded upon separation of the two institutions. In practice, however, they still viewed the state as an instrument

to enhance their particular religious ideas. They had accepted the theory of separation of church and state, but not the reality.

All these changes in the way men viewed God, religion, and the world, however, created a fundamental uneasiness in society. The settlers in the Middle Colonies lost the self-assurance that accompanied the old theocentric cosmology. They feared God's wrath for abandoning the quest for religious purity. They liked the new secular world, but the old religious values and outlooks nagged at their consciences. Theirs was an uneasy world of changing value, guilt, and fear. Theirs was a conscience in need of purgation.

Titian Leeds lived in this uneasy world, and more than many of his contemporaries he wrote about it. He lamented that his world was one in which "all things are fading . . . and nothing certain but uncertainty." He could never be sure that he was following God's will, and this created for him a "world of grief" filled with the nagging torments of an uncertain conscience. "Peace to the wicked sure was never known," Leeds declared, "but, oh, mild peace is now from Zion flown." Worse yet, Leeds did not know how to regain inward serenity. "Lord give me patience, if not strength," he prayed,

"for . . . I'm but one to bear."[29]

In truth, Leeds was but one of many forced "to bear" with uneasiness, guilt and fear. Many middle colonists felt as he did. Such a situation could not continue, for it made life intolerable. Though Leeds and his contemporaries did not know it, they would soon have a chance to purge themselves of guilt. They would soon become part of a major religious revival, the Great Awakening.

---

29. Titian Leeds, The American Almanack (Philadelphia, 1716), page for October; ibid, (Philadelphia, 1717), page for March; ibid. (Philadelphia, 1716), page for September; ibid. (Philadelphia, 1717), page for March.

Chapter IV

The Changing World of "Hell Fire Tennent"

Early in March 1740, the Presbyterian minister Samuel Blair left his parish in Fagg's Manor, Pennsylvania, to visit friends in East Jersey about one hundred miles away. It was a long horseback ride, one that afforded Blair an opportunity to ponder the spiritual state of his congregation. There were, he decided, some "hopefully pious" people in his flock, but unfortunately most were in a "natural unregenerate state." The vast majority seemed "careless at heart, and stupidly indifferent about the great concerns of eternity." Blair felt discouraged. He had labored for almost a year and had but four or five souls "brought under deep conviction" to show for it. "Religion," he decided, lay "dying, and ready to expire its last breath of life." Only God, he realized, could save the church, and so he prayed for Divine aid.[1]

On the Sunday following Blair's departure his friend and fellow minister, Gilbert Tennent, stood in the pulpit of the Presbyterian Church at Fagg's Manor. A tall, well

---

1. Samuel Blair, A Short and Faithful Narrative of the Late Remarkable Revival of Religion in A. Alexander, Biographical Sketches of the Founder and Principal Alumni of the Log College (Princeton, 1845), pp. 269-270.

built man, of grave and solemn countenance, he stared intently at the congregation. His eyes, afire with emotion, signaled that his would be no ordinary sermon. As he spoke "the thunderings and mighty vociferations of Mount Sinai seemed to roar from the sacred desk."[2] With rising emotion Tennent unfolded "the dangerous and awful case of such as continue unregenerate." Vividly, boldly, almost lovingly, he painted a verbal picture of the horrors of hell awaiting his sinful listeners.[3]

The congregation stirred uneasily. Tennent, sensing their discomfort, thundered on about hell, fire and damnation. Many people became visibly disturbed. Then, overcome by fear and grief, one person cried aloud, then another, and another. Tennent pleaded for silence but to no avail. The cries and sobs of convicted sinners filled the church. Joyfully Tennent raised his eyes to heaven and thanked God for sending His saving grace.

A few days later news of these events reached Samuel Blair in East Jersey. "I was very joyful to hear of it," he later recounted, "in hopes that God was about to carry on an extensive work of converting grace amongst

---

2. Alexander, Sketches, p. 86, 37.

3. Blair, Narrative, p. 271.

them." Returning to Fagg's Manor, Blair found his hopes fulfilled. In his first sermon, he pressed the "unconverted and ungodly" with the injunction "first of all seek the kingdom and righteousness of God." "This consideration," he remembered, "seemed to come and cut like a sword upon several in the congregation; so that while I was speaking upon it, they could no longer contain, but burst out in the most bitter mourning."

Throughout the next six months God lavished his grace on Fagg's Manor. As news of conversions spread, people flocked to the Sunday assemblies from miles around. They seldom left disappointed. As Blair described it, "I think there was scarcely a sermon or lecture preached here through that whole summer, but there were manifest evidences of impressions on the hearers; and many times the impressions were very great and general." Fainting, sobbing, screaming, and even convulsions became common place as men, women, and children realized their sinful lost state.[4]

These sinful people were not hysterical, nor was the manner of their conversion unusual. In fact, the awakening at Fagg's Manor typified the religious revival that swept the American colonies between 1739 and 1742.

---

4. Ibid., pp. 271-272.

In small country villages and large towns people flocked to hear evangelical preachers, and many listeners were physically and mentally overcome. Vital, direct, emotional piety returned to the colonies.[5]

This "Great Awakening" in the middle colonies followed two decades of intellectual confusion in which changing social values and an unchanging theocentric cosmology created dissonant religious and ethical demands. For many people it served as a catharsis for accumulated guilt, arising out of a loss of zeal in the quest for the perfect church. It reinvoked in them the quest for religious perfection, yet it simultaneously altered that quest to the needs of an increasingly secular society. It arousedthe hostility of those who emphasized reason, order authority, and orthodoxy, forced them to define and defend their position, and, thereby helped to clarify the nature of the colonial religious quest. It led to increased toleration through a proliferation of religious sects, through an emphasis on personal religion, and through the provision of common aims and objectives for supporters of denominationalism. Finally, it laid the foundations for an adaptation of religious zeal to American secular objectives.

---

5. For general accounts of the Awakening See: Edwin Scott Gaustad, The Great Awakening in New England (New York, 1957); Alan Heimert, Religion and the American Mind (Cambridge, 1966); C.H. Maxson, The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies (Chicago, 1920); Leonard J. Trinterud, The Forming of an American Tradition (Philadelphia, 1949).

On the most fundamental level, for many people who were uneasy about their loss of religious zeal, the Awakening provided an opportunity to purge their guilt in the emotional orgy of a conversion experience. Every revivalist minister stressed the need to realize sin, and they structured their preaching to provoke that end. As Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen, the Dutch dominie, declared, "we must acknowledge salvation to be quite a different thing from what is supposed by most men who yet hoped to be saved, for they imagine that it is entirely well with them, and that they shall be saved, provided they avoid outward and gross sins; live honest and correct lives; perform the external duties of godliness, and diligently pursue the business of their calling." To Frelinghuysen such a life style was "only in accordance with the practice of the heathen." To be saved, he believed, men needed "a lively convincing apprehension of their spiritual need, sinfulness, ill-desert, and impotence."[6]

---

6. Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen, Sermons, Rev. William Demarest, trans. (New York, 1856), p. 114, p. 32. For other direct statements on the need for "conviction" see: Gilbert Tennent, The Espousals or a Passionate Perswasive to A Marriage with the Lamb of God (New York, 1735), p. 11, A Solemn Warning to the Secure World (Boston, 1735), p. 161; A Short Direction for an Unregenerate Sinner (New York, 1739), p. 22; George Whitefield, The Marks of a New Birth (New York, 1739), p. 7; What Think Ye of Christ (Philadelphia, 1739), p. 12; Jonathan Dickenson, A Call to the Weary (New York, 1740), p. 9, A Display of God's Special Grace (Philadelphia, 1743), pp. 8-10, The Nature and Necessity of Regeneration (New York, 1743), p. 48. Samuel Finley, Christ Triumphing and Satan Raging (Philadelphia, 1741), p. 16.

To engender such a response in hearts of unconcerned sinners revivalist ministers preached the terrors of the Lord, the wrath and jealousy of the Jehovah God. "The terrors of an enraged God," Gilbert Tennent asserted, "are the most proper objects for secure sinners to consider upon; because being selfish they are more apt to be influenced by fear than by love." "Ministers in all ages," declared the internationally-renowned preacher George Whitefield, "have found it necessary frequently to remind their people of . . . the terrors of the Lord." According to the fiery revivalist Samuel Finley, "the demands of the Law and its terrible threats, must be awfully set forth, in order to convince the secure of sin and misery."[7]

---

7. Gilbert Tennent, The Danger of Forgetting God (New York, 1735), p. 8. George Whitefield, Sermons on Various Subjects (Philadelphia, 1740, 2 vols.), I, 193; Samuel Finley, Clear Light Put Out (Philadelphia, 1743), p. 89. The preaching of all revivalist ministers exhibited this emphasis upon the terrors of the law. For other direct statements defending the practice see: Samuel Blair, A Perswasive to Repentance (Philadelphia, 1743), pp. 1-8; Dickenson, Display, pp. 3-4; Gilbert Tennent, Love to Christ a Necessary Qualification in Order to Feed His Sheep (Philadelphia, 1744), p. 17.

Once a person convicted himself of sin and realized the terrible punishment that awaited him, he became ready to embrace Christ. Frelinghuysen believed that through the sorrow and terror of the conversion experienced sinners would be "driven out of themselves and become humble suppliants at the throne of grace." Jonathan Dickenson told his congregation that after they realized their "sinful and miserable state" and their total "impotency" they would "see such safety in believing in Christ as will enable them readily to venture their eternal interests in His hands." In short, revivalist ministers preached justification through faith in Christ. They hoped their congregations would actively seek and lovingly nurture the smallest iota of Christ's saving grace.[8]

Through this grace, the revivalist ministers believed, people could achieve the ultimate end of religious quest, a mystical union with God. Like their spiritual forefathers of the seventeenth century, they desired oneness with God and a complete sublimation of their

---

8. Frelinghuysen, Sermons, p. 33; Dickenson, Display, p. 60, Nature, p. 48. For more technical discussions of justification by faith see: Whitefield, Marks of New Birth, What Think Ye, pp. 12-18, On Justification by Christ (New York, 1740); Finley, Christ Triumphing, pp. 15-23. Gilbert Tennent, A Sermon Upon Justification (Philadelphia, 1741).

wills to His. As George Whitefield phrased it, they longed for "a thorough inward change of nature, a divine life, a vital participation of Jesus Christ, a union of the soul with God." Gilbert Tennent evidenced the intensity of this desire to follow God's will completely. Despite "unutterable groans, transports, ravishments, outcrys, and fastings" caused by direct communion with God, he still declared, "if it were lawful I could freely try to pluck my heart out, and tear it to pieces, that I might be avenged on it for its backslidings, treachery and most horrid, deep and unexpressible wickedness."[9]

Undoubtedly, many people shared Tennent's feelings while undergoing the emotional trauma of the conversion experience. They too became convinced of their utter unworthiness, they too gave themselves completely to Christ, they too resolved to follow God's will to perfection. In so doing they purged their souls of guilt, for in admitting their transgressions and begging for God's mercy they transferred the burden of their

---

9. Whitefield, Sermons, I, 64. Gilbert Tennent, "Letter" in Three Letters to the Reverend Mr. George Whitefield (Philadelphia, 1739), p. 9, 11.

sins to Christ.

For Gilbert Tennent and his fellow revivalist ministers, this purgation of guilt recurred continuously. However, for many people who screamed, sobbed, fainted, and were "convicted" because of revivalist preaching, conversion and purgation were isolated events. Men and women long guilty about giving up the quest for religious purity, stung to the quick by brilliant emotional preaching, terrified at the thought of God's wrath, spurred by the cries and sobs of neighbors and friends, admitted their guilt and truly felt God's presence. Having achieved this union with God, many of them ceased to desire further religious experience and insight. Their quest for religious purity fulfilled, they exalted in an abiding sense of God's favor.[10]

In a society becoming economically, politically and socially more complex, a society leaving little time for religious ardor, the conversion experience proved eminently useful. By giving people a feeling of communion with God, it released them to pursue their

---

10. Revivalist ministers constantly complained of backsliding by their congregations, and urged people to work continuously to maintain grace. The most explicit statement concerning the necessity of recurring conversion is Gilbert Tennent, The Necessity of Keeping the Soul (Philadelphia, 1745).

worldly interests without a nagging sense of guilt. The converted, after all, received God's saving grace. They knew God approved of them, and so they could devote their energies to secular affairs. If ever their assurance of religious well-being wavered, they could look back on the emotional intensity of the conversion experience and restore their spiritual confidence. They enjoyed the best of two worlds, for they were godly men free to pursue ungodly ends.

For those who accepted the revivalism of the Great Awakening, therefore, the old theocentric cosmology and the new secular orientation of society blended into a unified world view. In this new outlook, God's sovereignty, jealousy and wrath were maintained. The necessity of following God's will also remained, but His will became understandable in the conversion experience, thereby releasing men from the search for theological and liturgical purity and freeing them to pursue secular ends.

This blending of ideas began with an emphasis on the sovereignty of God. Revivalist ministers stressed His complete control of both spiritual and secular affairs. For example, Theodorus Frelinghuysen told his congregation that God "provides for them and sustains them, with all that they need--with spiritual and corporeal blessings;

and suffers them to want naught requisite for life or godliness." Gilbert Tennent put the concept quite simply, "It is reasonable," he declared, "that God in the dispensation of his providence should magnify his sovereignty." Men, Tennent declared, could not question God's ordering of their affairs.[11]

Though men were powerless to oppose the dictates of God's providence, they could obtain some assurance of how God would act towards them. As the revivalist ministers constantly reiterated, violations of God's will drew God's wrath upon the world. Both the torments of hell and the failure of worldly enterprises awaited those who refused His commands. The corollary was also true. Spiritual and temporal success came to those who followed God's will if they would discover it.

Herein lay the essence of the revivalist transformation of theocentric cosmology. Prior to this, God's will had been interpreted in terms of doctrinal and liturgical purity. Men had sought communion with God in a denominational context. Now the emphasis shifted to personal,

---

11. Frelinghuysen, Sermons, p. 40; Gilbert Tennent, All Things Come Alike to All (Philadelphia, 1745), p. 13. Also see: Tennent, Danger of Forgetting God, p. 13; Benjamin Keach, God Acknowledged (Philadelphia, 1738), p. 39; Charles Woolverton, Christ the External Word (Philadelphia, 1738), p. 39; George Whitefield, Sermons, I, 173-193.

experimental, emotional pietism. Revivalists preached a direct, felt relationship with God. In the conversion experience men came to know God, to experience His grace. They no longer needed formal organized religion, and they no longer wondered about God's approval or disapproval of them.

Consequently, adherents of revivalist religion overcame any sense of guilt about ignoring the quest for denominational religious purity. They could devote all their energies to business, politics, and other worldly ends and forget sectarian religious problems. Furthermore, since they "felt" God's grace, they knew that He approved of their spiritual and temporal endeavors. They could, therefore, participate actively in a secular society and remain godly.

Blending the old theocentric cosmology and the new secularism under revivalist religion produced an interesting phenomenon. A secular society geared to trade, money, political power, and other temporal ends became subsumed under a world view which stressed God's complete control of both religious and civil affairs, and which necessitated a strict adherence to divine will. Inherent in this situation was the possibility of equating secular goals with God's will, and thereby adding moral imperatives to political, economic, or social policies.

While the religious and emotional fires of revivalism burned, however, this possibility lay dormant. Spiritual concerns overshadowed all else. Witness the following description of Philadelphia from the Pennsylvania Gazette of 1740:

> The alteration in the face of religion here is altogether surprising. Never did the people show so great a willingness to attend sermons, nor the preachers greater zeal and diligence in performing the duties of their function. Religion is become the subject of most conversations. No books are in request but those of piety and devotion; and instead of idle songs and ballads, the people are everywhere entertaining themselves with psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs.[12]

Though religion probably was the "subject of most conversations," the Gazette should have mentioned that some of those conversations exhibited an acrimonious tone. Revivalist religion sparked heated controversy. To many ministers and laymen, revivalism meant a perversion of truth. Anti-revivalists rejected the revivalist's concept of religion and their solution to its preservation in a secular world. They proposed a different adaptation of the theocentric cosmology to social interests. In doing so they brought to the fore a fundamental disagreement on the nature of the colonial religious quest.

---

12. Pennsylvania Gazette, June 12, 1740.

Anti-revivalists viewed revivalists as ignorant fanatics. They were, according to the Anglican minister Archibald Cummings, men "who decry learning and the use of reason, and consequently promote ignorance and encourage an implicit faith." Cummings decried the emotionalism in revivalist preaching, and voiced the opinion that "Religious truths are always best conveyed by calmness of reasoning and clearness of argument." Presbyterian Ebenezer Kinnersley agreed. "What spirit such enthusiastic ravings proceed from" he said, "I shall not attempt to determine; but this I am very sure of, that they proceed not from the Spirit of God; for our God is a God of order and not of such confusion." To him, revivalist ministers were "little better than madmen," and revivalism would "end in confusion to the great prejudice of the cause of virtue and solid religion." [13]

---

13. Archibald Cummings, Faith Absolutely Necessary (Philadelphia, 1740), pp. viii, xiv; Ebenezer Kinnersley, "Letter to the Editor," Pennsylvania Gazette, July 24, 1740; quoted in E. R. Beadle, The Old and the New (Philadelphia, 1876), p. 18. This attitude can also be seen in George Gillespie, A Sermon Against Divisions (Philadelphia, 1740), appendix, pp. vi-viii, Remarks Upon Mr. George Whitefield, pp. 7-15; A Protestation Presented to the Synod of Philadelphia (Philadelphia, 1741), p. 11; William Law, The Grounds and Reasons of Christian Regeneration (Philadelphia, 1741); The Querists, Part III (Philadelphia, 1741), p. 4; An Examination and Refutation of Mr. Gilbert Tennents Remarks (Philadelphia, 1742), p. 11, 14, 99. Alexander Gordon, Take Heed How Ye Hear (New York, 1742), p. 19.

For their part, revivalists debunked the anti-revivalist stress on reason, order, and knowledge. According to George Whitefield, only "experimental" knowledge of Christ in the heart was valuable; all other knowledge was as worthless as knowing "that a bird dropped a feather upon one of the Pyrenian mountains." According to Gilbert Tennent, anti-revivalists were "Pharisee-Teachers." They lacked "experience of a special work of the Holy Ghost in their own souls," and consequently "they have not the courage or honesty to thrust the nail of terror into sleeping souls." Actually, he asserted, "they oppose the very work of God's spirit in the souls of men." Tennent concluded that only men who possessed "the plain evidences of experimental religion" should be admitted to the ministry.[14]

---

14. Whitefield, Sermons, I, 93; Gilbert Tennent, The Danger of an Unconverted Ministry (Philadelphia, 1740), pp. 9, 10, 16. For other explicit defences of experimental religion see: George Whitefield, The Rev. Mr. Whitefield's Answer to the Bishop of London's Last Pastoral Letter (New York, 1739); Samuel Blair, A Particular Consideration (Philadelphia, 1741), p. 7; Samuel Finley, Christ Triumphing, Clear Light; Gilbert Tennent, The Righteousness of the Scribes and Pharasies (Boston, 1741), The Examiner Examined (Philadelphia, 1743), p. 5.

This difference of emphasis--reason, order, knowledge on the one side and pietism, emotionalism, experimentalism on the other--indicated basic differences concerning the form of the religious quest. Whereas revivalists rejected the theological, liturgical, sectarian aspects of the old theocentric cosmology in favor of the more mystical and personal quality of that outlook, anti-revivalists rejected the mysticism and stressed the denominationalism. Consequently, the two parties arrived at divergent conclusions concerning the nature of the church, extent of ministerial authority, and essentials of the salvation process.

Anti-revivalists saw the church as a people united under a common rule and sharing common religious doctrines. They stressed theological systems and were proud of denominational peculiarities. When revivalists ignored such things, anti-revivalists became stupified. John Thompson, for example, could not understand how some of his fellow Presbyterian ministers "preach and act contrary to the very plan of Church government . . . from whence we have the denomination of Presbyterians, and by which we are known and distinguished from other denominations of Christians." For anti-revivalists church equaled sect.[15]

---

15. John Thompson, The Government of the Church of Christ (Philadelphia, 1741), p. viii.

For revivalists, the church meant the community of regenerate souls, of those who had undergone the conversion experience and who had received God's saving grace. As John Thompson's revivalist colleagues saw it, "Particular rules of Churches are only so far to be valued and obeyed, as they serve to answer their supposed design, namely the edification of the Body of Christ." From the revivalist point of view, particular churches served only as vehicles to convict congregations of sin and to arouse them to embrace Christ's grace.[16]

Because of this outlook, revivalist ministers disregarded congregational, parishional, and synodical prerogatives. When, for example, George Whitefield encountered opposition from some Philadelphia clergy, he told his listeners "since Christ was not preached in the Church, they might go to hear him where they could." Samuel Blair encouraged people to turn against the "dry beasts" and "secure formalists" who refused to preach experimental religion. Gilbert Tennent asked, "If God's people have a right to the gifts of all God's

---

16. Remarks Upon a Protestation Presented to the Synod of Philadelphia (Philadelphia, 1741), p. 31.

ministers, pray, mayn't they use them as they have opportunity?"[17]

This espousal and practice of itinerancy by revivalist ministers horrified anti-revivalists. They saw it as a threat to the very foundations of church and ministerial authority. As Presbyterian George Gillespie noted, "the question comes to this, may a person lawfully separate from his congregational minister and go to another congregation." Gillespie answered emphatically, "Now this separation is unlawful and sinful, because this will naturally and of itself bring in divisions and rents in Christ's Church." His fellow anti-revivalist minister, Anglican Archibald Cummings declared that such "extravagant liberty" could only end "in the pulling down of the godly frame of the Church."[18]

---

17. George Whitefield, A Continuation of the Rev. Mr. Whitefield's Journal (Philadelphia, 1740), p. 36; Samuel Blair, A Particular Consideration p. 7; Gilbert Tennent, Danger of an Unconverted Ministry, p. 20.

18. George Gillespie, Sermon Against Division, p. 11, Archibald Cummings, The Danger of Breaking Christian Unity (Philadelphia, 1737), p. 15. Also see Ebenezer Kinnersley, A Second Letter from Ebenezer Kinnersley (Philadelphia, 1740); A Protestation, pp. 3-6; The Querists, Part III, pp. 3-4, John Thompson, The Doctrine of Conviction (Philadelphia, 1741); p. iii; Examination and Refutation, pp. 27-30.

Not only did anti-revivalists foresee the crumbling of Church authority, they also realized that itinerancy threatened their personal power. This proved traumatic, especially since anti-revivalists held an autocratic conception of their prerogatives. As Archibald Cummings saw it, "the true religion of Jesus Christ teaches men to live without disturbance in that society of which they are members; to be obedient to its constitutions and to be subject for conscience sake to those that rule over them." The anti-revivalist Presbyterian, John Thompson, argued that his church Synod spoke for all church members whether they agreed or not, because "the people who are ruled . . . have devolved all their right in authority and government upon their representatives." These people, he continued, no longer had the power to judge their own liberties. In short, anti-revivalists believed they should rule and their congregations should obey.[19]

And why not? After all, anti-revivalist ministers viewed themselves as God's representatives on earth. It behooved men to obey them because they could direct

---

19. Archibald Cummings, Faith Absolutely Necessary p. xiii, John Thompson, Government of Church of Christ, p. 6. Also see The Querists, Part III, p. 17ff; An Examination and Refutation, pp. 11-20.

men to salvation. How did they do this? They rationalized the salvation process into ordered theological systems, precise liturgical forms and codes of church discipline. Men, they asserted, could be saved by belonging to a formal organized church and by following that church's moral and religious codes. In their view, men earned salvation communally rather than individually.

Just as revivalist religion freed men to devote their energy to secular affairs without experiencing guilt, so too did the anti-revivalist approach. Anti-revivalist ministers placed religion into set forms, and either singly or collectively declared these forms capable of producing salvation. If men but followed them they could feel assured of salvation. They need not worry about the purity of these forms, for ministers took care of that. They need not experience communion with God, for that part of the old theocentric cosmology had no place in the anti-revivalist scheme. Hence, men could engage in wordly enterprises and rely on ministers to direct them to salvation.

While anti-revivalists blended the old theocentric cosmology and the new social values, they maintained much of the old world view. Like the revivalists, they still saw God controlling men's civil and spiritual affairs

and they, too, believed that men must follow God's will under penalty of material and spiritual consequences. Their approach to religion subsumed a secular society under a theocentric world view. It would be as possible for them, as for revivalists, to equate political, economic and social programs with God's will, and, thereby, add a moral imperative to them. For the moment, however, religion remained their overriding concern.

During the Awakening almost everyone worried about religion, and almost everyone had to choose between revivalist and anti-revivalist approaches. To explain why individuals opted for one or the other, or to say why religious groups tended to be for, against, or divided on revivalism is no easy task. Economic, political, social, and intellectual interpretations abound. They suggest that wealth, social prominence, political conservatism, and a rationalistic intellectual temperament led a person to the anti-revivalist side, while contrary qualities led to revivalism, but it is impossible to say which, if any, of these characteristics should serve as the overall explanation. Perhaps, it is best to say,

as Alan Heimert did, that the question was one of "taste."[20]

In the middle colonies, differences in taste led to a great interchange of people among religious sects, and to splintering church groups. To a large extent Anglicans and Quakers remained aloof from revivalism, though some members deserted each of these staid churches. Revivalism among Baptists enormously stimulated their growth, and the revivalist Moravians picked up many converts from other German-speaking sects in Pennsylvanis. The large Presbyterian church split and became two churches. In short, the already multifarious religious scene of the middle colonies became even more complex as a result of the Awakening.[21]

---

20. Alan Heimert, Religion and the American Mind, p. 10. Aside from the books listed in note 9, see: Maurice W. Armstrong, "Religious Enthusiasm and Sepratism in Colonial New England," Harvard Theological Review, XXXVIII (1945), pp. 111-140; Lawrence Brynestad, "The Great Awakening in New England and the Middle Colonies," Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society, XIV (1930), pp. 80-91; 104-141. Samuel P. Hayes, "An Historical Study of the Edwardian Revivals," American Journal of Psychology (1902), pp. 550-574; Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York, 1963); Perry Miller, "The Great Awakening from 1740 to 1750," Encounter (The Divinity School, Duke University, March 1956); Eugene E. White, "The Pratasis of the Great Awakening in New England," Speech Monographs, XXI (1954), pp. 10-20.

21. C. H. Maxson, The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies, provides the most detailed description of the response of various groups to the Awakening.

During the heat of the Awakening this increasing complexity engendered strident religious controversy. Revivalists and anti-revivalists fought bitterly. So intense were religious feelings that controversy raged even within these major camps. For example, Samuel Finley and Gilbert Tennent argued bitterly with their pro-revivalist counterparts among Baptists and Moravians.[22]

Yet, this increasing complexity actually stimulated the growth of toleration. When the Awakening subsided and religious intensity waned, practicality required mutual forebearance. There were so many religious groups, and so many people who had switched from one to another that men were forced to admit each other's sincerity. Besides the secular business of society functioned best in a climate of toleration, and both revivalist and anti-revivalist approaches ultimately freed men to wholeheartedly engage in worldly enterprises.

The Awakening encouraged toleration in other ways, Revivalism, with its stress on the conversion experience, made religion a personal matter. This reduced sectarian hostility, for religion became private rather than public.

---

22. Samuel Finley, Satan Strip'd (Philadelphia, 1743), A Charitable Plea for the Speechless (Philadelphia, 1747), A Vindication of the Charitable Plea (Philadelphia, 1748); Abel Morgan, Anti-Paedo-Rantism (Philadelphia, 1747); Gilbert Tennent, Examiner Examined, p. 123 and passim.

Many people looked to their own resources to achieve spiritual satisfaction, and they assumed others did the same. Creeds, platforms, dogmas and church rules no longer mattered to many and consequently they ceased being major bones of contention.[23]

Not everyone lost interest in such matters. Anti-revivalists certainly stressed creeds and rules, and they tried to uphold denominational distinctions. In so doing, however, they created a common bond among themselves. Anti-revivalists came to view each other as upholders of reasonable and solid religion, and though their sectarian differences remained, they would not argue with each other over them.

Furthermore, and perhaps paradoxically, the very enhancement of pride in a particular denomination that accompanied anti-revivalism increased toleration. Since in the middle colonies only the Anglicans in New York enjoyed any form of establishment, all other groups maintained themselves without state aid. These other sects, as their pride grew, came to value the freedom from state interference that accompanied their

---

23. William Livingston phrased this attitude well in 1744: "Every man has a right to think for himself, as he shall answer for himself, and it is unreasonable for me to be angry with anyone for being of different principles, as he has the same pretence to quarrel with me." William Livingston to Rev. James Sprout, Sept. 22, 1744, in T. Sedgwick, A Memoir of the Life of William Livingston (New York, 1833), p. 54.

financial independence, and they looked down upon Anglicans for needing the state. The Dutch Reformed pastor, Gualterus Du Bois declared, "Praise God, we enjoy the free exercise of our religious services in every respect, although there is not the least provision made for our church by the civil authorities." "Hence," he continued, "mutual affection, and unity in faith and piety, under God's blessing and in conformity with His word, are the only means of perserving our Christian churches, of making them flourishing and prosperous." One need not read between lines to see that Du Bois exulted in Dutch Reformed independence from the state. Though he did not speak for all non-Anglicans, his attitude revealed a temper of mind that looked snobbishly rather than jealously at Anglican prerogatives.[24]

In one other sense the Great Awakening helped to lay the foundation for a separation of church and state. Inherent in revivalist religion was an anti-authoritarian bias. Revivalists attacked church rules and discipline and declared men free to seek spiritual enlightenment outside of their own parish or congregation. This attitude could easily be carried over to the state. If the church

---

24. Rev. Gualterus Du Bois, to the Rev. Classis of Amsterdam, Oct. 20, 1738, in Hugh Hastings, ed., Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York (VII vols., New York, 1901-1916), IV, 2715, hereafter cited as E.R.N.Y.

or local minister possessed no authority in spiritual affairs, so much less did the state or politician.

Though the Awakening prepared the way for development of a separation of church and state, it also laid the groundwork for a closer union of the two institutions. Both revivalist and revivalist approaches to religion and the world subsumed a secular society under a theocentric cosmology. Both opened the door for active participation in the world, and both made it possible to equate secular goals with God's will. It did not take long to transform this possibility into reality. The Awakening hardly subsided in the middle colonies, when revivalist and anti-revivalist ministers began calling for military activity against French forces in the colonies. They phrased this call in terms or moral imperatives. True religion, they asserted, demanded taking up arms against France.

Of course, the further possibility existed that revivalist and anti-revivalist ministers might equate conflicting social values with God's will. If this happened, as it did in the decade prior to the Revolution, bitter, impassioned, irreconcilable argument inevitably resulted. It can be argued that the intensity of feeling between tories and revolutionaries owed much to conflicting views of God, man and the world that came out of the Great Awakening.

Viewed as a response to the problem of maintaining a theocentric cosmology in an increasingly secular world, the Great Awakening emerged as a watershed in the intellectual history of the middle colonies. Out of the Awakening came two conflicting solutions to the problem, two views of God, man, and the world. Both solutions freed men to engage in secular affairs while maintaining the religious quest. Both stimulated the growth of toleration and development of separation of church and state. Both eventually added moral imperatives to secular goals. Together, these solutions provided the mental context within which future religious and secular battles would be fought. They determined the form and to some extent the substance of intellectual arguments for years to come.

Creation of these new thought patterns, however, did not signal a sudden drastic alteration in the actual conduct of church-state relations in the middle colonies. The 1730's and 1740's witnessed continued confusion concerning the functions and prerogatives of the two institutions. With no major issue as a focal point for a redefinition of principles, church and state interacted along the same lines in the years immediately following the Awakening as in those immediately preceding it. Not until the 1750's would forces leading to toleration and separation of church and state coalesce into a coherent pattern. Prior to that, confusion reigned supreme.

Of course, there had always been one exception to this muddled situation, one religious group that approached church-state relations in a consistent fashion. During the 1730's and 1740's Anglicans continued to press for state support and special privileges. Unaffected by the growing sentiment for toleration, they defended their established position in New York and expanded their power in other colonies. As far as they were concerned, the state existed to support and encourage the Anglican Church.

In Pennsylvania, where there was no establishment and where the Quakers controlled the political apparatus, Anglicans saw insidious designs in the most innocuous legislation. In 1730, for example, the Pennsylvania Assembly passed "A Supplement to an Act, Intitled an Act for Preventing Clandestine Marriages." This required all ministers to publish banns of matrimony and to obtain parental consent when one of the parties involved was a minor. Though the act in no way violated Anglican religious principles, the Anglicans objected because the "rules and rubrics of the Church of England" contained no specific provisions in this regard. They saw the law as a plot against them. As a group of Anglican missionaries phrased it, "The said supplementary law has a manifest tendency to extirpate the doctrine and

discipline of the Church of England out of said province, there being no reason to imagine that those who trample on one branch of her constitution in so bare faced a manner will give her better quarters in any other instance when it is in their power to effect her total overthrow."[25]

Such Anglican fears were not a manifestation of paranoia. It was reasonable for them to think in such a fashion, because they desired an established position for themselves in Pennsylvania. Since Quakers were not about to provide them with state support, Anglicans turned to England for aid. In 1738 Archibald Cummings wrote to the Bishop of London suggesting that Pennsylvania be made a royal colony. "Till that be done," he declared, "the Church of England will meet with little solid encouragement in this province." By solid encouragement, of course, he meant legal and financial assistance from the state.[26]

---

25. The act is reprinted in William Stevens Perry, ed., Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church (Hartford, 1871), II, 175-176; hereafter cited as H.C.; "Representation of the Missionaries in Pennsylvania," ibid., p. 173. Also see: Richard Backhouse to the Secretary for the S.P.G., May 14, 1730, ibid., p. 167.

26. Archibald Cummings to the Lord Bishop of London, May 30, 1738, ibid., p. 200.

During the turbulent years of the Awakening, Anglican ministers in Pennsylvania increased their cries for state support. They called on London authorities to intervene in their behalf. Rev. Alexander Howie told the Secretary for the S.P.G., "Mr. Whitefield has been twice in this Province, preaching in fields and commons, and has done a great deal of harm and undoubtedly will ruin the missions in this Quaker government, if special authority from home does not interpose and put a stop to his mad career." Archibald Cummings, disgusted by his congregation's enthusiasm for revivalism, wrote to the S.P.G., "I find it morally impossible for any clergyman to stay long among a people where there is no establishment and where he must depend entirely upon their caprice and humors."[27]

While Anglicans in Pennsylvania pleaded with the London government for support, Anglicans in New York defended their establishment. They jealously guarded every prerogative, real or assumed, and flew into paroxysms

---

27. Alexander Howie to the Secretary for the S.P.G., July 17, 1740, ibid., p. 207. Archibald Cummings to the Secretary for the S.P.G., ibid., p. 211.

of fear and rage whenever their objectives were thwarted. In the 1730's and 1740's they made no attempt to extend their privileges outside of the four southern counties, but they clung tenaciously to existing rights and powers. Their defence of the status quo proved difficult, because dissenters resented Anglican privileges. It proved possible, because dissenters still lacked a coherent philosophy on church-state relations.

In 1732, the Anglicans received an initial setback. The New York Supreme Court restored the church building at Jamaica to the Presbyterians. This church had been seized by the Anglicans during Lord Cornbury's administration. The Presbyterians brought suit in 1727 to repossess it, and the court finally found in their favor. Though the evidence clearly sustained Presbyterian claims, Anglicans fumed.[28]

Their anger resulted not only from the loss of the church building, but from what they considered double-dealing by Chief Justice Lewis Morris. Anglican lawyers desired to try the case on certain points of law, which they believed were "clearly in the church's favor." Morris informed them that he would try the case on fact, not law. He agreed, however, to direct the jury to find

---

28. Supra., pp. 94-96.

for the Anglicans, and if they refused, he promised a new trial. When the Anglicans lost, they approached Morris about a new trial and reminded him of his agreement. Morris replied "a bad promise was better broke than kept."[29]

The Anglicans then turned to the new governor, William Cosby, for support. He differed with Morris on a number of political issues and gladly moved against him. In 1734, he removed Morris as Chief Justice. In explaining his action to the Lords of Trade, Cosby cited Morris' conduct in the Jamaica church case as the first example of "notorious partiality in the administration of justice." The Lords of Trade, however, thought otherwise and restored Morris. The Anglicans not only lost the suit but their revenge as well.[30]

Meanwhile the Presbyterians of Jamaica continued to annoy the Anglicans. In 1733 they secured from the dissenting majority in the Assembly a bill entitled, "An Act to Impower the Vestry of the Parish of Jamaica, in Queens County to Dispose of Sixty Pounds Now in the Hands of the Church Wardens of the Said Parish for the

---

29. Governor Cosby to the Duke of Newcastle, May 3, 1733, E.R.N.Y., IV, 2623-2624; Rev. Mr. Colgan to the Secretary for the S.P.G., June 14, 1734, ibid., 2645-2646.

30. Colonel William Cosby to the Lords of Trade, May 10, 1734, E.B. O'Callaghan, ed., Documents Relative to the Colonial History of New York (XI vols., Albany, 1853-1887), VI, 8.

Use and Benefit of that Parish." The money in question came from taxes levied to support an Anglican minister, and had been raised during the period between the death of the Reverend Thomas Poyer and the induction of the Reverend Thomas Colgan. The Jamaica vestrymen claimed, since they did not receive the services of a minister during that time, that the money should not go to the Anglican church. The Assembly allowed the vestrymen to spend the money for the benefit of the parish as they saw fit.[31]

The Anglicans cried "hardship" and "oppression." William Vesey wrote to the Bishop of London that the act could "prove fatal" to the Anglican Church. The same persons that had the power and influence of procuring the passing of this Law," he argued, "may have the influence in obtaining a law for altering or repealing the laws now in force, for settling the ministry and raising the maintenance for them, and this dangerous precedent may be a leading card to effect such purposes." Clearly, the Anglicans recognized the dawning of a new era in church-state relations, and dreaded the consequences.[32]

---

31. The Act is reprinted in E.R.N.Y., IV, 2633-2644.

32. William Vesey to the Bishop of London, Dec. 16, 1733, ibid., p. 2635.

Such fears, however, were more than a decade premature. The dissenters annoyed Anglicans, but they were not ready for a full attack on the establishment. Their concept of church-state relations remained confused. In the 1730's and 1740's, the forces leading to toleration and to separation of church and state coexisted with older attitudes of intolerance and of church-state union. Consequently, dissenters reacted ambivalently to problems of this nature. Their responses depended upon the situation, not upon a coherent set of principles.

In 1733, for example, the sheriff of Westchester County refused to allow a number of Quakers to vote, because they would not take the oath of freehold. They offered instead their solemn affirmation, but he would not accept this. The Quakers complained to Governor Cosby, who appointed a committee to investigate the situation. This committee and subsequently the colony's attorney general upheld the sheriff's action. They declared that a special law would be required to allow the Quakers to substitute the affirmation for the oath. The Assembly quickly passed the necessary legislation and reenfranchised the Quakers. In this instance, therefore, the dissenting majority insured the civil rights of fellow dissenters.[33]

---

33. "Complaint Against the Sheriff of Westchester for Refusing the Votes of Certain Quakers at Election," ibid., pp. 2636-2637; "Report on the Complaint of Quakers for Not Being Allowed to Vote," ibid., pp. 2637-2638. Journal of the Legislative Council of the Colony of New York (IV vols., Albany, 1861), I, 632, 633, 636.

This action, however, did not indicate a coherent policy. Dissenters as a whole often ignored problems faced by particular sects and even acted against the rights of some religious groups. For example, the Presbyterian Church in New York City applied for a royal charter of incorporation at least twice between 1720 and 1730, but, due to Anglican opposition, never received it. Consequently, in 1733 they deeded their church on Wall Street to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland in order to protect their property rights and achieve some legal status. Other dissenters in New York ignored the plight of the Presbyterians and refused to support their attempts to secure a charter.[34]

In 1744, moreover, dissenters actually took legislative action against another dissenting sect. The Assembly passed an act requiring Moravian missionaries working with Indians to leave the colony. A number of motives lay behind this law. First of all, many religious groups, especially those of a Calvinistic bent, disliked the Moravian doctrine of free grace. Second, their German origin made Moravians different and consequently suspect. Finally, a series of wild

---

34. "Trusteeship of Presbyterian Property" in E.R.N.Y., IV, 2601.

rumors connected the Moravians with a Negro plot to burn New York City and with a papist plot to arouse the Indians on the frontier. The legislation, therefore, sprang from a climate of prejudice and fear. Whatever its origin, however, the bill indicated that dissenters in New York lacked a coherent policy on church-state relations. They failed to see that in using civil power against one religious group, however odious in their eyes, they continued the intolerance and persecution which they themselves had often fought since Lord Cornbury's governorship.[35]

For that matter, in 1741, dissenters actually contributed to continuation of the Anglican establishment in New York City. The Assembly passed a law obliging all merchants who came to the city after the annual assessment for ministerial maintenance to pay their share of the tax. Though the law sought a fairer distribution of the tax burden, it indirectly reaffirmed the Assembly's acquiescence in the Anglican establishment in New York City. If dissenters had any clear concept of separation of church and state, they never would have passed such a bill.[36]

---

35. "Moravians Ordered to Stop Preaching and to Leave the Province," ibid., pp. 2861-2862; "Reasons for Passing the Law Against the Moravians Residing Among the Indians," ibid., pp. 2906-2908. Count Zinzendorff to the Board of Trade, Dec. 31, 1744, ibid., p. 2865.

36. The Colonial Laws of New York (V vols., Albany, 1894-1896), III, 179.

The case of the Reverend John Hofgoed provides a final example of the dissenter's continuing confusion on the church-state question. In May 1746, Michael Knoll, minister of the Lutheran Church in New York City, petitioned Governor George Clinton, to order Hofgoed, another Lutheran minister, to stop preaching until he obtained a license from the governor. Knoll asserted that Hofgoed was an unordained imposter. Clinton investigated the situation and licensed Hofgoed in February 1748. Thereby, he reasserted his right to collate all ministers, something dissenters had objected to in the past.[37]

Knoll evidently failed to perceive the principle involved, for in June 1749 he again petitioned Clinton to stop Hofgoed from preaching. He complained that Hofgoed's doctrines "are founded on principles altogether unorthodox and tending to enthusiasm and sedition in the Church." As an anti-revivalist, Knoll objected to Hofgoed's revivalism and used the state to silence such doctrines. He did not see the possibility that civil

---

37. "Petition Against a Pretended Lutheran Minister, John Hofgoed," ibid., pp. 2930-2933.

authority could also be used against him. Like many dissenters he judged on the basis of particular situations, not coherent principles.[38]

Viewed as part of the ongoing pattern of church-state relations, therefore, the Great Awakening emerged as an event of little immediate consequence. It created no sudden transformation in the way men viewed the two institutions. Anglicans continued to seek an establishment and dissenters remained confused. Little, if anything, changed.

Viewed as an intellectual movement, however, the Great Awakening had momentous consequences. It altered the way men approached religion, established two rival concepts of God, man, and the world, united the old theocentric cosmology with the new secular society, provided the intellectual framework for separation of church and state, laid the basis for a union of moral imperatives to secular goals, and established the mental context for future intellectual arguments. As a group of emerging ideas the Awakening was, as Perry Miller asserts, "a crisis" in American history.

---

38. "Petition of Rev. Michael Knoll against John Hofgoed, June 5, 1749," ibid., pp. 3082-3084.

An intellectual crisis without practical results, a mental trauma without physical consequence, a watershed without a river, was that all the Great Awakening meant? In the 1740's, perhaps, but not for long. Once idea and reality met, once the intellectual forces released in the Awakening coalesced on major events in the 1750's the full impact of the revival became apparent. Then the World of the mind and the world of everyday affairs changed together.

Chapter V.

The Tolerant World of William Livingston

William Livingston sat hunched over his desk. A tall, lanky man, he looked awkward and uncomfortable. Gusto and enjoyment, however, enlivened his homely face, and his boney hand guided his quill swiftly across the paper. Livingston loved to write. A shy and retiring man, he became with quill, ink, and paper a fierce controversalist, an inveterate debator, an important public figure. Nervous, disorganized, timid and plain as a speaker, he became forceful, lucid, sarcastic, and eloquent as a penman.[1]

In 1752 Livingston waxed grandiloquent. "I have the magnanimity," he wrote, "to attack the enemies of the human race in whatever dignified shape they appear, and to burst the chains they cast over their species." Composing the "Introduction" for the Independent Reflector, a weekly journal of opinion, his language mirrored his enthusiasm. His thesis, however, remained clear. He sought to vindicate "the civil and religious rights" of his

---

1. For biographies of Livingston see: Theodore Sedgwick, Jr., A Memoir of the Life of William Livingston (New York, 1833); Milton M. Klein, "The American Whig: William Livingston of New York" (unpublished dissertation, Columbia University, 1954).

fellow citizens. To this end, he would subject every political party and every religious sect to careful scrutiny and expose any tendency to engross people's liberties.[2]

These noble sentiments appeared in print on Nov. 30, 1752, Livingston's twenty-ninth birthday. The son of Philip Livingston, second lord of Livingston manor, William grew up in affluence. Educated at Yale and apprenticed under leading New York City attorneys he now possessed a substantial law practice. Married to Susana French, daughter of a wealthy New Jersey landholder, he enjoyed a happy family life. He was, in short, a model young aristocrat, a man of wealth, family heritage, and assured position.

Yet Livingston refused to accept the conservative temperament, the unquestioning defense of the status quo often associated with his social standing. Though in 1752 his political attitudes still lacked precise definition, he had feuded for a number of years with the dominant Clinton and DeLancey faction. Together with William Smith, Jr. and John Morin Scott, fellow Yale graduates, New York lawyers and now contributors to the

---

2. William Livingston and others, The Independent Reflector, Milton Klein, ed. (Cambridge, 1963), p. 56, 55-59.

Reflector, he delighted in shocking the sensibilities of New York officialdom. Moderate Whigs in political outlook, Livingston and his friends would soon appear wild-eyed radicals to their less liberal peers.[3]

These three young men shared a common dislike for religious formalism, clerical pomposity and intolerance. Smith and Scott were life-long Presbyterians. Livingston grew up in the liberal Dutch Reformed Church of Albany. At Yale he witnessed the frantic zeal of revivalist ministers and the doctrinaire rigidity of anti-revivalists. He recoiled from both. After graduation, he remained in the Dutch church but became increasingly estranged from conservative pastors who persisted in preaching in Dutch. By 1752, no longer able to understand such sermons, he joined his friends Smith and Scott in the Presbyterian church.[4]

---

3. Klein, ed., Reflector, pp. 10-13; Klein, "American Whig," pp. 274-284. For a somewhat different view of Livingston's political attitudes see: Beverly McAnear, "American Imprints Concerning Kings College," The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, XLIV (1950), pp. 301-303. For a study of Livingston, Scott and Smith as a group see: Dorothy R. Dillon, The New York Triumvirate (New York, 1949).

4. Carl Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics 1689-1775 (New York, 1962); pp. 138-144; Klein, ed., Reflector, pp. 23-27; Klein, "American Whig," pp. 284-307.

New York in the 1750's still exhibited religious intolerance and sectarian strife. Anglicans persisted in demanding privilege and the dissenters showed no signs of developing a truly tolerant attitude or a coherent concept of separation of church and state. Religion and politics still intertwined as various religious groups sought state aid to achieve their disparate goals. Into this confused situation entered three young men with staunchly independent political and religious views, dedicated to preserving the "civil and religious rights" of all their fellow citizens. The result would surely prove unsettling. The Loyalist historian Thomas Jones remembered the consequences. "The Colony," he declared, "in a short time, . . . became a scene of confusion, of uproar, and disorder, thanks to the triumvirate Livingston, Scott, and Smith, and to them only."[5]

Of the triumvirate, Livingston was most active. He wrote the great majority of the Reflector articles and determined their content. From the start, Livingston concentrated on religious issues. For the sixth number of the Reflector, he penned "A Vindication of the Moravians Against the Aspersions of their Enemies" in which he

---

5. Thomas Jones, History of New York During the Revolutionary War (2 vols., New York, 1879), I, 7.

set down his religious principles in a clear and trenchant fashion.

Livingston revealed his ecumenism immediately, telling the reader that he entertained "a nobler idea of religion than to confine it to the speculative opinion of a particular set of Christians." To him, orthodoxy was: "a meer levitical engine that has done more mischief to mankind, than all the tyrants that ever ravaged the globe." Theological doctrines and modes of worship mattered little in the end, for a man would be judged on his deeds, not his beliefs. After all, Livingston declared, "Every man is orthodox to himself and heretical to all the world besides."[6]

Since religion was a personal matter, Livingston deprecated those clerics who "teach for doctrines the commandments of men and convert religion into a divinity shop." They should realize, he asserted, that they are "liable to err, as well as others." Perhaps then the clerics would be more charitable of those who differed from them, notably the Moravians, "a plain, open, honest, inoffensive people." Perhaps then the ministers would

---

6. Livingston, Reflector, p. 89, 91.

"distinguish their zeal, by inculcating universal charity and the indispensible duty of a holy life" and would avoid "mob reproaches and Billingsgate defamation, against a people to all appearance as good as themselves." Perhaps then--though Livingston probably did not realize it himself --ecclesiastical leaders would internalize all the forces in New York society which pushed for toleration, just as he had done.[7]

If they did that, the clerics would probably come to agree with him on church-state relations. Livingston argued that no man could tell another how to worship God, and that included civil authorities. The civil magistrate must "avoid persecuting his subjects for differing from him in their opinions." The only instance which justified civil authorities interfering in religious matters was to prevent one religious group from infringing on the rights of another. Since the Moravians were "proper members of society," he declared, they were entitled to the same civil and religious rights as everyone else. In acting against the Moravians, the state exceeded its proper jurisdiction.[8]

---

7. Ibid., p. 90, 91, 93.

8. Ibid., p. 94.

Livingston's vigorous defense of the Moravians and espousal of a tolerant religious position angered ministers of many denominations. Anglican, Dutch Reformed, and Congregational clerics took to the pulpit and the press to brand Livingston an atheist, libertine, and libeler. Their ire stemmed in large part from Livingston's failure to differentiate between worthy and unworthy clergymen and from his statement that religious truth depended upon individual perception. Justifiable as such anger may have been, it revealed that these critics missed Livingston's point about toleration and separation of church and state.[9]

Livingston dismissed most of these attacks offhand, but he became particularly disturbed by A Letter to the Independent Reflector by David Marin Ben Jesse. Livingston knew that Ben Jesse was a pseudonym for Theodore Frelinghuysen, a liberal Dutch Reformed minister. Since he still maintained a close affinity to the liberal faction of the Dutch church, he took Frelinghuysen's comments seriously.[10]

---

9. Ibid., pp. 128-134; McAnear, "American Imprints," pp. 327-328; Klein, "American Whig," pp. 318-320.

10. This identification is made by McAnear, "American Imprints," pp. 327-328n.

Frelinghuysen's pamphlet sharply rebuked Livingston for teaching a "false morality" and for paving the way to "atheism, deism, libertinism, and that latitudinarian way of freethinking." "As to your treatment of the clergy," Frelinghuysen declared, "had you in the spirit of discernment, levelled your weapons at the impious and unworthy of them, every sincere Christian would have praised your enterprise." Since Livingston did not, Frelinghuysen accused him of anticlericalism.[11]

Taken aback by Frelinghuysen's public condemnation, Livingston curbed his attack on religious intolerance. He realized that Frelinghuysen, like most of his fellow dissenters, remained acutely sensitive to any hint of irreligion and lacked precision in his concept of toleration. New Yorkers, he decided, needed further education along these lines. "The Town," he wrote his friend Noah Welles, "is not yet ripe for loosing plainer truth. The veil must be removed from their eyes by slow degrees." So, he confined his public statements to political questions, at least for the moment.[12]

---

11. David Marin Ben Jesse [Theodore Frelinghuysen] A Letter to the Independent Reflector (New York, 1753), p. 15, 21, 16.

12. Quoted in Klein, ed., Reflector, p. 32.

The more adamant clergy, however, refused a truce. The Anglicans, especially, continued to villify Livingston. Ever conscious of their real and assumed prerogatives, they found his implied disapproval of their establishment distasteful and threatening, and consequently they filled the newspapers with invective against him. For a month Livingston fumed but maintained public silence. By February 8, he exhausted his patience and lashed out at his critics.[13]

"The Reflector has said nothing," he declared, "which any priest ought to resent but a Popish priest." The zeal of his critics, Livingston argued, illustrated "the truth of his opinion about their persecuting spirit and irrefrainable bigotry." These men were more concerned with money and power than with true religion. Livingston vowed to continue his defense of civil and religious liberties.[14]

Such general attacks upon the clergy, in support of the unpopular Moravians, however, did little to enhance a more tolerant religious climate. His critics continued to brand him a deist or atheist, and the Moravian's doctrinal heterodoxy kept many people from seeing the true nature of Livingston's principles.[15] What he needed if he was to remove

---

13. Ibid., p. 31; Klein, "American Whig," p. 320.

14. Livingston, Reflector, p. 129, 128-134, William Smith Jr. also entered the literary war against the Anglicans and other ministerial critics of the Reflector, New York Gazette, February 19, 1753.

15. "Layman," New York Mercury, February 12, 1753.

"the veils" from the eyes of his fellow New Yorkers was an issue that could unite the majority against a common threat. Fortunately, from his point of view, such an issue was at hand.

In the American colonies the 1740's witnessed a "college enthusiasm." With the waning of the Great Awakening, revivalists and anti-revivalists established seminaries. Furthermore, as Americans became culturally, intellectually, socially and economically mature, they found time and interest to encourage education.[16]

This "college enthusiasm" in the middle colonies had religious overtones. The Presbyterians in New Jersey acted first. In 1745 William Tennent, Sr., resigned his pastorate and disbanded the so called "Log College" which served as the seminary for revivalist Presbyterian ministers. The revivalists sought a new college, but encountered Anglican opposition. Every college needed a charter from the state and Governor Lewis Morris, a strong Anglican, refused to charter a Presbyterian school. When he died in 1746, however, the interim governor issued a charter to four Presbyterian ministers, despite Anglican

---

16. Beverly McAnear, "College Founding in the American Colonies, 1745-1775," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLII (1955), 24-55.

objections to the "sudden and private" nature of the charter negotiations. The new governor in 1745, Jonathan Belcher, a New England Congregationalist by birth, supported the new college, granted it a permanent charter, and located it at Princeton. Anglican objections continued, but failed to arouse any sympathy from the dissenting majority.[17]

In Pennsylvania, Benjamin Franklin led the movement for a college. In 1749 his Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Pennsylvania suggested that "some persons of leisure and public spirit apply for a charter, by which they may be incorporated, with power to erect an Academy for the education of youth." A board of twenty-four trustees, with Franklin as president, organized themselves and raised funds for the school, which would operate on a non-sectarian basis. Some zealous Anglican missionaries objected to this arrangement, contending that Episcopalians should control the school. The proprietors saw things differently and granted a formal charter in 1753, but Anglican animosity and jealousy remained.[18]

---

17. Wallace N. Jamison, Religion in New Jersey (Princeton, 1964), pp. 40-43; Leonard J. Trinterud The Forming of an American Tradition (Philadelphia, 1949), pp. 124-125.

18. Leonard W. Labaree and others, eds., The Papers of Benjamin Franklin (New Haven, 1960), VI, 172.

New York also experienced this "college enthusiasm." The movement began in 1746 under the leadership of clergymen and politicans affiliated with the Anglican and Dutch Reformed churches. They induced the New York Assembly to pass legislation authorizing the raising of funds by public lottery. In the following years a succession of such bills brought thousands of pounds into the coffers of the proposed college.[19]

William Livingston contributed to New York's interest in this institution of higher learning. In 1749 his Some Serious Thoughts on the Design of Erecting a College in the Province of New York set forth the

---

19. The Colonial Laws of New York (V vols., Albany, 1894-1896), III, 607-616, 679-688, 731-732, 842-844, hereafter cited as C.L.N.Y. The best account of the entire Kings College controversy is Klein, "American Whig," pp. 275-384. Also see: Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, pp. 138-157; Raymond Polin "Theories of Limited Government in the Province of New York" (unpublished dissertation, New York University, 1959), pp. 56-122. Pratt, Religion, Politics, pp. 67-74; John B. Pine, "Kings College and the Early Days of Columbia College" New York State Historical Association Proceedings, XVII (1919), pp. 102-115; John B. Langstaff, "Anglican Origins of Columbia University," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, IX (1940), 253-268; Arthur P. Middleton, "Anglican Contributions to Higher Education in Colonial America," Pennsylvania History, XXV (1958), 258-263.

"numberless advantages of a public seminary of learning." He pointed out that a college would greatly uplift the community's intellectual and political standards and encourage advancement on the basis of intellect rather than wealth. "With respect to our morals," he continued, "no one is ignorant that the liberal sciences are vastly subservient to the cause of religion, and serve to demolish enthusiasm and superstition whereever they prevail." In short, Livingston felt that a college would make better citizens and lead to national religious principles. He assumed, of course, that the college would operate on a non-sectarian basis.[20]

By 1751, £3,433 had been raised from public lotteries. The Assembly appointed a ten-man board of trustees and empowered them to lend the money at interest and to receive proposals for the site of the college. Of the ten trustees, seven were Anglicans, two Dutch Reformed, and one, Livingston, a Presbyterian.[21]

Livingston later declared that the religious composition of the board was "so partial as could not but excite the jealousy of every unbiased mind." Yet he did not speak out

---

20. William Livingston, Some Serious Thoughts on the Design of Erecting a College in the Province of New York (New York, 1749), p. 1, 3.

21. C.L.N.Y., pp. 842-844.

on the issue. He knew of Anglican objections to colleges in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, but he trusted his Episcopalian colleagues and feared public apathy toward the college more than Anglican schemes.[22]

His trust, however, was misplaced. The Anglicans wanted a college under their domination. As the Anglican choice for the college presidency, Dr. Samuel Johnson, would soon tell the Archbishop of Canterbury, "Several worthy gentlemen of the Church . . . have of late been embarked in a design of erecting a College as a Seminary of the Church."[23] This desire was by no means new. As early as 1703 Anglican spokesmen suggested the Queen's Farm as a suitable site for a church college. Efforts to erect such an institution during Lord Cornbury's governorship failed, but the Anglicans never abandoned this idea. On March 5, 1752 the Trinity Church vestry gave the trustees part of the Queen's Farm as a site for the college. They attached no conditions to the offer, but as the Trinity Church vestry later explained, "We always expected that a gift so valuable in itself, and

---

22. "The Watch-Tower," I, New York Mercury, Nov. 25, 1754.

23. Reverend Samuel Johnson to the Archbishop of Canterbury, June 29, 1753, in Hugh Hastings, ed., Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York (VII vols., Albany, 1901-1916) V, 3388. Hereafter cited as E.R.N.Y.

so absolutely necessary . . . would be the means of obtaining some privledges to the Church."[24]

Unaware of these Anglican plans, Livingston did not object to Trinity's gift. He saw no reason for alarm. Late in October, however, Anglican intentions became public. The Reverend William Smith, later rector of the Philadelphia Academy, published Some Thoughts on Education, in which he argued for Anglican control of the college and nominated Dr. Samuel Johnson as president. Early in November Smith repeated these proposals in letters to the New York newspapers and suggested that Johnson might also serve as minister of Trinity Church.[25]

Livingston and his colleague, William Smith, Jr., responded angrily. They lambasted the Reverend Smith as an incompetent self-seeker. In letters to the New York papers, they suggested that the Reverend Smith desired the rectorship himself, and that he lacked the necessary mental capacity to comment on such an important subject.[26]

---

24. Trinity Church to the Society for Propagating the Gospel, November 3, 1755 in E.R.N.Y., V, 3611. For the early history of the Queen's Farm see Ibid., pp. 1516-1517, 1552, 1563-66, 1568-1569.

25. Rev. William Smith, Some Thoughts on Education: With Reasons for Erecting a College in this Province (New York, 1752); New York Mercury, Nov. 6, 1752; New York Gazette (Supplement) Nov. 7, 1752. For a biography of Smith see: Albert Frank Gegenheimer, William Smith Educator and Churchman (Philadelphia, 1943).

26. New York Mercury, Dec. 27, Jan. 8, 1752; New York Post Bay, Dec. 4, 25, Jan. 1, 1752.

Such sarcasm, however, hid a deeper concern. The triumvirate now realized Anglican plans for complete control of the college and viewed them with unmitigated apprehension. As Livingston told his friend Noah Welles, "Our future college will undoubtedly be of great importance to the province, and is like to fall without a vigorous opposition, under the sole management of Churchmen. The consequence of which will be universal priestcraft and bigotry in less than half a century."[27]

The triumvirate spread the alarm through the Reflector. Beginning on March 29 and for the next six weeks they dealt with the college. As usual, Livingston wrote the articles. He relished the college controversy, for it provided him with the perfect issue for "removing the veils" from the eyes of his fellow dissenters. Writing on this topic, he could expound his principles of toleration and separation of church and state and get everyone to listen because it affected everyone.[28]

Livingston began by arguing that education aimed at molding good citizens. "'Tis to improve their hearts and understandings," he wrote, "to infuse a public spirit and love of their country; to inspire them with the principles

---

27. Quoted in Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, p. 149.

28. Livingston, Reflector, pp. 171-214.

of honour and probity; with a fervent zeal for liberty and a diffusive benevolence for mankind; and in a word to make them more extensively serviceable to the commonwealth." Unfortunately, he noted, most colleges failed in this endeavor. Dominated by particular religious sects, they dealt in "all those visionary whims, idle speculations, fairy dreams, and party distinctions, which contract and embitter the mind and have so often turned the world topsy-turvy." To avoid this, Livingston stressed "the necessity and importance of constituting our college upon a basis the most catholic, generous and free."[29]

If this advice went unheeded, if one sect dominated the college, Livingston foresaw dire consequences. The favored denomination would naturally seek dominion over all other religious groups. No one's civil and religious liberties would be secure. "Should any future House of Representatives become generally infected with the maxim of the college," Livingston warned, "nothing less can be expected than an establishment of one denomination above all others, who may, perhaps, at the good pleasure of their superiors be most graciously favoured with a bare liberty of conscience while they faithfully continue their annual contributions, their tythes, and their Peter-Pence."[30]

---

29. Ibid., p. 172, 175, 178.

30. Ibid., p. 181.

Livingston urged the establishment of the college through an act of the Assembly, rather than by royal charter, since the multiplicity of religious opinions in the legislature would ensure the non-sectarian character of the college. Furthermore, he argued, this method of incorporation kept college officials responsible to the public and avoided uncertainties inherent in a royal charter, which royal whim could alter.[31]

With an "animated address, intended to warm the imagination, and excite activity," as he described it, Livingston closed this series of articles. He called upon each major dissenting group to honor its tradition of independence and freedom of thought, a tradition for which their ancestors had been persecuted and had died. The time had come, he declared, for all New Yorkers to resist Anglican demands. "I exhort, I beseech, I abtest, I implore you," he cried, to expostulate the case with your representatives and testify your abhorrence of so perillous, so detestable a plot."[32]

The Anglican perpetrators of the plot, perhaps dumbfounded by the virulence and effectiveness of Livingston's attack, responded slowly. Aside from one pamphlet and a few letters to the New York Mercury, they said little on the college issue, and what they did say lacked originality

---

31. Ibid., pp. 193-198.

32. Ibid., p. 208, 214.

and substance. Take, for example, one response to the charge of Anglican bigotry: "But it is evident from the violent manner of his [Livingston's] writing that he is a most furious party man himself, and of the most abject republican party both in politics and religion, and as great a bigot to it, as ever took pen in hand." The "tit for tat" nature of this argument demonstrated Anglican unpreparedness for the challenge posed by Livingston.[33]

By June, Anglicans recovered their composure, and Samuel Johnson could report to the Archbishop of Canterbury, "We have several of us been writing in the Church's defence against them."[34] This Anglican counter attack took two directions. First, they branded Livingston and his supporters as deists, atheists, or enemies of all religion. In an anonymous satirical pamphlet, A Scheme for the Revival of Christianity, they claimed that the triumvirate desired to extirpate the clergy from the province, burn all religious books, burn all Christian

---

33. Rev. William Smith, A General Idea of the College of Mirania (New York, 1753). New York Mercury, June 11, 1753. Most of the early 1753 issues of the Mercury have been lost so our knowledge of Anglican arguments is a bit sparce. See NcAnear, "American Imprints," p. 308n.

34. Rev. Samuel Johnson to the Archbishop of Canterbury, June 29, 1753, in E.R.N.Y., V, 3388.

magistrates, establish Mohammedanism, and finally prohibit all religion under pain of death. In a more serious vein, Anglicans reprinted Francis Squire's An Answer to Some Late Papers Entitled the Independent Whig, which defended "the clergy of all sorts and profession . . . against infidelity and prophaneness and an indiscriminate treatment of the clergy, especially when joined with sneers and scoffs at mysteries and rites of religion." A one page "advertisement" accompanying republication made it clear that Livingston was the impious soul who scoffed at religion and the clergy.[35]

When not directly attacking Livingston, the Anglicans defended both their establishment and their proposed control of the college. Here, the Reverend William Smith showed the way. "If, according to the Reflector's scheme," Smith wrote in the Mercury, "all religions were equally favored by the civil power, none established, and every man left at liberty to preach and practice what he thought proper, what a scene of confusion would arise!"

---

35. A Scheme for the Revival of Christianity (New York, 1753); Francis Squire, An Answer to Some Late Papers Entitled the Independent Whig (New York, 1753), p. iii. The triumvirate responded with a reprinting of Thomas Gordon, The Craftsmen (New York, 1753).

Smith argued that religious groups would proliferate and "every gifted layman would make a different sect." Only the established church, Smith felt, stood as a bulwark against such confusion. "No new sects will spring up out of it," he declared, "as no change is permitted in it, and the majority of the people will adhere to it, especially if it is a qualification for civil office."[36]

Not only did the established church maintain religious order, in Smith's view, it also provided political stability. "The statesman has always found it necessary," Smith explained, "for the purposes of government to raise some one denomination of religious above the rest to a certain degree. This favored denomination by these means, becomes as it were the creature of the government, which is thus enabled to turn the balance and keep all in subjection." In short, the established church stood as a bastion of order, without which society's civil and religious foundations would crumble.[37]

Turning directly to the college controversy, Smith employed the same logic in claiming Anglican predominance. Accepting Livingston's argument that in fifty years the religion of the college would become the religion of the

---

36. New York Mercury, July 23, 1753.

37. Ibid.

country, he asserted that a non-sectarian college meant "this country in half a century must either have no appearance of religion, or a new one patched up from the ruins of all those we have at present." To prevent the "dreadful convulsions" of such a change, Smith declared, "Our future safety, security and happiness then, greatly depends upon making the establishment in favor of the church established here, and in the mother country." Only by this action could New Yorkers be "sure half a century hence to be as orthodox as happy, and as far removed from a country of infidels in the one hand and fanatics on the other, as we are at this day."[38]

Other Anglicans reiterated these ideas and added some of their own. Livingston, they claimed, was involved in a Presbyterian plot to destroy the New York college for the benefit of the New Jersey college, or perhaps he really sought to replace the Anglican establishment with a Presbyterian one, or perhaps he sought to advance his own political fortunes. Through it all, however, the Anglicans centered their attack on Livingston's "irreligion" and emphasized their claim that they preserved religious and civil order.[39]

---

38. Ibid., July 30, 1753.

39. Ibid., Sept. 24, Oct, 8, 22m Dec. 3, 1753.

Livingston responded to this claim with a vigorous argument for separation of church and state. Borrowing from Locke, he traced the origin of government to the "inconveniences" of the state of nature. Without a judge armed with proper authority, men lacked security in their rights and possessions. Consequently, they formed society and invested the magistrate with power to repel attacks on their rights and property. "Nothing therefore," Livingston argued, "but what is injurious to society or some particular member of it can be the proper object of civil punishment; because nothing else falls within the design of forming the society." This excluded a man's religious opinions from the magistrate's business because they "are not injurious to the person or possessions of another." "Matters of religion," Livingston concluded, "relate to another world, and have nothing to do with the interest of the state."[40]

There in one short sentence appeared the ultimate American answer to the problem of church-state relations. Since each institution concerned itself with a different facet of man's existence, each should remain a separate and sovereign entity. Any interference of one with another was unwarranted. Livingston had provided the

---

40. Livingston, Reflector, p. 307, 306-318.

dissenting majority with a principle around which they could organize their opposition to Anglican claims for special treatment. At this point, the question still remained: Would dissenters accept it or would they continue their muddled, confused response to church-state questions?

The Anglicans wanted the continuance of confusion. Turning to the press, they denied the "imaginary" compact to which Livingston attributed the origin of government, and refused to accept the notion of a state of nature. God, in their view, created both man and society and decreed that society should guard religion. Drawing upon the Bible and history for support, they asked, "was there ever a wise and great nation under heaven, wherein the civil magistrate did not interpose in matters of religion; and did not those nations ever prosper most where religion even though corrupted was the principle care of the state?" Livingston's denial of magisterial authority in religion ranked "among the many other contrivances to bring religion into contempt in this degenerate age."[41]

Lest their arguments prove ineffective, the Anglicans resorted to more direct measures. They attempted to silence the triumvirate by pressuring the New York printers.

---

41. New York Mercury, Aug. 27, 1753; Sept. 3, 10, 1753; Occasional Reverberator, II, Sept. 14, 1753.

With Hugh Gaine, printer of the New York Mercury and a staunch Anglican, they experienced little difficulty. Gaine's paper had already become an exclusively Anglican organ. James Parker, the Reflector's printer and publisher of the New York Gazette and the New York Post Boy, was also printer for the Assembly. Since Parker could ill afford to lose the colony's official business, he could be intimidated, and he closed his newspapers to the triumvirate. Henry DeForest, the city's other printer, old and nearing retirement, disliked controversy and refused to open his New York Evening Post to either side. Consequently, the only organ for dissenting ideas was the Reflector.[42]

The triumvirate complained bitterly about this closed press, but could do little. In September they convinced Parker to print a new journal, The Occasional Reverberator, but this proved so vituperative and personally insulting to Anglicans that they pressured Parker to cease publishing it. Parker, ever watchful of his pocketbook and fearful of losing his official business, agreed and the journal ceased after only four issues.[43]

---

42. Klein, ed., Reflector, pp. 19-20, 31-32, 40-42; McAnear "American Imprints," 314-315.

43. Occasional Reverberator, I-IV, Sept. 7, 14, 21, Oct. 5, 1753; Livingston, Reflector, 336-342.

Incensed, Livingston and his allies continued their literary assaults on the Anglicans in the Reflector. Late in September they published a piece by Livingston stating "that the notion of a general religious establishment in this province is entirely groundless." This article threatened the legal status of Anglican privileges and drove them into a fearful frenzy. Livingston followed it with a statement of his personal religious creed, which included scathing denunciations of clerical pretensions, and reiterated his belief in separation of church and state. Then, early in November, the triumvirate returned to the college issue and called again for a non-sectarian institution.[44]

All of this proved too much for the Anglicans. According to Livingston, they "threatened Parker with the loss of public business if he continued the publication of my papers."[45] Parker stopped printing the Reflector after the fifty-second number of November 22, 1753. The Anglicans, it appeared, prevailed again, for no hue and cry rose from the dissenting sects. They seemingly ignored

---

44. Ibid., p. 367, 387-396, 427-432.

45. William Livingston and William Smith Jr., The Independent Reflector, Preface (New York, 1754), pp. 2-3.

the principles of toleration and separation of church and state so forcefully presented by Livingston, they seemingly acquiesced once again in Anglican predominance.

Indeed, the situation looked bleak for the Livingston forces. In October, James DeLancey, a long time political enemy of Livingston, had been sworn in as lieutenant governor. Shortly thereafter, on October 10, Governor Sir Danvers Osborne arrived, but he committed suicide the following day, thereby making DeLancey acting governor. Since DeLancey's political allies controlled the Assembly, and since he sympathized with the Anglicans, the Livingston forces could expect little help from the legislature. Actually, the Assembly under DeLancey's prodding pressured Parker into ending publication of the Reflector.[46] Livingston's position appeared desperate.

However, Livingston planned to continue his campaign. "If a man must be knocked down," he wrote, "at all rates he may as well fall fighting, as running away."[47] Livingston now engaged in political as well as literary fighting. On the day of the last issue of the Reflector, the trustees of the college met to select a president. Realizing that

---

46. Klein, "American Whig," pp. 384-385.

47. Quoted in Klein, ed., Reflector, p. 43.

he could not prevent election of the Anglican candidate, Dr. Samuel Johnson, Livingston nominated him. At the same time he proposed his old friend Rev. Chauncey Whittelsey, a Congregationalist, as assistant president or first tutor. This strategem forced the Anglicans to accept both candidates or publicly expose their desire for absolute predominance in the new college. It worked, and the trustees accepted both candidates.[48]

At the same time, Livingston looked about for a new printer. After unsuccessful attempts to secure one in Boston or Philadelphia, he finally convinced Henry DeForest, publisher of the now-defunct New York Evening Post, to come out of retirement. Together with William Smith, Jr., Livingston composed a Preface, which appeared late in February 1754. They assailed Parker and the Anglicans for their "insidious and indirect practices" in ending the Reflector's literary life, attacked clerical pretensions, disavowed any interest in promoting Presbyterianism, and pleaded for a non-sectarian college so that a persecutor could not "unfurl his bloody standard." The Preface contained little that was new, but it kept Livingston's ideas before the public.[49]

---

48. Klein, "American Whig," pp. 385-386; McAnear, "American Imprints," 315-316; C.L.N.Y., III, 908-910.

49. Livingston and Smith Jr., Preface, p. 31.

The Anglicans temporarily withdrew from literary warfare and concentrated on behind-the-scenes maneuvering. They drafted a charter for the college, providing for an Anglican president and Anglican public prayers. To ensure the acceptance of these conditions, Trinity Church modified its offer of land. On May 14, the vestry announced that their donation depended on two absolute conditions: that the president "forever be a member of and in communion with the Church of England, and the morning and evening service . . . be in the liturgy of the said Church."[50]

On May 16, the Anglican trustees presented the charter at a meeting of the board. They suggested that the governor be petitioned to incorporate the college under that charter. Livingston, a minority of one, dissented with "Twenty Unreasonable Reasons" against the charter. Essentially, he argued that an Anglican college constituted, "a manifest encroachment on the rights of all the different denominations of Christians residing in the province." The other trustees ignored his protest, approved the charter, and agreed to petition the governor for incorporation.[51]

---

50. Morgan Dix, A History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York (4 vols., New York, 1898), I, 271; E.R.N.Y., V, 3478.

51. Livingston's reasons are reprinted in E.R.N.Y., V, 3515-3517. The petition is in ibid., V, 3478-3479.

The combat now shifted to the Council, which received the charter petition on May 28. It was referred to a committee of five. Two members of this committee, William Smith, Sr., and James Alexander, opposed the petition. Smith did so on religious grounds and Alexander out of a desire to embarrass DeLancey politically. When the committee approved the petition and reported it to the full Council, Smith and Alexander issued a strong dissent. This gave DeLancey second thoughts, and he delayed action on the petition.[52]

The triumvirate, sensing a new opportunity to defeat the Anglicans, redoubled their efforts. They printed several hundred copies of the charter petitinn along with Livingston's protest and distributed them throughout the province. Then through a letter-writing campaign and through personal contact they urged the dissenters to action, to petition the Assembly against the charter and against the transfer of lottery funds to the Anglican trustees. Soon the colony was in an uproar, with town meetings, petitions, counter-petitions, and speeches.[53]

---

52. "Watch-Tower," I, New York Mercury, Nov. 25, 1754, "Report on the Petition For a Charter for a College in New York," "Protest Against a Sectarian College," "Order of the Governor on the Petition for a Charter," in E.R.N.Y., V, 3478-3483.

53. The Petition of the Trustees of the College of New York . . . With Reasons Offered by One of the Trustees for Protesting the Charter Then Prayed For (New York, 1754); Jones, History, I, 12-14.

Livingston and his allies proved partially successful in their quest for dissenting support. They convinced most of the Presbyterians and Quakers to instruct their representatives to oppose the charter. When the Assembly met in August, the triumvirate marshalled enough support to prevent approval of the charter and transfer of lottery funds to the college trustees. Furthermore, DeLancey, sensing a shift in the political wind, again delayed signing the charter.[54]

At this point, the balance of power rested with the Dutch Reformed Church. Both the Anglicans and the Livingston forces recognized the importance of Dutch support, and both openly solicited it. Certainly, the Anglicans had reason to feel more secure. In the past, the Dutch Reformed Church had supported an Anglican establishment in return for minor concessions. There was no outward reason to expect a different result this time.[55]

However, a close examination of the internal affairs of the Dutch Reformed Church revealed that the Dutch were no longer a solid block. Since the

---

54. Livingston reviewed the summer campaign and the Assembly session in a letter to Chauncey Whittelsey, Aug. 22, 1754 in E.R.N.Y., V, 3487-3488; Klein "American Whig," pp. 395-400.

55. Supra., pp. 70-73.

Great Awakening, Dutch ministers split into liberal and conservative camps. The liberals wanted to substitute English for Dutch in church services and to free themselves from control of the Classis of Amsterdam. The conservatives stood for the status quo.[56]

For a moment, in September of 1754, the liberal Dutch faction appeared victorious. They created a "coetus," or ministerial assembly, as the first step toward an independent American classis, and the conservatives offered no objections. The liberals also set out to establish a seminary for Dutch ministers. Consequently, they saw no reason to join with the Anglicans on the college issue.[57]

However, the Dutch conservatives rebelled under the leadership of Johannes Ritzema, pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church in New York City. Ritzema convinced the consistory of his church to secede from the coetus, disavow the planned American classis, and repudiate the

---

56. Alexander J. Wall, "The Controversy in the Dutch Church in New York Concerning Preaching in English," New York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin, XII (1928), 39-58; Nelson R. Burr, "The Episcopal Church and the Dutch in Colonial New York and New Jersey 1664-1784," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XIX (1950), 90-109; E.R.N.Y., IV, 2582-2583, 3018, 3037-3038.

57. Ibid., V, 3490-3494.

proposed seminary. The conservatives then made a deal with the Anglicans. They petitioned the Assembly for a Dutch Reformed Professorship of Divinity on the faculty of the proposed college, and agreed to support the charter and the transfer of lottery funds provided the Anglicans agreed to the professorship. Naturally, the Anglicans agreed.[58]

The Anglicans realized that with only partial Dutch support they needed a wedge in the Assembly. Therefore, they pressured DeLancey to sign the charter. They believed they could then get the Assembly to approve the charter, especially since the Dutch professorship would be added to a legislative bill. Furthermore, they felt that the Assembly would not persist in denying the lottery funds to them once the governor approved the charter. DeLancey bowed to their will early in November, and King's College officially came into being with provision for an Anglican president and Anglican prayers.[59]

---

58. "Church of New York. Oct. 1, 1754," in ibid., V, 3495-3496. The "deal" is described in Rev. Henry Barclay to Rev. Samuel Johnson, Nov. 4, 1754, ibid., V, 3517-3518. The petition is reprinted in ibid., V, 3505-3506.

59. Ibid., V, 3506. The charter is reprinted in ibid., V, 3506-3514.

This Anglican victory, as all realized, meant little. The real battle would still be waged in the Assembly which controlled the lottery funds. When the Assembly met in October, 1754, Livingston's forces secured a resolution barring the lottery funds to any college not established by the Assembly.[60]

Both sides then presented bills for a college. The Anglicans proposed acceptance of the signed charter with provision for a Dutch Reformed Professorship. Livingston and his cohorts introduced a "free college bill" which reflected Livingston's earlier proposals in the Reflector. It called for a non-sectarian college, established by the Assembly and governed by trustees appointed by the Assembly. In the ensuing legislative battle neither side could muster sufficient strength to secure its ends. The Assembly session ended in a stalemate.[61]

Each side returned to the press to seek support for its views. Hugh Gaine, publisher of the New York Mercury, finally agreed to print articles by Livingston's

---

60. Rev. Henry Barclay to Rev. Samuel Johnson, Nov. 4, 1754, in ibid., V, 3517-3518, "The Disposition of the Moneys Raised for the College," ibid., V, 3520.

61. "Proposal for an Unsectarian College," ibid., pp. 3523-3525, "Watch-Tower," XLVIII, XLIX, New York Mercury, Oct. 20, 27, 1755.

forces as well as by the Anglicans. Soon the triumvirate issued a new series entitled "The Watch Tower," to which the Anglicans responded, often under the title "John Englishman." Another literary war erupted in the newspapers, pamphlets, and broadsides.[62]

This latest round of arguments presented little that was new. Livingston wrote a series of articles tracing the "History of the Persecution, by High Churchmen in the Colony of New York." He offered a disquieting view of the colony in the 1770's if the Anglicans secured their ends, reprinted Francis Makemie's Narrative with a warning that such persecution could occur again, and listed forty-eight objections to the Anglican charter. The Anglicans responded with personal invective against Livingston, raised the specter of atheism, defended their establishment and charter as being in accord with the English constitution and royal desires, and accused Livingston of falsifying the minutes of the trustees in his statements to the Assembly.[63]

---

62. William Livingston to Rev. Noah Welles, Dec. 7, 1754, E.R.N.Y., V, 3525-3526.

63. "Watch Tower," XXI-XXX, New York Mercury, April 14, 1755. Francis Makemie, A Narrative of a New and Unusual American Imprisonment (New York, 1755); William Livingston, The Querist (New York, 1754); John Englishman, April 9 to July 5, 1754; Benjamin Nicoll, A Brief Vindication of the Proceedings of the Trustees (New York, 1754).

Livingston got the best of this exchange. As he told Noah Welles, "The Dutch begin to see, and the designs of our adversaries give a more general umbrage than ever."[64] The truth of this statement became apparent when the Anglicans made their next move. On June 3, 1755, they secured from DeLancey a supplementary charter establishing the Dutch Reformed Professorship. In return, Dominie Ritzema promised to use his influence with Dutch Assemblymen to secure the lottery funds. He and the Anglicans got nothing. The Majority of the Dutch Reformed Churches opposed his action, his consistory formally censured him, the Classis of Amsterdam reprimanded him, and Theodore Frelinghuysen, Livingston's old critic, supported the triumvirate in print. Clearly, Livingston's crusade had proved effective. For the first time in New York history, the Dutch united against the Anglicans. The dissenters were no longer confused on the church-state issue.[65]

---

64. William Livingston to Rev. Noah Welles, Dec. 7, 1754, E.R.N.Y., V, 3526.

65. "Personal Petition of Dominie Ritzema," "The College and the Dutch Church:"The American Classis and Academy," "Commission of Rev. Theodore Frelinghuysen," "The Additional Charter," "Rev. John Ritzema," ibid., V, 3542-3555, 3574-3577. Theodore Frelinghuysen, A Remonstrance (New York, 1755).

The Anglicans, however, persisted. They petitioned the Assembly to transfer the lottery funds. The Livingston forces countered by securing a postponement of the question until the next Assembly session, and by continuing their literary efforts. These proved highly successful. By September, many assemblymen feared for their political lives, if they supported the Anglican cause. Even David Jones, Speaker of the House and long-time ally of DeLancey, publicly denied his support for the charter, lest his Quaker constituents on Long Island turn against him.[66]

Jones probably made this public announcement because he believed that new elections were in the offing. Sir Charles Hardy had arrived as governor on September 2. Both sides believed that he would settle the controversy by calling elections. Livingston, feeling secure, sent the governor an address from the "Watch Tower," urging him to ignore DeLancey, avoid partisanship, and order elections.[67] Hardy, however, decided that the war with France demanded the immediate attention of the Assembly, and consequently he recalled the existing legislature.

---

66. New York Gazette, July 21, 1755.

67. "Watch-Tower," LII, Sept. 8, 1755.

From this point on, the college issue gradually dropped from public view. Everyone realized that a stalemate had been reached. One brief flurry of activity occurred in January 1756, when Hardy gave a handsome donation to the college. This inspired the Anglicans to petition the Assembly again for the lottery funds. Livingston revived the "Watch-Tower" and castigated the proposal.[68] It was dropped.

By the end of the year, both parties were ready for a compromise. So, in December 1756 the money was divided equally. One portion went to King's College and the other to the City of New York for construction of a jail and a pest-house. It was also stipulated that King's College would receive £500 a year for seven years from the province. "It rids us of a bone of contention," William Smith, Sr., said, "by dividing it between the two pest houses."[69]

---

68. Klein, "American Whig," pp. 431-435.

69. William Smith Jr., History of the Late Province of New York, New York Historical Society Collections (New York, 1830), II, 237; C.L.N.Y., IV, 160-162.

This division between "pest houses" might well be construed as a victory for the Anglican church. After all, they obtained a college charter that specified an Anglican president and required Episcopalian prayer services. They now added over a £1000 from the lottery money, and were guaranteed another £500 a year. They had their "seminary" and state support. They fulfilled their objectives.

On closer examination, however, this Anglican victory was a Pyrrhic victory. They won the battle, but lost the war. For the first time, dissenters in New York united in opposition to Anglican demands. Livingston aroused them from their lethargy, provided them with coherent principles, and motivated them to resist. They reached maturity in the Kings College controversy and finally saw the necessity of toleration and of separation of church and state. There would be no more Anglican victories.

More important, the Kings College controversy made toleration a reality in New York. No longer would dissenters fight among themselves. There would be no more legislation directed against Moravians or any other sect. They learned the lesson that toleration meant toleration for all. The state might still promote religion, but religion no longer meant a particular sect.

Furthermore, Livingston's arguments in the Reflector had been reprinted throughout the middle colonies and New England as well. New York dissenters fought not only for themselves, but for all the Northern colonists. Opposition to Anglican demands now permeated this area. When Anglicans sought an American bishop, dissenters throughout the North opposed them and thereby added fuel to the fire that would eventually burn the ties of empire to ashes.

William Livingston accomplished his ends just as the Anglicans accomplished theirs. He "removed the veils" from his countrymen's eyes by making toleration and separation of church and state a reality in the once confused minds of his fellow dissenters. He first articulated and propagated the American answer to church-state problems. The Anglicans may have won a Pyrrhic victory. Livingston won the war.

CHAPTER VI

The Holy World of War

On Sunday, December 29, 1747, Gilbert Tennent, the fiery Presbyterian revivalist, stood in the pulpit of his Philadelphia church and prepared to rouse his congregation. Intensity radiated from his face, and his eyes mirrored inward passion. It had been a few years since his congregation saw these signs, but they knew their meaning. Expectantly and uneasily they waited for "Hell-Fire Tennent" to lash out at sin and sinners, to confront them with the terrible terror of God's fury, to exhort them to repent. They would be surprised.

"The Lord is a man of war," Tennent cried, "a strong and potent warrior, a famous and eminent warrior." "God," he shouted, "presides over all wars and battles, and brings them to such an issue as He pleases." God commands defensive war against the "Popish" enemies of England and her colonies, he declared, and expects every man to contribute to the conflict. "Unpreparedness," he spat, is "vain confidence or presumption." On and on he went, exhorting his hearers to prepare for war and bolstering his argument with a seemingly endless string of scriptural quotations. Then, after about an hour, he ended with a final reminder: "But sirs, allow me to observe that although outward means are necessary,

and excellent in their place, yet they are not like to be crowned with success, except we look above them to God for direction and assistance; except we repent of our sins and reform our lives."[1]

On Sunday, June 22, 1755, the staid, orderly and proper congregation of Christ Church, Philadelphia, waited for the visiting minister, Philip Reading, to deliver his sermon. Since Anglican ministers avoided emotionalism and concentrated on learned examinations of various theological doctrines, Reading's listeners undoubtedly prepared themselves for another exercise in logic and scriptural analysis. They, too, would be surprised.

Reading started calmly enough, but as he warmed to his subject his voice filled with emotion. "Indignation swells in our breasts," he cried, "love of freedom inflames us, while we behold the slaves of France, and the Inquisitors of Rome approaching to crush us. Give me leave then my breathren, to contribute all in my power towards animating these good dispositions." Animate them he did, with a terrifying and gruesome description of murder, rape, torture, and mass slaughter. "The Church of Rome," he declared, "allows and justifies" such

---

1. Gilbert Tennent, The Late Association For Defence Encouraged (Philadelphia, 1747), p. 1, 9, 39.

horror. Consequently, the sons of "the perfect Church, the English Church" must prepare for war. Reading pleaded for action, "Let manly and martial exercises be introduced as the recreation of liesure hours." Then, he called upon God to do his part: "Arise now, O god, and let thine enemies be scattered . . . Bless our Zion, the vineyard which thine own right hand hath planted and thy good providence preserved, that neither the gates of hell, the Gates of Rome, nor the Gates of France, may ever prevail against her."[2]

These two martial sermons, delivered years apart by such dissimilar individuals and addressed to such diverse congregations, exemplified the fusion of secular goals and religious norms in the decades following the Great Awakening. Ministers, believing that God controlled the material and spiritual destinies of men, had always called upon the laity to implement His will perfectly. Formerly they stressed man's responsibility in moral and liturgical affairs, but with the Awakening the emphasis broadened to include secular concerns. No longer could religious men afford the luxury of avoiding material problems. Now, they had to fulfill their moral duty in

---

2. Philip Reading, The Protestants Danger and the Protestants Duty (Philadelphia, 1755), p. 7, 9, 23, 30.

secular as well as spritual action. For Tennent and Reading this concept of duty transformed the wars against France into religious crusades.[3]

Just as religious men differed in interpreting God's will on spiritual matters, they arrived at conflicting conclusions regarding His will in secular affairs. In the middle colonies, Tennent and Reading spoke for the majority, but they faced strong opposition from Quakers and some German pietists. During the 1740's and 1750's, this disagreement about God's will resulted in a vehement argument on the morality of war.[4]

The discussion centered in Pennsylvania where pacifist Quakers controlled the Assembly. Following the principle laid down by their founder, George Fox, they asserted, "Dwelling in the light, it takes away the occassion of wars and gathers the hearts together to God, and unto one

---

3. For a more detailed analysis of the fusion of the theocentric cosmology with secular goals see: Supra., pp. 134-137, 144-145.

4. Discussions of this controversy can be found in: Robert L.D. Davidson, War Comes to Quaker Pennsylvania 1682-1756 (New York, 1957); Frederick B. Tolles, Meeting House and Counting House, The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia 1682-1763 (Chapel Hill, 1948), pp. 3-28; Edwin B. Bronner, "The Quakers and Non-Violence in Pennsylvania," Pennsylvania History, XXXV (1968), 1-23; Guy F. Hershberger; "The Pennsylvania Quaker Experiment in Politics, 1682-1756," Mennonite Quarterly Review, X (1936), 187-221.

another and brings to the beginning before wars were." Consequently, they even refused to engage in defensive military activity.[5]

Unfortunately, the majority of Pennsylvanians rejected the "light" and, more unfortunately, the eighteenth century found them pressed to support Britain in a succession of wars. During King William's War and Queen Anne's War, the Quaker Assembly appropriated funds earmarked for the "King's use" or the "Queen's use," thereby avoiding any direct conflict between pacifist principles and defensive measures. What the king or queen did with the money was not their responsibility, or so, at least, the Quakers rationalized.[6]

This convenient moral laxity, however, proved increasingly difficult to maintain. Strict Quakers demanded adherence to pacifist principles, while non-Quakers called for extensive military preparation. Caught between these conflicting demands, Quaker assemblymen squirmed, evaded, procrastinated and finally surrendered.

---

5. Quoted in Tolles, Meeting House, p. 9.

6. Votes and Proceedings of the House of Representatives of the Province of Pennsylvania, in Pennsylvania Archives, 8th ser. (8 vols., Harrisburg, 1931-35), II, 871; Minutes of the Provincial Council of of Pennsylvania, in Colonial Records of Pennsylvania (8 vols., Philadelphia and Harrisburg, 1851-52), I, 400, 492.

The beginning of the end came in 1739 with the start of what eventually became King George's War, pitting England against Spain and France. Plans were laid for a combined British and colonial expedition against the West Indies, but the Quaker Assembly refused to raise troops. Governor George Thomas responded by recruiting men on his own authority. A protracted quarrel followed, during which the Assembly maintained the upper hand by its control of finances. No troops were sent.[7]

By 1744, however, the Quakers bowed to public pressure and voted four thousand pounds for "the purchase of bread, beef, pork, flour, wheat or other grain" to be sent to Louisburg. Some Council members urged Governor Thomas to reject this appropriation and to renew his demand for military supplies. According to Benjamin Franklin, Thomas replied, "I shall take the money, for I understand very well their meaning; 'other grain' is gunpowder." He purchased the gunpowder and no one objected.[8]

---

7. Davidson, War Comes, pp. 28-33; Bronner, "The Quakers and Non-Violence," p. 11; Tolles, Meeting House, 23.

8. Votes and Proceedings, IV, 3042; Herbert W. Schneider, ed., Benjamin Franklin: The Autobiography (New York, 1953), p. 114.

In the following year the Assembly again evaded the issue. This time they responded to a request for aid in the reduction of Canada with a grant of five thousand pounds for the "King's use." At the same time, however, they persisted in their refusal to supply money or troops for local defense. Evidently, they could rationalize fighting at a distance but not at home.

The majority of Pennsylvanians saw this as complete hypocrisy. More interested in local defense than in strategic measures, and believing that God demanded military preparation, they called upon the Quakers to protect Pennsylvania. When this failed to produce results, Benjamin Franklin took matters into his own hands. In 1747 he published Plain Truth, in which he depicted the horrors of invasion, chided the Quakers for refusing to take defensive measures, and proposed a voluntary association for defense of the colony.[9]

Pennsylvanians responded enthusiastically to Franklin's proposal. In short order some ten thousand men joined the Association for Defense and began military training. They constructed a battery below Philadelphia, and Franklin conned a drunken Governor Clinton of New York into supplying eighteen cannon. Quakers watched these developments in dismay.[10]

---

9. Ibid., pp. 108-115; Benjamin Franklin, Plain Truth (Philadelphia, 1747).

10. Schneider, ed., Franklin Autobiography, pp. 109-111.

Well they should have, for Franklin then called in "the aid of religion" to enhance the martial fever. He proposed that Governor Thomas proclaim a day of fast "to promote reformation and implore the blessings of heaven on our undertaking." When Thomas agreed, Franklin drafted the proclamation. "This," he observed, "gave the clergy of the different sects an opportunity of influencing their congregations to join in the Association."[11]

Most non-Quaker ministers welcomed this opportunity. They sincerely believed that God wanted all good Protestants to fight the Popish enemy. From the pulpit and in the press, they exhorted their congregations to support the Association. Under their leadership defense became more than a physical necessity, it became a moral duty.

Herein, Gilbert Tennent showed the way. Ever a lover of controversy, he published a number of sermons supporting the Association. The Quaker, John Smith, answered. Others entered the argument on both sides. Soon Pennsylvania became the scene of a combined civil and religious debate, a debate which revealed how closely

---

11. Ibid., pp. 110-111; Pennsylvania Gazette, Dec. 12, 1747.

moral imperatives were now tied to secular affairs.[12]

In essence, Quakers and non-Quakers agreed on a number of important points. They shared the same cosmology, with God at the center controlling the civil and spiritual affairs of men. God, they agreed, demanded complete obedience and punished those who deviated from His will with both physical and spiritual calamities. Consequently, it behooved men to carefully analyze their every action to be sure that it conformed to Divine desires.

Here, of course, arose the problem. From their "inner light" Quakers knew that any military preparation was "to doubt God's over-ruling providence" and to forsake "the simplicity of the gospel." Non-Quakers, from their reading of the gospel, agreed with Gilbert Tennent, "that a gracious Jehovah, would please in his

---

12. Gilbert Tennent, The Late Association for Defense Encouraged, The Late Association for Defense Further Encouraged (April, 1748), The Late Association for Defense Further Encouraged or Defensive War Defended (Philadelphia, 1748), A Sermon Preached at Philadelphia (Philadelphia, 1748), Two Sermons Preached at Burlington (Philadelphia, 1749), A Sermon Preached at Burlington (Philadelphia, 1749); William Currie, A Treatise on the Lawfulness of Defensive War (Philadelphia, 1748); A Sermon Preached in Radnor Church (Philadelphia, 1748); Mr. Franklin, The Absolute and Obvious Necessity of Self-Defence (Philadelphia, 1748); John Smith, The Doctrine of Christianity, As Held by the People called Quakers Vindicated (Philadelphia, 1748); Samuel Smith, Necessary Truth (Philadelphia, 1748); Benjamin Gilbert, Truth Vindicated (Philadelphia, 1748); Pennsylvania Gazette, January 6, March 16, November 5, 19, December 3, 1747, September 1, 1748.

infinite and unmerited goodness, to smile upon the necessary and noble essay of the Association, and be our glory and defense."[13]

An argument of that nature could not be settled. Both Quakers and non-Quakers believed they possessed the truth, believed God was on their side, believed He would punish them for failure to fulfill His will. So, the impass continued. The Quaker-controlled Assembly refused to take defensive measures and the Association advanced its military preparations. King George's War ended without a resolution of the controversy, but the positions had been stated, the lines drawn. The issue would arise again with the next military threat.

Such a threat came quickly, as the French and Indians prepared another onslaught against British North America. In 1755 they defeated a combined British and colonial force at Fort Duquesne on the Ohio River. Then, in the fall of 1756, the Indians began attacking settlements along the Pennsylvania frontier, beginning the Great War for the Empire.[14]

---

13. Samuel Smith, Necessary Truth, p. 14, John Smith, The Doctrine of Christianity, p. 2; Gilbert Tennent, The Late Association for Defence further Encouraged, p. 32.

14. For a complete discussion of the background for Indian attacks on the frontier see: Julian P. Boyd, "Indian Affairs on Pennsylvania, 1736-1762," in Indian Treaties Printed by Benjamin Franklin (Philadelphia, 1938), pp. 1-lxxxv.

As refugees poured into the interior of Pennsylvania with tales of murder, scalping and general slaughter, Pennsylvanians demanded military action. The Quakers responded, "We have found it to be our duty to cease from those national contests productive of misery and bloodshed, and submit our cause to Him the most high." Needless to say, this answer failed to satisfy their critics, who viewed participation in the war as a moral and physical necessity.[15]

When slaughter continued on the frontiers and the Quaker Assembly refused to act, Governor Robert Morris took matters into his own hands. Without consulting the Assembly, he and his Council drafted a declaration of war. On April 14, 1756, they published it, and for the first time Pennsylvania was officially at war. The Quakers confronted with the choice of serving in a government at war or resigning to preserve their principles, chose the latter course, and by the fall of 1756 only a few renegade Quakers remained in the Assembly.[16]

---

15. Society of Friends, An Epistle from Our General Spring Meeting of Ministers and Elders (Philadelphia, 1755), p. 2.

16. Tolles, Meeting House, pp. 26-28, Bronner, "The Quakers and Non-Violence," pp. 14-18. The first six Quakers to resign made their motives quite clear: "As many of our constituents seem of opinion that the present situation of public affairs calls upon us for services in a military way, which from a conviction of judgement after mature deliberation we cannot comply with, we conclude it most conductive to the peace of our minds, and the reputation of our religious professions to persist in our resolution of resigning our seats, which we now accordingly do." Quoted in Isaac Sharpless, A Quaker Experiment in Government (Philadelphia, 1898), pp. 221-222.

That ended the argument about the morality of war, but it did not end the war. In the following years, ministers from virtually every denomination--Quakers, of course, excepted--equated the English and colonial cause with the will of God and exhorted their congregations to support the military effort. Throughout the middle colonies the cry went up for a holy war.[17]

---

17. Such exhortations can be found in: Aaron Burr, A Discourse Delivered at New Ark (New York, 1755), A Sermon Preached Before the Synod of New York (New York, 1756); Samuel Davies, Religion and Patriotism (Philadelphia, 1755), The Curse of Cowardice (Woodbridge, New York and Philadelphia, 1759); Samuel Finley, The Power of Gospel Ministers (New York, 1755), The Curse of Mercy (Philadelphia, 1757); Theodore Frelinghuysen, Wars and Rumors of Wars)New York, 1755); Philip Reading, The Protestants Danger; An Address to Those Quakers (Philadelphia 1756); The Christians Duty to Render to Caesar (Philadelphia, 1756); John Lidenius, The Lawfulness of Defensive War (Philadelphia, 1756); Gilbert Tennent, The Good Man's Character (Philadelphia, 1756), The Happiness of Rewarding the Enemies of our Religion (Philadelphia, 1756), Sermons on Important Subjects (Philadelphia, 1758); George Whitefield, A Short Address to Persons of All Denominations (Philadelphia, 1756); A Serious Call From the City (New York, 1757); William Smith, The Christian Soldiers Duty (Philadelphia, 1757); Francis Alison, Peace and Union Recommended (Philadelphia, 1758); Abraham Keteltas, The Religious Soldier (New York, 1759); Ebenezer Prime, The Importance of the Divine Presence (New York, 1759); Joseph Treat, A Thanksgiving Sermon (New York, 1762); Pennsylvania Gazette May 15, 1755, May 6, October 21, June 16, 1756; June 1, Dec. 14, 1758, Oct. 18, 1759; New York Mercury, April 12, April 26, 1756; June 6, 1757, May 22, 1758, March 26, 1759; New York Gazette, June 18, June 25, Nov. 12, 1759, March 2, 1761, April 19, 1762.

For religious men this crusade entailed more than fighting for Protestantism against anti-Christian Papists; it was also a war against their own sinfulness. God, they believed, unleashed the French and Indians to punish them for "drunkeness, whoredom, blasphemy, profane swearing, sabbath breaking, contempt of the Gospel and holy ordinance."[18]

If they did not repent, God would not relieve them of the scourge. As the Presbyterian Synod of New York declared in 1756:

> We have been warned and chastised, first more gently, then more terribly; but not returning to Him that smites us, His anger is not turned away, but His hand is stretched and still. Judgment yet proceeds, the prospect becomes darker and darker . . . Nothing but impiety rouses his vengence, and nothing but repentance towards Him, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ can turn it away.[19]

This sense of guilt and need for repentance permeated the middle colonies during the war. Over and over again ministers and laymen reiterated that God demanded vigorous military measures coupled with personal and national reformation. In public proclamations, sermons, pamphlets, and newspapers, this theme appeared constantly. No one could avoid contact with it, and in such a religious age few would ignore it.

---

18. Samuel Finley, The Curse of Mercy, p. V.

19. Pennsylvania Gazette, Oct. 21, 1756.

Any man who accepted this view of the war became doubly bound. He had to support the military effort and at the same time reform his own life. In a subtle psychological fashion this dual demand enhanced militancy, for one way of repenting was to oppose the irreligion of French Papists. A man could demonstrate his moral rectitude by fighting the enemies of Protestantism. To fight the French and Indians became more than a divine command on the nation and the individual, it became a catharsis for personal guilt.

Such religious overtones clearly added ardor to the war against France. It became more than a contest for Empire, it became a religious experience. The strength of moral imperatives wedded to national political objectives, produced a response which went beyond the logic of the secular situation.[20]

After the Great War for Empire ended in 1763, the American colonists became embroiled in disputes with Great Britain which culminated in the American Revolution. The secular aspects of these controversies have received extensive coverage in historical literature. Comparatively little attention, however, has been paid to the religious aspect. In light of the moralistic response of the middle

---

20. The foregoing analysis is based on the publications cited in note 17.

colonists to the Great War for Empire, some suggestions regarding the role of religion in the Revolution, therefore, seem in order.

Historians of religion in the middle colonies have concentrated upon either the history of a particular sect or the general religious history of a particular colony. These studies demonstrate that while many clergymen actively supported the Revolution, large numbers of Anglicans, Quakers, Methodists, and the conservative faction of the Dutch Reformed Church opposed it. However, the nature of the religious support given to the Revolution, and the reasons for opposition to it have not been precisely delineated. On these points, the study of religious thought in the middle colonies, and some recent studies on the religious and psychological aspects of the Revolution in general, lead to some hypotheses.[21]

---

21. Standard religious histories emphasize the differences between sects or laud the accomplishments of a particular sect. They do not approach religious thought as a coherent whole. They vary in value, but the following contain much useful information and the generalization about the role of various sects in the Revolution is based upon them: Charles Briggs, American Presbyterianism (New York, 1885); Nelson Burr, The Anglican Church in New Jersey (Philadelphia, 1954); Andrew Drummond, The Story of American Protestantism (Boston, 1951); Gillian Collin, Moravians in Two Worlds (New York, 1967); Wallace Jamison, Religion in New Jersey (Princeton, 1964); Guy Klett, Presbyterians in Colonial Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1937); Julius Pratt, Religion, Politics, and Divinity (New York, 1967); Julius Sachse, The German Sectarians of Pennsylvania (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1899-1900); Isaac Sharpless, A Quaker Experiment in Government; Leonard Trinterud, The Forming of an American Tradition: A Reexamination of Colonial Presbyterianism 1760-1778 (Philadelphia, 1949).

Carl Bridenbaugh, in Mitre and Sceptre: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775, demonstrated that the Anglican attempt to secure an American Bishop produced a long and bitter debate in the middle colonies and New England. This debate culminated between 1760 and 1765 and convinced many dissenters of an Anglican plot to curtail American liberties. Such a belief, Bridenbaugh argued, contributed to the explosive reaction to the Stamp Act in the Northern colonies, and added fuel to the growing revolutionary fire.[22]

This concept of an Anglican plot received attention from Bernard Bailyn in The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution. He asserted that fear of an episcopate stimulated among many leaders of public opinion, "a general sense that they live in a conspiratorial world in which what the highest officials professed was not what they in fact intended, and that their words masked a malevolent design." The colonists came to believe that British statesmen intended to subvert their civil and religious liberties. Englishmen, they reasoned, were corrupt both morally and politically. Americans rebelled, therefore, not only to prevent tyranny but to preserve religious and civil virtue.[23]

---

22. Carl Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775 (New York, 1962), pp. 207-340.

23. Bernard Bailyn, The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution (Cambridge, 1967), p. 98. This idea of a revolution to preserve virtue is also put forth by H. Trevor Colbourn, The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution (Chapel Hill, 1965).

The preservation of virtue, Edmund Morgan declared, meant more to Americans than just a refusal to succumb to British degeneracy, it meant an internal character reformation as well. In "The Puritan Ethic and the American Revolution," Morgan asserted that Americans viewed their difficulties as punishment from God for abandoning the virtues of industry and frugality. They sought to reform themselves by fighting British vice, believing that "There remained no way of preserving American virtue unless the connection with Britain was severed."[24]

Morgan admitted, "The meaning of virtue in this context embraced somewhat more than the values of the Puritan Ethic," but, he continued, "those values were pre-eminent in it." In the middle colonies during the Great War for Empire, however, the ministers spoke of moral declension in a much broader context, one that included the entire range of moral behavior. They complained of all types of sin, not just greed and sloth. This suggests that Morgan's strong New England orientation led him to overemphasize a peculiar Puritan point of view. Industry and frugality formed part of the galaxy of moral virtues in the middle colonies, but they did

---

24. Edmund Morgan, "The Puritan Ethic and the American Revolution," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd. ser., XXIV (January, 1967), p. 43.

not receive the same emphasis as in New England.[25]

Be this as it may, the Revolution as a fight against British degeneracy and a movement for internal reformation received added support from Perry Miller. In "From the Covenant to the Revival," Miller examined the American response to the outbreak of fighting in 1775. He discovered that the colonists viewed God as the controller of the universe, who visited the British army on America as punishment for sin. By resisting the British, who stood for impiety, the colonists could reform themselves. "What carried the ranks of militia and citizens," Miller explained, "was the universal persuasion that they, by administering to themselves a spiritual purge, acquired the energies God had always, in the manner of the Old Testament, been ready to impart to His repentant children."[26]

Miller argued that while all colonists could share this view of the war, New Englanders led the way. They, Miller asserted, "most highly elaborated the theorem that the sins of individuals brought calamity upon the

---

25. Ibid., p.3. Supra., pp. 216-218.

26. Perry Miller "From the Covenant to the Revival," in James Ward Smith and A. Leland Jamison, eds., The Shaping of American Religion (Princeton, 1961), p. 331.

commonwealth." In light of the theocentric cosmology in the middle colonies and its adoption to the secular world, however, Miller's assertion seems to reflect his immersion in Puritan thought, rather than historical fact. The middle colonists viewed their relationship to God in much the same fashion as their Puritan counterparts, and long before the Revolution they wedded moral commands to secular goals. They did not borrow the New England view of the Revolution, they shared it.[27]

Miller, like Morgan, placed undue emphasis on the New England contribution to the religious psychology of the Revolution. However, their basic insight deserves attention. From the perspective of the middle colonies, 1689-1763, the intellectual framework already existed for viewing the war as a conflict against internal and external vice, and as Miller, Morgan and others have indicated, the middle colonists reacted within that framework after 1763. In short, the Revolution in the middle colonies, like the Great War for Empire, was as much a religious crusade as a secular movement.

Why, however, did some religious men refuse to join the holy war? Throughout the colonies many ministers remained loyal to England, and urged their congregations

---

27. Ibid., p. 323. ; Supra., pp. 216-217.

to do the same. They suggested that God willed obedience, not revolution. To completely understand the religious aspect of the Revolution, therefore, their conduct must be explained as well as the religious psychology of the Patriots.

A few attempts have been made to do this. William H. Nelson in The American Tory asserted, "In religion, the lines that divided Tories from Whigs were quite clearly drawn. Adherents of religious groups that were in a local minority were everywhere inclined towards Loyalism, while adherents of the dominant local denomination were most often Patriots." Though this generalization stands up in the middle colonies, where Quakers, Anglicans, Methodists, and the conservative wing of the Dutch Reformed Church usually opposed the Revolution, it only partially explains the dynamics of their choice. Were they Loyalists because they "felt weak and threatened," as Nelson argues, or was their response more complex? What about the differences between these religious groups, and what about Loyalists from other religious denominations? Was Loyalism the same for all these people?[28]

---

28. William H. Nelson, The American Tory (Boston, 1964), p. 90, 91.

Alan Heimert provided an answer to these questions in Religion and the American Mind From the Great Awakening to the Revolution. Heimert analyzed the divergent intellectual attitudes of revivalist and anti-revivalist ministers and studied their conflicting responses to the Revolution. He concluded that anti-revivalists leaned to the Loyalist side because of their emphasis on reason, order and authority and their elitist social ideology. Revivalists, on the other hand, because of their stress on emotionalism, millenialism, and personal moral regeneration, viewed the Revolution as a God-given opportunity for both personal and national reformation. The war became for them an emotional experience much like a religious revival.[29]

Clearly, Heimert's explanation dovetails with the religious psychology of the Revolution described earlier. In the middle colonies, however, his generalization should be considered in light of local circumstances, for although it provides a convincing and cogent explanation of the religious nature of Loyalism and Patriotism, it needs further elucidation and it neglects a few important factors.

---

29. Alan Heimert, Religion and the American Mind From the Great Awakening to the Revolution (Cambridge, 1966), especially pp. 239-510.

Of the four religious groups who generally opposed the Revolution, Anglicans and Dutch Reformed conservatives best fit Heimert's intellectual model. They belonged to the anti-revivalist camp, stressed reason, order, and authority, and adhered to an elitist social ideology. They consistently agreed on civil and religious issues, and supported each other's privileged positions. Certainly a desire to maintain these privileges helped to determine their response to the Revolutionary crisis, but that fact does not subvert Heimert's generalization.[30]

With the Quakers, the case is less clear. They generally took an anti-revivalist position during the Awakening, but they shared a common intellectual heritage with the revivalists. As Frederick Tolles has shown, however, many Quakers by the 1740's rejected their intellectual heritage, eschewed emotionalism, and assumed an elitist social ideology. They had, he declared, "no desire to be associated in anyone's mind with a religious movement which was making headway in the same social class from which they themselves had originated in the previous century." For Quakers who held this view, Heimert's analysis of the anti-revivalist mind holds true.[31]

---

30. Supra., pp. 70-71, 137-140.

31. Frederick Tolles, "Quietism Versus Enthusiasm: The Philadelphia Quakers and the Great Awakening," The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, LXIX (1945), p. 48.

Quakers who remained loyal to their early heritage, however, require a further explanation. Their intellectual affinity with revivalist thought should have led them to support the Revolution, but generally it did not. Herein, Quaker pacifism explains their behavior. They saw the hand of God controlling the British statesmen and armies, and they saw the need for moral reformation to avert the calamity of defeat, but they could not make the Revolution a holy war, because to them participation in any war was sinful.[32]

The Methodists, however, were not strict pacifists. They traced their origins to the revivalist movement and yet they generally failed to support the Revolution. Why? First, despite their revivalist heritage, the Methodists maintained a close affinity to the Anglican Church, and stressed order and authority as much as the Episcopalians from whom they had separated. Second, their founder, John Wesley, urged his followers to remain neutral. And, third, as Elie Halévy has shown, Methodism inculcated a philosophy of social acceptance which prevented rather than encouraged revolution. The Methodist

---

32. Supra., pp. 204-215.

response to the Revolution therefore does not belie Heimert's thesis,[33] it simply complicates it.

The same holds true for the response of anti-revivalist Presbyterians to the war. Though they reunited with their revivalist breathren long before the Revolutionary crisis, they clung to their old ideas. What prevented them once again from splitting with their revivalist colleagues? Why were they not found in the Loyalist ranks?[34] Heimert's generalization fails to answer this question.

The answer lies in Presbyterian anomosity to the Anglican Church. Especially in New York, but in the other middle colonies as well, Anglicans and Presbyterians had fought a continuous battle over religious freedom since 1689. Reaching its height with the King's College controversy, this argument left the Presbyterians extremely distrustful of Anglican motives. During the Revolutionary crisis the proposal of an Anglican episcopate further enhanced Presbyterian suspicions. Consequently, anti-revivalist Presbyterians failed to join the Loyalist ranks.

---

33. W.W. Sweet, Men of Zeal: The Romance of American Methodist Beginnings (New York, 1935); Elie Halevy, A History of the English People (6 vols., London, 1948-1952), I, pp. 410-417.

34. The best study of Presbyterian attitudes is Leonard J. Trinterud, The Forming of an American Tradition, pp. 228-258.

However, this does not mean that Presbyterians became fiery revolutionaries. Generally speaking they split into two camps during the Revolutionary crisis. Revivalists became ardent Patriots, urging their congregations to combat internal and external sin by fighting the British. Anti-revivalists became conservatives, calling for a negotiated settlement of grievances and continued union with England. Only after the war began, did anti-revivalist Presbyterians join the Patriot cause.

The response of these anti-revivalist Presbyterians to the Revolution suggests a possible addition to Heimert's thesis. In the middle colonies, at least, the long struggle for religious freedom and the eventual development of a concept of separation of church and state undoubtedly prevented some anti-revivalists of all denominations from joining the Loyalists. Furthermore, as the Patriots stressed English intentions of creating a national establishment, fear of this development enhanced the ardor of those who saw the war as a movement against British degeneracy and internal vice. It gave them added reason to fear British corruption, and it supplied them with another colonial virtue to defend.

Concommitant with the expanding idea of separation of church and state was the development of increased religious toleration. This, too, contributed to the

Revolutionary crisis by allowing men of every denomination to express their views in a relatively open atmosphere. By 1763 ideas could be judged on their merit, rather than on the religious affiliation of the man who expressed them, and consequently radical ideas had a better chance of acceptance.

Furthermore toleration contributed to the "internal" American Revolution. As many historians have noted, the Revolution entailed more than a break with Britain, it also encompassed a fight for freedom at home. Throughout the colonies, those sects who still found themselves persecuted, called upon the Patriots to grant them the freedom which Britain supposedly sought to suppress. They demanded a reformation of the vice of intolerance along with all the other colonial vices.[35]

Thus the colonial response to the Revolutionary crisis was in part determined by complex religious judgments. Men did not act on the basis of the political and economic situation alone. They did not view events with the cold, critical eye of secular rationalism. Rather, their understanding of the world and themselves as instruments in the divine scheme of creation colored their perception of British actions and affected their own secular decisions.

---

35. Bernard Bailyn, Ideological Origins, pp. 246-272.

For the middle colonists, an understanding of the world began with God's omnipotence and providence. God, they believed, controlled men and events. He rewarded those who followed His will and punished those who disobeyed Him. God concerned Himself with secular as well as spiritual matters, and consequently men found it necessary to follow His commands in their every action.

During the Revolutionary crisis, New Yorkers, New Jerseyites and Pennsylvanians arrived at conflicting conclusions regarding God's will. Some decided that He demanded resistance to Britain, while other concluded that He wished obedience. Their decisions were not solely rationalizations of political and economic facts, but also logical outgrowths of differing religious experiences.

For those colonists adhering to revivalist religious tradition, the war became another religious revival. They concluded that Britain, corrupted by every form of vice, sought to suppress American liberties because the colonists themselves wallowed in degeneracy. God allowed this, but he would give them victory if they reformed. To prove their sincerity, they had to actively fight vice, both within themselves and as personified by the British army. Hence the war became a religious crusade.

A number of factors enhanced the ardor of those who viewed the war in this fashion, and influenced some anti-revivalists to lend their support once the Revolution began. The long and heated argument between Anglicans and other religious groups in the middle colonies created a deep distrust. Many people became convinced that the Anglicans plotted a national establishment by seeking an American bishop during the 1760's. Since the concept of separation of church and state had won substantial support by this time, any hint of an establishment revived old animosities and kindled new fears. Furthermore, the Revolutionary crisis occurred within a tolerant religious climate, which allowed for the disseminations of ideas with a minimum of sectarian prejudice. Revolutionary ideas could therefore, receive a free and open hearing.

Loyalist ideas could also be judged on the same basis. Generally speaking, those who adhered to the anti-revivalist religious tradition viewed the war as anathema. Possessing a strong sense of reason, order, and authority, they preached obedience in both civil and religious affairs. Furthermore, their elitist social ideology led them to look askance at any disruption of the status quo.

Two other factors contributed to the Loyalist psychology. Some anti-revivalists became ardent Tories to defend their special religious privileges. In the middle colonies, Anglicans and the conservative faction of the Dutch Reformed Church saw the Revolution as detrimental to their financial and political interests, for without British support they would be reduced to equality with every other sect. The second factor stimulating Loyalism was pacifism, as in the case of the Quakers, many of whom might otherwise have joined the Patriot cause.

For Loyalist and Patriot alike, however, religion motivated and sustained their decisions. Their conception of God's will helped to determine their choices, and the knowledge that they acted in accord with His will added moral imperatives to their actions. God was on their side,whether Loyalist or Patriot, and they both formed the battalion of the Lord.

Conclusion

In 1964 Henry F. May wrote, "For the study and understanding of American culture, the recovery of American religious history may well be the most important achievement of the last thirty years. A vast and crucial area of American experience has been rescued from neglect and misunderstanding."[1] The foregoing study has hopefully added to this ongoing recovery, by supplying some understanding of the religious thought of the middle colonists and illustrating the importance of that thought. This "Conclusion" will suggest further avenues of thought in regard to the significance of religious ideas in American history.

To begin with, this study approached the religious thought of the middle colonists partially in terms of its interaction with institutions. Other historians, concentrating on different periods, have demonstrated that religion had an important influence on, for example, the reform movements of the 1830's,[2] the appeal of

---

1. Henry F. May, "The Recovery of American Religious History," The American Historical Review, LXX (October, 1964), 79.

2. Timothy Smith, Revivalism and Social Reform (New York, 1957).

Jacksonian Democracy,[3] the origins of the Civil war,[4] and American foreign policy.[5] This list of course barely scratches the surface. It is presented simply to indicate the persistent influence of religion in America, a persistence that perhaps deserves more careful scrutiny from those interested in American themes.

Though this author is so interested, it is neither within his capabilities, nor pertinent to the scope of this study, to even attempt the deliniation of an American theme. It is possible, however, on the basis of the foregoing study, to suggest the broad outlines of a theme for colonial history. From that suggestion some very tentative hypotheses about an American theme will be possible.

---

3. John W. Ward, Andrew Jackson: Symbol for an Age (New York, 1955); Marvin Myers, The Jacksonian Persuasion (Stanford, 1957).

4. A.M. Schlesinger, Jr., "The Causes of the Civil War: A Note on Historical Sentimentalism," Partisan Review, XVI (Sept. 1949), 969-981; Charles G. Sellers, Jr. "The Travail of Slavery," in The Southerner as American, ed. id. (Chapel Hill, 1960), 40-71.

5. Arthur S. Link, Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era (New York, 1954), pp. 81-223; McGeorge Bundy, "Foreign Policy: From Innocence to Engagement," Paths of American Thought, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. and Morton White, eds. (Boston, 1963), 293-308.

In dealing with the religious thought of the middle colonies, this study has shown the persistence of a set of ideas termed the "theocentric cosmology." Simply stated, this meant that religious men believed that God controlled the material and spiritual destinies of men and that they were required to follow His will under pain of Divine wrath. Their attempt to implement God's will and the consequences of this attempt have been examined.

Historians of New England have long stressed the role of religious thought as a determining factor in the material and spiritual activity of the Puritans. Without wishing to undermine in the least the many highly sophisticated theological and philosophical insights they have given us, it is clear that this set of ideas, the "theocentric cosmology," was also basic to the Puritan religious experience.

Though general studies of religion in the southern colonies, are few, there is no reason to think that religious men in that section thought any differently on these fundamental points. They belonged after all, to the same religious denominations as their contemporaries elsewhere in the colonies. Furthermore, the "theocentric cosmology" is really nothing more than the basic Christian schema relating to God's activity in the world.

This being the case, it can be suggested that one theme for colonial American history would center on the attempt of the colonists to fulfill God's will. Though their experience was surely diverse in this regard, they grappled with the same problem. A general history of the colonies from this perspective should, therefore, give us one overall explanation of the colonial experience.

Some suggestions about the nature of that experience can also be made. It was probably first of all an ironic experience. In the middle colonies, religious men attempting to implement God's will discovered that their actions brought about unintended consequences. When they tried to achieve the perfect morality and the perfect church, they discovered that they could not accomplish their task. They fought among themselves, persecuted each other, used the state in an attempt to enforce orthodoxy, but nothing worked. When they failed, they lost their zeal for the perfect church and the perfect morality, and succumbed partially, at least, to secularism. When they tried to revive their religious zeal in the Awakening, they succeeded in making religion and piety vital once again, but they also opened the door wider than before to the secular side of life.

The ironic nature of this experience suggests another characteristic, unevenness. In the middle colonies the intensity with which men attempted to fulfill God's

will fluctuated. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, their ardor was high. Then, it declined markedly only to rise again with the Awakening, slack off, and rise again with the Revolution. Furthermore, their interpretation of God's will varied with these ebbs and flows of zeal.

The existence of this unevenness may be explained by still another characteristic of the suggested colonial theme, perfectionism. In the middle colonies, religious men often strove for perfection in their fulfillment of God's will. They sought the perfect church and the perfect morality. When this failed, some of them sought perfect union with God in the conversion experience. With the Revolution many of them sought the perfect society, free from internal and external vice. Through the period, they acted on the belief that man could perfectly fulfill God's will.

Finally, the colonial religious experience was also an unfinished experience. They never completed their task. How could they? God's will was too all encompassing. Even if they could have agreed on the essence of His injunctions in one case--which they could not--there would have been a never ending list of other injunctions to implement.

The unfinished character of the colonial religious experience leads to speculation about the possible persistence of this theme, or something like it, throughout American history. If the reform movements of the

1830's were based in large part, as Timothy Smith has shown, on the belief in the possibility of perfect holiness, might not our knowledge of latter American reform movements be enhanced when viewed from that perspective?[6] Do not the revival experiences of the 1740's, 1850's and 1950's suggest a persistent need by Americans to maintain at least some feeling of union with God?[7] Don't we still see about us the ironic results of applying morality to an imperfect world? Isn't the American religious experience still unfinished?

---

6. Smith, Revivalism and Social Reform. Also see: John L. Thomas, "Romantic Reform in America," American Quarterly, XVII (1965), 656-681.

7. For a good study of revivalism in the 1850's see: Whitney R. Cross, The Burned-Over District (Ithaca, 1950). For the revival of the 1950's and its relation to earlier revivals see: Timothy Smith, "Historic Waves of Religious Interest in America," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXXXII (Nov. 1960), 9-19.

Bibliographical Essay

General.

This dissertation is based largely on original sources. The basic ideas set forth were culled in great measure from the writings of the colonists themselves. In pursuing such research the modern historian owes a tremendous debt to past scholars and modern technology. Charles Evans' American Bibliography (15 vols., New York, 1941-1959) provides a chronological listing of all books, pamphlets, periodicals, and other literature published in the U.S.A. from the genesis of printing in 1639 to 1820. The works listed by Evans have been collected by the American Antiquarian Society and reprinted on microcards. Hence, the modern historian has at his fingertips research material it would have taken scholars in the past a lifetime just to collect.

Furthermore, many colonial newspapers have been microfilmed, providing the historian with another convenient and invaluable source of information about colonial thought. Among the most useful for the middle colonies are The New York Gazette (1726 to 1744), The New York Gazette and Weekly Mercury (1752 to 1783), The New York Weekly Journal (1733 to 1751), The New York Weekly Post-Boy (1743 to 1749), The Pennsylvania Gazette

(1728 to 1789), The Pennsylvania Journal or Weekly Advertiser (1742 to 1793).

A number of published collections of source materials also make the modern historian's research more convenient and more complete. Anyone interested in the religious history of the middle colonies must examine Edward T. Corwin, ed., Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York (7 vols., Albany, 1901-1916). These volumes contain documents and correspondence relating to all aspects of church history in New York, and provide much valuable information for Pennsylvania and New Jersey as well. Less specialized, but still indispensable, collections of documents and correspondence relating to New York are E.B. O'Callaghan, ed., The Documentary History of the State of New York (4 vols., Albany, 1849-1851) and Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York(11 vols., Albany, 1853-1887). In dealing with the legislative aspects of New York History the Journal of the Votes and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Colony of New York (2 vols., New York, 1764-1766) and the Journal of the Legislative Council of the Colony of New York (2 vols., Albany, 1861) provide the historian with the basic information. Finally, Charles Z. Lincoln, William H. Johnson and A. Judd Northrop have edited The Colonial

Laws of New York from 1664 to the Revolution (5 vols., New York, 1909).

For documents and correspondence relating to New Jersey history, historians are indebted to William Whitehead who edited Documents Relative to the Colonial, Revolutionary and Post-Revolutionary History of the State of New Jersey (36 vols., Newark, 1880-1941), and to the New Jersey Historical Society whose Collections contain the private correspondence of many colonial leaders. For Pennsylvania, the standard collections of documents are Pennsylvania Colonial Records, 1683-1790 (16 vols., Philadelphia, 1852) and Samuel Hazard, ed., The Pennsylvania Register (16 vols., Philadelphia, 1828). Of great value for the religious history of Pennsylvania is the second volume of William Stevens Perry, ed., Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church (5 vols., Hartford, 1871), which contains the correspondence of Anglican clergymen. For the institutional aspects of early Quakerism, Eva Michener, ed., A Retrospect of Early Quakerism (Philadelphia, 1860) is of value. Finally, Leonard W. Labaree and Whitfield J. Bell have provided a masterful edition of The Papers of Benjamin Franklin (11 vols. to present, New Haven, 1959-1967).

Though primary sources are the basic ingredients for a historical study, the narratives and interpretations of many scholars enable the historian to ply his craft with greater precision. Students of colonial religion should begin by examining W.W. Sweet, Religion in Colonial America (New York, 1947) and H. Shelton Smith, Robert T. Handy and Lefferts A. Loltscher, eds., American Christianity an Historical Interpretation With Representative Documents (New York, 1960). These works provide a good overview of the doctrines and practices of the various colonial sects.

Though there is no comprehensive study of religion in the middle colonies, there are a wealth of monographs dealing with particular sects or individual colonies. Charles Augustine Briggs, American Presbyterianism: Its Origin and Early History with Letters and Documents (New York, 1885), and Robert E. Thompson's A History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (New York, 1895), though outdated, contain much information not available elsewhere. Guy S. Klett's more specialized study Presbyterians in Colonial Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1937), thoroughly examines the development of the Presbyterian Church and its relationship to Quaker politics.

Leonard J. Trinterud's The Forming of an American Tradition: A Reexamination of Colonial Presbyterianism 1706-1788 (Philadelphia, 1749) is an indispensible work for anyone interested in the Presbyterian contribution to American religious thought and politics.

There are two general histories of Anglicanism in America, William W. Manross's A History of the American Episcopal Church (New York, 1935), and William S. Perry's The History of the American Episcopal Church, 1587-1883 (2 vols., Boston, 1885). For historians of the middle colonies, Nelson R. Burr's The Anglican Church in New Jersey (Philadelphia, 1954) is very valuable because it deals extensively with local church records. Arthur A. Cross covers the problem of an Anglican bishop in The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies (New York, 1902) as does Carl Bridenbaugh in Mitre and Sceptre: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities and Politics (New York, 1962). Bridenbaugh's study also includes a general analysis of the friction between Anglicans and other sects in colonial America.

The history of Congregationalism is traced in Gaws Glenn Atkins and Frederick L. Fagley, History of American Congregationalism (Boston, 1942) and Henry M. Dexter, The Congregationalism of the Last

Three Hundred Years: As Seen In Its Literature (New York, 1880). Quakerism is examined in general terms by Russel Elbert in History of Quakerism (New York, 1943) and in a more specialized way by Frederick B. Tolles, Quakers and the Atlantic Culture (New York, 1960). Quaker involvement in politics receives attention in Isaac Sharpless, A Quaker Experiment in Government (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1898), and social history is covered in Frederick B. Tolles, Meeting House and Counting House, The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia 1682-1763 (Chapel Hill, 1948).

For studies of the German sects in the colonies the best sources are Lucy F. Bettinger, German Religious Life in Colonial Times (Philadelphia, 1906) and Julius F. Sachse, The German Sectarians of Pennsylvania 1708-1800 (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1899-1900). Gillan L. Gollan's Moravians in Two Worlds (New York, 1967) provides an excellent description of the thought and practice of this sect.

There are also a number of studies dealing with sects whose membership in the middle colonies was comparatively small. John T. Ellis's Catholics in Colonial America (Baltimore, 1965) is a good source

of information on this group. Albert H. Newman, A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States (New York, 1894) and William A. McLaughlin, Isaac Baccus and the American Pietistic Tradition cover Baptist history. Herbert Morais, Deism in Eighteenth Century America (New York, 1934) provides a convenient summary of the rise of this religious position, and Hyman B. Grenstein's The Rise of the Jewish Community in New York, 1654-1866 (Philadelphia, 1945) throws light on the often ignored history of tnis religious group. Finally, there is W.W. Sweet's Men of Zeal: The Romance of American Methodist Beginnings (New York, 1935).

Lawrence H. Leder's Liberty and Authority (Chicago, 1968) examines the growth of the concepts of toleration and separation of church and state for the colonies in general. This work provides the best overview for the development of these ideas. John W. Pratt's Religion, Politics, and Diversity (New York, 1967) covers the institutional aspects of church-state affairs in New York. It serves as a good complement to Leder's study.

Needless to say, many other monographs and articles contributed to this study. Since most of them dealt with specialized topics, however, they will be noted in the following chapter-by-chapter bibliographical essays.

Chapter I

The major source for information on the Keithian controversy is the large body of literature reproduced on microcard from the listings in Evans's Bibliography. There is one full length biography of Keith, Ethyn Williams Kirby, George Keith, 1638-1716 (New York, 1942). Though a bit laudatory, it is certainly adequate. There are a number of articles dealing with Keith's activities, Horace M. Lippincott, "The Keithian Separation," Bulletin of Friends Historical Association, XVI (1927), 49-58, Edgar Legare Pennington, "Keith the Quaker and Keith the Anglican," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church (1951), 346-362, C.S. Lewis, "George Keith, the Missionary," Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society XIII (1865), 38-45, and James A. Muller, "George Keith," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church XIV (1914), 94-106. All of these are valuable for narrative information but are weak in analysis. Keith's Journal is reprinted with valuable footnotes in Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XX (1951), pp. 372-382. Finally, Nelson R. Burr, The Anglican Church in New Jersey and Charles P. Keith, Chronicles of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1917) provide much background information.

Chapter II

The published collections of documents and correspondence, especially Corwin's Ecclesiastical Records, provide the bulk of the information for this chapter. John W. Pratt's, Religion Politics and Diversity, gives a good short summary of the Church-state question, as does Herbert L. Osgood in The American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century (3 vols., New York, 1924) and Carl Bridenbaugh in Mitre and Sceptre. Anglican activity can be followed in volume one of Morgan Dix, A History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York (4 vols., New York, 1898-1906). Presbyterian reaction to events are covered by Leonard J. Trinterud, The Forming of an American Tradition and C.W. Baird, "The Civil Status of the Presbyterians in the Province of New York," Magazine of American History, III (1879), 593-682. The political situation can best be followed in Lawrence H. Leder's Robert Livingston and the Politics of Colonial New York (Chapel Hill, 1961). Milton Rubincom's "The Formative Years of Lord Cornbury, the First Royal Governor of New York and New Jersey," New York Genealogical and Biographical Record, LXXXI (1940), 106-116, is of great value in tracing the origins of Cornbury's character. Charles W. Spencer's "The Cornbury Legend," New York State Historical Association Proceedings, XIII (1914),

309-320 is a good analysis of Cornbury's career in America. Biographies of Francis Makemie tend to be extremely laudatory in tone. I. Marshall Page's The Life Story of Francis Makemie (Grand Rapids, 1938) is the most complete. Makemie's A Narrative of a New and Unusual American Imprisonment gives the best account of his trial. It is reprinted in Peter Force, ed., Tracts, IV (#4).

Chapter III

This chapter is based almost entirely on the literature listed in Evans's Bibliography, and on the colonial newspapers, especially the Pennsylvania Gazette. Corwin's Ecclesiastical Records and Labaree and Bell's Papers of Benjamin Franklin have much information on the various church-state controversies. Merton A. Christensen's "Franklin on the Hemphill Trial: Deism Versus Presbyterian Orthodoxy," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd. ser., X (1953), 422-440 gives a complete analysis of the Hemphill controversy.

Chapter IV

The description of revivalist and anti-revivalist ideas is based largely on the published writings of the ministers themselves, which are listed in Evans's

Bibliography. The discussion of church-state relations is based on material in the published collections of sources. Biographies of revivalist ministers and reprints of some of their writings can be found in A. Alexander, Biographical Sketches of the Founder and Principle Alumni of the Log College (Princeton, 1845). The only study of the Awakening in the middle colonies is C.H. Maxson's The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies (Chicago,1920). It is a good narrative of events. Presbyterian involvement in the Awakening can be followed in Trinterud's The Forming of an American Tradition, and Quaker involvement in Frederic Tolles, "Quietism Versus Enthusiasm: The Philadelphia Quakers and the Great Awakening," The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, LXIX (1945), 26-49. The best analysis of the revivalist and anti-revivalist mind is Alan Heimert's exhaustive and insightful Religion and the American Mind (Cambridge, 1966).

Chapter V

The controversial literature relating to Kings College is reprinted on microcard's from the Evans's listing. The New York newspapers were also filled with articles on Kings College. Milton Klein's edition of

William Livingston's series, The Independent Reflector (Cambridge, 1963) provides a convenient and well annotated version of this central group of articles. Beverly McAnear's, "American Imprints Concerning Kings College," The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, XLIV (1950), gives an excellent survey of all this literature. The best discussion of the Kings College controversy appears in Milton M. Klein, "The American Whig: William Livingston of New York" (unpublished dissertation, Columbia University, 1954), 275-384. Carl Bridenbaugh's Mitre and Sceptre also covers the issue but in much less detail than Klein. Dorothy R. Dillan's The New York Triumverate (New York, 1949) deals with the careers of Livingston, Scott and Smith but emphasizes their later activities. Dutch response to the controversy can be followed in Nelson R. Burr, "The Episcopal Churchmand the Dutch in Colonial New York and New Jersey 1664-1754," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XIX (1950), 90-109, and Presbyterian response in Trinterud's The Forming of an American Tradition. Many of the documents relating to the college and a wealth of private correspondence concerning it are conveniently reprinted in Corwin's Ecclesiastical Records.

Chapter VI

The controversy between Quakers and non-Quakers over the morality of war receives excellent summary from Edwin B. Bronner in "The Quakers and Non-Violence in Pennsylvania," Pennsylvania History, XXXV (1968), 1-23, and from Guy F. Hershberger, "The Pennsylvania Experiment in Politics, 1682-1756," Mennonite Quarterly Review, X (1936), 187-221. R.L. Davidson's War Comes to Quaker Pennsylvania 1682-1756 (New York, 1957) provides a more detailed account. Background information is supplied by Frederick B. Tolles, Meeting House and Counting House, and Isaac Sharpless, A Quaker Experiment in Government. The response of non-Quakers to the Great War for Empire can be followed in the literature listed in Evans's Bibliography and in the New York and Pennsylvania newspapers. For the religious aspects of the Revolution the following works are central: Bernard Bailyn, The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution (Cambridge, 1967), H. Trevor Colbourn, The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution (Chapel Hill, 1965), Bridenbaugh's Mitre and Sceptre, Religion and the American Mind, Edmund Morgan, "The Puritan Ethic and the American Revolution," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd. ser., XXIV (January, 1967), 3-34, and Perry Miller, "From the Covenant to the Revival," in James Ward Smith and H. Leland Jamison, eds., The Shaping of American Religion (Princeton, 1961), 323-368.

Vita

Edward James Cody, the son of Howard Cody and Elizabeth (Casey) Cody was born in Jersey City, New Jersey on September 28, 1943. He attended St. Paul's Grammar School in Jersey City and Marist High School in Bayonne, New Jersey.

He received his undergraduate training at St. Peter's College, Jersey City, New Jersey, graduating magna cum laude with a Bachelor of Science degree in History in 1965. He obtained a Master of Arts degree from Lehigh University in 1967. During his period of residence at Lehigh he served for two years as a teaching assistant. From 1967 to 1970 he was honored as the recipient of an Alumni Fund Fellowship.

He has been a member of the history faculty at Muhlenberg College and Moravian College. Presently he is a member of the history faculty at Albright College, Reading, Pennsylvania.