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I. CAUSES OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

At the close of a Chapter entitled "Contest for New York City," C. H. Van Tyne in his American Revolution makes the statement: "So prominent was this religious phase of the struggle that men of limited understanding asserted that the Revolution was a religious war, but they saw only that phase in which they were interested." Certainly no-one would think now of characterizing the revolution as a religious war: yet we know that the various denominations did play an important part, both as factors in the causes of the break with England, and as actual participants in the revolution. In no state, probably, was this true to a greater extent than in New York, where Anglican, Presbyterian, and Dutch Reformed churches were of similar strength, and bitterly pitted against one another. However, before discussing in detail the relation between religion and politics in this state, it is well to mention briefly the relation between the colonies and the mother-country, and in another chapter to say something about the social and economic conditions in New York at the time of the revolution.

The causes of the American revolution have been discussed according to various plans; as, remote and immediate, general and particular; I shall discuss them briefly as economic, political, and religious. This does not insinuate that a sharp line can be drawn between the items of such classification, for economic and political causes are bound in some instances to overlap, just as political and religious will often merge into one and the same. It is only in the large that this system can be followed, and it is in

1-Van Tyne, American Revolution, p. 114.
this general manner that I intend to use the classification.

Economically, the colonies were considered a source of revenue for the mother-country. England still governed her trading policy according to the Mercantile theory, and she looked upon her colonies not as a part of herself, but rather in the capacity of dependencies. This condition of affairs applied to all the colonies in general; but over certain particular ones, New York included, there was additional economic pressure, for they belonged, nominally at least, to the king, who was sometimes, as in the case of Charles the Second, a poor man, desirous of obtaining funds without the necessity of calling Parliament. In order to carry out the policies of the government, such measures as the Navigation Act of 1660, the Molasses Act of 1733, the Sugar Act of 1764 (which was in substance a renewal of the earlier Molasses Act), and the Stamp Act of 1765 were passed. Later there came the obnoxious Townshend Acts of 1767 which resulted in the Boston Tea Party and the subsequent Boston Port Bill, passed on the very eve of the revolution. While several of the Acts were later annulled, and the disadvantages of others were lessened considerably by the extensive amount of smuggling which was practiced by the colonists,

2-See Chapter II.
3-MacDonald, Select Charters, 1606-1775, p. 110.
4-MacDonald, Select Charters, 1606-1775, p. 248.
   Howard, Preliminaries of the Revolution, p. 59.
5-Ibid., p. 104.
   MacDonald, Select Charters, 1606-1775, p. 281.
6-Howard, Preliminaries, Chapter VII, "The sugar act and the menace of a stamp tax were before the country at the same time; but it is very significant that the first movement in America was against the sugar act." p.109.
7-Ibid., Chapter 10.
yet the very existence of maternal control was felt to be humiliating and degrading. This was an instance of the interplay of economic with political causes. Originally, America had been colonized in the main by undesirable subjects: criminals, debtors, dissenters, radicals of all sorts came to this country, voluntarily or otherwise, leaving in England the substantial, conservative classes. In their new homes in a far distant land entirely lacking in traditions of every sort but abounding in dangers from savages and starvation, these exiles developed a sturdy independence which resented any attempt at interference or, worse still, at coercion, on the part of the mother-country. Not that the colonists had before 1775 any desire for independence; on the contrary, their own analysis of their grievances in the decade preceding the revolution was that they were not receiving the benefits and privileges to which, as British subjects they were by constitution entitled. After the Peace of Paris in 1763 the colonists were no longer concerned with defending themselves from the French, nor were they dependent upon England for protection from their troublesome neighbors; consequently they had more time to consider political grievances, and it is in this period that the immediate

8-MacDonald, Select Charters, 1606-1775, p. 337. The Boston Port Act was passed March 31, 1774, and the Declarations and Resolves of the first Continental Congress were dated October 14, 1774.
9-Van Tyne, American Revolution, Chapter 10.
10-Channing, History of the United States, III, pp. 31, 32.
preliminaries of the struggle may be said to have begun. Meanwhile England was developing her imperialistic theory at the expense of her colonies; and perhaps most serious of all as a source of other difficulties, her ministry was composed of men who were either incapable of understanding the American colonies or who were indifferent to their protests. Such a situation produced men like James Otis, Thomas Paine, Patrick Henry, and Samuel Adams, whose eloquent pens and fiery orations formulated for the people their own vague opinions and stimulated them to action.

Finally, in considering the religious causes of the revolution, we find them closely connected with the political phase. New England had early been settled by Puritan dissenters, and at a later date the Catholics had found refuge from their persecutions in Lord Baltimore's Maryland Colony. During the reign of Charles the Second, immigration for religion's sake had been augmented by the passage of the "First Conventicle Act," prohibiting preaching by non-conforming clergy to groups exceeding in number one family and five guests; for the first two evidences of contempt of this law, the offender was to be imprisoned or fined; but if convicted the third time, "such offender shall be transported beyond the sea to any of His Majesty's foreign plantations (Virginia and New England only excepted) there to remain seven years. It

11-Channing, United States, III, Chapter 2.

England's policy of colonization was the exact opposite of Spain's, whereby only the strictly orthodox were allowed to assist in extending the boundaries of the Catholic domain.
was during the same reign that New York was taken from the Dutch, and the Carolinas were founded, hence it was to these colonies in particular that the dissenting clergy came. America was the panacea for various religious ills: Puritans, Quakers, Catholics, and other non-conformists came to her shores and built new homes in a strange country where every man could worship in peace, according to the dictates of his conscience. Naturally such immigrants had not the warmest attachment to the Mother who had thrust them from her doors.

Moreover, there was an element within the colonies themselves which helped to keep alive and active the characteristic Puritan tendency to pugnacity: this element was the Anglican Church and its missionary agent, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, or as it is more familiarly known, the S. P. G. This Society was chartered by the king in 1701, having for its purpose the spreading of the Gospel in the English colonies; its missionaries were volunteers, but only those were eligible who could present satisfactory evidence of their sound character, orthodoxy, and loyalty to the government; and having once entered upon their labors, they must endeavor to maintain a close relationship with the parent Church in England by sending a letter at least twice a year. In New York the Society was especially active, since here the Indians could be reached with little difficulty.

13-Pascoe, Two Hundred Years of S.P.G., pp. 4,5. An Account of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, p. 15.
14-Ibid., pp. 20-22.
Originally the Society seems to have chosen for its field of activity the care of spiritual matters, leaving temporal affairs to other hands. But to the Society, as to the organized Church, there came eventually the realization of the need of a Bishop in the colonies, especially for the ceremony of ordination; it was an expensive and tedious trip for every priest to go to England before he could be properly ordained to the rectorship; and with the attempt to establish an Episcopate in the colonies, trouble began. The average dissenter did not object at all to an Episcopate as a religious factor; but he did seriously object to it as a political instrument, for its organization was closely associated with the English system of government. It was from this same institution and its instrument, the Clarendon Code, designed by Stuart absolutism, that their fathers had fled; they feared too, that an Episcopate would mean the eventual establishment of Anglicanism as a state church, with compulsory tithes, et cetera. In 1728 the Bishop of London had been given jurisdiction in the American colonies, so it was to him that appeals for an Episcopate were made.

One appeal of particular interest because it contains a hint concerning the political benefits of the desired Episcopate, is that of the Reverend Bradbury Chandler, written from Elizabeth--

15-Cross, Anglican Episcopate, p. 36.
16-Ibid., p. 159.
18- Cross, Anglican Episcopate, Appendix A XIII, p. 345.
town, New Jersey, on October 21, 1767: "Having been prevailed upon to draw up, and publish, a pamphlet on the subject of an American Episcopate, I have taken the liberty to send your Lordship a copy of it, which is the occasion of my being troublesome at this time. The most I can say in favor of the performance is, that it expresses the opinion of the Clergy in most of the colonies, of the case of the American Church of England, and represents some of those reasons and facts, upon which their opinion is founded. There are some other facts and reasons, which could not be prudently mentioned in a work of this nature, as the least intimation of them would be of ill consequence in this irritable age and country: but were they known, they would have a far greater tendency to engage such of our superiors, if there be any such, as are governed altogether by political motives, to espouse the cause of the Church of England in America, than any contained in the pamphlet. But I must content myself with having proposed those only which can be mentioned safely, and leave the event to Divine Providence."

The pamphlet to which he referred was the "Appeal to the Public in behalf of the Church of England in America," which began the memorable "Chander-Chauncey Controversy," Charles Chauncey being the Presbyterian minister who answered Chander's arguments. Among other remarks, Chandler spoke of the lenient and kindly attitude of the Anglican Bishops toward non-Episcopalians. In

19-Cross, Anglican Episcopate, Chapter VII.
20-Chauncey, The Appeal to the Public Answered, in behalf of the Non-Episcopal Churches in America; wherein the Reasons for an American Episcopate are shown to be insufficient and the Objections against it in full Force.
answer to this statement, Chauncey wrote: "It is further said, to show there could be no reason for discontent, that 'the English Bishops have, for a long course of years, exercised their authority with so much mildness, tenderness and moderation, as scarcely to have afforded an instance of reasonable complaint, especially to Dissenters.' Their tenderness and moderation toward the Colonists, that are Non-Episcopalian, has not of late been remarkably visible, should this have been the case in regard to dissenters at home."

Another petition was an "Address of a Committee of the Clergy of the Church of England in New York and New Jersey" to the Colonial secretary, Lord Hillsborough; this petition said in part: "The members of the national Church are from Principle and Inclination, firmly attached to the Constitution. From them it must ever derive its surest support.......... Independence in religion will naturally produce Republicans in the State; and from their Principles, too prevalent already, the greatest Evils may justly be apprehended. The Church must inevitably decrease in the Colonies, if bishops are not sent to relieve its Necessities; and the Dissenters will in time gain an entire Ascendancy. How far it may be consistent with good Policy and the Safety of the State to permit this, we are willing that your Lordship should determine."

This appeal was made in October 1771, and "by order of the Clergy" was signed by Samuel Auchmuty, Thomas Bradbury Chandler, John

21-Chauncey, Appeal Answered, p. 187. In this connection he mentions the failure of the presbyterian Church to secure a charter. See below, Chapter IV.

22-Cross, Anglican Episcopate, 255, quoted from New Jersey Archives, X.
Ogilvie, and Charles Inglis; Dr. Myles Cooper, president of King's College, presented the appeal in person. "But observes Professor Cross, "the English officers of states if they considered this argument at all, saw the fallacy of it, saw that in the situation in which they were placed further to disregard the will of the majority of the colonists was not the way to hold them in submission. Unwise in other respects, they were wise in this." 24

In 1690, the instructions issued to Colonial Henry Stoughter, governor of New York, contained the following provisions. "We do further direct that no school master be henceforth permitted to come from England and to keep school within our Province of New York without the License of the said Bishop of London and that no other person now there, or that shall come from other parts be admitted to keep school without your license first had............... and you are to permit a liberty of conscience to all persons (except Papists) so they be contented with a quiet and peaceable enjoyment of it, not giving offence or scandall to the government." 25

Practically these same instructions were issued to each governor of New York from time to time as he began the administration of his new duties.

24-Ibid., p. 255.
25-The Roman Catholic Church was not established in New York city until 1783, and the first Church was occupied in 1786. Greenleaf, History of the Churches of New York City, pp. 333-334.
II. NEW YORK CITY AT THE TIME OF THE REVOLUTION

In the census reports for the year 1771, the total population of the province of New York was estimated at 148,124 whites and 19,883 blacks, or a total of 168,007 inhabitants; while that of the county and city of New York was 18,726 whites and 3,137 blacks, in all, 21,863 persons. Albany was a much larger city (having at this time 81,535 inhabitants) but New York was rapidly growing, a fact due largely to its excellent situation. It was the one principal harbor of the province, and was remarkable both for its beauty and for its economic importance. A traveller there in 1788 remarked; "Nothing is more magnificent than the situation of this town between two majestic rivers, the north and the east. The former separates it from New Jersey: it is so profound that ships of the line anchor in it. I have at this moment under my eyes, a French ship of twelve hundred tons, destined to the East India trade, which has come into it to refit...........Ships mount this commodious river as far as Albany, a town situated one hundred and seventy miles from New York."

The existence of the old fort must have added to the city a touch of the picturesque; there stood the ruins of the Governor's house, a magnificent building which had been destroyed by fire, December 29, 1773. Between the fort and the principal part of the city there was a bit of green grass, surrounded by an iron rail,

---

1-Documentary History of New York, I, p. 697.
2-Governor Tryon's Report, in Documentary History of New York I, p. 752.
3-Brissot, Travels, p. 152.
4-Adams, Work of John Adams, II, pp. 345-346 and Note.
and containing in its center a huge equestrian statute of George the Third, made of solid lead, gilded, and standing upon a pedestal of marble. Perhaps it was well for the city that its inhabitants were of Dutch descent, if the proverbial cleanliness of that nation may be considered the basis of New York's clean streets and neat yards and homes. "The streets of this town are vastly more regular and elegant than those in Boston," wrote John Adams, "and the houses are more grand as well as neat. They are almost all painted, brick buildings and all." Until 1762 the streets of the city were lighted by lanterns hung in the windows of private homes, but that year marked the introduction of public lamp-posts, maintained at the expense of the city.

Among the greater structures of the city was King's College, which had been begun in 1756. In the midst of a court, surrounded by a high fence, this stone building rose three stories high, containing within its walls a chapel, hall, library, museum, anatomical theater, and school for experimental philosophy. The students at the college, all of whom resided in this same building, were few in number, never exceeding more than forty at a time. On the eve of the Revolution, Dr. Cooper, an Anglican clergyman and staunch Tory, was the president of King's College, but he resigned in 1775. There was also a city hospital, a brick

5-Later destroyed by zealous patriots.
7-Wilson, Memorial History, II, p. 462.
8-Ibid., II, p. 449.
10-See Chapter 3.
building constructed in 1774 on the bank of the North River, "out of town and yet sufficiently near it," under the administration of the Quakers. The Quakers also had charge of the workhouse. Then there were the ever popular taverns: Province Arms, Queen's Head, King's Arms, De la Montanye's and Hampden Hall,—the latter two being favorite resorts of the Liberty boys.

In the matter of churches, nine denominations were holding regular services at the time of the Revolution: the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Dutch Reformed, Methodist, Moravian, Baptist, Quaker, French Church, and Jewish. Of these, the Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Dutch Reformed were the largest, each denomination having three separate edifices of its own. The "new Dutch church" built in the seventies, was one of the chief sources of community pride to New Yorkers, and of interest to strangers in the city. "It is the most elegant building in the city," wrote John Adams; "The pillars are smaller than Dr. Cooper's and the pews are all painted, but the building is not so handsome."

This was the day of luxurious living in New York. During the actual period of the revolution extravagances were slightly modified; yet it was but five years after peace was made that a traveller through the city made the comment: "If there is a town on the American continent where the English luxury displays its follies, it is New York. You will find here the English fashions.

12-Brisson, Travels, p. 162.
13-This administration was taken away from the Friends during the war, but was restored again in 1783. Brissot, Travels, p. 161.
14-Ibid., Travels, p. 162.
15-Wilson, Memorial History, p. 450.
In the dress of women, you will find the most brilliant silks, gauzes, hats, and borrowed hair.... The men have more simplicity in their dress; they disdain gew-gaws, but they take their revenge in the luxuries of the table. Luxury forms already in this town a class of men very dangerous in society—I mean bachelors. The expense of women causes matrimony to be feared by men."

Persons other than the French visitor commented upon the luxurious tables of New York families. The faithful diary-writer thus described a breakfast at which he was a guest: "A more elegant breakfast I never saw—rich plate, a very large silver coffee pot, a very large silver tea-pot, napkins of the very finest materials, toast, and bread, and butter in great perfection. After breakfast a plate of beautiful peaches, another of pears, and another of plums, and a musk-melon, were placed on the table."

Tea was almost as popular as in New England; fruit, vegetables, and especially fresh fish and oysters were found at meals.

Even at that early day, New York had an atmosphere of gaiety. Horse-racing was especially popular, and some of the coarser sports were indulged in, bull-baiting, bear-baiting, and cock-

16-Wilson, Memorial History, II, p. 448.
17-The editor of the George Clinton Public Papers mentions another congregation of Episcopalians which worshipped in a building in Horse and Cart Lane.
19-Brisso, Travels, p. 156.
20-Works of John Adams, II, p. 349. This breakfast took place at the home of Mr. Morin Scott who lived on the banks of the Hudson, three miles outside the city.
22-Ibid., p. 157.
fighting. A theater was opened in December of 1762, and seems to have been a popular place of amusement. There were also numerous side-shows advertising queer freaks of nature, wild animals, and tight-rope walkers. Dancing was, of course, a favorite winter pastime. The markets and coffee-houses were places for those to congregate who wished to read the papers and to talk politics.

But New York lacked something in the way of natural refinement and culture, a fact which surprised visitors who witnessed everywhere the evidences of wealth and prosperity. To the comment made in 1788 by Brissot de Warville, that "men of learning do not abound in this city," we may answer that the departure of the loyalists at the close of the war robbed the city of many refined, conservative individuals. But this answer cannot be made to John Adams, who wrote in 1774: "With all the opulence and splendor of this city, yet there is very little good breeding to be found. We have been treated with assiduous respect; but I have not seen one real gentleman, one well-bred man, since I came to town. At their entertainments there is no conversation that is agreeable; there is no modesty, no attention to one another. They talk very loud, very fast, and altogether. If they ask you a question, before you can utter three words of your

23-Wilson, Memorial History, II, pp. 456-461.
24-Ibid., II, p. 449.
26-Brissot, Travels, p. 163.
answer, they will break out upon you again, and talk away."

From Governor Tryon's report for 1774 we learn something of the economic situation in 1774. At that time about one-twelfth of the inhabitants of the province were clothed in the products of British manufactures, except linens which came from Ireland, and hats and shoes that were made in the province. The furniture used in the houses, especially that of the better sort, came from Great Britain, as did also most groceries (except sugar, coffee, and ginger from the West Indies), iron, firearms and ammunition, lead, tin, sheet copper, drugs, coals, sail-cloth, paints, et cetera. Such a list reveals in part the importance both to England and to the colonies themselves of the non-importation policy recommended by the Continental Congress. "When no particular stop is put on the trade with Great Britain," continued the report, "it is generally estimated here that the annual Imports amount on an average to 500,000 Pounds Sterling. The Annual Amount of the Exports to Great Britain on an Average, is 130,000 Pounds Sterling, exclusive of the Cost of Ships built here for the Merchants in England to the amount of 30,000 Pounds Sterling Annually." A difference of 370,000 Pounds Sterling in favor of the mother-country was, of course, quite in harmony with the Mercantile theory then included in the policies of Great Britain, such policies extending even to her colonies. One important reason why New York was so strongly loyalist was her commercial nature and her consequent need of England.
To John Adams we are indebted for a statement concerning the
government of the city: "The mayor and recorder are appointed by
the governor; the aldermen and common council are elected an-
nually by the people. The aldermen are the magistrates of the city,
and the only ones; they have no justices of the peace in the city;
so that the magistracy of the city are all the creatures of the
people. The city cannot tax itself; the constables, assessors,
etc. are chosen annually; they petitioned the assembly every year
to be empowered by law to assess the city for a certain sum. The
whole charge of the Province is annually between five and six
thousand pounds, York money." Mr. Cushing says the charge of the
Massachusetts is about twelve thousand, lawful money, which is
sixteen thousand, York currency. The support of Harvard College,
and of forts and garrisons and other things, makes the difference.

In the social, economic, and political life of New York,
aristocracy was an element to be reckoned with. Perhaps most pro-
minent among the select "old families" were the DeLanceys and
the Livingstons, after whom the conservative and liberal parties
were named. Other families of note were the Van Cortlandts, Van
Rensselaers, Joneses, Coldens, Morrises, Lispenards, Cuylers, De
Puysters, Waltons, Crugers. Raised in a Church where form and

29-Van Tyne, American Loyalists, p. 108. Additional reasons
for her loyalty, he points out, was the fact that she bordered on
Canada and was influenced by loyalty there; and that her one and
all - important sea-port would soon be captured by the British in
case of war, which, of course, did occur.

traditions were venerated and loyalty was a fundamental principle, closely united by blood and by commercial interests, with the upper classes in England, and to those conditions the added fact that aristocracy and conservatism are usually found hand in hand, it is not surprising that these families looked with disfavor upon a radical policy of republicanism. Yet all except the extreme Tories were in sympathy with a protest, even favored a mild application of force, in order to secure from the Mother-country an "American interpretation of the British Constitution." In 1773 the Tories were in control of the government of the Province. But the tea episode at Boston and the consequent passing of the Boston Port bill ushered in a critical moment in New York affairs. While many Tories believed that the violence of the Boston people should not be tolerated, and that only constitutional means should be used to secure their rights, yet they assumed to a limited degree a sympathetic attitude toward their Massachusetts neighbors. The Whigs of the city were so greatly incensed at the closing of the Boston port, that the more conservative forces feared for the peace and safety of the committee, should these radicals gain municipal control. Accordingly they appeared at the next city meeting and succeeded in electing a majority of

31-Works of John Adams, II, p. 347. "Mr. McDougall was talkative and appears to have a thorough knowledge of politics. The two great families in this Province upon whose notions all their politics turn, are the DeLanceys and Livingstons. There is virtue and abilities as well as fortune in the Livingston's and not much of either of the three in the DeLanceys' according to him."
Van Tyne, American Revolution, p. 88.
32-Flick, Loyalism in New York, p. 20, and note 5.
33-See Chapter III.
34-Flick, Loyalism in New York, p. 21.
their own party to the Committee of Fifty-one, into whose hands the problems of the day were placed. Later this Committee of Fifty-one was superseded by a Committee of Sixty, which helped to call the First Continental Congress in 1774. Thus by a strange irony of fate, it was the loyalists themselves who created the instrument which later brought about their own downfall.

Such, then, was New York on the eve of the Revolution: a small city, prosperous, aristocratic, luxury-loving, about to pass through the fire of internal strife. What part were the churches to play in this impending civil war?

III. THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND THE REVOLUTION

In the early days of the English occupation of New York, the Dutch opened their church to the congregation of the Establishment, and it seems that for a number of years services were held, with more or less irregularity, under this system. But as the English population grew in numbers and in opulence, the inadequacy of such an arrangement was felt, and on March 19, 1695, a petition was submitted to Benjamin Fletcher, Captain General and Governor-in-Chief of the Province of New York, by "Sundry Inhabitants of the City of New York, members of the Church of England," asking for the privilege of purchasing a small piece of land upon which to build a church, and for the right to receive all voluntary contributions to this cause. The petition was granted.

Two years later, on May 6, 1697, the "Managers of the Church of England in the City of New York" petitioned for a charter granting to the Church in New York the full privileges and immunities usually held by the Churches of the Establishment. The Church building had already been erected, but the application of the maintenance voted in the act of the Assembly of 1693 was asked for ministers' support. This petition, also, was granted, and Mr. William Vesey was ordained resident rector on Christmas Day. Trinity Church was formally opened the following March.

For thirty years, Trinity stood as first erected, but in

1-Ecclesiastical Records, VI, p. 4304.
2-On 1696; there seems to be uncertainty as to the year. See Documentary History of New York, III, p. 407.
3-Ibid., pp. 409-410.
4-Tiffany, Protestant Episcopal Church, p. 168.
1737 it was enlarged and remodelled, so that it became one of the
most imposing edifices in the province. The interior was beauti-
fully ornamented, the aisles paved with flatstone, and the seating
capacity was estimated at two thousand. But the real pride of
the congregation was the steeple of the church, which was one
hundred and seventy-five feet high,—a fact often mentioned with
a certain degree of satisfaction. Meanwhile there were disputes
within the Dutch Church over the question of whether or not their
services should still be carried on in the language of the mother-
country, and as a result, many of the younger members left the
Reformed church and became communicants of the Church of England.
By 1762 Trinity was proving inadequate to meet the demands of the
increasing congregation, and St. George's Chapel was built on
Beckman street. Finally, there was the more pretentious structure
of St. Paul's, finished, with the exception of its spire, in 1766.

Regarding St. Paul's, John Adams wrote in his diary: "This is a
new building, which cost eighteen thousand pounds, York money. It
has a piazza in front and some stone pillars, which appear grand;
but the building, taken altogether, does not strike me like the
Stone Chapel, or like Dr. Coopers' meeting-house, either on the
inside or outside." There were also Churches of the Establish-
ment at Albany, Rye and Westchester, Hempstead, and Jamica, and

5-George Clinton's Public Papers, I, p. 80.
6-Documentary History of New York, pp. 210-521.
7-George Clinton's Public Papers, I, p. 80.
8-Wilson, Memorial History of New York City, II, p. 448.
at Richmond; but political interests were centered most in those of New York city. When the war began, the Church of England communicants in the entire province composed about one fifteenth of the population,—an influential element in New York life. According to a Tory writer of the period, "To this Church the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, most of His Majesty's Council, many members of the General Assembly, all the officers of Government, with a numerous train of rich and affluent merchants, and landholders, belonged." Of the five delegates chosen from the Province to the Convention at Philadelphia in 1774, four were Church of England adherents. One reason why the Whigs were especially suspicious of the Episcopalians and ready to call them Tories, was the fact that so many of them were supported by the British government; such men, for instance, as judges, lawyers, collectors of port duties, et cetera. Besides the organized Church, there was also the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, whose missionaries had acquired considerable influence in New York. To this Society belonged the famous Samuel Seabury, whose activities will be discussed later.

Aside from prominent Clergymen in the Church and the principles for which they stood, what was the actual teaching of the

10-Tiffany, Protestant Episcopal Church, p. 189.
11-Ibid., p. 189.
12-Flick, Loyalism in New York, p. 10.
14-The delegates were Isaac Low, James Duane, John Jay, John, and Philip Livingston, the latter, only, being a non-Anglican. See Works of John Adams, II, p. 350. Also Jones, I, p. 35.
Church herself? Flick says, "The political science of Anglicanism was a fundamental principle in loyalism." Certain it is, that aside from politics, and considering only the religious elements, loyalty to the king of England as the earthly head of the Church was an essential teaching; in every service prayer was offered for His Majesty, the royal family and the government.

But the clearest reflection of the times is to be seen in the attitude of the Anglican clergy. On March 3, 1777, a letter was addressed by that body to Lord Viscount Howe of Ireland, and Honorable Sir William Howe, general of his Majesty's forces in America, extracts from which are as follows: "We take the liberty to assure your excellencies that We beheld the Rise and Progress of disorders which have plunged this Continent into its present calamitous State, with Grief and Disapprobation. Determined to hazard the Loss of Everything rather than violate our religious Principles, or deviate from that Allegiance We justly owed to his Majesty, not only as our rightful Soverign, but as Supreme Head on Earth of the Church of England, we endeavored to preserve a steady Conduct, and to adhere to that Line which was pointed out to us by our Conscience and which the Duties of our Functions required." The letter closes with a desire that "all Delusion may be removed from His subjects, and no longer frustrate His gracious Intentions to promote their Welfare."

When John Adams talked with Mr. Livingston before the meeting of the first Congress, he was told by that worthy old gentle-

16-Flick, Loyalism in New York, p. 9.
man that Dr. Cooper, Dr. Chandler, and other Episcopal clergymen had been employed night and day in writing letters and sending dispatches to the other colonies and to England, in an attempt to form a union with the Episcopal party on the continent in support of Ministerial measures. This statement has been challenged and refuted by later study; yet it shows something of the sentiment of the day. And after the meeting of the first Congress, there did appear a large number of loyalist pamphlets, sermons, et cetera, for part of which, at least, Anglican clergymen were responsible.

An interesting "battle of words" was conducted by ministers of both Tory and Whig persuasion who chose their texts to fit their political convictions. Thus, one favorite scripture verse of the Anglicans was from the thirteenth Chapter of Romans, the first two verses: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist that receive to themselves damnation."

In Evington's Gazette for March 16, 1775, an unsigned article appeared, addressed to the inhabitants of the State of New York: "Beloved countrymen, let us read, hear, and endeavor rightly to understand the subsequent passages and unjunctions of the most Holy Bible.......Read, heard rightly, fully understood, and with

---

20-Becker, New York Parties, p. 158.
exact punctuality obeyed, they may, for aught any mortal knows to the reverse, by a divine benediction operate powerfully, and contribute much to the restoration of that union and harmony between Great Britain and her American Colonies, so essentially requisite to promote the prosperity, welfare, and felicity of the whole English Empire; and therefore so ardently wished and longed for by all good Protestant, loyal subjects to our very gracious Sovereign. The texts then referred to are: "Thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people." "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of men for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the King as supreme, or unto Governours, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well." "The fear of the King is as the roaring of a lion; whose provoketh him to anger, sinneth against his soul, be just, be free."

While in several states the Anglican clergy were in sympathy with, and even aided the American cause, in New York there was consistent and almost universal loyalty to the mother-country. "I am happy," wrote Mr. Auchmuty in 1775, "that the Clergy............ have conducted themselves so prudently and successfully, and hope that the Church, for the labour of her sons, will not be forgotten. Dr. Seabury congratulated the Society upon the fact that the New York Missionaries had conducted themselves "with great propriety.

---
24—Exodus, XXII, 28.
25—Proverbs XX, 2.
26—This was particularly true in Virginia.
and, on many occasions, with a firmness and steadiness that have done them honor," in contrast to the Philadelphia clergy whose conduct had been "the very reverse. It is possible that both of these loyal subjects had forgotten Dr. Provoost who was such an ardent whig that he had found it expedient to retire from the city in 1770.

Perhaps the most ardent and influential of the clergy were Dr. Cooper, Dr. Auchmuty, Dr. Charles Inglis, and Dr. Samuel Seabury. Dr. Cooper was president of Kings College and was so pronounced in his loyalism that he soon found it necessary to resign his position and withdraw from the country. There is a story to the effect that in August, 1775, plans were being made to seize the doctor and subject him to the most severe punishment for his preachings against the Americans and their cries for liberty; but the plot was discovered by a student who succeeded in warning Dr. Cooper so that he escaped by night to a British ship lying in the harbor. Whether or not the details of the case are correct, it is true that he did go in one of the King's ships to England and that he never returned to America.

Dr. Auchmuty was the rector of Trinity Church and the general

28-Beardsley, Life and Correspondence of Samuel Seabury, p. 49
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Beardsley, Life and Correspondence of Samuel Seabury.
head of Anglicanism in New York during the early days of the revolu-
tion. His health was not of the best so during the exciting
spring of 1775 he went with his family to New Brunswick, New Jersey
shortly after the burning of New York in the autumn he returned,
and his death occurred on March 3, 1777,—hastened, perhaps, by
the loss of his Church.

During the illness and absence of Dr. Auchmuty, the reverend
Charles Inglis, who was the eldest assistant rector at Trinity,
took charge of Church affairs, "a situation," he says, "truly
difficult and trying in such times; especially as the other
assistants were young and inexperienced, though very loyal, and
otherwise worthy young men," and at the death of the rector, he
became his successor. The new rector was already hated by the
Whigs; for besides possessing a stubborn, dogmatic disposition,
the narrowness of which is apparent in all his writings, he had
offended the Americans upon two different occasions: he had
written and published an answer to Thomas Paine's pamphlet "Com-
mon Sense" and at the time of the British occupation of New York,
he had drawn up a petition to the King, praying for pardon for the

He had been appointed catechist to the negroes, and assistant
rector of Trinity in 1747, and upon the death of Dr. Barclay in
1764 he was made rector in charge of the parish.
32-Ibid., III, p. 1055.
33-Letter of Chas. Inglis, Oct. 31, 1776, in Documentary
34-Tiffany, Protestant Episcopal Church, p. 187. Inglis was
inducted into office by Governor Tyron by placing his hands on
the crumbling walls of the Church which had been destroyed by fire.
35-Ibid., p. 187.
temporary submission of His Majesty's subjects to the rebel forces. He had also been reported by the Committee of Safety in December, 1776, as "a dangerous and insidious enemy to the liberties of the United States," and "strongly disposed to adhere to their enemies."

Not the least important of these representative clergymen was Dr. Samuel Seabury, rector of St. Peter's Church at Westchester, a prominent figure among those who put forth every effort to maintain the control of the mother-country over her colonies. He, with Dr. Cooper and the Reverend Charles Inglis had passively supported Congress, looking to it for a permanent reconciliation with Great Britain, until the Suffolk resolutions were passed; from that moment, Congress had no more bitter enemies than these same clergymen.

Motives, in this question of loyalty to the king, as in most cases, are exceedingly difficult to determine. Doubtless personal and selfish interests influenced to a certain degree many of the loyalists, including the Anglican clergy; but there is no doubt that the clergy were subjected to real persecution at the hands of the enthusiastic Whigs whose activities they attempted to check and to counteract. A local paper for October 21, 1776 contains an item to the effect that "The subscription for the Clergy of the Church of England in America, who have suffered by the Rebellion, amounted to above six thousand pounds Sterling, when the last accounts came away." Probably a portion

36-Letter of Chas. Inglis in Documentary History of New York, III, p. 1061.
of this fund, at least, was expended in New York.

From the earliest days of disturbance until the difficulties were closed with the formal peace of 1783, Dr. Samuel Seabury was known in New York affairs. In the early spring of 1770 he wrote to the Society for the Propogation of the Gospel that party strife was running high at his home, but that he had faith in the stability of his people, and that reasonable people were already quite weary of the clamour for liberty; also that "the behavior of the Church people, considered as a body, has been such as has done her honor."

His active pen began to participate in New York politics in 1774. On November sixteenth of that date, his first pamphlet appeared, with the long title characteristic of the times: "Free thoughts on the Proceedings of the Continental Congress held at Philadelphia, September fifth, 1774: wherein their errors are exhibited, their reasonings confuted, and the fatal tendency of their non-importation, non-exportation, and non-consumption measures are laid open to the plainest understandings, and the only means pointed out for preserving and securing our present happy Constitution." The author of the pamphlet assumes the role of a

---
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Westchester farmer, signing himself thus, and adopting the rustic phrases and jests peculiar to a sturdy yeoman, saying that he chooses to address himself to the farmers of the province of New York, because he is more nearly connected with them, and also "because the interest of the farmers in general will be more sensibly affected and more deeply injured by these agreements than the interest of any other body of people on the continent .......... From the day that the exports from this province are stopped, the farmers may date the commencement of their ruin. Can you live without money?..........and unless you sell your produce, how are you to get money?" Then referring again to Congress and its usurpation of power, "Will you be instrumental in bringing the most abject slavery upon yourselves? Will you choose such committees? Will you submit to them should they be chosen by the weak, foolish, turbulent part of the country people? Do as you please; but by Him that made me, I will not! No, if I must be enslaved, let it be by a King at least, and not by a parcel of upstart, lawless committeemen. If I must be devoured, let me be devoured by the jaws of a lion, and not gnawed to death by rats and vermin!" By mathematical computation, the Farmer shows that "in order to pay this monstrous duty on tea, which has raised all this confounded combustion in the country, I have only to sell the produce of a bushel of flax-seed once in thirty-three years. Ridiculous!" Then followed an outline of the proper conduct for all true Americans: they were to renounce congresses, ignore com-

43-Non-importation, non-exportation, and non-consumption measures recommended by Congress.
mittees, and prevent their election whenever possible, and for the future to rely upon their constitutional representatives in the assembly. From the first appearance of the article, Dr. Seabury was suspected of being its author; and it is scarcely remarkable that he became immediately the object of much Whig persecution.

Less than two weeks after the appearance of the "Free Thoughts" pamphlet, a companion article was published; this second protest was "The Congress Canvassed; or, an examination into the Conduct of the delegates at their Grand Convention, held in Philadelphia, September first, 1774." The general tone of the article was similar to that used in "Free Thoughts," but this one was addressed to the merchants of New York, and its object was to point out to that class of individuals, the hardships which they would have to undergo, should Congress succeed in carrying out its proposed program.

The county of Westchester, where Dr. Seabury resided, was the scene of many bitter meetings of both Whigs and Tories, and numerous resolutions and protests were adopted by each party, beginning with the Westchester Resolutions drawn up by loyalists at White Plains on August twentieth, 1774. It is quite likely that Seabury's influence was not lacking in these controversies, although

44-Free Thoughts, p. 4.
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his name did not actually appear until the time of the protest of April 13, 1775, when it stood third of some three hundred and fifteen names, to the following: "We, the subscribers, freeholders and inhabitants of the White Plains, in consequence of certain advertisements, do now declare, that we met here to declare our humblest abhorrence of all unlawful Congresses and committees, and that we are determined, at the hazard of our lives and properties, to support the King and Constitution; and that we acknowledge no Representatives but the General Assembly, to whose wisdom and integrity we submit the guardianship of our rights, liberties, and privileges."

On May 30, 1775, the Reverend Seabury wrote to the Society for the propagation of the Gospel: "We are here in a very alarming situation. Dr. Cooper and Dr. Chandler have been obliged to quit this community, and sailed for England last week. I have been obliged to retire a few days from the threatened vengeance of the New England people who lately broke into this province. But I hope I shall be able to keep my station. The charge against the clergy is a very extraordinary one,—that they have in conjunction with the Society and the British Ministry, laid a plan for enslaving America."

The summer of 1775 was a critical one. As the idea of a real separation from the mother-country took form and grew, animosities between Whigs and Tories increased, and petty annoyances gave way._

50-See above, note, 30.
51-Beardsley, Samuel Seabury, p. 33.
to serious indignities and real hardships. In the latter part of November, armed horsemen under Captain Lothrop's command, seized the Reverend Seabury at the Grammar school which he conducted in Westchester, and carried him to New Haven, Connecticut where he was confined in the house of Mrs. Lyman. The charges brought against the prisoner were: that he had been implicated in a plot to seize Captain Sears in Westchester and to convey him on board a man o'war; that he had signed a protest at White Plains against the proceedings of Continental Congress; that he did not open his church on the day of the Continental Fast; and that he had written pamphlets and newspapers against the liberties of America. To the first and last of these charges, the prisoner pleaded "not guilty;" for the other two, he offered excuses: But meanwhile he was detained at New Haven until his letter of December twentieth to the General Assembly of Connecticut had been received, and the president of the Provincial Congress demanded of the governor of Connecticut his immediate discharge. A few legal difficulties remained, but Seabury was allowed to return to his home on January second. For several weeks he was closely watched, but was found to be very cautious. When Congress issued the July edict of "death to any person giving aid, support, or comfort to the king or his servants," Seabury with many other Anglican clergy closed his Church, because he could no longer pray for George the Third.

With the British defeat of the American troops at New York, Dr. Seabury escaped from Westchester to the lines of the King's

52-Van Tyne, American Revolution, Chapter, IV, especially pp. 50-57.
army where he acted as chaplain to the royal troops, and furnished information concerning roads and the country about Westchester. Here he remained until peace was declared. Then he went to England, and later to Scotland, where he was consecrated Bishop of Connecticut, the first protestant bishop who ever held office in the United States.

Turning then to the journal and correspondence of Charles Inglis, we find a strongly loyalist account of conditions, which offers, nevertheless, an interesting comment, and one which really conveys, despite its prejudices, more or less accurate information. According to his story, the loyal clergy had much difficulties in carrying on their services for more than a year before the Declaration of Independence was adopted. Even when they confined themselves to sermons dealing with doctrinal questions, not touching on politics, the wrath of the "flaming patriots" descended upon their heads, on the principle that "those who were not for them were against them."

In April, 1776, Washington and his forces marched into New York and took charge of the city, disarming the loyalists and even banishing those upon whom suspicion fell strongest. "It should be observed," Inglis adds, with characteristic bitterness, "that members of the Church of England were the only sufferers on this occasion. The members of the Dutch Church are very numerous here, and many of them joined in opposing the rebellion; yet no notice

54-Beardsley, Samuel Seabury, p. 48. After his escape from Westchester, his house was robbed of food, the Church converted into a hospital, and the school destroyed.
was taken of them, nor the least injury done to them." Soon after his arrival in New York, Washington attended Church. Previous to the service, a rebel general called at the rector's house and requested him to omit the "violent prayers" for the king and his family. To this request Inglis paid no attention, and upon meeting the same general a few days after, he asked him about the strange message; thereupon the general awkwardly apologized for his action. Upon another occasion while Inglis was officiating in the service, one hundred armed rebels marched into the Church, with drums beating and fifes playing. They were invited into the pews and accepted the invitation, sitting quietly through the remainder of the service, displaying no violence even when prayers were said for the king, much to the surprise and relief of the other worshippers.

Because of the critical state which political affairs had reached, Congress ordered that Friday, May seventeenth, should be observed throughout the country as a day of public fasting, prayer, and humiliation. All the Churches of New York province except two, obeyed the order, though "submission to an authority that was so far usurped was exceedingly grating and disagreeable... It was exceedingly difficult for a loyal clergyman to preach upon such an occasion, and not insure danger on the one hand, or depart
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from his duty on the other," Inglis continued; "I endeavored to avoid both by making peace and repentance my subject, and explicitly disclaimed having anything to do with politics."

After the Declaration of Independence was signed, the clergy of the Anglican Church no longer dared to continue their duties, for to officiate publicly and not pray for the king according to liturgy was contrary to the oath which they as Churchmen had taken; while to pray for the enemy of the country as personified in the person of George the Third, would certainly be considered a treasonable act. Consequently Anglican Churches throughout the province were closed, except those of New York city and of Long Island, which were under the protection of the king's forces.

Upon the subject of the principles involved in the revolution, Charles Inglis had decided opinions. He considered the rebellion one of the "most causeless, unprovoked, and unnatural that ever disgraced any country," and declared that few men, even of the laity, who were respectable or men of property had joined in the rebellion. One of the principal causes of the rebellion, according to this chronicler, was an attempt to abolish the Church of England though in order to accomplish this result it was necessary.

61-Possibly one of these two was the Church at Westchester; but Dr. Seabury says that he did not conduct services on that day because he had received no official notice (Beardsley, Seabury, p. 39) while Dr. Inglis says that here the "clergyman thought they might without danger omit services."


63-Ibid., p. 1053.

Journal of Chas. Inglis, Canadian Archives, 1912, p. 217.

to appeal to the people by throwing out the bait of civil liberty. Yet the rebels were failing to accomplish their real purpose: "Upon the whole the Church of England has lost none of its members by the rebellion as yet--; I mean, whose departure from it can be deemed a loss; on the contrary, its own members are more firmly attached to it than ever. And were the more sober and rational among dissenters--for they are not all equally violent and frantic look with reverence and esteem on the part which Church people here have acted."

To his credit be it said that Dr. Inglis was consistently loyal throughout the days of the revolution as late as January 30, 1780, he preached in St. George's and St. Paul's chapels a sermon on "The Duty of Honoring the King."—that date being the anniversary of the martyrdom of Charles I. When the British evacuated New York in 1783 he was numbered among the refugees who
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Inglis was not the only one who considered the Church of England a paramount factor in the revolution. When the great fire occurred in New York in September twenty-eighth, and Trinity Church the Rector's house, the Charity school and two hundred houses on Church property were destroyed, Governor Tryon wrote to Lord George Germain: "It really seems the conflagration has been directed against the interest of the Church." Ecclesiastical Records, VI, p. 4291. Also, New York Colonial Documents, VIII, p. 686.
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fled to England. In 1787 he returned to Novia Scotia where he became the first colonial bishop for the Church of England in America. In this capacity he served until his death in 1816.

After the resignation of Dr. Inglis on November 1, 1783, but before the evacuation of New York by the British, the vestrymen, most of whom were loyalists since the Whigs had been obliged to leave New York during its occupation by royal forces, proceeded to elect the Reverend Benjamin Moore to the rectory of Trinity. But in April of the following year an act was passed by the legislature to bring the character of the parish into conformity with the State constitution, and the vestry appointed by this act disregarded the election of Mr. Moore, placing the Reverend Samuel Provoost in his place,—an action which was sustained by the government.
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IV. THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AND THE REVOLUTION

It is somewhat difficult to determine just how and when Presbyterianism became established in New York city, chiefly because at various times ministers appeared, preached, and went their way again, without actually mentioning Presbyterianism as such, although there is little doubt that they belonged to that denomination. A Puritan minister, Francis Doughty, who had immigrated to Taunton, Massachusetts, having been silenced at Gloucester, England, for non-conformity, became so deeply involved in difficulties with the New England church because he expressed a belief in infant baptism, that he went in 1642 to New York and attempted to found a Presbyterian colony near Newton, Long Island. But Indian raids forced him to seek shelter on Manhattan Island, where he became the first Presbyterian minister in New York, serving there from 1643 to 1648. There was, however, no permanent nor solid organization of a church, for the minister was supported by contributions from the Puritans and Dutch.

The stormy aspect of Presbyterian life in New York which continued until the revolution, may be said to have begun in January 1707, with the visit of Francis Makemie and his friend John Hampton. These two men had been sent out by the London Union of Presbyterian and Independent ministers to pursue their labors in

2-Sometimes spelled "M'Kenie."
Maryland; but having occasion while en route to New England to spend a few days in New York Makemie asked permission to preach in the Dutch church in that city. The governor of the Province, the memorably infamous Lord Cornbury, refused the petition; but at the urgent request of numerous individuals, Makemie did preach at the home of William Jackson on Pearl street. On the following Wednesday Makemie was arrested and taken before Lord Cornbury at Fort Anne, where he was charged with being a "strolling preacher" without a license, spreading pernicious doctrines, and preaching in a private house. At the governor's orders he was imprisoned until the fourth of June, when his case was tried before the grand jury, who returned a verdict of "not guilty." The experience had cost Makemie over four month's time, and eighty-three pounds in money.

For nearly ten years after this episode, the Presbyterians in New York made no effort to open a church, but managed to keep together and to hold services occasionally in private homes. In 1716, taking advantage of a temporary disagreement between the Anglican clergy and the governor, the dissenters organized themselves into a church, and extended a call to the Reverend James Anderson of Delaware, who became pastor of the first Presbyterian church in New York city. Immediately plans were laid for erecting a church building, but until 1719 the congregation met in the city hall, moving that year into their new edifice on Wall street near Broad-


4-Gillet, I, pp. 31-38.
way, -- "a modest building of rough stone." In 1756 there was dis-
sension in the church over the question of the psalmody, and part
of its members withdrew, erected a church in Grand street, and
called themselves Scotch Presbyterians. A third church was the
"Brick meeting-house" on the corner of Beekman and Nassau streets
which was an overflow edifice under the same administration with
the original Wall street church. These, then, were the three Pres-
byterian churches in New York city at the time of the revolution.

Referring to this denomination in 1752, Jones, the Tory his-
torian, wrote: "The Presbyterians were next in consequence; the
congregation in general consisted of people of the middle rank, but
at the same time there belonged to it some rich, wealthy, sensible
men; among these were William Smith, Esquire, a gentleman of the
law, Peter Van Burgh Livingston, Esquire, brother to the lord of
the manor by that name, and Mr. David Van Horne." In this same
year the Whig club was established by William Livingston, William
Smith, and John Morin Scott, three lawyers, graduates from Yale
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and had always been at New Haven since he entered from the

first grade. He was known to be a good student and to have

never been absent from school. He was also popular with his

classmates and was often chosen as a leader in school activities.

The teacher's assistant, Mrs. Smith, had noticed that he was

always the first to raise his hand and answer questions. She had

also noticed that he was often one of the quietest students in

class, rarely speaking unless spoken to directly. However, when

asked to write a report, he would always produce a well-written

piece, often with more detail and analysis than the others.

Mr. Johnson, the principal, had observed that he was often

chosen as the class representative to speak to the faculty,

and that his reports were always well-received. He was also

considered to be one of the top students in the school, often

 scoring perfect scores on tests and exams.

When asked why he had decided to transfer to a different school,

the student explained that he was feeling restless and wanted

a change of environment. He also mentioned that he was

interested in studying abroad and wanted to experience a new

country. The principal, however, was surprised and concerned

about the decision, as he was considered one of the top students

in the school and had always been known for his dedication.

The student's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Johnson, were also

surprised by the decision, but they supported their son's

interest in studying abroad. They were confident that he

would find a new school that would suit him better and

continue his academic success.
College, who were Presbyterians by profession and republicans in principle." These men were largely responsible for the "Independent Reflector" and the "Watch Tower," political papers calculated to "pull down Church and State, and to raise their own government and religion upon its ruins, or to throw the whole province into anarchy and confusion."

These comments were from an Anglican whose entire work pronounces him radical and narrow-minded; nevertheless, they indicate the well-developed and constantly growing antagonism between the High Church and dissenters. In 1767 the Presbyterians petitioned the fourth time for a charter from the English government, and were again refused the request, largely it seems through the efforts of the Bishop of London, who persuaded the king that to grant the petition would be a breach of his coronation oath. Another evidence of animosity between the two religious bodies may be found in the comments made upon the results of a united church election in 1769: "Our election in New York city is ended and the Church is triumphant, in spite of all the efforts of the Presbyterians. The Churchmen regard it as a complete victory: it is a lasting monument of the power of the mercantile interest. The Presbyterians think they have, as a religious body, everything to dread from the growing power of the Church."

Perhaps the best example of the extreme bitterness with which the Presbyterians were regarded by the loyalists, is to be
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found in a letter of May 31, 1774, from a gentleman in New York to his correspondent in London: "You will have discovered that I am no friend to Presbyterians, that I fix all the blame of these extraordinary American proceedings upon them. You would, perhaps, think it proper to ask, whether no Church of England proper were among them? Yes, there were, to their eternal shame be it spoken! But in general they were interested in the motion, either as smugglers of tea, or as being overburdened with dry goods they know not how to pay for, and would therefore have been glad to have a non-importation agreement, or a resolution to pay no debts to England. But, sir, these are few in number. Believe me the Presbyterians have been the chief and principle instruments in all those flaming measures, and they always do and ever will act against government, from that restless and turbulent anti-monarchial spirit which has always distinguished them everywhere, whenever they had, or by any means could assume power, however illegally. . . . . . . It is an indubitable fact that previous to, and during all these acts of violence committed in the Colonies, especially to the eastward, the Presbyterian pulpits groaned with the most wicked, malicious and inflammatory harangues, pronounced by the favored orators amongst that sect, spiriting their Godly hearers to the most violent opposition to Government. . . . . . . .But in general, the Church of England people during all this time, without any public oratory to spur them, did, from principle, from their own truly loyal principles, in which care is taken to indicate them, everything they could by writing and argument and their influence, to
stop the rapid progress of sedition, which would have gone much further lengths if it had not been for them."

In some instances, the Presbyterian factions seemed anxious to separate the religious and political issues; as, for example, a certain Mr. Warren who wrote to the printers of the Boston Gazette requesting his countrymen to avoid any actions aimed against the Episcopalians in the free exercise of their religion, "to which we know they have the most undoubted claim; and which, from a real regard to the honor and interest of my country, and the rights of mankind, I hope they will enjoy as long as the name of America is known to the world." But unfortunately, the liberal minded Mr. Warren was not representative of the majority. Just as the Anglicans closely associated the terms "Presbyterian" and "Whig", so, in most cases, did the Presbyterians look upon the Anglicans as Tories, the chief source of their woes.

Yet the Anglican condemnation of the Presbyterians as "antimonarchical" was not entirely a just sentence,—at least not before 1776. Many of the Presbyterian leaders drew a distinction between the ministry and the crown, condemning the former as tyrannical, while still maintaining allegiance to the latter. For instance, in a pastoral letter of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, May 20, 1775, two particular instructions are given: devotion to the king, and the maintenance of a firm union. On the other hand,

14—American Archives, 4th Series, I, p. 300, and note. The author's name is not given.
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quoted are: "But the mid-wives feared God, and did not as the king commanded them......Therefore God dealt well with the midwives and the people multiplied, and waxed very mighty." "The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over man must be just, ruling in the fear of God." Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and that write grievances which they have prescribed." "He shall judge the poor of the people, he shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressor."

When it was finally decided that the union with Great Britain was no longer compatible with the liberties of the colonies, Presbyterianism took its stand with the cause of freedom. The only clergyman in the Continental Congress of 1776 was John Witherspoon, a Presbyterian president of the college in New Jersey; his vote was cast for the Declaration of Independence. After that time it was a recognized fact that the Presbyterian church under the leadership of its ministers stood almost united for the cause of American liberty. In October, 1776, Charles Inglis, rector of Trinity Church in New York, wrote: "I have it from good authority that the Presbyterian ministers, at a synod where most of them in the middle colonies were collected, passed a resolve to support the Continental Congress in all their measures. This and this only can account for the uniformity of their conduct; for I
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This letter may be found in American Archives, 4th Series, II, p. 349.
do not know one of them nor have I been able after strict inquiry, to hear of any, who did not, by preaching and every effort in their power, promote all the measures of the congress, however extravagant."

The Presbyterian church buildings of New York suffered the same fate during the revolution as did many of those in other cities and villages; that is, they were confiscated for military uses. Wall street church was converted into barracks for King George's men, while the "Brick Church" on the outskirts of the city was used for hospital purposes. In both churches the pews and other furnishings were carried out, and the buildings were so badly used that much cleaning and repairing was necessary to render them fit for religious services after the war. It is interesting to note that during this period of repair, the vestry of Trinity Church opened St. George's and St. Paul's Chapels to the Presbyterian congregation for religious services until their own buildings should again be fit for use. The congregations, too, were scattered; the Reverend Joseph Treat left the city and never returned, while the Reverend John Rodgers was forced to flee for his life. He then became chaplain of Heath's brigade, and later an influential member of the Convention of the State and of the council of safety, returning to the city in 1783 where he re-
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mained pastor of the church on Wall street until his death in 1811.

The Presbyterian church in New York city seems, then, to have adhered consistently to the cause of freedom in the colonies. Their attitude is well expressed in a pastoral letter issued by the synod of New York and Philadelphia in 1783: "We cannot help congratulating you on the general and almost universal attachment of the Presbyterian body to the cause of liberty and the rights of mankind. . . . The Synod . . . . . request you to render thanks to Almighty God, for all his mercies, spiritual and temporal, and in a particular manner for establishing the Independence of the United States of America."
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V. OTHER CHURCHES AND THE REVOLUTION

As one would naturally expect when he considers the circumstances of the origin of the fort which later became New York city, it was the Dutch Reformed Church which preceded in point of time all other denominations. In 1626, before regular services were held, Sebastian Crol and Jean Hynck performed the duties of "Krankenbesorchken" or comforters; this meant that they read the Scriptures and creeds on Sundays, and administered spiritual solace to the sick. The same year Francois Molemaecker built a mill, and finished a room above it for worship, which served until a church was erected. Regular services began in the colony with the advent of the Reverend Jonas Michaelius, in 1628. "We have established the form of a church," he wrote to the Reverend Adrianus Smoutius in August of that year; we have had at the first administration of the Lord's Supper full fifty communicants." A permanent stone structure was erected in 1642, in a corner of the fort; this building remained in use until its destruction by fire in 1741. The growing congregation necessitated the building of another church in 1693, which was afterwards known as the "South Church." The "Middle" church on Nassau street, opened in 1729 as an overflow from South church, was remodelled in 1764; here it was that Dr. Franklin performed various experiments with electricity. On May 25, 1769, "North Dutch Church" was formally opened, this latter being the most imposing structure of its kind, and a source of
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pride to the city. These were the three Dutch Reformed Churches in New York city at the time of the revolution, all three being closely connected in activities and in government. It is difficult to estimate the number of members belonging to the three churches at that time, but Jones stated that the denomination ranked next to the Anglican church for its "riches, its influence, and from the number of its wealthy, opulent, and reputable citizens."

There seems to be a greater difference of opinion concerning the sympathies of the Dutch church in the revolutionary war than there is in the case of any other denomination. For instance, one writer of religious history reached the conclusion that the Dutch Reformed church was, generally speaking, on the patriotic side (meaning the American side) and that this fact was recognized in the conduct of hostilities. Corwin, the special student of that denomination, made a statement even more pronounced: "During the mighty struggle the Reformed Dutch church was in hearty sympathy with the cause of freedom. Her pulpits rang with stirring appeals which roused the patriotic ardor and inspired the martial courage of the people." On the other hand, precisely the opposite view
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was revealed by a letter of Lieutenant-Governor Colden's to the Earl of Hillsburrough, February 21, 1770; referring to certain outbreaks in New York against government, he wrote: "The friends of the administration are the Church of England, the Lutherans, and the old Dutch congregation, with several Presbyterians." To this he added the less charitable comment that "from this, the reason will appear of some bills having passed the House of Assembly in favor of the Dissenters, and in prejudice to the few ministers of the Church of England, who have stipends by a Law of this Province."

At a general meeting of the ministers and elders of the Reformed Dutch Church of New York in April, 1775, the following recommendation was adopted: "This body taking to heart the present sad and perilous condition of our land, and considering that our multiplied, aggravated, long continued and un lamented aims, have afforded reason to God to give up our land to the most deplorable calamities, judge, that its inhabitants are in the clearest manner called to repentance and conversion, and they thus recommend to all the Reformed churches of their communion in the two Provinces of New York and New Jersey, to set apart Wednesday, seventh May next, as a day of solemn humiliation, with fasting and prayer, for the forgiveness of sins and averting of deserved miseries." But upon this statement one must place his own individual interpretation, for apparently there is no means of determining from the
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document itself whether "the most deplorable calamities" referred to British or to American policies. At a similar meeting of the same body in October, 1778, there was again great lamenting at the deplorable conditions of the country, and November twelfth was named as a day of "humiliation and prayer."

Much more indicative of the policy of the church was a letter from the general meeting of New York and New Jersey by means of the Reverend John Leyat and the Reverend Reynier Van Nest, to the Classis of Amsterdam, October 8, 1778: "In view of the manifest, and to all rational and conscientious people, most clearly evident justice of the course, all our brethren, with the exception of only three, so far as we know, as also those of the Presbyterian churches, with perhaps very few exceptions, have felt no hesitancy in choosing the side of Congress. And herein we are from time to time increasingly strengthened and confirmed, among other things, by the unrighteous acts and unheard of cruelties committed by the English army everywhere.......above all, the malicious and God-provoking destruction of our churches, both in New York and in the country." Charles Inlgis also refers to certain members of the Dutch Church as having taken part in the rebellion.

Whether or not the Dutch church may be said to have been really loyal to England, it is certain that there was little antagonism between their members and the Anglicans; indeed their attitude toward one another was exceedingly friendly. On the records of

13-Ecclesiastical Records, VI, p. 4302.
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Trinity church one finds an entry for October 29, 1779, as follows: "It being represented to this corporation by one of its members that the Old Dutch Church in this city is at present used as a hospital for His Majesty's troops: the Board impressed with a grateful remembrance of the former kindness of the members of that ancient church in permitting the rise of their church to the members of the Church of England, when they had no proper edifice of their own for that purpose, offer to the members of the Ancient Dutch Church the use of St. George's Chapel for the celebrating their worship on Sundays and such other times as they shall choose to perform Divine service. They hope from nine to eleven o'clock in the morning, and from one to three in the afternoon will be convenient to the members of the Dutch Church." The Reverend Charles Inglis declared to the Society that the members of the Dutch church had always lived in perfect harmony with those of the Anglican Church. By April 1, 1780 the sick and wounded had been removed from the "Old" or "Middle" church, and the congregation returned to its own home; in a letter of appreciation to the vestry of Trinity for their hospitality, the Reverend Garret Lydekker, the loyalist minister who had been preaching to the people, spoke of their congregation as those "who have always considered the interests of the two churches as inseparable," and expressed the hope that "this instance of brotherly love will evince to posterity the cordial and happy union subsisting between us."
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John H. Livingston, the famous minister in the Dutch Reformed Church in New York city, may not have entertained unfriendly feelings toward the Anglican church, but certainly he was strenuously opposed to the establishment of an American Episcopate. Since he must have been representative of a large class of people within the church, it seems worth while to quote from his letter to the Reverend Dr. Eilardus Waterloo, on October 22, 1763: "The Revolution in our political interests has made a change in the general face of our American world, and as it has removed some difficulties...... so it has introduced others which deserve a very weighty and impartial discussion. The common enemy to our religious liberties is now removed; and we have nothing to fear from the pride and domination of the Episcopal hierarchy."

Of the Lutheran denomination in New York during the revolution little is known. The church was established in the latter half of the seventeenth century, and a small stone building was erected for their services in 1702. This church was destroyed in the great fire of September, 1776, and was not re-built. In 1751 another Lutheran congregation was formed, which in 1767 built an attractive stone church known as the "Swamp Church." No particular action seems to have been taken by this sect in New York regarding the revolution; but of the denomination in general, Wolf says: "Many of
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the old German settlers, who had on their arrival taken the oath of allegiance to the British crown, conscientiously entertained the opinion that they ought not to act contrary to their sworn promise, while the majority of their brethren in the faith adopted without hesitation the new order of things, and cheerfully defended the cause of liberty and independence with their blood and treasure. 23

The Moravian, or United Brethren, church was also small and not vitally concerned in revolutionary affairs. It was organized in 1728 by a small colony under the leadership of Count Zinzindorf, founder of the Moravian church in Germany, en route to Pennsylvania, and in 1751 a small frame church was built. Here the Reverend 24 Gustavus Shewkirk was pastor in 1775; during the revolution, services were suspended and the congregation was scattered, but at the close of the war they again occupied the little wooden church. Although some of the "Brethren" were in sympathy with the American cause, they were for the most part conservative or neutral.

While the activities of the Quakers were extensive in some localities, particularly in Philadelphia, there seems to be little record of their proceedings in New York. An epistle of 1779 from the yearly meeting in London to the quarterly and monthly meetings in Great Britain, Ireland, and elsewhere, states: "The sufferings of our brethren in America have been great in many places, especially in Pennsylvania, the Jerseys, Long Island, and Nantucket.

23-Wolf, p. 290.
24-Greenleaf, p. 277.
25-Corwin, p. 472.
26-Yearly Meetings Epistles, II, p. 38.
These sufferings have principally arisen from that confusion and distress which are inseparable from war, from the laws enacted for promoting military services, and from acts enforcing declarations of allegiance to those in power." The Quakers had mildly favored non-importation and non-exportation measures, but beyond this they dared not go; under no circumstances could they be expected to join the military forces of either side. Their attitude may safely be characterized as neutral.

The Baptist church was new and small at the time of the revolution, having been reorganized and actually established in 1762, after a struggling existence of more than forty years. During the revolution, the church building was used by the British for stabling their horses, and the congregation itself was badly scattered, only thirty-seven of its original two hundred members remaining after the war. The Reverend John Gano, who is described as an excellent young man "of rare gifts and grace," served as a chaplain to American forces throughout the entire war, returning to the city and re-opening the church in September, 1784.

There were two other churches of Christian denominations in New York city at the time of the Revolution, the Methodist and the French church, Du St. Esprit. The former was the first Methodist church established in America, and the year of its founding was 1766. The French church was founded by immigrants after the re-

28-Greenleaf, p. 286.
30-Greenleaf, p. 227.
31-Ibid., p. 281.
vocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, the church being built in 1704. Neither of these two churches took any active part in the events of the revolution.

Finally, there was in New York city, a small band of Jewish people who, like their Hebrew brethren in other parts of America, were staunch patriots. When Brazil was lost by the Dutch in 1654, the Jewish community at Recife was also scattered, and twenty-seven of its men, women and children were brought to New York, in a condition of such poverty that their few remaining goods were sold by the shipmaster to pay their passage. Peter Stuyvesant, governor of the colony, protested to the Dutch West India company, asking that these unchristian persons be removed from their midst, but the request was unheeded, and the Jews were given limited protection in civil and political rights, though not in religion. They might hold services in their houses but could neither build nor rent a place for that purpose. Because of the refusal of various members of the Dutch guard to associate with them, they were exempt from military service, but were required to pay a tax for such exemption. Under James, Duke of York, more toleration was granted to the Jews, who then built a temporary Synagogue in 1695, the first in America; in 1728 a larger, stone structure was erected on Mill street, and the congregation assumed the name "Shearith Israel," meaning "Remnant of Israel." In general, their condition seems to have been much better in New York than in the other colonies, and
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certainly it was much better than in most of the European countries. They were few in numbers, but rather influential, especially among the merchant classes. Many of them left the city before the coming of the British, but most of those who remained seem to have been united, at least in sympathy, with the American forces. Rabbi Gershom Mendes Seixas, who had been the spiritual head of the community since 1766, was early known to have espoused the cause of the colonies, and when the British occupied New York, he considered it his patriotic duty to close the doors of the synagogue.

Among the Jews of New York who made themselves specially valuable to the American army, were Isaac Franks, and Hayne Salomon. Isaac Franks was seventeen years old when the revolution broke out, and immediately he enlisted in Colonel Lesher's regiment of New York volunteers, serving with that regiment in the battle of Long Island. He was taken prisoner on September fifteenth, but escaped three months later, and was placed in the quarter-master's department. He was appointed by Congress, ensign in the seventh Massachusetts Regiment, in February, 1781.

Hayne Salomon was born in Poland, travelled rather widely through Europe, and finally settled in New York. Soon after the British occupation of New York, he was arrested as an American spy; when it was found that he spoke fluently in the German, French, Italian, Polish, and Russian languages, he was placed in the commissariat department. Here he is credited with having helped numer-
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ous American and French prisoners to escape. In August 1778 he himself escaped from New York to Philadelphia. Being a wealthy financier and good business manager, he was closely associated with Robert Morris, and loaned money to James Madison and James Wilson. An inventory of his estate showed more than three hundred and fifty thousand dollars loaned to the government.

At the close of the revolution, Shearith Israel congregation presented to Governor Clinton an address of congratulation upon the outcome of the war.
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VI. CONCLUSION

What part, then, did the churches of New York city play in the revolution? Obviously, the two factions concerned in the strife were represented by the Anglican and Presbyterian churches; the very nature of their respective governmental organizations, the fundamental principles upon which their doctrines were built, the circumstances under which the two denominations were established in America,—all these things were determining factors in the action taken by these two New York churches. It would be exceedingly uncritical, and indeed, untrue to suggest that the members of the churches "rose as one man" to defend the principles for which they, as religious bodies, stood; nevertheless their attitudes were generally consistent, the majority of Anglicans remaining loyal to the mother-country, while their Presbyterian neighbors were the acknowledged leaders of the American movement. In each case, the clergy served as a stimulus to partisanship, and as exponents of the principles which their congregations maintained.

To summarize briefly, with the Tory forces were the Anglicans, a portion of the Dutch Reformed, and a few Quakers; with the Whigs were the Presbyterians, the Baptists, another portion of the Dutch Reformed, and the Jews; while outside the sphere of active participation, standing conservatively on neutral ground, were most of the Quakers, the Lutherans, the Moravians, the Methodists, and the French church. Such, then, was the relation between religion and politics in New York city during the American revolution.
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