To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Ronald William Howard entitled "Education and Ethnicity in Colonial New York, 1664-1763: A Study in the Transmission of Culture in Early America." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in History.

Milton M. Klein, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

EDUCATION AND ETHNICITY IN COLONIAL NEW YORK, 1664-1763: A STUDY IN THE TRANSMISSION OF CULTURE IN EARLY AMERICA

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Ronald William Howard

August 1978

1289933

© Copyright by Ronald William Howard 1978
All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

For Kathy

ABSTRACT

This is a study of education and ethnicity in colonial New York from 1664 to 1763. Cultural pluralism was part of the Dutch legacy to English New York, and it remained the most salient characteristic of life in the province throughout the colonial era. The imperial connection with Britain gradually Anglicized the public life of the province, but ethnic distinctions remained pronounced, carefully propagated by people who were always on guard against cultural aggression of any kind. The part that education played in this cultural maelstrom was crucial.

Amidst the medley of nationalities and religions, education necessarily performed a dual function in colonial New York. On the one hand, the educational process responded to the conservative impulse among New Yorkers of different national backgrounds and religious confessions to preserve and perpetuate their own respective ethnic identities. But on the other hand, the educational process also responded to cultural, economic, and political forces that facilitated social interaction and integration despite ethnic differences. Caught between the cultural past and cultural future, the family was the primary educator, being especially potent because there were no laws requiring schooling and no established church in New York. In fact, whether offered within the family circle or the larger community, education in colonial New York remained a local and personal matter, regulated only broadly by the provincial government, but ultimately the responsibility of particular towns and especially the family itself.

Taking place within a context of increasing Anglicization, the educational history of colonial New York is largely the story of the cultural adjustments among ethnic and religious groups. The present study is designed to elucidate that complex process. Chapter I is a historiographical essay on early American education in general and education in colonial New York in particular. Arranged chronologically, the next three chapters are concerned with the development of an educational pattern which was thoroughly centered on the family. Chapter II looks at education in New Netherland, especially the efforts of Peter Stuyvesant and the Dutch Reformed clergy for social control and religious conformity. Chapter III discusses the impact of the transition to English rule upon the pattern of education New York inherited from New Netherland. While Chapter IV examines three different plans by English officials to Anglicize the diverse peoples of New York between 1690 and 1710, Chapter V explains the educational expression of the cultural accommodation that emerged following the failure of cultural coercion during Governor Cornbury's tenure.

Following a thematic approach, Chapters VI, VII, and VIII are concerned with the educational response to certain integrating forces at work in eighteenth-century New York. Chapter VI is on occupational training, the rise of the private schools, and the educational results of the growing cultural self-consciousness of New Yorkers. Chapter VII explores the relationship between education and religious rivalry, especially during the revivals of the Great Awakening and later the King's College controversy. Projecting the analysis into the

decade before the American Revolution, Chapter VIII considers the relationship between ethnic politics and education.

The educational process did much to foster a dualistic identity among New Yorkers. By the time of the American Revolution, although many New Yorkers were beginning to think of themselves in terms of provincial interests, ethnicity remained strong because the family dominated the educational process almost completely. Recognizing the threat to cultural accommodation, New Yorkers were reluctant to choose sides as the War for Independence began. They had been educated to preserve and advance the interests of their respective families, and in the revolutionary crisis, parochial concerns tended to determine the actions of many New Yorkers, making them loyalists or patriots according to the immediate threat to their way of life.

PREFACE

The writing of American educational history has undergone remarkable revision in recent years. The decade of the 1960s began with Bernard Bailyn's seminal essay on Education in the Forming of American Society and concluded with Lawrence A. Cremin's magisterial study of American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783. Calling for the reconsideration of the role of education in early America, Bailyn challenged historians to look beyond the school and investigate other educational institutions like the family, apprenticeship, the church, and newspapers, to mention the most prominent. Cremin took Bailyn's counsel, refined the latter's definition of education as the conscious and deliberate transmission of culture across the generations, and delineated with consummate skill the transit of English culture across the Atlantic and its adaptation to the American wilds.[1]

Judged by almost any objective criterion, Cremin's monograph is a remarkable synthesis of early American cultural history. Going far beyond Bailyn's suggestions, Cremin was concerned not only with the basic mechanics of the educational process but also with the interrelationships of the different educational institutions and especially the substance of the traditions, values, and skills transmitted. But like all truly path-breaking scholarship, Cremin's

---

[1]Bernard Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1960); Lawrence A. Cremin, American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783 (New York, 1970).

work raised as many questions as it answered. Surveying the American colonies in their entirety, Cremin, although referring to data drawn from virtually every province throughout the colonial period, was looking for broad cultural patterns, and he found them. Rightly concerned with the dominant English culture, he wrote at a level of generality which precluded particular consideration of the many ethnic and religious groups which made up the colonial population.

Unlike many scholars who have portrayed American colonial history almost exclusively in terms of Virginia planters and New England Puritans, Cremin recognized the limitations of his perspective with regard to education among the heterogeneous people of the Middle Colonies. Given the focus of his work, Cremin explained education among ethnic and religious minorities primarily in terms of their gradual Anglicization. Looking at the same Middle Colonies almost three centuries ago, Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, that Frenchman who settled in Orange County, New York, following the French and Indian War, depicted a much more thorough process of cultural transformation. Crevecoeur described the British colonials he knew as "a mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch, Germans, and Swedes. From this promiscuous breed," he exulted, "that race now called Americans have arisen."[2]

Despite Crevecoeur's description and the obvious diversity of the British North American colonies, scholars have shown much

---

[2]J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, Letters from an American Farmer (1782; reprint ed., New York, 1908), 51.

more concern with the finished American product than the motley European material from which this new genus of humanity was made. In fact, that evolution from old world refugee to new world yeoman is still popularly regarded as an almost mystical metamorphosis, much too sacrosanct to be comprehended by mere mundane intelligence. The complexity of the process has only strengthened the popular mystique. However, as Edward Eggleston noted in 1900, the making of the American was fundamentally an educational enterprise. Education was the medium through which the English and Europeans adjusted to the American present and prepared for the future.[3] Thanks in large part to the work of Bailyn and Cremin, historians have lately become keenly aware of how pervasive the educational process is, and thanks to the popular rediscovery of ethnicity in American life, scholars who today study the role of education in early America must take into account the cultural diversity of the colonies.

How did the different ethnic and religious groups in the American colonies transmit their traditions from generation to generation? What does the educational process tell us about the cultural adjustments that took place as different ethnic and religious groups reacted to each other and to the American landscape? These are just two of the questions that historians must keep in mind as they fill in the particular details of Cremin's excellent general analysis. A

---

[3]Edward Eggleston, The Transit of Civilization from England to America in the Seventeenth Century (New York, 1900).

few scholars have taken steps in that direction.[4] The present work is an effort to continue that forward progress on a journey which should ultimately lead to a much deeper understanding of acculturation in early America. Although all the Middle Colonies were known for their heterogeneity, New York was the least English of the motley lot. That mixture of peoples makes an examination of education in colonial New York especially instructive regarding the process by which different ethnic and religious groups interacted culturally, propagated their respective traditions, and responded to Anglicizing influences. This study will not supply the last word on whether New Yorkers by 1763 were thoroughly transformed Americans or merely Anglicized Europeans, but it should provide some insight into just how New Yorkers became what they were on the eve of the American Revolution.

Following a discussion of educational historiography, Chapter I briefly summarizes the succeeding chapters. But at the risk of being redundant, I should like to explain at the outset the scope of this study and the nature of the primary sources upon which it is based. It is about the interaction of education and ethnicity. It is especially concerned with episodes when education became the subject of public controversy, for at such critical junctures, the educational process in pluralistic New York may best be observed and understood. A balance has been sought between explaining how educational institutions worked and analyzing the substance of

---

[4]Jerry W. Frost, "As the Twig is Bent: Quaker Ideas of Childhood," Quaker History, LX (Autumn 1971), 67-87; James Axtell, The City upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England (New Haven, 1974).

the culture transmitted. Although the focus is on the years from 1664 to 1763, a chapter on Dutch New Netherland has been included because the educational pattern which later sustained New York's pluralistic society first emerged in the Dutch colony. In the final chapter on education and ethnic politics, the analysis is carried forward beyond 1763 because education and ethnicity had much to do with the way New Yorkers responded to the Revolutionary crisis.

The primary sources for this dissertation were many and varied. Searching for information on child-rearing techniques and educational attitudes in manuscript collections of family papers has been very much like looking for that proverbial lost needle in a rather large haystack. But if the yield from the manuscript materials was thin, what has been gleaned confirmed conclusions based on data from other sources, and the search itself was rewarding because it shed valuable light upon family life in colonial New York. Much more direct information on education was obtained from public documents of a personal nature. Among the vast number of printed documents on colonial New York, apprenticeship indentures, wills, and court records were especially fruitful sources. Also instructive were the newspapers of the period, many of whose essays dealt specifically with education. An extremely valuable source were the thousands of letters contained in the Letter Books of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts available since 1964 on microfilm by Microfilm Methods, London. The missionaries were stationed throughout most of the province, and their letters are filled with information on education and ethnicity in colonial New York.

Whatever positive contribution this study may make to historical scholarship is due largely to the wise and humane gentlemen who have so generously served as my doctoral committee. I owe the most to my friend and mentor, Dr. Milton M. Klein. Dr. Klein suggested the topic, lifted my flagging spirits when the research seemed overwhelming, and provided patient and constructive criticism throughout the ordeal of researching and writing. His rare abilities as both teacher and scholar have constantly inspired and challenged me. My work has also profited considerably from the scholarly scrutiny of Dr. Bruce Wheeler, whose wit and wisdom have been deeply appreciated. For several years now, Dr. Clinton Allison has given me the benefit of his extensive knowledge of educational history, and though he may not agree with the way this study turned out, whatever conceptual consistency it has is due in no small measure to his thoughtful consideration. I would also like to thank Dr. LeRoy Graf, whose support and encouragement during my graduate career have been unceasing, and Dr. Charles Jackson, under whose tutelage I first encountered American cultural history, for reading the manuscript and making helpful suggestions. The Bernadotte Schmitt History Graduate Research Fund paid part of the expenses I incurred in research journeys to New York, and my work was sustained in large part by two University of Tennessee Graduate Fellowships which allowed me to do extensive research and rewriting. I am deeply grateful for all of this scholarly and financial support which is largely responsible for whatever merit this study has. I alone am responsible for the mistakes in judgment and fact that remain.

Numerous other individuals and institutions assisted me in my research. Among these were the manuscript librarians at the New-York Historical Society, New York Public Library, and the New York State Library. Most helpful of all were the librarians and staff of the James D. Hoskins Library at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, especially Ms. Danuta Nitecki in Interlibrary Services and Mr. Paul Trentham in Circulation. Since coming to Mississippi College, I have been similarly assisted by Mr. J. B. Howell, Mrs. Ada Sumrall, and Mrs. Mary Jo Cocroft of the Leland Speed Library. I should also like to thank Dr. Edward McMillan, Vice President for Graduate Affairs, and Dr. Charles Martin, Vice President for Academic Affairs, at Mississippi College for reducing my teaching load so that I could have more time for writing. Ms. Taubbie Capps, Mr. Hoyt Canady, and Mr. Ted Baehr deserve special thanks for helping me when I was away from the Knoxville campus.

Finally I want to express my appreciation to two very special women, my mother and my wife. My mother, Helen Hickman Howard, introduced me to the joy of learning as a child and never wavered in her encouragement later on when the going got rough. My wife, Kathleen Krulac Howard, not only provided moral and emotional support but also assisted with the research and typed the final draft. Without Kathy's help, this dissertation could not have been written.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

VOLUME I

I. THE HISTORIANS AND EDUCATION IN COLONIAL NEW YORK 1

II. THE NEW NETHERLAND WAY IN EDUCATION: SHAPING AN EARLY AMERICAN SOCIETY 55

III. THE TRANSITION TO ENGLISH RULE: RELIGION, EDUCATION, AND THE PERPETUATION OF ETHNIC IDENTITY 128

IV. TO BRING FORTH UNITY OUT OF DIVERSITY: ATTEMPTS AT ANGLICIZATION THROUGH EDUCATION IN NEW YORK, 1690-1708 . 211

V. TO BRING FORTH UNITY OUT OF DIVERSITY: ATTEMPTS AT ANGLICIZATION THROUGH EDUCATION IN NEW YORK, 1708-1719 . 270

VOLUME II

VI. PARENTAGE AND PLACE: EDUCATION FOR LABOR AND LIFE IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY NEW YORK 323

VII. PARSONS AND PEDAGOGUES: THE GREAT AWAKENING AND EDUCATION IN NEW YORK 415

VIII. CONCLUSION: CULTURAL PLURALISM AND ETHNIC POLITICS IN COLONIAL NEW YORK 480

BIBLIOGRAPHY 523

APPENDIX 549

VITA 551

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORIANS AND EDUCATION IN COLONIAL NEW YORK

The Department of Superintendence of the National Educational Association began its annual midwinter meeting in Philadelphia on February 24, 1891. The molders and shapers of the expanding public school systems in the United States were there, including Andrew S. Draper, Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of New York and current President of the Department of Superintendence. During the first session, another prominent public school administrator, George H. Martin, Agent for the Massachusetts Board of Education, delivered a paper on "Compulsory Education in Massachusetts" which infuriated Superintendent Draper and led to the first major controversy in the historiography of early American education.[1]

Beginning with the famous Massachusetts law of 1642 requiring that children be raised "to learning and labor," Martin identified six steps in the evolution of public schooling in America and concluded that "Massachusetts took each of these in advance of the other States--a little in advance of her sister States in New

---

[1]The two most prominent scholars of the historiography of early American education refer to the "famous Martin-Draper controversy," but the dispute itself has not been studied in any detail. See Bernard Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1960), 11, 55-56; Lawrence A. Cremin, The Wonderful World of Ellwood Patterson Cubberly: An Essay on the Historiography of American Education (New York, 1965), 59.

England, far in advance of all the others."[2] Draper believed that Martin had deliberately slighted the contributions of New York to public education, but he decided to do some research before taking the Massachusetts Agent to task. The next year, in an article published in the Educational Review, Draper accused Martin of propagating traditional myths as historic truths and set forth his own conviction that the basic principles of free schooling were transferred directly to America from Holland by the Dutch of New Netherland and that New York rather than Massachusetts had subsequently led the way in the evolution of modern public schooling. "The people of this great State must know," Draper concluded, "and must have just pride in the wise and heroic leadership of the fathers, that it may be an incentive for the present and an inspiration in the future."[3]

---

[2]George H. Martin, "Compulsory Education in Massachusetts," in National Education Association, Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, 1891 (Washington, D. C., 1891), 403-12. Born in Lynn, Massachusetts, in 1841, Martin taught school before becoming a school administrator. He was an agent for the Massachusetts Board of Education, 1882-1892; supervisor of schools for Boston, 1892-1904; secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, 1904-1909; treasurer of the same, 1909-1911. He was a member and served as president of the Lynn (Mass.) Historical Society. Among his publications are The English Language (1880); Civil Government (1875); and Hints on Teaching Civics (1895). He died in 1917. See Who's Who in America: A Biographical Dictionary of Notable Living Men and Women of the United States, XIX, 1394; Who Was Who in America: A Companion Volume to Who's Who in America, 4 vols. (Chicago, 1897-1942), I, 783.

[3]Andrew S. Draper, Public School Pioneering in New York and Massachusetts (1892; reprint ed., Rathaway, N. J., 1948), 313-16, 336. Born in Westford, New York, in 1848, Draper taught school while studying law. Admitted to the bar in 1871, he practiced law in Albany until 1887. A Republican, he served on the Albany Board of Education from 1879 to 1881. Elected to the State Assembly

Battle was joined, and for the next year Draper and Martin waged verbal warfare through the pages of the Educational Review, arguing whether Puritan New England or Dutch New Netherland had first instituted public schooling in America. Playing a significant part in shaping the historiography of early American education in general, the Martin-Draper controversy particularly influenced the way in which the history of education in colonial New York has been written. In challenging Martin and the tradition of New England leadership in public education, Superintendent Draper had to organize the scattered data on schooling in colonial New York into an interpretive framework. What Draper said defined the issues and set the pattern for the next generation of educational historians who studied colonial New York. He and his successors were narrowly focused and viewed the history of education almost exclusively in terms of schooling. Even so, despite their distorting emphasis on the school, once the assumptions that guided them are viewed in the light of recent criticism, the information they assembled may be seen in its historical context; and when that is done, another interpretation of education in colonial New York will begin to

---

in 1881, he was selected by his Republican colleagues in 1886 as a state superintendent of instruction. Draper was removed from that position by a Democratic legislature in 1892. He then served for two years as superintendent of schools in Cleveland, Ohio. He next became president of the University of Illinois. Draper returned to New York in 1904 as the newly appointed Commissioner of Education. He wrote extensively on education, Abraham Lincoln, and current affairs. See James Sullivan, "Andrew Sloan Draper," Dictionary of American Biography, ed. Allen Johnson, et al., 20 vols. and 4 suppl. (New York, 1928-1941), V, 434-35 (hereafter cited as DAB).

emerge, an interpretation having much to do with the cultural pluralism of the colony and little to do with the public schools of the state.

I

Fifteen years ago, Bernard Bailyn, in launching what has since become a major scholarly debate, eloquently condemned the historiography of American education because of its traditional preoccupation with formal schooling, especially the rise and triumph of public schooling in the United States. Since the turn of the century, Bailyn pointed out, textbooks in the history of American education had been largely concerned with defending as well as describing the rise of tax-supported, state-regulated primary and secondary schools. It was inspirational history, Bailyn complained, designed to improve the professional morale and public image of the burgeoning teaching profession. It all began with the professional educators-turned-historians of the late nineteenth century. Among them were Andrew Draper and George Martin, whose emphasis on public schooling was enlarged upon by the first academically trained educational historians of the early twentieth century. The latter, especially those who were members of Paul Monroe's seminar at Teachers College, Columbia University, wrote monographs that influenced Ellwood P. Cubberly, whose very popular textbook of 1919 made American educational history largely into

the inspiring story of the rise and triumph of the public school.[4]

According to critics like Bailyn and later Lawrence Cremin, that narrow focus on formal schooling not only generally ignored or neglected other educational institutions; it particularly distorted the history of education in early America, where schools were fewer and less important in the educational scheme than in nineteenth-century America. Indeed, the early history of American education was usually ignored except as the humble origin from which the glorious public school had supposedly risen. The result was, to use Bailyn's felicitous phrase, a view of the past as simply "the present writ small." The Martin-Draper dispute is an excellent example of this anachronistic rendering of early American history.[5]

Martin and Draper both surveyed the seventeenth century for some sign of the public schools of their own day, searching desperately for something of the familiar present in the unfamiliar past. Apart from the professional rivalry between Martin and Draper and the traditional sectional antagonism between New York and New England, what led to the controversy in the first place was their genuine belief that the history of American education ought to inform

---

[4]Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society, 3-15; Cremin, Ellwood Cubberly, 3-15. For two excellent essays on the recent revolution in the study of educational historiography, see Douglas Sloan, "Historiography and the History of Education," in Review of Research in Education, ed. Fred N. Kerlinger (Itasca, Ill., 1973), 239-69; and Sol Cohen, "New Perspectives in the History of American Education, 1960-1970," History of Education, II (Jan. 1973), 79-96.

[5]Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society, 9-14.

public policy on education for the present and future. In his appeal to the historical record, Draper was trying mightily to discredit the decentralized system of public education in Massachusetts. He firmly believed that New York State possessed the kind of centralized public school system that all the other states in the nation ought to have as well to assure their citizenry equal education, and that conviction more than anything else made him deny the primacy of Massachusetts in public schooling, past and present.[6]

To succeed, Draper would have to discredit a mountain of revered traditions. "A less able and fearless man might have shrunk from the task," Martin noted sarcastically, "but, as everyone knows, Dr. Draper has the courage of his convictions, possibly beyond them."[7] At least since the days of Horace Mann and Henry Barnard, the educational preeminence of New England in general and Massachusetts in particular had usually been assumed. New Englanders continued to dominate American historiography, and every schoolboy who read his civics knew that both popular democracy and popular education had sprung from that noble American institution, the New England town meeting.[8] During the political struggles for tax-supported, state-regulated primary and secondary schooling, Massachusetts

---

[6]Draper, Public School Pioneering, 330-36; and his "Public School Pioneering in New York and Massachusetts: A Final Reply," Educational Review, VI (Apr. 1893), 358-62.

[7]George H. Martin, "Public School Pioneering: A Reply," Educational Review, IV (June 1892), 34.

[8]Cremin, Ellwood Cubberly, 7, 55; J. Franklin Jameson, The History of Historical Writing in America (Boston, 1891), chap. 3.

was always the exemplar. The first textbook in the history of American education, Richard G. Boone's Education in the United States: Its History from the Earliest Settlement (1889), though concerned with many different educational institutions, sketched the progression of public schooling in America from its beginning in early New England. George Martin had been gathering materials for several years to write a history of public schooling in Massachusetts. His paper before the Department of Superintendence in 1891 was a summary of an early draft of that projected monograph. Draper had challenged not only popular tradition but also the man probably best prepared to defend it.[9]

Against this apparent New England hegemony in public schooling, Draper could draw upon a slender tradition of dissent. It stemmed from the fact that England did not have public education. If the Puritans did have public schools then, where did they get the idea for them? During the 1860s, John Lothrop Motley, the well-known historian of the Netherlands, suggested that the Pilgrims set up in New England the kind of schools they had come to know in Holland.[10] But Motley hopelessly confused the Puritans with

---

[9]Elmer Ellsworth Brown, The Making of Our Middle Schools: An Account of the Development of Secondary Education in the United States (New York, 1902), 69-71; Richard G. Boone, Education in the United States: Its History from the Earliest Settlements, International Education Series, vol. XI (New York, 1889), 8; Martin, "Public School Pioneering: A Reply," 45.

[10]John Lothrop Motley, History of the United Netherlands: From the Death of William the Silent to the Twelve Years' Truce--1609, 4 vols. (New York, 1860-1870), IV, 547-70. In this work, Motley merely implied that the Dutch schools influenced the Pilgrims, but he was apparently more specific in letters and public addresses;

the Pilgrims, and his specific suggestion was easily discredited because the Pilgrims were not especially devoted to schooling. Taken more seriously was Herbert Baxter Adams, whose seminar at Johns Hopkins produced many monographs on the evolution of American institutions from putative European origins. Adams himself did not directly enter the fray. But one of his students, Irving Elting, apparently with Adams' endorsement, asserted that the Dutch influence on American education had never been adequately appreciated. "Our free public school system," Elting wrote in 1886, "of which we are so justly proud, seems to have its beginnings distinctly traceable to the earliest life of the Dutch colonies here in America, and to have had its prototype in 'the free schools in which . . . Holland had led the van of the world.'"[11]

Draper said pretty much the same thing, but he did not refer to Elting, perhaps because the Johns Hopkins scholar had not deigned to support his remarks with factual evidence. As both Martin and Draper were to discover, it was well-nigh impossible to find in the seventeenth century unequivocal evidence of public schooling as they knew it, though the colonial data on schooling was in general

---

see the letter from Motley to the St. Nicholas Society quoted in Richard S. Storrs, The Early American Spirit, and the Genesis of It (New York, 1875), 47; see also D. C. Gilman, "Education in America, 1776-1876," North American Review, CXXII (Jan. 1876), 191-228.

[11]Adams favored a general Calvinistic origin of public schooling; see his "The Church and Popular Education," Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, 4th series, XVIII (1900), 403. Irving Elting, "The Dutch Village Communities on the Hudson River," Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, 4th series, I (1886), 11.

more complete for Massachusetts than for New York. Only two historical works, both of them stemming from the political battles of recent years for common school reform, had assembled data from public documents and personal papers on elementary and secondary schooling in New York before 1776.[12] Of the two, the one that Draper relied on almost exclusively was a jeremiad inspired by the decline of parochial schooling and the rise of public schooling in the state.

The History of the School of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church in the City of New York, from 1633 to 1825, by Henry W. Dunshee, was first published in 1853, the year that New York established a State Department of Education to coordinate its common school efforts. The Reverend Dunshee, then the principal of the school, wrote to preserve "in substantial form the history of this, the oldest educational institution existing at present in the western world. . . ."[13] Quoting lavishly from colonial manuscripts and from general histories of New York, Dunshee catalogued the educational activities of the Dutch in New Netherland, but his emphasis was on the Collegiate School when it became the responsibility

---

[12]Among the works on schools in New York after 1776 are Thomas Boese, Public Education in the City of New York (New York, 1869); William Oland Bourne, History of the Public School Society of the City of New York (1870; reprint ed., New York, 1971); Samuel Sidwell Randall, History of the Common School System of the State of New York, from Its Origin in 1795 to the Present (New York, 1871).

[13]Henry Webb Dunshee, The History of the School of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church in the City of New York, from 1633 to 1883, 2d. rev. ed. (New York, 1883), xi.

of the Dutch Reformed Church alone following the English conquest in 1664; and implicit throughout is the lament that public schooling could never equal the Christian education given by the Collegiate School.[14]

For some reason, perhaps because his primary concern was with education in New Netherland, Draper did not refer to an even handier compilation of information on education in colonial New York, though it is reasonable to assume that he knew of its existence. Drawing heavily from Dunshee for his section on New Netherland, Daniel J. Pratt, the assistant secretary to the Regents of the University of the State of New York, had compiled Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, from 1626 to 1664 (1872), drawn from colonial manuscripts, general histories, and newspapers. By public education, Pratt apparently meant any school open to the public, though he carefully distinguished between the twenty "official" and the ten "private" schoolmasters he identified in New Netherland. His data showed that the English discontinued the Dutch policy of supporting schools with provincial revenues, but the records also revealed numerous private schoolmasters in colonial New York, many of whom were subsidized by the Anglican-sponsored Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Nevertheless, had not the English gained control of New York, Pratt noted wistfully,

---

[14]Ibid., 1-6, 90-93.

"free public schools supported solely by taxation . . . might, perhaps, have continued without interruption to this day."[15]

II

Again, Draper said practically the same thing, but unlike either Elting or Pratt before him, the New York Superintendent explicitly made the analogy between the Dutch schools of New Netherland and the public schools of late nineteenth-century America. He did not equivocate. Martin had ridiculed the suggestion made by Motley and by some "recent writers" that the "Massachusetts people learned their school lesson from Holland."[16] Draper agreed completely, charging that nothing remotely resembling the public schools of Holland ever existed in the Bay colony. His basic argument was that the Puritans of New England and the Dutch of New Netherland continued in America the educational traditions of their respective homelands. Holland had public elementary schooling and so did New Netherland, Draper reiterated, but England did not and neither did New England.[17]

According to Draper, England at the time of the founding of Massachusetts was a backward nation whose people were thrice oppressed

---

[15]Daniel J. Pratt, comp., Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, from 1626 to 1746 (Albany, N. Y., 1872), 41-55, 85-110, quotation on 61; the italics are mine.

[16]Martin, "Compulsory Education in Massachusetts," 405. Some "recent writers" may be a reference to Gilman, "Education in America," 196; and Dunshee, School of the Collegiate Dutch Church, vii-viii.

[17]Draper, Public School Pioneering, 315-20, 324-30.

by the monarchy, the nobility, and the established church. The only schools were Latin schools and universities for the sons of the aristocrats who ran the church and state. Having no rights and no schools, the common people were kept in ignorance "for fear they would learn their rights and demand them." True to English tradition, the Puritans first established Harvard College and then Boston Latin School to educate the aristocratic leadership of their biblical commonwealth but neglected elementary schools for the common people. The law of 1642 requiring parents and masters to teach their children and servants to read and understand the catechism and capital laws, Draper contended, was an attempt by the Puritans to inculcate their sectarian values through family instruction, indicating that elementary schooling did not exist in the colony. Similarly, what Martin called the "Compulsory School law" of 1647 imposed penalties upon towns for failing to erect Latin schools, not elementary schools. Not until the Puritan influence had waned, Draper said, did Massachusetts begin to adopt the general principles of public education that had already been applied in New Netherland.[18]

At the time New Netherland was settled, Draper explained, the Dutch republic had just freed itself from the dual tyranny of the Spanish crown and the Catholic Church. It was a prosperous nation, built on trade, governed by the people, tolerant of religious

---

[18]Ibid., 330-36; Andrew S. Draper, "Public School Pioneering in New York and Massachusetts: A Reply to a Reply," Educational Review, IV (Oct. 1892), 244-48.

differences, and rapidly becoming the cultural as well as the commercial leader of Europe. Its universities were the best in Christendom, and almost every town had at least one Latin school, but most important of all, Draper emphasized, legislation passed by the States-General in 1579 and 1581 and endorsed by the Dutch Reformed Church's Synod of Dort in 1618 required towns to provide elementary schooling for children from all classes regardless of sex. True to Dutch tradition, the West India Company ordered the establishment of public schools in New Netherland. Such schools were set up first in New Amsterdam and then in the outlying villages, paid for by public revenues and regulated by public officials.[19]

As Draper explained it, the English who conquered New Netherland in 1664 abandoned the Dutch policy of public education. Although New Yorkers of Dutch descent dominated the provincial Assembly much of the time and tried on many occasions to enact legislation for elementary schooling, the royal governors repeatedly opposed them. On two different occasions, the Assembly and the governor were able to agree on extending public support for a few years to a Latin school in New York City. However, Draper insisted that the only educational act in colonial New York for which the English government pressed was the establishment of King's College, and that institution of higher learning was especially intended to perpetuate the Anglican elite and combat the growth of "republican principles" in the province. Following the American Revolution,

---

[19]Draper, Public School Pioneering, 315, 322-28.

New York revived the principles of free schooling first brought to America by the Dutch and led the nation in the development of a thoroughly integrated system of state-supported, state-supervised public education which even Horace Mann warmly praised. Such were the facts as Draper saw them.[20]

Martin saw them differently and accused Draper of maliciously misinterpreting the history of both England and Massachusetts. England as well as Holland underwent a proliferation of schooling following the Protestant Reformation, he insisted; and though the Netherlands had perhaps the best Latin schools in Europe, its elementary schools were reported to be primitive and parochial, frequently run by an illiterate man or woman who made the unfortunate children endlessly repeat the Reformed catechism and the alphabet. Thoroughly dominated by the Reformed clergy, the parochial schools in Holland somehow became the "public schools" Draper praised so much in New Netherland. "A public school," Martin argued, "is a school established, supported, and controlled by the people acting in their public capacity, as a civil body politic."[21] The Massachusetts Bay colony had public schools, supported and regulated by the town meeting, he claimed, but New Netherland did not, because there was no "body politic" in the colony. The West India Company governed New Netherland without the consent of the people. The company paid the official schoolmasters, though they were usually

---

[20]Ibid., 329-36; Draper, "A Reply to a Reply," 246-50.

[21]Martin, "Public School Pioneering: A Reply," 37.

selected and supervised by the Dutch Reformed clergy. What a stark contrast, Martin concluded, between the few parish schools of New Netherland and the many public Latin and elementary schools of Massachusetts Bay, where even a poor but talented lad could get a college education.[22]

Draper had his own definition of public education. He defined the common school system of his day as "schools for the common welfare and the public security, supported by public moneys, managed by public officers, in which all the people have common rights, and which are free from whatever may offend conscience or abridge those rights. . . ."[23] New Netherland had such schools, he asserted, but not Massachusetts Bay, because the intolerant Puritans persecuted, tortured, and hounded out of both the so-called "body politic" and "public schools" anyone who dared to disagree with them. There was nothing public about the Massachusetts Bay colony; it was a thoroughly sectarian venture. Massachusetts had not disestablished its church until the fourth decade of the nineteenth century, Draper reminded his readers, adding that New Netherland and New York had never known a state church. The Dutch tradition of religious toleration continued as New Netherland became New York, enshrined in the Articles of Capitulation of 1664 between the victorious English and the defeated Dutch. That spirit of religious toleration, together with the earlier tradition of public schooling

---

[22]Ibid., 37-44.

[23]Draper, Public School Pioneering, 330.

in New Netherland, Draper implied, had allowed New York to forge a truly state system of public education much ahead of the other American states.[24]

Throughout the controversy, the arguments continuously shifted from the past to the present, indicating just how thoroughly both Martin and Draper were reading the issues of their own day into the educational history of early America. Martin reiterated that the Massachusetts laws of 1642 and 1647 led naturally to the six basic steps in the evolution of public schooling in America--compulsory education, compulsory schools, compulsory certification of teachers, compulsory supervision, compulsory taxation, and compulsory attendance. Each step, Martin said with obvious pride, was initiated by local town meetings, and once it proved successful, the towns themselves pressured the General Assembly to make it part of the standard for public education throughout Massachusetts. In true democratic fashion, reforms in public education had come from the people of Massachusetts themselves, not imposed by the state.[25]

Draper doubted that elementary education in Massachusetts was what it ought to be. He pointed out that public schooling in modern America was not the child of the town meeting. Rather, it was the offspring of the state, based upon state taxes and state

---

[24]Draper, "A Reply to a Reply," 242-52; Draper, "A Final Reply," 351-54, 358-62.

[25]Martin, "Compulsory Education in Massachusetts," 407-12; Martin, "Public School Pioneering: A Reply," 45-46.

supervision. The town meeting "fetish," as Draper called it, perpetuated unequal educational standards, with the amount of tax support, the requirements for teacher certification, and the extent of school supervision varying with the whims of the local politicians who controlled the town meetings. He advised Massachusetts to wake up and follow New York's example. As early as 1795, the legislature of New York had imposed taxes for education. In 1812, a state superintendent of schools had been appointed, and since that time New York had continuously increased the authority of the state government to maintain quality public schooling.[26]

Martin replied that New Englanders did not need and would not accept the authoritarian system of public education that New York had felt compelled to adopt in 1867, not 1812 or 1795. "The people of New York have always shown a willingness to be governed," he said; "they began that way. The people of New England have as signally manifested a determination to govern themselves; they began that way."[27] In New England, public education and local self-government had always been inextricably entwined. It all began, Martin emphasized, with the much-maligned Puritan theocracy, where for the first time "the people themselves" committed their government to realizing the advanced ideals of universal education originating with the Protestant reformers of England and Europe. From that

---

[26]Draper, Public School Pioneering, 330-36; Draper, "A Reply to a Reply," 251-52; his arguments are more precisely stated in "A Final Reply," 350-62.

[27]Martin, "Public School Pioneering: A Reply," 46.

time on, the various town meetings had nurtured public education, adjusting it to local conditions, and advancing it through trial and error from one step to another.[28]

Draper acknowledged that public education in Massachusetts harkened back to the colonial past. That was the very problem. Town meeting control of common schooling was outdated, he reiterated; it kept the state government from enforcing uniform standards and from collecting taxes for education that would make the wealthy towns contribute to quality schooling in the poorer towns. In short, just as in colonial times, Massachusetts continued to discriminate against the educational needs of the common folk. Superintendent Dickinson of Massachusetts, Draper noted, had recently urged a state assembly committee to propose legislation strengthening the powers of his office for that very reason. On the other hand, despite what Martin had said, Draper insisted that New York had early begun the task of creating a state system of public education that did not discriminate against the poor or vary substantially in quality from place to place.[29] And so it went, with each antagonist doing much more to discredit the arguments of his opponent than to prove his own inflated claims.

---

[28]Ibid., 40-45; Martin, "Public School Pioneering: A Final Statement of the Massachusetts Claim," Educational Review, IV (Mar. 1893), 239-42.

[29]Draper, "A Final Reply," 353-62.

III

Martin and Draper closed their public debate in the April 1893 issue of the Educational Review. However, the controversy was far from over. Complimenting both Martin and Draper for defending their respective positions with exceptional ability, an editorial in the Educational Review especially praised Draper for telling the neglected story of New York's contribution to public education. It declared that any unprejudiced mind would have to admit that "the germ" of the common school system in America "is to be found in the schools established by the early Dutch settlers in New Amsterdam." Henceforth, the editorial concluded, the history of American education would have to be written in the new light Martin and Draper had thrown on the origins of the public school.[30]

Well aware that what Draper had said was favorably received in some quarters, Martin, urged on by his friends, hurriedly finished his book on The Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System (1894), in which he repeated his arguments for the leadership of Massachusetts in public schooling, though he emphasized that it was a slow evolutionary process. The same year, Martin got the endorsement of the Reverend Amory Dwight Mayo, an ardent campaigner for public schools and a prolific writer. According to Lawrence

---

[30]Editorial, Educational Review, VI (Apr. 1893), 406-7. Nicholas Murray Butler, a founder of Teachers College and later president of Columbia University, was a friend of Draper and one of the editors of the Review at the time. It is purely speculation, but Butler may have had something to do with the slant of the editorial in Draper's favor.

Cremin, the Reverend Mayo wrote the first general synthesis of educational history emphasizing the reciprocal influence of the rise of the public school and the development of democracy in America. In the first of many book-length articles, Mayo admitted that the Puritans were intolerant and authoritarian, but he still insisted that political democracy prevailed among the faithful church members. The people themselves legislated compulsory schooling in Massachusetts Bay, said Mayo echoing Martin, but the people of New Netherland had no political rights and no public schools. Only someone sadly misinformed about the link between popular government and public education in America, Mayo concluded, "could transform the early parochial schools in the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam [sic] to the beginnings of the American common-school system."[31]

The Martin-Mayo thesis of American educational history had tremendous appeal. It confirmed what many Americans already believed regarding the New England origin of both public schooling and participatory democracy. Even so, Draper was not about to retreat from the field of battle. He twice reprinted in pamphlet form his initial article launching the debate with Martin, first in 1892 and again in 1898.[32] He also reprinted in 1896 an address

---

[31]George H. Martin, The Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System: A Historical Sketch (1894; reprint ed., New York, 1904), 1-37; Amory Dwight Mayo, "Public Schools during the Colonial and Revolutionary Periods in the United States," Report of the United States Commissioner of Education, 1893-94, I (Washington, D. C., 1896), 652.

[32]Andrew S. Draper, Public School Pioneering.

he had given in 1890 on The Origin and Development of the Common School System of the State of New York. In 1903, perhaps partly to combat the popularity of Martin's monograph, he revised and enlarged that pamphlet into a small book. Emphasizing how alien public schooling was to British tradition, Draper continued to insist that all the English schools in the province of New York were parochial, supported and regulated "by a great religious society, organized under the auspices of the Church of England, and, of course, with the favor of the government, called 'The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.'"[33] In this and his later writings, Draper portrayed modern public schooling in America as a uniquely nineteenth-century phenomenon. Schooling in all of the British colonies, he claimed, was either private or parochial; and public schooling did not evolve until after the Revolution, though the Dutch of New Netherland had pioneered free elementary schooling in America.[34]

Draper attracted attention. However, except in the minds of local historians anxious to rescue the Dutch from the caricatured world of Washington Irving, he was not able to discredit the Martin-

---

[33]Andrew S. Draper, Origin and Development of the Common School System of the State of New York (Syracuse, N. Y., 1903), quotation from pamphlet version (Albany, N. Y., 1890), 12.

[34]Andrew S. Draper, American Education (Boston, 1909), 17-38; also Draper, Addresses and Papers (Albany, N. Y., 1911-1912), 49-70.

Mayo thesis.[35] The second textbook in the history of American education, Edwin Grant Dexter's History of Education in the United States (1904), though broadly concerned with colleges, libraries, lyceums, and even newspapers as well as schools, cited Draper's articles and Martin's book. Seldom making any interpretative comment, Dexter praised the Dutch of New Netherland for their devotion to schooling; but he made it clear that the Puritans had "played a much more important part in the making of our school system than their predecessors in Virginia, or those at the mouth of the Hudson."[36] Fifteen years later, in the third major textbook, Ellwood P. Cubberley would completely ignore Draper and say next to nothing about education in New Netherland and colonial New York.

By the time Cubberley wrote in 1919, the history of American education had become a distinct discipline taught in normal schools, departments of education, and teachers colleges throughout the nation. His popular textbook quickly captured the field, elevating the Martin-Mayo thesis of public schooling into the orthodox interpretation of American educational history. Much of what he said was drawn from the first Ph.D. theses in the history of American education, most of them coming from Paul Monroe's seminar at Teachers College, Columbia. As Lawrence Cremin has noted, Monroe's students consistently

---

[35]For example, see William Elliot Griffis, The Story of New Netherland: The Dutch in America (Boston, 1909), 175-84. The Reverend Griffis repeated Draper's arguments in favor of the Dutch origin of public schooling almost verbatim.

[36]Edwin Grant Dexter, A History of Education in the United States (New York, 1904), 10-24.

portrayed the history of American education as "the history of the public school realizing itself over time."[37] In his history, Cubberly depended heavily upon monographs by Henry Suzzallo, Harlan Updegraff, and George Leroy Jackson which considerably refined but basically confirmed and gave academic legitimacy to the Martin-Mayo version of the New England origins of public education in America.[38] However, Cubberly took little interest in the works by Monroe's students who wrote on education in New Netherland and New York. Exploring the issues first raised by Draper, they modified much of what he had said. Though looking at the past in terms of the present, they revealed more fully than ever before the variety of schooling that had existed in the colony along the Hudson.

The first of the Columbia contributions dealing with education in colonial New York was Elsie W. Clews' Educational Legislation and Administration of the Colonial Governments (1899). Her study was a compilation rather than a history, and she made few interpretive comments, but the data in the sections on New Netherland and New York spoke for themselves. Supporting at least in part what Draper had said, the sheer bulk of the documents indicated that the Dutch government of New Netherland was much more involved

---

[37]Cremin, Ellwood Cubberly, 25-30; Natalie A. Naylor, "Paul Monroe," DAB, Suppl. 4, 591-93.

[38]Henry Suzzallo, The Rise of Local School Supervision in Massachusetts, 1635-1827, Teachers College Contribution to Education, no. 3 (New York, 1906); Harlan Updegraff, The Origin of the Moving School in Massachusetts, Teachers College Contribution to Education, no. 17 (New York, 1908); George Leroy Jackson, The Development of School Support in Colonial Massachusetts, Teachers College Contribution to Education, no. 25 (New York, 1909).

with elementary schooling than the English government of New York. Indeed, in a rare interpretative remark, Clews suggested that the educational efforts of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts allowed the provincial government of New York "to throw off for a number of years all educational responsibilities."[39]

In view of the reductive tendency of American educational historiography, what is most intriguing about Clews' monograph is the preface, where she explained how the history of American education ought to be written. Influenced by the concepts of institutional evolution coming out of sociology, Clews, who had studied under Nicholas Murray Butler and Herbert L. Osgood, recognized that education is a complex process intricately interwoven with the fabric of any society. Education is always more than just schooling, she insisted; it is the entire socialization process that mediates between the individual and his environment. The social history of the American colonies, together with the social history of the different nations from which the colonists came, would have to be thoroughly studied, she emphasized, before the history of education in early America could be written. Clews regarded her own work as simply a preliminary step toward understanding the attitude of colonial Americans toward education.[40]

---

[39]Elsie W. Clews, Educational Legislation and Administration of the Colonial Governments, Columbia University Contributions to Philosophy, Psychology and Education, vol. VI (New York, 1899), 197-250, quotation from 239.

[40]Ibid., v-ix.

Despite her broad definition of education, Clews found that the available records dealt mainly with schooling of one kind or another. The other dissertations on education in colonial New York done at Columbia Teachers College were directed by Paul Monroe, whose understanding of Social Darwinism led him to encourage his students to examine schooling in the past with the public schooling of the present in mind. The first of them was The Dutch Schools of New Netherland and Colonial New York (1912), by William Heard Kilpatrick. A scholarly work based on meticulous research in colonial manuscripts, this study demonstrated that the Dutch schools in early America were jointly supported and regulated by the clergy of the Reformed Church and the local civil officials. Kilpatrick was reluctant to get involved in the passionate dispute over the origins of public schooling in America, but he felt compelled to conclude that the Dutch schools of New Netherland and New York were definitely public schools. "They were open to all the children," he said, "were controlled by the duly constituted civil authorities and were both housed and supported by the public moneys."[41] Moving far beyond Draper, Kilpatrick found solid evidence that the Dutch schools did not disappear but expanded following the English conquest in 1664 and continued to flourish in many areas of the province until the American Revolution. Given the general apathy of the English toward elementary education, Kilpatrick believed that at least

---

[41]William Heard Kilpatrick, The Dutch Schools of New Netherland and Colonial New York, United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin no. 12 (Washington, D. C., 1912), 230.

as far as New York was concerned the Dutch commitment to education must have influenced that state to adopt early a strong policy of public schooling.[42]

Admitting that colonial New Yorkers were apathetic toward education, William Webb Kemp nevertheless suggested in 1913 that the English in New York had access to more elementary schools than Kilpatrick had indicated, thanks primarily to The Support of Schools in Colonial New York by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. From his careful search in the S. P. G. records, Kemp estimated that the Society continuously patronized from five to ten schools in New York, averaging about forty pupils per school, from 1710 to 1776. He believed that the educational efforts of the Society constituted the closest thing to a public school system among the British in colonial New York. Though the S. P. G.'s work for education in New York ended abruptly during the Revolution, Kemp explained that the charity school of Trinity Church in New York City continued, providing a model of effective schooling for those who fought for public education later in the nineteenth century.[43]

Ellwood Cubberly, a Teachers College graduate who had served as a school superintendent in California for many years before joining the education faculty at Stanford University, was aware of what

---

[42]Ibid., 161-215, esp. 214-15.

[43]William Webb Kemp, The Support of Schools in Colonial New York by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, Teachers College Contribution to Education, no. 56 (New York, 1913), 1-16, 63-70, 276-77.

Kilpatrick and Kemp had concluded. But the story he had to tell of education in colonial America had little to do with New York. His popular textbook, Public Education in the United States: A Study and Interpretation of American Educational History (1919), followed almost exactly the Martin-Mayo thesis. His focus was on the nineteenth century, however, and whatever came before then was not to be included unless it had special bearing on education in the present. Too often, he explained, perhaps thinking of Boone and Dexter, educational historians wrote textbooks that submerged the prospective teacher in useless facts, without relating them to current problems in education. He did not intend to make that mistake. An enthusiastic Progressive, Cubberly believed that the public school was the primary engine of popular democracy and upward mobility in American life. His design was both to inspire and instruct by recounting the rise and triumph of public schooling in the United States.[44]

Cubberly gave short shrift to education in early America. He limited his remarks mainly to the three attitudes toward education he found in the different colonies: the "compulsory-maintenance attitude" of Massachusetts, the "parochial-school attitude" of Pennsylvania, and "the pauper-school non-state-interference attitude" of Virginia. The three attitudes toward education overlapped in some of the colonies, but everywhere in early America, the school was the child of the church. "In New England, however, and the

---

[44]Ellwood P. Cubberly, Public Education in the United States: A Study and Interpretation of American Educational History (Boston, 1919), vii-xii.

New England evolution in time became the prevailing American practice," Cubberly explained, "the school passed through a very interesting development during colonial times from a church into a state school."[45] The "compulsory-maintenance attitude" of Massachusetts was the educational contribution of Calvinism to America, and out of it, once the church and state were separated, the modern state school systems had evolved. Here was the "usable past" that Cubberly would give to the triumphant public school.[46]

The Middle Colonies in general and New York in particular were deliberately neglected by Cubberly. Unlike either Kilpatrick or Kemp, he did not believe that the Dutch schools affiliated with the Reformed Church or the charity schools sponsored by the S. P. G. played any constructive part in the evolution of free schooling. On the contrary, he saw them as formidable obstacles to public education. The parochial schools of the Middle Colonies, tied as they were to the particular religious faith of different ethnic groups, resisted state participation in education. The S. P. G. schools, dedicated to the notion that the church rather than the state should educate the poor and orphaned, attached the stigma of charity to the concept of free schooling. As for the private schools, the usual alternative to charity and parochial schooling in New York, Cubberly emphasized that the "poorest teachers were to be found in the private schools, many of them being itinerant teachers."[47] Dominated by

---

[45]Ibid., 15-25, 44.

[46]Ibid., 23-24.

[47]Ibid., 20-21, 23-24, 34.

a regressive mixture of the "parochial-school attitude" and the "pauper-school attitude," education in New York was of little concern to Cubberly until the struggles for public schooling began in the nineteenth century.[48]

The only scholarly challenge to Cubberly's evaluation of education in colonial New York came from Robert Francis Seybolt, another graduate of Monroe's seminar at Teachers College. Seybolt exploded two myths concerning schooling in early America. The first was Draper's claim that the only English schools in colonial New York were supported by the S. P. G. In his doctoral thesis, Apprenticeship and Apprenticeship Education in Colonial New England and New York (1917), Seybolt found that it was common practice for private schoolmasters to run evening schools especially for apprentices, whose indentures frequently required their masters to provide them with so much schooling. For the next ten years, he continued to study private schooling in early America, looking mainly at New York City, Philadelphia, and Boston. In 1926, he responded directly to what Draper had said earlier, publishing a list of over 200 private schoolmasters who taught in New York during the eighteenth century.[49]

As for the other myth, Seybolt became convinced that the private schoolmasters in New York and elsewhere in colonial America were

---

[48]Ibid., 71-72, 200-204.

[49]Robert Francis Seybolt, Apprenticeship and Apprenticeship Education in Colonial New England and New York, Teachers College Contribution to Education, no. 85 (New York, 1917), 105-7; Seybolt, "The S. P. G. Myth: A Note on Education in Colonial New York," Journal of Educational Research, XIII (Feb. 1926), 129-37.

not the incompetent lot of penniless pedagogues described by Cubberly. In New York, he referred to William Clajon, Alexander Malcolm, and Garrat Noel as equal to or better than the town schoolmasters of New England. He believed that such private schoolmasters had led the way in curricular reform in early America. They pioneered the so-called "English Grammar School," teaching the traditional Latin and Greek as well as a host of other subjects, including "all the Branches of the Mathematicks, Geometry, Algebra, Geography, Navigation, Merchants Book-Keeping after the most Perfect Manner."[50] The rigidly supervised town and church schools were slow to change, Seybolt insisted; but the private schoolmasters adjusted their curricula to the shifting economic demands and intellectual currents of the day. They contributed much, he concluded, to the liberal secondary curriculum of the present.[51]

The intriguing implications of Seybolt's work were not followed up. Nor did Kilpatrick and Kemp inspire others to investigate the link between religion and education in colonial New York. Indeed, the historiography of American education tended to petrify around Cubberly's interpretation of the rise and triumph of the public school. What this meant was continued neglect of the history of

---

[50]Robert Francis Seybolt, Source Studies in American Colonial Education: The Private School (Urbana, Ill., 1925), 83-102, quotation on 100.

[51]Ibid., 100-104; Robert Francis Seybolt, "The Evening Schools of Colonial New York City," in Fifteenth Annual Report of the [New York State] Education Department (1919), I, 630-45; see also Seybolt's Evening School in Colonial America (Urbana, Ill., 1925), 5-15.

education in New York before the advent of common schooling. Cubberly had made the compulsory-maintenance model of schooling in New England the measure of all things belonging to the American educational tradition. Education among the polyglot population of the Middle Colonies seemed strangely un-American, with its bewildering mixture of parochial and private schooling. As he explained it, during the first decade of the nineteenth century, New England immigrants poured into central New York and it was their influence that finally began moving the state toward public schooling.[52]

Such was the denouement of the Martin-Draper controversy. It was perhaps inevitable that Cubberly would find Martin and the Puritans of Massachusetts far more attractive than Draper and the Dutch of New Netherland. Except among self-conscious descendants, the Dutch were seldom taken seriously as Founding Fathers; Washington Irving had seen to that. Equally important, Draper himself had admitted that the English undid whatever the Dutch had done for public education in America, thus acknowledging a gap of some hundred and thirty years between the primitive public schools of New Netherland and the modern public schools of New York State. That kind of discontinuity went against the ruling precepts of social evolution; the town schools of Massachusetts, on the other hand, had a continuous existence from colony to state, and the legitimacy of the Puritans as Founding Fathers was unquestioned, of course.

---

[52]Cremin, Ellwood Cubberly, 42-46, 47, n. 81; Cubberly, Public Education in the United States, 67-72.

From the standpoint of American historiography in general, it would have been unusual had Cubberly given more attention to education in colonial New York. The cultural heterogeneity of the Middle Colonies, especially New York with its pronounced Dutch heritage and aristocratic manor lords, has usually repelled rather than attracted interpreters of the American experience. Neglecting the Middle Colonies, scholars generally located the roots of American life in the early history of New England or Virginia, or in both. Paradoxically, as the nation became more heterogeneous as a result of immigration in the nineteenth century, American historians looked harder for cultural unity in the past, thus making the Middle Colonies even less desirable for study. However, following the scholarly lead of Milton Klein and Alice Kenney, historians are now taking a new look at the Middle Colonies, particularly New York, and what they have found so far suggests that the cultural pluralism of the "forgotten region" contributed much to American civilization.[53] With the current reappraisal now under way in both the historiography of early New York and the historiography of early American education, the time is ripe for a reinterpretation of education in colonial

---

[53]The reasons why New York and the other Middle Colonies have been neglected by historians are discussed by Milton M. Klein, Politics of Diversity: Essays in the History of Colonial New York (Port Washington, N. Y., 1974), 3-6, and chap. 8; for the neglect of the Dutch by historians, see Alice P. Kenney, Stubborn for Liberty: The Dutch in New York (Syracuse, N. Y., 1975), 257-67. Klein and Kenney have been pointing the way for years, and now many historians are exploring the impact of cultural diversity upon the history of colonial New York; see Jacob Judd and Irwin H. Polishook, eds., Aspects of Early New York Society and Politics (Tarrytown, N. Y., 1974).

New York. What role did education play in the development of colonial New York? To begin answering that question, one must turn to the recent efforts of historians who have tried to free the historiography of education in early America from its preoccupation with the origins of modern public education.

IV

During the past fifteen years, many historians have heeded Bernard Bailyn's call to restore educational history to the mainstream of American historiography. They have extended both the criticism and the revisionism that Bailyn began. Shaped during the Progressive era, the regnant interpretation of American educational history, with its stultifying emphasis on the progress of the public school, has itself been subjected to the same kind of debunking that Progressive historians like Charles A. Beard and James Truslow Adams levelled some sixty years ago against revered American political and economic institutions and the historians who had praised them. Once the great hope of Progressive reform, the public schools have lately been denounced as fundamentally repressive, conservative institutions, forged during the nineteenth century to maintain the status quo and keep the "working people" in their place rather than to facilitate upward social mobility for the masses.[54]

---

[54]For a superb introduction to the belated "Progressive phase" now underway in the historiography of American education, see Carl F. Kaestle, "Social Reform and the Urban School: Essay Review II," History of Education Quarterly, XII (Summer 1972), 211-28. Among the works in this vein are Michael B. Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth

That dark view of public schooling in the nineteenth century has led to some rather idyllic portrayals of the unorganized, informal arrangement of education in early America.[55] However, the thrust of recent research in the early history of American education has been relatively less concerned with the school than with the re-conceptualization of education in terms more appropriate to life in the American colonies. Many scholars have been involved in this task, but works by Bailyn, Cremin, and James Axtell epitomize the three stages of research and writing through which the revision of early American education has progressed so far. Moving in scope from the general to the particular, each stage has sharpened our understanding of the complex processes of cultural transference that took place between the Old World and the New and from the first generation of colonial Americans to the last. So far, though, the Middle Colonies have played only a marginal role in this reappraisal.

Century Massachusetts (Cambridge, Mass., 1968); Carl F. Kaestle, The Evolution of an Urban School System: New York City, 1750-1850 (Cambridge, Mass., 1973); Stanley K. Schultz, The Culture Factory: Boston Public Schools, 1789-1860 (New York, 1973); Henry J. Perkinson, The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education, 1865-1965 (New York, 1968). For a synthesis of the various critiques, see Colin Greer, The Great School Legend: A Revisionist Interpretation of American Public Education (New York, 1972). Revising the revisionists is Timothy L. Smith, "Immigrant Social Aspirations and American Education, 1880-1930," American Quarterly, XXI (Fall 1969), 523-43; and Smith's "New Approaches to the History of Immigration in Twentieth-Century America," American Historical Review, LXXI (July 1966), 1272-94.

[55]Kaestle, The Evolution of an Urban School System, 1-23; Greer, The Great School Legend, chap. 1; Daniel Calhoun, The Intelligence of a People (Princeton, N. J., 1973). Calhoun's work is more of a Hofstadteresque critique of the standardized methods of schooling that arose between 1750 and 1850.

Nevertheless, drawing upon the insights of the research already accomplished, much may be learned for moving the revision of early American educational history into a fourth stage, one based upon a research design responsive to the cultural diversity of the Middle Colonies, in general, and New York, in particular.

Bailyn began it all by redefining education. He took his cue from Edward Eggleston's Transit of Civilization from England to America in the Seventeenth Century (1900), viewing education as the entire process by which culture is transferred across the generations.[56] Education so defined depends on many different agencies whose importance in the configuration of educational institutions may vary from place to place and from time to time. Education in early America, Bailyn explained in his famous essay in hypothetical history, was shaped largely by changes in the structure of the family. In England, the family was extended, including not only parents, children, grandparents, and various relatives but servants and apprentices. The family did most of the educating, imparting literacy and occupational skills and socializing the child to his place in the world. The church and school and other community institutions merely reinforced and confirmed the socializing efforts of the family. Indeed, the family blended smoothly into the larger community, and life as well as education was customary, automatic, and almost instinctive "within the continuing traditions of an

---

[56]Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society, 5-6, 14.

integrated, unified culture."[57]

In America, the family became nuclear in structure, responding to the abundance of land and the scarcity of labor. Therefore, Bailyn claimed it was impossible for the family to perform its traditional role in the educational process. Lest the young lapse into barbarism, laws were passed throughout the colonies requiring parents to educate their children. The church and especially the school began assuming educational functions once performed largely by the extended family, thus bridging the gap between the nuclear family and the larger community. Education became deliberate and systematic, he emphasized, with formal schooling increasingly relied upon to transmit not only literacy and occupational skills but also religious traditions. That shift from the customary to the deliberate had a profound impact. Unlike their communal-minded cousins in England, colonial children, separated if not isolated from the community by the nuclear family, were insular, individualistic, and conscious of being outside the community.[58]

Despite the Turnerian quality of his essay, Bailyn was concerned mainly with the mechanics rather than the content of the educational process in early America. He drew attention away from the school and to the family as the primary educator, though the increasing importance of the school was fundamental in the shift from customary to deliberate education. His call for rewriting American educational history was widely endorsed. However, the practicality of his

---

[57]Ibid., 14-21.

[58]Ibid., 21-49.

anthropological definition of education was seriously questioned. Lawrence Cremin noted that Bailyn's definition of education as the entire process of cultural transmission was descriptive rather than analytical and provided no organizational framework for the working historian. All human experience, after all, is potentially educational. As an alternative, Cremin, influenced by Werner Jaeger's study of Greek culture, offered the concept of paideia, the ideal of human perfection held by a people. The working historian of education ought to concentrate on "the deliberate, systematic, and sustained effort to transmit or evoke knowledge, attitudes, values, skills and sensibilities," Cremin insisted, without forgetting that non-deliberate influences are sometimes more important educationally than the deliberate ones.[59]

Initiating the second stage in the reconceptualization of education in early America, Cremin followed his own advice in American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783 (1970), the first in a projected three-volume history of education in America. He identified three major strands of English culture in the seventeenth century, and the first part of his work is devoted to explaining how piety, civility, and learning were transmitted from one generation to another in both England and the American colonies. He pointed

---

[59]Ironically, Cubberly had made the same criticism of the descriptive approach to educational history followed by Boone and especially Dexter. Cubberly referred to Eggleston's work as an "interesting description of the transfer of English civilization to America." See his Public Education in the United States, 49. Cremin's comments are in his Ellwood Cubberly, 47, n. 81; and his American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783 (New York, 1970), xiii.

out that the family was usually nuclear in both England and America, drawing upon demographic data not available to Bailyn. The family was the preeminent educator, especially in colonial America, where other community institutions were not firmly rooted. Next to the family, the church was the most important educator in seventeenth-century America, though the church later declined and the school rose in educational significance. In eighteenth-century America, piety, civility, and learning were transformed into denominationalism, republicanism, and utilitarianism; and the school played an important part in that transformation. Indeed, Cremin believed that the number, variety, and accessibility of schools in the American colonies led to a liberating literacy, that is, literacy that promoted genuine life alternatives. That liberating literacy, together with a relatively inclusive politics, Cremin concluded, provided colonial America with its distinguishing characteristics.[60]

Unlike Bailyn, Cremin emphasized the cultural continuity between America and Britain, though he insisted that English culture was continually being transformed in the colonies. He mentioned the cultural pluralism of the Middle Colonies, but his focus was on the Anglicizing of diverse ethnic elements rather than the reciprocal relationship that must have existed to some degree. Indeed, Cremin wrote about education in colonial America at such a high level of generality that many questions were left unanswered. What was especially needed, said one critic after another, was a more localized

---

[60]Cremin, American Education, passim, esp. 113-95, 251-67, 516-70.

study with enough depth to give some insight into the impact of the educational process upon the people so educated.[61]

James Axtell read both Cremin and his critics carefully, and learned much from them all. In 1974, Axtell pushed the reconceptualization of early American education into its third and most current stage with The School upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England. Like Cremin, Axtell defined education as "the self-conscious pursuit of certain intellectual, social, and moral ideals (which makes it normative) by any society (from the family to the nation) that wishes to preserve and transmit its distinctive character to future generations (which makes it conservative)."[62] Since not all the English in New England were Puritan, he called them the "New English," though noting that most of them adhered to the English brand of Calvinism usually labelled Puritan. Indeed, it was the process of socializing the young to the Puritan paideia that primarily concerned him. He found the Puritan's cultural identity epitomized in the catechism, whose constant study tended to internalize the prohibitions imposed upon sinful man by an all-powerful God. As the primary educator, the family was initially charged with the major responsibility of teaching the catechism to the young, though

---

[61]Arthur G. Powell, review of American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783, by Lawrence A. Cremin, Harvard Educational Review, XLI (Summer 1971), 251-55; Merle L. Borrowman, "The Educational Roots of Polity," review of American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783, by Lawrence A. Cremin, Teachers College Record, LXXIII (Sept. 1971), 117-20.

[62]James Axtell, The City upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England (New Haven, Conn., 1974), xiii-xv.

the church and dame school usually assisted. However, the decline in conversion among the second generation led to a decline in family catechizing. Provincial laws were passed ordering pastors and elders to catechize the young, and grammar schools, once confined simply to imparting language tools for religious study, also began teaching the catechism. The quest for the Puritan paideia continued, Axtell explained, though New England did not even remotely resemble Winthrop's city upon a hill.[63]

From his study of child-rearing techniques, occupational training, and schooling, Axtell concluded that the socialization of the New Englanders was entirely too restrictive for the New World environment. As New England became secular and devoted to things of this world, its educational institutions continued to propagate the old vision of a Puritan commonwealth. The result was social dysfunction, fed by increasing psychological tension. Social frustration was especially obvious among restive college students, who were still treated like children. However, the gap between the ideal and the operative values of New England created such stress generally that at least several hundred New Englanders opted for life among the Indians. The revolt from Britain, with its vision of a rising American republic, Axtell concluded, at last bridged the gap and restored direction and commitment to both education and society in New England.[64]

---

[63]Ibid., 1-4, 20-35, 202-88.

[64]Ibid., 75-96, 131-65, 192-200, 240-44, 275-88.

The School upon a Hill has rightly been praised as an excellent example of the "new" educational history. Defining education broadly, Axtell focused his attention on the socialization process itself, detailing the relationship through time of different educational institutions to the basic cultural aims of New England society.[65] However, his conservative paradigm, based upon the continuous pursuit of an apparently changeless Puritan paideia, assumed a degree of cultural homogeneity in New England that probably existed nowhere else in colonial America, and that assumption of cultural regularity would limit its application in the Middle Colonies, where ethnic diversity prevailed. In fact, if Axtell is right, if the initial sectarian values of the Puritans remained dominant in the educational process of New England long after the social reality that shaped them had disintegrated, the impact of Anglicization upon the pluralistic sectarian culture of the Middle Colonies in the eighteenth century may well have been overdrawn.[66] At any rate, the educational process holds the key to the persistence of cultural differences and the homogenizing effects of English culture.

---

[65]Ronald D. Cohen, review of The School upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England, by James Axtell, New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LIX (July 1975), 273-76.

[66]Winston U. Solberg, review of The School upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England, by James Axtell, Journal of American History, LXII (June 1975), 106. For an early discussion of what has since become the popular subject of Anglicization, see Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, The Founding of American Civilization: The Middle Colonies (1938; reprint ed., New York, 1963), 101-11; his Golden Age of Colonial Culture (Ithaca, N. Y., 1949), 40-51; also Cremin, American Education, 251-72, 345-46.

V

Any study of education in colonial New York must be based on the ethnic diversity of the province. Governed by the Dutch West India Company until 1664, New Netherland was peopled by French, German, Norwegian, Swedish, Portuguese, and English traders and settlers as well as the Dutch. Cultural pluralism was part of the Dutch legacy to English New York, and it remained the most salient characteristic of life in the province throughout the colonial era. True, the imperial connection with London increasingly Anglicized the public life of the province, but ethnic distinctions remained pronounced, propagated by mutual suspicion and fear of cultural aggression. The part that education played in this cultural maelstrom was crucial.[67]

Some of the earlier studies of schooling in New Netherland and colonial New York clearly suggested the vital link between education and cultural pluralism in the province. However, their preoccupation with the colonial school as the harbinger of public education prevented them from explicating the ethnic dimension more fully. Kilpatrick came the closest to doing so, though both he and Kemp were mainly concerned with the administrative aspects

---

[67]Thomas J. Condon, New York Beginnings: The Commercial Origins of New Netherland (New York, 1968), 116-59; George L. Smith, Religion and Trade in New Netherland: Dutch Origins and American Development (Ithaca, N. Y., 1973), 191-246; Gerald F. De Jong, The Dutch in America, 1609-1974 (Boston, 1975), 28-108; Alice P. Kenney, "Private Worlds in the Middle Colonies: An Introduction to Human Tradition in American History," New York History, LI (Jan. 1970), 5-31; Klein, Politics of Diversity, 189-92; Michael Kammen, Colonial New York: A History (New York, 1975), 86-87, 128-60.

of schooling. Even so, Kilpatrick made it quite clear that Dutch culture in New York was perpetuated by the Reformed Church and the school acting in tandem.[68] The same kind of alliance between church and school generally existed among other non-British New Yorkers, who, together with the Dutch, outnumbered New Yorkers of British birth or descent until the middle of the eighteenth century.[69]

British New Yorkers were themselves divided into different ethnic groups. English dissenters in New York, from Quakers to Presbyterians, continually squabbled among themselves, agreeing on little except their mutual dislike for the Anglican Church. Among them the school and church were expected to protect the ethnic identity of the family.[70] They, perhaps even more than New York's

---

[68]Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 68-70, 109, 158-59, 216-27. The expansion of the Dutch Reformed faith and Dutch schools after 1664 is discussed by De Jong, Dutch in America, 87-108; and by Edward T. Corwin, A Manual of the Reformed Church in America, 1628-1902, 4th ed., rev. and enl. (New York, 1902), 45-130.

[69]As Michael Kammen has noted, New York contained remarkable diversity, but within that diversity were pockets of intense cultural homogeneity; see Kammen, Colonial New York, 87. This was noted earlier by travelers in the province; see Bartlett B. Jones, ed., Journal of Jasper Danckaerts, 1679-1680 (New York, 1913), 220-30, 257-60; Peter Kalm, Travels in North America, ed. Adolph B. Benson, 2 vols. (New York, 1934), I, 130-50, 325-40; "Journal of a Tour from the City of New York to Canada," New York History, XIII (Apr. 1932), 181-96, 305-22; Andrew Burnaby, Travels through the Middle Settlements of North America in the Years 1759 and 1760, ed. Rufus Rockwell (1798; reprint ed., New York, 1904), 75-88, 113.

[70]John Webb Pratt, Religion, Politics, and Diversity: The Church-State Theme in New York History (Ithaca, N. Y., 1967), 26-80; Herbert L. Osgood, ed., "The Society of Dissenters Founded at New York in 1769," American Historical Review, VI (Apr. 1901), 498-507; William Smith, Jr., The History of the Province of New York, ed. Michael Kammen, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), I, 233-45. Though usually critical of the "inadquate" education provided by dissenters, Anglicans in New York continually complained of the

ethnic minorities of foreign descent, interpreted the missionary and educational activites of the Anglican Church as a form of cultural aggression. Kemp acknowledged this hostility, but he did not reveal just how extensive were the efforts of the dissenters to set up their own schools to counteract the S. P. G. schoolmasters. Indeed, based on what both Kemp and Kilpatrick suggested, New Yorkers seemed to have taken English culture on their own terms, leaving a powerful substructure of ethnic diversity in the province.[71]

To be sure, New Yorkers had certain common interests, or at least interests that united and divided them without much regard for ethnic affiliations. If the works by Kilpatrick and Kemp demonstrated that education in colonial New York perpetuated ethnic differences, Seybolt's study of the private school suggested that the educational process also responded to broader economic and cultural forces. While some of the private masters operated distinctive schools for ethnic minorities, others taught specialized subjects and appealed to the public at large. Their curricula indicated the secularization of New York society under the twin influences

---

"prejudice of education" which made dissenting children reluctant to convert to the Church of England. The best primary source materials I have found on the educational activities of the dissenters are in the S. P. G. Letter Books, Series A, B, C (London, 1964). (Wherever possible in the citations from this material, the series, volume number and page number of each letter will be given in that order.) To cite just a few examples, Cornbury to Secretary, Nov. 29, 1707, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, III, 155; Francis MacKenzie, missionary to Staten Island, to Secretary, Nov. 8, 1705, ibid., A, II, 116; Hezekiah Watkins, missionary to Newburgh, to Secretary, Oct. 30, 1764, ibid., B, III, 308.

[71]Kemp, Support of Schools in Colonial New York, 28-53.

of commercial expansion and Enlightenment thought, both of which were conduits of English culture. Rather than running the risk of being labeled a religious partisan, such schoolmasters were likely to concentrate on qualifying students "for business, either as mechanic, merchant, seaman, engineer, &c."[72] Similarly, the many dancing and language schools were designed to impart social graces to gentlemen of the upper class, regardless of their ethnic origin. Such schools probably endowed some students with what Cremin called a liberating literacy, allowing them to move into intellectual and occupational worlds far removed from the narrow ethnic world of the family.[73]

The variegated nature of schooling was indicative of the entire educational process in provincial New York. As Carl Kaestle has recently emphasized in his study of the evolution of public schooling in New York City, the school was but a part of the configuration of educational institutions, working in conjunction with apprenticeship, the family, and the church. The family was the primary educator, usually imparting literacy and through apprenticeship occupational skills. The family, assisted mainly by the church, also transmitted cultural traditions and moral values. The role of the school was distinctly supplementary. According to Kaestle, the ethnic

---

[72]New York Mercury, Nov. 10, 1766, in Seybolt, Source Studies in American Colonial Education, 53. The role of the school as both conservator and innovator is discussed by Talcott Parsons, "The School Class as a Social System: Some of Its Functions in American Society," Harvard Educational Review, XXIX (Fall 1957), 197-318.

[73]Seybolt, Source Studies in American Colonial Education, 35-53.

diversity of colonial New York precluded the cultural agreement necessary for the formulation of public policy toward schooling, except for requiring apprentices to have some instruction. "Huguenot, Dutch, Anglican, Presbyterian, Deist--each arranged his child's moral and doctrinal education to his liking," Kaestle explained, "not only at home and at church as in later periods but also in school."[74] A kind of cultural amalgamation rather than assimilation took place, with many New Yorkers becoming Anglicized not by systematic cultural aggression but by the pursuit of their own economic and political interests.[75]

My own thinking on education in colonial New York parallels Kaestle's. By expanding on Kaestle and by drawing insights from both the older studies of schooling in New York and the recent critiques of American educational historiography, a research design of the relationship between education and ethnicity in New York from 1664 to 1763 may be constructed. Following Cremin, education is defined as deliberate and sustained efforts to evoke or transmit knowledge, values, and skills. Following cultural anthropologist George De Vos, ethnic group is defined as "a self-perceived group of people who hold in common a set of traditions not shared by

---

[74]Carl F. Kaestle, The Evolution of an Urban School System, 7-20, quotation on 20.

[75]Ibid., 20-27.

the others with whom they are in contact."[76] Amidst the medley of nationalities and religions in colonial New York, education necessarily performed a dual function. On the one hand, the educational process responded to the conservative impulse among New Yorkers of different national backgrounds and religious confessions to preserve and perpetuate their own respective ethnic identities. But on the other hand, the educational process also responded to cultural, economic, and political forces that facilitated social interaction and integration across ethnic differences.[77]

Though theoretically discrete, the two functions of the educational process interacted and operated simultaneously in practice, sometimes within the same educational institution. For example, consider the family, the primary educator in provincial New York. The family usually patronized the neighborhood church and school to form an interlocking institutional triad dedicated to preserving and perpetuating the ethnic traditions of the Old World in the New.[78]

---

[76]George De Vos, "Ethnic Pluralism: Conflict and Accommodation," in Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change, ed. by George De Vos and Lola Romanucci-Ross (Palo Alto, Calif., 1975), 9-18, quotation on 9.

[77]The basic concepts for my research design of education and ethnicity in colonial New York are drawn from Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins (1964; reprint ed., New York, 1971), 23-50; Parsons, "The School Class as a Social System," 297-318; and De Vos, "Ethnic Pluralism," 10-23.

[78]For an introduction to the study of the family in colonial America, see David Rothman, "A Note on the Study of the Colonial Family," William and Mary Quarterly, 3d series, XXIII (Oct. 1966), 627-34; Ruby Ray Seward, "The Colonial Family in America: Toward a Socio-Historical Restoration of Its Structure," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXV (Feb. 1973), 58-70. On New York,

At the same time, the family also had social and economic ambitions, and that quest for wealth and status, noted by every perceptive commentator on colonial New York society from Cadwallader Colden and William Smith, Jr., in the eighteenth century to Milton Klein and Michael Kammen in the twentieth century, led some parents to prepare their children for careers that would give them economic and political interests far beyond narrow ethnic concerns.[79] Reflecting both family ambition and the impact of secularization, Archibald Kennedy, writing as a "Dissenter from the Anglican Church" during the King's College controversy, was quite willing to see his son follow the Anglican faith, if that would give him some advantage in serving the public and himself. Religious differences were based on meaningless distinctions, concluded Kennedy, whose son succeeded him as collector of the customs in the province of New York.[80]

---

see Charles Edward Ironside, The Family in Colonial New York: A Sociological Study (New York, 1942), 20-40, 77-93; Alice P. Kenney, "Patricians and Plebeians in Colonial Albany: Part IV--Community Analysis," De Halve-Maen, XLV (Jan. 1971), 13-14; and Kenney's "Private Worlds in the Middle Colonies," 5-32; Wertenbaker, The Middle Colonies, 84-107.

[79]Kammen, Colonial New York, xvi; Klein, Politics of Diversity, 110-23, esp. 111. The economic ambitions of the family and the preparation of children to advance the family interests can be seen in Alice P. Kenney, The Gansevoorts of Albany: Dutch Patricians in the Upper Hudson Valley (Syracuse, N. Y., 1969); Brook Hindle, "A Colonial Governor's Family: The Coldens of Coldenham," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, XLV (July 1961), 233-50; Lawrence H. Leder, "Robert Livingston's Sons; Preparation for Futurity," New York History, L (July 1969) 234-49; Philip L. White, The Beekmans of New York in Politics and Commerce, 1647-1877 (New York, 1956).

[80]Archibald Kennedy, A Speech . . . by a Member Dissenting from the Church (New York, 1755), 14-19; Charles W. Spencer, "Archibald Kennedy," DAB, V, 332.

The importance of the family as mediator between cultural change and cultural continuity was enhanced because education was completely decentralized in provincial New York. There was no legislation regulating schooling, and there was no established church, though something remotely resembling an Anglican establishment existed in the four lower counties.[81] The English government granted charters of incorporation only to Dutch Reformed and Anglican congregations, thus inhibiting the ability of dissenters to accumulate capital from one generation to another. The immediate impact of that policy of incorporation was to exacerbate the already unstable pluralism of the province, making the dissenting churches especially dependent upon the continued patronage of the surrounding families.[82] The local governments in some of the rather homogeneous Dutch towns and New Englander villages in New York at times cooperated with the church and allocated public revenues for the schoolmaster, but the ethnic mixture in many areas of the province made any kind of public support for education or religion unacceptable.[83] Thus, the family was the cultural arbiter, deciding what school, church, and even

---

[81]R. T. Henshaw, "The New York Ministry Act of 1693," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, II (1933), 199-204; John Webb Pratt, Religion, Politics, and Diversity, 36-48.

[82]Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes, comp., The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 6 vols. (1915-1928; reprint ed., New York, 1967), IV, 278, 492; William H. W. Sabine, ed., Historical Memoirs from 16 March 1763 to 9 July 1776 of William Smith (New York, 1956), 169-70.

[83]Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 201-15. An excellent account of the ethnic mixture in settlement patterns is in Beverly McAnear, "Politics in Provincial New York, 1689-1761" (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1935), 20-116.

community to support. The result was a kind of cultural federalism, with the educational process at once perpetuating considerable ethnic diversity while propagating an emerging provincial identity shaped by certain common interests and experiences.

Having sketched in rather broad terms the educational pattern, let me hasten to add that the chapters that follow do not represent a comprehensive history of education and ethnicity in colonial New York. The impact of the educational process upon every village and town in New York between 1664 and 1763 has not been assayed. Nor has an exhaustive analysis been made of the part played by any or several of the various educational institutions. The incomplete and scattered state of the evidence precludes at this time the writing of a comprehensive history of education in the province. However, the chapters that follow are designed to demonstrate with specific data just how the educational process functioned in colonial New York.

Concentrating on the development of a pattern of education thoroughly centered on the family, Chapters II, III, IV, and V are arranged in chronological order, though each spotlights different themes. Chapter II looks at education in New Netherland, focusing sharply on the efforts of Stuyvesant and the Reformed clergy to use education for social control and religious conformity. Chapter III is concerned with the impact of the transition to English rule upon the educational pattern New York inherited from New Netherland, especially

the rise and decline of the policy of multiple religious establishments based upon the authority of local governments. At this juncture, the attitudes of the Dutch and English in New York toward children and education will also be compared and contrasted, projecting the analogy into the eighteenth century.

Chapter IV examines three different plans developed by English officials to Anglicize the culturally diverse peoples of New York during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. As part of a larger scheme of imperial reorganization, the first plan began when New York was joined in 1688 to the Dominion of New England, following years of pleading by different governors to dilute the foreign population of New York by adding Connecticut to it. That arbitrary act, together with the subsequent Leisler's Rebellion shaped the contours of provincial politics for at least a generation. The second plan called for the establishment by law of the Anglican Church and resulted in the Ministry Act of 1693. The act was ineffectual for years, but Governor Cornbury instilled new life into it as part of his plan to use both the provincial government and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel to impose some kind of conformity upon the cultural pluralism which he despised. This attempt to Anglicize New York by force failed. But as Chapter V emphasizes, it left a legacy of suspicion among non-Anglicans that persisted despite the laissez-faire attitude toward religion and education that characterized the government of the colony from the time of Governor Robert Hunter's administration, 1710-1719.

Turning to the educational manifestations of certain integrating

forces, Chapters VI and VII are thematic, each concerned with the development of different aspects of the educative process in the eighteenth century. Chapter VI is on occupational training and economic expansion. It is organized around the theme of the growing complexity of economic life in the colony. The focus is on changes in apprenticeship training, the rise of private vocational schools, and the role of the family in occupational choices. Economic expansion undergirded the nascent cultural life of New York, and that also will be explored.

Chapter VII is concerned with the relationship between education and religious competition in eighteenth-century New York. Some attention will be given to the work of missionaries and teachers among slaves and Indians, but the focus is on the educational impact of revivalism and the rise of denominationalism among the white settlers. The Great Awakening did not blaze as brightly in New York as in some of the other colonies, but the fires of revivalism continued to smolder there for years. As Dietmar Rothermund found in Pennsylvania, the Awakening in New York may well have played a vital part in the forging of a New World identity for many of the colonists.[84] Presbyterians and Reformed congregations were split, but denominations tended to cooperate according to broader conservative and evangelical attitudes, ethnic distinctions seemingly playing a less important part than ever before. The extent of denominational rivalry was manifest in the King's College controversy.

Pulling together the themes set forth in the other chapters,

---

[84]Dietmar Rothermund, The Layman's Progress (Philadelphia, 1961), 1-18.

the conclusion delineates the dualistic identity that determined in large measure the behavior of colonial New Yorkers. The relationship between ethnic politics and education is also considered, focusing first on the educational implications of politics and next on the political implications of education. The first involved the expansion of popular participation in the political process. Having been drawn into the extremely volatile arena of politics by competing political factions and sometimes by the desire to protect their own ethnic integrity, New Yorkers of different ethnic backgrounds learned through the political process the necessity of cooperation and compromise to preserve their own respective interests and became acquainted with the British political tradition and Enlightenment thinking on government and the rights of man.

The political implications of education may best be seen in the controversy regarding Anglican influence at King's College and the English language in Dutch Reformed schools and churches. These disputes demonstrated that ethnic antagonisms were far from dead and that fear of Anglican aggression was still very much alive. It could hardly have been otherwise, despite the unifying impact of economic expansion, denominational religion, and the spread of English culture. Ethnicity remained strong in New York because the family dominated the educational process almost completely, and the family continued to perpetuate ethnic traditions. New Yorkers of different ethnic backgrounds had learned to cooperate politically to protect their ethnic integrity or advance their private interests. However, much of their unity was negative, that is, against any major

innovations that threatened to disrupt the cultural balance. The mounting confrontation between the British Parliament and the colonies posed a dilemma; independence or subservience to an overweening Parliament, both were equally unattractive to cautious New Yorkers. They had been educated to preserve and advance the interests of their respective families, and in the revolutionary crisis, parochial concerns tended to determine the actions of many New Yorkers, making them loyalists or patriots according to the immediate threat to their way of life.

CHAPTER II

THE NEW NETHERLAND WAY IN EDUCATION: SHAPING AN EARLY AMERICAN SOCIETY

Ethnic diversity was part of the cultural inheritance that Dutch New Netherland left to English New York. At the time of the British conquest in 1664, New Netherland had a population of approximately 10,000 colonists of many different nationalities and religious persuasions, though at least 60% were clearly of Dutch descent, and of those who were not, many had lived for years in the Netherlands before coming to America.[1] The economic prosperity and religious toleration of the Dutch republic were so appealing that the Amsterdam directors of the West India Company had difficulty finding colonists for New Netherland, whether foreign or native Dutch. Indeed, writing to the Amsterdam directors in July 1661, Director General Peter Stuyvesant complained that "the English and French colonies are continued and populated by their own nation and countrymen and consequently bound together more firmly and united, while your Honors' colonies in New-Netherland are only gradually and slowly peopled by the scrapings of all sorts of nationalities (few excepted) who consequently have the least interest in the welfare and maintenance

---

[1] Ruth Putnam, "The Dutch Element in the United States," in Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1909 (Washington, D. C., 1910), 205-12; Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, The Founding of American Civilization: The Middle Colonies (1938; reprint ed., New York, 1963), 35.

of the commonwealth."[2]

Director General Stuyvesant had been trying for years to forge the fragile bonds of community that would unite the motley peoples of New Netherland. His administration began in 1646 just as the West India Company was giving up its commercial monopoly and pledging itself to the colonization and agricultural settlement of New Netherland. With the English threatening even then to seize the underpopulated colony, immigrants were anxiously recruited, regardless of their ethnic or religious backgrounds. In fact, when some Dutch colonists sent over by the Company proved to be "mostly traders and hence persons unaccustomed to labor," Stuyvesant urged the Amsterdam directors to "look about and send us farmers or farm laborers, foreigners or exiles, used to labor and poverty."[3] But whatever their nationality or religion, the director general expected them to follow his standard of manners and morals and either worship privately or conform publicly to the tenets of the Dutch Reformed Church.

Regarding social stability and religious conformity as mutually dependent, Stuyvesant believed that not enough of either had ever existed in New Netherland. He sought both vigorously, discriminating

---

[2]Peter Stuyvesant to Amsterdam Directors, July 21, 1661, Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, ed. Edmund B. O'Callaghan and Berthold Fernow, 15 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1856-1887), XIII, 204-5 (hereafter cited as NYCD).

[3]Advice of the Chamber of Account of the West India Company Respecting New Netherland, May 27, 1647, NYCD, I, 237; Amsterdam Directors to Inhabitants of Manhattan, Apr. 4, 1652, ibid., XIV, 175; Stuyvesant to Amsterdam Directors, Sept. 4, 1659, ibid., XIV, 444.

against Jews and prosecuting Lutherans and Quakers until the Amsterdam directors ordered him to moderate his campaign against religious diversity.[4] Despite his periodic appeal to force, the director always looked to education rather than coercion as the principal means of making New Netherland both orderly and orthodox. Inspired by the same vision of religious unity held by Calvinists in the Netherlands, Stuyvesant was also guided by the earlier educational efforts of the Reformed Church and the Company, especially with regard to educating the Indians. His instruments of popular instruction were preachers, schoolmasters, regulations for apprenticeship, and legislation on manners and morals. Under his direction, New Netherland was transformed from a fur trading post into a commercial colony, but not into a Calvinistic commonwealth. Dutch educational tradition favored ethnic and religious diversity rather than cultural uniformity, and though Peter Stuyvesant would modify it somewhat, that was the tradition which shaped the New Netherland way in education both before and during his regime.

I

Education in New Netherland would bear the imprint of the crusade for religious conformity which Dutch Calvinists had waged for decades

---

[4]The best discussions on Stuyvesant and religion are contained in Frederick J. Zwierlein, Religion in New Netherland, 1623-1664 (1910; reprint ed., New York, 1971), esp. 1-9, 319-31; for a rebuttal to Zwierlein, see George L. Smith, Religion and Trade in New Netherland: Dutch Origins and American Development (Ithaca, N. Y., 1973), passim, esp. 1-64. 236-48.

in the Netherlands. Playing a major role in the Dutch wars begun in 1575 for independence from both the Catholic Church and Spanish crown, Calvinism did not capture the Dutch Reformed Church until the Synod of Dordrecht in 1618-1619. At that fateful convocation, the theology of John Calvin was codified in the Heidelberg Catechism and Belgic Confession of Faith and became the doctrinal foundation of the Reformed Church. Although militant and well organized, Dutch Calvinists were still just a small minority in a population overwhelmingly Catholic in religion, if not in politics. In addition, rival Protestant sects proliferated with the arrival of thousands of refugees from Germany, Scandinavia, and especially the southern Netherlands. To advance their faith, Dutch Reformed preachers--or domines as they were called--redoubled their efforts to suppress rival creeds and to educate the young in the tenets of orthodox Calvinism.[5]

That Calvinistic quest for religious uniformity was especially difficult because of the decentralized structure of civil authority in the Dutch republic. The United Provinces of the Netherlands was a loose confederation of seven sovereign provinces, dominated in foreign matters by the province of Holland and the city of Amsterdam. But domestic policy was formulated provincially and carried out locally, usually by the oligarchic municipal councils which

---

[5]Zwierlein, Religion in New Netherland, 9-35; George L. Smith, Religion and Trade in New Netherland, 23-65; William Heard Kilpatrick, The Dutch Schools of New Netherland and Colonial New York, United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin no. 12 (Washington, D. C., 1912), 1-38.

governed the different cities and towns in the Netherlands. The Dutch Reformed Church therefore had to depend upon local governments to pay its clergy and enforce its edicts. Throughout the United Provinces, the Reformed faith was established by provincial law, and Catholicism was conversely prohibited. Militant Calvinists also convinced some of the provinces to prohibit or restrict the public worship of certain Protestant sects.[6] But in practice, Catholics, Lutherans, Anabaptists, and other Protestants as well as Jews worshipped publicly though sometimes discreetly, thanks to the connivance of local officials who customarily took bribes to ignore the laws restricting religious practices. Connivance thrived because the merchant patricians on the powerful municipal councils wanted to maintain social harmony and economic stability, both of which would be jeopardized by the imposition of religious conformity.[7]

Although very much opposed to the prevailing de facto religious toleration, Dutch Reformed preachers recognized realistically that the future dominance of their faith depended primarily upon education, especially schooling. At the Synod of Dordrecht, three methods of introducing children to Reformed doctrines were endorsed. First,

---

[6]Bernard H. M. Vlekke, Evolution of the Dutch Nation (New York, 1945), esp. 31-70; Jan DeVries, "On the Modernity of the Dutch Republic," Journal of Economic History, XXXIII (Mar. 1973), 191-202; Zwierlein, Religion in New Netherland, 25-35; George L. Smith, Religion and Trade in New Netherland, 40-77.

[7]George L. Smith, Religion and Trade in New Netherland, 77-114; Violet Barbour, Capitalism in Amsterdam in the Seventeenth Century (Baltimore, 1950), 130.

parents were enjoined to instruct their offspring diligently in the principles of the faith. Second, schools were to be established throughout the provinces, subsidized by the civil magistracy and conducted by teachers of the Reformed creed. Third, ministers and elders were required to catechize the children at church, to admonish parents to nurture their children in godliness, and "to visit all the schools, private as well as public," urging the masters to teach the catechism and prayers of the Reformed Church to their pupils.[8]

Reformed domines knew that the faith favored by the schools would likely become the dominant faith. Almost all Dutch children went to school. Reading, writing, and arithmetic were, after all, important skills for a people devoted to trade; but equally important perhaps, infant and elementary schools performed a valuable custodial function in the crowded, cramped cities of Holland and Utrecht. In both town and country, Calvinists set up elementary schools, financed in part by the municipal councils and taught by the voorlezers (readers) or voorsangers (choristers) of the different Reformed churches. The provinces also enacted laws forbidding anyone not of the Reformed faith from teaching. In many regions, the civil magistracy allowed the local consistories to license infant and elementary school teachers, though the magistrates usually kept

---

[8]Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 19-24. Pertinent sections on education in the resolutions of the Synod of Dordrecht are in Henry Webb Dunshee, The History of the School of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church in the City of New York, from 1633 to 1883, 2d rev. ed. (New York, 1883), 3-5.

control of the town Latin school in their own hands. Although Calvinists continually complained that many heretics still taught school, the Dutch Reformed Church exerted considerable influence on elementary schooling in the United Provinces, and that influence no doubt contributed to increasing the number of Calvinists from a slight minority of the population at the beginning of the seventeenth century to possibly a majority by the end of that period.[9]

Despite its considerable success in regulating the elementary schools, the Reformed Church could not alter the fact that in Dutch tradition the family decided matters of both religion and education. Indeed, during the seventeenth century, life in the United Provinces continued to revolve around the family, much as it had since the Middle Ages. The basic political entity was generally the town, and its self-perpetuating municipal council was virtually the private domain of a few wealthy merchant families, whose own particular economic and ethnic interests dictated that government not infringe upon the traditional privacy and prerogatives of the family.[10] As Paul Zumthor for Holland and Alice Kenney for New York have both pointed out, the Dutch were extremely devoted to the family, undisturbed for the most part by any competing sense of transcendent nationalism or zealous religious mission. Finding fulfillment

---

[9]Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 24-38; Dunshee, School of the Collegiate Dutch Church, 1-6; Paul Zumthor, Daily Life in Rembrandt's Holland (New York, 1963), 84-89.

[10]Henri Pirenne, Early Democracies in the Low Countries, trans. J. V. Saunders (1915; reprint ed., New York, 1963), 34-54, 234-37; Zumthor, Rembrandt's Holland, 36-48, 79-94, 224-34.

and immense satisfaction in the family, they tended to define their own success in terms of its economic improvement. The household structure of the Dutch family was almost invariably nuclear, though kinsmen in related businesses or living in the same region usually cooperated for the mutual success of the clan. Geared for economic advancement, the Dutch family of the seventeenth century cushioned the impact of the rapid urbanization and commercial expansion going on in the United Provinces, providing a remarkable source of stability for a society generally unsettled by profound economic and social changes.[11]

The family was the chief guardian and perpetuator of culture among the mixture of peoples in the Dutch republic. Its patronage extended to complementary institutions like the church or synagogue, the trade guilds, and the schools. Generally speaking, parents thought of education as the means of preserving the traditions and advancing the economic interests of the family. Religion was usually a vital part of the family's ethnic identity, and in an age when God was as real as omnipresent death, religious training was regarded as essential for the young. Whether Catholic or Protestant, Dutch parents began early to instruct their offspring in the rudiments of the family faith. Dutch Calvinists especially

---

[11]Zumthor, Rembrandt's Holland, 79-117; Alice P. Kenney, "Private Worlds in the Middle Colonies: An Introduction to Human Traditions in American History," New York History, LI (Jan. 1970), 5-31; A. M. Van der Woude, "Variations in the Size and Structure of the Household in the United Provinces in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," in Household and Family in Past Times, ed. Peter Laslett and Richard Wall (Cambridge, 1972), 5-31.

were known for their cultivation of family piety, including praying, reading the Bible, and repeating the catechism together. At the same time, the Calvinists, like Dutch parents in general, usually treated their children with indulgence and much affection, which may help to explain why Calvinism among the Dutch apparently provoked much less morbid introspection than among the English Puritans.[12]

Patronizing the church of its choice, the family also chose the school where its sons and daughters continued to be instructed in the faith and were taught reading, writing, and sometimes arithmetic. Children of poor parents had less choice, but schools conducted by the Reformed Church taught them without charge. The specialized occupational training which counted most for the child's economic future was secured directly through the family. Even though girls as well as boys frequently participated in the family business, mothers took special pains to instruct their daughters in caring for the home, the most visible symbol of the family's accomplishments. Fathers similarly initiated their sons into the family trades or else arranged apprenticeships for them through the guilds or through associates outside the guilds. Boys being groomed for public positions went to Latin school, and a few others continued their formal education at colleges known as "illustrious schools" or at the four chartered universities, studying theology, law, medicine, or the natural sciences. So in spite of the growing influence of the Reformed

---

[12]Zumthor, Rembrandt's Holland, 79-94; George L. Smith, Religion and Trade in New Netherland, 93-114; Zwierlein, Religion in New Netherland, 32-34.

Church over schooling, the family still eagerly determined what instruction its children received, and education in the Dutch republic continued to perpetuate ethnic diversity while it also propagated Calvinist orthodoxy.[13]

II

Some twenty years before Peter Stuyvesant came to New Netherland, the Dutch educational tradition began its transit to America. The primary agents for this transfer of culture from the Old World to the New were the West India Company, the Reformed Church, and the colonists themselves. Impelled by antagonistic aspirations, the Company, the Church, and the people projected their own conflicting interests into the development of education in the Dutch colony. Trying with some success to reconcile the contending parties, Stuyvesant would later build upon their earlier educational efforts.

Chartered in 1621 to wage war against Spain and to expand Dutch trade, the West India Company wanted to exploit commerce rather than promote colonization. It was empowered by the States General of the United Provinces to exercise a monopoly of trade and sovereign rights of government in America, West Africa, and islands scattered throughout the western hemisphere. In America, the directors of the Company were primarily interested in conquering Brazil from Portugal, but New Netherland was of value because of its furs and its strategic location as a base for trade and

---

[13]Zumthor, Rembrandt's Holland, 102-19; Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 37-38.

privateering in Spanish America.[14] The Assembly of XIX, which served as the executive board of the Company, delegated the responsibility of administering New Netherland to its Amsterdam Chamber, the most influential of the five administrative branches into which the Company was divided. The Amsterdam directors further delegated the management of New Netherland to commissioners appointed from among themselves for six-year terms.[15]

Led by Director Kiliaen Van Rensselaer, the Commissioners of New Netherland drew up plans for an almost self-sufficient trading colony composed of resident traders and clerks, artisans and farmers, and soldiers under contract to the Company. In March 1624, the Commissioners sent the first colonists to New Netherland. Among the thirty families, most of whom were Walloon refugees, was Bastiaen Jansz. Krol, appointed Comforter of the Sick by the Consistory of the Reformed Church at Amsterdam and employed by the Company.[16] In lieu of an ordained preacher, Krol, like other Comforters of the Sick who served in both the Netherlands and the East Indies because of the shortage of qualified Reformed ministers, not only consoled the ill but also read from a book of approved sermons and led

---

[14]Van Cleaf Bachman, Peltries or Plantations: The Economic Policies of the Dutch West India Company in New Netherland, 1623-1639 (Baltimore, 1969), 40-68; Thomas J. Condon, New York Beginnings: The Commercial Origins of New Netherland (New York, 1968), 36-61.

[15]S. G. Nissenson, The Patroon's Domain (New York, 1937), 7-15; Condon, New York Beginnings, 59-61.

[16]Nicolaes Van Wassenaer, "Historisch Verhael (Historical Account), 1624-1630," in Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664, ed. J. Franklin Jameson (New York, 1909), 75 (hereafter cited as NNN). See also Condon, New York Beginnings, 62-72.

the singing of psalms during worship services. He also was given a special dispensation by the Amsterdam Consistory to baptize infants and solemnize marriages in New Netherland.[17]

The Provisional Articles of 1624 allowed only the Reformed religion to be publicly practiced in New Netherland, but freedom of conscience was to be respected, and colonists were especially enjoined to live as good Christians for the edification of the heathen. Indeed, the Commissioners were apparently much influenced by John de Laet's New World, or A Description of the West Indies (1624), which claimed that the Indians of the Hudson Valley "might be civilized and brought under better regulations, particularly if a sober and discreet population were brought over and good order preserved."[18] Hence Krol was ordered not only to instruct the Indians in the Christian religion but also to prevent all idolatry, blasphemy, and Sabbath breaking among the colonists. "By the example of godliness and outward discipline on the part of the Christians," the Commissioners reasoned, "the heathen may sooner be brought to a knowledge of the same." However deep the religious motive, the Commissioners obviously wanted the cooperation of the Indians for trade, and

---

[17]Krol is discussed at some length in A. Eekhof, Jonas Michaelius: Founder of the Church in New Netherland (Leyden, Holland, 1926), 3-12; see also Gerald F. De Jong, "The Ziekentroosters or Comforters of the Sick in New Netherland," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LIV (Oct. 1970), 339-59.

[18]John de Laet, The New World, or A Description of the West Indies, in Collections of the New-York Historical Society, 2d series, vol. I (New York, 1841), 301.

missionary work was seen as one way of gaining it.[19]

The Indians were much more willing to trade with the Dutch than to worship with them. Krol apparently did not win a single convert from the Mohawks, but he learned their language and gained their trust, and when the Company picked New Amsterdam on Manhattan Island as its headquarters in 1627, Director General Minuit made Krol the Commissary of Fort Orange (Albany). Equally unsuccessful was Domine Jonas Michaelius, the first Dutch Reformed minister in New Netherland, who arrived in 1628 and found the heathen devilishly resistant to Christianity. He denounced them as "entirely savage and wild, strangers to all decency, yea, uncivil and stupid as garden poles, proficient in all wickedness and godlessness; devilish men, who served the Devil. . . ."[20] He believed the only way to Christianize the Indians was to separate the young from their parents before they learned "the heathenish tricks and deviltries" of their savage elders. Placed under the charge of a godly schoolmaster, they could then be taught the principles of Christianity and the Dutch language. After that, they might be returned to their own people to spread the Gospel. However, the frustrated domine doubted that even this plan would work, for the savages were loath to

---

[19]Instructions to Willem Verhulst by the Commissioners for New Netherland, Jan. 1625, Documents Relating to New Netherland 1624-1626 in the Henry E. Huntington Library, ed. Arnold J. F. Van Laer (San Marino, Calif., 1924), 36 (hereafter cited as Huntington Documents); see also instructions sent Apr. 22, 1635-6, ibid., 178.

[20]Eekhof, Michaelius, 132; Michaelius to Domine Adrianus Smotius, Aug. 11, 1628, NNN, 126.

part with their children even for a short time.[21]

Michaelius had higher hopes for the Reformed faith among the colonists. He took over the flock at New Amsterdam from Jan Huygen, another Comforter of the Sick, who was also Minuit's brother-in-law and manager of the Company store. By 1628, New Amsterdam had about 270 inhabitants. They were just beginning to replace their hovels and cellar-like dwellings with houses made from plank and stone. The domine found the colonists rather rough and rowdy though respectful toward him. Michaelius immediately organized the consistory, choosing as elders Minuit and Huygen, and joyfully reported "fully fifty communicants, Walloon and Dutch," at the first celebration of the Lord's Supper in New Amsterdam. He preached in Dutch, because almost everyone there understood it, but he administered the Lord's Supper to the Walloons in their native French, no doubt at their own insistence.[22]

The Instructions of the Commissioners for 1625 called for the construction of both a church and a school, but neither had been built, and Michaelius was becoming increasingly critical of the way the Company was managing New Netherland. He complained bitterly about the quality of the colonists. Rather than do their assigned jobs, they either loafed or else participated illegally in the fur trade reserved to the Company. He also accused Director General Minuit of governing badly and swindling the Company, and he was

---

[21]Michaelius to Domine Adrianus Smotius, Aug. 11, 1628, NNN, 128-30.

[22]Ibid., 123-25; Wassenaer, "Historisch Verhael," NNN, 89.

probably right on both counts. Most important, ignoring the fact that the Company wanted to exploit commercially rather than colonize the region, the enraged preacher rebuked the Amsterdam directors for not sending farmers. Here was a clear-cut difference of expectations. As personified by Minuit and Michaelius, respectively, the Company wanted commerce and the Reformed Church wanted settlement.[23]

By the time the Company recalled the quarrelling Minuit and Michaelius in 1632, Van Rensselaer and the others appointed with him as Commissioners of New Netherland had served their terms and had been replaced by directors who intended to curtail the Company's investment in the colony. However, Van Rensselaer and his friends persuaded the Amsterdam Chamber to approve the Charter of Privileges and Exemptions of 1629 which allowed the major stockholders in the Company to found colonies called patroonships.[24] Reflecting the influence of the Reformed Church, Article XXVII of the Charter concerned education:

> The patroons and colonists shall in particular, and in the speediest manner, endeavour to find out ways and means whereby they may support a minister and schoolmaster, that the service of God and zeal for

---

[23]Michaelius to Domine Adrianus Smotius, Aug. 11, 1628, NNN, 125-26; Michaelius to D. Joannes Foreest, Secretary to the Illustrious Lords of North Holland and West Friesland, Sept. 13, 1630, in Eekhof, Michaelius, 66-69. George L. Smith delineates this struggle as it began in Holland and was transferred to New Netherland, Religion and Trade in New Netherland, 40-63.

[24]Condon, New York Beginnings, 116-25; Nissenson, Patroon's Domain, 21-26.

> religion may not be neglected among them, and they shall, at the first, provide a comforter of the sick there.[25]

Six patroonships were registered, but only Van Rensselaer's colony around Fort Orange lasted, and Van Rensselaer alone of the patroons took care to have one of his colonists perform the duties usually assigned to the Comforter of the Sick, that is, reading sermons and prayers on the Sabbath.[26]

Like Michaelius before him, Domine Everardus Bogardus opposed the reduction of the Company's establishment at New Amsterdam and argued with the director general, Wouter Van Twiller, nephew to Kiliaen Van Rensselaer. Apparently at the urging of Bogardus, the Company agreed in 1638 to employ a schoolmaster, Adam Roelantsen, who was certified by the Reformed Classis of Amsterdam, the ecclesiastical body having jurisdiction in New Netherland. Roelantsen turned out to be a regular rogue, given to wine, women, and libelous gossip; but his appointment as the official schoolmaster of New Amsterdam marked a dramatic shift in Company policy favoring the settlement of New Netherland.[27]

---

[25]Charter of Freedoms and Exemptions of June 7, 1629, Van Rensselaer Bowier Manuscripts, ed. Arnold J. F. Van Laer (Albany, N. Y., 1908), 151 (hereafter cited as VRBM).

[26]Edmund B. O'Callaghan, History of New Netherland, 2 vols. (1846; reprint ed., Spartanburg, S. C., 1966), I, 121-40; note documents relating to the registration of patroonships in New Netherland, VRBM, 154-66; also instructions to Rutger Hendricksz Van Soest, Schout (Sheriff), ordering Brandt Peelen to read a sermon each Sunday to the colonists, July 20, 1632, ibid., 208.

[27]Wouter Van Twiller to Amsterdam Directors, Aug. 4, 1637, New York State Historical Association, Quarterly Journal, I (Oct. 1919), 44-50; Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 39-50; Resolution of the States General Urging the Colonization of New Netherland, and Report

With a declining population of less than 1,000, New Netherland faced the very real possibility of being overrun by the English, who numbered about 14,000 in Massachusetts Bay and about 8,000 in Virginia by 1640. Pressured by the States General of the United Provinces to respond to the English threat, the Company began by appointing Roelantsen as schoolmaster, firing Van Twiller, and hiring Willem Kieft as Director General in 1638. To stimulate immigration, the Company's Board of Accounting recommended that colonists be allowed to participate in the fur trade heretofore reserved to the Company, that smaller land grants be made available to all settlers, and that each inhabitant pay a small tax "for the maintenance of clergymen, comforters of the sick, schoolmasters and such like necessary officers."[28] The Freedoms and Exemptions for New Netherland approved in 1640 made the first two recommendations law. Perhaps influenced by the Reformed Classis of Amsterdam, the third recommendation was altered quite significantly:

> And no other Religion shall be publicly admitted in New Netherland except the Reformed, as it is at present preached and practised by public authority in the United Netherlands; and for this purpose the Company shall provide and maintain good and suitable preachers, schoolmasters and comforters of the sick.[29]

---

on the Condition of the Colony of New Netherland, in 1638, NYCD, I, 106-7.

[28]Population statistics compiled by Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 13. Proposed Articles for the Colonization and Trade of New Netherland, Sept. 2, 1638, NYCD, I, 112.

[29]Charter of Freedoms and Exemptions Granted and Accorded by the Directors of the General Incorporated West India Company, July 19, 1640, NYCD, I, 123; O'Callaghan, New Netherland, I, 218-22.

The population of New Netherland increased remarkably, from 1,000 in 1640 to 3,000 in 1643. The fur trade attracted more transient adventurers than settlers, but colonists like Olaf Stevenson Van Cortlandt, Cornelis Melyn, David De Vries, and Myndert Meyndertsz began sinking deep economic roots into the colony. Furthermore, groups of dissident New Englanders settled on western Long Island under charters granted by Director General Kieft: Mespath (Newtown) in 1642, Hempstead in 1644, and Vlissingen (Flushing) and Gravesend in 1645.[30] People also came from Virginia, the Netherlands, and throughout Europe. "On the island of Manhate, and its environs," wrote Father Isaac Jogues who visited New Netherland in 1643, "there may well be four or five hundred men of different sects and nations; the Director General told me that there were men of eighteen different languages . . . scattered here and there on the river. . . ." The Reformed faith was the only religion publicly exercised in New Netherland, but the Jesuit reported finding besides Dutch Calvinists, English Puritans, Lutherans, Catholics, and Anabaptists called Mennonites.[31]

Despite growing religious diversity, the Reformed faith was

---

[30]Evarts B. Greene and Virginia D. Harrington, American Population before the Federal Census of 1790 (New York, 1932), 88; Condon, New York Beginnings, 144-53; Albert E. McKinley, "The English and Dutch Towns of New Netherland," American Historical Review, VI (Oct. 1900), 1-18; O'Callaghan, New Netherland, I, 236-39.

[31]Father Isaac Jogues, "Novum Belgium," in NNN, 259-60. A word should also be said here about quotations and dates. I quote almost verbatim, changing punctuation and spelling only when absolutely necessary for clarity, while writing out completely some abbreviated words. As for dates, I cite the day and month as given but begin the new year in January rather than March.

doing well in New Netherland. Cooperating with Domine Bogardus, Kieft led a drive to build a new stone church, chose Jan Stevensen to succeed Roelantsen as schoolmaster and precentor in 1642, and issued tough ordinances against profaning the Sabbath and disturbing the peace. Bogardus even spoke hopefully of converting the blacks and Indians.[32] Farther up the Hudson at the colony of Rensselaerswyck, Domine Johannes Megapolensis was installed in 1642 to minister both to the hundred-odd inhabitants and the Indians. Admitting he wanted to make money from his colony, Patroon Van Rensselaer had also planned "by means of settling the country and the practice of godliness, to have the Christian Reformed religion proclaimed there in order that the blind heathen also might be brought to the knowledge of our Savior Jesus Christ. . . ."[33] To his chagrin, the colonists tended to become as licentious and as wanton as the "blind heathen." During his eight years in the colony, Domine Megapolensis, through diligent preaching and catechizing, built his congregation into over a hundred communicants. He also learned the language of the Mohawks and wrote a small book about them,

---

[32]Edmund B. O'Callaghan, comp., Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland (Albany, N. Y., 1868), 25-35 (hereafter cited as Laws of New Netherland); Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 51-59; Minutes of the Classis of Amsterdam, Apr. 22, 1642, Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York, ed. Edward T. Corwin, 7 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1901-1916), I, 150-51 (hereafter cited as Ecclesiastical Records).

[33]Kiliaen Van Rensselaer to Johannes Megapolensis, 1642, VRBM, 604-19; also his letter to the same of 1643, ibid., 645-55; Kiliaen Van Rensselaer, Redress of the Abuses and Faults in the Colony of Rensselaerswyck (1643), in VRBM, 686.

but he converted few if any to Christianity.[34]

Under the protection of the Mohawks, Rensselaerswyck and Fort Orange remained unscathed by the Indian wars that ravaged the scattered settlements of the lower Hudson between 1642 and 1645. The Wappingers and several other tribes had long been nursing grievances against Dutch intrusions, but Kieft apparently provoked hostilities by foolishly levying a tax upon the Indians. While ending whatever missionary work Bogardus might have been doing among the local tribes, the brutal conflict played an important role in the political education of New Netherlanders. Hoping to get popular support for his war policy, Kieft called upon the people of New Amsterdam and surrounding areas to elect twelve men to advise him. As the Indians gained the upper hand and forced the settlers off their farms, the Twelve Men (later the Eight Men) became the conduits of popular resentment against the Company in general and against Kieft in particular. Domine Bogardus joined the dissidents, making lightly veiled attacks upon the director general from the pulpit, while the Eight Men petitioned the Amsterdam Chamber for redress.[35]

The Indian wars reduced the population of New Netherland to a few hundred people. Formulating plans to attract immigrants to the colony, the Amsterdam directors adopted several suggestions made by the Eight Men. First, Stuyvesant replaced Kieft as Director

---

[34]Call to Rev. Johannes Megapolensis, Mar. 22, 1642, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 146-47; Rev. Johannes Megapolensis, Jr., A Short Account of the Mohawk Indians (1644), in NNN, 168-80, esp. 178-79.

[35]O'Callaghan, New Netherland, I, 229-79; The Case of Domine Bogardus, June 19, 1646, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 196-200.

General in 1646. Stuyvesant was instructed to let the people of Manhattan and western Long Island elect a Board of Nine Men who would advise the government on matters relating to the commonalty. During the next few years, the Company gradually surrendered its monopoly of the carrying trade, thus allowing private merchants to trade directly between New Netherland and Holland upon the payment of import and export duties. Measures were also taken to promote cheap or free transportation to New Netherland, and the Amsterdam Chamber expressed greater concern for supplying the colony with preachers and teachers.[36]

This desire for the agricultural settlement of New Netherland was partly inspired by the terms of the Treaty of Munster ending the Eighty Years' War in 1648. Spain officially recognized the independence of the United Provinces, and the Dutch stopped raiding Spanish shipping, forcing the Amsterdam directors to turn to colonization as an alternative source of revenue. The fall of Dutch Brazil in 1654 further committed the Company to the colonization of New Netherland, lest Dutch holdings in America dwindle to a few Caribbean islands. Although dwarfed by the populations of the surrounding English colonies, the population of New Netherland increased significantly, producing a greater demand for formal institutions of education.[37]

---

[36]The Eight Men to the Amsterdam Chamber of the West India Company, Oct. 28, 1644, NYCD, I, 209-13; many of the changes were based on the Report of the Board of Account, 1644, ibid., 151-56.

[37]Vlekke, Evolution of the Dutch Nation, 213-30; George L. Smith, Religion and Trade in New Netherland, 137-41.

III

Heading the government of New Netherland during these critical years of transition was the autocratic Peter Stuyvesant. Born the son of a Dutch Reformed preacher, Director General Stuyvesant was only thirty-seven years old when he came to the colony in 1647. A veteran employee of the Company, he had previously served as military governor of Curacao, and during a battle in 1644 to retake the island of St. Martin from the Spanish, his right leg was shattered by a cannon ball and later had to be amputated just below the knee. Stuyvesant attributed his miraculous recovery from such a deadly operation to the power of God. Every step he took reminded him of his duty to the Lord, and everywhere he looked in New Amsterdam disrespect for the laws of God and the rule of the Company was evident. Smuggling, drunkenness, brawling, and prostitution were commonplace.[38] From the first, Stuyvesant set out to reform the undisciplined New Netherlanders, utilizing the church, the school, and the law itself to instruct the colonists, old and young alike, in manners and morals. As intelligent as he was stubborn,. the dedicated Director General must have known that he could not transform the chaotic little colony into a Calvinistic commonwealth, but that was clearly the vision which compelled him again and again to try to impose order and orthodoxy upon what the Dutch domines called the "Babel of confusion" that was New Netherland.

---

[38]Henry H. Kessler and Eugene Rachlis, Peter Stuyvesant and His New York (New York, 1959), 3-23, 35-50; Michael Kammen, Colonial New York: A History (New York, 1975), 48-72.

After shoring up the regulations against smuggling, Stuyvesant began his reformation with schooling in New Amsterdam. "Whereas by want of proper place," he told his council shortly after arriving, "no school has been kept in three months, by which the youth is spoiled, so is proposed, where a convenient place may be adapted to keep the youth from the street and under a strict subordination."[39] Domine Backerus, who was serving at New Amsterdam while Bogardus returned to Holland to continue his dispute with Kieft, affirmed the need for proper schooling. "In order to best help the church of God here, and to resist a bad world," he wrote the Amsterdam Classis in 1648, "I think we must begin with the children, for many of the older people are so far depraved they are now ashamed to learn anything good."[40]

Schoolmaster Jan Stevensen was returning to Holland, and Stuyvesant and Backerus both petitioned the Company and Classis to send them a qualified teacher. "He should not only know how to read, write and cipher," wrote Backerus, "but should also be a man of pious life, and decent habits. He should have a good knowledge of the principle [sic] points of our Faith, and set

---

[39]Ordinance against Smuggling and to Oblige Merchants to Exhibit Their Books and Accounts, July 4, 1647, Laws of New Netherland, 65-68. Quotation from Council Meeting of Nov. 11, 1647, in Daniel J. Pratt, comp., Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, from 1626 to 1746 (Albany, N. Y., 1872), 7; complete minutes and different translation in Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch, ed. Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, 4 vols. (Baltimore, 1974), IV, 463-65 (hereafter cited as Dutch Manuscripts).

[40]Johannes Backerus to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 2, 1648, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 236.

a holy example to the children."[41] Agreeing that the growth of the Reformed Church was highly dependent upon the proper schooling of the rising generation, the Classis promised to send an experienced schoolmaster as soon as possible. In the meantime, Peter Vander Linden, a surgeon and wealthy landowner in New Netherland, assisted Backerus as reader to the congregation and may have conducted the official school, though by 1650 there were several private masters teaching in New Amsterdam, and one of them, Jan Cornelissen, was conducting the town school--variously called the official or public school.[42]

In their famous Remonstrance of 1649 against the misrule of the Company, the Nine Men emphasized the neglect of schooling in New Netherland. There was no Latin school, and elementary schooling took place on a very haphazard basis. They made some specific suggestions:

> There ought to be also a Public school provided with at least two good teachers; so that the youth, in so wild a country, where there are so many dissolute people, may first of all, be well instructed and indoctrinated not only in reading and writing, but also in the knowledge and fear of the Lord. Now, the school is kept very irregularly by this one or that, according to his fancy, as long as he thinks proper.[43]

---

[41] Ibid.; Peter Stuyvesant to Amsterdam Classis, Aug. 1649, ibid., 263.

[42] Amsterdam Classis to the Rev. Johannes Backerus, Apr. 26, 1649, ibid., 250; Classis Minutes, Oct. 8, 1648, ibid., 242; Cornelis Van Tienhoven, Answer to the Representatives of New Netherland (1650), NNN, 360.

[43] Remonstrance of New Netherland to the States General by the People of New Netherland, July 28, 1649, NYCD, I, 317.

The very next year, the Classis appointed and the Company employed Willem Vestensz as Comforter of the Sick for New Amsterdam. Vestensz served as reader, sexton, and official schoolmaster until 1655. Stung by the complaint of the Nine Men, Stuyvesant set up a Latin school in 1652, taught by Dr. Jan de la Montagne, but it apparently failed after a few months. Following the resignation of Vestensz, the elementary school sponsored by both the Company and local congregation was conducted by Harmanus Van Hobocken, who was replaced in 1660 by Evert Pietersen, the Comforter of the Sick previously assigned to the Dutch settlements on the Delaware. As in Holland, the official schoolmaster in New Amsterdam was also the reader, or chorister, or both in the church; he taught both boys and girls for a small tuition fee, though poor children were taught free. Besides reading, writing, and arithmetic, he instructed his students in the prayers and catechism of the Reformed Church and history of the Dutch nation. Throughout New Netherland, the official schoolmasters were thus agents of literacy, Calvinistic orthodoxy, and Dutch nationalism.[44]

Laws were also passed instructing New Netherlanders, both old and young, in manners and morals. To begin with, Stuyvesant and Backerus agreed that excessive drinking was a primary cause of fighting, prostitution, cheating the Indians, and other crimes. The economic hardships caused by the Indian wars turned many colonists

---

[44]Amsterdam Directors to Stuyvesant, Apr. 20, 1650, ibid., XIV, 123; Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 13-21; Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 51-70, 95-109.

to brewing and tapping. In 1648, Domine Backerus complained there were seventeen taverns in New Amsterdam; Stuyvesant reckoned that to be one out of every four houses. Of the 170 members of the New Amsterdam church, Backerus told the Classis that most of them were "very ignorant in regard to true religion, and very much given to drink. What bad fruits results therefrom, your Reverences will easily understand."[45] Stuyvesant blamed the taverns for "not only the neglect of honest handicraft and business, but also the debauching of the common man and the Company's servants and what is still worse, of young people from childhood up, who seeing the improper proceedings of their parents and imitating them leave the path of virtue and become disorderly."[46]

That adults should set the proper example for children was the primary logic behind many of Stuyvesant's ordinances and court decisions. The first law he promulgated as Director General was against the excessive drinking, quarrelling, and fighting that profaned the Sabbath and disturbed the peace. At the risk of losing the privilege to tap, tavern keepers were not to serve beer or any strong drink until after divine services on Sunday and never later than 9:00 p.m. each night. Stuyvesant came down hard on the brutal practice of knife fighting. In old Amsterdam, the penalty

---

[45]Backerus to Amsterdam Classis, Aug. 15, 1648, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 236.

[46]Ordinance against Unreasonable and Intemperate Drinking at Night and on the Sabbath, Mar. 10, 1648, Records of New Amsterdam, from 1653 to 1674, ed. Berthold Fernow, 7 vols. (New York, 1897), I, 6 (hereafter cited as RNA).

for drawing a knife was twelve guiders or six weeks in jail on bread and beer; for wounding someone, it was twenty-five guilders or three months in jail. But in New Netherland, the penalty for drawing a knife was 100 guilders or six months hard labor on bread and water; for wounding someone, it was 300 guilders or a year and a half of menial labor.[47] Enforcement lapsed periodically, and similar ordinances were passed again and again, reducing the number of taphouses, making innkeepers responsible for disorders in their houses, prohibiting the sale of liquor to Indians, and the like.[48]

Some of the ordinances dealt directly with the instruction of the young. In April 1648, the Director General and Council ordered that thereafter preaching would be held in the afternoon as well as in the morning of the Sabbath and enjoined "all officials, subjects and vassals" to attend the sermons. Furthermore, as the population of the colony increased, so did the details in Stuyvesant's blue laws, suggesting that the Sunday ban on such activities as visiting taverns, dancing, playing cards, ball, and ninepins were honored primarily in the breach. According to an ordinance passed in 1663, children found playing, shouting, and screaming excessively in the streets on the Sabbath were to be fined their "upper garment" or six guilders for the first offense and whipped for the second. During the cold

---

[47]Ordinances against Selling Liquor during Divine Services on the Sabbath, and after Nine O'Clock at Night; and against Fighting with Knives, May 31, 1647, Laws of New Netherland, 60-62.

[48]For a sampling, see ordinances in Laws of New Netherland, Apr. 29, 1648, 98-99; May 13, 1648, 100; June 12, 1657, 310; there were many others.

winter of 1657, an ordinance was passed warning that parents who taught their sons or daughters to steal wood would be severely punished, lest the children "grow up in their wickedness and finally cannot give up their daily habit."[49] Public punishments, ranging from confinement in the stocks to death on the gallows, were also calculated to dramatize the wages of crime to the masses, especially to the young.[50]

The courts of New Netherland imposed severe punishment upon adults who would lure the young into illicit sexual practices, though such cases were relatively rare, and mitigating circumstances sometimes clouded the issue. For example, consider the attempted rape in 1648 of Maria Barents, an eleven year old servant girl, by Willem Guilford, a thirty year old Englishman. Making it quite clear that Guilford justly deserved to be executed, the Provincial Council deplored his crime as "a matter of very serious consequence, which in a country where justice prevails can not be suffered or tolerated, but ought to be severely punished, in order that the children of honest people may not be dishonored and led away from the path of virtue by such evildoers."[51] However, because the precocious Maria had since

---

[49]Ordinances cited in Laws of New Netherland, Apr. 29, 1648, 8-9; Sept. 10, 1663, 448; Ordinance of Burgomasters and Schepens of New Amsterdam, Dec. 3, 1657, RNA, I, 333.

[50]Edmund B. O'Callaghan, ed., Calendar of Dutch Historical Manuscripts in the Office of the Secretary of State, Albany, New York, 1630-1664 (1865; reprint ed., Ridgewood, N. J., 1968), 78, 84, 213 (hereafter cited as Calendar of Dutch Manuscripts); these are just a few of many examples of public execution of punishment in New Netherland.

[51]Council Minutes, Feb. 18, 1648, Dutch Manuscripts, IV, 482-83.

been caught freely having sexual intercourse with another young man, the court simply sentenced Guilford to be flogged severely and banished. Homosexuality was so heinous a perversion that there could not be mitigating circumstances. In the few cases of sodomy that came before the courts, the men were quickly executed, and the boys involved were whipped and publicly humiliated.[52]

Except with regard to public behavior, the prerogatives of the family in Dutch tradition kept the civil authority from telling parents how to raise their children. However, that same tradition was based in part upon the Roman law which guaranteed the civil rights and inheritance of any child who lost one or both parents. When the Orphan Asylum in Amsterdam sent several hundred children to New Netherland, Stuyvesant himself took a personal hand in arranging indentures for them, ruefully admitting in 1660 that most of the transported orphans were "accustomed and more inclined to carry a beggar's gripsack than to labor." For the children of New Netherlanders, it was the deacons of the Reformed congregation initially and the Orphanmasters after 1655 who appointed guardians. Before a widow or widower remarried, the espoused couple and the guardians involved invariably drew up a contract protecting the rights of children from previous marriages. The educational provisions in the agreement signed in 1656 by the widow Aryaentie Cornelis and Albert Leendersen were typically found in other prenuptial contracts:

---

[52]Ibid.: Calendar of Dutch Manuscripts, 103-201, 213.

> they herewith promise to bring up the six children aforesaid, to feed them, to have them taught to read or write, to have them learn an honest trade, as their state and condition may allow, and when they come of age or marry to fit them out decently.[53]

Similar provisions regarding reading and writing were included in most of the apprenticeship indentures negotiated under the auspices of the Orphanmasters.[54]

Especially concerned with every aspect of educating the young, the Dutch Reformed Church was at the center of Stuyvesant's plan for reforming New Netherland. Called to New York City in 1649, Domine Johannes Megapolensis, formerly minister at Rensselaerswyck, became Stuyvesant's trusted friend and ally and led the Reformed Church in the colony until his death in 1670.[55] In 1652, Megapolensis was joined by the multilingual Domine Samuel Drisius, who ministered not only to the Dutch and English but also to the French-speaking

---

[53]Amsterdam Directors to Stuyvesant, Apr. 4, 1652, NYCD, XIV, 165; quotation from Stuyvesant to Amsterdam Directors, Apr. 21, 1660, ibid., 471. For a discussion of orphans in Dutch law, see Berthold Fernow, ed. and trans., The Minutes of the Orphanmasters of New Amsterdam, 1655-1663 (New York, 1902), v-viii; the legal agreement quoted on 24 (hereafter cited as Minutes of the Orphanmasters).

[54]Such was the promise made by many guardians who were to supervise the apprenticing out of children mentioned in prenuptial contracts; see Minutes of the Orphanmasters, 25, 230-31, for example.

[55]Minute of a Visit of the Director General to the Rev. Mr. Backerus Forbidding Him to Read, or Allow to Be Read, Any Political Writings in the Church, May 8, 1649, NYCD, XIV, 114; Resolution. To Retain and Engage Rev. Johannes Megapolensis as Minister, Aug. 2, 1649, ibid., 116; Gerald F. De Jong, "Domine Johannes Megapolensis: Minister to New Netherland," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LII (Jan. 1968), 7-47.

Walloons on Staten Island.[56] Encouraged by Megapolensis and Drisius, Stuyvesant made plans to export his reformation through education from New Amsterdam to the other settlements of New Netherland.

During his seven years at Rensselaerswyck, Domine Megapolensis had laid the foundation for the improvement of manners and morals in the patroonship. Domine Gideon Schaets, formerly schoolmaster at Beest in Holland, was sent to Rensselaerswyck in 1652. In anticipation of Schaets' arrival, Patroon Johann instructed Schout Garrit Swart to enforce the ordinances against the public practice of any religion except the Reformed and against the indecent "mingling" of Dutchmen with the wives of the heathen. Besides preaching and ministering to the colonists, the domine was especially enjoined to "use all Christian zeal there to bring up both the Heathen and their children in the Christian religion." His success in converting the Indians, though, was negligible, and the mingling between Dutchmen and Indian women continued.[57]

No doubt because of his experience as a teacher, Schaets was also instructed "to pay attention to the office of schoolmaster for old and young." There was not much schooling there for him to supervise. At least since 1648, when Evert Noldingh, a tailor, was granted permission to conduct a school, private teachers had

---

[56]Acts of the Classis of Amsterdam, Feb. 12, 1652, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 302; also Feb. 26, 1652, ibid., 303.

[57]Lease from Van Rensselaer to Jan Dircksen of Bremen, Jan. 14, 1649, ibid., 248; the Rev. Gideon Schaet's Contract, May 8, 1652, and Instructions of Patroon Van Rensselaer, Concerning Religion, May 8, 1652, ibid., 309-10.

occasionally plied their trade in Rensselaerswyck. In November 1651, the council of the colony granted fifty guilders to Schoolmaster Adrian Jansz. Van Ilpendam to pay his house rent for the year. Van Ilpendam continued teaching at Fort Orange at least until 1660, though how much if any support he received from the government or the church is not known. Much to his chagrin, Van Ilpendam lost his monopoly of day and night schooling when in 1655 the Court of Fort Orange and Beverwyck granted the petition of Ludovicius Coles to teach. The records are suggestive rather than explicit, but Domine Schaets himself may have conducted a school in 1657, and Jan Becker probably continued teaching when he came from New Amsterdam to Fort Orange in 1663.[58]

The development of formal institutions of education in other parts of New Netherland may be attributed to both population growth and religious rivalry. Much of the demographic increase came from immigration, but as Nicasius de Sille, Secretary of the colony, wrote in 1654, "children and pigs multiply here rapidly and more than anything else." The settlers generally scattered to find the best lands for farming and locales for trading with the Indians. However, an Indian uprising in 1655 brought forth the very next

---

[58]Schaet's Contract, May 8, 1652, ibid., 309; Nissenson, Patroon's Domain, 159; Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., Minutes of the Court of Rensselaerswyck (Albany, N. Y., 1922), 133 (hereafter cited as Minutes of Rensselaerswyck); also Nov. 23, 1651, ibid., 60; Arnold J. F. Van Laer, ed. and trans., Minutes of the Court of Fort Orange and Beverwyck, 1652-56, 2 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1922), I, 236-38 (hereafter cited as Minutes of the Court of Fort Orange).

year an ordinance calling for the inhabitants to form villages for their own protection.[59]

Unlike the charters granted to the English villages, the charters incorporating Dutch settlements called for the appointment of local officials, not their election by the landowners of the community. Following Dutch tradition, Kieft appointed magistrates to the court he set up at Breuckelen in 1646. Stuyvesant did the same when he chartered Beverwyck (Albany) in 1652. Next came New Amsterdam in 1653, followed by Midwout (Flatbush) and Amersfoort (Flatlands) on western Long Island in 1654. Then came the post-1655 surge of village incorporations. New Amstel (New Castle, Del.) was chartered in 1657 and New Haerlem (Harlem) in 1660, followed by Bergen (Newark), Boswyck and New Utrecht on western Long Island, and Wiltwyck (Kingston) up the Hudson Valley, each in 1661.[60]

Director General Stuyvesant, together with Domine Megapolensis and Domine Drisius, were anxious that the outlying settlements of both the Dutch and the English be supplied with preachers and schoolmasters. In 1655, Domine Johannes Polhemus, formerly stationed at Brazil, became minister to Midwout, Amersfoort, and Breuckelen, though some of the inhabitants were reluctant to pay the domine

---

[59]Arnold J. F. Van Laer, ed., "Nicasius de Sille to Maximiliaen Van Beeckkerke, May 23, 1653," in New York State Historical Association, Proceedings, XXIII (1923), 101; O'Callaghan, New Netherland, II, 289-94; Ordinance for the Formation of Villages, Jan. 18, 1656, Laws of New Netherland, 296-97.

[60]McKinley, "The English and Dutch Towns of New Netherland," 109; Benjamin F. Thompson, History of Long Island, 3d ed., 3 vols. (New York, 1918), I, 50.

his salary. The next year, Domine Casparus Carpentier came to New Amstel, although he died shortly thereafter. In 1657, of the five English villages under Dutch jurisdiction, Hempstead had a Presbyterian minister, Richard Denton; John Moore, an Independent, preached at Middelburgh, but the people of Gravesend were said to be Mennonites who renounced preachers, and Vlissingen had a mixture of religious creeds and no regular preachers; the New England Congregationalists at Oostdorp (East Village, later Westchester) employed a lay reader, as did the Dutch Calvinists at the Esopus, later called Wiltwyck.[61]

As for schooling in New Netherland, Domines Megapolensis and Drisius reported in 1657 that to their knowledge of all the Dutch and English villages only New Amsterdam, Beverwyck, and Fort Casimir on the South River had schoolmasters. "And although some parents try to give their children some instruction," noted the domines, "the success is far from satisfactory, and we can expect nothing else than young men of foolish and undisciplined minds."[62] The people in the villages were too poor to pay for preachers and teachers; moreover, there were few qualified among them who would teach. Therefore, unless the Company and Classis were to supply more orthodox

---

[61]Note on Church at Midwout and Domine Polhemus, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 330; Megapolensis to Amsterdam Classis, Mar. 18, 1655, ibid., 334. Petition of the Magistrates of Breuckelen against the Assessment for the Minister's Salary and Objecting to the Appointment of the Rev. Polhemus, Jan. 16, 1657, NYCD, XIV, 308-82; Megapolensis and Drisius to Amsterdam Classis, Aug. 5, 1657, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 393-401.

[62]Megapolensis and Drisius to Amsterdam Classis, Aug. 5, 1657, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 398.

preachers and teachers, the domines warned that New Netherlanders would remain largely unchurched, unlettered, and unable to lead the heathen to Christ. Indeed, referring to their single Indian convert whom they had instructed for some two years, Megapolensis and Drisius sadly related that the neophyte had taken to drink, pawned his Bible, and "turned into a regular beast, doing more harm than good among the Indians."[63]

The Indians were a minor consideration, however. The real concern by 1657 was for enough orthodox preachers and teachers to stem the rising tide of sectarianism before it became a crushing wave of heresy that would wash away the rather fragile foundations of the Reformed Church in New Netherland. As early as 1653, the Lutherans of New Amsterdam petitioned unsuccessfully to call a preacher. Megapolensis and Drisius denounced the scheme as destructive to their infant congregation. "It would also pave the way for other sects," they warned, "so that in time our place would become a receptacle for all sorts of heretics and fanatics."[64] Two years later, when the collapse of Dutch Brazil led fifty or so Sephardic Jews to seek sanctuary at New Amsterdam, the Reformed preachers, again speaking for Stuyvesant as well as for themselves, vigorously opposed the settlement there of such "godless rascals":

> For as we have here Papists, Mennonites, and Lutherans among the Dutch; also many Puritans or Independents, and Many Atheists and various other servants of Baal

---

[63]Ibid., 398-99.

[64]Megapolensis and Drisius to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 6, 1653, ibid., 317.

> among the English under this Government, who conceal themselves under the name of Christian; it would create a still greater confusion if the obstinate and immovable Jews came to settle here.[65]

Noting that Jewish merchants had invested heavily in the Company and had lost much in Brazil, the Amsterdam directors insisted that Jews could live, worship privately, and trade in New Netherland.[66]

Far more disturbing than the religious toleration accorded the Jews was the threat to the Calvinist establishment presented first by the Lutherans and then by the Quakers in New Netherland. Backed by the Reformed clergy, Stuyvesant employed several tactics in his strategy to combat heresy. He enacted laws against unauthorized conventicles, licensed private teachers largely on the basis of religious creed, and on behalf of the Company subsidized orthodox preachers and especially schoolmasters. Following the Dutch conquest of New Sweden on the Delaware in 1655, Stuyvesant allowed the two hundred Swedish Lutherans to continue public worship and keep one of their three Lutheran ministers, Lars Lokenius. The Director General had no intention of lifting elsewhere the traditional ban against the public exercise of any faith except the Reformed, but Lutherans in New Amsterdam and Beverwyck, led by lay readers like Paulus Schrick and Tierck Claesen, began holding worship services together.[67]

---

[65]Megapolensis to Amsterdam Classis, Mar. 18, 1655, ibid., 335-36.

[66]Amsterdam Directors to Stuyvesant, Apr. 26, 1655, NYCD, XIV, 315-17.

[67]O'Callaghan, New Netherland, II, 289-90; Harry Julius Kreider, Lutheranism in Colonial New York (1942; reprint ed., New York, 1972), 14-16; Kessler and Rachlis, Peter Stuyvesant, 171-73.

Because the Lutherans were generally tolerated in the Dutch republic, Stuyvesant moved against them by indirection, referring to certain "irregular" religious gatherings among the English at Middelburgh as the provocation for an ordinance passed on February 1, 1656, strictly forbidding "all such public or private conventicles and meetings, except . . . meetings held for the religious service of the Reformed Church, conformably to the Synod of Dort." Heavy fines were to be imposed upon those conducting and those attending such conventicles.[68] Domine Drisius was immediately dispatched to appoint a lay reader at Middelburgh, and the Lutherans, the primary objects of the ordinance, were subject to ex post facto prosecutions. In Beverwyck, Tierck Claesen and Albert Andriesz were both fined for participating in a Lutheran meeting that took place a week before the ordinance prohibiting such conventicles was passed.[69] For the time being, the Lutherans stopped their meetings, but the Amsterdam directors disapproved of Stuyvesant's harsh ordinance, and believing that they had the tacit approval of the directors, the Lutherans of New Netherland made plans to bring over a minister of their own faith.[70]

---

[68]Order on a Petition of the Clergy against Conventicles and Preaching by Unqualified Persons at Newtown, Long Island, Jan. 15, 1656, NYCD, XIV, 336-37; Ordinance against Unlawful Conventicles, Feb. 1, 1656, Laws of New Netherland, 211-12.

[69]Van Laer, Minutes of the Court of Fort Orange, I, 247, 251-52.

[70]Amsterdam Directors to Stuyvesant, June 14, 1656, NYCD, XIV, 350-52; Kreider, Lutheranism in Colonial New York, 17-18; Petition of the Lutherans to the Director General and Council, to Be Permitted to Enjoy Their Own Public Worship, Oct. 24, 1646, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 358-59.

The summer of 1657 brought heresy to a head in New Netherland, with the arrival of a Lutheran preacher and sundry Quaker missionaries. The Rev. Ernestus Goetwater was told bluntly that the ordinance against conventicles was still in force, and when the Amsterdam directors made it clear that they had not officially sanctioned Lutheran worship in the colony, Stuyvesant ordered the Lutheran divine to depart, though his followers spirited him out of New Amsterdam and kept him hidden for almost two years before he was finally sent back to Holland. Should the Lutherans form a separate congregation, Megapolensis and Drisius had warned in July 1657, "the Papist, Mennonites and others, would soon make similar claims. Thus we would soon become a Babel of confusion, instead of remaining a united and peaceful people."[71]

The very next month, Quaker missionaries began to arrive, destroying whatever illusions ever existed about religious unity in the colony. Some came by ship directly from England; others came from Rhode Island, called the sewer of New England. Sweeping through the English towns on western Long Island, Quakerism aroused deep fears of religious and political anarchy and evoked rigorous religious persecution. In the most brutal case, Stuyvesant ordered the Quaker preacher Robert Hodgson repeatedly beaten almost to death before banishing the young zealot to Rhode Island. His first ordinance

---

[71]Petition of the Revs. Megapolensis and Drisius to the Burgomasters, etc., against the Toleration of the Lutherans, July 6, 1657, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 387-88; Report of the Burgomasters and Schepens of New Amsterdam upon the Petition of the Ministers against Allowing Lutheran Services, July 14, 1657, ibid., 388-89.

against them made any ship bringing Quakers to the colony liable to confiscation and imposed upon anyone who sheltered a Quaker for a night a fine of fifty Flemish pounds, half of which would be paid the informer.[72] That intolerant ordinance inspired the Vlissingen (Flushing) Remonstrance of January 1658, denouncing religious discrimination as unchristian and proclaiming religious liberty as the glory of the Dutch republic. Deploring the remarkable remonstrance as "a seditious, mutinous and detestable letter of defiance," Stuyvesant responded by revoking the town charter and imprisoning its sheriff and clerk.[73]

Far more important than legal prohibitions, orthodox schoolmasters and preachers were expected to fortify the people against Lutheran heretics and Quaker sectarians and to extend the Reformed faith. Usually, licenses to conduct private schools were granted by Stuyvesant as a matter of course, but in 1654, just as the question of Lutheran worship was becoming an issue, Andries Hudde, a prominent merchant and former official of the Company, asked for permission to teach and was told "that the council shall ask upon his proposal the opinion of the minister and consistory."[74] Since the official records contain no other mention of him he was apparently rejected. Similarly, in February 1658, while the Rev. Goetwater was circulating

---

[72]Zwierlein, Religion in New Netherland, 213-19; George L. Smith, Religion and Trade in New Netherland, 220-29.

[73]The Flushing (Vlissingen) affair is recorded in Ecclesiastical Records, I, 411-15; O'Callaghan, New Netherland, 352-53.

[74]Quoted in Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 113.

among Lutheran conclaves, Jacobus Van Corlaer, another successful merchant who had lived many years in New Netherland, was ordered by the Director General and Council to close the school he had presumed to conduct without obtaining a license. The next summer, Jan Lubberts was granted permission "to open a school for reading, writing, and arithmetic . . . provided he behave himself as such a person ought to behave."[75] The evidence is circumstancial rather than conclusive, but the implication is clear enough. The public Hudde had intended to serve and whom Corlaer did serve probably consisted of Lutherans and others not especially keen on having their children taught the Reformed creed in school.

Because Reformed domines were so hard to come by, the official schoolmasters generally led the battle for orthodoxy in the outlying villages. Beginning with Midwout in 1659, all the Dutch villages except New Utrecht and Amersfoorts hired teachers before 1664, and given the Dutch tradition of schooling, there were no doubt some private schoolmasters at work in the villages also. Chosen jointly by the consistory and magistracy, the official schoolmaster also performed various functions for both the local congregation and court. He was paid in part by the church and civil authority and in part by the Company. His religious fitness was of prime importance. For example, before Boudewyn Manout became schoolmaster of the Huguenot settlement of Boswyck in 1662, Stuyvesant required that he be "first

---

[75]For data on the Jacobus Van Corlaer affair, see NYCD, XIV, 412-13; RNA, II, 348; Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 114-16; Petition of Jan Lubberts to Teach School, Aug. 13, 1658, NYCD, XIV, 424.

examined by the reverend clergy of this city and declared fit for the performance of the said duties."[76] The Classis and Company also sent dozens of psalters, liturgies, catechisms, and Bibles to be distributed by Reformed ministers and teachers, sometimes without charge and sometimes for a small fee.[77]

Stuyvesant repeatedly urged that several more Reformed preachers be sent to keep down heresy among both the Dutch and English settlers. However, the Company wanted clergymen who unlike either Megapolensis and Drisius were willing to make concessions to the Lutherans, especially regarding the formulary of baptism which required parents and godparents to confess that "the doctrine . . . taught in the Christian church here, is true and sufficient for salvation."[78] In the interest of religious harmony, the Amsterdam directors thought the offensive "here" ought to be deleted; it was not contained in the older formularies of baptism used by the Reformed Church. In 1660, having agreed with the Amsterdam directors on the deletion of the word "here," the Rev. Henricus Selyns began preaching at Breuckelen and Stuyvesant's bouwery, and the Rev. Hermanus Blom

---

[76]Council Minutes. Bushwick Affairs, Dec. 28, 1662, NYCD, XIV, 519. Like so many other teachers, Manout was also clerk to the village court; see ibid., 541. The role of the teacher-lay reader of New Netherland is explored in detail by Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 119-41.

[77]References to psalters, liturgies, or textbooks can be found in NYCD, XIII, 155; Ecclesiastical Records, I, 402, 473-74, 486, 503.

[78]The standard formulary of baptism is given in John H. Livingston, ed., The Psalms and Hymns with the Catechism, Confession of Faith, and Liturgy of the Reformed Dutch Church in North America (New York, 1814), 497-99.

became minister at Wiltwyck. The attitude of the younger domines, together with the threat from the Amsterdam directors that the Lutherans just might get public worship, led Megapolensis and Drisius to concede the point on baptism and kept the bulk of the Lutherans in the Reformed congregation.[79]

The Quakers were generally regarded as beyond the pale of religious legitimacy. Stuyvesant tried to supply orthodox preachers and teachers for the English villages threatened by the ubiquitous sectarians. In 1661, he approved Richard Mills to conduct school and lead the worship service at Middelburgh. The next year, the Director General ordered the people of Hempstead to pay the salary of the Rev. Josiah Fordham, and Domines Selyns and Drisius occasionally ministered to the English on Long Island, but Vlissingen, New Utrecht, Gravesend and Rustdorp (Jamaica, founded in 1660) were without orthodox guidance. So Stuyvesant came to rely largely upon coercion rather than education to combat Quakerism, making mass arrests in the towns of Rustdorp and Vlissingen in 1661, and encouraging local magistrates to prosecute Quakers because they tended to "the Subversion of good Lawes, Orders and of the protestant Religion. . . ."[80]

---

[79]Amsterdam Directors to Stuyvesant, May 20, 1658, NYCD, XIV, 418; also June 7, 1658, ibid., 421. Megapolensis and Drisius to Stuyvesant, Aug. 23, 1658, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 428; Amsterdam Directors to Stuyvesant, Dec. 22, 1659, NYCD, XIV, 448-52; Drisius to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 4, 1660, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 485-86; Kreider, Lutheranism in Colonial New York, 20-21.

[80]Zwierlein, Religion in New Netherland, 227-32; George L. Smith, Religion and Trade in New Netherland, 227; Council Minutes. Proceedings against the Quakers at Jamaica, Jan. and Feb., 1661, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 496-99, quotation from 498.

Stuyvesant strengthened the ordinance against conventicles in 1662, including a provision prohibiting the importation and distribution among the Common people" of "seditious and erroneous boecks [sic], writings and letters."[81] The Director General clearly intended to tighten up on the Quakers. But then the Amsterdam directors reviewed the conviction of John Bowne from Vlissingen for entertaining Quakers. Writing to Stuyvesant in 1663, the Amsterdam directors instructed him to treat the sectarians less rigorously, lest he diminish the population and reduce immigration "at a so tender stage of the country's existence."

> You may therefore shut your eyes, at least not force people's consciences, but allow every one to have his own belief, as long as he behaves quitetly [sic] and legally, gives no offence to his neighbors and does not oppose the government. As the government of this city [Amsterdam] has always practised this maxim of moderation and consequently has often had a considerable influx of people, we do not doubt, that your Province too would be benefitted by it.[82]

During the time that remained to him, Stuyvesant would follow that maxim of moderation toward religious dissenters, though he relied much more than ever before upon the schools to advance both order and orthodoxy in the colony. In March 1664, just a few months before the English conquest of New Netherland, Stuyvesant and his council promulgated an ordinance requiring schoolmasters to bring their students to the church every Wednesday to be examined in

---

[81]Ordinance against Conventicles, Sept. 21, 1662, Laws of New Netherland, 428-29.

[82]George L. Smith, Religion and Trade in New Netherland, 230; Amsterdam Directors to Stuyvesant, Apr. 16, 1663, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 530.

the Heidelberg catechism in the presence of the ministers, elders, and interested public. The official schoolmasters had customarily catechized their pupils in public, so the ordinance apparently turned the custom into a legal obligation for private teachers as well, and though clothed in language especially applicable to New Amsterdam, Stuyvesant no doubt would like to have seen it applied elsewhere in New Netherland.[83]

Especially significant, while relating catechetical training to the instruction of youth in general, the preamble of the ordinance defined the aim and purpose of education:

> Whereas, it is most highly necessary and most important that the youth from childhood up be instructed not only in reading, writing and arithmetic, but especially and chiefly in the principles and fundamentals of the Reformed religion, according to the lesson of that wise King, Solomon--Train up a child in the way he shall go, and when he is old he will not depart from it--so that in time such men may proceed therefrom, as may be fit to serve their Fatherland as well in the Church as the State.[84]

Here was the Calvinistic view of education that Peter Stuyvesant had been trying for seventeen years to apply in New Netherland. He had enjoyed some success. However, if Stuyvesant patronized schools and preachers who propagated Calvinism, there were Lutherans, Quakers, and Jews who also propagated their respective faiths, sometimes openly and sometimes surreptitiously. Furthermore,

---

[83]Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes, comp., The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 6 vols. (1915-1928; reprint ed., New York, 1967), IV, 234-35; Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 85-94.

[84]Ordinance for the Better and More Careful Instruction of Youth in the Principles of the Christian Religion, Mar. 17, 1664, Laws of New Netherland, 461.

education in Dutch culture centered not on the church, not on the school, not even on the community in general, but rather on the family in particular, thus assuring that ethnic diversity rather than cultural homogeneity would prevail in New Netherland.

IV

During the Lutheran controversy, Domines Megapolensis and Drisius angrily reported to the Amsterdam Classis that Lutherans in New Netherland "praise Luther only because they call themselves by his name. They are Lutheran and will remain such, because their parents and ancestors were Lutheran, as Paulus Schrick, their leader, in his wisdom once declared." Scarcely one among them, scoffed the domines, "has any proper acquaintance with the teaching of Dr. Luther."[85] True enough perhaps, but New Netherlanders generally wanted to perpetuate their own respective ethnic identities, and the Lutherans were not the only colonists who deeply resented the efforts of Stuyvesant and the Reformed domines to impose Calvinism upon them. Traditions and religious beliefs provided crucial psychological security for Europeans adjusting to the New World, rooting the uncertain future in the certainties of the past, and urging the family forward on that quest for material advancement characteristic of New Netherlanders.

Whether Dutch Reformed, Lutheran, Quaker, or Congregationalist, New Netherlanders showed a keen appreciation for making money.

---

[85]Megapolensis and Drisius to Director General and Council of New Netherland, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 428-29.

"All the people here are traders," wrote Nicasius de Sille from New Amsterdam in 1654. He might have added that trading was generally a family enterprise, with the lines of commercial intercourse criss-crossing among various kin and family friends. Indeed, despite the initial plan of the Amsterdam directors making all the colonists employees, the colonial families usually put their own interests before the interests of the Company. Although the data on immigration to New Netherland is incomplete, it suggests that the immigrants usually came as individual families or small groups of relatives rather than as communal groups like the Puritans or as individuals like the early Virginians. From the beginning of organized colonization, New Netherland was settled to a significant degree by adventurous families, some of whom would remain and some of whom would return to the Netherlands.[86]

As the Company became more concerned with colonization and agricultural settlement, the Amsterdam directors recognized that the family was the primary bastion against barbarism and anarchy in New Netherland. They saw the family as a stabilizing social institution threatened by the hedonism of the Indians and the sexual promiscuity of many of the youthful colonists. More than a few New Englanders thought so, too. The people of Plymouth strictly punished fornication and adultery, noted Isaack de Rasieres from

---

[86]Van Laer, "Nicasius de Sille to Maximiliaen Van Beeckkerke, May 23, 1653," 101; Bertus H. Wabeke, Dutch Immigration to North America, 1624-1860 (Freeport, N. Y., 1944), 13-20; Condon, New York Beginnings, 137-43, 163-79.

New Netherland in 1628, and they "speak very angrily when they hear from the savages that we live so barbarously in these respects, and without punishment." Ten years later, the inhabitants of Hartford were equally disturbed by the loose sexual mores of the Dutch. "These people give out that they are Israelites," wrote Captain David de Vries in 1638, "and that we at our colony are Egyptians, and that the English in Virginia are also Egyptians."[87] Stuyvesant tried to legislate sexual standards, but he was never able to chase all the "lewd women" from New Amsterdam, and despite laws against "mingling" with the natives, obliging Indian maidens were never far away. Furthermore, as innumerable libel suits amply testify, New Netherlanders male and female alike constantly flung sexual innuendos and obscene epithets at each other with wild abandon.[88]

Although apparently beseiged from all sides, the family not only survived but prevailed in New Netherland. The scarcity of preachers led couples to cohabit for months, even years before a clergyman came around to perform marriages and baptize infants; sometimes the cohabitants parted before marriage, and sometimes hearts as well as promises were broken. Always deploring the practice, Stuyvesant formally outlawed cohabitation without benefit of clergy in 1658, though it persisted in some regions for many years as

---

[87] Isaack de Rasieres to Samuel Blommaert, 1628, NNN, 112; David Pietersz. de Vries, "Voyages (1655)," ibid., 199.

[88] For several typical examples of court cases resulting from sexual misconduct or alleged sexual misconduct, see Calendar of Dutch Manuscripts, 68, 137, 183, 203; also Joast Goderis v. Gilym d'Wys, RNA, I, 51.

accepted custom.[89] Judging from detailed court records that have been published, the family life of New Netherlanders was remarkably stable and harmonious, especially given their penchant for bickering with neighbors. As in Holland, divorce was exceptional, though a few were granted on grounds of adultery and incompatibility. Indeed, because of the weaknesses of other communal institutions, the family in New Netherland actually enlarged upon the prerogatives and responsibilities assigned to the family by Dutch tradition. Because of Stuyvesant's crusade against the public worship of any except the Reformed faith, New Netherlanders who were not Calvinists relied especially upon the family to perpetuate their respective faiths.[90]

The joint wills and prenuptial agreements of New Netherlanders provide considerable insight into the relationship between spouses and their attitude toward the education of children. As in Holland, the wife was not merely the spouse in charge of the cherished home; in many cases, she was her husband's business partner as well, and

---

[89]Some cases involving cohabitation and alleged breach of promises to marry are cited in RNA, I, 235-38; Minutes of Rensselaerswyvk, 86; Minutes of the Court of Fort Orange, I, 188-89; NYCD, 145; Calendar of Dutch Manuscripts, 117, 171. Ordinance to Oblige Parties to Marry after the Publication of their Bans, Jan. 15, 1658, Laws of New Netherland, 328; Alice P. Kenney, The Gansevoorts of Albany: Dutch Patricians in the Upper Hudson Valley (Syracuse, N. Y., 1969), 29.

[90]Calendar of Dutch Manuscripts, 149, 180, 268; Alice Morse Earle, Colonial Days in Old New York (New York, 1896), 47-52. Lutheran and Quaker worship was sustained through the collective efforts of different families; see also William Harper Bennett, Catholic Footsteps in Old New York: A Chronicle of Catholicity in the City of New York from 1524 to 1808 (1909; reprint ed., New York, 1973), 16-17.

if he should die before her, it was not uncommon for the wife to continue the family enterprises, assisted sometimes by both sons and daughters. To cite just a few examples, following the death of New Amsterdam's foremost blacksmith, Heilke Peterse carried on her husband's prosperous business. Margaret Backer, Rachel Vinje, Margaret and Heligonda Van Slechtenhorst, and Margaret Hardenbroek were all merchants of means, and there were others.[91] Annekje Jans Bogardus educated her daughters, as one writer put it, "after the fashion of Patria," and they all became worthy housewives, but they also learned English and spoke the Algonquin language of the Indians fluently. Sara, one of the daughters, married Hans Kierstede, surgeon of the colony, traded with the Indians in her own right, and became the official interpreter for government conferences with the Indians. The Dutch wife usually devoted her skills to managing the household and raising the children, but Dutch law and custom did not discriminate against women in business, no doubt because business of whatever variety was so completely identified as a family enterprise.[92]

Almost invariably the husband and wife agreed to leave to the survivor all their joint possessions, to do with as he or she wished,

---

[91]Eugenie A. Leonard, The Dear Bought Heritage (Philadelphia, 1965), 27-29, 267-69, 311-21; Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer, The Goede Vrouw of Mana-ha-ta: At Home and in Society (New York, 1898), 1-35; Earle, Old New York, 154-70; Calendar of Dutch Manuscripts, 101.

[92]Van Rensselaer, The Goede Vrouw of Mana-ha-ta, 22-28; Esther Singleton, Dutch New York (1909; reprint ed., New York, 1968), 45-47, 89; Helen Evertsen Smith, Colonial Days and Ways: As Gathered from Family Papers (1900; reprint ed., New York, 1966), 107-22.

though specific instructions were sometimes given regarding the appointment of guardians of the estate and the education of their children. As noted earlier, when the surviving spouse remarried, the inheritance due children from the estate of the deceased parent was scrupulously defined and protected by prenuptial contracts between the intended couple and the guardians of the children involved. A significant part of that inheritance was the right to an education preparing the child for life in the adult world. Before his second marriage in 1657, Claes Pietersen Kos promised to take care of his daughter "with food and clothing, until she comes of age or marries, and meanwhile he is to make her learn, as opportunity offers, to read, write, sew and some other useful knowledge; that he shall settle upon the child and when she is of age or marries to pay her 200fl. by which she shall consider herself satisfied for her maternal estate."[93] A few months later, besides agreeing to pay him 175fl. when he came of age, Pieter Jansen promised "honestly to bring up and educate his son, to make him learn reading, writing, a good trade or liberal arts, so that he may earn his living in due time, and to have him instructed in the Reformed Christian religion as a good father is bound to do. . . ."[94] Dozens of such documents have survived, always with the same refrain of school--

---

[93]Will of Jan Evertsen Bout and Wife, Aug. 19, 1649, Dutch Manuscripts, III, 158-60; Will of Egbert Woutersen and Engeltje Jans, His Wife, June 12, 1652, ibid., III, 348-49; Contract Agreed to by Claes Pietersen Kos, Jan. 23, 1657, Minutes of the Orphanmasters, 27-28.

[94]Contract Agreed to by Pieter Jansen, June 26, 1657, Minutes of the Orphanmasters, 35.

reading, writing, and sometimes arithmetic, plus a decent trade.[95]

The primary functions of education in Dutch culture were to transmit religious doctrine, literacy, and occupational skills, and so it was in New Netherland. The emphasis varied according to the family and its particular traditions. As in Holland, religion was usually fundamental to the ethnic integrity of the New Netherland family. It was of prime importance, for example, to Anna Van Rensselaer, whose teenage son, Jeremias, came to New Netherland in 1654 and permanently established the Van Rensselaer family in America. Her advice to Jeremias would doubtless have been endorsed by many Dutch mothers, Catholic as well as Protestant:

> Now I must recommend to you most urgently to conduct yourself in such a way that I hear nothing but praise about you. Above all, fear the Lord God and keep Him constantly before your eyes and pray fervently that His Holy Spirit may guide you in truth. Go diligently to Church and practice God's Holy Words, as thereby you may save your soul. In that way you may expect the blessing of the Lord here temporally and hereafter eternally.[96]

Linking practical piety to economic success was a common theme in Dutch culture. But so was the religious diversity which sustained the different ethnic identities of the people of the

---

[95]Examples can be found in Minutes of the Orphanmasters, 30-31, 68, 95, 119-20, 230-31; see also Dutch Manuscripts, I, 12-13, 42, 48-49, 115, 144-45; II, 336-38, 432-34; IV, 105, 563.

[96]Anna Van Rensselaer to Jeremeias Van Rensselaer, Dec. 26, 1654, Correspondence of Jeremias Van Rensselaer, 1651-1674, ed. Arnold J. F. Van Laer (Albany, N. Y., 1932), 15-16 (hereafter cited as Correspondence of Jeremias Van Rensselaer). The matriarch of the Van Rensselaer family continued advising her son similarly (letter of May 8, 1660, ibid., 131-32) until his conversion (letter of June 8, 1660, ibid., 230).

United Provinces. Religious tenets were of course taught by the family, but New Netherlanders of whatever creed looked to the congregation and whenever possible the school to confirm the young in the family faith.[97]

Within the broader framework of perpetuating family tradition and ethnic identities, schools were regarded as critical for propagating religious creeds and literary skills needed to read God's Word and write bills of lading. But there were New Netherlanders who wanted their children knowledgeable not only in the Dutch vernacular but in Latin and perhaps even Greek, the languages of the scholarly professional and true gentleman. In their Remonstrance against the Company in 1649, the Eight Men had faulted the Amsterdam directors for not setting up a Latin school. Although the trivium school begun by Stuyvesant in 1652 and taught by Councillor Jan de la Montagne apparently failed for lack of popular support, Latin and Greek were probably being taught by others at that time in the colony. In 1652, the wealthy Cornelis Van Werckhoven came with his family to lands he had patented in New Netherland, bringing with him Jacques Cortelyou, a young man well versed in the classics, as tutor to his children.[98] Referring to his son Samuel who had previously studied at "Cambridge Academy" and was then studying theology and

---

[97]Zumthor, Rembrandt's Holland, 77-110; Helen Evertsen Smith, Colonial Days and Ways, 7-9; John Webb Pratt, Religion, Politics, and Diversity: The Church-State Theme in New York History (Ithaca, N. Y., 1967).

[98]Amsterdam Directors to Stuyvesant, Apr. 4, 1652, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 307; Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 110-11.

medicine at the University of Leyden, Domine Megapolensis wrote in 1658 that "I instructed him myself for several years in the Latin and Greek languages."[99]

Domine Drisius may also have taught a few students the classics. At any rate, it was Drisius who revived the idea of a Latin school, easily gaining the support of Stuyvesant and the burgomasters and schepens of New Amsterdam. The latter, evincing a nascent civic pride, petitioned the directors in Amsterdam concerning the matter on September 19, 1658:

> Further, laying before your Honors the great augementation [sic] of the youth of this Province and place, which yearly increases more and more, and finds itself now very numerous, and though many of them can read and write, the Burghers and inhabitants of this place and neighbourhood having neither the ability nor means to send their children thither, we shall therefore again trouble your Honors and humbly request that your Honors would be pleased to send us a suitable person for Master of a Latin School, in order that our children be instructed in, and study such language, not doubting but were such person here, many neighbouring places would send their children hither to be instructed in that tongue; hoping that, increasing from year to year, it may finally attain to an Academy, whereby this place arriving at great splendor your Honors shall have the regard and praise next to God the Lord, who will grant His blessing to it.[100]

The Amsterdam directors agreed to look for a qualified Latin master, "care being taken, that he writes a good hand, to teach the children also calligraphy; you may expect him by the ships

---

[99]Megapolensis to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 25, 1658, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 434-35.

[100]Quoted in RNA, III, 233.

sailing from here this Spring."[101] His name was Alexander Carolus Curtius, a professor from Lithuania, whose "industry is astonishing and the progress of the young people remarkable," claimed Stuyvesant. But Dr. Curtius never was satisfied with his salary, engaged in some disputatious trading ventures, and illegally raised tuition rates, leading the Amsterdam directors to dismiss him in July 1661.[102] The Latin school thus languished for almost a year. Meanwhile, Stuyvesant summoned Domine Aegidius Luyck from New Amstel to tutor his two sons. The Director General was very impressed by Luyck's "good method of inculcating the first principles of the Latin and Greek languages, as in writing, arithmetick, catechising, and honorum morum praxis--with respect to the children." He urged the young cleric to reopen the Latin school, which soon "increased to 20--among whom were two from Virginia and two from Fort Orange--and ten or twelve more from the two aforesaid places were expected, while others were intended to board with me." Upon Stuyvesant's recommendation, the Amsterdam directors hired Luycks to replace Curtius, and the young domine conducted the Latin school until the English conquest in 1664.[103]

---

[101]Amsterdam Directors to Stuyvesant, Feb. 13, 1659, NYCD, XIV, 430.

[102]Amsterdam Directors to Stuyvesant, Apr. 25, 1659, ibid., 436-37; Stuyvesant to Amsterdam Directors, Sept. 17, 1659, ibid., 445. For more on Curtius and his fall, see Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 25-27.

[103]Aegidius Luyck to Director General and High Council in New Netherland, July 30, 1663, in Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 32-33; Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 104-9.

The Latin tongue was indeed a useful languge for the law, for medicine, and for scholarly activity of any kind. William Beekman brought his boys from the South River especially to study under Professor Curtius. However, the primary means of occupational training was some form of apprenticeship. In the United Provinces, apprenticeship was generally controlled by the guilds, self-regulating organizations of the different trades and professions. The guild system was not transferred to New Netherland, and apprenticeship developed there through a mixture of custom and expedience. Indeed, because of the lack of any orderly procedure for occupational training, Domine Schaets, not a university man himself, wanted his children to return to the fatherland. "Here they learn nothing but rudeness," he wrote in 1657, "instead of useful things. The journey is desirable especially for my sons, each of whom is fit now to undertake something to his liking."[104]

Schaets had a point. Choice apprenticeship training was not always readily available in New Netherland, not even in Fort Orange and New Amsterdam. From the beginning of settlement, the children of merchants and artisans were taught the family trade by their parents or other relatives, but clearly defined apprenticeship agreements calling for occupational training do not begin to appear in the official record with any regularity until the 1650s. Before that time, the indentures simply emphasized the labor the youth

---

[104]Vice Director Beekman to Stuyvesant, Mar. 15, 1660, in Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York; Domine Schaets to Rev. Laurentius, June 23, 1657, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 385.

was expected to perform--not learn how to do, or else legally transferred the child to another family because its original parents were unable to sustain the family unit. Consider the contract made by seaman Cornelis Jansen, who in 1639 bound out his young son Jan for seven years to Jacob Hendrick Harmansen, a farmer living near Newtown. No mention is made of Jan's mother, and her absence because of death or other reasons may have precipitated the agreement, whereby Harmansen promised to "take care of the boy as if he were his son," and Jansen promised to leave his son with Harmansen without trying to get him back for the said time. So the son had a home while the father apparently returned to the sea.[105]

In most of the early indentures involving children, the emphasis was on servitude rather than training. For example, in 1640 James Claughton sold the indenture of his servant boy, Jan Duytse, to Pieter Cornelissen. The boy was to work for eleven consecutive years. Although Cornelissen was a house carpenter and Jan probably learned a trade while serving out his indenture, Cornelissen had paid 130 guilders for the boy's labor, with no provisions that he educate him in any way. What Jan learned was not the issue. Nor was occupational training specified in many

---

[105] Indenture of Robert Koeck to Arent Van Curler, Oct. 9, 1642, Dutch Manuscripts, II, 163; Indenture of Cornelis Segersz Binding His Son to Thomas Keuningh, Mar. 18, 1649, Minutes of Rensselaerswyck, 69; Indenture of Jan Cornelissen to Hendrick Harmansen, Aug. 3, 1639, Dutch Manuscripts, I, 204.

similar indentures.[106] However, now and again, there would appear a fleeting reference to some form of occupational education. The 1644 indenture of Marritje Hans, daughter of Hans Jansen, to Philip Gerritsen, tavern keeper, is indicative of the transition from the purely occupational to the partly educational indenture. Marritje was to serve the Gerritsens, husband and wife, for three years, during which time they would give her "board, lodging and the necessary clothes, and also have her taught sewing, in such a manner as a father should or might do with his child. . . ."[107]

The population growth of the 1650s brought more artisans and merchants and a greater demand for their wares to New Netherland, thus widening the opportunities for occupational training. No doubt reflecting in part Stuyvesant's crusade for order and discipline, apprenticeship agreements began to state more precisely than ever before their educational requirements. For instance, Evert Duyckingh agreed in 1648 to take Cornelis Jansen, whose father had been killed in the late Indian wars, as an apprentice for eight consecutive years. Besides providing the necessary food, clothing, and shelter, Duyckingh promised "to teach [Cornelis Jansen] the trade of a glazer or such [other] trade as Evert can and to have him taught reading and writing." Reporting to the Orphanmasters in 1661 on the situation of his orphaned brothers and sister, Jeremias

---

[106]Transfer of Indenture of James Claughton's Servant Boy to Pieter Cornelissen from Rotterdam, Aug. 27, 1640, Dutch Manuscripts, I, 292.

[107]Indenture of Marritje Hans, Daughter of Hans Jansen, to Philip Gerritsen, Tavern Keeper, May 23, 1649, ibid., II, 222.

Janzen Hagenaar explained that his brother Arien, age 14, was remaining with him to learn the family trade of carpentry.[108] Hoping to gain some experience in retail sales, Cornelis Van Schelluyne, with his father's approval, bound himself in January 1663 to serve Jan Cornelissen Van der Heyden "in merchandising, keeping books and whatever appertains thereto, which service shall continue till the first day of September next." Besides board and lodging, Cornelis was to receive a new suit of cloth and a present at the end of his service, plus whatever knowledge in running a shop he might pick up.[109]

Apprenticeship was valuable for more than the trade that was learned. Personal contacts were usually made that would be of vital importance in converting occupational skills into a successful livelihood. Tavern keeper Daniel Litschoe had to pay "a good sum" to get his stepson, Herman Jansen Swaartvegar, apprenticed to a surgeon in New York. But while learning surgery, Herman was also gaining potential patients.[110] Though not apprentices as such, many young New Netherlanders got their start in the service of Patroon Van Rensselaer. Anticipating the many economic alliances that would later be forged through wedlock, the marriage of Jeremias Van Rensselaer to Maria Van Cortlandt in 1662 brought together two

---

[108]Indenture of Cornelis Jansen from Rotterdam to Evert Duyckingh, Oct. 6, 1648, ibid., III, 64; Minutes of the Orphanmasters, Apr. 14, 1661, 175.

[109]Indenture of Cornelis Van Schelluyne as Clerk in Jan Cornellisen Van der Heyden's Store, Jan. 13, 1648, Dutch Manuscripts, III, 64.

[110]Will of Daniel Litschoe, Dec. 26, 1661, Minutes of the Orphanmasters, 216.

powerful commercial families with many branches and wide-ranging commercial connections that would both expand apprenticeship opportunities and the chances of business success for kin and friend alike.[111]

However, the biggest patron in New Netherland was of course the West India Company. Stuyvesant knew this when he asked the Amsterdam directors collectively to be the godfather of his first born son, Balthazar. William Beekman, Vice-Director General at the South River, wangled from the Company an appointment as a cadet for one of his sons. Evert Pietersen, Comforter of the Sick and official schoolmaster at New Amstel from 1656 to 1659, happily acknowledged the patronage of the Company toward his two boys. His son Arent, a miller, was assisted by the Company to come to New Amstel. "My son Jan Evertsen," Pietersen wrote in 1656, "goes daily to the office of the Director to write, for which he receives his thanks. He is on the road to success."[112] Similarly, Domine Megapolensis urged the Classis in 1658 to use its influence to get his son Samuel employed as a clergyman by the Amsterdam directors. Samuel wanted to remain in Holland and study medicine for a few more years, but in 1664, he was hired by the Company to serve

---

[111]Jeremias to Jan Baptist Van Rensselaer, July 13, 1662, Correspondence of Jeremias Van Rensselaer, 296-97; see also Jeremias to Anna Van Rensselaer, Aug. 19, 1662, ibid., 300; Jeremias to Oloff Stevenson Van Cortlandt, Aug. 27, 1663, ibid., 326. Other letters in this collection make it clear that the whole Van Rensselaer family and kin were deeply involved in trade.

[112]Amsterdam Directors to Peter Stuyvesant, Jan. 27, 1649, NYCD, XIV, 107; Evert Pietersen to Domine Hendric Ruiteus, Aug. 12, 1657, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 401.

the Reformed Church in New Amsterdam.[113]

Apprenticeship in the Netherlands was not much different from apprenticeship in England, but the practice of binding out the young in New England differed significantly from apprenticeship in New Netherland. Apprenticeship in New England was deeply embedded in the communal traditions that the Puritans brought with them from Britain. Immigrating in small family groups or as individuals, New Netherlanders were reluctant to form settlements, and formal apprenticeship for occupational education emerged under the twin influences of population growth and Stuyvesant's reforms. Apprentice training was nonetheless a vital economic institution to the Dutch, whether in New Netherland or Holland. When brother Richard in Amsterdam changed his apprenticeship from a lady shopkeeper to a merchant, Jeremias Van Rensselaer wrote bluntly to his younger sibling. "You must take care to learn something," he scolded in 1656, "for it is high time for you to learn, and by changing in this way from one person to another, one can not acquire any business method."[114]

However, unlike the New Englanders, New Netherlanders did not make binding out the young into a ritual whereby children were regularly shipped away from their parents about the time of puberty

---

[113]J. Megapolensis to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 25, 1658, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 435; Amsterdam Directors to Stuyvesant, Jan. 20, 1664, ibid., 541.

[114]Edmund S. Morgan, The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth Century New England (1944; reprint ed., New York, 1966), 68-77. Jeremias to Richard Van Rensselaer, June 19, 1657, Correspondence of Jeremias Van Rensselaer, 42-43.

to undergo the anxieties of adolescence with families other than their own without any apparent educational advantage that they could not have gotten in their own homes. This "psychologically wrongheaded" practice, as Edmund S. Morgan labeled it, has lately been identified by Emory Elliott as part of a larger scheme designed by the first generation of New Englanders to keep their children diffident and undefiant before their elders.[115] On the basis of the evidence that Elliott cites, there is no indication that the suspicion and distrust which the founding fathers of New England allegedly felt toward their offspring characterized the relationship between the founding fathers of New Netherland and their sons and daughters. Indeed, indulgent perhaps to a fault, New Netherlanders usually kept their children around them or among close relatives in the kinship structure. As in New England, apprenticeship in New Netherland was both a social and economic institution, and the master assumed parental obligations toward the apprentice, but the Dutch looked at apprenticeship primarily in terms of occupational training.[116]

---

[115] Morgan, Puritan Family, 75-77; Emory Elliott, Power and the Pulpit in Puritan New England (Princeton, N. J., 1975), 72-76.

[116] Zumthor, Rembrandt's Holland, 99-103. Along with Stuyvesant and the domines who commented upon the "wild youth," Alexander Carolus Curtius, the first Latin master, complained that "his hands were tied, as some parents forbade him punishing their children"; quoted in Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 26. Schout de Sille also complained about unruly boys in the streets of New Amsterdam; see Administrative Minutes, July 8, 1660, RNA, VII, 256.

V

What part did education play in the founding of New Netherland? That part was surely fundamental, involving the transference of Dutch culture to the New World and its transformation by the American wilderness. In the broadest sense, education was that sometimes jarring, sometimes subtle process of cultural accommodation constantly taking place as transplanted Europeans adjusted to colonial conditions. More specifically, education involved the literacy and occupational training of the younger colonists, the educational efforts of dozens of teachers and preachers and countless parents, the instruction of the indigenous Indians and the enslaved blacks, and the reading habits and value structures of the settlers themselves. From all that, a pattern began to emerge in New Netherland which would largely determine the relationship between educational institutions and the community in colonial New York.

Equating schooling with education, William Heard Kilpatrick concluded years ago that literacy in New Netherland was significantly higher than literacy in many of the English colonies. His data was incomplete, but on the basis of signature levels on documents from Beverwyck (Albany) and Midwout (Flatbush), Kilpatrick suggested that male literacy in the Dutch villages was approximately 80%, compared to 60% in Virginia at about the same time and 74% among the German immigrants to Pennsylvania during the first half of the eighteenth century. According to his data, male literacy was about 10% higher in Suffolk County, Massachusetts, than in the Dutch villages, though literacy among

colonial Dutch women was higher than among English colonial women, something like 45% to 25% in Virginia and 42% in Suffolk County, Massachusetts.[117] However, as Kenneth Lockridge has so recently shown, Kilpatrick inadvertently inflated the literacy rate of Suffolk County by about 20%, and on the basis of a much more thorough compilation of data, Lockridge concluded that male literacy in New England was only 60% in 1660, and female literacy was only about 33% in 1670.[118]

The higher literacy levels among New Netherlanders indicated perhaps no more than that parochial schooling in the Netherlands was better than parochial schooling in England. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the educational tradition of the Netherlands committed New Netherlanders to literacy training begun at home and continued at school and at church. Along with the twenty official schoolmasters subsidized jointly by the Company, the civil magistracy, and the Reformed Church consistory, there were at least twelve private schoolmasters in the colony between 1650 and 1664.[119] Furthermore, besides urging their congregations to read the Bible and inspirational tracts, the fifteen Dutch Reformed preachers who ministered to New Netherland contributed much to literacy

---

[117] Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 228-30.

[118] Kenneth A. Lockridge, Literacy in Colonial New England: An Enquiry into the Social Context of Literacy in the Early Modern West (New York, 1974), 14-20, 38.

[119] Compilation of teachers based on Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 1-56; Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, esp. 70, 101-18, 121-41.

through catechetical exercises. And the efforts of the Reformed preachers, led by Megapolensis and Drisius, in conjunction with Director General Stuyvesant, to make Calvinism dominant aroused New Netherlanders of other faiths to engage in literacy training to perpetuate their respective religious creeds.[120]

The pedagogical impact of the Dutch upon Indians and blacks was limited. On the one hand, encountering the European intruders from a position of relative strength, the Indians found Dutch liquor and guns much more appealing than Dutch Calvinism. Domine Michaelius' plan for an Indian school never materialized, and when the Eight Men in 1649 criticized the Company for not teaching Christianity to the Indians, Secretary Cornelis Tienhoven answered that people "conversant with the Indians in, and around New Netherland, will be able to say, that it is morally impossible to convert the adults to the Christian faith. Besides, 'tis a Minister's business to apply himself to that, and the Director's duty to assist him therein."[121] By the summer of 1657, just following the apostasy of their single Indian convert, Domines Megapolensis and Drisius saw little chance of converting the Indians, "until they are subdued by the numbers and power of our people, and reduced to some sort of civilization; and also unless our people set them a better example, than

---

[120]Edward T. Corwin, A Manual of the Reformed Church in America, 1628-1902, 4th ed., rev. and enl. (New York, 1902), 1-44, 1045.

[121]Answer of the West India Company to the Remonstrance from New Netherland, Jan. 27, 1650, NYCD, I, 340.

they have done heretofore."[122] Cultural mingling of the Dutch with the Indians continued unaltered, through illicit sex, the marriage of Dutchmen to Indian maidens, and of course through trade. "My children already begin to speak the language of the savages," wrote Nicasius de Sille in 1654, "and can trade with them."[123]

On the other hand, while the Indians were wary of both the Dutchman's church and school, the Dutch themselves were somewhat wary when it came to literacy and Christianity for black slaves. Free blacks enjoyed all the rights and privileges of other free men, and every year one to three black infants were baptized into the Reformed Church at New Amsterdam. And although in bondage, black slaves "were treated as members of the New Netherland community, not as a caste of inferior aliens fit only for brutalization and repression," writes Edgar J. McManus, the historian of slavery in colonial New York.[124] Slaves could own property, testify in court, learn trades, and buy their own freedom. Even so, the public confession of faith required of all converts as evidence of their divine election kept most--if not all--slaves from full membership in the Reformed Church. Dutch domines were also reluctant to baptize children born to slaves, "partly on account of their lack

---

[122]Megapolensis and Drisius to Amsterdam Classis, Aug. 5, 1657, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 398.

[123]Van Laer, "Nicasius de Sille to Maximiliaen van Beeckkerke, May 23, 1653," 100. See also Allen W. Trealease, Indian Affairs in Colonial New York: The Seventeenth Century (Ithaca, N. Y., 1960), 85-137.

[124]Edgar J. McManus, A History of Negro Slavery in New York (Syracuse, N. Y., 1966), 1-22, quotation on 9.

of knowledge and of faith, and partly because of the worldly perverse aim on the part of said negroes. They wanted nothing else," wrote Domine Selyns in 1664, "than to deliver their children from bodily slavery without striving for piety and Christian virtue."[125] The confusion over whether a Christian baptism freed a slave did not deter Selyns from catechizing blacks, and most of the students at the school Stuyvesant had Harmanus Van Hobocken start at his bouwery in 1660 were black, children of slaves and blacks manumitted by the Company.[126]

Whether the students were black or white, the religious emphasis dominated schooling in New Netherland, though some modern history and arithmetic were also taught along with reading and writing conveyed through little didactic stories. The curricula reflected the reading habits of New Netherlanders. In 1655, Sysbert Van Imborck got permission "to make a lottery of certain quantity of Bibles, Testaments and other books. . . ." At his death in 1665, Van Imborck's estate included over five hundred books, most of them school primers.[127] In 1643, the inventory of the widow Bronck's estate included numerous books, including works by Calvin and Bullinger,

---

[125]Gerald F. De Jong, "The Dutch Reformed Church and Negro Slavery in Colonial America," Church History, XL (Dec. 1971), 423-36; Selyns to Amsterdam Classis, June 9, 1664, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 548.

[126]Selyns to Amsterdam Classis, June 9, 1664, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 541-50; Ellis Lawrence Raesly, Portrait of New Netherland (1945; reprint ed., Port Washington, N. Y., 1965), 245-47.

[127]Council Minutes, Feb. 22, 1655, RNA, I, 288; Raesly, Portrait of New Netherland, 254-56.

Luther's Psalter and his Complete Catechism, a book on medicine, a child's book in Danish, and several moral and practical discourses, plus a German Bible.[128] Similarly, among the books sent in 1642 by Kiliaen Van Rensselaer to his patroonship especially for the use of Domine Megapolensis were seven dealing with theology and biblical interpretation, three on mathematics, one on philosophy, one on geography, one on history, another on economics, and two Bibles. Far more typical of what New Netherlanders generally read were the books included in the estate of the late Jan Jansen Damen, a wealthy New Netherland farmer who died in 1651: one folio Bible, one chronicle (perhaps of the Dutch wars for independence), and one quarto Bible.[129]

There was no printing press in New Netherland, but printed materials of all kinds could easily be obtained from the fatherland. The "complaints" of the Eight Men against the Company and the response made by Secretary Tienhoven were transformed into pamphlets published in Amsterdam and circulated there as well as in New Netherland.[130] The Amsterdam directors frequently had ordinances for New Netherland printed and forwarded on to Stuyvesant; Van Rensselaer similarly sent printed regulations to be posted in his colony, and on one

---

[128]Inventory of Estate of Widow Bronck at Emas, May 6, 1643, NYCD, XIV, 42-43.

[129]Catalog of Books Sent to Rensselaerswyck (1642), Ecclesiastical Records, I, 156-57; Inventory of Estate of Jan Jansen Damen, July 6, 1651, Dutch Manuscripts, III, 267-76.

[130]NNN, 287-92, 357-58; Kessler and Rachlis, Peter Stuyvesant, 95-125; see also VRBM, 628-97.

occasion, he wrote and had printed a pamphlet aimed at quelling his critics and edifying his unruly colonists. Ordinances enacted directly by the Director General and Council were copied by hand, read at strategic places, and tacked to tavern doors and other public places.[131]

While importing books and pamphlets and other printed materials from the Netherlands, New Netherlanders were not without their own prose and verse writers of widely varying degrees of talent. Among a people who thrived on salacious gossip, lampoon writers were numerous. In 1645, for example, the Reverend Francis Doughty, the Presbyterian minister of Newtown who had been holding services at New Amsterdam since the Indian wars, complained to the Provincial Court that Willem Gerritsen had written a scandalous song detrimental to Doughty and his daughter. The court reviewed the song, agreed that it was indeed libelous, and ordered Gerritsen to "stand in the fort tied to the Maypole, with two rods around his neck and the said song over his head, and remain there as an example to others until the English service is over."[132] In 1655, some anonymous lampooner gave humorous and sometimes scandalous nicknames to the houses of many of Beverwyck's leading citizens, causing quite a stir. For instance, the house of Gerritt Jansz was called "The House of Discord," and the house of Volckert Jansz. was called "The Bird

---

[131]Amsterdam Directors to Stuyvesant, Apr. 4, 1652, NYCD, XIV, 166; see also the procedure announcing laws and proclamations in Stokes, Iconography of Manhattan Island, IV, 126-29.

[132]Council Minutes, June 10, 1645, Dutch Manuscripts, IV, 266.

Song," probably an oblique reference to a street known for prostitution in the city of Gouda.[133]

The next year, Hendrick Jansz, the cowherd, was put in irons for writing "some notorious lampoons," though Jansz admitted only helping "to compose a lampoon or little verse, without hurting anyone." In 1664, for writing an "insolent letter" to the magistrates of Bushwyck, Jan Willemsen Van Iselsteyn was given the following sentence:

> that he be fastened to a stake at the place of public execution, with a bridle in his mouth, rods under his arms, and a paper on his breast with an inscription--"Lampoon writer, False accuser and Defamer of its magistrates," and afterwards banished, with costs.

Iselsteyn's friend, William Jansen Traphagen of Lemgo, who had delivered the offensive letter was likewise "tied to a stake as above, with a paper on his breast inscribed, 'Lampoon carrier,' and then banished, with costs."[134]

New Netherland did of course inspire prose and verse of a much higher quality than that manifested by the works of the lampoon writers. Robert Juet, one of Hudson's officers on the Half Moon in 1610, was just the first of many who wrote of what they found in the lands that became known as New Netherland. John de Laet wrote next (1625), followed by Megapolensis on the Mohawks (1644), Father Jogues on his visit to the Dutch colony (1644), the anonymous Journal of New Netherland (1647), and the description which accompanied

---

[133]Court Minutes, Feb. 2, 1655, Minutes of the Court of Fort Orange, I, 198-200, 213.

[134]Council Minutes, May 12, 1664, Calendar of Dutch Manuscripts, 265.

the complaint of the Eight Men and response by Cornelis Van Tienhoven, Secretary to the Provincial Council, both published in Holland in 1650. David de Vries published his journals of voyages made a decade earlier in 1655, and Adriaen Van der Donck, the young lawyer who led the New Netherland dissidents in 1650, published in 1656 his detailed Description of the New Netherlands, aimed at informing as well as encouraging potential immigrants to the Dutch colony.[135]

New Netherland also had three poets of some note, though they all followed the rather mechanical styles of the Dutch rhetoricians who believed "that poems could be constructed with application substituted for inspiration."[136] The first was Jacob Steendam, already a poet of some note, who brought his family to New Amsterdam in early 1651 or 1652 with profits--not poetry--on his mind. He returned to Holland around 1661, but two years before that, he had written and sent to Amsterdam for publication The Complaint of New Amsterdam (1659), the first verse of any significance written in the colony. The Complaint deplored the neglect that New Amsterdam, personified in the poem as the daughter, had received from old Amsterdam, the mother who had for so long ignored her maturing child. Having returned to Holland, Steendam published in 1661 The Praise of New Netherland, which was essentially a promotional tract in

---

[135]See NNN, 11-60, 163-80, 255-352; Adriaen Van der Donck, Description of the New Netherlands (1656), ed. Jeremiah Johnson, in Collections of the New-York Historical Society, 2d series, vol. I (New York, 1841), 125-242.

[136]A thorough discussion of the New Netherland muse is given by Raesly, Portrait of New Netherland, 292-330.

verse urging the tremendous potential of the colony upon prospective settlers.[137]

The second poet of New Netherland was Nicasius de Sille, who came to New Netherland in 1653 and became not only First Councillor but also Attorney-General, or Fiscal, of the province. A founder of the town of New Utrecht, De Sille began in 1657 to keep a journal of the village as it grew, and throughout his history of New Utrecht, he wrote little poems celebrating the fertility of the soil of New Netherland epitomized in the progressive settlement of New Utrecht.[138] Similarly, though a much more sophisticated poet than De Sille, Domine Henricus Selyns, who came to the colony in 1660, wrote verse memorializing events both small and great in the lives of New Netherlanders. In 1663, Selyns wrote a nuptial song to celebrate the marriage of his friend, Aegidius Luyck, to Judith Van Isendoorn. A short time later, that marriage was again memorialized by Selyns in his much longer poem, "Bridal Torch," which juxtaposed the joys of conjugal love with the horrors of the recent Indian attack upon Wiltwyck. No doubt reflecting the domine's Calvinism, "Bridal Torch" strongly suggested that God's wrath against sinful man could be seen in both the massacre at Wiltwyck and the ominous earthquake which had preceded the bloodletting by several months.[139]

The poets--Selyns, De Sille, and Steendam--were not the only

---

[137]His poems are in Henry C. Murphy, ed. and trans., Anthology of New Netherland, or Translations from the Early Dutch Poets of New York (1865; reprint ed., Amsterdam, Holland, 1966), 23-75.

[138]Ibid., 187-95.

[139]Ibid., 79-130.

men of learning and talent in New Netherland. There were the other domines, most of whom were university graduates, Aegidius Luyck and his predecessor at the Latin school, Alexander Carolus Curtius, and Dr. Johannes de la Montagne and his son Jan. A successful landowner and surveyor, Jacques Cortelyou was a student of Cartesian philosophy and notorious as a freethinker. There were also the many elementary teachers, most of whom were well-educated and knowledgeable men. Hendrick Courtourier painted portraits; Evert Duyckingh, a glazier, was an artist in glass; and Augustine Herrman made maps and sketches of New Amsterdam. These men knew each other, and on occasion, some of them no doubt discussed or argued philosophical, theological, and intellectual issues over their ale at the local tavern. However, it was the lampoon rather than the poem, and the Bible rather than the theological treatise, that characterized the literary culture of New Netherland.[140]

And that is not at all surprising. People generally came to New Netherland to make money, not to write poetry or pursue intellectual interests. Indeed, though divided by pronounced religious and ethnic differences, New Netherlanders were in the main commonly committed to the advancement of their economic interests, and that quest for material gain usually found expression along familial lines, much as in the Dutch republic itself. However, the strong communal tradition of the Dutch town dissipated in the American wilderness, and the family, that sturdy foundation upon which the

---

[140]Raesly, Portrait of New Netherland, 303-5; Singleton, Dutch New York, 298-320.

communal tradition of the Netherlands was based, almost naturally filled the vacuum. Even more so than in the Dutch republic, the family in New Netherland determined the education of the young, though the efforts of Stuyvesant and the domines to secure social unity through religious orthodoxy no doubt helped Dutch Calvinists to sink the roots of their church deep into the soils of New Netherland. While impelled by a vision of a Calvinistic commonwealth, Stuyvesant had to make concessions to first the Jews, then the Lutherans, and finally the Quakers--to that "Babel of Confusion" the Dutch domines so feared. In fact, because the family in New Netherland was dedicated to such diverse ethnic traditions and religious creeds, Stuyvesant opted at last for cultural accommodation rather than for cultural conflict, the only choice available for both New Netherland and for colonial New York.

CHAPTER III

THE TRANSITION TO ENGLISH RULE: RELIGION, EDUCATION, AND THE PERPETUATION OF ETHNIC IDENTITY

The cultural diversity of Dutch New Netherland persisted in English New York. Indeed, the mixture of peoples became even more varied in New York, stirred occasionally by further emigration from Europe and Britain and by the multiplication of religious sectarianism. Reporting to the Lords of Trade in 1687, Governor Thomas Dongan especially noted the variety of religious groups in the province. While he found qualified preachers to be scarce in the countryside, Governor Dongan observed that New York City alone had an Anglican chaplain attached to the British garrison there, along with a Dutch Reformed domine, a French Calvinist preacher and even a Lutheran priest. Of the colony as a whole, Dongan, himself a Catholic, wrote, "Here bee not many of the Church of England; few Roman Catholicks, abundance of Quakers--preachers men and women especially: Singing Quakers, Ranting Quakers; Sabbatarians; Antisabbatarians; some Anabaptists, some Independents; some Jews; in short of all sorts of opinion there are some, and the most part none at all." Dongan added that "the most prevailing opinion is that of the Dutch Calvinists."[1] Although two decades of English rule had elapsed, New York still very much possessed that fascinating

---

[1]Thomas Dongan to the Committee of Trade of the Province of New York, Feb. 22, 1687, Documentary History of the State of New York, ed. Edmund B. O'Callaghan, 4 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1850-1851), I, 116 (hereafter cited as DHNY).

blend of aggressive materialism thoroughly mixed with ethnic and religious diversity which had characterized Dutch New Netherland.

Had the conquering English imposed harsh surrender terms and urged the Dutch to leave in 1664, or had British immigrants poured into the sparsely populated lands along the Hudson and Mohawk Rivers, the Dutch legacy to the cultural life of colonial New York might well have been negligible. But as it turned out, the British submitted Articles of Capitulation that encouraged New Netherlanders to remain and become citizens of New York. Furthermore, the lack of a regularly elected legislative assembly until 1691, the comparatively high tariffs, and the proximity to hostile Indians and French Canadians made New York less appealing to English emigrants than some of the other British colonies, especially Pennsylvania and New Jersey.[2] Not until at least 1700 did the British equal the Dutch population of polyglot New York City, and New Yorkers of Dutch descent dominated the economy and politics of the upper Hudson Valley and of western Long Island until the American Revolution. Anxious to placate New Yorkers of whatever nationality, the English governors of early New York found it expedient to accept, broaden, and even give legal sanction to the religious accommodation that Peter Stuyvesant

---

[2]A still reliable introduction to early New York and its place within the British Empire is Herbert L. Osgood, The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, 3 vols. (New York, 1904-1907), II, 132-59. The best single study of proprietary New York is Robert C. Ritchie, "The Duke's Province: A Study of Proprietary New York, 1664-1685" (Ph.D. diss., University of California at Los Angeles, 1972). Especially instructive because of its remarkable synthesis is Michael Kammen, Colonial New York: A History (New York, 1975), 73-127.

had reluctantly tolerated only in practice.[3]

The proprietor of New York, Duke James, brother to King Charles and a closet Catholic himself, was not about to impose rigorous religious restriction upon the colonists who inhabited the lands between Delaware Bay and the Connecticut River just recently granted to him by Charles II. James may well have seen New York as a potential haven for English Catholics. Undoubtedly, the Duke of York and Albany wanted his extensive American domain to be profitable, and pecuniary success was predicated largely upon reconciling the inhabitants to his Lordship's regime. The Duke's subjects included not only Dutch, English, and the assorted Europeans of New Netherland but also erstwhile New Englanders on eastern Long Island, in western Connecticut, eastern Maine, Nantucket, and Martha's Vineyard, who had been loosely affiliated with Connecticut or New Haven.[4]

Following New Netherland custom, the Duke appointed the governor, approved the provincial council, and refused for almost two decades to allow a popularly elected legislative assembly. Even so, James and his lieutenant governors followed a policy of conciliation

---

[3]Ruth Putnam, "The Dutch Element in the United States," in Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1909 (Washington, D. C., 1910), 205-12; Marcus L. Hansen, "The Minor Stocks in the American Population of 1790," in Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1931, vol. I (Washington, D. C., 1932), 360-70; Albert E. McKinley, "The Transition from Dutch to English Rule in New York," American Historical Review, VI (July 1900), 693-724.

[4]Ritchie, "The Duke's Province," 7-10, 65-94; McKinley, "Transition from Dutch to English Rule," 693-712, 721-23; Langdon G. Wright, "Local Government in Colonial New York, 1640-1710" (Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1974), chap. 3.

and compromise that permitted the devolution of responsibility for local matters from the arbitrary provincial government to the appointed county justices and the popularly elected town selectmen. Education in New York before 1690 was vitally linked with ethnic and religious traditions and cultural identity itself; hence, the provincial government chose wisely not to formulate or apply any systematic educational policy, thereby reducing the chances of arousing ethnic antagonism or fears of cultural aggression.

Whether offered within the family circle or the larger community, education would remain a local and personal matter, regulated only broadly by the provincial government, but ultimately the responsibility of particular towns and especially the family itself. Certain provisions in the Articles of Capitulation of 1664, the Duke's Laws of 1665, and the short-lived Charter of Liberties and Privileges of 1683 provided the general framework within which the immediate community, the church, the school, and particularly the family performed their respective educational functions. Two points ought to be emphasized at the outset. First, group identity tended to become more than ever before a fusion of ethnic and religious traditions, with religion coming to dominate because of the suspicion and rivalry among the different sects. Second, insight into the relationship between education and ethnicity may be found by exploring popular attitudes on subjects ranging from apprenticeship to infanticide. During the years from 1664 to 1690, while different economic and political interests cut across cultural lines, the nature

of the educational process itself ensured that ethnic and religious diversity would become soundly entrenched in colonial New York.

I

New York was truly unique among the English colonies. Not only was it the first British province in America established by conquest, but its ducal proprietor and polyglot population set it apart both politically and culturally. Throughout the seventeenth century, New York was always more Dutch than English culturally, and its political status remained uncertain for years after 1664. The surprise British assault on New Netherland precipitated the second Anglo-Dutch war, and Jeremias Van Rensselaer, among other New Netherlanders, fully expected the Dutch to regain the colony, either by force of arms or by skillful diplomatic negotiations. However, the Treaty of Breda ending the war again assigned the lands between the Connecticut River and Delaware Bay to the English. "Now it seems that it has pleased the Lord [to ordain] that we must learn English," wrote Jeremias to his mother in June 1668. "The worst of it all is that we have already for nearly four years been under this jurisdiction and that as yet I have learned so little. The reason is that one has no liking for it."[5]

---

[5]Ritchie, "The Duke's Province," 57-60; Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, The Founding of American Civilization: The Middle Colonies (1938; reprint ed., New York, 1963), 101-20; Jeremias Van Rensselaer to Anna Van Rensselaer, June 10/20, 1668, Correspondence of Jeremias Van Rensselaer, 1651-1674, ed. Arnold J. F. Van Laer (Albany, N. Y., 1932), 401-3 (hereafter cited as Correspondence of Jeremias Van Rensselaer).

Many another New Netherlander liked neither the English language nor the Englishmen who spoke it and now ruled over them. England, after all, had long been the commercial rival of the Dutch republic, and commercial rivalry had rapidly ripened into national antipathy. However lenient the surrender terms, the English conquest posed a dilemma for all Dutch New Netherlanders. Heretofore, they had been Dutchmen living in America; but under English authority, the commercial and cultural connections with the United Provinces were precarious at best, though never completely broken. During the early years following the British conquest, there was always the chance that the Dutch might recapture the province, and the Dutch did exactly that in 1673 and held the colony for almost a year. However, the Treaty of Westminster ending the third and last Anglo-Dutch war in 1674 returned the lands between the Connecticut River and Delaware Bay to the English, to the chagrin of many a Hollander. The Dutch of New York had to decide where their heart and interests truly lay, in the fatherland or in British America. Some would return, but most stayed and became colonial New Yorkers.[6]

The Reformed clergy especially lamented the passing of New Netherland. "The Articles of Surrender," wrote Domine Samuel Drisius to the Classis of Amsterdam on September 15, 1664, "stipulate

---

[6]Kammen, Colonial New York, 73-99; Alice P. Kenney, Stubborn for Liberty: The Dutch in New York (Syracuse, N. Y., 1975), 51-57; Ronald D. Cohen, "The New England Colonies and the Dutch Recapture of New York, 1673-1674," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LVI (Jan. 1972), 54-72. Note the ambivalent attitude toward the return to English rule in the letter of Jeremias Van Rensselaer to Jan Baptist Van Rensselaer, June 29, 1674, Correspondence of Jeremias Van Rensselaer, 464-65.

that our religious services and doctrines, together with the preachers shall remain and continue unchanged. Therefore," he continued, "we could not separate ourselves from our congregation and hearers, but consider it our duty to remain with them for some time yet, that they may not scatter and run wild."[7] Drisius wanted to return to patria, but the Classis urged the disgruntled domine to stay and encouraged both him and Domine Johannes Megapolensis "to oppose the introduction of the English Liturgy into our Church as much as possible."[8] Both elderly men decided not to leave their ministry in New York, though the younger son of Megapolensis, Samuel, made plans to return to Holland, following the example of Hermanus Bloom, who left Esopus in 1688.[9]

During the first years following the English conquest, while Britain and the United Provinces were still at war, Governor Richard Nicolls continued to let public funds pay for the expenses of the Reformed Church in New York City. However, the English government no longer subsidized the Reformed clergy as the West India Company had done. To collect their pay, the domines were obliged to solicit from house to house. "You may imagine," moaned the younger Megapolensis, "the slights and murmurings occasioned thereby concerning the ministry

---

[7]Samuel Drisius to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 15, 1664, Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York, ed. Edward T. Corwin, 7 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1901-1916), I, 562 (hereafter cited as Ecclesiastical Records).

[8]Minutes of the Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 7, 1665, ibid., 574.

[9]Johannes Megapolensis to Amsterdam Classis, Apr. 17/27, 1669, ibid., 601-3; Samuel Megapolensis to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 7, 1668, ibid., 595-97.

and the ministers." Even in Albany, that bastion of Dutch political and economic influence, Domine Gideon Schaets complained of being paid little and irregularly. Schaets planned to remain at Albany, explaining that he simply did not have enough money to return to Holland. His impecunious state made the old domine especially sad, not so much for himself, he claimed, but for his sons, "who here can only come to grief."[10] Similarly disappointed, Evert Pieterzen, schoolmaster for the city and clerk of the Reformed Church in New York, petitioned the municipal government for his pay for some five years without success. Aegidius Luyck, the master of the Latin school, apparently had no such difficulty getting paid.[11]

What Nicolls had done was to appropriate for the provincial government the revenues from the excise on beer and wine which had formerly been used to pay Reformed ministers and schoolmasters in both New York City and Albany. Despite the grumbling of the Reformed clergy, Nicolls sought to make the transition from Dutch to English rule as smooth as possible. To encourage mutual understanding, Nicolls initiated what became weekly meetings between

---

[10]Samuel Megapolensis to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 7, 1668, ibid., 596; Gideon Schaets to Amsterdam Classis, May 7, 1667, ibid., 587-88.

[11]Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes, comp., The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 6 vols. (1915-1928; reprint ed., New York, 1967), IV, 249, 254, 257, 259, 270, 279. For a fuller treatment, see William Heard Kilpatrick, The Dutch Schools of New Netherland and Colonial New York, United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin no. 12 (Washington, D. C., 1912), 142-46; also Mrs. John King Van Rensselaer, History of the City of New York in the Seventeenth Century, 2 vols. (New York, 1909), II, 73.

English and Dutch community leaders in New York City and the surrounding area. He also urged that the Navigation Acts be temporarily ignored so that trade between New York and Holland might not be ended abruptly. Having headed the royal commission charged with capturing New Netherland and investigating the New England colonies, Nicolls wrote that the Dutch of New York would "prove better subjects than wee found in some of the other colonyes, and with a moderate permission both for time and trade, will support this government better than can be reasonably expected from newcomers of our own nation. . . ."[12] Time and time again, Nicolls cautioned Captain John Baker to keep order among his troops at Albany. "Let not your ears bee abused with private Storyes of ye Dutch being disaffected to ye English," he wrote to the imperious Baker in 1668, "for generally wee cannot expect they love us."[13]

Equally significant, Nicolls did not hesitate to circumscribe the almost absolute authority granted his ducal overlord. In the interest of peaceful surrender, Nicolls offered Articles of Capitulation that guaranteed the burghers of New Amsterdam their property rights, customs of inheritance, and freedom in church discipline. Similar surrender terms were shortly accepted by New Netherlanders

---

[12]Samuel Maverick to Richard Nicolls, July 5, 1669, Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, ed. Edmund B. O'Callaghan and Berthold Fernow, 15 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1856-1887), III, 182-84 (hereafter cited as NYCD); Nicolls to Lord Arlington, Apr. 9, 1666, ibid., 114.

[13]Instructions to Captain John Baker, Aug. 1668, Minutes of the Executive Council of the Province of New York, 1668-1673, ed. Victor H. Paltsits, 2 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1910), I, 387-89 (hereafter cited as Executive Council Minutes).

at Beverwyck (Albany) and at the South River, where Captain Robert Carr violated his orders and drew the Dutch into futile battle, leaving a legacy of bitterness that would keep the Delaware country politically unstable for more than a decade. Unlike Carr, Nicolls opted for compromise rather than confrontation. In changing the municipal form of government for New York City from Dutch to English, Nicolls retained the Dutch custom of double nomination. His most controversial action was his publication of the Duke's proclamation of 1666 granting Lutherans not only the privilege to profess but also to worship publicly according to their faith.[14]

The proclamation in favor of the Lutherans was merely the tip of the iceberg. Duke James made it clear that Christians of whatever persuasion could practice their own particular faith in New York. With heresy not simply tolerated but given legal sanction, Domines Drisius and Megapolensis feared for the future of the Reformed faith in the province. Not that church attendance was falling. To the contrary, people filled the church every Sunday, wrote Johannes Megapolensis in 1669, "and apparently like the sermon; but most of the listeners are not inclined to contribute to the support and

---

[14]Steve J. Stern, "Knickerbockers Who Asserted and Insisted: The Dutch Interest in New York Politics, 1664-1691," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LVIII (Apr. 1975), 113-38. The terms of surrender for New Amsterdam may be found in NYCD, II, 250-53; for Beverwyck and the upper Hudson settlements, ibid., XIV, 559; and for the Delaware or South River region, ibid., II, 71-73. Elizur Y. Smith, "Captain Thomas Willett: First Mayor of New York," New York History, XXI (Oct. 1940), 404-17; Nicolls to His Council, Oct. 13, 1666, NYCD, XIV, 626; Harry Julius Kreider, Lutheranism in Colonial New York (1942; reprint ed., New York, 1972), 21-23.

salary of the preacher. They seem to desire," noted the old domine wryly, "that we should live upon air and not upon produce." Governor Lovelace, who succeeded Nicolls in 1668, offered little solace. His standard reply was "if the Dutch will have divine service their own way, then let them also take care of and support their own preachers. . . ." The presence of a rival Lutheran preacher complicated the matter still further. "When we are dead," concluded Megapolensis, referring to himself and Drisius, "I fear there will be great confusion and scattering among our people at this place."[15]

Nor did the Classis of Amsterdam provide any consolation, somewhat confused as to its ecclesiastical authority in the English province. But the very next year, following the death of Johannes Megapolensis and the enfeeblement of Drisius, Governor Lovelace relented and agreed that the mayor and aldermen might levy a tax upon New York City to provide a salary of 1000 Holland guilders per year to a prospective preacher. Significantly, not the Classis, but a former deacon of the New York Church negotiated a contract with Willem Nieuwenhuysen, who was then ordained by the Classis before coming to America. The Dutch Reformed Church in New York now had a preacher whose "Person is very agreeable to us, and his gifts fully satisfy the Congregation. He labors daily," reported the elders to the Classis in 1672, "and diligently in edifying our people, whether by preaching God's Word, or by catechising the young." Two years later, Domine

---

[15]Johannes Megapolensis to Amsterdam Classis, Apr. 17/27, 1669, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 601-3; Kreider, Lutheranism in Colonial New York, 24-26.

Van Nieuwenhuysen reported, "Our church consists of between four and five hundred members; of whom, we can assure your Rev. Body, without boasting, more than one hundred have been received under our ministry." The industrious domine said he preached three times a week, on Wednesdays as well as Sundays.[16]

II

The English governors of New York recognized the need for competent preachers and teachers as agents of conformity and stability among the "wild" and "tumultuous" and "widely-scattered" peoples of the province. To provide for preachers without arousing fears of cultural aggression, Governor Nicolls established the precedent of letting the majority in each township decide who would preach to them and teach their children. That procedure was codified in the Duke's Laws, promulgated in 1665 by delegates meeting at Hempstead, Long Island, from the towns on Staten Island, Long Island, and the Bronx peninsula. These settled areas were organized into the County of York (Yorkshire), which remained the only politico-administrative unit of the colony until the creation of new counties after 1690. A mixture of laws and customs from both New England and New Netherland, the Duke's Laws were put together by Nicolls

---

[16]Minutes of the Amsterdam Classis, July 1, 1669, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 603; Francis Lovelace to the Mayor and Aldermen of New York City, June 22, 1670, Records of New Amsterdam, from 1653 to 1674, ed. Berthold Fernow, 7 vols. (New York, 1897), VI, 240-41 (hereafter cited as RNA); Dutch Church of New York to Amsterdam Classis, 1672, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 624-25; William Van Nieuwenhuysen to Amsterdam Classis, July 26, 1674, ibid., 654-55.

to serve the English majority and large Dutch minority in Yorkshire. This legal code was later applied to the whole province, extending first to Manhattan and the Hudson River Valley in 1674 and then to the Delaware region in 1676.[17]

The Duke's Laws required every township or parish in Yorkshire to build a church large enough to hold two hundred people. The elected selectmen or overseers in each parish would levy an assessment upon the populace for building and repairing the church, for taking care of the poor, and for maintaining the preacher. To placate those who might disagree with the majority of any given parish, the Duke's Laws promised that "no Congregation shall be disturbed in the [sic] private meetings in the time of prayer, preaching or other divine Service. Nor shall any person be molested, fined, or Imprisoned for differing Judgment in matters of Religion who profess Christianity."[18]

There were a few restrictions. No doubt framed with disruptive Quaker enthusiasts in mind, one provision of the Duke's Laws required that only preachers who could prove they had been ordained by some Protestant bishop or minister were to officiate in Yorkshire. Nicolls also continued Stuyvesant's policy of licensing teachers, not so much for religious reasons, but to make sure that the public

---

[17]"The Duke's Laws," in The Colonial Laws of New York from the Year 1664 to the Revolution, 5 vols (Albany, N. Y., 1894-1896), I, xi-xx, 1-77 (hereafter cited as Colonial Laws of New York); McKinley, "Transition from Dutch to English Rule," 710-15; Kammen, Colonial New York, 77-78, 83.

[18]"The Duke's Laws," Colonial Laws of New York, 22-25.

had a school all through the year and that the full-time schoolmaster might not be injured financially by part-time teachers. Professional pedagogues were licensed variously by the governor himself or by local officials. In October 1664, Nicolls licensed John Shutte as the only teacher of "the English tongue" in Albany. Probably about the same time, the governor appointed Jan Becker and Jacob Joosten exclusively to keep the Dutch school at Albany. Five years later, Governor Lovelace confirmed the two teachers in their positions as Dutch schoolmasters. Following the return of New York to Britain in 1674, Governor Edmund Andros approved the application of Thomas Smith "to admitt and teach any Gentlemen or other free Men the use or Exercise of Arms, for which to meet any fitt times and Places within this City, without Lett or Molestation: Comporting themselves as they ought."[19]

New York City was supervising and subsidizing a school in 1676. Some citizens complained that it was not well regulated by its master, Matthew Hillard. Even so, and despite the offer of Ebenezer Kirkland "to teach the youth of the city reading, writing, arithmetic, and Latin or Greek," the Common Council continued Hillard in that position, although not without extracting from him a pledge to behave better and replacing his subsidy of £12 per annum with a room adequate for conducting school. If the minutes of the Common Council are to be trusted, the city did not subsidize another school

---

[19]Daniel J. Pratt, comp., Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, from 1626 to 1746 (Albany, N. Y., 1872), 57-58, 61.

during the seventeenth century. And as William Heard Kilpatrick explained over sixty years ago, after the return of New York to the British in 1674, the Dutch school that had formerly been regarded as the official school of the city became purely an adjunct of the Dutch Reformed Church.[20]

In Albany, where Dutch hegemony was all but complete, the magistrates licensed schoolmasters, thus allowing a few usually reliable teachers to monopolize the teaching trade. The municipality seldom subsidized schooling, except in cases where the schoolmaster also served the church or court. However, the license to teach carried with it a certain amount of economic security and prestige, even though the criteria for selection included more than just professional expertise. For example, Geritt Swartt, Jan Becker, and Adrian Appel were chosen as the only schoolmasters allowed by law to teach at Albany in 1676. But shortly thereafter, the magistrates appointed another deserving candidate as schoolmaster, Luykus Gerritse, deserving "because he was impotent in his hand."[21]

At Kingston, William La Montagnie petitioned in 1666 "to keep a day and evening school here, and besides, that no other schools may be permitted but his, and also that he may be exempt from lodging soldiers." The Kingston magistrates agreed "under condition

---

[20]Common Council Minutes, Aug. 12 and 25, 1676, Minutes of the Common Council of the City of New York, 1675-1776, ed. Herbert L. Osgood, 8 vols. (New York, 1905), I, 22-24; Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 147-60.

[21]Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 62. See also Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 202-5.

that he shall be reasonable in his charges of school money and be obliged to keep up the school for one year." Two years later, Evert Noldingh was granted "his request concerning school, and he will have to agree with the people, and he is permitted to use the front part of the village house until he shall have found another place. And," insisted the Kingston Court, "he is to keep himself competent and sober, and to properly instruct the children in accordance with the Reformed religion." In 1671, the Court similarly granted Cornelis Hoogenboom's request to teach school, provided he did so both summer and winter, having use of the "village house and lot rent-free, for the time of two years." Despite the lingering antagonism between the Kingston Dutch and the former English soldiers who settled there as farmers, the Dutch school at Kingston continued with few interruptions until the American Revolution.[22]

While local governments were for the time being largely left alone, the ascension of James II to the English throne in 1685 not only changed New York from a proprietary to a royal colony but also threatened the aggressive intervention of the provincial government into educational and religious affairs. According to his Instructions of 1686, Governor Thomas Dongan, who served in New York from 1683 until 1688, was to permit only schoolmasters licensed

---

[22]Court Minutes, June 6, 1666; Apr. 27, 1669; Oct. 23, 1671, New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch, Kingston Papers, ed. Peter R. Christoph, Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, 2 vols. (Baltimore, 1976), I, 298; II, 409, 433, 467. For the "rebellion" at Kingston in 1667, see Marc B. Fried, The Early History of Kingston and Ulster County, N. Y. (Kingston, N. Y., 1975), 120-34. For more on school affairs, see Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 151, 212-15.

by either the Archbishop of Canterbury or the governor himself. Nor was Dongan to collate any minister to a benefice in New York "without a certificate from ye most Reverend the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury of his being conformable to ye Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England, and of a good life, & conversation." Of more immediate consequence, Dongan was also instructed to consult with his Council and determine what means were best for converting Indians and blacks to the Christian faith.[23]

New Yorkers had heretofore sorely neglected the souls of the Indians. Shortly after the English conquest of New York, Governor Nicolls dispatched Colonel George Cartwright as his deputy at Albany. Cartwright, working with the local Dutch fur traders, assured Mohawk sachems that the British would maintain the covenant of friendship that the Dutch had previously made with the Iroquois and would join with the Five Nations against their Indian allies. Governor Lovelace continued to curry favor with the Iroquois, for both he and Nicolls wanted desperately the friendship and furs of the Five Nations, but neither governor tried to Christianize them. For a time at least, Lovelace encouraged the missionary work of the Reverend Thomas James among the Montauk Indians near East Hampton, Long Island. James had written a catechism in the Montauk tongue, and Lovelace promised to have it published, either by some printer he hoped to lure to New York or in London. Despite the governor's eloquent encouragement for a catechism especially designed

---

[23]Instructions to Governor Thomas Dongan, May 29, 1686, NYCD, III, 372-75.

for "those dark soules" who were hardly yet "embroys in Christ," the scheme apparently came to nothing.[24]

So before Governor Dongan's administration, there had been virtually no systematic effort by the English to convert the Mohawks or any other of the Five Indian Nations. However, some Christianity had rubbed off on a few Indians who traded furs with the Albany Dutch. Indeed, according to Banckaerts and Sluyter, the only true Christians the self-righteous Labadists found in all of New York in 1679 were a half-breed Mohawk woman and her young nephew.[25] Aside from genuine Christian concern, the English suddenly viewed the conversion of the Iroquois as of extreme importance because of the inroads being made by the French among some of the tribes. Good Catholic that he was, Dongan planned to substitute English Jesuits for French Jesuits among the Iroquois, believing that French priests were simply stalking horses for diplomatic intrigue aimed at separating the English and their Indian allies. His plan was not carried out, but Dongan very likely inspired Domine Godfridus Dellius, who had considerable success proselytizing among the Mohawks.[26]

---

[24]Allen W. Trelease, Indian Affairs in Colonial New York: The Seventeenth Century (Ithaca, N. Y., 1960), 228-50; Francis Lovelace to Thomas James, Nov. 19, 1668, NYCD, XIV, 610-11.

[25]Jasper Danckaerts and Peter Sluyter, A Journal of a Voyage to New York, 1679-1680 (1913; reprint ed., Ann Arbor, Mich., 1966), 301-10. Led initially by Domine Jacob Coleman in the United Provinces, the Labadists were the pietistic branch of the Dutch Reformed Church, regarded by the orthodox clergy as schismatic. See also Ecclesiastical Records, II, 876, 1004, 1232.

[26]Trelease, Indian Affairs in Colonial New York, 254-77; Thomas Dongan's Report on the Province of New York, 1687, DHNY, I, 100; Dutch Reformed Church of Albany to Amsterdam Classis, July 31, 1690, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 1004-5.

As for spreading the Gospel among blacks, Governor Dongan observed in 1687 that New Yorkers "take no care of the conversion of their slaves." Slaves were commonly brought to church and instructed in religion by their masters or dames just as they were instructed in various crafts and trades. Nor was it unusual for owners for one reason or another to free their slaves. In 1679, the sizeable number of black farmers on northern Manhattan caught the eye of Danckaerts and Sluyter. However, gatherings of blacks, free or slave, whether for religious meetings or whatever, were still looked upon as potentially subversive. Furthermore, converting slaves to Christianity was discouraged outrightly because the Duke's Laws stated ambiguously that no Christian could be kept a slave and yet went on to exempt "servants for life" from that prohibition.[27] Attempting to clarify the law, Governor Andros ordered in 1688 that slaves ought to be "instructed and bred" in the Christian religion and that their status as property would be "nowise altered." Needless to say, the issue remained unsettled.[28]

---

[27]Thomas Dongan's Report on the Province of New York, 1687, DHNY, I, 116-17; Danckaerts and Sluyter, Journal of a Voyage to New York, 136; Edgar J. McManus, A History of Negro Slavery in New York (New York, 1966), 68; Will of Anna Medford, Aug. 31, 1669, Abstracts of Wills on File in the Surrogate's Office, City of New York, 1665-1801, in Collections of the New York Historical Society for the Years 1892 to 1908, ed. William S. Pelletreau, 17 vols. (New York, 1893-1909), I, 141 (hereafter cited as Abstracts of Wills); Mayor's Court, Order against Free Negroes Entertaining Servants, Whether Christian or Negro, Mar. 7, 1671, RNA, VI, 286-87; "The Duke's Laws," Colonial Laws of New York, 18.

[28]Van Rensselaer, History of the City of New York, II, 335-36; Instructions for Sir Edmund Andros, Apr. 16, 1688, NYCD, III, 547-48.

III

Laws and racial prejudices aside, another important reason for the negligible religious education afforded Indians and blacks was the scarcity of preachers in general throughout the province. The Duke's Laws had set up the mechanism for maintaining both preacher and church. But many of the parishes were too poor to comply with the law, or found it almost impossible to find a qualified minister, and tried to get along with a schoolmaster who would read the sermon on Sunday. Equally important, the religious diversity of some communities led to controversy whenever the subject of selecting a preacher or schoolmaster was considered. In fact, New York under the Duke's Laws provides an excellent example of what Michael Zuckerman has recently identified as the dichotomous dedication of early Americans to that contradictory pursuit of both communal conformity and individual gratification. That volatile combination led to the unstable cultural pluralism which Michael Kammen has described as profoundly shaping colonial New York society.[29] Ethnic and religious tensions found expression in the educational process. Indeed, much insight into the continual cultural adjustments which New Yorkers had to make may be gained by looking at the ways they sought to perpetuate their different customs and traditions. Among both the English and Dutch, the battle to preserve the cultural identity of the past was decided by the effectiveness of their

---

[29]Michael Zuckerman, "The Fabrication of Identity in Early America," William and Mary Quarterly, 3d series, XXXIV (Apr. 1977), 183-214, esp. 189-99; Kammen, Colonial New York, 81-82, 86-87, 112-13.

respective educational efforts.

Whether English or Dutch or a mixture of peoples, the villages on Staten Island and especially Long Island were now and again marked by communal dissension, due in part to the social and economic pressures caused by burgeoning population growth and limited cultivable land. Towns brought suits against towns over disputed lands, and neighbor took neighbor to court over plots and lots and fields. The mounting economic and social tension exacerbated religious differences. Governor Nicolls had anticipated some of the problems. According to the Duke's Laws, "no Minister shall refuse the Sacrament of Baptism to the children of Christian parents when they shall be tendered under penalty of loss of preferement."[30] Nicolls had expected that regulation to weaken sectarian intolerance, and it did to a degree, but religious prejudice lingered still.

Consider what happened when the minister at Southold refused to baptize the children of a Mr. Booth. The enraged father in turn refused to pay the church tax. The zealous Presbyterian magistrates

---

[30]Thomas Dongan's Report on the Province of New York, 1687, DHNY, I, 103; Land Dispute between Bushwyck and Newtown, May 17, 1672, Executive Council Minutes, I, 125; Secretary Nicolls to Flatbush Magistrates, Sept. 15, 1666, NYCD, XIV, 586; Lawsuit between Flatbush and Gravesend, Sept. 27, 1666, ibid., 588-89; Lawsuit between Southampton and Southold, 1666, ibid., 600; Judgment of the Court of Assizes, in the Case of Richard Smith, agst. the Inhabitants of Huntington, L. I. for Plaintiff, Oct. 1675, Calendar of British Historical Manuscripts in the Office of the Secretary of State: English Manuscripts, 1664-1776, ed. Edmund B. O'Callaghan (Albany, N. Y., 1866), 40; Decision between the Whites and Indians about Certain Lands in the Vicinity of Cow Neck, L. I., Oct. 1675, ibid., 40; Nicholas Eedes Petitions for Land at Southold Once Claimed by John Hand of Easthampton, 1677, ibid., 58; Richard Nicolls to the Inhabitants of Jamaica, Jan. 2, 1665, NYCD, XIV, 562-63.

of the township retaliated by seizing Booth's cows, thus depriving his "poore innocent little children of their Dayly sustenance of Milk."[31] In July 1671, writing to both the minister and magistrates of Southold, Lovelace made it clear that the "extraordinary indulgence" afforded them as religious dissenters from the Church of England by the Duke of York was not "thereby Intended that such Severity should be extended to those of a different persuasion to your discipline." Scolding and threatening harsh consequences, Lovelace left no doubt that the law required Christian ministers of whatever calling to administer the sacraments of baptism to infants and the Lord's Supper to children regardless of the faith of their parents. "I believe you better know," Lovelace concluded, "than (I fear) practice."[32]

The Southold incident was caused primarily by religious rather than economic differences. However, hard times had struck Long Island, spawned by population growth. Town records bear witness to this developing economic crisis. It apparently played a part in the plight of Schoolmaster Richard Charlton. In March 1672, Charlton complained to Lovelace that the people of Hempstead had failed to fulfill their contract made at a "Public Meeting," while he claimed to have scrupulously instructed the "Children & Youth there to read and write." Lovelace ordered the Hempstead magistrates "To cause speedy Payment to bee made unto him, according to your

---

[31]Lovelace to the Minister and Magistrates of Southold, July 10, 1671, DHNY, III, 209.

[32]Ibid.

contract, that Persons of that calling bee not discouraged, otherwise he will have good Remedy against you at Law to your greater Charge & Disparagement."[33]

The following October, at the annual meeting of the Court of Assizes, the supreme legislative and judicial body of Yorkshire, Lovelace and his Council, together with the appointed justices and sheriffs, reaffirmed that proviso in the Duke's Laws regarding the maintenance of ministers, which also included schoolmasters who led the community in worship services. The inhabitants of a town "may be of Different Judgment," so ran the statute, "yett all shall contribute to the Minister Established and allowed of, which is noe way judged to bee an Infringement of the Liberty of conscience, to the which they may pretend."[34] The law was so blatantly disregarded that in 1675 the Court of Assizes ordered a "Double Rate levyed upon all those Townes that have not already a sufficient maintenance."[35]

Among the English on Long Island, some preachers were maintained as the law directed; others were not. The religious tradition

---

[33]Lovelace to Justices of the Peace, Constable, and Overseers at Hempstead, Mar. 21, 1672, NYCD, XIV, 661-62. Town Meetings, Sept. 23, 1669; Feb. 20, 1670; Mar. 3, 1682; Nov. 7, 1682, Records of the Town of Jamaica, Long Island, 1658-1751, ed. Josephine C. Frost, 3 vols. (Brooklyn, N. Y., 1914), I, 43-45, 211, 223-26. See also Town Meetings, Nov. 29, 1682; Oct. 7, 1697, Records of the Towns of North and South Hempstead, Long Island, ed. Benjamin D. Hicks, 8 vols. (Jamaica, N. Y., 1896-1904), I, 408-9, 487; II, 123.

[34]Minutes of the General Court of Assizes, Oct. 2-7, 1672, Colonial Laws of New York, I, 94.

[35]Minutes of the General Court of Assizes, Oct. 13, 1675, ibid., 99.

of New Yorkers was endangered by both the scarcity of preachers and the inability of the people to provide more than meager support for ministers. In 1678, Governor Edmund Andros found in the English settlers of Long Island much desire "to house and maintain" preachers, if only they were to be had. Nine years later, Governor Thomas Dongan complained of the Long Island English because it was a "hard task to make them pay their minister." The differing observations reflected in part the lapse of time and in part the geographic perspective of the respective governors. Andros most probably was addressing himself to the English of eastern Long Island who had migrated from Connecticut and still thought of themselves as part of New England rather than of New York. Revealing much the same unanimity and conformity as New England towns, the English villages of the north and east judicial districts of Yorkshire urged the Court of Assizes in 1677 "that there may be a minister in Each Respective Town that wants" and that "there may also bee some way Established for the Maintenance of a School Master in Each Towne." Regarding the establishment of schools, the Court of Assizes assigned the matter for consideration by the towns of the two judicial ridings and by their respective courts of session.[36]

The English of whom Dongan complained nine years later were settled on western Long Island. Their forefathers had resisted

---

[36]Answers of Governor Andros to Enquiries about New York, Apr. 16, 1678, NYCD, III, 260; Thomas Dongan's Report on the Province of New York, 1687, DHNY, I, 117; Proposalls from the Constables of ye East & North Ridings to the Governor and Court of Assizes, Oct. 4, 1677, NYCD, XIV, 730-31.

Puritan conformity, migrated to lands under the tolerant jurisdiction of the Dutch, and nurtured such a contentious disposition that their progeny in New York had established a strong tradition of religious dissent. So at least it seemed to Dongan, who found his efforts to support the local preacher frustrated because of the lack of anything approaching a religious consensus. Dongan was particularly upset by the way the people of Hempstead and Jamaica treated their duly chosen ministers, the Reverend Jeremiah Hobart and the Reverend John Prudden, respectively.[37]

Prudden was apparently a Presbyterian, and Hobart, though he seems to have begun his ministry as either a Presbyterian or Congregationalist, was confirmed in 1683 by Dongan as Anglican minister at Hempstead. Besides the preacher's drift from dissent to Anglicanism, the Hobart affair was further complicated by an earlier agreement made between the settlers of Hempstead and of nearby Madnan's Neck to share his ecclesiastical services. Resisting the assessment levied on them by the magistrates of Hempstead, the protestors at Madnan's Neck charged that Hobart seldom came to their village. They prepared to call a preacher of their own, insisting that "we doe not only want a minister to instruct ourselves but alsoe one that will instruckt our children, for other wise we cannot expect but that Atheism or Irreligion will grow up amongst us for we have

---

[37]For background information on Prudden, see Ecclesiastical Records, I, 710; II, 921-22, 927, 960; for data on Hobart, see ibid., II, 844, 848, 929, 1021-22, 1043.

neare three score children."[38] The revolt against paying Hobart's salary gradually spread during the next few years among the inhabitants of Hempstead itself. Dongan asked the Hempstead magistrates to show cause why they should not pay the preacher. However, for reasons not entirely clear, Dongan pursued the matter no further. Finally, eight years after Hobart was confirmed as Anglican minister at Hempstead, Governor Henry Sloughter ordered the constable to collect what was owed the pastor in 1691.[39]

Lurking behind the Prudden incident was the shadow of Quakerism and an earlier dispute between Jamaica and another preacher over what the minister should be paid. At a town meeting in June 1676, the voters of Jamaica promised John Prudden a place to live and £40 per year "so long as he should continue in ye town imployed in ye work of ye ministry and his fire-wood brought home free as specified in ye town registry."[40] The promise, so Prudden told Governor Dongan in 1686, had not been kept. Dongan consequently instructed the magistrates of Jamaica to pay the preacher his due. But despite the Governor's order, Prudden remained unpaid, very probably because some of his more recalcitrant parishioners got the matter tied up in Sessions Court. Two years later, having by

---

[38]Petition of Madnan's Neck against Rev. Mr. Hobart to Governor and Council, 1682, DHNY, III, 211.

[39]Petition of Mr. Hobart, Dec. 9, 1686, ibid., 120; Petition of Rev. Jeremiah Hobart to Governor Sloughter, July 3, 1691, and Sloughter's Order, ibid., 123-24.

[40]Nathaniel Denton to Secretary Nicholas Bayard, May 9, 1674, ibid., 120-21; Certificate of Nehemiah Smith and John Carpenter, 1686, ibid., 122.

then served Jamaica for twelve years, Prudden once again asked Dongan to intervene and secure his unpaid salary, lest he be forced "to desert his calling" and lest the province of New York gain a bad reputation for not supporting its clergy.[41]

Having had his fill of public contracts unkept, Prudden asked the governor to allow a number of willing individuals to contribute voluntarily to his maintenance. Such a scheme, the exasperated preacher believed, would "neither be offensive nor prejudiciall to any person or persons under ye liberty granted by our gracious Sovereign." By approving this subscription method, Prudden emphasized that Dongan would thereby "give encouragement unto us that are settled in this Province and an invitation to others or at least remove evill surmizal against ye Government which so many in ye Neighboring Colony are apt to entertain to the prejudice of his Majesty's interest in this Province."[42] Dongan's reply is not known, but the governor most certainly approved of Prudden's plan, for subscription was to supplant public support.

Preaching--and teaching, too--by private subscription rather than by public contract was especially suited to the ethnic and religious diversity of the Duke's province. The multiple establishment envisioned by the Duke's Laws simply did not correspond to the

---

[41]Governor Dongan's Order of Council, Nov. 18, 1686, ibid., 216; Petition of Rev. Mr. Prudden, 1688, ibid., 121-22.

[42]Ibid. A similar division occurred at this time on Staten Island, where the population was largely Dutch and French, with the English in a distinct minority. See Justice of the Peace Richard Stillwell to Secretary John West, Jan. 19, 1683, NYCD, XIII, 567; Jan. 24, 1683, ibid., 568.

pluralistic reality of many towns and villages in New York, where there was seldom a religious majority, let alone a religious consensus. In the broader sweep of things, subscription in colonial New York was the transitory state of institutional development between the breakdown of coercive orthodoxy and the rise of what Sidney Mead has labeled voluntary denominationalism. Subscriptions for both preacher and teacher came to prevail in New York by 1690. Its dominance was the result of the simultaneous weakening of pockets of religious orthodoxy brought about by social and economic tension and of the remarkable rise of religious sectarianism.

Even among the fairly homogeneous Dutch villages of western Long Island, where the Reformed faith was a vital part of the cultural identity of most of the people, the working relationship among the local minister, schoolmaster, and magistrates was rocked by controversy, as Domine Caspar Van Zuuren was to find out. Following the death of the aged John Polhemus in 1676, Domine Van Nieuwenhuysen urged the Classis of Amsterdam to send another preacher to the Dutch Reformed Church on Long Island. "It is well known that trees grow miserably wild," Van Niewenhuysen cautioned, "if not trimmed and pruned in season." Arriving in September 1677, Van Zuuren discovered that the trees had indeed grown "miserably wild." The dispute began innocently enough. Van Zuuren decided to live at Flatbush (Midwout) because of its central location; however, the congregations at Flatlands (Amersfoort), New Utrecht, and Brooklyn also wanted Van Zuuren to live in their respective towns and consequently refused to contribute to building a parsonage at Flatbush.

Behind the parsonage dispute were long-festering personal and community quarrels over land in overpopulated western Long Island. Van Zuuren shortly became caught up in a welter of social and economic tensions that would finally drive him from the province in 1684.[43]

According to his own account, Van Zuuren labored selflessly, preaching to and catechizing both young and old alike, though his adversaries contended that he neglected his responsibilities, especially that of visiting his many parishioners. Consequently, his salary was not forthcoming. At first, the distraught domine saw his plight as largely the result of Domine Van Nieuwenhuysen's malevolent disposition toward him. "He excites against me the members of my congregation," complained Van Zuuren, "and blackens my character among the merchants, because I often censure their improper gain and godless traffic, which tends not to accommodate and serve us, but almost to ruin the inhabitants here, as he himself says."[44] Receiving a salary which scarcely allowed him to feed his family, Van Zuuren found the unabashed materialism of New York merchants thoroughly disgusting.[45]

Making his peace with Van Nieuwenhuysen, Domine Van Zuuren

---

[43] Van Nieuwenhuysen to Amsterdam Classis, Aug. 29, 1676, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 688; Caspar Van Zuuren to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 30, 1677, ibid., 699-702.

[44] Van Zuuren to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 30, 1678, ibid., 711-17.

[45] Postscript to Letter of Van Zuuren of Sept. 30, 1677, ibid., 703-4.

continued to suffer from a rather humiliating case of culture shock. As was sometimes the case in Holland, Van Zuuren believed that the preacher ought rightly dictate to the consistory and the congregation regarding church discipline. However, he soon found that such was not the case in New York. His consistory would not allow him "exactly to regulate myself according to the church rules of Holland." When he asked for a raise, his congregation refused him; some of the parishioners dared to slander "not only myself, but all ministers in the Fatherland, who leave a smaller congregation to serve a larger one, as having in their opinion no other object in view than the increase of money and therefore are nothing else, than hirelings."[46]

Increasingly, Van Zuuren tended to see the controversy that whirled about him in terms of the loyal Dutch against the Anglicized Dutch and their meddling English associates. Referring to an especially obnoxious justice of Flatbush, the domine claimed, "He howls with the English and oppresses his own, the Dutch people, with unreasonable and unnatural zeal."[47] A staunch opponent of Anglicizing influences, Van Zuuren was devoted to maintaining the purity of the Reformed faith. That devotion led him to impose church discipline upon anyone whose life discredited the Dutch Reformed Church. During his peregrinations, he particularly scrutinized the Dutch schoolmasters who served as voorlezers or voorsangers (readers or

---

[46]Van Zuuren to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 30, 1678, ibid., 716-19.

[47]Ibid., 718.

choristers) and led the congregation in worship when the domine was preaching at another village. Van Zuuren was apparently well satisfied with the work of the Dutch schoolmasters in his parish, except for one, Jan Gerritsz Van Marcken of Flatbush.[48]

In 1676, probably about the time Domine Polhemus died, the magistrates of Flatbush appointed Van Marcken schoolmaster. He continued to hold that position despite the fact that he was soon known to pay "more attention to the tavern than to the school." Van Marcken--or perhaps his son--assumed the office of reader after Polhemus died and continued to lead the worship service at Flatbush for almost a year and a half until Van Zuuren arrived. That Van Marcken would resent the young domine was likely; that Van Zuuren would disapprove of Van Marcken was almost inevitable. In the early summer of 1682, while trying to mediate a land dispute between the widow Polhemus and her neighbors, Van Zuuren reported, "I was most irreverently and slanderously abused by the schoolmaster, and worse by her [the widow's] eldest son."[49] The consistories of the Dutch Reformed Church in both New York and on Long Island immediately censured the "slanderers." And to his great relief, the domine found that church elders and town selectmen alike "had long wished for some opportunity to discharge this schoolmaster, and this

---

[48]Thomas M. Strong, The History of the Town of Flatbush in Kings County, Long Island (1842; reprint ed., New York, 1908), 79-80; Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 170-71.

[49]Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 170; Van Zuuren to Amsterdam Classis, June 25, 1681, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 771-73.

statement was verified by others, and his discharge was effected."[50]

Put on the defensive, Van Marcken increased his crusade of vilification against Van Zuuren and his friends. The Domine in turn petitioned the courts to prosecute Van Marcken for his slanderous crimes. However, fearful lest the English courts restrict Dutch religious privileges, Reformed lay leaders made an agreement with the former schoolmaster to let a committee from the Reformed Church of New York City arbitrate the dispute. The decision was against Van Marcken, who placed himself under bond to retract his slanderous charges and silence his foul mouth. Even so, Van Zuuren was outraged that the dispute had been referred to outside arbitrators. "I see the following in this judgment," he wrote the Amsterdam Classis in June 1681:

> 1. We are held in the same esteem as this scoundrel, and our clerical resolutions are subordinate to the decisions of some individual members of other congregations.
> 2. Our church will never be free from English politics, etc. Therefore, I most humbly request, that your Reverences please consider this, and guard our cause and liberty. Such things may happen to me again, even in censuring an ordinary member, etc.[51]

Van Zuuren saw the machinations of Anglicized Dutch and English merchants as the real force behind Van Marcken's attack upon his ecclesiastical prerogatives. Indeed, the zealous young domine, whose letters usually referred to New York as New Netherland, fought tooth and nail against the Anglicizing influences abroad

---

[50]Van Zuuren to Amsterdam Classis, June 25, 1681, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 774-76.

[51]Postscript to Van Zuuren's Letter, June 25, 1681, ibid., 776.

in the land. In a postscript to one of his lengthy letters, he wrote, "One thing is very desirable, and that is that this country should be governed either by the Dutch, or by the English in a Dutch manner." He continued, "I say this in reference to public worship and its maintenance."[52] Many families were scattered throughout the province without the financial resources to support a preacher but still yearned for "the means of grace--the Word and the Sacraments."[53]

In lieu of support from the provincial government for ministers, Van Zuuren knew that qualified schoolmasters who would also serve as readers and choristers were vitally important for the perpetuation of the Dutch Reformed faith. The link between the Dutch preacher and teacher was critical, not only because of their respective liturgical roles but also because the schoolmaster prepared the children for the catechizing classes conducted once or twice a week at the church. Following his troubles with Van Marcken, Van Zuuren took care that the preacher and consistory chose the next schoolmaster, with the advice and consent of the civil magistrates. Their first choice, Jan Tibout, who had taught once before at Flatbush, turned out to be both a drunk and a lecher and scarcely lasted the year. However, his contract is most instructive. Instead of the usual twelve-month school calendar, Tibout was bound to

---

[52]Another Postscript to Van Zuuren's Letter, June 25, 1681, ibid., 778.

[53]Ibid. The scattered nature of settlement in colonial New York was confirmed by many travelers, including Danckaerts and Sluyter, Journal of a Voyage to New York, 144-45.

hold school for nine months, being excused from keeping school during the three summer months, "if the number of school children does not reach twenty, in which case his wife may keep the school."[54] This contract contained the first mention of what would later become the traditional nine month year in American schools. Moreover, for the first time in any extant agreement between Dutch community leaders and their schoolmaster, a woman is specifically given authority to hold school. The existence of dame schools may well have been more prevalent among Dutch Americans than the records indicate; infant schools conducted by women were common in the United Provinces. Tibout's successor, Johannes Van Eckkellen, was given a similar contract, though the duties of the schoolmaster to both the school and church were spelled out in extraordinary detail. Quite clearly, while social, economic, and political tensions were weakening the cultural homogeneity of regions like western Long Island, preachers like Van Zuuren and pedagogues like Van Eckkellen and their successors contributed much to the perpetuation of the Dutch Reformed faith and traditions in English New York.[55]

IV

The effectiveness of the sectarian challenge depended upon the ability of dissenters to utilize the educational process.

---

[54]Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 172-73; Strong, History of Flatbush, 109-10.

[55]Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 65-66.

Conversely, the groups that failed to mount an effective educational campaign were always just one generation from extinction. The rise of dissenting sects clearly weakened the efforts of Dutch domines and schoolmasters to maintain the dominance of their faith; however, the resulting religious competition stimulated educational activity. In 1669, the Reverend Jacobus Fabritius arrived in New York City and began preaching to the Lutheran congregation there. Initially, the Lutherans were overjoyed at having their own pastor. However, Fabritius was given to drink and lechery, and while he ministered variously at New York City, Albany, and along the Delaware, Fabritius became an embarrassment to the followers of the Augsburg Confession. Finally, having taken part in what were called "riots" against the magistrates at New Castle, the Lutheran priest was suspended from the ministry and forbidden to preach by Governor Andros in 1675. By that time, the Reverend Bernardus Arensius, who replaced Fabritius at New York City in 1671, had become the respectable mainstay of Lutheranism in the province.[56]

Serving the primary centers of Lutheranism in New York, Arensius preached at Albany during the winter and at New York during the summer. While Arensius was away from either place, a lay reader led the worship service. Quite possibly, since the Lutherans in New York copied closely the Dutch Reformed structure of church government, the lay readers also served as schoolmasters. At any rate, the Lutherans almost certainly patronized schoolmasters

---

[56]Kreider, Lutheranism in Colonial New York, 21-27; see also Ecclesiastical Records, I, 602, 607, 609, 621, 640-41, 673-77.

sympathetic to their creed, for they, no less than Dutch Calvinists, wanted to perpetuate their own particular religious traditions.[57]

While Lutherans organized their separate congregations, Dutch Calvinists began to apply subtle pressure. To begin with, the deacons of the Reformed Church in New York City rejected the petition for poor relief submitted in December 1671 by John Fossacre, a professed Lutheran. A few weeks later, following the complaint of the Reformed Church deacons that "they are charged with the poore in the said Lutheran Church," the mayor and aldermen ruled "that each Church should for the future maintain their own Poore." The decision was quite significant; no longer was the Dutch Reformed the established church of the city in the complete sense of the term, although the Calvinists and their ministers were favored and partly subsidized by the municipal government for many more years. By recognizing the responsibility of the Lutherans to maintain their own poor, the magistrates were inadvertently admitting what Duke James had already proclaimed--the Lutheran Church was as legitimate as the Reformed Church in New York City.[58]

Following the Dutch reconquest of New York in the summer of 1673, the Reformed faith was once again formally proclaimed as the state church. However, while Lutherans were not to hold office, their worship services were not strictly forbidden. And Governor

---

[57]Kreider, Lutheranism in Colonial New York, 27-29.

[58]Court Minutes, Oct. 18, 1670, RNA, VI, 266; Court Minutes, Dec. 5, 1671, ibid., 348; Court Minutes, Dec. 12, 1671, ibid., 352-53.

Anthony Colve affirmed Lovelace's order that Lutherans in Albany did not have to pay the Reformed sexton and could bury their own dead.[59] Reporting to the Amsterdam Classis shortly before the return of New York to the English in late 1674, Domine Van Nieuwenhuysen maintained that the Lutherans "do us no harm, while we occasionally gain a few from their small number." Indeed, upon the arrival of Governor Andros in November of that year, the elders of the Lutheran Church petitioned for and received an order from Andros directing recalcitrant Lutherans to pay what they had subscribed to support their preacher.[60] The Calvinists had reason to gloat, but the Lutherans were far from leaving the field of religious rivalry, and theological differences soon transformed the Calvinist preacher and the Lutheran minister into bitter personal enemies. In his memoirs, the Reverend Charles Wolley, Anglican chaplain from 1678 to 1689 to the British garrison at New York City, wrote that Arensius and Nieuwenhuysen had not spoken a civil word to each other for six years before his arrival and "behav'd themselves one toward another so shily and uncharitably as if Luther and Calvin had bequeathed them their violent and bigoted Spirits upon them and their heirs forever."[61]

---

[59]Petition of the Lutherans of Willemstadt for Leave to Bury Their Dead to Governor Colve, 1674, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 659-60.

[60]Van Nieuwenhuysen to Amsterdam Classis, July 26, 1674, ibid., 653; Petition of the Elders and Principals of the Augsburg Congregation to Governor Edmund Andros, Nov. 1674, ibid., 664.

[61]Charles Wolley, A Two Years' Journal in New York (1701; reprint ed., Cleveland, Ohio, 1902), 66.

Hoping to arrange a truce between the feuding divines, Wolley invited both to "Supper one night unknown to each other, with an obligation, that they should not speak one word in Dutch, under the penalty of a Bottle of Medera [sic]," explaining that he knew so little Dutch that the discourse at the meal would be in Latin. After the initial shock of confronting one another and after a few glasses of wine, the two antagonists seemingly forgot their differences and began to converse warmly, speaking Latin so fluently that the embarrassed Wolley could not follow the table talk. Remembering that the grammar schools of Holland taught students to speak as well as write Latin, Wolley "could not forbear reflecting upon our English Schools and Universities (who indeed write Latine Elegantly) but speak it, as if they were confined to Mood and Figures, Forms, and Phrases, whereas it should be their common talk in their Seats and Halls, as well as in their School Disputations, and Themes."[62] Wolley did not say if he followed the superior Dutch method with his own "Scholar and Servant," the son of John Edsal, the official Indian interpreter of the colony. Nor is there any solid data that either Arensius or Van Nieuwenhuysen ever taught a Latin school. However, because it was common for scholarly preachers in New York to instruct some of the children of their parishioners, it would be strange indeed had not Van Nieuwenhuysen and Arensius taught at least a few promising youths Latin and Greek.[63]

In Albany, where the Reformed Church remained established by

---

[62]Ibid., 67.

[63]Ibid., 63.

law until 1674 and by practice for many years thereafter, the antagonism between the Dutch Reformed Calvinists and the Lutherans was much more pronounced. The Rev. Fabritius got things off to a bad start by refusing at first to show the Albany Court his license to preach. The Albany Court, in turn, ordered Helmer Otten in May 1669 "not to marry in the Lutheran church until he has first been married before the magistrates of the honorable court here." On May 2, 1670, the Albany Lutherans complained to the Court that they were "looked at askance by the majority of the inhabitants of this place on account of their religion," taxed unfairly for the same reason, and urged that they should "not be treated like inimical persons." The Albany Court replied indignantly that the petitioners were not assessed unjustly, nor otherwise discriminated against, and that some of their goods had been seized because of their own obstinate refusal to pay the just assessments.[64]

Wishing to dissociate themselves as much as possible from the Reformed faith, Lutherans asked the Albany Court in January 1671 to ring the bell Thursday evenings to announce their worship service. The magistrates replied that the request was "contrary to all reason, but that they may hold their services on the same days as those of the Reformed Church and regulate themselves accordingly on the

---

[64] Instructions from Governor Francis Lovelace for Mr. Thomas Delavall and Captain Dudley Lovelace Going to Albany, Apr. 11, 1670, Executive Council Minutes, I, 384-85; Albany Court Meeting, Apr. 1, 1669, Minutes of the Court of Albany, Rensselaerswyck and Schenectady, 1668-1673, 1675-1680, 1680-1685, ed. Arnold J. F. Van Laer, 3 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1926-1932), I, 66 (hereafter cited as CARS Minutes); Order to Helmer Otten, May 13, 1669, ibid., 69; Petition of the Lutherans, with Answer of the Court, May 2, 1670, ibid., 144.

Sabbath and likewise on Wednesday."[65] There were also lawsuits and countersuits filed by Lutherans and Calvinists involving what apparently began as doctrinal disputes between Domine Schaets and Magister Fabritius, both quarrelsome and hard-drinking men. Jan Hendrick Bruyns sued Robert Sanders, charging that the defendant had grossly slandered Fabritius. Sanders in turn sued Maes Cornelisz and Frans Jansz Pruyn, charging that they had heard Fabritius say, "These lying and rascally Calvinists." In October 1672, the public peace was once again broken when the Calvinist magistrates cautioned some Lutherans working on the fence in front of their church not to extend the width of the gate any farther than allotted by law. In response, Jocchum Wessels, the baker, testily told the magistrates to mind their own business. The court once again found against the Lutherans, but its judgment was not without some humor, imposing a "perpetual silence and obligation to keep still" upon the garrulous baker.[66]

Despite the obvious antagonism, the Calvinist magistrates of Albany harassed rather than oppressed the Lutherans. Indeed, Hans Hendricksen, a Lutheran leader, was also a captain in the Albany militia. Moreover, when the Dutch recaptured New York in 1673, the Albany Court petitioned the Council of War asking that "conscience shall not be subject to any constraint, as there are some here of different

---

[65]Petition of Albany Lutherans, Jan. 5, 1671, CARS Minutes, I, 211.

[66]Jan Hendrick Bruyns v. Robert Sanders, May 25, 1671, ibid., 254, 263-64; Robert Sanders v. Maes Cornelisz and Frans Jansz Pruyn, May 4, 1671, ibid., 243; Gate Dispute, Oct. 10, 1672, ibid., 311-13.

opinion who have intermarried, but that every one shall be at liberty to go where he pleases to hear the word of God." A few weeks later Governor Colve formally granted the Lutherans at Willemstadt (Albany) the free exercise of their worship, "on condition of comporting themselves peaceably and quietly without giving an offence to the congregation of the Reformed Church, which is the State Church." Officeholding was limited to members of the Reformed Church, but that restriction, along with the establishment of the Reformed faith itself, was removed with the return of English rule in late 1674.[67]

Soon regarded as a far greater threat to the Reformed faith than the Lutherans was Domine Nicholas Van Rensselaer. A son of the first patroon of Rensselaerswyck, Nicholas had drifted from one apprenticeship to another before informing his bewildered mother that God had called him to the ministry. Nicholas was a mystic, and his younger brother Richard called him "quite a Quaker" and "not a little crazy." Crazy or not, Nicholas journeyed to Brussels in 1659 to tell the exiled Charles II that God would shortly restore him to the British throne. King Charles never forgot the young Dutch visionary, and when he returned to England in 1660, Van Rensselaer went with him, where he was ordained by an Anglican bishop into the ministry and where he lobbied to secure English patents for the family manor of Rensselaerswyck. Upon the return of

---

[67]Gerritt Swartt v. Hans Hendricksen, July 8, 1669, ibid., 90; Petition from Willemstadt (Albany) to Council of War, Sept. 1, 1673, NYCD, II, 593; Colve to Lutherans at Willemstadt, Sept. 26, 1673, ibid., 636. See also Ecclesiastical Records, I, 636-40.

New York to the English in late 1674, Charles urged Governor Andros to install Nicholas as preacher in the Dutch Reformed Church at either New York or Albany. Since Domine Schaets was sixty-six years old and somewhat feeble, Andros appointed Nicholas as associate pastor at Albany, much to the dismay of the elderly Schaets and Dutch Calvinists throughout the colony.[68]

Such intervention by Andros seemed to violate the privileges of the Reformed Church guaranteed by Nicolls in 1664. Reporting to the Amsterdam Classis, Domine Van Nieuwenhuysen explained that Nicholas had "been palmed off upon the pulpit here, rather than called to it in a legal way." This was an especially dangerous precedent because Van Rensselaer was "invested with the ministry of the Church of New Orange, now New Albany, without the least consultation with any ecclesiastical persons outside of the said place," emphasized Van Nieuwenhuysen. "This I judged to be directly contrary to the rules and order of the Church of the Fatherland."[69]

When Domine Van Rensselaer came to New York and prepared to baptize some children, Van Nieuwenhuysen refused him, claiming that his Anglican ordination hardly qualified him to baptize and preach in the Dutch Reformed Church. At this juncture, Andros forced a compromise. Van Nieuwenhuysen backed down, admitting that

---

[68]Lawrence H. Leder, "The Unorthodox Domine: Nicholas Van Rensselaer," New York History, XXXV (Apr. 1954), 166-76; Richard Van Rensselaer to Jeremias Van Rensselaer, Nov. 30, 1658, Correspondence of Jeremias Van Rensselaer, 114-21.

[69]Gideon Schaets to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 7, 1675, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 676-77; Van Nieuwenhuysen to Amsterdam Classis, May 20/30, 1676, ibid., 684.

Van Rensselaer could serve the Dutch Reformed Church if he swore allegiance to the Synod of Dordrecht, which he did. The compromise was short lived, however. A few months later, Jacob Leisler, a German-born New York merchant and militant Calvinist, and his son-in-law, Jacob Milbourne, charged Van Rensselaer with preaching heretical doctrine and had him arrested at Albany. Once again, Andros intervened to release the beleaguered domine. But the strain of public controversy intensified an already pronounced mental instability, and Andros was forced to suspend Nicholas from the ministry in 1677 because of what Domine Van Zuuren called "his bad and offensive life." The unorthodox Van Rensselaer died the next year.[70]

Arousing considerable resentment because of his rather roughshod methods, Andros intervened in the affairs of the Dutch Reformed Church on two other occasions. The first incident involved Kingston and the villages located in an especially fertile region midway between Manhattan and Albany known as the Esopus. Having been without a regular clergyman for ten years, the Dutch Calvinists warmly received Domine Laurentius Van Goosbeeck in 1678. To put ecclesiastical matters and church government in proper order, Van Goosbeeck began immediately educating the people to conform "to the government of the Netherland Churches." Very likely working closely with the local schoolmaster, although the records are mute on this point, Domine Van Goosbeeck emphasized catechetical training, holding classes

---

[70]Difficulties in the Dutch Church at Albany, ibid., 678-81; An Albany Minister in Confinement, ibid., 689-91; Leder, "Unorthodox Domine," 174-76; Van Zuuren to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 9, 1677, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 704.

every Sunday following the sermon on the Heidelberg Catechism and on two evenings every week at his home. "I consider this to be very necessary on account of the very small amount of knowledge which I discover in many," he wrote, "and God Almighty has been pleased to bless this work, so that my congregation has made progress in virtuous living, knowledge and godliness."[71] As a visible testimony to the domine's successful efforts, his congregation built a new church in 1674. The very next year, Van Goosbeeck died.

Along with his parishioners at Kingston, Governor Andros deeply regretted the passing of that worthy divine who had done so much to bring stability to a region that less than a decade before had been torn by Anglo-Dutch antagonism. Andros agreed that another minister should be called immediately, but the governor added that the preacher should speak English as well as Dutch if at all possible and that the English Church in Holland be asked to supply such a clergyman. A few days later, the Church of Kingston wrote the Amsterdam Classis, not the English Church in Holland, and requested another qualified minister, noting that the governor had asked for someone who could preach in both Dutch and English, but left that to the discretion of the Classis. Unable to find a willing preacher so qualified, the Classis settled upon and ordained John Weecksteen, brother-in-law to the widow Van Goosbeeck and schoolmaster at Haerlem. Domine Weecksteen reached Esopus in 1681

---

[71]Laurentius Van Goosbeeck to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 25, 1679, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 727.

and for the next eight years continued the work his brother-in-law had begun.[72]

In requesting another preacher, the Church of Kingston stressed that without "a proper shepherd and leader" the results would be "negligence in the matter of divine service, as well as in all the duties of piety, and the breaking out of all kinds of excesses and prejudices. For it is well known," continued the church fathers, "that sheep without a shepherd stray further and further away, and become quite estranged to their fold and food, and are exposed to manifold dangers from wild beasts and robbers." They went on to explain that the congregation numbered about 250 and would further increase because of the many children, who especially needed the guidance of a qualified preacher. These remarks seem much exaggerated, and no doubt the Kingston elders shaped their statement to spur the Amsterdam Classis into action. Even so, the church elders very likely believed deeply what they wrote; Governor Andros certainly thought in those terms, and there is considerable evidence to suggest that what appears to be hyperbole and emotional rhetoric corresponded rather closely with the reality of the day.[73]

Such at least was part of the justification for Andros'

---

[72]Dutch Reformed Church of Kingston to and Response from Governor Andros, Nov. 19, 1680, ibid., 748; Dutch Reformed Church of Kingston to Amsterdam Classis, Nov. 22, 1680, ibid., 748-50; Amsterdam Classis to the Dutch Reformed Church of Kingston, Hurley and Marbletown, June 2, 1681, ibid., 765-68; Johannes Weecksteen to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 27, 1681, ibid., II, 789.

[73]Reformed Church of Kingston to Amsterdam Classis, Nov. 22, 1680, ibid., II, 749.

intervention into the affairs of the Dutch Reformed Church at the Delaware. Fifteen years before, Sir Robert Carr literally forced the Dutch soldiers at New Amstel to fight before surrendering to the British, thus leaving a legacy of violence that hung over the region like threatening storm clouds periodically bursting into a tempest of social turmoil. The region was inhabited by a volatile mixture of Dutch, Finns, Swedes, Germans, Norwegians, and some English settlers. In the late 1600s, something of a revolt began under the leadership of a man known as the Long Swede, who claimed to be the son of a famous Swedish general. That uprising was swiftly crushed by the British, but the Swedes and Finns argued among themselves over obscure religious issues, and when Jacobus Fabritius was forced to resign his pastorates at New York and Albany, the disreputable divine moved to the South River and brought Dutch Lutherans into the maelstrom of religious frenzy that swirled from settlement to settlement. In fact, the Delaware region possessed some of the most unseemly characters of the colonial American frontier. Banckaerts and Sluyter reported a kind of nether world, filled with assorted scoundrels, religious prophetesses, and social bedlam.[74]

Andros was profoundly disturbed by the lawlessness, religious frenzy, and general instability of the South River. His garrison there could do little more than maintain a surface calm. The governor

---

[74]The Insurrection at the Delaware, Oct. 18, 1669, Executive Council Minutes, I, 38-39, 311-16; A Petition from the Lutherans, June and July, 1675, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 672-75; Danckaerts and Sluyter, Journal of a Voyage to New York, 183-86.

wanted fundamental reform, that is, religious reform, and Peter Tesschenmacher, bachelor of divinity, was chosen to be the instrument of God and Andros to reform manners and morals there. Tesschenmacher could preach in both Dutch and English, and given sufficient time, he could be expected to master the other tongues being spoken at New Castle. But Tesschenmacher was not an ordained preacher, and the Classis alone could ordain pastors, the very regulation Van Nieuwenhuysen had cited in his dispute with Nicholas Van Rensselaer. But on the basis of dire necessity, Andros disregarded that rule, called Domines Schaets, Van Nieuwenhuysen, Van Zuuren and Van Goosbeeck together, and authorized them to ordain Tesschenmacher. Forming a temporary classis, the domines did as they were told.[75]

In letters to the Amsterdam Classis, admitting that Andros' order had hardly been proper procedure, the four domines nonetheless defended their ordination of Tesschenmacher. To begin with, they noted that Andros had responded to an appeal from the Reformed congregation at the South River for a preacher. If they had overstepped themselves--and clearly they had--by temporarily forming a classis to ordain Tesschenmacher, the domines apologized to the Amsterdam Classis, pleading mitigating circumstances imposed by the exigencies of the frontier. "Your Reverences are well aware that human hearts are like the soil of the earth," they explained. Left uncultivated, even good soil brings forth nothing but thorns

---

[75]Order of Andros to Examine and Ordain Tesschenmacher, Sept. 30, 1679, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 724-25; Proceedings of Ordination of Domine Peter Tesschenmacher, Oct. 9, 1679, ibid., 726-27.

and briars. "And in the particular case of this people," they continued, "it is especially necessary, as it is a wild country, and the way of speaking . . . [and] manner is also corrupt." Agreeing that the domines had in this instance done rightly, the Amsterdam Classis nonetheless urged them to continue their "praiseworthy correspondence with the Rev. Classis, and the maintenance of that good order customary in the churches of the Fatherland."[76]

The Dutch Reformed ministers of New York recognized that certain compromises had to be made. "We are in a foreign country, and also governed by the English nation," wrote the domines in 1680. We must exercise much prudence in order to preserve the liberties granted us." And despite its problems, membership in the Reformed faith continued to grow, numbering about 1,500 in 1680. Because of the lack of ministers and the scattered population, some people had to walk hours to reach church. Except for the baptism of infants or the taking of communion, Dutch Calvinists who lived in remote hamlets increasingly depended upon the schoolmasters to lead them in worship services. Indeed, as William Heard Kilpatrick amply illustrated, there was a Dutch schoolmaster in practically every Dutch community in New York, even in those villages where the Dutch were in the minority. Although the English government had done nothing "toward the support of religious services and ministers," Domine Van Zuuren exulted in the achievements of the

---

[76]The Four Dutch Ministers, Schaets, Van Nieuwenhuysen, Van Zuuren and Van Goosbeeck, to Amsterdam Classis, Nov. 1679, ibid., 730-33, quotation on 732; Classis of Amsterdam to the Dutch Ministers in America, Apr. 2, 1680, ibid., 739.

Dutch Reformed faith in New York:

> It is an honor to our nationality here in this country, that in the matter of religious services we far excell the English. They have but few ministers. Some of these are Independents; others Episcopalians; yet few of the right kind. Even the Capitol, New York, has no English minister or chaplain, and very few ever partake of the Lord's Supper. Therefore, religion which is the solid foundation of all government, is on a better footing among the Dutch; although even they have their failings and abuses, and neither are they small.[77]

Without endangering the privileges they already enjoyed, the ministers and lay leaders of the Dutch Reformed Church wanted the provincial government to buttress their dominant position in the colony. The New York Charter of Liberties and Privileges of 1683 reflected that ambivalent view toward civil authority. Put together by the elected representatives of the first Legislative Assembly in New York, the Charter of Liberties and Privileges has rightly been regarded as an early statement of advanced American thinking on religious liberty and representative government.[78] But while proclaiming the right of New Yorkers to practice the Christian faith as they saw fit without disturbing the peace, the charter emphasized "That this liberty or any thing contained therein to the contrary shall never be construed . . . to make void the Settlement of any publique Minister on Long Island whether Such

---

[77]Ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church in New York to Amsterdam Classis, 1689, ibid., II, 755; Van Zuuren to Amsterdam Classis, June 25, 1681, ibid., 779; Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 146-230.

[78]David S. Lovejoy, "Equality and Empire: The New York Charter of Libertyes, 1683," William and Mary Quarterly, 3d series, XXI (Oct. 1964), 493-505.

Settlement be by two thirds of the voices in any Towne thereon which shall always include the Minor part or by Subscripcons of particular Inhabitants in Said Townes provided they are the two thirds thereon." Indeed, justices of the peace were to issue warrants enforceable by the constable making sure that the preacher got his just due.[79]

The Charter of Liberties and Privileges was vetoed by James II in 1686, but Governor Dongan was not about to meddle in the religious affairs of the colonists, and the trend toward subscription for the payment of preachers and teachers continued. Records dating from this time bear witness to the presence of schoolmistresses as well as schoolmasters who operated private subscription schools. According to annalist Daniel Pratt, the first evidence of dame schools in New York comes from the English on Long Island. Rachel Spencer, who taught school at Hempstead during the 1680s, is Pratt's candidate for the first schoolmistress on record in New York. In 1685, Goody Davis kept school in Jamaica. John Bowne of Flushing recorded several payments to Elizabeth Cowperthwaite. In 1683, Bowne paid the schoolmistress "a red petticoat, bought of John Broke," to teach his daughter Martha for thirty weeks.[80] Given the close ties between the towns on eastern Long Island and New England,

---

[79]"Charter of Libertyes and Privileges," Oct. 17, 1683, Colonial Laws of New York, 115-17.

[80]Instructions of James II to Thomas Dongan, May 29, 1686, NYCD, III, 370-74; Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 86-87.

it is highly likely that dame schools were operating there at the time the British conquered New Netherland in 1664.

The drift away from the public contract and toward subscription for teachers and preachers and the reluctance of the provincial government to meddle in the religious affairs of the colony was not altogether pleasing to some Dutch and English preachers in New York. Domine Selyns, for example, who had replaced the deceased Van Nieuwenhuysen at New York City in 1682, believed that the religious sects were given too much liberty. Selyns and the Amsterdam Classis were equally appalled when the Reformed congregation at the South River withheld the salary of Domine Tesschenmacher and prepared to call Jacobus Coleman, the notorious head of the schismatic Labadists. Warning that the English were looking for reasons to impose an episcopacy upon New York the Amsterdam Classis convinced the South River Calvinists not to divide the American Church at this critical time by calling Coleman.[81]

More troublesome than the Labadists were the Quakers, who were the bane of Dutch and English Calvinists alike. Domine Van Zuuren left the Long Island Dutch in 1684, and his replacement, Domine Varick, did not arrive in New York until 1686. During the interim, Quakerism began to spread among the former Dutch Calvinists on Long Island. "Their impudent head and teacher, Tellenaar," wrote Selyns in 1685, "has dared, may God help us, to disturb public

---

[81]Dutch Reformed Church of New Castle (South River) to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 25, 1682, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 823-24; Henricus Selyns to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 28, 1682, ibid., 830-34; Amsterdam Classis to Church of New Castle, Delaware, July 1683, ibid., 849-50.

divine service at Breuckelen and Midwout, on one Sunday at the former place, and on the next Sunday at the latter." According to Selyns, Jacob Tellenaar and his followers would come into a church singing; then Tellenaar would claim that God had told him to speak to the congregation, beginning at once to denounce other preachers as only hirelings, not genuine men of God. Selyns also reported that his attempt to help some tailors and cobblers recently from the Netherlands to become schoolmasters had led these ambitious ingrates to presume to declare themselves preachers. Bewildered by all of this, Selyns asked the Amsterdam Classis to send extracts from the General Digest of Acts of the Synods "concerning schoolmasters and precentors in order that churches and schools in this country may be regulated and conducted according to the familiar usages of the churches and schools in the Netherland."[82]

During the next few years, the threat of Quakerism among the Dutch would abate somewhat, thanks in part to the work of Domine Rudolph Varick. Even so, New York remained a potpourri of religious groups, producing what Michael Kammen has labeled "unstable culutural pluralism." Besides the iniquitous Quakers, there were Dutch and German Lutherans, English Calvinists--either Presbyterian or Congregationalist, Dutch Labadists, increasing numbers of French Protestants, some Jews, and a few Catholics, all of whom had their separate meetings. In 1682, Domine Selyns reported that the Anglicans had only a reader who conducted services in the Dutch

---

[82]Selyns to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 20, 1685, ibid., 907-9.

Church following the Reformed meeting every Sunday morning. Relations between the Anglican few and the Dutch many were generally quite cordial. In fact, following the death of the Reverend John Gordon, Anglican chaplain to the English garrison at New York from 1683 to 1685, his widow left a substantial legacy to the poor of the Dutch Reformed Church there.[83]

As a practicing Catholic, Governor Dongan personified religious toleration at its best, but his Catholicism did have an unsettling effect on many New Yorkers who feared "popish plots" and the Catholic French in Canada. Accompanying him to New York in 1682 were two English Jesuits, one of whom reportedly conducted a Latin school for a short time. Also assisting schooling in the city, the Reverend Josiah Clarke, successor to Gordon as Anglican chaplain, paid the redemption on one David Jameson, a liberally educated young man who had been deported from Scotland because of his affiliation with what may be termed an extremely eccentric Quaker sect known as the "Sweet Singers." Some wealthy merchants of New York, so the story goes, repaid Clarke, who encouraged Jameson to set up a Latin School where young gentlemen of both English and Dutch descent were taught.[84]

---

[83]Selyns to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 28, 1682, ibid., 829-30; Rudolphus Varick to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 30, 1688, ibid., 956; Conditional Legacy to the Poor of the Dutch Church, ibid., 909-10.

[84]Oloff Stephenus Van Cortlandt to Maria Van Cortlandt, Jan. 16, 1783, Correspondence of Maria Van Rensselaer, 1669-1689, ed. Arnold J. F. Van Laer (Albany, N. Y., 1935), 83 (hereafter cited as Correspondence of Maria Van Rensselaer); English Jesuits in New York, 1683, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 877; Early Catholics in New York,

Such was Dongan's New York. Dongan himself was quite popular, and his devotion to the British Crown was unquestionable, but his patronage of English Jesuits made both Dutch and English Calvinists uneasy, especially because another war between Catholic France and Protestant Europe loomed on the horizon. New York society was still characterized by an "unstable cultural pluralism." Nevertheless, New Yorkers of various ethnic and religious backgrounds were learning to adjust to one another, working toward a satisfactory cultural accommodation. The pivotal institution in this accommodation was not the church or the school but the family.[85]

V

The cultural diversity of English New York in the seventeenth century was primarily sustained by the family. The family began to teach the young the religious and ethnic traditions that church and school alike were expected to confirm. To be sure, the family was the fundamental social and economic unit throughout colonial America, but in the Middle Colonies generally and in New York particularly, the family had additional educational functions. Here colonists of differing ethnic and religious backgrounds desperately sought to perpetuate their respective family traditions, finding security in an Old World identity even as they struggled

---

[85]For more on Dongan, see John H. Kennedy, Thomas Dongan, Governor of New York, 1682-1688 (New York, 1974). For a brief but cogent description of the social and political aspects of New York's ethnicity, see Thomas J. Archdeacon, New York City, 1664-1710: Conquest and Change (Ithaca, N. Y., 1975), 19-57.

to construct another identity for themselves in the New World.

The primacy of the family in Dutch tradition limited the extent of communal conformity in Albany, Schenectady, the Dutch villages on Long Island, and especially heterogeneous New York City. Because of their religious differences, the New Englanders who had much earlier settled among the Dutch on western Long Island similarly clung to the privileges and privacy of the family against any encroachment by town or provincial governments. Only among the so-called Puritan towns of eastern Long Island--Southold, Southampton, Northampton, Easthampton, Brookhaven, and Huntington--was the strong communal tradition characteristic of New England towns successfully transferred to New York. Here, with admitted significant exceptions, community and family were fused by common traditions which made it quite natural for the household to merge easily with the village school and church. Even so, taking into consideration the communal tradition of the English on eastern Long Island, the family among Dutch and English New Yorkers alike must be recognized as not only the dominant but the determinative educational institution in the seventeenth century.[86]

---

[86]The only study broadly focused on the family in New York is still Charles Edward Ironside, The Family in Colonial New York: A Sociological Study (New York, 1942). Although dated and of limited use to the historian, Ironside's work provides some light on the part played by the family in ethnic accommodations. Alice P. Kenney, The Gansevoorts of Albany: Dutch Patricians in the Upper Hudson Valley (Syracuse, N. Y., 1969) is an excellent study of the rise of a Dutch family. Also very useful is George W. Schuyler, Colonial New York: Philip Schuyler and His Family, 2 vols. (New York, 1885). The basis for the distinction concerning the communal traditions of English and Dutch New Yorkers is my study of wills and local records.

The conquering English realized that the family was the first line of defense against social and political turmoil in New York. Consequently, the Duke's Laws of 1665 paid particular attention to the regulation of marriage, the treatment of children, servants, and slaves, and the inheritance due to orphans. However, given the keen desire of Governor Nicolls and Duke James to placate erstwhile New Netherlanders, whether Dutch or English, the Duke's Laws were especially designed to regulate broadly, leaving plenty of room for local governmental and particularly familial discretion. Consider the provision on marriage. Noting that all the "formality" of English law and custom "cannot be duly practiced in these parts," the law required that the marriage banns be publicly read in the local church or posted by the constable and two overseers fourteen days before the marriage. In lieu of publishing banns, a license might be received from the governor, and in either case, any lawful minister or justice of the peace might perform the marriage, provided the couple swear neither was promised to another. Bigamy was not uncommon in colonial America, and the punishment for bigamy in New York was to be "boored thru the tongue with a red hot iron."[87]

The Duke's Laws also prescribed death for anyone committing adultery, defined as sexual intercourse between a married man or woman and another's spouse, although mitigating circumstances no doubt usually kept the full severity of the law from being imposed. Any single person committing "Carnall Copulation" with a married

---

[87]"The Duke's Laws," Colonial Laws of New York, 46.

man or woman was to be grievously fined and punished, but punishment did not extend to life or limb. Persons convicted of homosexuality were to be executed, excepting youths under fourteen years old who might be forced into sodomy. Such children would be punished at the discretion of the Court of Assizes. According to a law commonly broken, two unmarried persons convicted of fornication were to be punished either by marriage, by fine, by corporal punishment, or by any combination thereof as the Court saw fit. Behind that law was the genuine desire to protect the most visible consequence of fornication, the unborn child of the unwed mother.[88]

Cases involving the paternity of the illegitimate child could become quite complex. For example, during the extreme pangs of childbirth, the unwed Marritie Jacobs declared under oath to the sworn midwives that Rouloff Carstensen was the father of her child. Carstensen apparently agreed and prepared to marry Marritie, who suddenly had a change of heart and declared that the "real" father of the child was Jacob Claesen. In early May 1676, Marritie brought suit against Rouloff Carstensen to be freed from her pledge to marry him, preferring instead to marry Jacob Claesen. While Rouloff Carstensen seems to have been quite hurt by Marritie's change of mind, the Albany magistrates were furious, finding "it to be a matter of grave consequence first to commit fornication with one person and then to attribute the child to another, so that such person should be punished as an example to others." Besides paying court

---

[88]Ibid., 20, 21, 35.

costs, Marritie was ordered to be taken to the whipping post and given twenty-one lashes. Whether she then married Jacob Claesen, the records do not say.[89]

The evidence indicates that New York magistrates scrupulously investigated the deaths of infants, lest any foul play go undetected. In most cases, accident or sickness was the cause of death. In a few others, it was not. In 1666, Engel Hendricx, born twenty-five years before at Bushwyck on Long Island, confessed to the Court of New York City "that she hath Lived in this Towne in fornication and hooredom in soo much that uppon the first of July last past she is delivered of a Child, and having turned out al Motherly affection, she burried the same with Sods uppon the boddy in a open field to the mercy of al wild beast." The child was discovered before it died, and Engel was put into prison. Less than a year later, however, Engel was freed from prison and granted custody of the child. But in 1669, whether for the death of this child or another subsequently born to her, Engel Hendricx was put to death.[90]

More often than not, the alleged father and pregnant woman got married. But if the sexual morals of the woman were doubtful, the accused father might escape marriage by paying the expenses of the child in question for three or four years. With settlements

---

[89]Marritie Jacobs v. Rouloff Carstensen, May 2, 1676, CARS Minutes, II, 94-96; Extraordinary Session, June 13, 1676, ibid., 120-21.

[90]Extraordinary Session, Death of Pregnant Woman, Dec. 24, 1677, ibid., 285: see also Sessions for Dec. 20. 1675, and Apr. 7, 1676, ibid., 55, 88-90. Trial of Engel Hendricx, Sept. 13, 1666, and July 26, 1669, RNA, VI, 34-35, 188.

widely scattered and clergymen scarce, it was not unusual for a couple to set up housekeeping without benefit of clergy, and when the preacher did come around, he might be called upon to marry the couple and baptize their child--or children--on the same day. This practice became a custom, and preachers from time to time roundly condemned it, but betrothed couples continued to live together until it was convenient to be formally married.[91]

Domestic relations between husband and wife were only generally regulated by the Duke's Laws. A wife who deserted her husband and refused to obey a court order to return to him forfeited her dowry. However, should a woman find herself married to an abusive husband, magistrates in both New York and Albany on several different occasions stepped in to protect the wife. During the first decade or so of English rule, the governor and his Council granted several divorces, usually on grounds of adultery, desertion, or impotency. Having found their respective wives to be unfaithful, Daniel Denton of Jamaica in 1672 and Jacob Phoenix of Albany in 1682 were granted divorces. In 1670, Rebecca Leveridge of Huntington, Long Island, brought suit for divorce from Eleazar Leveridge, charging that her husband of seven and a half years "hath not perfourmed Conjugill Rights unto his wife, but ye contrary hath caused her to lead a very uncomfortable life with him. . . ." When court-appointed

---

[91]Schout Van Vechten v. Cornelis Muller, Jaques Janngn, Slyntie Slyntie, Sept. 21, 1671, CARS Minutes, I, 274; Cornelis Stevensz Muller v. Ida Adriaents, Dec. 3, 1670, ibid., 207; Kenney, Gansevoorts of Albany, 29-30. This practice was bitterly denounced by the Reverend John Miller, New York Considered and Improved, 1695 (1843; reprint ed., Cleveland, Ohio, 1903), 60-63.

examiners confirmed that Eleazar was indeed impotent, the Executive Council granted Rebecca the divorce.[92] Unlike Dutch-Roman law, English common law left the matter of divorce to the ecclesiastical courts, which in England seldom granted divorces except to the very rich who would pay the expensive court costs. As English law gradually supplanted Dutch-Roman law, New York, which had neither an established Anglican Church nor ecclesiastical courts, never developed any standard legal mechanism for divorce, although annulments for impotency or bigamy still had legal standing. The common alternative to a bad marriage was desertion.[93]

While buttressing the institution of marriage with certain legal safeguards, the Duke's Laws also defined to some extent the responsibility of parent to child and vice versa. The only explicitly educational provision in the Duke's Laws required constables and overseers "to Admonish the Inhabitants of Instructing their Children and Servants in matters of Religion, and the Lawes of the Country, And that the Parents and Masters do bring up their Children and Apprentices in some honest Lawful Calling, Labour or Employment."[94] Unruly children or servants might be brought before the local

---

[92]Daniel Denton's Divorce, June 20, 1672, Executive Council Minutes, II, 132; Jacob Phoenix v. Niesie Ysbrants, His Wife, Nov. 7, 1682, CARS Minutes, III, 295; Divorce Case of Rebecca Leveridge v. Eleazar Leveridge, of Huntington, L. I., May 6, 1670, Executive Council Minutes, I, 336.

[93]Ironside, The Family in Colonial New York, 60-72; Matteo Spalletta, "Divorce in Colonial New York," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, XXXIX (Oct. 1955), 422-40.

[94]"The Duke's Laws," Colonial Laws of New York, 26.

magistrates and publicly punished, "not exceeding ten stripes, providing that such Children be of Sixteen years of Age." Drawn from New England law and custom, an oft-quoted proviso of the Duke's Laws provided even further protection for parents from devilish children. Upon complaint of the parents, so reads the law, any sons or daughters who strike either of their parents without provocation before witnesses "shall be put to death."[95] If this law was ever enforced, any record of it has so far eluded the diligent historians who have sifted the court records of colonial New York time and time again.

As in the case of children and their parents, the Duke's Laws called for mutual responsibility between servants or apprentices and their masters or dames. On the one hand, servants or apprentices--the two terms were used interchangeably much of the time--were to obey their masters or dames as if the latter were their natural parents. Servants were prohibited from buying or selling anything and any apprentice or servant who ran away would have to serve beyond the terms of his indenture twice the time of his unexcused absence. On the other hand, besides instructing their servants and apprentices in manners and morals and some honest calling, masters or dames were not to provoke their servants or treat them cruelly or tyrannically. Should a master abuse his servant, the latter could justly complain to the constable or overseers of the town. And should a master or dame "smite out the Eye or Tooth, of any

---

[95]Ibid., 20, 26.

such man or maid Servant, or shall otherwise Maime or disfigure them, such Servants after due proof made shall be sett free from their Service, and have a farther allowance and recompense as the court of Sessions shall judge meet."[96] Unlike black slaves, servants or apprentices were not regarded as inheritable property.[97]

Dutch and English laws on apprenticeship and indentured servitude were very similar. Therefore, as New York passed from Dutch to English control, there was no dramatic change in this primary agency of occupational training for the young. The legal distinction between an apprentice and a servant was blurred. The servant was indentured to do a stated job for a certain length of time and for a specific payment, while the apprentice was bound to learn a trade. As it was under the Dutch, indentures either for apprentices or servants gave masters or dames virtual parental authority over their charges. Whether the indenture was written or oral, the courts of New York tended to favor the master or dame unless gross abuse was evident, and even then the courts were hesitant to abrogate the contract.[98]

Consider the case of Barendt Mynderse v. William Hoffmayer tried at Albany in April 1677. Mynderse complained that the defendant "keeps his son from his work and that the boy's term does not expire until the fall." Hoffmayer replied that Mynderse's wife mistreated the boy and sent him away, and that Mynderse's children called

---

[96]Ibid., 47-48. [97]Ibid.

[98]Samuel McKee, Labor in Colonial New York, 1664-1776 (New York, 1935), 62-84.

young Hoffmayer a bastard. Even so, Hoffmayer was "willing to have the boy learn the smith's trade, if they treat him decently." The court ordered the boy to return to his master and "serve out his time, but the plaintiff is ordered to treat him decently, and pay the costs, because the boy was sent away."[99] In another Albany case, Abel Hardenbroock, a shoemaker previously charged with mistreating an apprentice, brought suit in March 1671 against Hendrick Van der Borgh, who had run away after agreeing to serve four years to learn the shoemaking trade. Hardenbroock demanded that the defendant be condemned to serve out his time or else pay him board money for thirteen months time. The mediators for the defendant reported that Hardenbroock did not "provide proper board for the boy and so ill treates him with beatings and kicking that it is impossible for deft. to live any longer with him." The Mayor's Court decided that the apprenticeship should be terminated, though Hendrick Van der Borgh had to pay his former master one hundred guilders sewant and to the court the cost of the litigation.[100]

As a means of upward mobility for some and of preserving economic status for others, apprenticeship in colonial New York served the children of rich and poor alike. The Orphanmasters in New York City and the Consistory of the Reformed Church in Albany took it upon themselves to find apprenticeships for orphans or children

---

[99]Barendt Mynderse v. William Hoffmayer, Apr. 3, 1677, CARS Minutes, II, 216-17.

[100]Abel Hardenbroock v. Hendrick Van der Borgh, Mar. 7, 1671, RNA, VI, 288; see also Mayor's Court, Aug. 23, 1671, ibid., 252. Sewant refers to certain seashells used by the Indians as money.

of poverty-stricken parents. Although his efforts were undertaken with the best interests of the children in mind, Domine Dellius was rebuffed in 1674 by one Paulyn and his wife when the clergyman tried to arrange for the Paulyn children to live "with some good people who would support them and bring them up decently." Rather than give up his children, Paulyn asked that his family be taken off the poor rolls of the Reformed Church. Having heard that the children were still not getting enough to eat, the consistory secured the intervention of the Albany Court "to see to it that the said children do not suffer want or damage through the unreasonable obstinacy of their ignorant parents."[101]

The reaction of the Paulyns was typically Dutch. Judging from dozens of contracts from the years 1664 to 1690, Dutch New Yorkers apprenticed or hired out their children either because they simply could not care for them or because they wanted their offspring to gain special occupational skills. The instances where Dutch New Yorkers indentured their children at an early age were usually the result of one parent being dead or not at hand or of dire economic necessity. Probably for one of these reasons, Elizabeth Gerritz "hired out" in 1677 her ten-year-old son Abraham Jansen to Gerrit Visbeeck for eight consecutive years. Visbeeck agreed not only to supply the youngster with adequate food and clothing but also "to teach him to read." Having recently remarried, Barentie Stratsman in 1674 bound out her eight-year-old daughter by her first husband

---

[101]Domine Dellius and the Paulyns, Mar. 10, 1684, CARS Minutes, III, 432.

to Richard and Elizabeth Pretty for a term of eight years. In 1683, hard times and possibly the death of his wife may well have induced Jan Heyndricksen Van Solsberghen to indenture his ten-year-old son for six years to Claes Jansen Van Bockhoven.[102]

Far more common were apprenticeship indentures that explicitly called for occupational training of one sort or another. For example, Simon Le Roy hired out his eleven-year-old son Augustyn in 1682 for six years to Adam Winne on condition that Winne teach young Augustyn ropemaking. In 1674, Peter Winne apprenticed his fifteen-year-old offspring Francoys to Rutgert Arentsen for four years to learn the shoemaker's trade. Similarly, in 1677, William Parker, the court messenger of Albany, apprenticed his seventeen-year-old son James to shoemaker Hendrick Bries for two years to teach him both the shoemaking and tanning trades. In 1687, Elizabeth Howell of Southold put out her son George Harrud to Joshua Horton for four years. Horton promised to give the boy room and board, plus "to learn him to read and write, and to teach him the trade of an house carpenter."[103] Many other exapmles could be cited. Quite clearly, during the

---

[102]Indenture of Abraham Jansen to Gerrit Visbeeck, Sept. 22, 1677, Early Records of the City and County of Albany and Colony of Rensselaerswyck, ed. Arnold J. F. Van Laer and Jonathan Pearson, 4 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1869-1919), III, 474 (hereafter cited as Albany Records); Indenture of Johanna Hans to Richard Pretty and Wife Elizabeth, Sept. 30, 1674, ibid., 415; Indenture of Jan Jansen to Claes Jansen Van Bockhoven, Oct. 26, 1683, ibid., 562-63.

[103]Indenture of Augustyn Le Roy to Adam Winne, Nov. 28, 1682, ibid., 546-47; Indenture of Francoys Pietersen Winne to Rutgers Arentsen, Dec. 9, 1674, ibid., 422; Indenture of James Parker to Hendrick Bries, Dec. 13, 1677, ibid., 445.

two decades following the English conquest, population growth and economic expansion broadened the variety of apprenticeship training and increased the demand for apprentices in New York. In the minds of many New York parents, an apprenticeship under some skilled shoemaker, blacksmith, wheelwright, cooper, or carpenter was especially advantageous for the future well-being of their sons.

The more well-to-do or ambitious families had higher economic aspirations for their progeny. Besides sending his boys to the Latin school at New Amsterdam, William Beekman underwrote the mercantile ventures and political forays of his eldest son Henry. Beekman's younger son Gerardus either studied medicine in Leyden or more likely was apprenticed to some doctor in New York. At any rate, there still exists in Beekman's hand a copy of the famous medical text by Sylvius of Leyden published in 1672. Settling in Flatbush, Gerardus began to lay the foundation for a most successful career in both politics and medicine.[104] At just about the same time, Oloff Stephensen Van Cortlandt of New York City was personally directing the mercantile education of his sons, Stephenus and Jacobus. Stephenus seems to have served a kind of internship with his father's merchant friends in Boston, and Jacobus received similar training in Jamaica. In Albany, Harmen Gansevoort was hard at work building up the family brewery. His young son Leendert literally grew up in the business and acquired skills that would

---

[104]Philip L. White, The Beekmans of New York in Politics and Commerce, 1647-1877 (New York, 1957), 73-78, 83-100, 122-44, 151-58.

make him one of Albany's wealthiest brewers and merchants.[105]

Although atypical because his family was the largest landowner in the colony, the apprenticeship of Kiliaen Van Rensselaer illustrates the importance of this traditional form of occupational education in the developing economic and social structure of colonial New York. The eldest child of Maria Van Cortlandt and Jeremias Van Rensselaer, Kiliaen was the pride and joy of his parents. Pampered throughout his childhood, he was sent to school at age four. Following the death of his father in 1674, Kiliaen's education was left in the hands of his strong-willed mother, who was ably advised by her father, Oloff Stephensen Van Cortlandt. Young Kiliaen had spent considerable time with Grandfather Van Cortlandt, due in part to the frequent pregancies, complicated by generally poor health, of his mother.[106] Maria had at first planned to send Kiliaen to Holland for his professional training, but the second Anglo-Dutch war intervened, and on the advice of the Van Cortlandts, she apprenticed the fifteen-year-old Kiliaen to a New York City silversmith in 1678. This apprenticeship was probably arranged by Grandfather Van Cortlandt, who doubtless kept a watchful eye on both his grandson

---

[105]Oloff Stephensen Van Cortlandt to Maria Van Rensselaer, Jan. 16, 1677, Correspondence of Maria Van Rensselaer, 19-20; Oloff Stephensen Van Cortlandt to Maria Van Rensselaer, Jan. 1871, ibid., 45; Kenney, Gansevoorts of Albany, 28-32.

[106]Jeremias Van Rensselaer to Anna Van Rensselaer, Sept. 12, 1663, Correspondence of Jeremias Van Rensselaer, 328-29; Jan Baptist Van Rensselaer to Jeremias Van Rensselaer, Jan. 5, 1664, ibid., 339-43; Jeremias Van Rensselaer to Anna Van Rensselaer, Apr. 15, 1665, ibid., 378.

and the latter's master.[107]

Four years later, Kiliaen had successfully completed his apprenticeship. Although now nineteen and probably qualified as a journeyman silversmith, Kiliaen wanted to continue his training in the art and become a master silversmith himself. Since master silversmiths were not only highly skilled artisans but also the bankers of their day, Maria and the Van Cortlandts approved of Kiliaen's professional aspirations. Taking charge of the matter, Grandfather Van Cortlandt called upon his mercantile colleagues in Boston, who in turn placed Kiliaen in the service of the most talented silversmith in the city, Jeremiah Drummer. Because he was already a journeyman, Kiliaen probably did not pay Drummer the customary apprentice fee. Nor did Drummer pay Kiliaen for his assistance, providing only his room and board. Two Van Cortlandt business associates, Utscher and Paterschall, were "his sureties, in case he should undertake some big piece of work and spoil it, so that he would have to make good the loss." Within a year, Drummer had taught Kiliaen how to make the big silver goblets, tankards, and platters, the mark of a true master silversmith. Kiliaen's younger brother, Hendrick, who had been taught at the school of Geritt Swartt before continuing his schooling in New York City, was apprenticed there to a merchant. Kiliaen himself, besides exercising his trade as a master silversmith, began to manage the affairs of Rensselaerswyck, which would benefit

---

[107]Maria Van Rensselaer to Richard Van Rensselaer, June 1678, Correspondence of Maria Van Rensselaer, 21; Maria Van Rensselaer to Richard Van Rensselaer, Jan. 1682, ibid., 58.

even more by Hendrick's mercantile training. Utilizing their several talents and family connections, Kiliaen and Hendrick not only preserved but extended the economic and political power of the Van Rensselaer clan in New York.[108]

Whether the parents of the children involved were rich, or poor, or of middling economic standing, the apprenticeship agreements made by New Yorkers of Dutch ancestry provide considerable insight into their attitudes toward education. First, excepting orphans and children of poverty, youths were generally bound out in their middle teens and sometimes when older, and the term of the apprenticeship was seldom over five years. Unlike what we know of Puritan New England, Dutch New Yorkers socialized their children primarily in their own households, not binding them out during the critical years of early adolescence. Although evidence is scanty, the English who settled among the Dutch on western Long Island seem to have followed the Dutch practice of apprenticeship, while the English on the "East End" very likely perpetuated that traumatic ritual of putting out young children begun by their Puritan forebears.[109]

Second, Dutch New Yorkers, again unlike their Puritan neighbors, used apprenticeship almost exclusively for occupational training.

---

[108]Oloff Stephensen Van Cortlandt to Maria Van Rensselaer, Aug. 10, 1682, ibid., 73; Catrina Darvall (Sister) to Maria Van Rensselaer, Aug. 31, 1682, ibid., 77-78; Catrina Darvall to Maria Van Rensselaer, Oct. 9, 1680, ibid., 44; Oloff Stephensen Van Cortlandt to Maria Van Rensselaer, Jan. 16, 1683, ibid., 81.

[109]See Edmund S. Morgan, The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth Century New England (1944; reprint ed., New York, 1966), 66-77; also Emory Elliott, Power and the Pulpit in Puritan New England (Princeton, N. J., 1975), 72-76.

While the range of apprenticeship opportunities was very limited in New Netherland, New York by the last quarter of the seventeenth century had many and needed more coopers, smiths, wheelwrights, carpenters, and artisans of various trades. The emphasis in apprenticeship was always on learning the trade; the parents might pay the master, or as in many cases, pay for the apprentice's clothing and laundry. The strong belief that an apprentice should be "taught" a trade and assisted "to learn" a skill that would secure his future was occasionally applied to servants, even slaves. In 1682, Captain Johannes Clute of Albany hired out "a certain little negress (named Sara) for the time of three succeeding years" to Aernot Cornelise, but there were explicit conditions that Cornelise had to meet. He promised "to exercise her in godly prayer and to bring her up in the fear of the Lord, likewise to teach her to sew, knit and spin according to her capacity."[110]

Thirdly, and very much like their New England neighbors, Dutch and English New Yorkers alike usually included some provision for schooling in the indentures they made for their children. The usual time and season were for three months every winter. When Simon Le Roy hired out his son Augustyn in 1682, ropemaker Adam Winne promised to send Augustyn "to an evening school three winters and pay for the tuition." Rutgers Arentz, the shoemaker,

---

[110] Indenture of Apprenticeship of Gerit Van der Zee to Learn the Tailor's Trade from Willem Ketelhuyn, July 30, 1683, Albany Records, III, 660-61; Indenture of Apprenticeship of Jellis de la Grange to Cornelis Van Schelluyne to Learn the Shoemaker's Trade, Oct. 30, 1682, ibid., 544; Lease of Young Negress Named Sara to Aernot Cornelise, Nov. 16, 1682, ibid., 545 (emphasis mine).

however, conditioned his promise to send Francoya Pietersen Winne to evening school every winter, "provided the father pay the tuition" for the four years. In 1680, Sacharias Sickels apprenticed his son Lambrecht to blacksmith Meyndert Fredericz for six years, the latter agreeing to provide room and board for young Lambrecht and "also to teach him the smith's trade as well as he shall be able to and to send him to the evening school for three winters, namely two months each winter, and pay the school tuition."[111] Schooling was obviously thought of as supplementing the primary skills being learned by the apprentice.

VI

The same emphasis on a suitable trade and schooling for the young found in apprenticeship indentures is also manifest in wills of both English and Dutch parents. However, along with reading and writing and a suitable trade, the wills of New Yorkers made between 1664 and 1700 also emphasized the religious nurture of the child. "I leave all my children," declared Richard Terry of Southold, Long Island, in his will proved in 1676, "to be at my wife's command, to be educated and brought up, both for the good of their Souls and Bodys, till the sons are twenty-one and the daughters eighteen." Similarly, in the will signed by Marten and Maeycke Cornelissen of Albany on January 12, 1677, the survivor of the two was pledged

---

[111]Indenture of Augustyn Le Roy to Adam Winne, 1682, ibid., 423; Indenture of Francoya Pietersen Winne to Rutgers Arentz, ibid., 423; Indenture of Lambrecht Sickels to Meyndert Fredericz, Feb. 9, 1689, ibid., 485.

"to bring them [the children] up in the fear of the Lord (so far as he or she can) to have them taught reading and writing, together with some handicraft whereby under God they may earn their living with honor."[112]

The legacy passed on from parent to child very often assisted the latter in his--and sometimes her--occupation. Samuel Holmes of Gravesend left his sons Samuel and Joseph "all my wearing clothes and carpenter tools." In 1679, John Leggett of Westchester made Frederick Phillipse his executor and asked that the latter bring up his little son to be a mariner as Leggett himself was. In 1697, John Pelletreau of New York City left his nephew, Elias Pelletreau, "all the tools that are employed about candle making and whalebone cutting." While artisans willed their tools and shops and account books, merchants bequeathed their various holdings, and farmers divided their lands and livestock among their children.[113]

There are many similarities between the wills of Dutch and English New Yorkers, but even more striking are the differences. The most obvious difference is the Dutch custom of partible inheritance and the English tradition of primogeniture and entail. Reflecting clearly the accommodation that Nicolls recognized was necessary between English law and Dutch custom in New York, the Duke's Laws

---

[112] Will of Richard Terry of Southold, May 13, 1676, Abstracts of Wills, I, 35-36; Will of Marten and Maeycke Cornelissen, Jan. 12, 1677, Albany Records, III, 359-60.

[113] Will of Samuel Holmes of Gravesend, Feb. 28, 1679, Abstracts of Wills, I, 51-52; Will of John Leggett of Westchester, Oct. 2, 1679, ibid., 67; Will of John Pelletreau of New York City, Dec. 10, 1697, ibid., 96-97. See also ibid., 98-100, 118-20, 143.

on inheritance said that one-third of the real and personal property should go to the widow and the other two-thirds to the children, "provided the Eldest son shall have a double portion, and where there are no Sonnes the daughters shall inherit as Copartners."[114] Until 1674, the Duke's Laws were limited pretty much to Yorkshire, the remainder of the colony being left under Dutch law and custom. Even after the Duke's Laws were promulgated throughout the province, Dutch New Yorkers were most reluctant to substitute the English custom of favoring the sons, especially the eldest son, for the Dutch custom of dividing the inheritance equally between sons and daughters. Charles Wolley, Anglican chaplain from 1678 to 1680 to the King's garrison in New York City, noted the difference immediately. Referring to the great wealth of merchant Frederick Phillipse, Wolley remarked to some Dutch acquaintances that Phillipse's only son would truly inherit a princely fortune. True, agreed his Dutch companions, but his daughter would inherit just as much as the son.[115]

The wills of Dutch New Yorkers are filled with explicit statements of "share and share alike," "all to share equally," and "no child shall have more than another." Indeed, husbands and wives almost invariably made joint wills, giving the survivor complete control over the property they had owned in common. Should the widow remarry, she was enjoined to protect half of the estate for the children of her first marriage, but the other half of the estate remained hers,

---

[114]"The Duke's Laws," Colonial Laws of New York, 9.

[115]Wolley, A Two Years Journal in New York, 69-70.

to do with as she thought best. The joint wills usually renounced the right of relatives, the orphanmasters, or other public officials to demand an inventory of the estate or in any way compromise the right of the widow or widower to manage the property and raise the children as he or she chose. Still, despite statements abrogating the English "rights" of the first-born male and making the widow rather than the eldest son the executor of the estate, Dutch New Yorkers began to make some concessions to English law and custom, especially after the Judiciary Act of 1691 thoroughly established the English court system throughout the province.[116]

Consider the will of Cornelis Van der Hoeven written in 1685. Should his widow marry again, she would keep half the inheritance, and the other half would go to "the children, to be divided equally among them (at their majority), to each child a like share, without regard to sex, and the oldest son shall not participate more largely therein, but the oldest son, before any division be made, shall first receive twenty shillings current money here." During the

---

[116]For example, Will of Christoph Hoogland of New York, Mar. 12, 1676, Abstracts of Wills, I, 142-43; Will of Cornelis Corsoen of Staten Island, Dec. 9, 1692, ibid., 231; Will of John Martinse Schenck, Jan. 28, 1689, ibid., 239; Will of Domine Rudolph Van Varick, Oct. 22, 1689, ibid., 242-43. For examples of joint wills, see Will of Teunis Teunissen Metselaer and Egbertie Egberts, His Wife, of Albany, Aug. 7, 1685, Albany Records, IV, 117-18; Will of Henry Van Dyke and Mrs. Divertie Cornelisen, His Wife, Aug. 13, 1685, ibid., 304; Will of Jan Jansen Langendyke and Gretie Wessels, His Wife, Apr. 13, 1678, ibid., 402. For wills of a compromising tone, see Will of Balthazar De Hart of New York, Jan. 4, 1672, Abstracts of Wills, I, 59; Will of Johanes Van Burgh of New York, proved 1699, ibid., 89; Will of Stephen Van Cortlandt of New York, Apr. 14, 1700, ibid., 78; Will of Henry Cuyler of New York, Mar. 21, 1691, ibid., 161.

last years of the seventeenth century, Dutch New Yorkers gradually but inexorably shifted from granting the eldest son token gifts for his "right" as the first born to giving lands and businesses to the sons who would in turn compensate the daughters, and to giving the eldest son at least a double portion and leaving the daughters considerably less than an equal portion.[117] Nevertheless, while New Yorkers of Dutch descent were manifestly adjusting to both English law and New York conditions, English New Yorkers were in many cases adopting variations of the Dutch custom of partible inheritance because of the availability of land.[118]

Whatever their standing in practice, women in English common law were passive creatures, hardly less than an extension of the husband who alone could legally transfer property that the wife might inherit or receive as her dowry. In fact, the passive if not lowly position of women revealed in the wills of the English on Long Island stands in marked contrast to the attitude toward wives and daughters found in the wills of Dutch New Yorkers. In his will of 1675, Samuel Clarke of Southampton left all his lands to his two sons and gave his four daughters a single sheep each. Three years later, John Burrough of Newtown willed most of his estate to his son John; however, his widow was to manage the property and raise the

---

[117]Will of Cornelis Van der Hoeven, Sept. 5, 1685, Albany Records, III, 605-6; Will of Johannes Van Cowenhoven, Nov. 8, 1690, Abstracts of Wills, I, 140.

[118]Will of Thomas Halsey of Southampton, July 8, 1679, Abstracts of Wills, I, 49-50; Will of Robert Williams of Oyster Bay, Dec. 2, 1680, ibid., 118.

children until they reached their majority or until she remarried. "But if she marry again," spoke John Burrough from the grave, "then her husband must provide for her as I have done."[119]

Indeed, the bond of trust between husband and wife and children that led to the many joint wills among Dutch New Yorkers is seldom seen among the wills of English New Yorkers, especially eastern Long Islanders who were closely linked culturally and economically with New England. When the Dutch husband left everything to the management of his wife, the English husband was apt to name guardians or tutors to "assist" his wife in looking after the estate and the children. And if dying husbands could not be sure that their wives would be able to carry on without falling prey to temptation of one sort or another, many English New Yorkers also agreed completely with the Reverend John Robinson who claimed that children were naturally devilish creatures whose "natural pride" must be "beaten down" before anything good could come of them.[120]

According to the will of John Jenners of Brookhaven written in 1674, his wife was to have complete control of his estate. "It is my intention that my children may hereby stand obliged to carry themselves dutifully to their mother," wrote Jenners, "soe that in soe doing she may be induced, of her motherly affection to preserve

---

[119]Will of Samuel Clarke of Southampton, May 11, 1675, ibid., 50; Will of John Burrough of Newtown, July 2, 1678, ibid., 55-56.

[120]Will of John Underhill of Oyster Bay, Dec. 4, 1675, ibid., 31; Oral Will of Samuel Boory of Jamaica, Aug. 13, 1675, ibid., 39-40; John Robinson, "Of Children and Education (1628)," in Child-Rearing Concepts, 1628-1861: Historical Sources, ed. Philip J. Greven, Jr. (Itasca, Ill., 1973), 14-18.

the said accommodations for their future good." When he died in 1679, Ellis Cook of Southampton left the bulk of his estate to his young son John, "if he behaves himself well to his mother, and live civilly in conversations in the judgment of my friends, whom I appoint overseers of this my will." Again, according to the will signed by Robert Williams of Oyster Bay in 1689, "If any of my sons or daughters doth walk disorderly, according to the truth, they shall have no part or parcel in this my will."[121]

A former minister of Southampton and man of considerable estate, Robert Fordham left his son Jonah only £20 in the will he made in 1679. Captain John Howell asked the elderly Fordham why he gave so little to Jonah. The old man replied that Jonah was a rebellious son who had wasted £20 many times over "and he was not bound to give to rebelious children." Less drastic but in the same vein, John Budd of Southold left most of his land to his eldest son, John. However, there was a condition. "If he marries without the consent of my executors," wrote John Budd, Esquire, in 1684, "then he is to have only two-thirds of what is here left to him." Also more directive than punitive, Robert Ashman of Jamaica in 1683 left his estate to his wife for life and then divided it among his children, "only Thomas Flewellen was to have a double portion, if he was a dutiful and good child to his grand mother." Apparently attempting to direct both his wife and son from beyond the grave,

---

[121]Will of John Jenners of Brookhaven, Mar. 7, 1674, Abstracts of Wills, I, 51; Will of Ellis Cook of Southampton, Sept. 5, 1663, ibid., 52; Will of Robert Williams of Oyster Bay, Dec. 2, 1680, ibid., 118.

Jasper Smith of Flushing willed in 1695 that his "wife is to have a comfortable living out of my estate for life, but if she remarry then she shall have only £20." Upon the death of his widow, his estate would then be divided between his children--John, Judith and Hannah. "My will is that my son John be careful and diligent and seek to please his mother and goe forth in her business and not grieve her," urged Jasper Smith. If John did that, he was to receive £10 more than the rest; if he did not, "and he be careless and disobedient," then he was to have £10 less than the rest.[122]

Especially instructive because of their religious overtones are the wills of Lewis Morris of New York and William Hollyoake of Southold. Morris' will of 1691 is to a large extent an indictment of his namesake and nephew, Lewis Morris, the future Chief Justice of New York, Governor of New Jersey, and bastion of the Anglican Church. Uncle Lewis was a rich Quaker who denounced his nephew for his "many and great miscarriages and disobedience toward me and my wife, and his causeless absenting himself from my house and adhering to, and advising with, those of bad life and conversation, contrary to my directions and example unto him. . . ." Instead of the disobedient nephew, Uncle Lewis made his wife the executrix of his estate, but he willed the bulk of it to the unruly nephew anyway, and Lewis Morris the younger was granted letters of administration for his

---

[122]Will of Robert Fordham of Southampton, Dec. 26, 1674, ibid., 44-45; Will of John Budd of Southold, Oct. 27, 1684, ibid., 130; Will of Robert Ashman of Jamaica, July 26, 1683, ibid., 125; Will of Jasper Smith of Flushing, Jan. 17, 1695, ibid., 92.

uncle's estate by Governor Henry Sloughter.[123]

William Hollyoake of Southold was a wealthy man not given to compromise. He gave most of his land to his son Thomas "to descend from heir to heir for ever, without any power of sale or alienation." But there were stipulations. "Always provided that if my sons Thomas, Peter or William, or any of their succeeding heirs, whether sons or daughters, whom I doe constitute my heirs," insisted William Hollyoake in 1684,

> shall Apostate from the Protestant Doctrine or faith of the Church of England as it is now by law established, and if they or any of them at any time hereafter, take upon him or them, any profession of such Doctrines and faith whereby they shall be drawn away from attendance upon the Public Worship of God, practiced in this place, and warranted by the Holy Scriptures.

Hollyoake went on to add that if Thomas or any of his heirs "at any time espouse and contract marriage with any Quaker, or the son or daughter of any Quaker as they are now called; It is my positive will that they shall be utterly disinherited and disowned." His son John was "an obstinate Apostate," and because of that, Hollyoake granted him only a small lot. What makes this will all the more intriguing is that Southold was Presbyterian country, but Hollyoake obviously intended to keep his family within the Church of England and beyond the reach of the Quaker heresy.[124]

This kind of dictating to children in wills was virtually

---

[123]Will of Colonel Lewis Morris of New York, May 15, 1691, ibid., 180-81.

[124]Will of William Hollyoake of Southold, Feb. 10, 1684, ibid., 128-29.

unknown among Dutch New Yorkers. There were exceptions of course, but certainly in the seventeenth century, the wills of Dutch New Yorkers evince much more trust and affection between husbands and wives and parents and children than existed in similar documents written by English New Yorkers. The difference is significant, for it determined among other things the way New Yorkers looked upon education and the relationship between education, the family, and the community. That contentment and joy in domestic affairs which many people mistook for complacency were very genuine, deeply rooted in a family tradition that had its beginnings in the Middle Ages.[125]

VII

New York on the eve of the social and political explosion of 1689 known as Leisler's Rebellion was still that study in contrast and contradiction that Peter Stuyvesant had tried to mold and shape without much success forty years before. If there was anything that just about every contemporary observer of New York could agree upon, it was the province's materialism, that quest for economic well-being which seemed to dominate the lives of so many. Danckaerts and Sluyter denounced it as unchristian and exploitive of the Indians; Chaplain Wolley was fascinated by it all, and Domine Van Zuuren found it

---

[125]The value of the will as an item of social and cultural history is discussed in David E. Narrett's insightful but largely descriptive article, "Preparation for Death and Provision for the Living," New York History, LVII (Oct. 1976), 417-37. The distinctive character of Dutch family life has been explored by Alice P. Kenney, "Private Worlds in the Middle Colonies: An Introduction to Human Tradition in American History," New York History, LI (Jan. 1970), 5-31.

utterly pervasive and disgusting. But along with that lust for things of this world, New Yorkers were still very religious. Governor Dongan implied that New York was a land of many religions but of very few truly religious people. He was completely wrong. New Yorkers shared not only the common fate of other peoples in the seventeenth century of living in an age where God was as real as life and as frightening as death, but they also found in religion, along with other ethnic traditions, the means of linking themselves with the past and thereby giving themselves a sense of security and identity as they labored to construct another identity in the New World.

The very ethnic diversity of New York intensified the desire to perpetuate distinctive family traditions. Dongan quickly noted this ethnic tenacity. "It is the endeavor of all Persons here to bring up their Children and servants in that opinion which themselves profess," he wrote in 1687, having previously noted that there were some Jews, a few Catholics, French, Dutch and English Calvinists, Dutch Lutherans, Quakers, and sectarians of a variety of descriptions.[126] The need to perpetuate their own respective ethnic identities is perhaps best illustrated by the most numerous religious group, the Dutch Reformed. Hardworking domines like Selyns were part of the reason for the growth of that faith. "For the sake of the

---

[126]Dongan to the Committee of Trade of New York, Feb. 22, 1687, DHNY, I, 116; William Harper Bennett, Catholic Footsteps in Old New York: A Chronicle of Catholicity in the City of New York from 1524 to 1808 (1909; reprint ed., New York, 1963), 82-112; Jacob Rader Marcus, Early American Jewry: The Jews of New York, New England and Canada, 1649-1794 (Philadelphia, 1951), 34-45.

children, who multiply more rapidly here than anywhere else in the world," wrote Selyns in 1682, "I hold a catechetical class on Sunday evenings, and it is filled to overflowing."[127] Another reason was commerce and communications with the Dutch Republic. That there continued to be significant intercourse between New York and the Dutch long after the British conquest of 1664 is just now becoming clear.[128]

The process of Anglicization progressed, but the Dutch were perhaps less anglicized than historians have previously thought. Signs of anglicization were everywhere. Aside from an English governor, New York City had a modified form of English government by 1666. In 1674, the Mayor's Court of New York required that all transactions be transcribed in English, though a Dutch record was kept and Dutch was allowed as well as English as the language of the proceedings. An Englishman, Captain Salisbury, became schout (sheriff) of Albany in 1670, but Albany records continued to be recorded in Dutch. In 1683, the first elected General Assembly in New York passed legislation requiring all land transactions to be recorded according to English forms and the records be sent to New York City. While Anglicization continued, it was resented by many Dutchmen. In

---

[127] Selyns to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 28, 1682, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 831.

[128] Jan Kupp, "Aspects of New York-Dutch Trade under the English, 1670-1674," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LXIII (Apr. 1974), 139-47; see also Ritchie, "The Duke's Province." The Van Rensselaers traded to the United Provinces, and Amsterdam merchants were frequently the mediators of Dutch Reformed congregations in their search for preachers; see Correspondence of Maria Van Rensselaer, 24, 69-79, 122.

Albany, several persons were fined for maligning the new General Assembly. The popularly elected General Assembly was not a part of Dutch tradition and was regarded with suspicion by some colonists.[129]

But what about the minor ethnic and religious groups? How can their persistence be explained? The government of New York was tolerant; it wanted to keep and attract settlers. There was still some repression; the Jews were officially denied public worship or the right to sell retail, though they did both in practice. Quakers were officially discouraged from engaging in meetings, though seldom persecuted. Catholics were for a time under Governor Dongan openly countenanced, but the harsh reaction that came shortly would drive New York Catholics underground for the remainder of the colonial period. What allowed other sects to exist and grow was the shift from coercion to subscription for preachers and teachers alike that occurred during the first decades of English rule. The Dutch Reformed Church first in New York and then in Albany moved toward congregational control and away from government dependence. The Lutherans, Quakers, and various other sects had always relied on subscription. Subscription perpetuated diversity, and diversity bred more diversity as colonial New Yorkers clung to the past while struggling in the present to build up security for the future. The threat of cultural aggression made almost every ethnic and religious group determined to resist any attempt to impose conformity.

---

[129]Andros Appoints New Magistrates, Extraordinary Session, Aug. 11, 1676, CARS Minutes, I, 143; Orders to Be Published in English and Dutch, Ordinary Session, Apr. 15, 1679, ibid., II, 404; Richard Pretty, Sheriff, v. Jan Cloet, 1863, ibid., III, 416; Richard Pretty v.

CHAPTER IV

TO BRING FORTH UNITY OUT OF DIVERSITY: ATTEMPTS AT ANGLICIZATION THROUGH EDUCATION IN NEW YORK, 1690-1708

Between 1691 and 1720, education was utilized as a social and religious instrumentality to create Anglo-American unity out of the ethnic and religious diversity of New York. That action stemmed from the fact that population growth in the province depended primarily upon the natural reproduction of the original settlers and their progeny; immigrants to America found land cheaper, government more accommodating, and Indians less threatening in Pennsylvania and New Jersey than in New York. Consequently, New York remained the least English of the British North American colonies throughout the seventeenth century and well into the eighteenth.[1]

The ethnic and religious diversity of New York troubled more than a few English officials as the years wore on. In his report

---

[1]Robert C. Ritchie, "The Duke's Province: A Study of Proprietary New York, 1664-1685" (Ph.D. diss., University of California at Los Angeles, 1972), 58, 103; Richard Nicolls to Earl of Clarendon, Apr. 7, 1666, Clarendon Papers, in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1869 (New York, 1870), 113-14; John Pomfret, The Province of East New Jersey (Princeton, N. J., 1962), 1-27; Michael Kammen, Colonial New York: A History (New York, 1975), xvi-xvii, 73-77; Ruth Putnam, "The Dutch Element in the United States," in Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1909 (Washington, D. C., 1910), 205-12; Marcus L. Hansen, "The Minor Stocks in the American Population of 1790," in Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1931, vol. I (Washington, D. C., 1932), 360-70.

on the province in 1687, Governor Dongan noted that the population of Long Island was burgeoning, spilling over into neighboring colonies, especially New Jersey. But the province as a whole remained underpopulated, and as for British immigration, "for these 7 years last past," Dongan lamented, "there has not come into this province twenty English, Scotch, or Irish familys." Encouraged by the Lords of Trade, several Huguenot families had immigrated from St. Christopher's and from England, and many more French immigrants were expected after Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes in 1682. Several families had recently come from Holland, but to Dongan, this influx of foreigners was yet "another great argument of the necessity of adding to this Government the neighboring English Colonys, that a more equal balance may be kept between his Majesty's naturall born subjects and foreigners which latter are the most prevailing part of this Government."[2]

The very next year, partly as a result of Dongan's pleading, New York was joined to the Dominion of New England, that amalgam of provinces ruled by an appointed governor and council without any representative assembly which James II had established in 1686 as part of his effort to reorganize and centralize the British North American colonies. At the seat of government in Boston, Governor Edmund Andros and his Council of prominent men from the consolidated provinces made the law; in New York City, Deputy

---

[2]Thomas Dongan to the Committee of Trade of the Province of New York, Feb. 22, 1687, Documentary History of the State of New York, ed. Edmund B. O'Callaghan, 4 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1850-1851), I, 103 (hereafter cited as DHNY).

Governor Francis Nicholson and his provincial Council were expected to administer the colony according to instructions from Boston. Britons were clearly a majority in the Dominion, but the arbitrary government of the enlarged province was repugnant to many colonists, English and non-English alike. When news reached America in 1689 that Catholic James had been forced into exile and Protestant William and Mary proclaimed King and Queen, Bostonians took advantage of the situation to imprison Andros and part of his Council. General elections were once again held for governors and assemblymen throughout New England.[3]

In New York, the Glorious Revolution inspired the Suffolk County militia to revolt. That minor insurrection turned into a spontaneous uprising. It spread across Long Island, Westchester County, and into New York City itself, where fears of a French invasion from Canada and Catholic subversion from within the councils of the provincial government led the city militia to form a committee of safety and assume governmental authority from Nicholson and other provincial and municipal officers. Emerging as the leader of this de facto government was Captain Jacob Leisler, a merchant of some means well known for his staunch Calvinism and opposition to Catholicism.[4]

---

[3]David S. Lovejoy, The Glorious Revolution in America (New York, 1972), 179-219, 221-50.

[4]Ibid., 98-121, 251-57, 283-84, 298-302, 312-25. See also Jerome R. Reich, Leisler's Rebellion: A Study of Democracy in New York, 1664-1720 (Chicago, 1953).

Although terribly more complex than just an effort of Dutch New Yorkers to repel resented English rule, Leisler's rebellion had pronounced ethnic and religious as well as class implications. His subsequent conviction for treason and execution embittered politics in the province for a generation. Dutch New Yorkers not of the ruling and professional elite were inclined to see Leisler as a martyr to political liberty and Protestantism. The uprising also indicated the fragmentation and instability of New York's heterogeneous society; and with the commencement of the first of several Anglo-French wars signalled by the Schenectady massacre in 1690, British officials and English New Yorkers alike sought some means to transform the apparent instability of the province into political order and social unity. The different schemes brought forth depended largely upon preachers and teachers to buttress the social and political structure of New York and to bring English Protestantism and civilization not only to the Five Indian Nations but also to the Far Indians who were allied with the French.[5]

Anglicans and dissenters both saw education as a primary instrument in the drive for English cultural hegemony among the colonists

---

[5]Thomas J. Archdeacon, New York City, 1664-1710: Conquest and Change (Ithaca, N. Y., 1975), 97-159; Lovejoy, Glorious Revolution in America, 298-302, 312-25. Considerable insight into the conditions of this period may be gained from Lawrence H. Leder, "Dongan's New York and Fletcher's London: Personality and Politics," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LV (Jan. 1971), 28-37; see also Leder, Robert Livingston, 1654-1728, and the Politics of Colonial New York (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1961), 57-116, 129-79, 211-40; Dixon Ryan Fox, Caleb Heathcote, Gentleman Colonist: The Story of a Career in the Province of New York, 1692-1721 (New York, 1926), esp. 195-284; William Smith, Jr., The History of the Province of New York, ed Michael Kammen, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), I, 83-132.

and Indians of New York. But from 1691 to about 1709, it was the advocates of the Church of England who most persistently pursued a vigorous educational policy designed to Anglicize the province; English dissenters shortly became preoccupied with preserving their own religious identity from Anglican aggrandizement. The educational policy that spearheaded the movement for Anglicization shifted markedly, passing through three discernible stages, each of which accented conformity to the Anglican faith as the prelude to bringing forth cultural unity from the ethnic and religious diversity that prevailed in New York. During the first stage, the Anglicans began organizing their efforts. Governor Benjamin Fletcher (1692-1698) labored mightily to have the Church of England established by provincial law; he succeeded only partly. Although ambiguously worded, the Ministry Act of 1693 at least held the promise of establishing the Church of England in the province, and Fletcher's charter of incorporation to Trinity Church secured for the Anglicans a power base in New York City.

The second stage was characterized by a remarkable scheme for thoroughly Anglicizing New York which had little chance of application because of a backlash among dissenters against Anglican pretensions. Appealing directly to the Bishop of London, Chaplain John Miller described in 1695 both the weaknesses and the wickedness he found in New York and explained in wondrous detail how an American bishop stationed there could immeasurably improve manners and morals in the province. His suggestions were not completely lost on interested contemporaries. Governor Bellomont (1698-1700) may

well have been influenced by Miller's ideas in formulating his Indian policy. However, Bellomont was appalled by Fletcher's corrupt regime and broke with the latter's Anglican and anti-Leislerian coalition, finding political support among the Leislerians and dissenters. Although an Anglican himself and bound by his instructions to advance the interest of the English Church, Bellomont nevertheless made some concessions to his dissenting backers, approving legislation designed to protect and perpetuate their religious beliefs.

In the third stage, Governor Cornbury (1702-1708), moving aggressively to transform diversity into conformity, used political pressure, legislation, and the missionaries and schoolmasters of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts to impose Anglicanism upon New Yorkers, regardless of their religious or ethnic background. His arbitrary and tyrannical actions created a storm of protest among the dissenters, both Dutch and English. Cornbury even managed to divide his once united Anglican supporters. In the midst of this political and religious maelstrom, Caleb Heathcote, a leading Anglican merchant and politician, submitted to the S. P. G. and the Lords of Trade an intricate plan designed to stimulate economic growth while establishing Anglican schoolmasters throughout the province at very little cost. Like the other stratagems to establish the Church of England and anglicize society, Heathcote's proposals were ineffectual; but such schemes influenced the relationship that came to exist between education and ethnicity in New York during the seventeenth century.

I

Following the fall of Jacob Leisler, Governor Henry Sloughter called for the election of representatives to a General Assembly, out of which came the Judiciary Act of 1691. This law established courts throughout New York, provided for appeals from lower courts to the Supreme Court of Judicature, and thereby supplanted Roman-Dutch civil law and local customs with the procedures and precedents of English common law. The anglicizing impact of the Judiciary Act has been widely recognized.[6] Less well known but also designed to anglicize New York were two other bills that failed to pass the Assembly. One sought to settle ministers and allot a maintenance for them "in each respective City and Town . . . that consists of forty Families and upwards."[7] Another aimed at appointing schoolmasters "for the Educating and Instructing of Children and Youth, to read and write English, in every Towne in the Province."[8]

Given the ethnic and religious diversity of the colony and the preponderance of Dutch New Yorkers, it is hardly surprising that the Assembly failed to pass either bill. English and Dutch

---

[6]"Law in Colonial New York: The Legal System of 1691," Harvard Law Review, LXXX (1967), 1757-72; Herbert A. Johnson, "The Advent of Common Law in Colonial New York," in Law and Authority in Colonial America, ed. George Billias (Barre, Mass., 1965), 74-91.

[7]Assembly Session, Apr. 18, 1691, Journal of the Votes and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Colony of New York, 1691-1765, 2 vols. (New York, 1764-1766), I, 7 (hereafter cited as Assembly Journal). See also Assembly Sessions, Sept. 13 and 15, 1691, ibid., 32-34.

[8]Assembly Sessions, Apr. 18 and May 1, 1691, ibid., 7, 10.

Calvinists both suspected the proposal to maintain preachers to be a vehicle for establishing Anglicanism in the province, and Dutch New Yorkers could hardly have been pleased by the prospect of paying taxes to establish English schools likely to alienate their children from Dutch family traditions. Such fears of cultural aggression were not without substance. "Our chiefest unhappiness here," wrote Captain Charles Lodwick from New York in 1692, "is too great a mixture of Nations, & English the least part." After noting with some uneasiness that the number of Huguenot immigrants was increasing remarkably, Lodwick went on to say that "as to Religion, we run so high into all Opinions, that here is (I fear) but little real [religion]. . . ."[9]

Three years later, the Reverend John Miller, Anglican chaplain to the two companies of British troops there, seconded Lodwick's observations. Of some 3,000 families in the province, Miller reckoned almost half to be Dutch, with a sizeable minority of French. "As to their Religion," wrote Miller, "they are very much divided: few of them intelligent & sincere but the most part ignorant & conceited, fickle & regardless."[10] No less concerned than Lodwick about the welfare of the province, Miller deplored the ethnic and religious mixture in New York as destructive of all good order.

---

[9]Charles Lodwick to Francis Lodwick, May 20, 1692, in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1849, 2d series, 2 vols. (New York, 1850), II, 241-50.

[10]John Miller, New York Considered and Improved, 1695 (1843; reprint ed., Cleveland, Ohio, 1903), 40.

But the chaplain recognized that as long as Dutch New Yorkers were divided against themselves, it might be possible to get the Church of England established.[11]

Leisler's Rebellion caused much antagonism among New Yorkers of Dutch descent and alienated many members of the Dutch Reformed Church from their pastors. Domines Selyns in New York City, Varick on Long Island, and Dellius at Albany, being conservative clerics who feared political instability and possessed ties with the ruling elite that Leisler replaced, all publicly opposed him. On the other hand, the schoolmaster of Flatbush, Johannes Van Eckelen, and schoolmaster Jacobus Goelet of New York were both strong supporters of Leisler. When Varick denounced Leisler's action, Van Eckelen called upon his friends and had the preacher seized and taken to New York City, where he spent six months under house arrest, learning French from a similarly incarcerated Frenchman.[12] Leisler himself threatened Selyns, who had married the wealthy widow of Cornelis Steenwyck, with imprisonment on several occasions, but he allowed the preacher to continue his ministry and keep his freedom. Taking no chances, Dellius, whose pastorate at Albany and mission to the Indians had led him to become friends with business

---

[11]Ibid., 67, 83-84.

[12]Selyns, Varick and Dellius to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 12, 1692, Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York, ed. Edward T. Corwin, 7 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1901-1916), II, 1041-1044 (hereafter cited as Ecclesiastical Records). See also Varick to Amsterdam Classis, Apr. 9, 1643, ibid., 1050.

rivals of Leisler, fled with his family to Boston.[13]

Reporting to the Amsterdam Classis more than a year after Leisler had been executed, the Dutch ministers revealed their own elitist bias and the extent of their alienation from the people. "Our ministers have been cast under suspicion through slanders against them," they wrote in October 1692, "while the populace, ever ready for any change, were advised not to contribute for the support of religious services or for ministers' salaries. Choristers and schoolmasters have been encouraged to perform ministerial duties," they continued indignantly. Former members of the Council, who were also elders of the church, had been "saluted by the unheard of titles (for them) of traitors and papists," and the preachers "treated with scorn, paid in insults, and deprived of what is justly our dues, receiving no salary worth mentioning."[14] Despite all the turmoil, the Dutch Reformed Church of New York City began building a new edifice on Garden Street, Dellius returned to Albany and his Indians, and Varick went back to Flatbush, where he shortly secured the removal of Van Eckelen as clerk and schoolmaster.[15]

---

[13]Selyns, Varick, and Dellius to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 12, 1692, ibid., 1041-44; Dellius to Amsterdam Classis, Nov. 1, 1693, ibid., 1086.

[14]Selyns, Varick and Dellius to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 12, 1692, ibid., 1041-44. For a Leislerian view see Jacob Leisler, Jr., and Abraham Gouverneur's Account of New York to Lords of Trade, Sept. 16 and 25, 1696, Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, ed. Edmund B. O'Callaghan and Berthold Fernow, 15 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1856-1887), IV, 197, 216-20 (hereafter cited as NYCD).

[15]Selyns, Varick, and Dellius to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 12, 1692, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 1043; Dellius to Amsterdam Classis,

With the Dutch Calvinists divided, the English dissenters largely unorganized, and the French Protestants having no reason to fear the English Church, Anglican leaders in New York as well as in Britain believed that the time was right to push for the establishment of the English Church in the province. Having emerged stronger and more influential from the Glorious Revolution, the Anglican Church had a staunch advocate in Benjamin Fletcher, governor of New York following the death of Sloughter. Encouraged by the influential Henry Compton, Bishop of London, Fletcher, with the assistance of ardent Anglicans like Caleb Heathcote, Lewis Morris, and James Graham, tried at every turn to advance the interest of the "National Church." In his first address to the General Assembly, Fletcher recommended that "provision be made for the support and encouragement of an able ministry."[16]

At the next session, Fletcher again urged "the settling of a ministry in this Province," but the Assembly, composed almost exclusively of dissenting English and Dutch New Yorkers, was not

---

Nov. 1, 1694, ibid., 1086-87; Edward T. Corwin, A Manual of the Reformed Church in America, 1628-1902, 4th ed., rev. and enl. (New York, 1902), 50-88; John Webb Pratt, Religion, Politics, and Diversity: The Church-State Theme in New York History (Ithaca, N. Y., 1967), 37-40; Varick to Richard Ingoldsby, Sept. 26, 1691, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, from 1626 to 1746, comp. Daniel J. Pratt (Albany, N. Y., 1872), 72-75; William Heard Kilpatrick, The Dutch Schools of New Netherland and Colonial New York, United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin no. 12 (Washington, D. C., 1912), 176-78.

[16]Fletcher's Opening Address, Oct. 25, 1692, Journal of the Legislative Council of the Colony of New York, 1691-1775, 2 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1861), I, 25 (hereafter cited as Journal of the Legislative Council).

anxious to endorse any ministry act. As the assemblymen prepared to conclude their session without acting upon the governor's proposal, Fletcher condemned their lethargy:

> Gentlemen, the first thing that I did recommend to you at our last meeting was to provide for a ministry, and nothing is done in it. There are none of you but what are big with the privilege of Englishmen and Magna Charta, which is your right; and the same law doth provide for the religion of the church of England, against Sabbath breaking, swearing, and all other profanity. But as you have made it last and postponed it this session, I hope you will begin with it the next meeting, and do somewhat toward it effectually.[17]

Goaded into action by the governor's threats and warnings, ten days after reconvening on September 12, 1693, the Assembly passed and sent to the governor a bill for settling a ministry in the City and County of New York and Richmond, Westchester, and Queens Counties. The bill called for six parishes, one in New York City, another in Richmond (Staten Island), two in Westchester, and two more in Queens. To supervise the maintenance of the ministers, the people in every parish were to elect annually ten vestrymen and two church wardens who would assess the inhabitants of the parish for the salary of the minister. Preachers would be called to the various parishes by the vestrymen and church wardens.[18] Fletcher objected because the bill made no provision for the governor to approve and collate the ministers into their respective parishes. Concerned that dissenting ministers might be called by the vestrymen

---

[17]Fletcher's Opening Address, Mar. 22, 1693, ibid., I, 35; Fletcher's Address, Apr. 10, 1693, ibid., I, 39.

[18]Fletcher to Lords of Trade, Oct. 9, 1693, NYCD, IV, 57; Assembly Session, Sept. 15, 1693, Assembly Journal, 33-34.

and church wardens, Fletcher insisted that his instructions from William and Mary authorized him to approve or suspend any preacher in his government. The Assembly, of whom only one representative was Anglican, disagreed and rejected his proposed amendments. Regarding the bill as better than nothing, Fletcher signed into law the act which ambiguously called for a "good and sufficient Protestant" ministry.[19]

The ambiguity of the Ministry Act of 1693 was deliberate. Although getting less than he had asked for, Fletcher was nonetheless proud of his accomplishment. "I have gott them," he wrote the Committee of Trade, "to settle a fund for a Ministry in the City of New York and three more Countys which could never be obtained before, being a mixt People and of different Persuasion in Religion."[20] Almost a dozen years later, Caleb Heathcote explained with pride that the Ministry Act of 1693 was the result of shrewd political handling of the unsuspecting dissenters in the Assembly. "It was the most that could be got at that time," wrote Colonel Lewis Morris in 1712, "for had more been attempted, the Assembly had seen through the artifice and all had been lost." The Assembly very likely saw through the artifice from the beginning. But King William's War was raging; the French and their Indian allies were raiding the

---

[19]An Act for Settling a Minister, Sept. 22, 1693, The Colonial Laws of New York from the Year 1664 to the Revolution, 5 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1894-1896), I, 328 (hereafter cited as Colonial Laws of New York); Ministry Act of 1693, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 1076-79.

[20]Fletcher to Lords of Trade, Oct. 9, 1693, NYCD, IV, 57.

frontier and even threatening Albany, so the Assembly perhaps felt obliged to facilitate the processes of government by conceding somewhat to the wishes of the very stubborn Fletcher.[21]

For the remainder of the century, New York City alone of the parishes created by the Ministry Act bothered to elect the requisite vestrymen and church wardens. In 1694, of the ten men elected to the vestry, only three were Anglican, and the majority quickly voted to call a dissenting minister. Fletcher vehemently denounced that action, and the year ended in a stalemate. The next year, only one of the ten vestrymen was Anglican, but under a barrage of threats from Fletcher, the vestry called William Vesey, an Anglican lay preacher on Long Island, knowing full well that the governor was determined that Chaplain Miller should get the position. While stalling for time, the vestry asked the Assembly for an interpretation of the Ministry Act. The representatives responded that "it is the opinion of this House that the Vestrymen and Church-Wardens have power to call a Dissenting Protestant Minister, and that he is to be paid and maintained according as the Act directs." Enraged by this pronouncement, Fletcher called the representatives before him, angrily explained that only the Church of England allowed

---

[21]Caleb Heathcote to Bishop of London, Feb. 25, 1716, S. P. G. Letter Books, Series A, B, C (London, 1964), A, XI, 298; Lewis Morris to Secretary of the S. P. G., Feb. 20, 1712, ibid., A, VII, 13. (Hereafter I shall cite S. P. G. Letter Books, then the series--either A, B or C, volume number and page number. Some volumes in the Letter Books have section numbers as well as page numbers; in such cases the page number will be preceded by the letter "p.") For a discussion of the manuscript S. P. G. Letter Books now available on microfilm, see John Calam, Parsons and Pedagogues: The S. P. G. Adventure in American Education (New York, 1971), 219-223.

for such offices as vestrymen and church wardens, and then summarily prorogued the Assembly.[22]

Meanwhile, the proposal for providing schoolmasters throughout the province languished, having aroused the deep suspicions of cultural aggression so prevalent among "a mixt People and of different Persuasion in Religion." Even so, the provincial government continued to license teachers, although town magistrates licensed them, too. In 1694, Southampton engaged John Moubray to teach and probably supported regular schooling thereafter. In January 1700, the magistrates of Albany admitted Cornelis Bogardus as schoolmaster of the city. Three years before, David Vilaut petitioned the Common Council of New York to "Keep School in the publick Citty Hall as has been formerly Granted to him by the preceding Mayor & Aldermen." There were also two attempts to get provincial support for a "Free-School" in New York City: one in 1695, and another a year later, but neither passed the Assembly. The failure probably disturbed few citizens of the polyglot city.[23]

While the Assembly rejected what was likely to become an

---

[22]First City Vestry, Jan. 9, 1694, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 1092, 1095; Second City Vestry, Jan. 8, 1695, ibid., 1112; Assembly Session, Apr. 12, 1695, Assembly Journal, I, 53; Fletcher to Assembly, Apr. 15, 1695, Journal of the Legislative Council, I, 114-15.

[23]Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 75; Council Minutes, Nov. 23, 1697, Minutes of the Common Council of the City of New York, 1675-1776, ed. Herbert L. Osgood, 8 vols. (New York, 1905), II, 2 (hereafter cited as Minutes of the Common Council); Assembly Session, Mar. 26, 1695, Assembly Journal, I, 48-49; Assembly Session, Oct. 24, 1696, ibid., 398; Chidley Brooks and William Nicoll to Board of Trade, Aug. 26, 1696, NYCD, IV, 182-83.

Anglican school for the city, the vestrymen and church wardens of New York were much more obliging to the supporters of the Church of England in 1696. In fact, for the very first time, the vestry that year contained a majority of Anglicans and Dutch New Yorkers who were ready to follow Fletcher's lead. The governor decided that Vesey rather than Miller ought to be the Anglican preacher for the city, and Vesey left straight away to be ordained by Henry Compton, the Bishop of London. Knowing that next year the vestry and church wardens might not be so obliging, Fletcher and other leading Anglicans made plans to incorporate their congregation and build Trinity Church. In 1697, Fletcher granted Trinity Church and its members a charter of incorporation, thereby assuming Anglican control over church government and the selection of ministers. The vestry and church wardens chosen under the Ministry Act for New York City now became simply civil officers, assessing and collecting the tax for maintaining the minister and turning it over to the officers of Trinity Church.[24]

Barely a year before Trinity received its charter, the Reformed Dutch Church of New York had also been granted a charter of incorporation by Fletcher. Dutch Calvinists still had to pay the tax levied for the support of the Anglican minister, but the Dutch Church of the city now had power to keep or transfer money and property, to choose its own ministers and schoolmasters without the approval

---

[24]Third Vestry Chosen, Jan. 14, 1696, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 1133-34; Caleb Heathcote to Secretary, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, IX, 19, p. 126; Morgan Dix, ed., A History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York, 4 vols. (New York, 1898-1906), I, 76-107.

of the governor, and to make its recalcitrant members pay their pastor and meet other financial commitments made by the church.[25] As early as 1689, the Dutch Reformed congregation of New York City had petitioned in vain for such incorporation. The turmoil in the Reformed churches during and after Leisler's Rebellion made the stability of a corporate charter even more desirable. Nor was it simply coincidental that Domine Selyns got the much coveted charter the same year that a coalition of Dutch and Anglican New Yorkers on the vestry called William Vesey as minister to the city parish. Indeed, without the backing of influential Dutch New Yorkers, the Anglicans had very little chance of gaining any advantage for the Church of England. As for their part, Dutch Reformed leaders viewed the acquisition of a charter of incorporation as assuring the privileges of their church. The charter placed them above other dissenters, making their faith almost equally as established as the Anglican church in New York City. However much the leaders praised it, the rank and file of the Dutch Reformed congregations viewed the expedient alliance with the Anglicans as less than a holy bond.[26]

---

[25]Petition of the Reformed Dutch Church of New York City to Benjamin Fletcher, Ecclesiastical Records, I, 1127-28; A Comparison of the Charter Given to the Anglican and Dutch Reformed Churches, ibid., 1136-69. Throughout the colonial period, only the Dutch Reformed and Anglican Churches were given charters of incorporation.

[26]Petition of the Dutch Church of New York City to Be Incorporated, Apr. 4, 1688, ibid., 952-53; Henricus Selyns to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 30, 1696, ibid., 1173; John Webb Pratt, Religion, Politics, and Diversity, 45-47. The dissension in the Dutch Reformed Church of New York can be seen in Ecclesiastical Records, II, 1189-1213.

II

Not altogether satisfied with the limited Anglican establishment in New York, Governor Fletcher accepted what could be secured at the time. At that, the Ministry Act touched off a furor that left English dissenters and some Dutch Calvinists embittered for years. Increasingly, Fletcher devoted himself to waging King William's War in America and taking advantage of his office to line his own pockets by means both fair and foul.[27] But among Fletcher's Council were zealous Anglicans like Caleb Heathcote and Lewis Morris who constantly sought the advantage of the English Church. Recipients from Fletcher of thousands of acres along with the political and economic rights of manor lords, Heathcote and Morris were pillars of the Church of England in New York and would later work closely with Bishop Compton and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts to entrench and extend the Anglican faith in New York. However, the first detailed plan for systematically anglicizing New York was put forth by Chaplain John Miller, who lived in the province from 1692 to 1694.[28]

Although not published for a hundred and fifty years after

---

[27]Charles Lodwick to Lords of Trade in Behalf of Fletcher, 1693, NYCD, IV, 53-55; Benjamin Fletcher to Lords of Trade, June 18, 1698, DHNY, IV, 159; Fletcher to Lords of Trade, Aug. 22, 1696, ibid., 216. Much of Fletcher's illicit activity was exposed by Jacob Leisler, Jr., and Abraham Gouverneur; see Report on New York to the Board of Trade, Sept. 16, 1696, NYCD, IV, 147; see also Sept. 25, 1696, ibid., 216-20; Peter De La Noy to Lords of Trade, June 13, 1695, ibid., 221.

[28]Fox, Caleb Heathcote, 194-265; Miller, New York Considered and Improved, 1-23.

it was written, Miller's New York Considered and Improved, 1695 may well have circulated in manuscript form among Anglican prelates and British officials interested in the North American colonies. The chaplain's plan for improving New York was not applied by the Lords of Trade. Nevertheless, the diagnosis that Miller made of what he had found wrong with the province and the antidote he prescribed to cure it shed considerable light upon the state of education at the time. Heading the list of social maladies Miller discovered in New York was "the wickedness & irreligion of the inhabitants." Parents did not teach their offspring the awful wages of sin nor the blessedness of salvation through Christ. Indeed, although exaggerating and distorting what was surely partly true, Miller insisted that New Yorkers generally displayed little concern for things divine, went to church more out of curiosity and to find fault with the preacher than out of genuine piety, and consequently fell easily into such sins as fornication, adultery, drunkenness, and swearing.[29]

Miller was quite sure that much of the godless behavior in New York was the result of too many religious sects and too few sincere preachers. Rather than pursuing piety and truth, the sects were selfishly partisan, dedicated to increasing their own numbers and to blocking "by their craft & cunning" the establishment of the benevolent Church of England. According to Miller's reckoning, there were approximately twenty preachers and one rabbi in New York

---

[29]Miller, New York Considered and Improved, 40, 55-60, 64-66.

in 1694. And since his own departure, the province had been without the services of a regular Anglican minister. Of the clergymen there, Miller said that many "of them have no orders at all but set up for themselves of their own head and Authority," though there were some ordained Presbyterians and Congregationalists. Whatever the nature of their call, ministers in New York had a precarious livelihood. "Now all these have no other incouragement for the Pain they pretend to take than the voluntary contribution of the People," Miller wrote, "or at best a Salary by agreement & Subscription which yet they shall not injoy except they take more care to please the humours & delight the fancyes of their hearers than to preach up true religion and a Christian life."[30]

Because preachers in New York were of so many different religious persuasions, Miller believed they did more harm than good, confusing and dividing the people rather than uniting them in Christianity. However, that very division provided the opportunity for improving New York, Miller thought. It would be relatively easy to establish an episcopate there, with a bishop who would preside over the Anglican Church in America and also be governor of New York, Connecticut, New Jersey and Rhode Island. Appointed by the Bishop of London, this suffragan bishop in New York would have the power "to promote the settlement & improvement of Religion & Unity both among the English subjects that are already Christians & the Indians Supposed to be made so."[31]

---

[30]Ibid., 54-55, 64-67, quotation on 65.

[31]Ibid., 74-80, quotation on 74.

According to Miller's plan, the American bishop would be accompanied to New York by "5 or 6 Sober young Ministers, with Bibles & Prayer books & other things convenient for Churches as shall be thought best." The bishop would of course enforce the Ministry Act of 1693, make sure that Anglican preachers throughout the province had a decent home and glebe, set up "schooles with Salaries," and endeavor to get the Ministry Act extended to include all the province. Miller did not seek to violate liberty of conscience, nor to coerce dissenting preachers. Nevertheless, it was clear that Miller profoundly believed the Anglican way would prevail among colonial New Yorkers:

> Men although at present of many & different opinions yet may be reconciled in a great measure by a Pious & prudent Ministry who will Seek to reduce them by good exhortation to oblige them by neighbourly & charitable kindnesses to incourage them by their own practice to live in the fear of God & in brotherly love & Unity one with another.[32]

While very disturbed by the lack of religious zeal among New Yorkers, Miller was perhaps even more concerned with the spiritual condition of the Indians who roamed the lands separating English New York from French Canada. Referring to the remarkable success of French Jesuits in winning Indians to Catholicism and the French side in King William's War, Miller lamented English neglect of the heathen and urged a massive missionary effort to convert the Five Nations, lest these worthy allies of the British Crown be debauched by the Jesuits and turned from being faithful friends into "most

---

[32]Ibid., 74-85, quotations on 82, 83 and 84.

dangerous & Cruell Enemyes." To facilitate matters, Miller planned to have his bishop-governor lead English army and naval forces against Canada; that was the reason Miller wanted the American bishop to be governor of Connecticut, New Jersey, and Rhode Island as well as of New York. This English expedition was expected to conquer Canada, and the Jesuits would then be expelled. But even if the planned invasion of Canada did not take place, Miller nevertheless provided detailed instructions regarding the conversion of the Five Indian Nations.[33]

Miller deplored the success of the French Jesuits, but he unabashedly admired their methods of engaging the loyalty of their Indian converts. As Miller well knew, Domine Godfrey Dellius at Albany had gained some two hundred Indian converts by 1693. The next year, urged on by Fletcher and Peter Schuyler, Dellius informed the Amsterdam Classis that he had "translated into the Indian language several prayers, the Ten Commandments, the Confession of Faith, and eight or ten Psalms. These are set to our notes," Dellius continued, "and they sing them with sweet melody."[34] Even so, Miller did not believe that Dellius taught his converts nearly as thoroughly as the French Jesuits taught theirs.

In emulation of the latter, Miller advocated that the American bishop bring with him both a Dutch and an English dictionary, considerable paper for printing books, and materials and tools

---

[33]Ibid., 72, 95-111.

[34]Ibid., 70-72; Dellius to Amsterdam Classis, Nov. 1, 1693, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 1087.

for building churches and parsonages. Once in New York, the bishop--or his surrogate--and two ministers especially chosen to assist him should immediately begin to learn the language commonly understood by the Five Nations, being taught by the best interpreter in the province, who would also help in composing an Indian dictionary. When he became fluent in the Indian tongue, the head missionary should call the Five Nations together and preach to them and urge them to become Christians. He should also ask the Indians to send "so many Sober young men of each nation, as he shall think convenient to live with him some time & learn to read & write in their own language & also to speak the English tongue & read and write in the same." About twelve other young Indians were to be taught the "trades of Joynery, Carpentry, Masonry & glasing," and given instruction in Christianity as well.[35]

The minister-teacher would translate into the Indian tongue such instructive works as the Book of Common Prayer, The Whole Duty of Man, Book of Psalms paraphrased, and the Practical Catechism. However, sacred works like the Bible would not be translated into the Indian tongue, so "that the Indians through a desire to read them may be Stirred up to learn the English language & so at length may be induced to exchange that for their own, for otherwise the Indian Nations being so many it will be almost impossible worke to convert them & provide for their civilizing & instruction."[36]

---

[35]Miller, New York Considered and Improved, 85-88.

[36]Ibid., 89-90.

As soon as the young Indians chosen to learn to read and write English as well as their own language were competently trained, they would be ordained as Anglican preachers. One of them would then be established in every Indian village, where the other group of Indians taught various trades would build "a Church, a Minister's house & large roome adjoyning to it for a Schoole of wood or stone as shall Seem best & cheapest. . . ." Serving as both clergymen and schoolmasters, the Anglican Indians who were settled among their people would repeat the process of instruction they had received by teaching other sober young Indians.[37]

With the bishop-governor supporting this scheme, Miller expected the Indians themselves to maintain the ministers and schoolmasters sent among them, paying a tenth of their profit from hunting, fishing, fowling, and farming. The Indian artisans would also encourage their fellow tribesmen to begin "building houses after the English manner, keeping Cattles & fowles, plowing the ground & imitating the English in their other trades, ways of living & customes & one thing after another so that by degrees they may leave of their savage wayes & become civilized, which except it can be effected, it will signify but little to plant Religion among them."[38] English civilization would thus perforce accompany Anglican Christianity to the Indians of North America.

Such was John Miller's remarkable scheme to bring Anglican

---

[37]Ibid., 90-92.

[38]Ibid., 91-94, quotation on 91.

civilization and Christianity to both the colonists and Indians of New York. The Lords of Trade would have found several features of his plan quite attractive. Besides giving new life to the Anglican establishment in North America, the office of bishop-governor would apparently cost less to maintain than royal governors in New York, New Jersey, and Rhode Island. In addition, a well-coordinated invasion of Canada had been on the minds of many an English strategist since the beginning of King William's War in 1689. But in the final analysis, Miller's plan was simply not practical, despite its intricate self-supporting organization. For one thing, Governor Fletcher, the most available candidate to become the Bishop of London's suffragan in America, was Anglican enough but notoriously corrupt. Moreover, judging from the dissension produced by the Ministry Act of 1693, the divided and contentious dissenters of New York would likely have united and fought any such scheme for an American bishopric centered in their province tooth and nail. But more important, King William's War ended in Europe in 1697 and ground slowly to a halt during the next two years in America, thereby precluding any expedition against Canada led by Miller's bishop-governor.[39]

The influence of Miller's discourse on New York is difficult to judge. It most certainly was seen and read by the Bishop of London, Henry Compton, to whom the manuscript was dedicated, and

---

[39]John D. Runcie, "The Problem of Anglo-American Politics in Bellomont's New York," William and Mary Quarterly, 3d series, XXVI (Apr. 1969), 191-217; Kammen, Colonial New York, 144, 150-52; Patricia U. Bonomi, A Factious People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York (New York, 1971), 76-77.

that industrious prelate may well have passed it around to members of the Board of Trade and perhaps even to the Privy Council. Much of what concerned Miller--the establishment of an American episcopacy, the deficiency of the ministry and the loose morals of the colonists in New York, and the desire to spread the Gospel among the Indians--laced conversations in drawing rooms and counting houses throughout London. The war in America made such long-neglected matters topics of considerable concern. Whether Richard Coote, Earl of Bellomont, read Miller's manuscript is not known; but replacing Fletcher as governor in April 1698, Bellomont did not approve of Domine Dellius' methods of proselytizing among the Indians and followed a policy that resembled Miller's scheme to a remarkable degree.[40]

Convinced that Dellius was the self-seeking instrument of the corrupt Fletcher and had deceived the Indians into surrendering to him and Peter Schuyler several hundred thousand acres of land patented to them by Fletcher, Bellomont moved swiftly to strip Dellius of his lands and pastorate at Albany. In July 1698, referring to the political as well as religious success of French Jesuits, Bellomont urged the Lords of Trade to send Anglican missionaries immediately to teach the Indians "sounder" Christian doctrines than the Jesuits were doing and thereby bring the benighted savages over to the interest of the English crown. Two years later, meeting

---

[40]John C. Rainbolt, "The Creation of a Governor and Captain General for the Northern Colonies," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LV (Jan. 1971), 28-37; and his "A 'great and usefull designe': Bellomont's Proposals for New York, 1648-1701," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LIII (Oct. 1969), 335-51.

with the chiefs of the Five Nations at Albany, Bellomont made a suggestion which Chaplain Miller would heartily have approved of:

> I wish you would send two or three Sachems' sonns out of each Nation to be kept at School at New York where I will take care to have them taught to write and read both English and Indian, and they shall be well clothed and dyeted at the King's charge and after three or four years that they are perfect in their writing & reading they shall return home to you and other boys shall come in their place.[41]

The chiefs replied that they could not honor Bellomont's request because "that is a matter that relates to our wives who are the sole disposers of their children while they are under age." But the chiefs did press Bellomont to throw out the Jesuits and replace them with English ministers. Therefore, Bellomont submitted a plan to the Lords of Trade which called for the establishment of forts throughout the Indian country, garrisoned by British troops and served by young preachers able to learn the Indian language and "of sober and exemplary lives and good scholars, as they will not [sic] be fit to instruct the Indians, and encounter the Jesuits in point of argument."[42] Bellomont asked that the missionaries be paid well, approximately £150 per year, and said it was essential for them to live in the fort among other Englishmen and their families, for "without a Fort 'tis next to impossible to prevail with the ministers to live among the Indians," he wrote; "they are so

---

[41]Bellomont to Lords of Trade, Oct. 22, 1698, and May 12, 1699, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 1262, 1296-97; Bellomont to Lords of Trade, July 1, 1698, NYCD, IV, 334; Bellomont to Indians, Aug. 29, 1700, ibid., 734.

[42]Indian Chiefs to Bellomont, Aug. 30, 1700, NYCD, IV, 737-38; Bellomont to Lords of Trade, Oct. 17, 1700, ibid., 719.

nasty as never to wash their hands or the utensils they dress their victuals with." Moreover, "their food is . . . loathsome to the last degree."[43]

Despite the urgency of his request, Bellomont's plan was rejected. Part of the reason was probably the resentment he had aroused among Anglicans both in England and New York. Although almost certainly guilty of accepting bribes and extorting money, Governor Fletcher won the support of both the anti-Leislerians and the Anglicans. Fletcher appointed the former to office and granted them huge land patents, and he pleased the latter by pushing through the Ministry Act of 1693. Disgusted by the extortion and bribery rife in Fletcher's administration and predisposed to believe that Jacob Leisler and Milbourne had been courageous patriots ruthlessly executed by the unscrupulous and greedy men who supported Fletcher, Bellomont acted vigorously to vacate several of the huge land patents issued by his predecessor, including a lease of the King's farm issued to Trinity by Fletcher just shortly before Bellomont's arrival. As for the Ministry Act of 1693, Bellomont informed the Lords of Trade that the villainous Fletcher had treacherously divided Dutch and English New Yorkers by trying to set up the Church of England against the Dutch and French churches in the province.[44]

As Bellomont dismissed official after official allegedly

---

[43]Bellomont to Lords of Trade, Oct. 17, 1700, ibid., 719.

[44]Bellomont to Lords of Trade, Apr. 27, 1699, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 1296-97. Charges against Fletcher, May 4, 1694; June 22, 1698; and Sept. 24, 1698, NYCD, IV, 313, 325, 379-80.

tainted by the crimes of Fletcher, the governor turned increasingly to the Leislerians who had long been proscribed from government positions. After the revocation of the lease of the King's farm to Trinity Church and the dismissal of Domine Dellius, Rector William Vesey preached publicly against the governor. Bellomont retaliated by deserting his pew at Trinity Church and attending the Reformed Dutch services, where he was warmly received. Indeed, the Leislerians and dissenters (there was considerable overlapping) who supported Bellomont decided to press their advantage. Now once again a majority in the Assembly, they passed a bill in 1699 calling for the "Settlement and Support of Ministers and Schoolmasters and Building and Repairing Meeting Houses" throughout the province. An extension of that earlier provision of the Duke's Laws by which the majority of a township could commit all the inhabitants to the support of a preacher, this act not only applied to schoolmasters but also was apparently intended by the Assembly to be enforced.[45]

Such legislation allowing local communities to decide the nature of their church and school went against Bellomont's official instructions which called for "the book of common prayer as it is now established read each sunday and holyday, and the blessed sacrament administered according to the rights [sic] of the Church of England" in churches throughout the province. Bellomont therefore vetoed the bill. However, Bellomont signed into law part of the bill,

---

[45]For an Anglican view, see Dix, History of Trinity Church, I, 118-33; Leder, Robert Livingston, 148-79; Council Meeting, May 4, 1699, Journal of the Legislative Council, I, 138-39.

thus enabling the majority of freeholders in any town to assess the entire township "to build and repair their meeting houses and other public buildings."[46] He further delighted the dissenters by approving a measure passed in 1700 threatening death to any Jesuit or "popish priest" found lurking in the province.[47]

While Rector Vesey of Trinity Church and New York Anglican leaders were drawing upon every resource available to them in Britain to discredit Bellomont, the Dutch Reformed Church was allowing old political wounds to heal. The Dutch Churches of Kingston and of Kings County were once again united following the division of Leisler's rebellion. The call of another minister to assist the aging Henricus Selyns in New York City revived the factional bitterness between the Leislerians and anti-Leislerians, but both sides agreed that the minister chosen, Gualterus Du Bois, was "pious, discreet, diligent and not inclined to strife or partisanship."[48]

The elderly Selyns when pressed continued to espouse the

---

[46]Instructions to Earl of Bellomont, Aug. 31, 1693, NYCD, IV, 28; Council Meeting, Journal of the Legislative Council, May 12, 1699, I, 186. In private correspondence to the Board of Trade, Bellomont made it clear that he was not about to become the tool of militant dissenters; see Bellomont to Lords of Trade, Oct. 17, 1700, NYCD, IV, 719.

[47]An Act against Jesuits and Popish Priests, Colonial Laws of New York, I, 428.

[48]John Keys' 32 Heads of Accusation against Bellomont, Mar. 11, 1700, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 1345-46; Report of the Council of Trade on Bellomont's Proposals, Oct. 4, 1700, NYCD, IV, 702; John Peter Nucella to Amsterdam Classis, Ecclesiastical Records, Sept. 30, 1696, II, 1171-73; Consistory of New York to Amsterdam Classis, Mar. 29, 1700, ibid., 1346-47; Consistory of New York to Amsterdam Classis, Apr. 24, 1700, ibid., 1353-55, quotation on 1354.

anti-Leislerian side, though he clearly wanted to compromise and was primarily concerned with uniting and expanding his congregation through preaching, visiting, and catechizing. Probably no Dutch Reformed preacher in New York before or since was as successful a catechist as Domine Selyns. He consistently surprised both his congregation in New York and the Classis of Amsterdam with the number of children he taught not only the Heidelberg Catechism but innumerable "Psalms and Pauses." In 1697, forty-four boys repeated two hundred and twenty-seven Psalms and Pauses and twenty-one girls repeated two hundred and thirteen Psalms and Pauses. The girls did considerably better than the boys, but all the catechumens possessed remarkable powers of memory and recitation. On September 14, 1698, Selyns reported that "our regular Sunday-prayer which is made before the sermon was recited without any mistake, and with energy and manly confidence, by Mauycken Popinga, a child of five years. It was repeated," Selyns emphasized, "not without tears by my church members."[49] Despite the Leisler controversy, the future of the Dutch Reformed faith seemed more secure than ever before in provincial New York.

III

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the threat of Anglican cultural aggression which had arisen under Governor Fletcher's regime thus abated under Bellomont's. The Ministry Act of 1693

---

[49]Selyns to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 14, 1698, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 1230-40, quotation on 1240.

was not enforced outside New York City, and Bellomont even questioned the charter of incorporation granted to Trinity Church. As for the Dutch Reformed, they scarcely regarded themselves as dissenters, having the oldest church in the province whose privileges had been confirmed by successive English governors and lately reaffirmed in the charter of incorporation granted the Dutch Reformed Church of New York City. The number of Dutch Reformed congregations in the province increased from eleven in 1664 to approximately twenty-nine in 1701, and growth was similarly taking place within the congregations themselves, thanks largely to the catechetical skills of Dutch preachers and teachers.[50]

Some converts to the Dutch Reformed faith came from the Lutherans, who were without a pastor following the death of the Reverend Arensius for some eleven years. But the Lutheran Church in New York did not die, and after Justus Falckner began his ministry in late 1703, the number of adherents to the Augsburg Confession increased steadily. Subsidized in part by the British government, the French Protestant congregations in New York expanded remarkably with the influx of Huguenot refugees. Seldom the subject of public scorn it once had faced, the small Jewish community in New York now had its own synagogue and rabbi and was swiftly acquiring the economic influence and social prestige that at once protected it as an ethnic group and at the same time facilitated its assimilation into the larger

---

[50]Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church, 99-100, 1074.

community, thereby threatening the existence of its ethnic identity.[51]

As for the English dissenters who most feared Anglican expansion, the Act for Maintaining Public Buildings of 1699 allowed them when in the majority at least to assess all the freemen in their township. In 1701, Jamaica thereby built a Presbyterian church: the assessment was paid despite the initial objection of some "Dutchmen living westward of the town of Jamaica." That law very likely kept down objections from disagreeable minorities. The Presbyterians of Queens County were largely organized and regulated independently, though there was some contact with the Presbyterians of Philadelphia. The Independents or Congregationalists of eastern Long Island were affiliated with the churches of New England and usually got their pastors and teachers from Connecticut or Massachusetts. By 1700, the most apparent threat to the Congregationalists and Presbyterians of Long Island was not the Anglicans but the Quakers, whose economic and political power in New Jersey and Pennsylvania allowed them to send missionaries to Long Island.[52]

---

[51]Harry Julius Kreider, Lutheranism in Colonial New York (1942; reprint ed., New York, 1972), 30-34; Simon Hart and Harry Julius Kreider, trans., Protocol of the Lutheran Church in New York City, 1702-1750 (New York, 1958), ix-xv; Jacob Rader Marcus, Early American Jewry: The Jews of New York, New England and Canada, 1649-1794 (Philadelphia, 1951), 43-49.

[52]Town Decision about Assessment to Build a Presbyterian Church at Jamaica, L. I., Apr. 15, 1701, Ecclesiastical Records, II, 1463-64. Just a glance at the basic biographical data of a few of the dissenting clergy on Long Island indicates their communications and cooperation with brethren outside the province. For data on John Hobart and George McNish at Jamaica, Eliphalet Jones at Huntington, George Philips and Samuel Hepburne (sometimes Anglican), see Frederick Lewis Weis, "The Colonial Clergy of the Middle Colonies: New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, 1728-1776," Proceedings of the

So it seemed in 1700 that the tiny Anglican minority was hardly in any position to challenge the rights and prerogatives dissenters had extracted from the various English governors through the years. Nevertheless, staunch Anglican laymen like James Graham, Lewis Morris, and Caleb Heathcote and Rector Vesey were still making plans for the expansion of Anglicanism in the province. Vesey and the anti-Leislerian merchants and landlords were using all their influence in England to get Bellomont removed as governor when he died in March 1701. And that very year Anglican leaders in England made it abundantly clear that they were not surrendering the Indians and colonists of North America to either atheism or dissenters from the Church of England. The instrument for their renewed missionary activites was the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, chartered in 1701 by William III. Edward Hyde, Viscount Cornbury, New York's new governor after 1702, began yet another campaign to anglicize New York, relying upon the law, his prerogative as governor, and especially the resources of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.[53]

The S. P. G., or the Venerable Society as it was often called, became the missionary arm of the Church of England abroad. It was

---

American Antiquarian Society, LXVI (Oct. 17, 1956), 212, 240, 248, 266, 289. For Quaker "menace," George Keith to Secretary of S. P. G., Nov. 29, 1702, DHNY, III, 251; Affidavits on Quaker Activity in Westchester County, May 8, 1705, ibid., 564-65.

[53]Alison Gilbert Olson, "Governor Robert Hunter and the Anglican Church in New York," in Statesmen, Scholars and Merchants: Essays in Eighteenth-Century History Presented to Dame Lucy Sutherland, ed. Anne Whiteman (Oxford, 1973), 49; Leder, Robert Livingston, 180-207.

modeled in large part after the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, which had been organized in 1699 by Dr. Thomas Bray and other prominent Anglican lay and clerical leaders who were determined to combat sectarians and the impiety of the age by subsidizing schoolmasters, catechists, and by distributing tracts, all aimed at improving public morals and participation in the Church of England. Sent in 1699 by Henry Compton, Bishop of London, as his commissary to Maryland, Bray labored there and elsewhere in British North America to establish libraries for Anglican ministers. Returning to England in late 1700, Bray, with the endorsement of the Bishop of London, wrote the charter for the S. P. G. From its inception, the Society was devoted to preaching the Gospel according to Anglican doctrines among both colonists and Indians. For a number of reasons, including its proximity to the Five Indian Nations and to the dissenting New England colonies, along with its own religious diversity, New York received much more attention from the Society than any other British colony on the American mainland. In fact, from 1710 until 1776, the S. P. G. continuously supported from eight to ten elementary schools, with an average enrollment of about forty students. And altogether over fifty Anglican missionaries were sent or sponsored by the S. P. G. to New York.[54]

Heterodox New York obviously offered a challenge to the

---

[54]Calam, Parsons and Pedagogues, 1-30; William Webb Kemp, The Support of Schools in Colonial New York by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, Teachers College Contribution to Education, no. 56 (New York, 1913), 1-53. Kemp's study is a masterful work of meticulous scholarship, though somewhat too sympathetic to the Anglican point of view.

S. P. G. The dissenters, Quakers and other sectarians, and foreigners who outnumbered Anglicans at least forty to one provoked considerable anxiety among certain Anglican leaders, especially Governor Cornbury. In his first address to the Assembly, Cornbury recommended "the erecting of public schools in proper Places." Thinking in more narrow terms, the Assembly decided ten days later "to erect a publick Free-School." Where the school should be built and the nature of its instruction were not immediately decided. Hempstead was at first considered, but a bill passed the Assembly in November 1702 allowing the City of New York to raise £50 per annum for a "Free-School."[55]

With some minor amendments, the bill was shortly approved by the governor and became law. Acknowledging the necessity of a free school in the city, the law read that "there shall be hereafter elected, chosen, licensed, authorized, and appointed one able, skillful and orthodox person to be schoolmaster for the education of youth and male children of such parents as are of French and Dutch extraction, as well as of the English, may come and be instructed in the languages or other learning usually taught in grammar school." The statute empowered the city to raise the £50 by assessment in order to pay the schoolmaster for seven years. The schoolmaster was to be chosen by the New York City Common Council and either

---

[55]Cornbury's Address to the General Assembly, Oct. 20, 1702, Assembly Journal, I, 48; Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 79-84.

licensed by the Bishop of London or approved by the governor.[56]

The Common Council petitioned the governor a few months later to request the Bishop of London and the S. P. G. to send a schoolmaster because there was no person available in the city for the task. Over a year elapsed before Cornbury persuaded George Muirson, who had been selected by the S. P. G. to become its schoolmaster at Albany, to stay in New York City "to instruct all children with whom you shall be entrusted in the English, Latin and Greek tongues or languages and also in the arts of writing and arithmetic."[57] In his report to the Anglican clergy who met in New York in 1704, William Vesey complimented Cornbury on his endeavors to train the youth of the province in the doctrines and discipline of the English Church. Vesey referred to the "ingenius Mr. Muirson"; the pedagogue's subsequent career as preacher at Rye and Anglican missionary to Connecticut proved him to be a remarkably talented mind indeed. But Muirson resigned as schoolmaster within a year and returned to England to be ordained into the ministry. The teacher who replaced Muirson and served for the next six years as master of the Latin school was Andrew Clarke, known for his sobriety, learning, and integrity.[58]

---

[56]An Act for the Encouragement of a Grammar Free-School in the City of New York, Colonial Laws of New York, I, 516-17.

[57]Common Council Meeting, Jan. 15, 1702, Minutes of the Common Council, I, 517; Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 87; Cornbury to Secretary, Nov. 6, 1704, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, II, 27.

[58]William Vesey's Summary Account, 1704, Ecclesiastical Records, III, 1551-55; Common Council Meeting, Jan. 22, 1705, Minutes of the Common Council, III, 69.

Rector Vesey of Trinity Church also praised Cornbury for establishing two other schools in the city and "by these and other means" increasing the number of communicants of the Anglican faith in the city. One of the schools may have been that which William Huddlestone, clerk of Trinity Church, had occasionally taught since 1688. Cornbury perhaps provided an additional subsidy, for Huddlestone apparently charged relatively little for tuition. Instead, as Caleb Heathcote observed in 1705, he obliged "all that sent their children of what nation soever to buy them Common Prayer books, and that they should attend the Divine Services and refusing otherwise to receive them into his School, by which reason he has grafted the Church not only amongst the English but many of the French and Dutch youth. . . ."[59] The other school Vesey referred to as established by Cornbury may have been the English and French school that the governor licensed Andrew Foucaut to teach in 1703. Or it could have referred to the catechetical school for children, Indians, and Negroes that Cornbury authorized Elias Neau to teach in August 1704.[60]

The "other means" Rector Vesey alluded to while praising Cornbury were equally as important as schools for the educational future of the Church of England in New York. To begin with, Cornbury in 1702 restored to Trinity Church the lease of the Queen's farm

---

[59]Heathcote to Secretary, Nov. 9, 1705, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, II, 117.

[60]Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 90-91.

which Bellomont had annulled in 1699. The next year, Colonel Lewis Morris urged the S. P. G. to petition the queen for that land. "New York is the centre of English America," wrote Morris in 1704, "and an appropriate place for a College; and that farm in a little time would be of considerable value, and it is a pity such a thing should be lost for want of asking, which, at another time, won't be so easily obtained."[61] The next year, at Cornbury's request, Queen Anne formally bestowed the farm on Trinity Church. Like the idea of an American bishopric, the idea of an Anglican college in New York lingered in the minds of the Anglican clergy and lay leaders in New York. But for the time being, the roots of the Church of England had to be set deeper before any such schemes would have any chance of success.[62]

Governor Cornbury also won Vesey's commendation by getting through the Assembly an "Act for the better Establishment of the maintenance for the Minister of the City of New York," which raised the salary of the minister for the parish of New York City from £100 to £150 per annum. Much more important for the establishment of the Anglican faith, Cornbury extracted from the Assembly another charter of incorporation for Trinity Church, much stronger than the earlier one. The new charter made it very clear that the Church of England via Trinity Church was the established church in New

---

[61]Dix, History of Trinity Church, I, 141-44; Lewis Morris to Secretary, June 1704, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, I, 181.

[62]Dix, History of Trinity Church, I, 145-46; Carl Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775 (New York, 1962), 121.

York City. Cornbury also tried to get the Assembly to rewrite the Ministry Act of 1693, stating specifically that preachers of the Anglican faith alone were to be inducted into the parishes created by the legislation. Still composed mostly of dissenters, the Assembly balked at changing the words "a good sufficient Protestant Minister" to "an Anglican Minister." Even so, Cornbury was suggesting that his instructions from the crown gave him extensive authority over the religious condition of the province, authority which he just might invoke if the Assembly did not respond favorably.[63]

The Assembly sought to compromise. The result was a statute passed in August 1705 to clarify the Ministry Act, and its language made it clear that the governor intended to enforce the Ministry Act as he interpreted it. Cornbury began immediately to make certain that the Anglican missionaries sent to Richmond, West Chester and Queens Counties received their salaries as the law stipulated. In Queens County, where numerous Presbyterians, Independents, or Congregationalists, and Quakers vehemently opposed contributing to the salaries of Anglican preachers, Cornbury removed recalcitrant justices of the peace from office and jailed and fined many of them. In 1705, confronted by hostile dissenters at every turn, the S. P. G. missionaries in Queens, William Urquhart at Jamaica and John Thomas

---

[63]An Act for the Better Establishment of the Maintenance for the Minister of the City of New York, June 19, 1703, Colonial Laws of New York, I, 543; An Act Granting Sundry Privileges and Powers to the Rector and Inhabitants of the City of New York of the Communion of the Church of England as by Law Established, June 27, 1704, ibid., 564; An Act for the Better Explaining and More Effectual Putting in Execution of an Act of General Assembly Entitled an Act for Settling a Ministry, Aug. 4, 1705, ibid., 576.

at Hempstead, wrote that Cornbury was a true "nursing father" to the infant Anglican Church there, protecting them from the malevolent designs of the passionate enemies of the Anglican faith.[64]

IV

Along with Governor Cornbury, Colonel Caleb Heathcote continued to advance the interests of the Church of England in New York. Like his good friend Lewis Morris, Heathcote was a manor lord, merchant, politician, staunch Anglican, and early advocate of the S. P. G. in the province. Working with both Morris and Cornbury, Heathcote recognized that the success or failure of the Anglican venture in New York depended largely on the educational activities of both parsons and pedagogues. A lay member of the Society, Heathcote kept a keen eye on S. P. G. work throughout the province, but he was particularly concerned with religious education in his own Westchester County. Having arrived in New York in 1692, Heathcote claimed years later that Westchester County was "the most rude & Heathenish Country I ever Saw in my Life," that had any pretence of being Christian. The Sabbath was not honored but disgraced by all "Manners of vain Sports, & Lewd Diversion."[65]

---

[64]Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, 120: Cornbury's Order to Rev. Mr. Hobart to Vacate Parsonage at Jamaica, Long Island, July 4, 1704, DHNY, III, 128; Order for the Prosectuion of Mr. Justice Talman, for Sceptical Remarks, Jan. 28, 1703, ibid., 124; William Urquhart and John Thomas to Secretary, July 4, 1705, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, III, 185.

[65]Caleb Heathcote to Secretary, Apr. 10, 1704, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, III, 177, p. 1.

As colonel of the local militia, the young Englishman decided to give to the Sabbath at least a semblance of the honor due it in Westchester County. He sent an order to all his militia captains to tell their men that unless they appointed readers to conduct the worship service each Sunday, Colonel Heathcote would insist that the militia spend the day drilling and performing various military exercises. The results were as he had anticipated. The scattered settlement got readers, and some of them may well have been schoolmasters, though Heathcote did not say, and the towns of Westchester and Rye respectively hired preachers from New England.[66]

Congregationalism was better than no Christian religion at all but, as Heathcote saw it, not very much better. Before the S. P. G. was formed, Heathcote had done what he could to lessen the aversion to the Church of England which came almost naturally to the progeny of erstwhile New Englanders in Westchester County. He escorted Rector Vesey and Reverend Daniel Bondet as they preached and baptized infants. At one time, Heathcote almost had the people of Westchester parish agreed on calling Bondet under the terms of the Ministry Act of 1693. Having been ordained by an Anglican bishop, Bondet spoke English as well as French and preached regularly to the Protestant French Church of New Rochelle and occasionally at various English settlements. Then at the last moment, the English dissenters, led by their preacher, Warren Mather, raised such a

---

[66]Ibid., A, III, 177, pp. 1-2.

cry of outrage that Heathcote's scheme fell apart. But by the time the S. P. G. was ready to send missionaries to the two parishes in Westchester County, Heathcote had managed to get rid of Mather by winning over to the Anglican faith several leading families in the county. The Reverends Thomas Prichard of Rye, Thomas Bartow at Westchester, and especially George Muirson, who succeeded Prichard at Rye in 1705 and subsequently took many preaching junkets into Connecticut accompanied by Heathcote, acknowledged that Colonel Heathcote's assistance had been indispensable.[67]

Time and time again, Heathcote advised the secretary of the Society to send missionaries to New York who were not only well prepared to preach but also to teach. In June 1704, referring to some earlier plans for a school in Westchester, Heathcote wrote gleefully that he had "the promise of an Extraordinary Good Man for a Schoolmaster, one who is not only very firm to the Church, but I am sure will be Indefatigable to Instill Those Principles into the Youth & Children of whom the Greatest Hopes are." His name was Joseph Cleator, and Heathcote asked that the Venerable Society grant him a stipend of £15 per year until the school was well established. The zealous colonel assured the S. P. G. that the investment would be worthwhile. Westchester County, he went on to say, was more generally English than any other shire in the

---

[67]Ibid., A, III, 177, pp. 3-7. Heathcote to Secretary, June 1, 1704, ibid., A, I, 174, p. 2; Nov. 9, 1705, ibid., A, II, 117. George Muirson to Secretary, Rye, Oct. 2, 1706, ibid., A, III, 75; Thomas Bartow to Secretary, Westchester, Oct. 20, 1704, ibid., A, II, 32.

province. Its population at the time only numbered about two thousand, but the amount of land still available for settlement was such that the county would almost certainly accommodate a very large population. So if Anglican preachers and teachers were to be established forthwith, the Church of England would surely rise to dominance as the population increased.[68]

Heathcote believed the same Anglican hegemony was possible throughout this most heterogeneous of colonies. Success depended upon the persistence and patience of schoolmaster and preacher alike. As Heathcote saw it, the preacher was to educate both young and old in the Christian life and doctrines of the Church of England. The schoolmaster would teach children more than just reading, writing, and arithmetic; he would exercise them in the church catechism, teach them Anglican prayers and selected psalms. Much depended on the attitude of the preacher, for if the preacher took the wrong approach, he might not only alienate his parishioners but also provoke them to remove their children from the instruction of the Anglican teacher. "If there is any good to be done here," wrote Lewis Morris in 1702, and Heathcote surely agreed, "it must be by men of Learning, Sobriety, and Prudence and not young and to give good Encouragement to such is cheap, for others will not serve but dessert [sic] the Church."[69]

---

[68]Heathcote to Secretary, Westchester, June 1, 1704, ibid., A, I, 174, pp. 2-3; and New York, Oct. 23, 1704, ibid., A, II, 37.

[69]Lewis Morris to Archdeacon Beveridge, East Jersey, Sept. 1702, ibid., A, I, 45.

Surrounded by a sea of sinners and dissenters, the Anglican missionaries had to tread with care. Heathcote and the preachers in the field urged a most accommodating approach. The missionary ought to instruct without provoking sectarian quarrels, baptize all infants freely, and be on hand to comfort the bereaved and troubled regardless of their religious persuasion. By such "easy methods," Heathcote believed with too much optimism, New Yorkers would in a few years be so well affected toward the Church of England that an "Act of Assembly might without Difficulty be obtained" for expanding public support of the Church of England.[70]

While the missionaries placated if not converted the adults, the schoolmasters subsidized by the S. P. G. were expected to inculcate Anglican doctrines in the minds of the rising generation. In 1705, counting only three Anglicans in his whole parish, John Thomas characterized the people of Hempstead as deplorably ignorant, rigidly independent, and averse to the Church of England by education and tradition, most of them being transplanted New Englanders. By education, Thomas meant child-rearing in general, not just schooling in particular. Indeed, Thomas believed that the lack of adequate schooling was one reason his numerous congregation did not answer the Responses in the liturgy. "In vain, I preach to them the Superstructure of Christianity," he wrote in 1707, "when they are destitute of the ground works and Fundamentals of Religion

---

[70]Heathcote to Secretary, Manor of Scarsdale, Apr. 10, 1704, ibid., A, I, 118, pp. 3-7.

by Education."[71] The only solution was to hire a schoolmaster, which Thomas did at his own expense. He got the people of Hempstead to agree to build a school house, to which the missionary made a substantial contribution. That contribution, Thomas said, "I presume is the most moving Rhetoric I can use to persuade those whose Intellects are so mean and earthy, that they cannot discern the advantage, worth, and Excellency of education for their Children's present and future Welfare." With the schoolmaster now at work, Thomas bought some catechisms for the children and hoped "in some time to have a set of catechumens."[72]

As Thomas' situation revealed so dramatically, the labors of the missionary were burdensome without the assistance of the schoolmaster, and the limited funds of the S. P. G. restricted the amount of subsidy allowed and the number of schoolmasters supported. Caleb Heathcote recognized the problem and sought solutions. Retreating from his former position of allowing each schoolmaster a rather large subsidy of about £15 per year, he recommended making £3 or £4 gratuities available to many more schoolmasters. Noting that £4 sterling of broadcloth, buttons, silk, and linen bought in London would be worth £10 sterling in the colonies, the frugal

---

[71]John Thomas to Secretary, Hempstead, June 27, 1705, ibid., A, II, 94; also, Aug. 23, 1705, ibid., A, II, 102; Nov. 1705, ibid., A, II, 109; Apr. 22, 1707, ibid., A, III, 67.

[72]John Thomas to Secretary, Hempstead, Apr. 22, 1707, ibid., A, III, 117.

Heathcote suggested payment in goods to save the Society some expense.[73]

Heathcote also had another plan, involving the manufacture of naval stores that the Board of Trade believed New York ought to produce. According to his scheme, several schoolmasters would enlist in the British garrison at New York City and be paid by the crown. The schoolmasters would continue to reside and teach at their respective communities, and Heathcote would bring to these communities all that was necessary for making rigging, sail cloth, and other naval stores. Heathcote would then take into the Queen's service as many skilled craftsmen as necessary at each community to instruct the young men of the place while themselves producing naval stores. Should his project be approved, Heathcote wrote,

> I intend to have a great many of the Youths besides their Learning taught trades, and will so order it in respect to the Division of their time, betwixt schooling and the other affairs, that they may not fall short in Learning one part as well as the other, that both Church and State, the Children's Bodys as well as their Souls, may all at the same time receive advantage by it, and . . . I am past a doubt but in a few years Matters may be so ordered and brought about as to have great Numbers of Schools erected in America, the Masters whereof to be solely under the Government of the Society and that without any Charge to them, and hope it won't be long ere the Crown will give me the Opportunity of doing the greatest Service to Church and State which of that kind hath hitherto never been done or thought of by any Man. . . .[74]

Shrill if not hysterical, Heathcote's letter explaining this scheme was written in a nervous scrawl quite uncharacteristic of

---

[73]Heathcote to Secretary, New York, Dec. 18, 1707, ibid., A, III, 161, pp. 5-6.

[74]Heathcote to Secretary, New York, Dec. 16, 1707, ibid., A, III, 160; also Dec. 18, 1707, ibid., A, III, 161, pp. 7-10, quotation pp. 9-10.

his usually sturdy script. Indeed, Heathcote was troubled--deeply troubled. The entire S. P. G. mission had fallen into disrepute by 1707. Anglican missionaries and schoolmasters aggressively sought to expand the membership of the English Church at the expense of the dissenters; their advocacy of the "National Church" was acknowledged and recognized from the beginning of the S. P. G., though Anglican leaders like Heathcote and Lewis Morris and the missionaries knew that discretion and compromise were much more effective than aggressive confrontation. The only S. P. G. missionary in New York who did not usually assume that Anglicanism was synonymous with Christianity was Elias Neau, who had been imprisoned as a galley slave because of his Huguenot beliefs in France and who had given up his successful mercantile business and membership in the Protestant French Church to devote himself to catechizing largely blacks but also Indians and white children for the S. P. G.[75]

The S. P. G. was early accused by dissenters of being less concerned with bringing the Gospel to Indians and non-Christian colonists than with enlisting Christian dissenters into the ranks of the Church of England. There was considerable truth to the charge, and during the early years of the S. P. G. zealous Anglicans like Heathcote, Lewis Morris, and Governor Cornbury and the missionaries themselves freely admitted their wish to transform heterodox New York into a bastion of Anglican orthodoxy. However, Lewis Morris

---

[75]Kemp, Support of Schools in Colonial New York, 28-31; Sheldon S. Cohen, "Elias Neau, Instructor to New York's Slaves," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LV (Jan. 1971), 7-27.

and especially Caleb Heathcote acknowledged that when zealous Anglicans passionately attacked the doctrines of the dissenters from the Church of England, "Loose and Irreligious Men Immediately own the Faith & turn Violent Prosecutors, being overjoyed of any opportunity to Gratify their Natural Temper. . . ."[76] Heathcote should have followed his own advice more closely. He and Cornbury schemed to have the Anglican preacher Bondet bring the French Protestant congregations at New Rochelle and New York into conformity with the English Church. His unabashed support of the Anglican religion aroused much more antagonism in Westchester County than he was prepared to admit. Furthermore, his missionary travels into Connecticut with Rev. Muirson and their attempt to settle a mission at Stratford enraged Congregationalists throughout New England.[77]

Although he was unwittingly assisted by many Anglican missionaries and lay leaders, it was Governor Cornbury himself who was primarily responsible for the popular reaction against the Church of England. Cornbury quite literally imposed Rev. Thomas on Hempstead and Rev. Urquhart on Jamaica, turning out of office two dissenting preachers and arousing such antagonism that the best efforts of both Thomas and Urquhart were seldom able to penetrate. "Government is our great Asylum and Bulwark," wrote Thomas, praising Cornbury, "which my Lord exerts to the utmost." Cornbury put Thomas and Urquhart

---

[76]Heathcote to Secretary, Scarsdale, Apr. 10, 1704, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, I, 177, pp. 2-3.

[77]Fox, Caleb Heathcote, 243-65.

beyond the reach of the "snarling of the vulgar, and secured to them a respect and deference from the best people."[78] The governor also urged the Society to send missionaries to Suffolk County, "which is wholly inhabited by English, but to this day there has never been a Minister of ye Church of England settled in those parts." Although the East End of Long Island was almost completely Congregationalist and economically and religiously allied with New England, Chaplain John Sharpe had been told that because of the frequent quarrels occurring there over the salaries of their ministers, "if they had one of the Church that would not be chargeable to them they would most comply."[79]

Cornbury's roughshod imposition of Anglicanism on Jamaica and Hempstead, his plan to introduce Anglican missionaries into Suffolk County, and the urging of Anglican preachers in New York that an American bishop was essential--all these activities thoroughly aroused the English dissenters of New York, who felt that their religion was gravely threatened by arbitrary governmental intervention. Presbyterians in New York developed closer ties with the Synod of Philadelphia and with New England Congregationalists, who had supporters in London lobbying against the repressive religious policy. New York Quakers were likewise assisted and guided by Quaker leaders in New Jersey and Philadelphia. The dissenters

---

[78]John Thomas to Secretary, Hempstead, Mar. 1, 1705, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, II, 71.

[79]Cornbury to Colonel Quarry, New York, July 15, 1705, ibid., A, II, 91; John Sharpe to Secretary, Fort Anne at New York, Nov. 24, 1705, ibid., A, II, 135.

and sectarians also established schools when they could to compete with Anglican schoolmasters.[80]

As for Dutch New Yorkers, Governor Cornbury saw them and their faith especially as major obstacles to Anglican hegemony in the province. Shortly after his arrival in New York in 1702, the governor denied the Dutch Reformed congregations of Kings County permission to call as their pastor Bernardus Freeman, who was then ministering to Schenectady. The denial dismayed the petitioners, who had appealed to Cornbury simply out of courtesy, not because they thought they were required to do so. No other English governor had required that. Indeed, Dutch Reformed leaders believed fervently that the Articles of Capitulation of 1664 guaranteed their right to call and dismiss preachers without recourse to the civil government. In November 1702, while Dutch Reformed leaders were still rather stunned, Cornbury ordered the sheriff of Albany County to detain and send Paulus Van Vleck to New York City to answer charges of contempt. Van Vleck had been an itinerant of sorts whom Cornbury forbade to continue preaching. The contempt charges were raised because Van Vleck had responded to a call from the Dutch Reformed congregation at Kinderhook to be their clerk and reader without getting a license from Cornbury first. Again, the Dutch Reformed throughout the province were quite upset by the governor's action. When they cited the Articles of Capitulation and custom since

---

[80]Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, 116-24. The examples of dissenting schoolmasters became more prevalent after 1720, but the desire to sustain their respective religious traditions must have encouraged earlier systematic educational efforts.

that time, Cornbury replied that his secret instructions from Queen Anne definitely gave him that authority.[81]

Though not without protest, Dutch Reformed New Yorkers tried to follow Cornbury's rules. In the spring of 1703, Cornbury granted the Dutch Reformed congregations on Long Island permission to call Domine Freeman, though the preacher responded with so many conditions that they doubted he would become their pastor. Therefore, Cornbury granted them permission to ask the Amsterdam Classis to send them another minister. When Domine Nucella left Kingston in 1704, Cornbury licensed Stephen Gracherie "to read the service of the Low-Dutch Church at Kingstowne in the County of Ulster from time to time until you receive further orders from me; and you are likewise hereby impowered and licensed to keep a reading and writing school at Kingstowne aforesaid, until you receive orders from me to the contrary."[82] A few days later, taking advantage of the absence of any Dutch preacher at Kingston and encouraged by the English families who lived there, Cornbury called out of retirement and sent to Kingston the Reverend Samuel Hepburne, an Anglican preacher who had lived for years with his daughter at Brookhaven.

---

[81]Petition of the Elders of the Dutch Churches in Kings Co. (1702), DHNY, IV, 89-90; Order of Council on Petition, Oct. 20, 1702, ibid., III, 90-91; Answer of the Governor, Oct. 23, 1706, ibid., III, 93; Cornbury and Council to Church at Kinderhook, Nov. 12, 1702, ibid., V, 38-39; John Webb Pratt, Religion, Politics, and Diversity, 57-58.

[82]Bernardus Freeman of Schenectady to the Consistories of the Dutch Reformed Churches of Long Island, Aug. 2, 1703, Ecclesiastical Records, III, 1539-43; Consistories of the Dutch Reformed Churches of Long Island to Amsterdam Classis, Dec. 11, 1703, ibid., 1544-48; Cornbury's License to Stephen Gracherie, Aug. 10, 1704, ibid., 1574.

According to Cornbury, Hepburne was well received by the English and some of the Dutch at Kingston. Hepburne was optimistic enough to ask the S. P. G. in 1705 to send some six dozen volumes of the Book of Common Prayer in Dutch and four dozen regular English prayer books.[83] However, despite warnings from the Council that the orthodox Hepburne ought to be as well paid as any Dutch Reformed preacher, Cornbury reported that most of the Dutch there "would not hear of it, for fear as they said themselves of having an English Minister imposed upon them."[84]

That was exactly what Cornbury intended to do, impose Anglican ministers not only upon the Dutch at Kingston but elsewhere in the province. His policy of Anglicization by force became evident as he brought educational agents like preachers and teachers under his control. In the summer of 1705, the governor had written to London "that there are some very good men among us, but you will be pleased to consider that the Inhabitants of this Province are of three Nations, English, Dutch, and French; of these the Dutch are very much the most numerous, and these are not Dutch by nation only but by inclination, at least generally speaking which appears here every day."[85]

---

[83]Secretary Clarke to Gentlemen at Esopus Regarding Rev. Hepburne, Aug. 30, 1704, ibid., 1576.

[84]Samuel Hepburne [Eburne] to Secretary, Oct. 25, 1705, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, II, 113; Cornbury to Secretary, Nov. 22, 1705, ibid., A, II, 131.

[85]Cornbury to Mr. Secretary Hedges, New York, July 15, 1705, Ecclesiastical Records, III, 1591-93.

Cornbury was not the only Englishman to have a poor opinion of the Dutch New Yorkers. Although Dutch Reformed leaders had at times proven the only ally the English Church had in the province, some Anglican missionaries saw the Dutch Reformed Church as the major obstacle to anglicizing the province. Thoroughgood Moore placed most of the blame for the failure of his Indian mission on the Dutch traders of Albany and urged that the "Society may use their Interest towards making the Dutch here better subjects. . . ." Moore's recommendations paralleled exactly those set forth by Governor Cornbury to the Venerable Society:

> There are some parts in this Province, where there are Dutch Ministers besides in this City, for Example, at Albany, at Kingston in Ulster County, and in Kings County. There are several English families who must either go to the Dutch Churches, or they must not go to Church at all, now I am of Opinion that if as the Dutch Ministers dye, their Churches were supplied with English Ministers that would with Schools be a means to make this colony an English Colony, which I am afraid will not easily be done without it, but that I submit to better Judgments.[86]

While those of better judgment were presumably pondering the problem, Cornbury went ahead with his own solution. He refused to license two Dutch schoolmasters, Jacobus Goelet and another named Kerflyl; and those teachers he did license were carefully scrutinized to make sure they were of the right religious persuasion. Still trying to bring the French Protestants around to Anglicanism, Cornbury found Andrew Foucaut acceptable to teach in an English

---

[86]Thoroughgood Moore to Secretary, New York, Nov. 13, 1705, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, II, 122; Cornbury to Secretary, Nov. 24, 1705, ibid., A, II, 131, p. 3.

and French school in New York City. Prudent De La Fayale was also authorized to keep a French school in the city. Similarly, Elias De Bonrepos was licensed to teach reading and writing at New Rochelle. Thomas Huddlestone, brother of William, teacher of the Trinity Church School, was licensed to teach the "English language, writing and arithmetic in the town of Jamaica, Queen Co." Also teaching in Jamaica, Henry Lindley was authorized "to Instruct all Children with whom you shall be intrusted in the English and Lattin Tongues or Languages and also in the art of Writing and Arithmetic for and During my Pleasure." Even John Wind had to be licensed to keep a dancing school in New York City.[87] Not since Peter Stuyvesant and never again would a governor of New York license schoolmasters as closely as Lord Cornbury.

Governor Cornbury also ordered that preachers be licensed, though he initially singled out Dutch Reformed ministers. By restricting their preachers and teachers, Cornbury however not only failed to anglicize the Dutch Reformed; he almost completely alienated them.[88] He also offended Presbyterians by prosecuting the Reverend Francis Makemie, a Presbyterian minister from Virginia, for preaching in a private home in New York City without a license from the governor

---

[87]Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 91-94; Civil Commission to Rev. Mr. Freeman to Be Minister in Kings County, Dec. 26, 1705, Ecclesiastical Records, III, 1607.

[88]Consistories of Dutch Reformed Churches at Kingston, Midwout, Amersfoorts, and Breuckelen to Amsterdam Classis, May 23, 1706, Ecclesiastical Records, III, 1646-62; Account Given by Dutch Reformed Churches in Kings County, Long Island, Apr. 22, 1702, ibid., 1639-45; Journal of Domine Beys, Jan. through Mar. 1706, ibid., 1615-20.

in July 1706. Makemie bluntly told Cornbury that under the Act of Toleration (1691), royal governors had no right to require that nonconformist ministers be licensed. The governor disagreed. The resulting trial was fundamentally a battle between two vain and egotistical men, Cornbury versus Makemie. The case was followed with keen interest by the Dutch Reformed and English dissenters of all varieties because it centered on Cornbury's infamous secret instructions from the Queen requiring all preachers in the province to have either a certificate from the Bishop of London or acquire a license from the governor. Cornbury produced the Instructions from the Queen, but the jury acquitted Makemie, though he had to pay court costs of £83. The notorious Instructions were widely thought to be a forgery at the time, and historians investigating the incident generally agree that they were indeed bogus.[89]

V

Cornbury was becoming a tremendous liability to the advancement of Anglicanism in New York. His attempts to use education to impose Anglican uniformity had backfired, steeling dissenters in their determination to perpetuate their respective ethnic and religious traditions. But what began to divide New York Anglicans was not so much his inept repression of other religious groups as his fetish for dressing like a woman. When he was all decked out in gown,

---

[89]Cornbury to Lords of Trade, Oct. 14, 1706, NYCD, IV, 1186-87; The Presbyterians of New York, 1706-1741, Ecclesiastical Records, III, 1671-73.

beads and rouge, the governor believed he bore a striking likeness to his cousin, Queen Anne. Anglican clergymen and lay leaders were scandalized. Writing to the Secretary of State on February 9, 1707, Lewis Morris referred to Cornbury: "Of whom I must say something which perhaps no body will think worth their while to tell, and that is, his dressing publicly in woman's clothes every day, and putting a stop to all public business, while he is pleasing himself with that peculiar but detestable magot."[90] Even on Sundays, Cornbury would hurry from church, regale himself in female garb and parade around the balcony of the fort for all his subjects to see. He did not like criticism, and when Thoroughgood Moore refused the governor communion because of the latter's peculiarity, Cornbury had him jailed. Even after he had been officially recalled by Queen Anne and jailed in New York for failing to pay his creditors, Cornbury continued to dress as a woman. But Elias Neau, the Anglican catechist to the slaves in New York City, heard that while in jail Cornbury had changed his style somewhat, dressing now "after the Dutch manner."[91]

Comparing intentions and accomplishments, it must be admitted that the Anglican drive for cultural hegemony in colonial New York was hardly a success. Carl Bridenbaugh's catchy phrase that Anglican preachers and pedagogues were impelled by a "lust for

---

[90]Lewis Morris to Secretary of State, Feb. 9, 1708, NYCD, V, 33-38.

[91]Elias Neau to Secretary, Feb. 1709, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, IV, 121.

dominion" in New York and the other Middle Colonies is surely exaggerated, but there is still much truth in the hyperbole.[92] The Society's efforts in New York during the early eighteenth century were clearly aimed at bringing the colony into conformity with the Church of England, and once that was done, Anglicans could then move against the deluded Quakers in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, on the one hand, and the obstinate Congregationalists, on the other. Such at least was the vision, and there can be no doubt that it was an engaging prospect, so potent that it became virtually an obsession to zealots like Talbot and to a lesser extent to Heathcote and Morris and Vesey.[93]

But the vision remained an illusion which never came close to realization despite the diligent efforts of fifty-eight Anglican missionaries and several hundred schoolmasters, the latter engaged at one time or another and for varying lengths of time in teaching the catechism and prayers of the English Church along with reading, writing, and arithmetic. The "National Church" itself was established only slightly in the four lower counties of New York, and that establishment was only grudgingly tolerated but never respected or acknowledged by New York dissenters. However, given the obvious fact that the Anglicans were trying to accomplish something that

---

[92]Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, 116-28.

[93]For general strategy, see Lewis Morris to Secretary, New York, June 1704, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, I, 181; John Talbot to Richard Gillingham, New York, Nov. 24, 1702, ibid., A, I, 56; Talbot to Secretary, Philadelphia, Sept. 1, 1703, ibid., A, I, 125; Heathcote to Secretary, Westchester, June 1, 1704, ibid., A, I, 174.

was almost impossible, their achievements were not so unimpressive. Trinity parish in New York was securely established by laws of incorporation, and as the church of the governor and English officialdom, it attracted other prosperous New Yorkers whose profession or social and economic standing led them to worship among the ruling elite. In 1720, the proportion of dissenters and sectarians to Anglicans in New York was something like thirty or forty to one.[94] During the next forty years, that proportion declined dramatically, thanks in large part to the labors of S. P. G. preachers and teachers, but never to such an extent that the Anglicans represented more than ten percent of the total population.[95]

---

[94] Heathcote to Secretary, New York, Aug. 24, 1714, ibid., A, IX, 31, p. 147; Heathcote to Secretary, New York, June 13, 1714, ibid., A, IX, 19, p. 126.

[95] William Smith, Jr., History of the Province of New York, I, 233-34.

CHAPTER V

TO BRING FORTH UNITY OUT OF DIVERSITY: ATTEMPTS AT ANGLICIZATION THROUGH EDUCATION IN NEW YORK, 1708-1719

The disgraced Cornbury was succeeded first by John, Lord Lovelace, who died a few months after arriving in New York, and then by Brigadier Robert Hunter (1710-1719). An urbane man of letters, friend of Addison and Steele and Dean Swift, and a skilled Whig politician, Hunter was instructed by the Lords of Trade to heal the wounds caused by Cornbury's excesses. Trying hard to reconcile all factions, Leislerians and anti-Leislerians, Anglicans and dissenters, Hunter had the unenviable task of advancing the interests of the Church of England while soothing and reassuring the dissenters.

His mission of conciliation exacerbated the already bitter divisons among Anglicans. Abandoning Cornbury's hostile policy toward the Dutch Reformed and English dissenters, Hunter gradually withdrew the provincial government from aggressive participation in religious proselytizing and gave up the gubernatorial prerogative of licensing teachers. While Anglicans quarreled, the dissenters went on the offensive, vigorously protesting the establishment of the English Church in Queens County, particularly in the town of Jamaica. The ensuing legal struggle further discredited Hunter in the eyes of Anglican zealots; but despite the stormy cross-currents of religious politics, the governor managed to steer a

remarkable course that ultimately reconciled antagonistic Anglican factions behind a much stronger effort aimed at colonists as well as Indians and black slaves.

The compromising stance that Hunter assumed began an Anglican accommodation with dissenters that would prevail for the next fifty years. Although clearly supportive of the English Church, the provincial government would never again become the tool of cultural aggression that Cornbury had made of it. A friend and ally of the governor, Chaplain John Sharpe personified the moderate but aggressive approach to advancing the Anglican cause that became characteristic during Hunter's administration. In 1713, Sharpe advanced a detailed plan for encouraging learning and the Anglican faith in the province. Henceforth, just like their dissenting opponents, Anglicans would rely more than ever before upon education as the basic means of proselytizing and perpetuating their religious creed.

I

Although a devout Anglican and a member of the S. P. G., Hunter found that his mission to reconcile and reduce religious and ethnic antagonisms was not especially appreciated by certain Anglican leaders in either England or New York. Before leaving Britain, Hunter had asked the Venerable Society to provide him with some general instructions for the Anglican missionaries regarding their demeanor toward dissenters. Some of the Society's directors apparently took umbrage at the implications of his request,

leading Hunter to protest his firm commitment to the English Church and his expectation to remain until death in her benevolent communion. However, just as the purest objects are always in danger of being corrupted, Hunter contended that the Church of England was not without destructive fanatics--"men of Zeal without knowledge, of extensive faith and narrow Charity, men so fond of shadows that they neglect the Substance." Such unthinking zealots, Hunter made clear, ought to be restrained for the good of the faith. His orders from Queen Anne and her ministers instructed him to reconcile men of different beliefs, and he again asked the Society for a letter urging the missionaries of New York "to mix less of human passions with their spiritual endeavours for reconciling Men to the Church; for if the Spirit of Kindness, that is the true Gospel Spirit, cannot work that effect, it is in vain to hope for it from its contrary."[1]

Some Anglicans in New York and New Jersey were in no mood for moderation. While Cornbury had virtually bankrupted the colony with his incompetence and scandalized everyone with his abject transvestism, his arbitrary efforts on behalf of the English Church appealed mightily to some Anglicans. What several Anglican missionaries wanted was a governor who would continue Cornbury's forceful support of their faith and oppose the dissenters but with enough business sense and integrity to keep the province solvent and with a preference for wearing breeches rather than dresses. There

---

[1]Robert Hunter to Secretary, [Gosport], Mar. 4, 1709, S. P. G. Letter Books, Series A, B, C (London, 1964), A, IV, 72; also Mar. 21, 1710, ibid., A, IV, 80.

was too much toleration and moderation already, claimed the Rev. John Talbot, missionary at Burlington and a leader of the militant branch of Anglicanism, "for here's nothing established but such a moderation to all that's good, and such a Tolleration of all that's evil, yea of the most damnable heresies which by the way is a damnable Toleration and worse than the persecution that ever was in the world, for that only destroys men's bodys but these destroy body and soul in hell for ever, which is damnable with a vengeance and will make the best State of poor America worse than the first, if not prevented."[2]

Talbot found it very difficult to catechize the children of his parish because there was no schoolmaster to teach them the fundamentals of reading. Nor were there enough qualified preachers. An American bishop was particularly necessary so that church discipline might be maintained, preachers ordained without risking perilous voyages to England, and communicants appropriately confirmed in the faith. To Caleb Heathcote, just as vital to the success of the English Church in New York was an upright governor well disposed toward the Anglican faith, along with a good printing press for battling heresy and heathenism with books and pamphlets, and a college that would turn out Anglican preachers not only to win the godless to Christ in New York but also to liberate the poor deluded souls in Connecticut and Massachusetts from the

---

[2]John Talbot to Secretary, Burlington, N. J., June 30, 1709, ibid., A, V, 19.

religious tyranny of the petty "popes" indoctrinated at Harvard and Yale.[3]

As Heathcote came to recognize, Hunter was an Anglican of integrity and wanted to advance the interests of the English Church within the bounds of his larger assignment of bringing some semblance of harmony and order to the factious province. The fiery Talbot, however, moved not to accept Hunter's moderate approach, and for several years, the Anglican missionaries of New York and New Jersey, led by Talbot and Rector Vesey of Trinity Church, found little to praise in Hunter's handling of religious affairs. Much of the criticism stemmed from Hunter's reaction to the Presbyterian seizure of the meeting house and parsonage at Jamaica following the death of Reverend Urquhart in 1709. His widow, whose daughter by a former marriage had married a dissenter studying for the ministry, turned the parsonage over to the Presbyterians on condition that she be allowed to live there until her death.[4]

Still enraged by the Makemie prosecution and refusing to concede to Anglican aspirations without a fight, the Presbyterians of Jamaica proceeded to elect vestrymen and church wardens who forthwith called the Reverend George McNish, a Presbyterian minister, and awarded him the salary collected by the dissenting vestrymen

---

[3]Ibid., A, V, 11.

[4]Cornbury's Orders to Rev. John Hubbard to Vacate Parsonage at Jamaica and Related Documents, Documentary History of the State of New York, ed. Edmund B. O'Callaghan, 4 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1850-1851), III, 128; Thomas Poyer to Secretary, Jamaica, Oct. 5, 1710, ibid., 136 (hereafter cited as DHNY).

according to the Ministry Act of 1693. Throughout their deliberations, the Presbyterians ignored the arrival of Thomas Poyer, an Anglican preacher, and his induction by order of Governor Hunter into the church at Jamaica. The governor encouraged Poyer to bring suit against the vestry and church wardens for his salary and the glebe and parsonage. But the justices of the peace were dissenters and found against Poyer, making the angry Anglican pay court costs. Hunter was embarrassed, for he had only recently appointed the justices who now rejected the Anglican claim. Rector Vesey and his colleagues were enraged. They warned the Society that the loss of this cause would be disastrous for the English Church not only in New York but also in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. In fact, they suspected quite correctly that the dissenters in the other "established parrishes" outside of New York City were already poised like vultures, waiting anxiously the death or retirement of the present incumbents to swoop down and pick the broken bones of the beloved English Church.[5]

The success of the Presbyterians at Jamaica inspired dissenters throughout New York. In the neighboring parish of Hempstead, the Reverend John Thomas now found it all the more difficult "to raise the so much despised worship of the purest Church to its own Native Grandeur, dignity & decency." The installation of the Presbyterian McNish was an ominous precedent, potentially destructive of the

---

[5]Poyer to Secretary, May 3, 1711, ibid., 138; Memorial of the Anglican Clergy Relating to Mr. Poyer and the Church of Jamaica to Henry Compton, Bishop of London, Nov. 13, 1711, ibid., 139-44.

slight Anglican establishment in New York. "All the rest of the Missionaries are settled in peace," Thomas wrote the Society in 1710, "and if these People are once more nipped in the Budd, and Mr. Poyer restored to his rights, I presume they'd scarce offer to flutter again as long as there is a crowned head that sways the Scepter of Great Britain."[6] Bartow at Rye, Talbot at Burlington, and especially Vesey at New York all added their voices to the rising chorus of Anglicans calling upon the governor to remove McNish without delay and force the church wardens to pay Poyer his salary.[7]

Hunter was unwilling to run roughshod over the rights of dissenters. Even Chief Justice Roger Mompesson urged him to leave the matter to the courts. Hunter offered Poyer his financial backing if the latter would put his grievances back into the courts, but Poyer claimed to be waiting for instructions from the Society, though the truth was that Vesey had warned Poyer not to trust Hunter and was using all his influence with the Bishop of London to get the governor removed. Vesey did not succeed, partly because Hunter constantly kept the Society informed of his side of the dispute and partly because the governor attracted the support of the two leading Anglican leaders in the province, Lewis Morris

---

[6]John Thomas to Secretary, Hempstead, Apr. 10, 1710, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, VI, 6.

[7]John Bartow to Secretary, Nov. 5, 1710, ibid., A, V, 177; Memorial of the New York Clergy, DHNY, III, 139-44.

and Caleb Heathcote.[8]

Morris saw the Jamaica quarrel as the direct result of Cornbury's ill-advised actions, rather than any lack of zeal on Hunter's part. Looking back at the turbulent history of the Ministry Act, Morris believed that it had been more trouble than it was worth. "The Dissenters [claim] the benefit of it as well," he wrote the Society in 1712, "and the Act without much wresting will admit a construction in their favour as well as ours."[9] The Ministry Act had so antagonized dissenters that they violently opposed the growth of the Anglican faith in America.[10]

To Morris and Heathcote, the moderate policy advanced by Hunter promised to serve the English Church far better than Cornbury's coercive campaign against the Dutch and English dissenters. Eneas MacKenzie on Staten Island and Thomas Barclay at Albany agreed, MacKenzie won the respect of the Dutch and French New Yorkers on Staten Island by being accommodating and by not insisting that the Ministry Act be rigorously enforced there. Similarly, Barclay, who spoke both Dutch and English and had married a woman of Dutch

---

[8]Hunter to Secretary, New York, Aug. 12, 1711, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, VI, 132; also Feb. 25, 1711, ibid., A, VII, 149. Alison Gilbert Olson, "Governor Robert Hunter and the Anglican Church in America," in Statesmen, Scholars and Merchants: Essays in Eighteenth Century History Presented to Dame Lucy Sutherland, ed. Anne Whiteman (Oxford, 1973), 50-64. Caleb Heathcote to Secretary, Jan. 5, 1711, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, VII, 16; also Feb. 14, 1711, ibid., A, VII, 17.

[9]Lewis Morris to Secretary, New York, Jan. 1, 1712, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, VII, 12.

[10]Ibid.

descent, had many members of the Dutch Reformed Church attending his Sunday service after Domine Lydius fell ill. Among his sixty catechumens were children of Dutch extraction, including Lydius' own. By giving them prayer books and a small gratuity, Barclay also prevailed upon the English and Dutch schoolmasters of Albany to teach their pupils the Anglican catechism. At least for the time being, his approach was fruitful:

> Unity in opinion and worship and consent in action are Most desirable qualitys where they can be had; but where they cannot, patience and peace, denying ourselves and seeking the good of our Brethren . . . do make for the credit of our profession and the engaging of others to come into it, is too manifest to need a proof, for tho I have a modest hope I shall ever continue firm to the Church and that no Change of times shall shake my constancy (this thro' God's strength I hope) yet I cannot damn all that differ from me.[11]

Surrounded by Dutch New Yorkers largely of the Reformed faith, Barclay realistically thought in terms of keeping their good will while gradually expanding his Anglican communion.

II

The new governor's policy of moderation and reconciliation, however, did not signal any lessening of the Anglican effort to bring forth unity from diversity. To the contrary, Hunter encouraged the advancement of Anglicanism by patronizing Anglican preachers and teachers. The years between 1710 and 1720 witnessed a remarkable expansion of the Anglican campaign among the Dutch, French, Germans

---

[11]Eneas MacKenzie to Secretary, Staten Island, May 4, 1711, ibid., A, VI, 74. Thomas Barclay to Secretary, Albany, Apr. 17, 1713, ibid., A, VIII, 36; also Dec. 7, 1710, ibid., A, VI, 50.

and English, among blacks both slave and free, and among Indians. This Anglican expansion was spearheaded by education rather than coercion. In 1709, after years of planning and no little personal expense, Caleb Heathcote reported to the Society that Reverend Bondet had at last brought the French congregation at New Rochelle into full communion with the Church of England. Lest this substantial victory be lost through neglect, Heathcote urged the Society to send several dozen books of the English Common Prayer written in French. Heathcote also asked that the S. P. G. supplement the slender and unsure salary Bondet received from his congregation.[12]

In 1709, advancing a similar design, Lewis Morris wrote the Society explaining his "endeavours to persuade the Dutch in my Neighbourhood into a good Opinion of the Church of England, and have had such success that they would I believe joyn a great part of them in the Sacraments and Worship had they Dutch Common Prayer Books and a Minister that understood their Language." Morris already had a minister, Domine Henricus Beys, who had left his quarrelsome congregation at Kingston and was willing to accept Episcopal ordination. Beys was regarded by English and Dutch alike as a very learned, even scholarly young man, and Morris asked the Society to employ him, agreeing to contribute from his own pocket £15 per annum.[13]

As Morris had anticipated, the people of Harlem were at first

---

[12]Heathcote to Secretary, June 13, 1709, ibid., A, V, 5.

[13]Lewis Morris to Secretary, New York City, May 30, 1709, ibid., A, IV, 149.

suspicious of Beys and the motives of his patron, fearing the Anglicans would try to seize the Reformed meeting house. But as the Harlemites gradually decided that Beys was not the advance guard of an Anglican assault on their liberty or property, they allowed him to preach in their church building Sunday afternoons, and several sent their children to his catechetical classes. Although Beys won some of the prominent Dutch families to the Anglican communion, Morris recognized the difficulty that lay ahead. "It is not an easy task to persuade men to change their Religion," he wrote the Society in early 1712, "and I think a great point is gained when they are prevailed upon to have as good an opinion of ours as their own."[14]

Getting the Dutch Reformed at Harlem to have a higher regard for the Church of England was one thing; winning them away from the faith of their fathers and to the Anglican communion was quite another. The Society agreed to subsidize Beys for a year but only on condition that he bring the people of Harlem into conformity with the Church of England. Diligent though he was at preaching and catechizing, Beys was not able to accomplish this almost impossible task. A considerable number were ready to conform, Morris intimated, were it not for the quarterly visits of Domine DuBois from New York City. Similar problems existed elsewhere in the province. Van Driessen in Albany succeeded in arousing the

---

[14]Lewis Morris to Secretary, New York, Jan. 1, 1712, ibid., A, VII, 12; James Riker, Revised History of Harlem: Its Origin and Early Annals (1904; reprint ed., Upper Saddle River, N. J., 1968), 408-9.

Dutch Reformed congregation against the Anglican doctrines purveyed by Barclay. The Albany Dutch, Barclay claimed, then dissuaded the Indians from coming to hear him preach as they had before. Many French Calvinists in Reverend Bondet's congregation at New Rochelle also balked at Anglican conformity, although after much contention Bondet kept the congregation firm to the English Church.[15]

The Anglican attempts to lure the German Calvinist and Lutheran refugees from the Palatinate into conformity with the Church of England were also largely unsuccessful. Having been driven from their homes by the wrack and ruin of the War of the Spanish Succession, the Palatines were warmly welcomed by Queen Anne into England, although English officials were not quite sure what to do with the displaced Germans who numbered almost 13,000 by the end of 1709. Beginning early the next year, English officials decided to ship some 3,000 of them to New York, where they were to be settled and engaged in producing naval stores for the Board of Trade. Each Palatine family initially received a small subsidy from the queen, and the German preachers, who were expected to bring their respective Calvinist and Lutheran flocks into the Anglican fold, were paid extra for ministering to the spiritual needs of the immigrants.[16]

---

[15]Lewis Morris to Secretary, New York, Jan. 1, 1712, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, VII, 12; Barclay to Secretary, Albany, Jan. 12, 1712, ibid., A, VI, 129; Bondet to Secretary, July 14, 1710, ibid., A, V, 135.

[16]Walter Allen Knittle, The Early Eighteenth Century Palatine Emigration (Philadelphia, 1937), 39, 65-66, 109, 130-34, 143-46.

The Palatines had scarcely begun to arrive in New York when Lewis Morris reported to the Society that the Germans who were conforming to the English Church were doing so less out of conviction than out of a sense of obligation to the English Crown and Church for helping them. The German Calvinists led by the Reverend John Frederick Haegar were already complaining about their participation in the Anglican communion because they had heard that their Lutheran countrymen were not conforming to the English Church. Preacher Haegar himself informed the Society shortly thereafter that the Lutheran minister, Joshua Kocherthal, had persuaded his communicants "to stick to that in which they were bred and borne." The Anglicanism intended to unite the Palatines simply did not have the potency to prevent their separation into Lutheran and Reformed congregations, though Kocherthal and Haegar respectively protested their dedication to the Society and to the Anglican creed.[17] Kocherthal contended that it was not he but his Lutheran congregation that was averse to union with the English Church. By November 1710, he reported "that I have brought them to receive the Holy Sacrament upon the knees and to take the ordinary bread instead of wafers which we use in Germany." Writing shortly before Kocherthal, Haegar reckoned he had "500 Communicants, of whom 52 were Instructed by me in the fundamentals of the Christian Religion according to the Church

---

[17]Lewis Morris to Secretary, New York, July 5, 1710, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, IV, 143; John Frederick Haegar to Secretary, New York City, July 25, 1710, ibid., A, VI, 21.

of England Catechism, 13 of whom were papists."[18] Both ministers asked for Common Prayer books, catechisms, and psalters written in German. The process of Anglicization was at least moving forward.

As the Palatines moved up the Hudson valley, they settled in fairly close but nonetheless scattered villages. Several of the villages were on land belonging to Robert Livingston, the chairman of the committee appointed by Hunter to oversee the Palatine project. In one of these, Queensberry, Haegar bought materials from Robert Livingston to build a school in 1711. The next year, though, Governor Hunter, having already gone deeply into debt to support the Palatines, stopped providing them allowances, and the construction of the school apparently stopped as well. Believing that they had been settled on poor land and taken advantage of by both Governor Hunter and Robert Livingston, many of the Palatines moved farther up the Hudson and into the Mohawk valley, where land disputes later drove most of them to Pennsylvania. Of all the towns ministered to by Haegar, Germantown alone conformed to the Anglican faith. None of the settlements Kocherthal preached to gave up its Lutheranism for Anglicanism.[19]

Except for the French at New Rochelle and the Germans at Germantown, the Anglicans were unable to convert en masse congregations

---

[18]Joshua Kocherthal to Secretary, New York City, Nov. 15, 1710, ibid., A, VI, 52. Haegar to Secretary, Oct. 20, 1710, ibid., A, VI, 44; also Oct. 24, 1715, ibid., A, XI, 275.

[19]Haegar to Secretary, July 16, 1713, ibid., A, VIII, 53, pp. 189-90; Knittle, Early Palatine Emigration, 161, 180-207.

of different denominations. Morris' attempt at Harlem failed completely, and Barclay saw his congregation shrink and began to experience considerable harassment following the arrival of Domine Peter Van Driessen in 1711. Ironically, while boycotted by angry Presbyterians, Poyer at Jamaica found his congregation greatly augmented by many Dutch who had become estranged from their church by the bitter feud between Domines Freeman and Antonides, which disrupted the Dutch Reformed Church of Kings County for a decade and a half. As for the English dissenters, many an Anglican must have agreed with the statement of the exasperated Roland Ellis, schoolmaster at Burlington. "We are beset with Heathenism, Paganism, Quakerism, and God knows what," wrote Ellis in 1714, "having the Law in their hands and our Lives & Liberties att their Mercy."[20]

In many instances, individuals became Anglicans out of spite rather than principle. In 1711, Lewis Morris was bold enough to claim that not one out of ten Anglicans in the province was a credit to the church. Disappointing though it surely was, Morris did not find that grim fact surprising, "for as New England excepting some families was the scum of the old, so the greatest part of the English in this Province was the scum of the New, who brought as many opinions almost as persons, but neither Religion nor Virtue, and have acquired very little Since." Morris wrote off the parents

---

[20]Lewis Morris to Secretary, New York, Jan. 1, 1712, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, VII, 12; also Feb. 20, 1712, ibid., A, VII, 13. Barclay to Secretary, New York, Oct. 22, 1714, ibid., A, IX, 36, p. 158; Richard Ellis to Secretary, Burlington, May 20, 1714, ibid., A, IX, 35, p. 155.

in particular and adults in general; they were too far deluded to be salvaged. "It is with the rising Generation the Work is to be done," Morris wrote, "and schools will be one great measure of doing it. . . ."[21]

Caleb Heathcote agreed. He dusted off his old plan of getting more schoolmasters to conform to the rules and regulations of the S. P. G. by giving them a small gratuity, about £5 or £6 sterling. "I must confess I look upon it the best Charity which can be laid out upon the Americans," wrote Heathcote, "there being very little hope of making Christians of any but the rising generation." Anglican missionaries in New York confirmed Heathcote's and Morris' analysis of where the emphasis of Anglican mission should be. But good schoolmasters were hard to find and harder still to keep because the pay was usually poor. In 1712, John Thomas at Hempstead implored the Society to provide a small annual salary for a schoolmaster at the village. "Honorable Sirs," he pleaded, "you may Strenuously promote for the Sake of those poor People, especially the children, who run about, for want of Letters and education, as wild, uncultivated, and unimproved as the Soyle was when their forefathers first tread it." Thomas went on to emphasize that it was virtually impossible for him to catechize the youth of his parish properly "without the help of a School Master, first

---

[21]Lewis Morris to Secretary, New York, Feb. 20, 1712, ibid., A, VII, 13.

to initiate the children."[22]

When requesting assistance from the Society for schoolmasters, Anglican missionaries like Thomas usually reiterated the necessity not only of teaching children the Gospel according to the Anglican communion but also of imposing order and discipline upon the anarchic lives "of our poor Children, who run wild about our Streets and are truly objects of the Honourable Society's great pity."[23] In the vocabulary of Thomas and his colleagues, wild meant rowdy and undisciplined; but it also meant disorderly in a religious sense, either openly irreligious or more often embracing Quakerism or some other brand of dissenting delusion. John Bridges, the missionary at Rye, found the Quaker madness springing up in his parish as migrants from overcrowded Queens County crossed Long Island Sound and settled in Westchester County. Dismissing the older Quakers as obstinate fools, Bridges found their children much more receptive to the "truths" of Anglican doctrine, and while complaining that Schoolmaster Cleator made too many concessions to the sectarians and did not bring his pupils to church as he should, Bridges had to look long and hard before he found Richard Cudrey, a teacher he believed to be sound in doctrine and morals.[24]

---

[22]Heathcote to Secretary, Dec. 12, 1711, ibid., A, VII, 14; John Thomas to Secretary, Hempstead, Feb. 20, 1712, ibid., A, VII, 8.

[23]John Thomas to Secretary, Hempstead, 1713, ibid., A, VIII, 52, pp. 188-89.

[24]Christopher Bridges to Secretary, Rye, Oct. 4, 1714, ibid., A, IX, 39, p. 164; also Mar. 20, 1715, ibid., A, XI, 312.

Because it was assumed to inculcate values in the rising generation, the school became a potent weapon for both Anglicans and dissenters in New York. The Society's schoolmaster at Burlington, Roland Ellis, was settled in the midst of a Quaker stronghold. He grew to loathe the followers of George Foxe, but not their children, some of whom he catechized and won over to a favorable opinion of the much despised Anglican Church. Regarding the irreligion of the time as the logical result of Quakerism, Ellis especially deplored the many people who regarded "neither Religion nor Learning nor their Children's welfare but bring them up like themselves, Heathen-like, having neither knowledge nor understanding of future things, nor indeed things present, unless [it] be how to gitt an Estate." Ellis was particularly grieved "to see so many idle Children leading one another to all manner of wickedness and follow mischevious Practices, but much more to hear their Parents indulge & uphold them therein. I have begged of them," Ellis concluded, "to send their Children to School but to no purpose."[25]

Such people were at least as numerous in New York as in West Jersey. As Bartow, Bridges, and Thomas were wont to emphasize, their efforts to bring forth Anglican unity from the admixture of peoples in New York were made equally difficult by both the dissenters and the irreligious. Under such circumstances, the Anglican missionaries were especially careful in choosing schoolmasters, whose work was hardly less critical than that of the missionary

---

[25]Roland Ellis to Secretary, Burlington, Aug. 23, 1714, ibid., A, IX, 35, pp. 155-58.

himself. After considerable searching, John Bartow and the people of Westchester proudly presented to the Society "our present Schoolmaster Mr. Charles Glover as a person well qualified to instruct the Youth of our place as well in the Principles of holy Religion (according to the Liturgy of the Church of England) as in reading, writing, arithmetick and also in the Latin Tongue so that we have good hopes of the rising generation if the said Schoolmaster can be Encouraged to continue among us." In 1715, John Thomas reported to the Society that he had at last secured a fine schoolmaster. The missionary of Hempstead explained that Thomas Gildersleeve "is truly a good honest man, & is from a rigid dissenter, become a hearty & zealous Churchman, and has prevailed upon his family, which is numerous, to conform accordingly." Thomas was very pleased, and rightly so.[26]

If schoolmasters were expected to play a significant part in laying the foundation for the Anglican Church among English dissenters in New York, their work among non-English New Yorkers on behalf of the Church of England was regarded as essential. From the very beginning of his ministry on Staten Island, Eneas MacKenzie had insisted that the success of the Anglican mission there depended considerably on teaching the children of the largely Dutch and partly French population the English language. Between 1705 and 1722, MacKenzie secured small stipends for many schoolmasters who

---

[26]Bartow to Secretary, Apr. 10, 1714, ibid., A, IX, 7, p. 107; Petition of the Inhabitants of Westchester to the Society, Apr. 10, 1714, ibid., A, IX, 8, p. 108; John Thomas to Secretary, Hempstead, Oct. 1, 1715, ibid., A, XI, 276-77.

in turn promised to catechize their children in Anglican doctrines and abide by the rules and regulations of the S. P. G. At Albany, Thomas Barclay not only preached and catechized in both Dutch and English but distributed the poor fund among English and Dutch schoolmasters who reciprocated by instructing their students in the Anglican catechism. In 1712, informing the Society that he sometimes preached at Yonkers to a large congregation of both Dutch and English, Thomas Bartow averred that "if we could have a Schoolmaster Settled there it would be of great use to Instruct the Dutch Children in English reading which I know they would be very glad of." And of course there was William Huddlestone, who had taught for years before being appointed the Society's schoolmaster at New York City in 1710. By the time of his death in 1724, Huddlestone had taught over six hundred students, including scores of Dutch and French children, the English language and the Anglican catechism.[27]

Regardless of whom they were teaching the schoolmasters subsidized by the S. P. G. followed the same general method, though there were pronounced differences in personal style and approach. The Society's rules and regulations for schoolmasters assured a certain amount of uniformity. School began with the Morning Prayer and concluded with the Evening Prayer and perhaps the singing of a psalm. Students were to memorize the Prayers as well as the Anglican catechism and be catechized by the pastor before the

---

[27] Eneas MacKenzie to Secretary, Richmond County, June 13, 1709, ibid., A, V, 18; Thomas Barclay to Secretary, Albany, Apr. 17, 1713, ibid., A, VIII, 36; Bartow to Secretary, Westchester, Dec. 1712, ibid., A, VII, 31; William Huddlestone to Secretary, July 22, 1715, ibid., A, X, 20.

congregation. The schoolmaster was especially to cultivate the proper manners and morals of his charges, boys and girls alike. But while requiring the schoolmaster to teach his pupils to read the Bible and understand its meaning, the Society also insisted that the students be taught "to write a plain and legible Hand, in order to the fitting them for useful Employments; with as much Arithmetick as shall be necessary to the same Purpose."[28]

Consider the method of two schoolmasters employed by the S. P. G. Teaching mainly the poor because the parents of his paying students had fled the charity school label, William Huddlestone in New York City taught his pupils "in the Forenoon to spell, read & write till Eleven a clock, at which time the Bell calls us to Prayers, where we daily appear to the great Growth and Encouragement of that Infant Church." From 1:00 to 5:00 p.m., Huddlestone exercised them in reading, spelling, writing, and cyphering, closing the day with the reading or singing of a few psalms. Needless to add, Huddlestone scrupulously ushered his charges to Trinity Church every Sabbath, taught them the catechism three days every week, and following the Sunday morning worship service, he brought them back to the school and questioned them about the sermon they had just heard and further exercised them "out of Lewis's Explanation

---

[28]William Webb Kemp, The Support of Schools in Colonial New York by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, Teachers College Contribution to Education, no. 56 (New York, 1913), 54-61, quotation on 58, Rule IV.

of the Catechism."[29]

By way of comparison, William Forster, formerly a midshipman in the British navy, became schoolmaster at Westchester on May 1, 1717. The following November, Forster reported having thirty-five scholars, ten of whom were unbaptized, including five Quakers. The well-organized schoolmaster divided his students according to their respective studies. Mr. Bartow's son was "in his Grammar; six schollars learn Arithmatick, whereof one in Practice, three in Reduction, one in Multiplication, and the other in addition." Of the remaining twenty-six, nine were learning to write, and the other seventeen to read and spell. "The Books I use for the children to spell and read in are the Primers (when to be got) with the Church Catechism in them, Psalters, Common Prayer Books, Testaments and Bibles, in some one of which the Children that spell or read four Lessons per Diem and those that write and cast accompts read twice per Diem." He catechized weekly, making the Quakers attend, but taking care not to ask the unbaptized any improper questions.[30]

Of considerable importance to missionary and schoolmaster alike for advancing the Anglican faith in New York were the thousands of books and tracts supplied by the Venerable Society. Some of the volumes were especially designated for the parochial library of a particular parish, where the missionary, schoolmasters, and

---

[29]William Huddlestone to Secretary, New York City, Sept. 14, 1716, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, XII, 4.

[30]William Forster to Secretary, Westchester, Nov. 2, 1717, ibid., A, XII, 364-65.

lay leaders might prepare themselves to refute the dissenters and expose heresy and godlessness. Far more numerous were the books and tracts distributed freely or at minimal cost to the people. Among these were innumerable copies of the Book of Common Prayer in French, German and Dutch as well as the standard English, various versions of the Anglican catechism, especially Bishop Beveridge's Catechism and Lewis' Exposition of the Church Catechism, Richard Allestree's The Whole Duty of Man, Archbishop Tillotson's famous Sermons (which appealed to dissenters and churchmen alike), countless homilies, primers, and hornbooks, just to mention a few. The emphasis on obedience in such books has been generally recognized; but nonconformist religious literature had almost the same emphasis on order, discipline and obedience to higher authority. What has not been explored sufficiently is the tremendous demand even among dissenters for such books, pamphlets, and tracts, suggesting a higher level of literacy--and perhaps even religiosity--than has usually been associated with colonial New York at this early time.[31]

What this abundance of printed matter clearly did not do was win large numbers of New Yorkers to the Anglican faith, though thousands of New Yorkers read them or heard them read. At the very least, Anglican missionaries believed that the literature they circulated among the dissenters would remove the deep aversion against the English Church because of the "prejudice of birth

---

[31]Frank J. Klingberg, Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York (Philadelphia, 1940), 141-44, esp. 144n; Kemp, Support of Schools in Colonial New York, 82-83, 147.

and education." Trapped between obstinate New England dissenters on the one side and fanatical Jersey Quakers on the other side, New Yorkers might be saved from "the Poyson they imbibe from the books they have heretofore been conversant in: by those most Sovereign Antidotes, the most learned unanswerable writings of the true Obedient Sons of the purest of Churches."[32] Barclay at Albany, Thomas at Hempstead, Bridges at Rye, Bartow at Westchester and the other missionaries praised the S. P. G. for sending books. Judging from the relatively few Anglicans in New York despite their frenetic efforts, it must be said that the missionaries and schoolmasters of the S. P. G. were much more successful in encouraging literacy than in winning converts to the English Church.[33]

III

While serving as chaplain to the British garrison at New York City from 1704 to 1717, the Reverend John Sharpe worked to catalog the books in the parochial libraries of the various missionaries in the province. Along with Reverend Talbot of Burlington, Chaplain Sharpe seriously considered ways of establishing a library in New York City that would be particularly serviceable to Anglican

---

[32]Thomas Poyer to Secretary, Jamaica, Oct. 24, 1717, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, XII, 359.

[33]Though dealing with the eighteenth century before the American Revolution, John Calam discusses with insight the impact of S. P. G. literature in Parsons and Pedagogues: The S. P. G. Adventure in American Education (New York, 1971), 62-102.

preachers, teachers, and lay leaders. Given the enormity of the task of trying to anglicize New York, Sharpe believed that such a library was absolutely necessary. "The design of the Venerable Society being so glorious as the spreading the light of the Gospel into the dark Corners of the earthe," wrote Sharpe in 1710, "where Infidelity has so long possessed the Natives as Profaness and Irreligion has overspread those that make profession of Xianity, that between them both there is little of the fear of God or true Substantial piety to be seen amongst us."[34] Returning to England in 1713, Sharpe took with him a plan for propagating learning as well as Anglicanism in colonial New York.

With the assistance of God, Sharpe was determined to have his "Proposals for Erecting a School, Library and Chapel at New York" put into practice. Like Miller and Heathcote before him, Sharpe was not successful with his particular scheme. Nevertheless, what he intended to do is important because of the astute insights and observations that shaped his thinking on education in colonial New York. By explaining why his proposals ought to be put into effect, Sharpe inadvertently answered the question of why his plan failed. "A Public School" headed his list for advancing piety and learning in materialistic New York, especially in the city itself. "There is hardly any thing which is more wanted in this Country than learning," he lamented, "there being no place I know of in

---

[34]John Sharpe to Secretary, New York, Dec. 4, 1710, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, VI, 1.

America where it is either less encouraged or regarded."[35] Sharpe believed that this neglect of letters was undoubtedly the result of the mercantile atmosphere that prevailed in the city and much of the province as well. Indeed, given "the Genius of the people so inclined to merchandize," scholarships would at first almost have to be forced upon the young. Yet once the benefits of serious study were recognized, Sharpe contended optimistically, "the improvement of a few would stir up Emulation not only in the Children but in their parents, and the happy influence would reach the most distant parts of the province."[36]

The public school Sharpe envisioned for New York City would provide instruction in Latin as well as English and other subjects usually taught in a grammar school. Students would come from throughout the province to the school, where not only their minds but also their manners and morals would be well improved. "This would reconcile them early to the National Church," wrote the Anglican chaplain, "and we might hope that in the rising generation there would be Unity, Uniformity, Loyalty, and Brotherly Love." The Anglican nature of the school was soft-pedalled. The master of the school, for example, was to be of sober and grave conversation, able to command respect and exercise authority, a man truly dedicated to God, but his Anglican faith was assumed rather than stressed

---

[35]John Sharpe, "Proposals for Erecting a School, Library and Chapel at New York (Mar. 11, 1713)," in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1880 (New York, 1881), 341.

[36]Ibid., 341-42.

outright. Only when Sharpe enumerated the rules of the school did he strike a partisan Anglican note. Even that was muted, with the emphasis on daily devotion and the proper observation of the Sabbath and holy days, though he roundly upbraided Dutch New Yorkers for respecting Sunday only during the hours of divine service and spending the rest of the day in idle play or blasphemous business. To be sure, the school would begin and conclude each day with the appropriate Anglican prayers. Every Sunday and holy day the students would meet and go to church together in the morning, and that afternoon spend an hour in catechetical exercises.[37]

While seeking support in England for what would certainly be an Anglican school, Sharpe set forth proposals that reflected both the tolerant Anglicanism first popularized years earlier by Archbishop Tillotson in England and the conciliatory religious policy advocated and practiced by Governor Hunter in New York. His appeal was to academic excellence as well as religious and moral probity. The schoolmaster must therefore be of sound judgment, even temper, and much knowledge, possessing a genius for the subject he would teach and for that elusive ability to instruct others effectively and pleasureably. Sharpe also emphasized that it would be most advantageous if the schoolmaster knew Dutch and French. The chaplain contended that New York City was the ideal place for the school. Everything the students might need was more abundant there "than in any other place on the Continent, besides a collateral

---

[37]Ibid., 344, 345.

advantage of learning both Dutch & French which are very useful accomplishments to scholars, as well as to travellers or traders." Sharpe also proudly pointed out that it was possible "to learn Hebrew here as well as in Europe, there being a Synagogue of Jews and many ingenious men of that nation from Poland, Hungary, Germany, &c."[38]

To house the school, Sharpe wanted a structure large enough to accommodate with ease one hundred and fifty students. On one side of the building, there would be an upper and lower room for the schoolmaster; on the other side, Sharpe suggested there should be a lower room for the clergy coming to the city from the country. And above that room, another of the same dimensions might house the school library, which the chaplain indicated might just as well be the provincial library, the last part of his tripartite educational plan for New York. The "Public Library" that Sharpe described would thus be ideally located to serve the students, clergymen in the city, and the public as well. The library would circulate books to the public, but a strict policy was to be enforced requiring the borrower to deposit with the librarian a sum exceeding the price of the borrowed book, to be forfeited should the book not be returned as scheduled. The trustees of the library would be appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, but the governor, the mayor of New York City, and a clergyman were to inspect the library every three years, reporting its growth

---

[38] Ibid., 342-43.

or decline to the trustees in England.[39]

Sharpe fully expected the library to advance both learning and piety in colonial New York. It would be open every day at convenient hours, and anyone might select a book and read in the library during its open hours. Once the library was under way, Sharpe thought it would receive an increasing number of books from benefactors both in New York and in England. To get things started, Sharpe volunteered his own library of some 150 volumes. He also urged that an act of Assembly be secured to buy and add to the public library the many books in the collections of the deceased Domines Lydius of Albany and Selyns of New York, along with the extensive library belonging to the scholarly Mr. Beys, who was then minister at Harlem. To the mainly religious and philosophical works that he and the preachers had acquired, Sharpe advocated the acquisition of "a small collection of Physick and Surgery in the hands of the Heirs of Dr. Gaudeneau. . . ."[40]

A public school and a public library were likely to do much to advance both learning and Anglicanism in provincial New York. But equally important to Sharpe was the construction of a "Catechizing Chappel" for the black and Indian slaves of New York City. Devoting at least half of the total narrative of his "Proposals" to the section on the catechizing chapel alone, Sharpe was quite clearly trying to do two things. First, he wanted to explain and defend the good work of his friend Elias Neau, S. P. G. catechist to the

---

[39]Ibid., 343-44, 346-47.

[40]Ibid., 348.

slaves of New York City since 1704. Second, he wanted to advance the Christianizing of the slaves throughout the province by constructing a chapel where the slaves might worship as well as receive catechetical instruction.

At the time Sharpe put forth his proposals, Elias Neau desperately needed all the friends and defenders he could get. On the night of April 6/7, 1712, some twenty to thirty slaves set fire to a privy and killed nine whites and wounded seven others who came rushing to put out the fire. Thus began what looked to be a well-planned slave insurrection. The city militia crushed the revolt the next day, and twenty-seven slaves were tried for conspiracy, twenty-one of them being convicted and executed. Although only two of Neau's catechumens were implicated in the conspiracy--and one of them was almost surely innocent of any association with the abortive slave uprising--Neau came under harsh attack. In fact, some New Yorkers claimed that regardless of whether Neau's black students were directly involved, the mere existence of the catechetical school inspired the slave conspirators at least in part.[41]

While arguing his case for the catechizing chapel, Sharpe described in graphic detail the diligence of the dedicated Neau, who had labored under the worst of conditions to bring Christianity to the slaves. Sharpe recounted how Neau had himself served some

---

[41]Sheldon S. Cohen, "Elias Neau, Instructor to New York's Slaves," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LV (Jan. 1971), 7-27; Sharpe, "Proposals," 352-53.

seven years as a galley slave in a French vessel because he would not recant his Protestant beliefs before Catholic magistrates.[42] From that experience Neau was convinced that his faith alone had preserved his sanity and health. Observing the vile lot of many slaves and the reluctance or negligence of their owners to instruct them in Christianity, Neau, who was at the time a deacon in the French Protestant Church of New York, first broached the subject of a catechist for the Negroes to the S. P. G. in 1702. The next year, he began catechizing some slaves on his own initiative, and was officially employed at £50 per annum by the S. P. G. in 1704.[43]

A successful merchant, Neau gave up his business to devote his time to his new work. Neau was a remarkable teacher, and his students were generally anxious to learn, but he labored under various hardships. Many masters callously begrudged the little time their slaves spent after work once or twice a week attending Neau's catechetical sessions held every Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday. At Neau's urging, the provincial government passed a law in 1706 clearly stating that a black slave remained a slave after being baptized as a Christian; neverless, some slave owners continued to believe--or claimed they did--that a Christian could not be a slave, nor a slave a Christian, and kept their slaves

---

[42]Cohen, "Elias Neau," 10-12; Sharpe, "Proposals," 348-50.

[43]Elias Neau to Secretary, New York, July 10, 1703, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, I, 106; also July 4, 1704, ibid., A, I, 177; also Apr. 1704, ibid., A, I, 178. Klingberg, Anglican Humanitarianism, 124-27.

away from Neau for that reason.[44]

Having overcome considerable opposition, Neau was teaching about one hundred slaves when the insurrection of April 1712 occurred. New Yorkers kept their slaves at home, and Neau became the convenient scapegoat for many people who were much too fearful to probe beneath the surface for either the causes or the consequences of the slave uprising. Sharpe rightly emphasized that Neau taught his catechumens obedience to masters as part of their Christian duty. Indeed, the chaplain suggested that the devout Neau had probably done more than anyone else to defuse the explosive emotions of slaves reacting to an almost unbearably dismal existence. Sharpe also made bold to challenge the morality of prohibiting Christian slaves from testifying at law, of denying them in many instances Christian marriages, and of breaking up slave families. The chaplain hoped that one day the white Christians of New York would organize a religious society dedicated to promoting the Gospel and improving the living conditions of the slaves. And for that reason, the catechizing chapel was of critical importance.[45]

Such a structure, Sharpe insisted, would encourage New Yorkers to become more concerned about the spiritual condition of blacks. It was essential if Neau was to catechize larger groups of slaves

---

[44]Sharpe, "Proposals," 351-54; Neau to Secretary, New York, Apr. 30, 1706, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, II, 167; also July 22, 1707, ibid, A, III, 80. For a detailed account of the S. P. G. mission to Negroes in New York at this time, see Klingberg, Anglican Humanitarianism, 121-38.

[45]Sharpe, "Proposals," 353-56.

and hold worship services with them on Sundays and holy days. Through the chapel, Neau's good work would produce such salutory results that public prejudice against Christianizing the slaves would disappear, and such a change in attitude was just as important for the education of whites as for blacks. "It is evident to all that live in this country, or can form a notion of it, as of a rich soil overgrown with weeds," he concluded. "Ingenious youth left uncultivated and tractable slaves left in ignorance and infidelity, how usefull these three things would be to the public, how highly advantageous to all ranks and degrees of men amongst us that there were a public School, a Public Library, and a Catechizing Chappell."[46]

Such was Sharpe's proposal for advancing education and Anglicanism in colonial New York. Given the strenuous efforts of the S. P. G. to proselytize the Indians at the time, it seems somewhat incongruous that the astute Sharpe made no mention of educating the natives as well as the ignorant colonists and the infidel slaves of colonial New York. Many Anglican missionaries and laymen in the field, however, believed that the Society should concentrate on irreligious colonists before concerning itself with either the Indians or the slaves. "To convert a heathen to Christianity is a very good & pious work," wrote John Thomas from Hempstead in 1709, "but to reconcile the English, in a great measure sunk into paganism & Infidelity to the principles of the Christian faith is with humble Submission, I imagine, a far worthier employment." As for the

---

[46]Ibid., 357.

English, Thomas said it was possible to bring them to Christ, but it was impossible to redeem the Indians, who were "wholly given up to drink and Sottishness, Rum and Strong Liquor being the only Deities they now care or are solicitious to worship."[47]

Thomas' sentiments were endorsed by several other missionaries in the province. Caleb Heathcote, who knew the political importance of placing missionaries among the Five Indian Nations, also argued that the colonists themselves ought to be the first concern of the S. P. G. Contending that blacks ought to be proselytized first, Elias Neau described the Indians as "miserable creatures who breathe nothing but Blood and Slaughter." Referring to John Elliot's work among the Algonquin Indians of New England, Neau doubted that the worthy Elliot ever made a true convert of any Indian. "In a Word, they are People who have nothing but the Figure of Man," concluded Neau, "and I am not surprized [that] the good & pious Mr. Moor has been obliged to say as St. Paul, since you refuse the Light which I would have given, I shake off the Dust of my Feet, and I leave you in your dismal unbelief."[48] The Mr. Moore referred to was Thoroughgood Moore, the first Society missionary to the Indians, who had arrived in New York in 1704. By November of the following year, Moore had given up on the Indians. He found the opposition of Dutch traders, the immoral example set by the

---

[47]John Thomas to Secretary, Hempstead, June 12, 1709, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, V, 6.

[48]Neau to Secretary, New York, Nov. 15, 1705, ibid., A, II, 125; Klingberg, Anglican Humanitarianism, 51-56.

English garrison at Albany, and the ill opinion the Indians had of the Englishmen because of New Englanders stealing their land huge obstacles that made it almost impossible to teach them Christian doctrines.[49]

Interest in the Indians by the Society lagged until 1710 when Peter Schuyler brought four Iroquois sachems from New York to London, where they appealed directly to Queen Anne for missionaries. Schuyler had taken the chiefs to England to drum up support for another British invasion of Canada, but all of London suddenly seemed astir with concern for the spiritually ignorant Indians of America. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London convened with the leading members of the Venerable Society and afterward declared that the S. P. G.'s primary mission would be to convert the heathen, sending missionaries among white Christians only where the incumbent pastors had died or left--a proviso dissenters claimed with justification the S. P. G. had grossly violated.[50]

While preparing to send a missionary to the Iroquois, the Society for the time being appointed Thomas Barclay its missionary and catechist for both Albany and Schenectady. His duties included instructing the neighboring Indians, and the Indian Commissioners at Albany turned over to him a young Indian lad to be trained as a teacher. Contacting Domine Freeman, who had formerly ministered

---

[49]Thoroughgood Moore to Secretary, Albany, Mar. 8, 1705, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, II, 75; also New York, Nov. 13, 1705, ibid., A, II, 122.

[50]Klingberg, Anglican Humanitarianism, 57-60; Kemp, Support of Schools in Colonial New York, 30-31.

to the Indians while pastor at Schenectady, Barclay secured from the Dutch Reformed preacher translations into Mohawk the latter had made of the Anglican liturgy and sent them to England for publication. He also pointed out certain well-known obstacles to Christianizing the Mohawks: the immoral behavior of English soldiers garrisoned at Albany, the hostility of the fur traders who feared that missionaries might interfere with their commerce, and finally the craving the Indians had for liquor and their reluctance to give up heathen customs.[51]

Governor Hunter had his own doubts that the Indians would ever be Christianized without first learning English and adopting many of the white man's ways. But the governor nonetheless instructed Peter Schuyler to go ahead and build a fort and chapel in the Indian country. The structures and the settlement that grew around them became known as Fort Hunter. Meanwhile, Barclay increased his efforts among the Indians, much encouraged by the solicitations of some fifty Indians at Schenectady who had been converted by either French priests, or Domines Dellius, Lydius, or Freeman. "After I had catechised several of them," Barclay wrote of the latter in June 1711, "I found three fit for receiving the Sacraments, and the day following being Sunday they very devoutly received it at my hands; the same day I Christened two of their Children."

---

[51] Barclay to Secretary, Albany, Sept. 26, 1710, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, V, 176.

He also began worship services in the Indian Chapel.[52]

In November 1712, Barclay's load was lightened by the arrival at Albany of the Reverend William Andrews, the missionary the Society had sent to build upon the shaky Christian foundations that Barclay and his Dutch predecessors had laid among the Indians. Idealistic but hardly naive, the young Andrews received such a friendly reception from the Indians first at Albany and then at Fort Hunter that he had every reason to anticipate swiftly bringing the Mohawks to Christ and under the watchful care of the Anglican Church. He was assisted by a Dutch New Yorker who was fluent in Indian but who knew little English and by John Oliver, formerly clerk to Barclay, whose primary purpose at first was just to translate Dutch into English and vice versa. Andrews entered his mission with high hopes and seemed to be making remarkable progress for a few years, but the Indians grew restless and less pliant toward him. By 1719 his hopes had turned into despair.[53]

There were, of course, certain problems from the beginning. The English soldiers at Fort Hunter were a lecherous and profane lot, and Dutch fur traders or "handlers" were not especially sympathetic to ministers among the Indians, lest anyone interfere with "their Extortion, deceitful Dealings, lying and cheating," as

---

[52]Hunter to Secretary, New York City, Nov. 14, 1710, ibid., A, V, 178. Barclay to Secretary, Albany, June 12, 1711, ibid., A, VI, 129; also Nov. 21, 1711, Albany, ibid., A, VII, 2.

[53]Klingberg, Anglican Humanitarianism, 62-65; William Andrews to Secretary, Fort Hunter, Mar. 9, 1713, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, VIII, 26.

Andrews put it. And the Indians, it was alleged, were much given to strong drink and adulterous behavior, changing wives whenever they chose. Yet the Indians came in increasing numbers to hear Andrews preach, have him baptize their children, and eat the food and take the trinkets and trifles that the missionary gave them. Andrews shortly proposed that Indian youths be taught to read and write, to which their parents agreed. As to whether the young Indians should be taught to read and write English or their own tongue, Andrews believed it best "to keep them to their own Language, for it has been observed that those that speak English are the worst, because it gives them opportunity of cavorting the more with the English as also with the Dutch who speak English, and so to learn their vices. . . ."[54]

The Indians began to build a school, and Andrews put forward John Oliver as schoolmaster, asking the Society to approve his decision in this matter. When he began teaching in 1714, Oliver had about forty students, some of whom were young Indian braves in their middle teens. The interpreter assisted Oliver with the teaching and began translating portions of various books of the Bible into Mohawk. Most of the young Indians learned well enough, Andrews reported in 1714, "but would learn much better if we had printed Books for them." Therefore, Andrews sent to the Society for printing Indian translations of the Church Catechism, Morning and Evening Prayer, the Litany, Psalms, and English hornbooks.

---

[54]Andrews to Secretary, Mar. 9, 1713, ibid., A, VIII, 24-26.

The Society urged that the Indians learn English, but the missionary explained that the Indians opposed teaching their children any other language but their own, though they might later be induced to learn English, thereby providing much-needed interpreters for the colony. Besides, Andrews defended teaching in Mohawk, contending that the Indians would now learn as much in one year using their own language as they could in three using English.[55]

As for his own method of instruction, Andrews reported that he took care to explain in detail the principles of Christianity. His sermons were delivered simply, drawing upon everyday examples in terms the Indians could understand. He also taught part of the Anglican catechism and explicated portions of Scripture. Most important, he emphasized the duty to live in the faith and put paganism and immorality behind. The piety of one Indian woman particularly impressed him. She devoutly attended his preaching and catechizing sessions, listening very intently as the interpreter translated. Following the sermon or catechetical exercise, she gathered the more pious Indians together at one of their wigwams, and there they discussed the sermon, talking about parts that one or the other might not have understood completely. Some of the Indians also met together for prayer meetings which sometimes lasted for hours. The following summer, Andrews was happy to report that the "young people begin to marry very orderly," looking upon

---

[55]Andrews to Secretary, Fort Hunter, Sept. 7, 1714, ibid., A, VIII, 51.

their former custom of taking wives at pleasure as scandalous.[56]

Despite this promising beginning, Andrews began to encounter so many difficulties that his mission to the Indians declined rapidly after 1715. Some of his fellow clergymen were critical of his methods. Thomas Haliday, for example, the missionary at Perth Amboy, complained to the Society in 1715 that Andrews improperly taught the Indians the catechism and prayers of the English Church before the ignorant creatures understood very much of Christianity. Haliday also charged that Andrews' translations into the Indian tongue were most imperfect. Such sniping from his colleagues increased during the next few years.[57] But what troubled Andrews most of all was the flagging support of the Indians themselves. By early summer 1714, he admitted that the Indian children tended to grow weary of schooling after three or four months. Their parents would not force their offspring to attend school, being "generally so over fond of their children and most having but little value for learning--thinking it a useless thing--will not force their children against their inclinations if they have not a mind to learn of themselves but leave it to their own choice, and they [the children] as it is generally with the most children had rather

---

[56]Andrews to Secretary, Fort Hunter, Oct. 17, 1714, ibid., A, X, 1, p. 155; Andrews to Secretary, Fort Hunter, July 12, 1715, ibid., A, X, 188.

[57]Thomas Haliday to Secretary, Perth Amboy, July 13, 1715, ibid., A, X, 191; Andrews to Secretary, Albany, Oct. 1717, ibid., A, XII, 318.

be at their play than their books. . . ."[58] Andrews also reported having prevailed upon a few parents to allow him to teach their boys the English language. And given all their faults, Andrews still maintained that the Indians without laws and any real knowledge of Christ generally lived more upright lives than the sordid Dutch traders who opposed propagating the Gospel among the Mohawks.[59]

His contempt for the Dutch traders continued to increase, but Andrews began to realize that the Indians themselves were less tractable than he had initially believed. Attendance at the school declined steadily, and the few Indian youths who remained threatened to stop coming if they were not given more supplies and trinkets. Much of Andrews' early success in preaching and establishing the school had been accomplished in part because the Indians came to receive the knives, blankets, food, and beads. He was further disillusioned by the effect of an act passed by the provincial government in 1716 prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Indians. The Dutch traders ignored the ban, Andrews reported, and the Indians urged the Indian Commissioners at Albany to have the prohibition repealed, threatening to get their liquor from the French in Canada if they could not get it at Albany. The act was repealed the next year, and although Andrews believed that the greedy Dutch traders egged the Indians on, he was coming to understand that

---

[58]Andrews to Secretary, Fort Hunter, May 25, 1715, ibid., A, IX, 18, p. 123.

[59]Ibid.; Andrews to Secretary, Fort Hunter, Apr. 20, 1716, ibid., A, XI, 317.

the Indians themselves were following their own preferences, and that included strong liquor.[60]

Considering their unquenchable thirst for firewater and their incessant demands for more gifts, Andrews gradually began to doubt that much good could be accomplished among the Indians. Although about fifty Indians still attended worship services fairly regularly at the chapel, he found that they were prone to lapse into pagan customs, and when he reproved them, they pointed out to him how inconsistent were the lives of white Christians. By April of 1717, the school had only five students. "The Indians have little Esteem for Learning," he wrote, understating the obvious, "and I think now generally as little for Religion." Only a few Mohawks still came to the chapel, and none of the other four Indian Nations attended any longer. Adding insult to injury, Indians on their way to Albany to trade skins would come to the door of the chapel "and Look in upon us and go away Laughing." The Indians had given themselves up to such intemperance that of his forty communicants of earlier days Andrews could admit only some eighteen or twenty to communion by 1717.[61]

The respect and authority that Andrews had once commanded among the Indians had all but gone by the end of 1717. What pained Andrews most was the negligible impact his preaching had upon the

---

[60]Andrews to Secretary, Mohawk Castle, Oct. 11, 1716, ibid., A, XII, 3.

[61]Andrews to Secretary, Fort Hunter, Apr. 3, 1717, ibid., A, XII, 44, p. 318; also 1717, ibid., A, XII, 44, p. 310.

customs of his listeners. One couple in particular, who had become known for their outward piety and Christian living, shocked Andrews by suddenly becoming great drunkards, breaking the Sabbath, and chewing the fingernails off a French prisoner in a drunken orgy of torture that the bewildered missionary was not likely to forget. When he refused to give them communion, the man left the chapel and returned with a gun, promising to kill Andrews. At least this one time, Andrews was happy to have the "sordid and lewd" English soldiers at the fort to protect him. "I would as soon die upon the spot as give the Sacrament to such vile wretches," Andrews wrote, referring to the vengeful Indian and his mate; "I won't make the Church Ordinance so cheap to them. . . ."[62]

The number of communicants shrank to two or three, and only some forty or so came to the chapel on Sundays, most of them very old Indians who attended perhaps less to hear the sermon than to enjoy the food Andrews prepared for them. And to Andrews' chagrin, following the meal, the old Indians would usually "get drunk, and the young ones spend the Sabbath dancing & making music, bells on leg & painted faces."[63] Andrews saw almost no hope for the Indian youths, "for as they increase in years they fall in with the vices of their Parents, treading Exactly in their Steps." The despairing missionary was well aware of how his lamentations contrasted with his earlier optimistic predictions. He found

---

[62]Andrews to Secretary, Fort Hunter, Oct. 7, 1717, ibid., A, XII, 44, p. 327.

[63]Ibid., pp. 328-30.

some--but not much--comfort in the knowledge that he had done his best and that all the other pious souls who had tried to convert the Indians similarly began well but always ended badly.[64]

Andrews tended to agree with the interpreter that it was virtually impossible to turn the savages away from their drunkenness, whoredom, thievery, and devil worship. By April of 1718, the missionary reported the final indignity. Of the handful of Indians who came to the chapel, several of them slept through his sermons, awakening at the end only to ask for food or gifts. "Heathen they are," he lamented, "and Heathen they will still be." Interpreter Close told him that rather than have a missionary preaching to them the Mohawks would much rather have the Society send the £30 or £40 worth of rum annually. Only about half a dozen Indian children still came to the school. The best student was a lame lad who was not as able as the other boys at hunting, and the others were girls. Andrews had taken over the duties of schoolmaster from Mr. Oliver, the students being so few. Asking to be dismissed as missionary to the Indians, Andrews was instructed by Governor Hunter in 1718 to take his leave as if he were just making another routine trip to New York, lest the Indians become excited or angered by his sudden departure.[65]

After Andrews left Fort Hunter, Thomas Barclay asked the S. P. G.

---

[64]Ibid., pp. 330-32.

[65]Andrews to Secretary, Fort Hunter, Apr. 17, 1715, ibid., A, XIII, 319; Hunter to Secretary, Nov. 4, 1718, ibid., A, XIII, 356.

to continue the Mohawk mission. Having borrowed heavily on his own account to pay for the recently constructed Anglican Church in Dutch Reformed Albany, Barclay sought desperately to augment his strained income, and with the additional salary as missionary to the Indians, he just might be able to stave off his creditors. But the S. P. G. decided not to continue supporting its Mohawk mission, and Barclay, whose efforts to construct the Anglican Church had been constantly obstructed by the Dutch Reformed magistrates, found himself facing bankruptcy. His mind snapped under the strain, and he lived the last years of his life in a darkened room, babbling incomprehensibly to himself. In a terribly tragic way, Andrews' deep despair and Barclay's awful insanity symbolized the frustration and futility of the early Anglican missions to both the Indian and the Dutchman in northern New York.[66]

IV

To a remarkable degree, the drive to bring New Yorkers into conformity with the English Church had the reverse effect upon the heterogeneous population of the province. Cornbury's arbitrary actions especially aroused latent fears of Anglican cultural aggression. The response varied from group to group, but in every case, the response, like Cornbury's attack, was primarily educational, the universal process of preserving what remained of that Old World identity whose existence provided comfort and direction

---

[66]Barclay to Secretary, Albany, June 2, 1718, ibid., A, XIII, 375-77; Klingberg, Anglican Humanitarianism, 70-71.

in the uncertain and sometimes confusing New World. Shades of the past would return periodically to resurrect the religious and ethnic antagonism. In short, the drive for Anglican hegemony would never be forgotten in colonial New York.[67]

Earlier than most of his fellow Anglicans, Lewis Morris came to recognize just how much of a liability the Ministry Act and Cornbury's heavy-handed use of the law had become. But Morris acquired that knowledge only after he had tried and failed to woo the Dutch Reformed of Harlem over to the Anglican communion of the apostate preacher, Henricus Beys. The Dutch Reformed of Albany pretty much let Thomas Barclay do as he pleased, allowing him to preach, catechize and establish English schools. But when Barclay began building an Anglican Church in the center of town, the Albany Dutch fought back against what appeared to be a threatening Anglicanism; this occurred despite the conciliatory religious policy followed at the time by Governor Hunter. Harassed first by questions regarding the boundary of the building site and then hounded by creditors, Barclay went mad, and Albany had a fine Episcopal church, though there were few Anglicans there to attend it. Generally speaking, the Dutch Reformed Church in New York had the organizational structure to combat Anglican intrusions, despite Cornbury's threat to disrupt

---

[67]William Smith, Jr., The History of the Province of New York, ed. Michael Kammen, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), I, 118-29; Carl Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775 (New York, 1962), 116-37; John Webb Pratt, Religion, Politics and Diversity: The Church-State Theme in New York History (Ithaca, N. Y., 1967), 53-75.

the educational process with his licensing policy.[68]

English dissenters were not so well established or organized. Indeed, the Cornbury confrontation provoked them to organize and become concerned about supporting preachers and teachers of their own particular faith. Thanks largely to the communications channels of the New England Congregationalists, the Makemie trial was widely reported. Then came the Jamaica incident in 1710, and once again Presbyterians throughout the colonies were alerted. The Reverend George McNish came to Jamaica, Long Island, to challenge the ecclesiastical legitimacy of Thomas Poyer, the Anglican minister inducted into the parish by order of Governor Hunter. It was more difficult to keep a schoolmaster in Jamaica, but in neighboring Suffolk County, the bulwark of Congregationalism in New York, preachers and teachers were not as difficult to procure because of the proximity of Yale and Harvard and cultural and religious relations with New England.[69]

The Quakers were generally well equipped with preachers and teachers. In 1718, an enraged John Talbot wrote from Burlington that the Friends were taking over meeting houses he had encouraged communities to build on the assumption that the Society would send deacons, teachers, or catechists to instruct them in the Anglican

---

[68]Klingberg, Anglican Humanitarianism, 70-71.

[69]Frederick Lewis Weis, "The Colonial Clergy of the Middle Colonies: New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, 1728-1776," Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, LXVI (Oct. 17, 1956), 266; Robinson and Reynolds to Secretary, London, June 13, 1711, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, VI, 83; Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, from 1626 to 1746 (Albany, N. Y., 1872), 74-75.

faith. From the time Roland Ellis became schoolmaster for the S. P. G. at Burlington, he had to contend with rival Quaker teachers. When no Quaker schoolmaster was around, some of the Friends would send their children to Ellis' school. Ellis found the Quaker children "kind and affable," but he described their parents as "a stiff-necked generation, and [they] will allow of no tuition or instruction according to the Church of England."[70] The Quakers had a school at Flushing in 1703. In Westchester, Bridges, the Anglican missionary there, complained to the Society in 1717 that Schoolmaster Cleator was not bringing his student to church as he should be doing because some of them were the children of "Quakers and such others as have never shewd any regard to any Religion under any Denomination whatsoever."[71]

Anglican leaders in New York had great hopes for their educational efforts because teachers were generally desired by the populace but were relatively underpaid and therefore relatively few and far between. Parents generally recognized the benefits of reading, writing, and cyphering for their children. However, the father and mother might not be able to instruct their children in such basic skills, and the nearest school might be too far away or tuition too expensive for the children to attend. Furthermore,

---

[70]Roland Ellis to Secretary, Burlington, N. J., Apr. 12, 1717, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, XII, 21, p. 28; also Aug. 24, 1717, ibid., A, XII, 379; Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 94.

[71]Christopher Bridges to Secretary, Oct. 3, 1717, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, XII, 345.

as children grew older, they were needed to help on the farm or in the shop and could not be spared for schooling. The uncertainty of enrollment was one of the reasons relatively few men became schoolmasters. "It is very difficult to get & fix a Schoolmaster here," wrote John Bartow to the S. P. G. in 1716, "because there are great advantages to be made by other employment." A common laborer or farm worker earned three shillings per day, Bartow reported, and a joiner, carpenter, mason, or weaver earned from five to six shillings per day. Many qualified men turned away from schooling, or at the most kept school only a few months a year, usually in the winter months. The little extra subsidy that the S. P. G. provided thus allowed some schoolmasters to continue at one place for most or all of the year and to charge slightly lower tuition rates. The children drawn to the school would, in turn, be instructed in the catechism and prayers of the Church of England.[72]

By setting up schools or by subsidizing schoolmasters, the Venerable Society evoked a similar educational response from the dissenters. The competition became quite bitter sometimes, but the antagonism quite often had beneficial educational results, making schooling more available to the children of New Yorkers living in scattered villages. It should be emphasized that the rivalry between Anglicans and dissenters was not simply a squabble between differing clerics who saw the school as a weapon of ecclesiastical warfare. The people at large were very much involved, perhaps

---

[72]Bartow to Secretary, Westchester, Feb. 9, 1716, ibid., A, XII, 18, pp. 273-76.

more involved in educational affairs than at any time before. Suggestive but by no means conclusive are the findings based on the abstracts of wills from 1670 to 1740 published by the New-York Historical Society. During that seventy year time span, the wills expressing concern for any particular religion or ethnic group or for education in connection with either were concentrated during the years from 1690 to 1720, especially from 1700 to 1720.[73]

Several of the testators were quite explicit in bestowing their property. Consider the will of William Leath, saddler of New York, signed in April and probated in June of 1708. Leath was a man of moderate means and a staunch supporter of the Anglican mission to America. To Reverend Bondet who was bringing the French Protestant Church at New Rochelle into conformity with the English Church, Leath left "20 pieces of 8." To his good friend John Thomas, Anglican divine at Hempstead, he bequeathed his gray horse. And he left to Caleb Heathcote "£5 toward building a church at Stratford, Connecticut." Other testators were more general in their bequests. Probated in 1709, the will of John Hendick de Bruyn, New York merchant, bestowed £25 on the Lutheran Church of New York. In 1718, Ellis Duxbury of Staten Island left his lands "to the Corporation of the Minister, Church Wardens and Vestrymen of St. Andrew's in Richmond County, and their successors forever." Duxbury also left £100

---

[73]See William S. Pelletreau, ed., Abstracts of Wills on File in the Surrogate's Office, City of New York, 1665-1801, in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Years 1892 to 1908, 17 vols. (New York, 1893-1909), vols. I, II, III (hereafter cited as Abstracts of Wills).

for building a new vestry room and making repairs to St. Andrew's Church. Many testators left from £5 to £10 to the poor of the various religions in the province, including Anglican, Dutch Reformed, Lutheran, and Quaker.[74]

A few testators referred directly to schooling. In 1715, Elizabeth Regnier, widow of Jacob Regnier, barrister at law, left much of her land in Kings County to Rector Vesey and the vestrymen and church wardens of Trinity Church. Mrs. Regnier instructed that the land be used to build a "chapel or church and free school." She emphasized that especially needed in that stronghold of Dutch Reformed sentiment was "a Free school to teach and instruct the children in reading the English tongue. . . ." Mrs. Regnier also left £50 to Trinity Church, £10 to the French Church, and £5 to the Dutch Church."[75] In 1715, George Norton, butcher at New York, bequeathed toward a "Free School" £20. Making his will in 1718, John Wick of Southampton wanted his "son John brought up to learning at college," and John Wick graduated from Yale in 1722, no doubt an ornament to both his community and his religion. In his will probated in 1720, Rutgert Waldron, a turner in New York City, left his wife most of his estate, including his large Dutch Bible and an exhortation that the children "be brought up and instructed in the Holy Evangelical Religion."[76]

---

[74]See Abstracts of Wills, II, 3, 25, 180. For smaller sums, see ibid., 16, 18, 81, 125, 186.

[75]Ibid., 153-54.

[76]Ibid., 151, 256.

Religious rivalry thus involved the people as well as their preachers. It is almost impossible to say with any precision what part the drive for Anglican hegemony played in leading New York dissenters of both English and European extraction to organize educational efforts designed to protect and perpetuate their particular religious and ethnic traditions. Other factors like economic expansion and the rise in the standard of living were equally important, for without the means to support parsons and pedagogues, the dissenters would not have been able to meet the educational challenge of the Anglican missionary movement. The family alone, still the primary educational institution, could have resisted Anglican pressures to conform, but to compete effectively, dissenting families had to organize and support pedagogical emissaries of their own particular brand of religious persuasion.

Ironically, the Anglican educational effort thus strengthened the organizational work of the dissenters. But at the same time, the English dissenters in New York began to broaden their horizons as they cooperated and communicated with leaders of the faith in different colonies. The Dutch Reformed Church shifted away from its earlier tacit alliance with the Anglicans. Dutch and German Lutherans and Reformed congregations retained their respective religious and ethnic identities despite Anglican pressure to conform to the doctrines of the Church of England. Indeed, the supreme irony was that Anglican attempts to bring forth unity out of diversity in New York by imposing religious conformity aroused the diverse element of the population to preserve and perpetuate their distinctive

ethnic and religious identities. Most paradoxically of all, while the Anglicans were laboring with little success to unify New Yorkers religiously, the people of the province were being Anglicized and unified to an ever increasing degree by the sheer force of economic expansion and cultural connections with England. The Anglicans failed to unify New Yorkers through education, but education exercised an active role as the economy and culture of New York became drawn into the emerging Anglo-American community of colonies in the eighteenth century.

EDUCATION AND ETHNICITY IN COLONIAL NEW YORK, 1664-1763: A STUDY IN THE TRANSMISSION OF CULTURE IN EARLY AMERICA

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Ronald William Howard

August 1978

1080934

VOLUME II

CHAPTER VI

PARENTAGE AND PLACE: EDUCATION FOR LABOR AND LIFE IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY NEW YORK

The family was the primary educational institution throughout early America. In provincial New York the dominance of the family in education was enlarged and intensified because the heterogeneous population of the colony made community institutions like the church and school largely dependent on voluntary subscription of like-minded families. Especially during the eighteenth century, families at different places throughout the province joined together to promote through church and school not only literacy and piety but also their own particular ethnic and religious traditions linking the Old World past with the New World present. Equally important to New Yorkers was the task of preparing their children for financially rewarding and personally satisfying careers. In fact, the perpetuation of ethnic and religious traditions and social status of any New York family depended significantly upon the economic success of its progeny.[1]

During the course of the eighteenth century, popular thinking on education underwent considerable change throughout the western world, including the British colonies in North America. The term

---

[1]Outdated but still of some use is Charles Edward Ironside, The Family in Colonial New York: A Sociological Study (New York, 1942), esp. 20-40. See also Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins (1964; reprint ed., New York, 1971), 23-50.

education continued to mean the entire process of child rearing and nurture. However, education was taking on yet another meaning induced by growing economic and social complexity and the popularization of John Locke's pedagogical theories. It was coming to mean systematic instruction, whether in the family, the church, or the increasingly important school. Furthermore, due in large part to philosophical empiricists like Locke and especially Isaac Newton, education was becoming much more secular, though the moral emphasis remained paramount, simply shifting away from the laws of Moses towards the laws of nature.[2]

The change in educational thought may be illustrated by an example from the Colden family. Time and time again, Alexander Colden, a Presbyterian clergyman in Scotland, advised his son in America to put God first and raise his children in the fear of the Lord. A loving and respectful son, Cadwallader Colden was naturally inclined to follow the sage advice of his aging father. His children would be brought up in piety but educated to the Anglican faith, not the Scottish Kirk. And contrary to his father's expressed desire, Colden had no intention of directing his son Alexander into the ministry. He thought the law or commerce much more suitable professions. Reflecting the shifting intellectual currents

---

[2]Lawrence A. Cremin, American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783 (New York, 1970), 251-302; Nicholas Hans, Comparative Education: A Study of Educational Factors and Traditions (London, 1967), 85-105, 174-214; Samuel Winslow Brown, The Secularization of American Education: As Shown by State Legislation, State Constitutional Provisions and State Supreme Court Decisions (New York, 1912), 1-27; Herbert M. Morais, Deism in Eighteenth Century America (New York, 1934), 13-84.

that separated his generation from that of his father, Colden believed that the fundamental purpose of education should be "to enable men and to incline them to be more useful to mankind in General and to their own Country in particular and at the same time to render their own lives happy."[3] Cadwallader Colden was hardly the typical eighteenth-century New Yorker, but his thinking on education was fairly representative of the emerging colonial elite.[4]

Although himself a successful surveyor and officeholder under the British crown, Colden, who was also a doctor and a mathematician, lamented the neglect of the genteel arts and sciences in the colony. He and other contemporary observers noted what modern historians have since confirmed: New Yorkers were inordinately bent upon the acquisition of worldly goods. New England merchants and Virginia planters might well have been just as acquisitive, but New Yorkers were much more blatant about it. Visitors to New York invariably commented upon the mercantile atmosphere that pervaded the colony and provided the most obvious common denominator among its peoples

---

[3]Alexander Colden to Cadwallader Colden, Feb. 19, 1725 and Aug. 5, 1732, The Letters and Papers of Cadwallader Colden, 1711-1775, in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Years 1917 to 1923 and 1934 to 1935, 9 vols. (New York, 1918-1936), I, 186; II, 75-77 (hereafter cited as Colden Papers). The quotation is taken from Brooke Hindle, "A Colonial Governor's Family: The Coldens of Coldenham," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, XLV (July 1961), 242.

[4]Hindle, "The Coldens," 242-50. For some comparative views, see David C. Humphrey, From King's College to Columbia, 1746-1800 (New York, 1976), 79-100, 157-83.

well-known for their many religious and ethnic antipathies.[5]

The impulse toward the materialistic was clearly present. Although competition was usually intense, the common pursuit of economic advancement acted as an integrating force in the variegated society of provincial New York. Its educational expression was particularly fascinating, for while occupational training usually took place and was securely tied to either the family or immediate kinship circle, the youth who learned a trade or craft or profession almost invariably found much of his personal identity intertwined with his particular occupation. Some parents purposely educated their offspring for trades or professions that complemented family business interests; nevertheless, the resulting occupational and social associations enlarged personal horizons and sometimes provided yet another psychological conception of self that broadened the family and kinship identity formerly based on narrow ethnic and religious traditions. Such was usually the case of young men who found themselves among the business and professional elite of the province. Having achieved economic success and social standing, they frequently wore the faith and traditions of their fathers lightly and devoted themselves to advancing their own economic

---

[5]Milton M. Klein, Politics of Diversity: Essays in the History of Colonial New York (Port Washington, N. Y., 1974), 110-23; Michael Kammen, Colonial New York: A History (New York, 1975), xvi, 243; Peter Kalm, Travels in North America, ed. Adolph B. Benson, 2 vols. (New York, 1934), I, 343-46.

and social interests. Cadwallader Colden was just one among many others.[6]

As thoughtful New Yorkers recognized, the economic success or failure of their offspring depended significantly upon proper preparation for some trade or profession. Apprenticeship was the principal form of occupational education in the colony. Informal apprenticeship that was served within the immediate family or among relatives apparently continued unabated throughout the colonial period. But except in the aristocratic trades like commerce, law, and medicine, formal apprenticeship of a contractual nature was becoming less important by the middle third of the eighteenth century.[7] The resulting slack in vocational education was taken up in part by the rise of private schools offering to the public numerous practical courses such as navigation, surveying, bookkeeping, and modern languages. Apprenticeship, though, held its own in some skilled trades and became firmly entrenched in the professions.

---

[6]George De Vos, "Ethnic Pluralism: Conflict and Accommodation," in Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuaties and Change, ed. George De Vos and Lola Romanucci-Ross (Palo Alto, Calif., 1975), 9-18. Especially revealing is Daniel Bell, "Ethnicity and Social Change," in Ethnicity: Theory and Experience, ed. Nathan Glazier and Daniel P. Moynihan (Cambridge, Mass., 1975), 140-74. For insight into the New York elite, see Milton M. Klein, "The Cultural Tyros of Colonial New York," South Atlantic Quarterly, LXVI (Spring 1967), 218032; Lawrence H. Leder, "Robert Livingston's Sons: Preparation for Futurity," New York History, L (July 1969), 234-49; John A. Krout, "Behind the Coat of Arms: A Phase of Prestige in Colonial New York," New York History, XVI (Jan. 1935), 42-52.

[7]Samuel McKee, Labor in Colonial New York, 1664-1776 (New York, 1935), 62-89; Richard B. Morris, Government and Labor in Early America (New York, 1946), 392-94; Cremin, American Education, 133-34, 483.

By the middle of the eighteenth century, for example, lawyers in New York were organizing to maintain apprenticeship standards and encourage college study for prospective members of the bar. But most significantly, whatever the relative importance of apprenticeship and schooling in occupational training, the path the youth would tread in preparing for the future depended primarily upon the family and its ability to place its children or prepare them itself.

I

Apprenticeship in England and Holland during the seventeenth century had much in common. There were essentially two kinds of apprentices. On the one hand, there were youngsters usually fourteen or older whose parents bound them out specifically to learn a trade. On the other, there were poor or orphaned children bound out by public officials or by relatives concerned primarily with finding decent homes for the unfortunate youths, although occupational training of some kind was usually assumed in such cases. In both England and Holland, apprenticeship assisted craft guilds to regulate their respective trades and enabled public officials to buttress social and economic stability by finding homes for deprived children. There was, however, one pronounced difference in the development of apprenticeship in the two nations: apprenticeship in England did not call for literacy instruction along with occupational training. Precisely why the Puritans of New England broke tradition and insisted that parents and

masters teach their children and servants to read is not known, though their association of literacy with social conformity and religious orthodoxy seems reason enough.[8]

The emphasis on literacy instruction in New York apprenticeship agreements was part of the colony's Dutch and Puritan cultural legacy. By the time New Netherland began to be settled, it was customary in the United Provinces for reading, writing, and sometimes arithmetic to be included among the skills that Dutch masters were expected to teach their apprentices. That same tradition was gradually transferred to New Netherland. According to the meticulous research of Robert Francis Seybolt, the earliest mention of the evening school in America may be found in the "Instruction and Rules for Schoolmaster Evert Pietersen, drawn up the the Burgomasters of this City [New Amsterdam]," dated November 4, 1661. Such schools very likely existed in New Netherland even before 1661. So when the English conquered New Netherland, schooling for apprentices was regarded as the rule by Dutch colonists who became New Yorkers and subjects of the British crown.[9]

The transition to English rule in New York scarcely disturbed

---

[8]Margaret Gay Davies, The Enforcement of English Apprenticeships: A Study in Applied Mercantilism (Cambridge, Mass., 1956), 1-12, 40-62; Paul Zumthor, Daily Life in Rembrandt's Holland (New York, 1963), 99-100; Kenneth A. Lockridge, Literacy in Colonial New England: An Enquiry into the Social Context of Literacy in the Early Modern West (New York, 1974), 43-71.

[9]William Heard Kilpatrick, The Dutch Schools of New Netherland and Colonial New York, United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin no. 12 (Washington, D. C., 1912), 190-91; Robert Francis Seybolt, The Evening School in Colonial America (Urbana, Ill., 1925).

the rules and regulations the Dutch had enacted much earlier regarding slaves, servants, and apprentices. In fact, much as the Dutch had done before them, Governor Richard Nicolls and his immediate successors, Lovelace, Andros, and Dongan, willingly allowed local custom to dictate the relationship between master and slave, servant and apprentice, placing the weight of the provincial government behind customary practices by way of vaguely worded statutes which could be invoked by town or county officers whenever necessary. Such was surely the logic behind the provision relating to apprenticeship in the Duke's Laws of 1665:

> The Constables and Overseers are strictly required to Admonish the Inhabitants of Instructing their Children and Servants in Matters of Religion and the Lawes of the Country, And that Parents and Masters do bring up their Children and Apprentices in some honest and Lawful Calling, Labour or Employment.[10]

Servants and apprentices were enjoined to obey and serve faithfully their masters and mistresses, and the latter were likewise warned not to abuse their servants or apprentices. A hundred years elapsed before New York enacted another provincial statute directly applicable to apprenticeship. In 1766, "An Act for Regulating Servants" simply reaffirmed the validity of contracts made between masters and servants and limited the length of time an infant might be bound out to age twenty-one, excepting slaves.[11]

Between the promulgation of the Duke's Laws and the enactment

---

[10]"The Duke's Laws," The Colonial Laws of New York from 1664 to the Revolution, 5 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1894-1896), I, 26.

[11]Ibid., I, 47-50, 56; IV, 924.

of the 1766 statute, several laws were passed having some bearing on apprenticeship, especially the statutes under which poor or orphaned children were bound out. The first such law was enacted in 1683. It made the maintenance of the poor and vagabonds a joint responsibility of the city or town and the province. That statute was superseded by another in 1691 which left the matter entirely to the town. The Ministry Act of 1693 provided for the vestrymen and church wardens to levy "a reasonable tax" for the "Maintenance of the Minister and Poor of their respective places."[12] The very next year, 1694, the Common Council of New York City ordered that "Noe Merchant or handy Craft Tradesman Shall take Any prentice to teach or instruct them in their Trade or Calling without being bound by Indentures before the Mayor, Recorder, or Any one of the Aldermen of the Said Citty and Registered in the Town Clerkes Office and not for a Less Term than four Years."[13]

The most complete lists of apprenticeship indentures extant come from New York City. From 1695 through 1707, some one hundred eight apprentices were registered in the city of approximately 4,500 people. Of these one hundred eight indentures, ninety-three were definitely trade agreements made by parents or guardians for their children. Among them were seven girls, three of whom were to be taught "housewifery," sewing, and in two cases reading as well. The boys--

---

[12]Ibid., I, 132, 237, 338. See also Robert Francis Seybolt, Apprenticeship and Apprenticeship Education in Colonial New England and New York (New York, 1917), 66-74.

[13]Council Minutes, Jan. 16, 1694, Minutes of the Common Council of the City of New York, 1675-1776, ed. Herbert L. Osgood, 8 vols. (New York, 1905), I, 373-74.

several were in their middle teens--were bound out variously to merchants, carpenters, wheelwrights, bakers, and others. One of the most striking features of the list is that almost half of the apprentices (47%) were either orphans or else sons or daughters of widows. Only thirty-one apprentices (29%) almost certainly had living fathers. It should also be noted that only forty-two (39%) apprenticeship agreements made any provision for literacy instruction. Dividing the indentures by nationalities, at least half of the Dutch (50%) and about one-third (35%) of the English apprentices were to be taught reading, writing, and sometimes arithmetic.[14]

Based on these figures, it may be said that close to a majority of the young people were bound out not simply to learn a trade but primarily to have a decent home because they were either orphaned or without one or the other parent. The custodial functions of appenticeship, so essential to maintaining social control over the young in England, were just as important in New York as its occupational functions. Especially noteworthy is the huge proportion of English as compared to Dutch apprentices, something like 66% to 17%. The English were not a majority in New York City in 1707. In fact, Britons were very likely still outnumbered by the Dutch. But as the apprentice list from 1694 to 1707 suggests, the English

---

[14]"Indentures of Apprenticeships, February 9, 1694 to January 24, 1708," in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1885 (New York, 1886), 565-622 (hereafter cited as "Apprentices, 1694-1708"). See Appendix.

were proportionately more numerous among the poor of the city.[15]

As for the Dutch, four of their eighteen indentures were for professional apprenticeships, two under merchants and two under "chirurgeons." Of the remaining fourteen, one was a shoemaker who bound himself as a journeyman, and the other thirteen were tightly drawn trade indentures, nine of which (68%) called for literacy instruction. Only four (31%) of the thirteen indentures involved boys who were orphaned or bound out by widowed mothers. No Dutch girls appeared on the apprentice list. This tends to indicate that the Dutch were making other arrangements for their children's occupational education. They may have simply disliked the formal registration requirement and evaded it. As Douglas Greenberg has recently demonstrated, Dutch New Yorkers generally were contemptuous of English political authority.[16]

The only other extant registration list of apprentices in New York City is for the years from 1718 to 1727. That list clearly reflects the fundamental demographic and economic changes which were occurring. Between 1700 and 1720, the population of colonial New York more than doubled, from 18,000 to about 40,000 people. Approximating the demographic growth of the colony, New York City numbered 7,000 people by 1720. Compared to one hundred eight apprentices in twenty-seven trades registered in the city between

---

[15]Morris, Government and Labor in Early America, 363-89; Davies, Enforcement of English Apprenticeships, 40-62.

[16]See Appendix; Douglas S. Greenberg, "Patterns of Criminal Prosecution in Eighteenth-Century New York," New York History, LVI (Apr. 1975), 148-50.

1695 and 1707, there were two hundred four apprentices registered in thirty-nine trades between 1718 and 1727.[17]

In 1711, concerned that the quality of workmanship among the trades was not improving, the New York City Common Council had increased the number of years that an apprentice had to serve from four to seven. Although their term of service was three years longer, the apprenticeship indentures registered in New York City between 1718 and 1727 were remarkably similar to those of a decade earlier. Once again, out of two hundred four registrants, the English vastly outnumbered the Dutch, approximately one hundred fifty-four to thirty-three, or 76% English and 16% Dutch. Significantly, though hardly surprising given the population growth and economic development of the city, one hundred fourteen (57%) of the indentures provided for some form of literacy instruction, usually three months every winter after Christmas. If the indentures for servants on the one hand and for aspiring young professionals on the other were removed from the list, the number of indentures calling for rudimentary schooling would be near 75%. Comparing the indentures of Dutch and English New Yorkers, twenty-nine of thirty-three Dutch indentures (88%) and only seventy-six of one hundred fifty-four English indentures (50%) called for literacy

---

[17]Evarts B. Greene and Virginia D. Harrington, American Population before the Federal Census of 1790 (New York, 1932), 89-90; Carl Bridenbaugh, Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1625-1742 (New York, 1964), 142-43; "Indentures of Apprentices, 1718-1727," in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1909 (New York, 1910), 111-99 (hereafter cited as "Apprentices, 1718-1727").

instruction. Much as before, though, at least eighty apprentices (40%) were either orphaned or fatherless. Only 32% of the agreements specifically mentioned both parents or the father alone.[18]

The indentures from 1718 to 1728 included twenty-two females, seventeen English, three Dutch, one French, and one black. Arjetta Davis was sixteen when bound out, but the other girls were all about eleven or under, several being three or four years old. Sixteen of the twenty-two girls were clearly apprenticed as servants, and even those whose masters or mistresses were required to teach them to sew, weave, or "housewifery" were primarily servants first and apprentices second.[19] For example, Ellecksander Gillou was apprenticed in 1720 by her mother and father for eight years to Thomas Inglis, painter, who promised to provide for Ellecksander during the year "that She is Learning a Trade." For the other seven years, Ellecksander was to be simply Inglis' servant. Only six of the indentures mentioned both the father and mother of the apprentice. Five of these were among the ten indentures calling for some sort of literacy training. The others were definitely hardship cases, where either the mother or father or both were dead.[20]

Although apprenticeship was both an instrument of social

---

[18]Council Minutes, Oct. 30, 1711, Minutes of the Common Council, II, 454-55. See Table 2 in Appendix.

[19]See Table 3 in Appendix.

[20]Indenture of Ellecksander Gillou to Thomas Inglis, Apr. 2, 1720, "Apprentices, 1718-1727," 130-31.

control and occupational training, the emphasis is clearly upon the former in the vast majority of extant indentures, whether from the bustling provincial capital itself or the sleepy little farming communities of Long Island and the Hudson Valley. In fact, outside of New York City and Albany, formal apprenticeship indentures were relatively so few that the small towns and villages did not bother to keep separate record books for children bound out. Indentures are therefore scattered throughout the public documents of every settlement. To be sure, many of the indentures were witnessed by parents anxious that their son or even daughter might learn some trade; but even in the towns of eastern Long Island, where the Puritan affectation for binding out children was present, much more common were indentures like the one whereby the Huntington overseers of the poor in 1774 bound out Mary Reuland to Abraham Sneddeker and his wife until Mary was eighteen years old. For the disadvantaged youth, apprenticeship might provide uplifting occupational training; but it undeniably imposed a measure of social uniformity upon those who posed a threat to social stability.[21]

---

[21]McKee, Labor in Colonial New York, 63-64, 84-85; Indenture of Mary Reuland to Abraham Sneddeker, June 13, 1774, Huntington Town Records, Including Babylon, Long Island, ed. Charles R. Street, 3 vols. (Huntington, N. Y., 1887-1889), II, 534; see also II, 494 (hereafter cited as Huntington Records). Other interesting indentures are Thomas Steevens to John Cooper, Mar. 14, 1663, Records of the Town of Southampton, ed. William S. Pelletreau, 3 vols. (Sag Harbor, N. Y., 1874-1878), II, 40; Edmund Pangborne to John Rogers, May 10, 1682, Oyster Bay Town Records, ed. John Cox, 8 vols. (New York, 1916-1940), I, 145-46; Jeams Chogum (Indian boy) to John Sands, Jr., Nov. 16, 1719, Records of the Towns of North and South Hempstead, Long Island, ed. Benjamin D. Hicks, 8 vols. (Jamaica, N. Y., 1896-1904), III, 51 (hereafter cited as North and South Hempstead Records); Benjamin (Indian boy) to Silas Carl, Apr. 4, 1767, ibid., II, 489.

Consider the children of the unfortunate Palatines who immigrated to New York in the early seventeenth century. In 1708, the first of some two thousand hapless Germans from the war-ravaged Palatinate made their way from England toward promised lands along the Hudson River. Wracked by a number of enervating diseases, hundreds of the Palatines died, presenting Governor Robert Hunter with the problem of what to do with all the orphaned children. Hunter's solution was to apprentice the bewildered orphans to New Yorkers. Between 1710 and 1714, some seventy-four Palatine children were bound out, including John Peter Zenger to the official printer of the colony, William Bradford. In fact, Hunter bound out not only orphans but also some German children from the larger families whose parents were still very much alive and thereby aroused considerable ill will against himself and his principal associate in the scheme to resettle the Palatines, Robert Livingston.[22]

Whether German, English, Dutch, French, or Jewish, the apprentice was usually under the same restrictions. While the master promised to instruct and usually provide food, clothing and lodging for his charge, the apprentice in turn was to serve faithfully and to protect the interests of his employer. According to the standard form, every youth bound out promised to abstain from fornication, marriage, gambling, absenting himself without leave, and "haunting Alehouses, Taverns or Playhouses."[23] Beginning in 1684, laws

---

[22]Walter Allen Knittle, The Early Eighteenth Century Palatine Emigration (Philadelphia, 1937), 140-59, 163-66, 180-217.

[23]McKee, Labor in Colonial New York, 69-71.

were passed periodically at both the local and provincial level prohibiting unscrupulous individuals from encouraging "servants and apprentices" to frequent taverns and pilfer from their respective masters; the law assumed a causal relationship between the consumption of alcohol and thievery among apprentices.[24]

The legislation regulating apprenticeship heavily favored the master, who exercised power in loco parentis and had the right to punish obstinate apprentices. Apprentices who violated their contracts were disciplined, and their parents or guardian might be fined. But the youth bound out did have rights protected by law. An apprentice who convinced the magistrate that he had been "immoderately treated" by his master was usually freed from his apprenticeship contract. For example, because John Schutz, barber and whigmaker of New York City, had beaten him without cause, William Lewis was discharged by the mayor's court in 1726 from his apprenticeship with the mercurial Schutz. In 1738, the Queen's County court released Joseph Dodge from his apprenticeship with blacksmith Jeremiah Dodge of Hempstead because the latter "hath not allowed his said apprentice sufficient meat." Dozens of examples could be recited, for despite the bias of the law in favor of the master, neither physical abuse nor failure of the master to instruct his apprentice adequately was tolerated by local or provincial

---

[24]An Act against Servants and Apprentices Frequenting Taverns, Oct. 24, 1684, Colonial Laws of New York, I, 158-59; McKee, Labor in Colonial New York, 64-67.

governmental officials.[25]

The benefits of serving an apprenticeship and learning a trade were many. Apprenticeship training of some sort was virtually the only means of joining the "aristocratic trades" of merchant, physician, and apothecary or chemist. But more will be said about occupational education for the elite later in this chapter; the focus here is on apprenticeship for the skilled arts and crafts. In New York City, a youth who successfully served out his indenture was made a freeman, that is, free to practice his trade in the city.[26] In addition to the usual two sets of clothes, one for work and another for Sunday, the apprentices sometimes received from their masters upon fulfilling their contract "tools" of their trade. But most important of all, they were qualified as journeymen in their craft, and such skills were very much in demand in the province of New York.[27]

In fact, it was common for rural villages to lure artisans

---

[25]McKee, Labor in Colonial New York, 76-85; George William Edwards and Arthur Everetts Peterson, New York as an Eighteenth Century Municipality, Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. LXXV (New York, 1917), 69-70; Joseph Dodge v. Jeremiah Dodge, Nov. 2, 1738, North and South Hempstead Records, III, 219-20; Richard B. Morris, ed., Select Cases of the Mayor's Court of New York City, 1674-1784 (Washington, D. C., 1935), 184-88.

[26]McKee, Labor in Colonial New York, 72. Note discussion of apprenticeship in New-York Gazette, Revived in the Weekly Post-Boy, Mar. 29, 1753. An example of the status that apprenticeship conferred in many cases may be found in the advertisement of Henry Witeman, brass button maker, in New-York Gazette, Revived in the Weekly Post-Boy, Oct. 1, 1750.

[27]Carl Bridenbaugh, The Colonial Craftsman (New York, 1950), 134, 143, 145; Morris, Government and Labor in Early America, 25, 50, 376-80.

into their communities with grants of lands, sometimes tools, and usually promises of a monopoly in the trade. For instance, the town of Jamaica voted in 1670 "that Nicklas the coper should have half a acrer of Land by the Bever pond to build a house and to supply the Towne with such copers work as the Towne shall stand in need of."[28] In 1680, John Davis, brick maker of Setaucket (Brookhaven), was given a lot in Huntington on condition he supply that town with bricks. At a town meeting in 1681, Huntington voted land to Thomas Skidmore to set up his house and blacksmith shop. Skidmore promised "to train another to take his place when he leaves." Four years later, Huntington gave land to Benjamin Scrivenir on condition that he "weave for the town." In 1730, Hempstead provided land for Joseph Pearce on condition he set up a blacksmith shop. And so it went throughout the colonial era, with supply never satisfying the demand for skilled artisans.[29]

Despite the increasing need for skilled artisans, apprenticeship in New York was becoming less important in many trades by the middle of the eighteenth century. As early as 1731, Cadwallader Colden attributed the scarcity of workers for both shop and field to the availability of free land, whose lure led settlers to live in a "miserable state" for many years when they could have maintained

---

[28]Town Meeting Minutes, Apr. 4, 1670, Records of the Town of Jamaica, Long Island, 1658-1751, ed. Josephine C. Frost, 3 vols. (Brooklyn, N. Y., 1914), I, 44-45 (hereafter cited as Jamaica Records).

[29]Town Meeting Minutes, 1681, Huntington Records, I, 292-93; also June 23, 1684, ibid., I, 393-94; Town Meeting Minutes, Apr. 7, 1730, North and South Hempstead Records, III, 107.

themselves comfortably by working for others. The very next year, the New York City Common Council eliminated the seven year requirement for apprentices registered before the mayor, recorder or one of the aldermen. Not only was the stipulated time not mentioned; but even the registration of apprentices was apparently not rigidly enforced, and the record of registration was haphazardly kept by city officials. Indeed, the city government passed no further regulation regarding apprenticeship, although the successful fulfillment of an apprentice indenture remained one of the ways of securing the freedom of the city.[30]

Contending that apprenticeship in most trades and crafts was declining in colonial New York, historians have based their arguments on various sources. For one thing, there is after 1730 the paucity of regulations and indentures dealing with apprenticeship. Furthermore, the scarcity of apprentices is indicated by newspaper advertisements soliciting apprentices and by the inclusion in apprenticeship contracts of provisions for cash payment or sets of tools for youths who fulfilled their contracts. Exactly why apprenticeship was declining is not clear, though the obvious explanation suggested is that for some reason parents were reluctant to bind out their children on the one hand and that skilled artisans were reluctant to assume the parental responsibility and sustain the years of marginal profitability that apprenticeship entailed on the other hand. And of course there is the explanation that apprenticeship

---

[30]Cadwallader Colden to Micah Perry, 1731, Colden Papers, II, 31-32; McKee, Labor in Colonial New York, 72.

was a part of the medieval guild system which simply could not be adapted to American conditions. All of these explanations contain a measure of truth, but they are all superficial, symptoms rather than causes of the decline of apprenticeship in colonial New York.[31]

Based on the analysis of the apprentice lists for New York City and on corroborating data taken from the records of various towns in the province, another explanation of the apparent weakening of apprenticeship in colonial New York is suggested. First, it is imprecise to speak of the decline of apprenticeship. If the earlier examination of apprenticeship agreements suggests anything, it is that formal apprenticeship was largely for the poor and the orphaned, though its importance for occupational education was equally apparent. So contractual apprenticeship did not decline so much as fail to keep pace with the growing demands of an expanding economy. Furthermore, the need for skilled craftsmen was met in part by slaves and journeymen to whom master artisans would rather pay a flat wage than take on young apprentices who would have to be trained for the job and maintained for what might be several unprofitable years.[32]

Perhaps most important of all, the middle third of the eighteenth century brought to New York thousands of "weavers, Taylors, Blacksmiths,

---

[31]McKee, Labor in Colonial New York, 72-73. Indenture of Benjamin Moore to Alexander De Bonrepos, June 13, 1723, "Apprenticeships, 1718-1727," 154; see also ibid., 122, 135-36, 162-63, 164. Morris, Government and Labor in Early America, 147-201.

[32]McKee, Labor in Colonial New York, 21-27, 59-61, 125-29; Speech of Lieut. Governor George Clarke to the General Assembly, New-York Gazette, Apr. 4, 1737.

Nailors, Shoemakers, Butchers, Sawyers, Wheel-Wrights, Hatters," and others who came as indentured servants or redemptioners from England, Scotland, Ireland, and Germany. The parental obligations and pedagogical responsibilities of apprenticeship probably seemed especially burdensome to masters who could cheaply purchase the labor of such skilled redemptioners. Like slave artisans, white servants were more economical than apprentices, though the tendency of these skilled servants to run away led many a master to yearn for reliable young apprentices. Hence the occasional newspaper appeal for a well-behaved young man to serve as apprentice in some trade. The poor and the orphaned were still apprenticed regularly by their relatives or public officials, but the appeal through the press was made to discover a reliable apprentice whose family would stand surety against his contract. Such apprentices, it must be reiterated, had always been in the minority in colonial New York.[33]

---

[33]Quotation taken from New-York Mercury, Apr. 25, 1774; other references may be found in New-York Gazette, June 3, June 17, Oct. 21, 1728; Apr. 21, 1729; Sept. 4, 1732; June 1, 1747; New-York Weekly Journal, June 27, 1737; June 4, 1739; May 25, Jan. 8, 1741; New-York Weekly Post-Boy, June 24, 1741; June 9, 1746; Aug. 19, Dec. 2, 1751; Apr. 20, 1752; Sept. 30, 1754; New-York Mercury, Nov. 6, 1752; June 10, 1754; Dec. 13, 1762. McKee, Labor in Colonial New York, 85-87; Orphans of the Alms-house to be Bound out, New-York Gazette, or Weekly Post-Boy, June 25, 1750; Morris, Mayor's Court, 24, 28-29, 185. Henry Moore to the Lords of Trade, Documentary History of the State of New York, ed. Edmund B. O'Callaghan, 4 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1850-1851), I, 498-99 (hereafter cited as DHNY).

II

Judging from extant apprenticeship indentures, New Yorkers in general and Dutch New Yorkers in particular relied much less upon contractual apprenticeship than previously thought. In his study of the colonial craftsman, Carl Bridenbaugh noted that occupational training was pretty much a family affair, with skills of any given trade being transmitted from parents to children across the generations. Sons began at an early age to imitate and assist their fathers and thereby learned their crafts and gradually acquired their skills. Daughters were similarly introduced to the many chores of housewifery by their mothers. Especially in families where the wives and husbands jointly ran some businesses, girls as well as boys were taught the different facets of the families' enterprises. This was particularly common among the Dutch, whose extended kinship structure followed complementary occupational patterns. Although the social structure of the colony was becoming increasingly complex, other New Yorkers similarly participated in reciprocal economic relationships between the family on the one hand and the ethnic or religious group on the other. Children whose parents possessed small to moderate means usually acquired their occupational education within this economic and ethnic matrix.[34]

---

[34]Carl Bridenbaugh, The Colonial Craftsman, 129-32. For the Dutch family in particular, see Alice P. Kenney, "Private Worlds in the Middle Colonies: An Introduction to Human Tradition in American History," New York History, LI (Jan. 1970), 5-31. For an insightful discussion of the extended kinship circle and commerce

While some artisans bound out their sons, the evidence overwhelmingly suggests that most New York children were taught the arts and crafts by their parents or close kin. During the late seventeenth century, Gerardus Duyckinck was a glazier and painter in New York City, and his son of the same name continued the family trade into the middle of the eighteenth century.[35] Marcus Burger had been a master blacksmith in New York City. Taking up his father's trade, Regnier Burger received from Marcus hammers, anvils, and other necessary equipment. Regnier apparently had as his apprentice his nephew Marcus, a favorite of his grandfather, whose will of 1727 bequeathed to his namesake "my smiths anvil, 1 large vise, 2 large hammers, being part of my smiths tools and now in possession of my son Reignier." In 1737, Andries Ten Eyck, cordwainer of New York, willed that his sons Dirck and Andries might have his tanning yard, "with all the pits and appurtenances." Similarly, Lewis Dubois, blacksmith of Staten Island, left to his eldest son Lewis, "for his heirship, the smith tools he now works with, and no more, for what he has already had."[36]

---

in New York, see Virginia Harrington, "The Colonial Merchant's Ledger," in History of the State of New York, ed. Alexander C. Flick, vol. II (New York, 1933-1937), II, 333-71, esp. 349-53.

[35]See advertisement by the Duyckincks in New-York Weekly Journal, Jan. 6, 1735, and Mar. 19, 1750; New-York Weekly Post-Boy, Aug. 18, 1746. Rita S. Gottesman, comp., The Arts and Crafts in New York, 1726-1776, in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1937 (New York, 1938), 129-30.

[36]Will of Marcus Burger, proved Jan. 26, 1727, Abstracts of Wills on File in the Surrogate's Office, City of New York, 1665-1801, ed. William S. Pelletreau, in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Years 1892 to 1908, 17 vols. (New York,

Henry Townsend, joiner of Oyster Bay, raised at least three and perhaps more of his seven sons to his craft and to carpentry. In his will of 1757, Townsend divided his "joyner's tools" among his three oldest sons, leaving his four younger sons "all my joyner's stuff such as boards, etc." To make the legacy somewhat more equitable, the four older sons were instructed to build several pieces of kitchen furniture for their sisters. According to his will of 1761, Abraham Van Duersen, tallow chandler of New York City, left his son Abraham "my soap kettles, tallow pot, and all the tools and implements belonging to the candle-making business." Abraham also received the house and lot belonging to his father, whose business the younger Van Duersen had probably assumed several years before. To the other children, young Abraham was to pay £300 upon the death of his father. A few months earlier in 1761, Othniel Sands, who himself had probably been a tailor in Westchester County, ordered that his son Samuel "be put to his brother Othniel to larn ye Taylor's Trade." Back on Long Island in 1764, Aaron Van Nostrand left to his son Aaron "all the tools of Turners' trade and all my carpenters tools."[37]

Few artisans limited themselves to just one trade. Except for New York City and Albany, New York did not have the concentrated population centers that nurture vocational specialization. Conversely,

---

1893-1909), II, 374-75 (hereafter cited as Abstracts of Wills); Will of Andries Ten Eyck, proved Sept. 7, 1757, ibid., I, 406; Will of Lewis Dubois, May 8, 1741, ibid., IV, 102-3.

[37]Will of Henry Townsend, proved Jan. 7, 1761, ibid., VI, 34-35; Will of Abraham Van Duersen, proved June 28, 1762, ibid., 160; Will of Aaron Van Nostrand, proved Mar. 19, 1764, ibid., 310; Will of Othniel Sands, Aug. 19, 1757, Early Wills of Westchester County from 1664 to 1784, ed. William S. Pelletreau (New York, 1898), 182.

because of the scarcity of skilled workers, many New York farmers cultivated the crafts themselves, and artisans who lived outside of New York City almost invariably engaged in farming to some degree while plying their respective trades. Johanes Traphagen of Kingston, for instance, was both farmer and wheelwright. When Traphagen died in 1727, he left his tools and his land to his only son Willem, who was likewise farmer as well as wheelwright. Besides his farm and other land holdings, Roeloff Eltinge of New Paltz willed in 1745 that his son Noah should have "dwelling house and tan vats and tan mills, and all appurtenances."[38] In 1754, John Nagel of Harlem prepared his will dividing his lands, looms and weaving tackling equally among his three sons. Back on Long Island in 1755, John Ryder of Gravesend provided that his son Wilhelmus should inherit all his farming implements and carpenter tools while sharing his real estate with the other brothers. And at Brookhaven in 1761, Samuel Davis, carpenter, bequeathed to his oldest son James his farm lands, buildings, animals, and equipment. To his younger son, Davis left all his carpentry tools and a half interest in his lumber mill; the other half remained in the hands of the other children.[39]

It was of course to the land that most New Yorkers were bred. Their involvement in the crafts was usually limited to producing homespun and performing other tasks complementary to life on the

---

[38]Will of Johanes Traphagen, proved Feb. 23, 1727, ibid., II, 377-78; Will of Roeloff Eltinge, proved Jan. 13, 1747, ibid., 153-55.

[39]Will of John Ryder, proved May 1, 1761, ibid., VI, 75-76; Will of Samuel Davis, proved June 25, 1761, ibid., 118-19; Will of John Nagel, Harlem, proved Oct. 11, 1763, ibid., 276.

farm. Literally thousands of wills from throughout the province bear witness to this obvious fact. According to his will of 1721, Anthony Ludlam of Southampton left to his son Samuel, who very likely was already handling his father's estate, all his lands, buildings, furniture, farming utensils, and most of his farm animals. In 1726, William Brown of Southold willed that upon his death his son Thomas should have two-thirds of his houses, lands, and meadows, plus the other third upon the death of his widow. To avoid any contention among the children, Benjamin White of Crom Elbow Precinct, Duchess County, bequeathed in 1756 to his "beloved son Peter the farm or lot of land where he now lives." White left to his other sons, "William and Andrew (whom I make executors), this farm or lot whereon I now live, with all buildings and improvements, likewise all my cows, horses, and live stock, farming utensils, and household goods."[40]

Despite the firmly established place of primogeniture in English common law, Dutch New Yorkers were especially reluctant to favor one son above the other when all were raised to the land. In 1743, Luykus Van Alen of Kinderhook, Albany County, willed that his eldest son Lawrence should receive as his right of primogeniture "my Dutch Bible and make no further pretense." The rest of the estate was to be divided equally between Lawrence and his younger brother Johannes, both of whom were likely already engaged in

---

[40]Will of Anthony Ludlam, proved Apr. 29, 1724, ibid., II, 289-90; Will of William Brown, proved Feb. 26, 1732, ibid., III, 104; Will of Benjamin White, proved Dec. 31, 1764, ibid., VI, 301-2.

farming. Similarly, in his will of 1758, Francis Titus of Bushwick provided that his eldest son Francis should have "my Large Dutch Bible for his birthright." Francis was also to have the farm where his father lived. The other three sons were given lands approximating that of their elder brother. Abraham Fonda of Claverack, Albany County, had eight sons by two wives. In his will probated in 1763, Fonda first gave his Dutch Bible to his oldest son Stephanus and then proceeded to provide for his sons as equitably as he could. "None of my sons," he dictated from the grave, "shall assume the right to Domineer over the rest, especially my youngest sons."[41]

The wills of New Yorkers with young children usually made provision for the further occupational preparation of their children. In his will proved in 1710, Elias Nezreau of Kingston instructed that Augustine, a young black boy who was probably Nezreau's illegitimate son, "be free, and sent to school, and taught a trade of Carpenter or Cooper, in New York or London, and is to have £20 to buy him tools."[42] In 1720, Rutgert Waldron, turner of New York City, left his second son Samuel two iron vises which were to be given him upon the completion of his apprenticeship. According to his will written in 1728, Caleb Beeck, gentleman of Schenectady, provided that his young son Caleb should have £5 to buy tools if he decided to learn a trade. Dying in 1762, Willem Hammond of Phillipsburg

---

[41]Will of Luykas Van Alen, proved June 23, 1762, ibid., 274-75; Will of Francis Titus, proved June 15, 1764, ibid., 324-25; Will of Abraham Fonda, proved Mar. 10, 1763, ibid., 239-40.

[42]Will of Elias Nezreau, proved Mar. 17, 1710, ibid., II, 40.

Manor instructed his son James to continue working his father's farm, provided James took care of his idiot brothers, Willem and Abraham. The next year, Moses Ward of Phillipsburg Manor willed that James Hill, a young man who had been living with Ward for many years, should have one half of the farm Moses had in partnership with Gilbert Ward, contingent upon Hill remaining with Ward's wife and treating her well.[43]

In the vast majority of wills made by fathers with small children, the education of the offspring was left to the surviving wife or guardian, though qualifying instructions were fairly common. In 1751, John Woolsey, Sr., of Bedford in Westchester County, left his wife Sarah £60, ordered that the remainder of his estate be sold, and insisted that half of the money should then be spent on his son Gilbert "to bring him up to learning." Nine years later in Bedford, Coles Golding bequeathed to his wife Phebe the use of his farm for eight years so she could bring up the children. But in 1768, the estate would revert to his son Amos. Four years earlier, Richard Hutchings of North Castle, Westchester County, left the use of his house and land to his wife to raise up the children. "The sons when old enough," Hutchings wrote, "are to be put out to learn Trades or Mysteries." Also in 1764, George Weiser of Smithtown, Suffolk County, left all his estate to his wife until his son George came of age. During that time, young George was to be

---

[43]Will of Rutgert Waldron, proved Nov. 3, 1720, ibid., 226; Will of Caleb Beeck, proved Oct. 3, 1733, ibid., III, 124-25; Will of Willem Hammond, proved Dec. 20, 1762, ibid., VI, 208; Will of Moses Ward, Mar. 4, 1763, ibid., 255.

maintained and receive "Schooling becoming his circumstances."[44]

From the wills of New Yorkers written in the eighteenth century, certain conclusions may be drawn regarding the attitudes of parents toward the occupational preparations of their children. Having done their best to secure the economic success of their offspring while alive, New Yorkers further assisted their progeny with meaningful legacies--tools, lands, houses, or money. Although little has been said about the education of young women, New Yorkers frequently sent both their sons and daughters to elementary schools, and girls were regularly given an "outset" of clothing, furniture, and sometimes land or cash when they married or upon the death of their parents.[45] In addition to setting the children up economically, New York parents were especially concerned with giving their children equal chances to succeed in life. This was demonstrated by arranging apprenticeships, dividing property and possessions equally, and by making special provisions for the less privileged, such as widowed daughters, daughters whose marriages were less than satisfactory, and handicapped

---

[44]Will of John Woolsey, Sr., Nov. 1751, Early Wills of Westchester County, 117-18; Will of Coles Golding, proved Mar. 28, 1760, ibid., 167; Will of Richard Hutchings, proved Feb. 11, 1764, ibid., 203-4; Will of George Weiser, proved June 7, 1764, Abstracts of Wills, VI, 332-33.

[45]Will of John Nagel, Harlem, proved Oct. 11, 1763, Abstracts of Wills, VI, 276; Will of Benjamin Strong, Goshen, Orange County, proved Dec. 26, 1760, ibid., 33; Will of Thomas Jackson, Hempstead Harbor, proved Oct. 27, 1750, ibid., 301-2. Provisions for daughters may be found throughout Abstracts of Wills.

children.[46] Perhaps most important of all, as the eighteenth century wore on, New York parents increasingly began to view the economic survival of their children as very much contingent upon the latter learning a certain amount of reading, writing, and especially cyphering.

III

"The City is so conveniently Situated for Trade," wrote the Reverend John Sharpe of New York in 1713, "and the Genius of the people so inclined to merchandise, that they generaly seek no other Education for their children than writing and Arithmetick."[47] Sharpe rather unrealistically believed that materialistic New Yorkers might be cleverly seduced into recognizing the intrinsic merit of the genteel arts and letters. But despite his illusions, the worthy chaplain quite correctly identified the growing importance of formal instruction in the occupational education of New Yorkers. As the eighteenth century progressed, the schools of New York were destined to play an increasingly larger part in preparing the young for future occupations. Parochial schools which had been established and sustained to perpetuate ethnic and religious traditions were becoming more numerous and influential, but the expanded role of

---

[46]For example, see the Will of Thomas Williams, Hempstead, proved May 11, 1736, ibid., III, 202-3; Will of William Jamison, proved May 3, 1746, ibid., IV, 159-60; Will of Daniel Turner, proved Mar. 18, 1746, ibid., 119-20; Will of Jorg Adam Smith, Rennselaerswyck, proved 1764, ibid., VI, 354-55.

[47]John Sharpe, "Proposals for Erecting a School, Library and Chapel at New York (Mar. 11, 1713)," in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1880 (New York, 1881), 340.

schooling may perhaps best be seen in the transformation of the private schools of New York City and larger towns under the impact of rapidly changing currents of occupational education. From teaching the rudiments of reading, writing, and arithmetic, private schools began to offer to the public increasingly technical and intellectual subjects during the eighteenth century.[48]

During the seventeenth century, it was becoming customary for apprenticeship contracts to call for youths bound out to be taught "to read, write and cypher." More often than not, such provisions specifically pledged the master to allow "the said Apprentice three Months after Christmas to goe to the Night Schools every year." Usually the master paid for the schooling, but the burden sometimes fell upon the father of the apprentice, or the master and father shared the expenses involved. For instance, according to the indenture whereby Jacob Coursen was apprenticed to William Bogaert, turner, in 1702, "the father shall provide and pay for two winters Nights schooling and his said Master Shall Allow him two halfe winters Schooling." In fact, as Robert Seybolt demonstrated half a century ago, the ubiquitous evening schools of colonial New York came into being to instruct apprentices and artisans who were at work during the day. The purpose of this collateral education was succinctly

---

[48]Robert Francis Seybolt, "The Evening Schools of Colonial New York City," in Fifteenth Annual Report of the [New York State] Education Department (1919), I, 630-45; also Seybolt's The Evening School in Colonial America (Urbana, Ill., 1925), 9-59; and his Source Studies in American Colonial Education: The Private School (Urbana, Ill., 1925), 83-109.

stated in an indenture of 1725: it called for teaching the apprentice to "Read Write and Cypher so far as will be Sufficient to Manage his Trade."[49]

As previously noted, there is considerable evidence to suggest that schooling was becoming regarded as a prerequisite to apprenticeship training. From 1710 to 1729, William Huddlestone first and then his son taught gratis many of the poor children of New York City, subsidized by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Careful to point out that his teaching had enlarged the Anglican congregation in New York City, the elder Huddlestone told the secretary of the S. P. G. that literacy instruction advanced the occupational aspirations of his poor little scholars. "As for my Success in teaching," he wrote the Society in 1716, "I have taught a Considerable Number who knew not a Letter (when they came to me) and can now read write & Cypher through the Rule of Three," that is, through addition, substraction, and multiplication. With justifiable pride, Huddlestone reported of his pupils, "Some of them are gone to sea, others to Trades."[50]

Thirteen years later, several years after Huddlestone's death, his son Thomas, who assisted by his mother continued the school, informed the S. P. G. that they were teaching "fifty poor children

---

[49]Indenture of Jacob Coursen to William Bogaert, Apr. 28, 1702, "Apprentices, 1694-1708," 600; Seybolt, "Evening Schools of Colonial New York," 630-35; Indenture of Isaac Gardner to Benjamin Bates, Oct. 26, 1725, "Apprentices, 1718-1727," 182.

[50]William Huddlestone to the Secretary of the S. P. G., Sept. 14, 1716, S. P. G. Letter Books, Series A, B, C (London, 1964), A, XII, 3.

and a great many of them are now fit for any trade." Regrettably, the younger Huddlestone conceded that he had been forced to turn away numerous poor parents who came "to see if there be any vacancy to admit their children, for they are not able to pay for their Learning."[51] The Dutch Reformed school of New York City and parochial schools sponsored by dissenters throughout the province also performed the same service for the underprivileged. And where there were no nearby schools taught by masters of their particular faith, dissenters were known to put aside their religious scruples and send their children to the more accessible Anglican-sponsored schools.[52]

For a variety of reasons, formal schooling for youths before they were apprenticed or hired out appealed to potential masters and employers. To prospective masters, it meant that they were relieved of the heavy responsibility of providing instruction in the rudiments of literacy for their apprentices and servants. Similarly, employers in many occupations preferred young employees who already had a functional knowledge of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Equally important to masters, employers, and parents alike were the socialization and self-discipline imposed by formal instruction. Indeed, although the tenure of young men and women at schools seldom

---

[51]Thomas Huddlestone to the Secretary of the S. P. G., July 10, 1729, ibid., A, XXII, 3, p. 357.

[52]William Webb Kemp, The Support of Schools in Colonial New York by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, Teachers College Contribution to Education, no. 56 (New York, 1913), 10-22, 95, 125-27, 131-32, 136, 141, 155, 157, 168.

was more than three months during three years (and even less for young women), many New Yorkers were coming to regard some form of systematic instruction as critical for preparing the young for adult roles. This emphasis upon formal schooling explains in part the proliferation of both parochial schools serving religious sects and ethnic groups and especially private schools serving the economic and cultural aspirations of the public in general.[53]

Besides its economic functions, formal schooling also acted as a cultural catalyst touching every aspect of colonial New York society. Unlike New Englanders, New Yorkers, excepting those who continued to cultivate their Puritan heritage, generally did not rely upon apprenticeship outside the family circle for socializing the young. Highly conscious of the cultural heterogeneity of the province, the family in New York was the overweening socializer, imbuing the young with the ethnic and religious traditions and the economic interest of the family. Although relatively speaking its influence might appear slight, schooling, whether parochial or private, assisted the young by mediating between the homogeneous culture of the family and the heterogeneous society of the colony.[54]

As demonstrated in earlier chapters, the neighborhood or

---

[53]Daniel Calhoun, The Intelligence of a People (Princeton, N. J., 1973), 134-38; Cremin, American Education, 489-91, 500-520.

[54]Bailyn's thesis of the school providing the link for the child between the nuclear family and the larger society has relevance to New York. However, it should be modified to apply to the ethnic group rather than the family alone. See his Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1960), 21-49.

village school was usually devoted to preserving and perpetuating ethnic distinctions; however, by teaching literacy, these schools prepared the young for both economic and social changes, and some schooling was particularly designed to facilitate cultural changes. For example, as Chaplain Sharpe noted in 1713, it was usual for some Dutch families at Albany and along the Hudson Valley to send their children to school at New York to learn English. English had become the language of commerce, and while continuing to raise their offspring to speak Dutch, New Yorkers of Dutch descent who were engaged in trade recognized the necessity of teaching English to their progeny.[55]

Furthermore, during the second third of the eighteenth century, the twin cultural trends of Anglicization and secularization were enshrined in the increasingly numerous private schools that offered to the public instruction not only in the rudiments of reading, writing, and arithmetic but also in bookkeeping, navigation, surveying, and advanced study in mathematics, natural philosophy, modern and ancient languages, geography, and history. While very much involved in disseminating what may be loosely called "high culture," such schools had a solid foundation based on public demand, having assumed many of the educational functions that had formerly been the almost exclusive domain of apprenticeship. Indeed, the rise of private

---

[55]Sharpe, "Proposals," 341; Kalm, Travels in North America, I, 346.

schooling coincided with the weakening of contractual apprenticeship.[56]

The private schools serving the public in colonial New York reflected both the growing economic complexity of the province and the intellectual trends of the European Enlightenment. All the colonial towns possessed such schools, but according to the researches of Robert Seybolt, adventurous schoolmasters were especially numerous in provincial New York, particularly in the capital city of New York City itself. Beginning as evening schools that instructed apprentices who worked during the day, private schools multiplied and expanded their curricula. While always insisting that apprentices continued to be the mainstay of private schools, Seybolt nonetheless admitted that free laborers and young men and women in general patronized such schools, where they might learn writing, arithmetic, accounting, navigation, surveying, and ancient and modern languages. In fact, given the relative unimportance of apprenticeship in many trades, the private schools very likely had the greatest appeal for free laborers who wished to refine their skills and for young men preparing for some particular trade.[57]

While schools for reading, writing, and arithmetic abounded in provincial New York in the seventeenth century, it was not until 1723 that a private school which taught advanced subjects is definitely known to have been on the scene. In October and November of that year, John Walton, recently graduated from Yale

---

[56]Seybolt, Source Studies in American Colonial Education, 35-53, 100-103.

[57]Seybolt, "Evening Schools of Colonial New York," 630-37.

College, advertised in the Philadelphia American Weekly Mercury that he was keeping school in New York City on Broad Street near the Exchange. Walton taught "Reading, Writing, Arethmatick, whole Numbers and Fractions, Vulgar and Decimal, the Mariners Art, Plain and Mercators Way; Also Geometry, Surveying, the Latin Tongue, the Greek and Hebrew Grammers, Ethicks, Rhetorick, Logick, Natural Philosophy and Metaphysicks, all or any of them for a Reasonable Price."[58] He added that if any "Young Gentlemen of the City will please to come in the Evening and make some Tryal of the Liberal Arts, they may have opportunity of Learning the same Thing commonly Taught in Colledges." Seybolt quite correctly classified Walton's undertaking as an academy rather than as simply a school. Although it is not clear how long he taught or how successful his academy was, Walton's ambitious educational plans were probably several years ahead of New York society.[59]

Yet Walton was not very far ahead of many culturally self-conscious New Yorkers. Within a few years, advanced study in the practical sciences was regularly offered to the public. In September 1730, James Lyne, who was currently completing his famous survey of New York City, published his design "to Teach in the Evenings (during the Winter) Arithmetick, in all its parts, Geometry, Trigonometry, Navigation, Surveying, Gauging, Algebra, and sundry other

---

[58] American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), Oct. 17, Oct. 24, Oct. 31, 1723.

[59] Ibid.; Seybolt, Source Studies in American Colonial Education, 99.

parts of Mathematical Learning." The next June, at a house near the customhouse, George Brownell "taught Reading, Writing, Cyphering, Merchants Accounts, Latin, Greek, & c., also Dancing, Plain-work, Flourishing Imbroidery, and various Sorts of Works."[60] Furthermore, during the early 1730s, New Yorkers of means were becoming increasingly culturally concerned, and amidst rumors that a college was in the offing for New York City, the Provincial Assembly passed and the Governor-in-Council approved legislation in 1732 "to encourage a Public School in the City of New York for teaching Latin, Greek and Mathematicks."[61]

The language of the act is itself instructive, revealing quite vividly the cultural pretensions and utilitarian concerns of colonial New Yorkers:

> Whereas, good Learning is not only a very great accomplishment but the properest Means to attain knowledge, Improve the Mind, Morality and good Manners, and to make Men better, wiser and more useful to their Country as well as to themselves.
>
> And Whereas, the City and Colony of New York abounds with Youths of a Genius not Inferior to other Countries, it must be a Loss to the Public and Misfortune to such Youths if they are destitute of the Opportunity to improve their Capacities by a Liberal Education.[62]

Therefore, the provincial government agreed to subsidize Mr. Alexander Malcolm, a highly respected New York teacher whose

---

[60] New-York Gazette, Aug. 31, 1730; ibid., June 14, 1731.

[61] Daniel J. Pratt, comp., Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, from 1626 to 1746 (Albany, N. Y., 1872), 124-25.

[62] An Act to Encourage a Public School in the City of New York for Teaching Latin, Greek and Mathematics, Colonial Laws of New York, II, 103.

income barely supported his large family. In return for an encouragement of eighty pounds, Mr. Malcolm was required to teach without additional pay twenty youths under sixteen years of age already well instructed in reading and writing English: ten for the City and County of New York, two for Albany, and one each for the remaining counties of Queens, Suffolk, Westchester, Richmond, Orange, Ulster. The youths for each county were selected by their respective local governments.[63]

Malcolm was a resourceful teacher, and his original contract for five years as master of the New York City public school was extended for another year, but rival schoolmasters appeared on the scene and the tightfisted Assembly refused to continue the subsidy in 1739 and only grudgingly paid the worthy pedagogue his just wages, which were much in arrears. Malcolm continued teaching in New York City, though competition from rival schoolmasters was becoming extremely keen. Besides the traditional three Rs, the pedagogical entrepreneurs of New York by the middle of the eighteenth century were tendering to the public a remarkable variety of subjects, including Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, Spanish, English grammar, geography, history, mathematics, and astronomy. Such schoolmasters were wont to emphasize how wonderfully attuned their respective curricula were to the latest refinements in English and European thought. But the private pedagogues recognized that

---

[63]Ibid.; Morris, Mayor's Court, 189.

their primary appeal had to be to the utility of the subjects taught.[64]

In the New-York Gazette, July 14, 1735, an anonymous schoolmaster advertised instruction in French and Spanish, both languages that were useful in trade and usually taught along with accounting and bookkeeping. Nor was the utility of English grammar to commercial correspondence forgotten. But it was mathematics that formed the basis for most commercial careers. Many examples could be cited, but fairly typical of dozens was the 1755 advertisement inserted in the New-York Gazette or Weekly Post-Boy by John Searson:

> Who teaches School at the House of Mrs. Coon, opposite to the Post-Office, proposes (God Willing) to open an Evening School, on Thursday the 25th of this Instand September; where may be learn'd Writing, Arithmetick Vulgar and Decimal, Merchant Accounts, Mensuration, Geometry, Trigonometry, Surveying, Dialling, and Navigation, in a short, plain, and methodical Manner, and at very reasonable Rates. Said Searson having a large and Commodious Room, together with his own diligent Attendance, the Scholars will have it in their Power to make good Progress in a short Time.[65]

Schoolmasters of the "practical branches of mathematics" relied upon a variety of techniques and what might well be considered teaching aids. In 1763, for instance, John Nathan Hutchins announced that "Young Gentlemen inclined to learn Surveying, will be instructed in the Practick as well as the Theoretical Part, he being provided

---

[64]Daniel J. Pratt, Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, 130-43; Seybolt, Source Studies in American Colonial Education, 93-102.

[65]Seybolt, "Evening Schools of Colonial New York," 647; New-York Gazette or Weekly Post-Boy, Sept. 15, Sept. 22, Sept. 24, Oct. 6, Oct. 13, 1755.

with Chain and Compass and has obtained Liberty of exercising his Scholars in a convenient Tract of Land not far distant." Hutchins also taught "Navigation by all the various ways ever yet taught, whether Tabular, Logarithmetical, or Instrumental, also without the Help of Books or Scales." In 1768, with sixteen years at sea to his credit, James Lamb "flatters himself he can render Navigation (in some Measure) familiar to the young Navigator the first Voyage."[66]

Hutchins, Lamb, and others who taught navigation had to instruct the students in geography and in the use of maps, globes, and various nautical instruments. Similarly, regarding the usual methods of accounting as tedious and time-consuming, John Searson proposed in 1755 "to teach a very short and perspicuous [sic] Method for Retaile & c. to adjust their Accompts by."[67]

The number and variety of private schoolmasters in New York by the 1750s strongly suggest that many occupations were requiring more technical knowledge than ever before and that the private school was replacing apprenticeship as the primary institution imparting technical and language skills. Given the competition between teachers, plus the extensive curricula of the private schools, one finds it easy to agree with Robert Seybolt that the private school played an especially important role in meeting the changing educational needs of colonial New Yorkers. At the same

---

[66] New-York Mercury, Apr. 25, May 2, 1763; New-York Gazette, or Weekly Post-Boy, Dec. 12, 1768.

[67] Seybolt, Source Studies in American Colonial Education, 35-53; New-York Gazette, or Weekly Post-Boy, Oct. 6 and 13, 1755.

time, Lawrence Cremin's provocative statement that many American colonials were the beneficiaries of a liberating literacy seems confirmed by the prevalence of the private schools. They catered to all people, young and old, male and female. And their obvious popularity meant that many New Yorkers were exposed to broadening intellectual trends and life alternatives not so readily available to earlier generations.[68]

IV

The proliferation and variety of private schooling was just one educational manifestation of the economic development and cultural self-consciousness of colonial New Yorkers. Another was the effort of the New York elite to prepare their children to preserve and even advance the wealth and prestige of the family. The manor lords of the Hudson Valley and the successful merchants of Albany and New York City were for the most part careful men who recognized that wealth was difficult to retain. They gave considerable thought to the education of their children, and so did other aspiring New Yorkers of means who were part of the upper class but on the periphery of political power and economic influence. "The Law or Commerce," wrote John Watts in 1765, with regard to possible vocations for his sons, "seems to be the only alternatives with us & such Numbers infest the first that the latter I think upon the whole is become

---

[68]Seybolt, Source Studies in American Colonial Education, 100-101; Cremin, American Education, 546-51. Cf. Lockridge, Literacy in Colonial New England, 97-101.

full as Creditable." A very successful merchant himself, Watts might have also mentioned medicine, usually listed amont the three "aristocratic" trades. But like so many other New Yorkers of the time, he looked upon most lawyers as pocket-picking pettifoggers and most doctors as ignorant, murderous quacks.[69]

To secure the best apprenticeship positions for their offspring in the aristocratic trades, New York parents had to have both money and contacts, especially contacts to obtain service under the most successful merchants, lawyers, or physicians. The prospective apprentice himself was expected to have all the schooling thought necessary by the master before beginning his apprenticeship. But not even parents of the upper class with contacts and adequately prepared sons were always assured of placing them with whomever they wished. Consider the example of young Peter DeLancey, whose maternal grandfather was Cadwallader Colden and whose deceased paternal grandfather had been Stephen DeLancey, perhaps the richest merchant in the province. Unlike his brothers James and Oliver, young Stephen DeLancey had inherited his father's vast estate in Westchester County and took no part in the family importing business.[70]

In June 1755, replying to Cadwallader Colden's earlier inquiry

---

[69]John Watts to Gedney Clarke, July 23, 1765, Letter Book of John Watts, Merchant and Councillor of New York, ed. Dorothy C. Barck, in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1928 (New York, 1929), 361 (hereafter cited as Watts Letter Book); John Watts to Sir William Baker, Jan. 22, 1762, ibid., 12-13; John Watts to General Henry Monckton, May 16, 1764, ibid., 254.

[70]Hindle, "The Coldens," 245-47; Cadwallader Colden to Peter Collinson, May 1742, Colden Papers, II, 257-63.

concerning the vocational training of his grandsons, Elizabeth DeLancey told her father that both she and husband Peter were anxious "about the boys, & wish Stephen was with a good Marchant but we have been so unlucky that those, that Mr. DeLancey has spoke to, could not take him." Meanwhile, Mr. Chambers, the family tutor, was instructing Stephen in bookkeeping along with his usual subjects. But by June of the following year, Beverely Robinson, partner in the trading house of DeLancey and Robinson, came to the rescue. His mother and father were especially pleased that Stephen was "going to live with Mr. Beverely Robinson to learn the Marchants busyness; from whose character, I have great reason to hope for Stephens well doing." Their second son Peter was also to go to New York to study Latin and Greek and live with Dr. Samuel Johnson, president of Kings College. But Elizabeth and Peter DeLancey were now having trouble finding a suitable merchant who would take as an apprentice their youngest son, John.[71]

An apprenticeship under an established merchant was quite expensive. The evidence is scanty, but the merchant probably charged from £50 to £100 per year until the apprentice learned the business, and the parents usually had to provide for the lad's room, board, and clothing. But as so many New Yorkers were aware, the rewards of a successful apprenticeship far outweighed the expenses involved. Not only did the apprentice learn the business; but more

---

[71]Elizabeth Colden DeLancey to Cadwallader Colden, June 24, 1755, Colden Papers, IX, 153; Elizabeth Colden DeLancey to Mrs. Cadwallader Colden, June 7, 1756, ibid., IX, 155-56.

often than not, he became an agent of the company his master was associated with, or else he joined another commercial house or struck out on his own, having extensive practical experience and invaluable personal associations that apprenticeship alone provided.[72]

Indeed, apprenticeship in trade provided an avenue whereby the sons of middling merchants and landholders like Ebenezer Haviland of Westchester might make it to the top of the economic pyramid. In his will proved in 1750, Haviland called upon his executors to keep his son Ebenezer at school to qualify him to be either a merchant or doctor. His two younger sons were likewise to remain in school and acquire "learning suitable for a merchant." However, the crucial factor in a commercial apprenticeship was selecting the right master, one who traded widely and had many merchant friends both in the colonies and abroad. In 1763, wanting his son to serve under the best, Edward Antill, a wealthy New Jersey landowner and politician with family and interests in New York as well, asked John Watts to accept his son as an apprentice. Unable to take another apprentice or even to recommend any other merchant, Watts sadly related that trade was so depressed that he was scarcely able to

---

[72]The only specific figure I found was for £50 mentioned by Henry Lloyd, Jr., to Henry Lloyd, Jan. 20, 1755, Papers of the Lloyd Family of Lloyd's Neck New York, 1654-1762, ed. Dorothy C. Barck, in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Years 1926 and 1927, 2 vols. (New York, 1927-1928), II, 527 (hereafter cited as Lloyd's Neck Papers). For importance of apprenticeship, see William Henry Smith to Henry Lloyd, Mar. 13, 1761, ibid., II, 594; Thomas Steele to Henry Lloyd, May 31, 1726, ibid., I, 269.

keep his own sons busy.[73]

Only the sons or close kin of the successful merchants could be assured of choice apprenticeship positions. Despite the depression that followed the French and Indian War, John Watts managed to maintain his large family rather well. He also managed to find plenty of work for his oldest son Robert. Like other wealthy New Yorkers, Watts had the education of his children tentatively planned. His son Robert would learn the business that Watts directed in partnership with his brother-in-law, Oliver DeLancey. His daughters would be educated as ladies, and if Watts had anything to do with it, they would marry well. As for his two younger sons, John and Stephen would be educated to professions that complemented the family business interests.[74]

Such had been the educational pattern that Stephen DeLancey and Robert Livingston had followed with regard to their progeny. So had Jeremias Van Rensselaer, John Walton, Frederick Philipse, Stephan Van Cortlandt, Lewis Morris, Augustus Jay, Gerardus Beekman, Henry Lloyd, and others of the upper class in New York. Just as the intermarriage of the sons and daughters of the elite strengthened respective family interests, the educational pattern was dictated by the intense desire to protect and perpetuate the prestige and

---

[73]Will of Ebenezer Haviland, proved Jan. 1, 1750, Abstracts of Wills, IV, 252-53; John Watts to Edward Antill, Esq., July 29, 1763, Watts Letter Book, 163.

[74]John Watts to Gedney Clarke, Dec. 21, 1762, Watts Letter Book, 108-9; John Watts to John Wickham & Sons, July 10, 1765, ibid., 358-59; John Watts to Gedney Clarke, Aug. 28, 1765, ibid., 280.

political and economic power of the respective families. Therefore, Peter DeLancey was determined to make his son Stephen the business success he himself never was. Similarly, Philip Livingston was educating his oldest son Robert to manage the manor, while his younger sons were being prepared to look after various other aspects of the vast Livingston family interests. Retiring to his manor of Queens Village on Long Island, Henry Lloyd continued to assist his two sons who were budding merchants and the third who wanted to become a doctor. And at Albany, Leendert Gansevoort educated his oldest son to commerce, his second son to the family brewery business, and his third son to medicine.[75]

By the mid-eighteenth century, the law was becoming the primary alternative profession to commerce in New York. It had not always been so. Indeed, reporting on his stay in New York from 1678 to 1680, the Reverend Charles Wolley noted with approval that "Attorneys were denyed the liberty of pleading." Less than twenty years later, the situation had changed radically, and Governor Bellomont could write the Treasury Lords in 1699 that there "was not such a parcel of wild knaves and Jacobites as those that practised

---

[75]Lawrence H. Leder, "Robert Livingston's Sons," 234-49; Will of Stephen DeLancey, proved Nov. 24, 1741, Abstracts of Wills, III, 336-38; Will of Henry Lloyd, proved June 30, 1763, ibid., VI, 251-52; Will of Frederick Phillipse, proved Oct. 14, 1751, ibid., IV, 355-61; Will of Frederick Van Cortlandt, proved Dec. 20, 1751, ibid., 375-76; Will of Augustus Jay, proved Nov. 13, 1758, ibid., V, 346-47; Will of Lewis Morris, Aug. 28, 1762, ibid., VI, 171-74; Will of Philip Livingston, proved July 5, 1749, ibid., III, 230-31; Henry Lloyd, Jr., to Henry Lloyd, Nov. 4, 1748, May 19, 1748, I, 406: William Lloyd to Henry Lloyd, Apr. 7, 1750, ibid., 449.

the law in the province of New York, not one of them a barrister, one was a dancing master, another a glover, a third . . . condemned to be hanged in Scotland for blasphemy and burning the bible."[76] In 1709, following the enactment of a provincial law regulating their fees, the lawyers of New York City formed the first bar association in North America. The organization apparently continued for some time thereafter, though little is known of its deliberations.[77]

According to the practice of the day, lawyers were licensed to practice before any particular court upon the recommendation of the judge or judges of that court and with the approval of the governor. Much to the scandal of the educated barristers, judges made recommendations loosely, and governors granted licenses as a matter of course to men with slight legal training. The result was that well-trained lawyers like William Smith, James Alexander, and John Chambers found their respective practices considerably diminished. In 1729, led by Smith, the prominent lawyers of New York City formed an association dedicated to decreasing the great number of lawyers "not sufficiently qualified for that business," who "use low and undue methods for acquiring business to themselves" and "reflect a general Odium on the profession of the Law." All of the signatories agreed not to assist any practitioner who had acquired his license "since the last day of

---

[76]Charles Wolley, A Two Years' Journal in New York (1701; reprint ed., Cleveland, Ohio, 1902), 68; quotation from Kammen, Colonial New York, 129.

[77]Paul M. Hamlin, Legal Education in Colonial New York (New York, 1939), 258-64.

June 1725." Furthermore, persons who employed such unqualified lawyers "in their common & easie business" but sought assistance from the qualified lawyers on difficult matters were to be flatly refused.[78]

This association of lawyers made its influence felt. It very likely had something to do with the decision of the Supreme Court in 1730 to henceforth require seven years experience as a clerk of any lawyer aspiring to practice before that court. The associated lawyers may also have contributed to the provision in the new charter New York City received in 1731 which gave to seven prominent lawyers a monopoly to practice before the Mayor's Court. However, lawyers with little legal training continued to be licensed and plead before the various county courts, and the popular resentment finally forced the provincial legislature in 1746 to break the monopoly to practice before the Mayor's Court.[79]

The quality of lawyers continued to improve, thanks in part to the Supreme Court's requirement of a seven-year clerkship, plus the presence of more attorneys trained at the Inns of Court, and the rigorous apprenticeship programs set up by qualified counselors like William Smith, James Murray, John Chambers, and James Alexander. Even so, the populace still viewed lawyers with a mixture of wry

---

[78]Agreement Made among Lawyers, July 28, 1729, John Jay Papers, Box III, New-York Historical Society. Also quoted by Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes, comp., The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 6 vols. (1915-1928; reprint ed., New York, 1967), IV, 513.

[79]Hamlin, Legal Education, 260-64; Morris, Mayor's Court, 52-54.

humor and nervous contempt. An article published in the New-York Gazette in 1746 warned against taking a dispute to court because unscrupulous lawyers were notorious for protracting suits until they had finagled their unfortunate clients' entire estates. The unlettered and immoral pettifogger was the subject of much satire, but because lawyers were becoming increasingly important, the satire at times betrayed the sarcasm of those who found themselves dependent upon a lawyer, regardless of the latter's scruples or sagacity.[80]

The education of lawyers was especially the subject of much scrutiny. In 1745, while serving what he regarded as hardly less than a torturously dull apprenticeship under James Alexander, William Livingston, who had recently graduated from Yale College, took advantage of the popular aversion to lawyers to inveigh against the pitiful plight of law clerks. "There is no Set of men that bear so ill a Character in the Estimation of the Vulgar, as the Gentlemen of the Long Robe," wrote Livingston pseudonymously in his oft-quoted letter to the Weekly Post-Boy; "whether the disadvantageous Idea they commonly entertain of their Integrity be founded upon solid Reasons, is not my Design to inquire into; but if they deserve the imputation of Injustice and Dishonesty, it is no Instance more visible and notorious, than in their Conduct toward their

---

[80]E. Alfred Jones, American Members of the Inns of Court (London, 1924), xviii-xxxviii; Milton M. Klein, "The Rise of the New York Bar: The Legal Career of William Livingston," William and Mary Quarterly, 3d series, XV (1958), 334-58, esp. 336-42; Hamlin, Legal Education, 116-17; New-York Weekly Post-Boy, Dec. 22, 1746; New-York Gazette, or Weekly Post-Boy, Feb. 18, 1751.

Apprentices." What especially galled young Livingston was the negligible instruction he was receiving from the famed Alexander:

> That a young Fellow should be bound to an Attorney for 4, 6, or 7 Years, to serve him part of the Time for the consideration that his Master shall instruct in the Mystery of the Law the Remainder of the Term; and that notwithstanding this solemn Compact (which is binding on either Side, is reciprocally obligatory) the Attorney shall either employ him in writing during the whole Term of his Apprenticeship, or, if he allows him a small Portion of the Time for reading, shall leave him to pere on a Book without any Instruction to smooth and facilitate his Progress in his Study, or the least Examination of what Proficiency he makes in that perplexed Science; is an outrage upon common Honesty, a conduct scandalous, horrid, base, and infamous to the last degree.[81]

Not all legal apprentices found clerking so exasperating. Indeed, young Livingston himself, dismissed by Alexander who was not amused by the publication of Livingston's satirical little essay on the social pretensions of his master's wife, found clerking for William Smith, Sr., intellectually broadening and stimulating.[82]

Livingston was just one of many younger sons who were finding their way into the legal profession. Some forty years before, William's uncle, Robert Livingston, Jr., had become the first New Yorker to enter the Middle Temple of the Inns of Court. Returning to the province upon the completion of his legal training, Robert complained to his father in 1713 that it was almost impossible for him to make a living at the law. By the mid-eighteenth century, however, economic growth had brought legal complexity, and good

---

[81] New-York Weekly Post-Boy, Aug. 19, 1745.

[82] Ibid., Mar. 3, 1746; Klein, "The Legal Career of William Livingston," 340-58.

lawyers were both very much needed and very well paid. The law, as John Watts had noted, was becoming second only to commerce as the way to wealth and prestige for ambitious New Yorkers. For fathers with varied business interests, it just made good sense to have a lawyer in the family.[83]

So in 1762 Peter DeLancey sent his second son Peter to England to study law. The enterprising John Watts, young Peter's uncle, made the necessary arrangements with the assistance of one of his London business associates, Sir William Baker. In a letter introducing Peter to Baker, Watts amusingly remarked that Americans had a high regard for the law as expostulated by Professor Blackstone of Oxford, "who they say has brought that Mysterious Business to some System, besdies the System of confounding other People & picking their Pockets, which most of the Profession understands pretty well."[84] Ten years later, John Watts, Jr., would be studying law in England, and John Jay and Robert R. Livingston, young Watts' friends from Kings College, would also be preparing to become gentlemen of the bar. Obfuscating pickpockets they might have been, but as even conservative John Watts, Sr., recognized, the day of the lawyer had arrived.[85]

---

[83]Leder, "Robert Livingston's Sons," 245-48; Robert Livingston, Jr., to Robert Livingston, Sr., Dec. 13 and 29, 1712, Livingston Family Papers, New-York Historical Society Library (Microfilm Reel 3); Klein, "The Legal Career of William Livingston," 344-58.

[84]John Watts to Sir William Baker, Jan. 22, 1762, Watts Letter Book, 12-13.

[85]John Watts to John Watts, Jr., Mar. 5, 1772, Watts Family Papers, New-York Historical Society; Humphrey, From King's College to Columbia, 195-201.

If John Watts had little good to say about most lawyers, he and his contemporaries had even less that was good to say about doctors. But following the law, medicine was rapidly becoming the third profession of the upper class in mid-eighteenth century New York. For four generations, the Beekman family, though primarily devoted to trade, had regularly furnished the colony with some of its most competent doctors. From the Jay family came Sir James Jay, the first New Yorker to take an M. D. from the University of Edinburgh. At Albany, Leendert Gansevoort, a wealthy brewer who was taking his family into the patrician class of that city, sent his third son Pieter to Boston, where he was apprenticed to a Dr. Cutler. On eastern Long Island, Henry Lloyd, lord of the Manor of Queens Village, arranged in 1745 for his third son James to serve an apprenticeship under Dr. John Clark of Boston.[86]

Some fathers of middling wealth saw medicine as the way their sons might enter the New York upper class. In his will probated in 1748, Edmund Fowler, yeoman of Eastchester, directed that "my son Soloman is to be put at a School or Colledge, and give him learning fit to qualify him to be a Doctor." According to his will of 1750, Ebenezer Haviland, merchant and farmer of Westchester

---

[86]Philip L. White, The Beekmans of New York in Politics and Commerce, 1647-1877 (New York, 1956), 122-25, 315-32, 337; Humphrey, From King's College to Columbia, 246; Alice P. Kenney, The Gansevoorts of Albany: Dutch Patricians in the Upper Hudson Valley (Syracuse, N. Y., 1969), 36-37. For a perceptive analysis of the early American medical profession, see Richard Harrison Shryock, Medicine and Society in America, 1660-1860 (New York, 1960), esp. 1-43, 51-60; and Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., The Colonial Physician & Other Essays (New York, 1975), 5-41.

Borough, wanted his son Ebenezer "put to school, and learnt good Arithmetick, Navigation and Surveying, and Latin sufficient to qualify him for a Doctor."[87] In Bedford, Westchester County, John Miller, a farmer of some wealth, willed in 1760 that his son Elisha should have "his support on his apprenticeship to a Doctor," plus £50 and a horse. The same year, John Cornell, storekeeper of Rumbout Precinct, Duchess County, willed "the education of my son Marten I desire may be such as will fit and qualify him for an Apprentice in order to Obtain the Science and knowledge of Physick, and then to be put to some able and skilled Practitioner of that Profession."[88]

As in both commerce and law, apprenticeship in medicine did not come cheap. Henry Lloyd paid Dr. John Clark £400 for the four years his son James served him. James wanted to learn more, and father Henry paid several hundred additional pounds so his son could study abroad, first in London and then in Paris. It was money well spent, for James Lloyd became perhaps the finest doctor in Boston, skilled in diagnosing ills, prescribing medicines, and performing surgery. All too often, even good doctors paid too little attention to what their apprentices learned, being more concerned with collecting their fees from both patients and apprentices. Medicine was still very much wrapped up in superstition and folklore, and the state of the profession was not improved by the internecine

---

[87]Will of Edmund Fowler, proved Nov. 30, 1747, Abstracts of Wills, IV, 151-52; Will of Ebenezer Haviland, proved Jan. 1, 1750, ibid., 252-53.

[88]Will of John Miller, proved Nov. 4, 1760, ibid., VI, 41; Will of John Cornell, proved June 6, 1761, ibid., 110.

feud which raged throughout the eighteenth century between the theorists and the empiricists, who unfortunately for the health of mankind found it difficult to find any common ground.[89]

Although medical education was improving, the empiricists prevailed in New York. In fact, Dr. Alexander Hamilton, the Maryland physician who toured the colonies in 1742 and recorded what he saw, found the state of the medical art surprisingly primitive in the province. None of the doctors impressed him in bustling New York City. In Albany, he noted that most of the doctors were Dutch, "all empyricks, having no knowledge or learning but what they have acquired by bare experience." Rather than medical books, their study was primarily herbs. "A great many of them take the care of a family for value of a Dutch dollar a year," Hamilton observed disdainfully, "which makes the practice of physick a mean thing and unworthy of the application of a gentleman." Most insulting of all was that the "doctors here are all barbers." Hamilton talked at some length to Dr. Rosaboom, "one of the Dutch medicasters of the place, a man of considerable practice in administering physic and shaving." His prize possession was a huge "Dutch Herbalists," whose very sight disgusted Hamilton, "especially when I understood it was writ in High Dutch." No self-respecting medical

---

[89]Henry Lloyd, Jr., to Henry Lloyd, Dec. 31, 1745, Lloyd's Neck Papers, I, 366-67; Henry Lloyd, Jr., to Henry Lloyd, Nov. 4, 1748, ibid., 413; "Essay on Medicine," New-York Weekly Post-Boy, Jan. 16, 1744; Richard Harrison Shryock, The Development of Modern Medicine: An Interpretation of the Social and Scientific Factors Involved (Philadelphia, 1936), 15-36.

tome could possibly be written in anything but Latin.[90]

New York did have some good doctors. Besides a number of Beekmans, there was John Dupuy, "that skillful Practiser in Physic," who died during the smallpox epidemic in the summer of 1745. The following November, Dr. Isaac DuBois, a much respected physician, died after a lingering illness. Along with the eccentric James Jay, there were Samuel Bard and Peter Middleton, both of whom graduated from Edinburgh and contributed much to the establishment of a Medical Faculty at Kings College in 1767. And there were other skilled New York physicians.[91] But there were also the "vile Quacks and base Pretenders" who either out of ignorance or greed preyed upon the misery and pain of unwitting victims.

What the learned physicians had against the unlettered herbalist was his ignorance of anatomy and physiology, and the relationship "between the several Parts, caused by the commerce of the Nerves, and their artful Distribution and Ramification throughout the whole Body." According to an article in the Weekly Post-Boy on January 6, 1744, the many quacks in the city pretending to be physicians knew virtually nothing about medicine, "yet they have by a far easier and much shorter course of Studies acquired the gainful Art of ingratiating themselves with the weak, vain, and undiscerning Part of Mankind, by soothing their Passions, and acquiescing with whatever

---

[90]Carl Bridenbaugh, ed., Gentleman's Progress: The Itinerarium of Dr. Alexander Hamilton (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1948), 66-67.

[91]New-York Weekly Post-Boy, June 18, 1744, ibid., Nov. 11, 1745; Humphrey, From King's College to Columbia, 240-47.

they say or do." Consequently, when the quacks seemed to cure, it was only by chance, though their admirers "ascribe it to their profound SKILL and Sagacity." However, the article continued, "no notice is ever taken of the many Constitutions ruin'd or Lives destroy'd through their ignorance and Rashness."[92]

New York newspapers regularly inveighed against the quacks and reported the tragic results of their handiwork. On May 28, 1744, the Post-Boy noted that the day before "Mr. John Fordham of this City, Taylor, was unhappily poisoned by drinking the Decoction of an unknown Root, given him by another Person, in order to cure the Stomach Ach; and we are told that the Person who gave it to him is since absconded."[93] Of the forty or so doctors in the city, William Smith, Jr., writing pseudonymously in the Independent Reflector for February 15, 1753, estimated that "the greatest Part of them are meer Pretenders to a Profession, of which they are entirely ignorant." "How many of the lives of the good People of this City," Smith asked rhetorically, "must annually fall a Sacrifice to those Pests of Society, those merciless Butchers of Human Kind!" Smith's answer was to impose a tough licensing requirement upon all medical practitioners. The provincial government, advised and assisted by a committee of reputable physicians, would be the licensing agent. Another proposal that had been offered a few years before was for the creation of a vigilante committee whose aim would

---

[92]"Essay on Medicine," New-York Weekly Post-Boy, Jan. 6, 1744.

[93]New-York Weekly Post-Boy, May 28, 1744.

be to remove notorious quacks by force. An act passed in 1760 required medical practitioners to obtain a certificate of competency from any of several public officers, but the law was apparently not rigidly enforced.[94]

While the question of adding a medical faculty to King's College was being discussed, several other schemes were considered for educating the quacks themselves. A Dr. Clossy proposed in 1764 to deliver a series of "Anatomical Lectures" not only for the benefit of the students at King's College but for the edification of the public and the improvement of doctors already practicing. Dr. Clossy's patron, Governor Robert Monckton, urged John Watts to drum up support for the scheme, but the circumspect Watts was reluctant to do so, explaining "that in the humour people are, they had rather One half were hang'd that allready practicing than breed up a New Swarm in addition to the old." Doubting that New Yorkers would be receptive to learned physicians any time soon, Watts noted the unlettered doctor was very much a part of colonial life. There is in every family, he reported, "a kind of old stupid Drone, who is as us'd to it, as a Horse to his Manger & the family as us'd to him, so that he becomes a necessary Evil, interwoven in the Constitution,

---

[94]"The Use and Importance of the Practice of PHYSIC; together with the Difficulty of the Science, and the dismal Havock made by Quacks and Pretenders (Feb. 15, 1753)," in William Livingston and others, The Independent Reflector: or Weekly Essays on Sundry Important Subjects More Particularly Adapted to the Province of New York, ed. Milton M. Klein (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), 135-42 (hereafter cited as The Independent Reflector); An Act to Regulate the Practice of Physics and Surgery, 1760, Colonial Laws of New York, IV, 455.

& has such hold, that it required some time & superiority of Talents to work him out. . . ."[95]

While the licensing act of 1760 was not satisfactory, the medical profession itself was improving, thanks largely to the higher standards that better educated and highly skilled young men brought to the practice of the medical arts. Similarly, although William Livingston, William Smith, Jr., and other young lawyers were unable to get provincial laws passed setting minimum educational standards for legal practitioners, they were able to achieve much of what they sought through a bar association, whose regulations prohibited members from accepting as apprentices young men unless they had studied for at least two years in college, would agree to clerk for five years, and would pay £200 to their respective masters. The elitest bent of those who would reform both the legal and medical professions is evident, though William Livingston, whose crusading little magazine, The Independent Reflector, spearheaded the fight against pettifoggers and quacks, denounced "The Vanity of Birth and Titles; with the Absurdity of claiming Respect without Merit," preferring instead to talk about personal worth and preferment based on natural ability and cultivated skills. Nevertheless, the leading professionals of the province, like Livingston himself, were with few exceptions from families of the rich and well born.[96]

---

[95]John Watts to Isaac Barre, Nov. 15, 1763, Watts Letter Book, 198; John Watts to Robert Monckton, Dec. 29, 1763, ibid., 202.

[96]Humphrey, From King's College to Columbia, 237-49; Hamlin, Legal Education, 258-64; The Independent Reflector, Sept. 20, 1753, 359-66.

While having their own separate professional associations, the businessmen, lawyers, and doctors of New York mingled together in the same social clubs, joined together or opposed each other for political office, and married each other's sisters, nieces, and cousins. Indeed, New York's upper class was highly inbred, though surprisingly receptive to energetic young blood that had proven itself in the economic arena. The New York upper class generally aped the British aristocracy, but the resulting Anglo-American culture was largely a glittering superstructure that rested on a solid foundation of cultural diversity which stubbornly refused to go away. True, the New York elite developed a class consciousness that transcended narrow group identity based on ethnic and religious traditions. There are also numerous examples of leading families leaving the Dutch Reformed Church or some English dissenting creed and embracing the established Church of England: the Van Cortlandts, Philipses, Stuyvesants, and latecomers like the Morrises, Watts, Jays, DeLanceys, and Coldens. In addition, preachers of every denomination agreed that religious allegiance was considerably weakened by the onslaught of secularism and materialism. The quest for wealth quite clearly brought about a certain amount of professional and class consciousness, even though New York continued to be characterized by a very heterogeneous culture.[97]

---

[97]For specifics, see Will of Frederick Philipse, Abstracts of Wills, IV, 355-61; Will of Frederick Van Cortlandt, ibid., 375-76; Will of Augustus Jay, ibid., V, 346-47; Will of Lewis Morris, ibid., 171-74. A more general account is given by Kammen, Colonial New York, 157-60.

V

The rising public discussion regarding what education lawyers and physicians should have reflected the growing cultural self-consciousness of New Yorkers during the second third of the eighteenth century. It was also part of a more general dialogue on child-rearing and vocational education that had concerned New Yorkers for many generations. The advent of Newtonian physics and Lockean psychology revolutionized the thought of western civilization, and Locke's special concern with educational psychology wrought radical changes in child-rearing practices. Under the impact of the "new learning," not only children but society as a whole became the subject of those who would mold and shape it, for the natural laws of Newton and the empirical philosophy of Locke armed the reformer with considerable scientific reinforcement in his battle to impose morality and reason upon unenlightened and immoral mankind. Never before and certainly not since the eighteenth century has western man been so intent upon improving himself and his neighbor.[98]

Although on the periphery of the Atlantic civilization, New York, too, was swept by the optimistic winds of the Enlightenment. The latest books, magazines, and newspapers from England were sold in New York City, and the essays that filled the city's own newspapers were an instructional mixture of the sacred and the secular, the serious and the satirical, but always unabashedly

---

[98]Cremin, American Education, 361-67; Henry F. May, The Enlightenment in America (New York, 1976), 5-9, 11-13, 26-41.

moralistic. The movement during the late 1740s and early 1750s to establish a college in New York reflected the desire to provide better education for the young in particular and to improve society in general. Even more important, the public discussion of the college issue provided rare insight into the attitude of New Yorkers toward education.

"That there are different Turns in Men, that qualify some for Improvements, for which others can never be fit," wrote AEsculapius to the New-York Gazette in 1751, "is so obvious a Truth, that whether we look abroad on the Conduct of Men, or consult the writings of the Learned in our Closets, we cannot in the least doubt it." It was the task of teachers, AEsculapius continued, to search out "the Genius of their Pupils, and so direct them to the Study and Practice of such Things, as fall in with their various Turns of Mind."[99] Such thoughts were hardly original. In fact, they go back to Plato and more recently to Locke's Some Thoughts Concerning Education, published in 1693. The child's mind was a tabula rasa, but it was also distinctive, inclined toward this vocation or that branch of learning but not so receptive to another. New Yorkers read Locke; his works, including his seminal essay on education, were regularly advertised by booksellers. Furthermore, Locke's Thoughts were paraphrased and quoted in many an article that appeared in the New York press after Bradford began publishing the Gazette in 1725. But undoubtedly the greatest popularizer of Locke in

---

[99]AEsculapius [William Smith?], "Essay on Lawyers," New-York Gazette, Revived in the Weekly Post-Boy, Feb. 18, 1751.

New York as elsewhere was Isaac Watts.[100]

A dissenting clergyman who was ecumenical in outlook, Watts placed Locke's educational psychology within a thoroughly moral context that made his child-rearing techniques acceptable to the broad spectrum of both English and colonial Protestants. His Improvement of the Mind (1741) has been called "the most influential popularization in America of Locke's Essay on Human Understanding (1690)." Watts' Logick (1725), his Divine Songs (1715), and his Catechisms (1730) as well as other devotional essays were regularly advertised by the booksellers of New York. In fact, Watts' works were extremely popular in eighteenth-century New York, second only to Bibles and primers. Also a favorite among New Yorkers was John Clarke's essay Upon the Education of Youth in Grammar School (1720) and his several other Latin primers and dialogues which adeptly applied Lockean pedagogical theory to the Latin grammar school. What Watts and Clarke got from Locke were the concepts that the mind of the child was malleable, that learning was a developmental process, and that the teacher should not force learning upon the child so much as simply adapt teaching methods to the intellectual level of the child and make learning as enjoyable to the pupil

---

[100]"Observations on Human Life," New-York Gazette, Mar. 24, 1729; Book Advertisements, New-York Weekly Journal, Feb. 15 and 22, 1741; New-York Weekly Post-Boy, Jan. 2, 1744; Cremin, American Education, 276-81.

as a game.[101]

While Lockean educational psychology was quite certainly known to New Yorkers, the extent to which it was understood and applied by the populace is difficult to ascertain. However, given the constant barrage of essays relating to child-rearing found in newspapers, almanacs, magazines, and books, it is not too much to say that Lockean educational psychology had at least some influence on the literate masses, and statistical data strongly suggest that the masses of New York were literate by the mid-eighteenth century.[102] Something else should be kept in mind. Well before Locke wrote his famous educational treatise, Dutch child-rearing ideas were considerably closer to what the perceptive philosopher had in mind than those dictated by stern Puritan theology. In the seventeenth century, Dutch New Yorkers seldom subscribed to the popular Puritan credo that children were depraved little creatures whose stubborn wills had to be broken for the glory of God and social stability. Noting the difference during her famous trip by horse from Boston to New York City late in 1704, Sarah Kemble Knight reported that the Sabbath was not well kept in the province, with boisterous

---

[101] Book Advertisements, New-York Weekly Journal, Feb. 8, 1741; see also New-York Weekly Post-Boy, Apr. 25, 1743; New-York Gazette, Revived in the Weekly Post-Boy, Apr. 18, 1757; New-York Mercury, Mar. 6, 1758; New-York Gazette, or Weekly Post-Boy, Jan. 15 and May 24, 1761.

[102] The works of both Watts and Clarke are briefly commented upon and excerpted in Theories of Education in Early America, 1655-1819, ed. Wilson Smith (Indianapolis, Ind., 1973), 61-126; Cremin, American Education, 538.

children tumbling about the streets in spirited merriment.[103]

According to several observers, there were some significant differences between the way Dutch and English New Yorkers raised their children. Dr. Benjamin Bullivant, who visited New York City in 1697, was somewhat surprised that the Dutch influence remained so strong in the provincial capital:

> The children of rich parents are usually without shoes or stockens, and young mayds (especially Dutch) Weare morneing gowns allday Long and barefooted; indeed, I cannot say I saw any of ye Dutch that well dresst, though rich enough to weare what they pleased.[104]

Anne Grant spent three years in New York with her father who was in the British army during the late 1760s. Writing some three decades after her visit, Grant noted that New Yorkers gloried in their children. Referring primarily to the Dutch around Albany with whom she had spent most of her time, she noted that "parents knew not what it was to find a rebel or a rival in a child; first, because they set the example of simplicity, of moderation, and of seeking their highest joys in domestic life; next, because they quietly expected and calmly welcomed the evening of life; and did not, by an absurd desire of being young too long, inspire their offspring with a premature ambition to occupy their place." Grant

---

[103]See Paul Zumthor, Rembrandt's Holland; John Robinson, "Of Children and Their Education (1628)," in Child-Rearing Concepts, 1628-1861: Historical Sources, ed. Philip J. Greven, Jr. (Ithaca, N. Y., 1973), 11, 13; Sarah Kemble Knight, The Journal of Madam Knight (Boston, 1972), 31-34.

[104]Wayne Andrews, ed., "A Glance at New York in 1697: The Travel Diary of Dr. Benjamin Bullivant," New-York Historical Society Quarterly, XL (Jan. 1956), 63-65.

also explained that the children of the same age divided themselves into three or four groups among which there was intense rivalry, usually expressing itself in berry-picking contests and the devotion of both boys and girls to picking a spouse from their particular group. The parents, Grant insisted, encouraged their children to join these little exclusive clans and gave them much independence.[105]

Above all else, Grant emphasized, the Albany Dutch were characterized by filial devotion. Indeed, her memoirs were largely a memorial to Mrs. Philip Schuyler, who though childless herself turned her household into a "little academy" where countless nephews, nieces, and "adopted children" improved themselves under madam's direction. Although households of the elite, whether Dutch or English, tended to be large and inclusive, Grant observed rightly that the Dutch found supreme satisfaction advancing kith and kin, especially kin. However, as Alice Kenney has demonstrated so convincingly, the unique quality of Dutch New York families was the intermingling of filial devotion with some particular commercial enterprise, where members of the same family were linked together not only by blood but by generations of economic cooperations. Children of Dutch New Yorkers were frequently pampered and spoiled. They were usually on their best behavior before their parents; but on the street, the rowdy side that Mrs. Grant so graphically described was likely to come out. In 1749, riding into Albany wearing his hair "bagged" in the French manner, Peter Kalm, the Swedish naturalist, found himself

---

[105]Anne Grant, Memoirs of an American Lady, ed. James G. Wilson, rev. ed., 2 vols. (New York, 1901), I, 196; II, 88-91.

surrounded by a small mob of howling children, "who called me a Frenchman, and some of the boldest offered to pick at my French head dress, so I was glad to get rid of it."[106]

Kalm rightly emphasized in 1749 that there was a cultural difference between the New York City Dutch and the Albany Dutch. The Swedish naturalist explained that the people of Albany were almost exclusively Dutch. "They speak Dutch, have Dutch preachers, and the divine service is performed in that language. Their manners," Kalm continued, "are likewise quite Dutch; their dress is however, like that of the English." He noted, too, that the Albany Dutch taught their children both the Dutch and English languages. But in New York City, though Dutch was spoken, especially by the elderly Dutch colonists, the majority of the inhabitants, Kalm claimed, "were succumbing to the English language." As for the rising generation, Kalm recognized what Dr. Hamilton had observed a few years before. Young Dutch New Yorkers "scarcely ever spoke anything but English, and there were many who became offended if they were taken for Dutch, because they preferred to pass for English." Kalm further observed that the young people were leaving the Dutch Reformed Church for the Anglican faith, as were many Presbyterians.[107]

The rising generation of New Yorkers faced a crucial decision during the second third of the eighteenth century. Wittingly and unwittingly, they were deciding how much of their respective ethnic

---

[106]Ibid., I, 90-91, 115-25; Kalm, Travels in North America, I, 346.

[107]Kalm, Travels in North America, I, 343-46; II, 626-28.

and religious traditions would be retained and how much would disappear under the homogenizing influence of Anglicization. At the same time, Locke and a few other profound thinkers were formulating the developmental stages for the child and the adolescent. So New Yorkers were bombarded from both the press and the pulpit with advice on child-rearing just as the current generation was making the choices that would determine the cultural identity of the province. The child, the young man and young woman, the husband and wife, and society at large--all were analyzed and instructed on how to improve themselves, for their own good and for the glory of the Lord. This spirit of reform was based on the Enlightenment, and the part of the Enlightenment which had its greatest appeal to colonial New Yorkers celebrated the "Rational Christian." With a human body and a rational soul, man was "the Buckle of both Worlds, in which the Spiritual and material worlds are clasped and united together."[108]

"It is justly observed by Mr. Locke, and others before him," began an essay in the New-York Gazette for March 31, 1729, "that we have no innate ideas, nor can reflect upon them before we have them, that is, we cannot think before we have something to think upon." The new born child was innocent, possessed of a malleable mind that could be shaped for good or for evil, for the benefit of the child or for its ruination. Indeed, parents had to be very careful even before the birth of the child. Pregnant women were

---

[108]"Of Human Virtues Which Belong to Man," New-York Gazette, Jan. 13, 1735.

warned to eat temperately and shun strong drink, lest they prejudice their children's chance of survival following birth. By the mid-eighteenth century, the process of birth itself was becoming better understood medically. In 1754, following a series of tragic deaths associated with childbirth, someone with considerable knowledge of midwifery wrote the Gazette vehemently denouncing the common practice of severing limbs from fetuses in situations where complications of birth supposedly threatened the life of the mother. The result was always the death of the unborn infant and usually the demise of the weakened mother as well, and all for naught, insisted the critic, who cited Mr. Smellie's study on midwifery which carefully explained how breach births and other complications might successfully be handled without dismembering the unborn child. Mincing no words, the critic blamed the recent deaths of three babies and the mothers of two of them on the "palpable Male Practice" of two surgeons who had claimed they had no choice but to sacrifice the babies in an effort to save the mothers.[109]

Once the child was born, parents began the critical procedure of nurturing the babe. Although most New York mothers very likely nursed their own babies, putting infants out to nurse was much in vogue among the English upper class, and the prospect that mothers from the New York elite were likely to follow suit led one reader of the New-York Mercury to have the printer publish in May 1754

---

[109]"Observations on Human Life," New-York Gazette, Mar. 24, 1729; "Extract from The Political State," ibid., July 12, 1731; Supplement, New-York Mercury, May 13, 1754.

an essay from The Spectator on the inconvenience of hired nurses. The article quite graphically pointed out that nurses were usually not healthy themselves, seldom took adequate care of the child, and transmitted to the unsuspecting babes through their milk the anger, malice, fear, melancholy, and aversion of the unfortunate nurses themselves. The essay affirmed what medical authorities agreed and nature confirmed, that it was best for both if the natural mother nursed her own child. Another essay published in the Gazette in 1753 cautioned against leaving children with servants, who Locke pointed out were apt to frighten the very young with ghost stories just to keep them quiet. And now and again, the newspapers reported tragedies resulting from children being left alone or with careless servants.[110]

Locke portrayed the minds of children "as easily turned, this or that way, as water itself." Although a champion of physically freeing children from the bonds, staves, and assorted apparatus that had produced bent, twisted, and deformed adults for generations, Locke insisted that children's minds be scrupulously cultivated, "giving them that seasoning early, which shall influence their lives always after." By indulging the whims and selfish desires of children, the philosopher emphasized, parents were virtually assuring that small vices would become larger and usually incorrigible. As adults, they would lack self-restraint and concern for anything except their own selfish desires. "For he that has been used to have his will

---

[110]New-York Mercury, May 6, 1754; New-York Gazette, Dec. 11, 1753; New-York Mercury, Mar. 12, 1753; ibid., Apr. 23, 1753.

in every thing," Locke claimed, "as long as he was in coats, why should we think it strange that he should desire it and contend for it still, when he is in breeches?" Without question, the parent had an awesome responsibility. Children who were not taught self-discipline and compassion would almost certainly become greedy and dissatisfied adults, disrespectful and neglectful of their parents and the bane of their fellow men. Well might Isaac Watts solemnly enjoin parents and teachers in his Divine Songs to take heed because "the wisdom and welfare of the succeeding Generation are entrusted with you beforehand, and depend much on your conduct. . . ."[111]

The primary axiom in Lockean child-rearing thought was that infants should learn early that they might have not what they wanted but what their parents and elders decided would be best for them. Though Locke placed the burden on both parents, his popularizers tended to be largely concerned with instructing the mother during the infant's early years. A poem taken from the London Weekly Journal and reprinted in the New-York Gazette for July 1, 1734, idealized the responsibility of motherhood:

> A Mother who vast Pleasure finds,
> In Modelling her Children's minds,
> In midst of whom, with great Delight,
> She passes many a winter Night,
> Mingle in every Play to find,
> What Byass Nature gives the Mind,

Locke believed that the minds of different children were more or less receptive to different experiences. Therefore, the parents,

---

[111]Wilbur Macey Stone, The Divine and Moral Songs of Isaac Watts (New York, 1918), 1-16.

especially the mothers, should take care to note its particular inclination. At the same time, the mother especially should continue to shape the developing mind of the infant:

> The Noblest Notions would inspire,
> Her Off-Spring conscious of her care,
> Tranſported hang around her Chair,
> Of Scriptures Heroes she would tell,
> Whose Names they'd lispe' er they could spell,
> Then the delightful Mother fries,
> And Shews the Story in the Tiles.

The reference to the story in the tiles was particularly appropriate because many New Yorkers of Dutch descent had huge fireplaces overlaid with tiles depicting scenes from the Bible. The poem, at least to this point, gives flashes of insight into the ordinary mother-child relationship. The poet then stretches credibility somewhat as the mother recounted the virtues of ancient heroes, entertained with stories from Addison and Steele, and brought tears to her child's eyes with the sentimental piety of the fables by John Gay.[112]

Besides Gay's Fables, there were numerous little devotional books especially designed for children and with instructions for those who taught them. There were of course the works of Isaac Watts. Rejecting the bearish Puritan theology that filled the New England Primer and Michael Wigglesworth's The Day of Doom of the seventeenth century, Watts offered pleasant piety and the personal concern of a benevolent God which surely brought joy to the hearts of the young, whereas The Day of Doom undoubtedly aroused fear

---

[112] New-York Gazette, July 1, 1734; Alice Morse Earle, Colonial Days in Old New York (New York, 1896), 122-27.

and guilt feelings. Also popularizers of Lockean educational psychology and kindly Christianity were Philip Doddridge and James Burgh, both of whom were Presbyterian clergymen. They wrote primarily for the benefit of parents and teachers rather than for the young, though Doddridge's Principles of the Christian Religion (1743) was penned especially for children.[113]

There were also the schoolbooks, the primers and spellers and readers through which may be traced the impact of Lockean pedagogy during the eighteenth century. They were sold by the dozen or singly, and though schoolmasters were relatively numerous in the province, it is likely that most New Yorkers learned to read at home. Therefore, readers and spellers that made an extraordinary effort to appeal to the interest of the young were especially welcomed, for many parents trying to teach their children probably barely read themselves. Such was the reader known as The Child's New Play-Thing, whose extenuated title published in an advertisement of 1752 reveals much about the progression of Lockean educational thought among New Yorkers:

> The Child's New Play-Thing, or best EMUSEMENT: Intended to make the Learning to read, a Diversion instead of a Task, Consisting of Scriptures--Histories, Fables, Stories, Moral and Religious Precepts, Dialogues, & c. The whole adapted to the Capacities of CHILDREN, and divided into Lessons of one, two, three, and four Syllables, with entertaining parts to each Story and Fable; new invented ALPHABETS for Children to play with; and a Preface shewing the use of them. To which are added, Three Dialogues: 1. Shewing how a little Boy or Girl

---

[113]Cremin, American Education, 280-85.

shall make every Body love them. 2. How they shall grow wiser than the rest of their School-Fellows. And, 3. How they shall become great in the World.[114]

During the middle third of the eighteenth century, New York booksellers and printers also made available to the public an increasingly wide variety of self-help books for young people preparing to enter or already engaged in some trade. As early as 1698, William Bradford had published his compilation entitled The Secretary's Guide, or Young Man's Companion. In Four Parts. Bradford imported other such vocational manuals and enlarged and reprinted his secretary's guide periodically into the 1750s. Another work very popular among school boys in both England and America was The Instructor: or, Young Man's Best Companion. Containing Spelling, Reading, Writing, and Arithmetick, in an Easier Way than Any Yet Published; and How to Qualify any Person for Business, without the Help of a Master (1757). Later reprinted in New York, the Instructor was a compendium of knowledge, from bookkeeping and carpentry to pickling and preserving, along with short and easy methods of learning geography and astronomy. Other vocational manuals were somewhat less encompassing: Trader's Sure Guide, Muir's Book-Keeping, Hutton's Comus Comercia, Ship-builder's Assistant, Turner's Surveying, and others of the same genre. Also very popular were works that mixed behavioral with devotional instruction: Young Man's Companion, Young Woman's Companion, Christian Pocket

---

[114]New-York Mercury, Dec. 4, 1752.

Companion, Religious Courtship, Caution Against Whoring, to mention just a few.[115]

As their reading indicates, New Yorkers were becoming increasingly self-conscious culturally about themselves and about their society. Even before mid-century, New York newspapers were filled with didactic essays urging young and old alike to reform this or that aspect of their lives. But the social commentary of the late 1740s and early 1750s possessed a special urgency. It was written largely by New Yorkers themselves addressing specific provincial problems. Providing the general background for every particular issue that arose was the quest for communal or civil values that might stabilize the volatile cultural pluralism that characterized colonial New York. Searching for common elements out of which to fashion an acceptable provincial identity, critics again and again called upon New Yorkers to discount ethnic and religious differences and work together to improve themselves and their society. Much of the criticism was leveled at what was called the deplorable state of manners and learning. By the late 1740s, many New Yorkers looked to the proposed college to resolve their own identity problems

---

[115]William Bradford, The Secretary's Guide, or Young Man's Companion in Four Parts (New York, 1698). (Unless otherwise indicated, pamphlets cited in full are available in the Readex Microprint edition of the Early American Imprints published by the American Antiquarian Society.) See Fifteenth to Eighteenth Century Rare Books on Education: A Catalog of the Titles Held by the Educational Research Library (Washington, D. C., 1976), 26; also "The American Instructor," New-York Gazette, Revived in the Weekly Post-Boy, Oct. 3, 1740. The other manuals cited were found in book advertisements, such as Supplement, New-York Mercury, May 13, 1754, ibid., Oct. 14, 1754.

and uplift their society.[116]

The young men and women of the colony were naturally singled out for criticism and exhortation. In the manner of Addison and Steele, satirical essays on the pretensions and foibles of the fairer sex regularly appeared in New York newspapers. In 1738, for instance, an essay in the New-York Gazette deplored the current fashion of women dressing similarly to men, warning that the streets would soon be filled with "Hermaphrodites." The essay went on to ridicule young ladies who literally disguised their femininity in quest of a "genteel Shape." A slender waist, the essayist noted,

> was some years ago reckoned so necessary a Qualification among the English Ladies, that some starv'd themselves to Death, and others (too young to die martyr to their waste) were Murder'd by their unnatural Mothers, meerly to reduce their Bodies to Broomsticks.[117]

The intellectual capacity of women was continuously debated. In early 1734, an article in the Gazette proclaimed that "Female oratory may be comprehended under one word, Gossip." About a year later appeared an "account of Mrs. Drummond of Bristol," a Quaker preacher known for her peerless eloquence. Shortly thereafter, the Gazette published a poem celebrating the remarkable Mrs. Drummond and championing the rights of women:

> Too long, indeed, our Sex has been deny'd,
> And ridicul'd by Men's malignant Pride,
> Who fearful of a just Return forebore,
> Made it Criminal to teach us more,

---

[116]The place of King's College in the political and cultural life of colonial New York is explored with insight by David Humphrey, From King's College to Columbia.

[117]New-York Gazette, Aug. 14, 1738.

That woman had no Soul, was their pretence.
And woman's spelling, part for woman sense,
Tell you, most generous Heroine, stood forth.
And Shew's your Sex's Aptitude and Worth.
Were there no more, yet you, bright Maid, alone,
Might for a world of Vanity Attone,
Redeem the coming Age, and set us free,
From that false Brand of Incapacity.
O see thy, accomplish'd oratrist appear,
Refin'd her Language, and her Reasoning clear,
Thou only Drummond, has the pleasing Art,
At once to charm the Ear, and mend the heart.[118]

Despite the admirable example of Mrs. Drummond, women continued to be used by essayists as foils against which the larger shortcomings of society in general might be portrayed. Women were assailed for their concern with external beauty while failing to cultivate the mind. The afternoon assemblages of women of fashion for tea and cookies were caricatured, and the apparently growing popularity of snuff among some of the older ladies was vigorously denounced as repugnant and disgusting and typical of how the vanity in young women turned to vulgarity in the old. Above all else, though, the scolding, domineering wife was satirized, with the cowing husband usually blamed for the aberrant behavior of his masculine spouse. On the other hand, the idealized woman and wife were the epitome of feminine modesty, devoted to her husband and family, raising her children in piety and love. The domesticity of the female was emphasized, but essayists regularly urged young women to apply themselves to learning, to know the arts and sciences, study geography and natural philosophy, and contribute to the republic of letters.

---

[118]"Essay on an Idle Tongue," ibid., Jan. 7, 1735; "Poem Inspired by Mrs. Drummond," ibid., Mar. 15, 1736.

Women were quite capable of such accomplishments, wrote a contributor to the Post-Boy in 1746, although the vain customs of the day predisposed them to idleness and frivolity.[119]

"There is nothing they so generally neglect as reading," wrote William Smith, Jr., of New York women in 1757, "and indeed all the acts for the improvement of the mind, in which, I confess, we have set them the example. They are," continued Smith in his famous history of New York, "modest, temperate, and charitable; naturally sensible, and good-humoured; and, by the helps of a more elevated education, would possess all the accomplishments desirable in the sex."[120] As Smith obliquely admitted, it was common for girls as well as boys to receive the "less elevated education" of the elementary schools. But there were "higher" schools which offered instruction "for the Benefit of young Ladies who may be already advanced but not thoroughly perfect in Arithmetick, and the writing of English with good Orthography." In 1763, Stephen Dwight taught young girls "the several Branches of Drawing." Needlework of various sorts was regularly taught from the 1730s on, and dancing schools for both young men and women were ubiquitous. By the mid-eighteenth century, schoolmasters made available to young women more elevated subjects. In 1762, Frederick Rothenbuhler announced that he taught "young Gentlemen and Ladies the Latin

---

[119]"A Speculation," ibid., Sept. 1, 1735; New-York Weekly Post-Boy, Apr. 15, 1745; ibid., July 28, 1746.

[120]William Smith, Jr., History of the Province of New York, II, 227.

and French Languages as usual." Geography, mathematics, and accounting were among the other subjects taught to young women in the provincial capital.[121]

As previously mentioned, besides the books and pamphlets sold in early New York, the essays in the newspapers likewise barraged the public with didactic prose designed especially for the rising generation, particularly the young men of the province. Some random examples of these instructional articles throw considerable light upon the intellectual and moral background against which the attitude of New Yorkers toward education may be more clearly perceived. Particularly during the first decade of newspaper publishing in New York, most of the essays were taken from English newspapers and magazines, and they reflected the rationalist moralism of the day. From January through June of 1729, the Gazette ran a series of articles under the general title of "Observations upon Human Life," whose particular themes reflected the didactic quality of the age: superstitious beliefs in spirits and witches undermined by natural law, the mind and body and soul are all one and yet distinct, nature's wonders makes one think of God, the vice of flattery, an allegory on avarice.[122]

During the midst of a severe smallpox epidemic in 1731, an essay appropriately recounted that "we all grow old and die. Your

---

[121] New-York Mercury, Apr. 25, May 2 and 9, Nov. 21 and 28, 1763; New-York Gazette, June 14, 1731; New-York Gazette, Revived in the Weekly Post-Boy, June 22, Aug. 3, 1747; New-York Gazette, or Weekly Post-Boy, July 8, 1762.

[122] New-York Gazette, Feb. 4 through Sept. 1, 1729.

beauty is not immortal. Since beauty will not continue, improve thy mind with Piety & Vertue: Thus shalt thou be always lovely." In February 1732, an anonymous New Yorker lamented that "Cunning and Artifice" were replacing simplicity in the colony. He warned "that Simplicity is the home spun Dress of Honesty, and Chicanery and Craft are the Tinsel Habits and the false Elegance which are worn to cover the Deformity of Vice and Knavery." Writing the following July from Manhattan Island, Callamancas denounced the clothing of his degenerate age. "Richness and Finery of Apparel," he admonished, "had usually been accompanied by "all kinds of Luxury, Debauchery and Excess, and that the Habit has a very sensible Effect upon the Mind." His answer was sumptuary laws keeping dress simple.[123]

As William Smith noted in his history, New York was one of the most sociable places on the continent. During his peregrinations through the colonies in 1742, Dr. Alexander Hamilton found New Yorkers especially convivial with their many social clubs which met frequently during the evenings at their favorite tavern to eat and drink and talk. In fact, Hamilton suspected that New Yorkers overly imbibed, always ready to make a toast and drink a "bumper" of ale. Some New Yorkers were disturbed by the drinking habits of their young gentlemen, and one anonymously penned an essay denouncing as "rude, unmannerly, and ill-bred" the sport of drinking "bumpers." In contrast to the bumper clubs of New York, the critic

---

[123]Ibid., Oct. 4, 1731, and Feb. 8, 1732.

noted the constructive contribution of various Philadelphia organizations to the improvement of that city. A respondent of the same temperament wrote in mock anger that the reason Philadelphians were "not putting about Bumpers so freely as we do is only owing to their Stinginess." So what if Philadelphians talked about books and learning! "That's because they have got a Turn to these Things," continued the respondent, "and have a better Library than our, and the like of that." But the defender of bumpers went on to insist that New Yorkers "might be as good Schollars as they are," if they had a mind to. In fact, New Yorkers had once had Mr. Alexander Malcolm, known to many as the best schoolmaster in the colonies, but had not thought "it worth while to keep him among us."[124]

Will Tipple agreed that New Yorkers had no intention of spending their time reading and pouring over books. "I never like puzzling my Brain with such Trash," said Will, who knew of better ways of killing time. "Come my Boys," urged Will, whose wit and wisdom was being reported from his favorite tavern, "let's be merry, that's what we came here about. D__n such stuff. . . ." Another wit contributed a collection of the words and phrases to be heard at Mr. West's new tavern on Long Island. Among the most repeated were,

> . . . O Laws! Lackadazes! O Dears! Goodlacks! Blessmies! 'Tis so! Shaw Shaw! . . . Umph! Say you So! Well I vow! So it is! . . . 'Pon my Life! Well to be

---

[124]Bridenbaugh, The Itinerarium of Dr. Alexander Hamilton, 42-50; "To the Author of the Essay on Bumpers," New-York Gazette, Revived in the Weekly Post-Boy, Dec. 26, 1748.

> sure! . . . Didn't I tell you so! Who cou'd a tho't it! I never see-the-like! . . . And so forth.[125]

Another New Yorker who had visited Pennsylvania was less inclined toward humor. "Our Youth here, it must be allowed," Americanus wrote indignantly, "are endow'd with as good Natural Parts, as those of the other Provinces; and had they equal Advantages, are, no doubt, as Capable of Improvement: Ought not then a Reflection on this induce us to enter upon some Plan for the good of our Posterity, that be as advantageous to them?"[126]

There were various plans afoot, though certainly not as extensive as Americanus would have liked. As early as 1730, New York City passed legislation setting up a circulating, public library. To the half-forgotten, dusty tomes donated to Trinity Parish fifteen years before were added a thousand volumes from the estate of the Rev. Dr. John Millington, late rector of Newington, England. Dr. Millington had bequeathed his extensive library to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, which in turn made the books available to New York, on condition that provision be made for the preservation of the books and for making them accessible to the clergy and gentlemen of New York and surrounding colonies. The General Assembly informed the mayor and council of the S. P. G. offer, and they voted to build a room for the library in the city hall. The city corporation formally received the volumes,

---

[125]New York Gazette, Revived in the Weekly Post-Boy, July 31, 1749.

[126]Ibid., Nov. 25, 1751.

and Alexander Lamb became "Keeper of the Library" in 1734 and served until 1742. As far as is known, no new books were added to the corporation library, which apparently languished despite the enterprising efforts of James Parker in 1746 to arouse public interest in the books. Parker ran the library in the name of the city for probably two years, and after that, it again fell into disuse until it was joined loosely to the New York Society Library in 1754, having never been widely accessible to the public.[127]

The New York Society Library was founded largely on the initiative of several young gentlemen who had formed in 1748 an informal literary club known as the "Society for the Promotion of Useful Knowledge." The creation of the Library was just another part of their various efforts to cultivate what they regarded as the intellectual wasteland of New York. The Library's stated purpose was to stimulate inquiry by loaning books to the public and to be both useful and ornamental "to our intended college." Indeed, following the arrival of an initial consignment of about 600 books in October 1754, the gentlemen of the Society Library publicly set forth their aims:

> We hope that all who have a Taste for polite Literature, and an eager Thirst after Knowledge and Wisdom, will now repair to those Fountains and Repositories from whence they can, by Study, be collected. And we heartily wish, that the glorious Motives of acquiring that which alone distinguishes human Nature (we mean Science and Virtue, join'd to the noble Principles of being useful to Mankind, and more especially to our dear Country)

---

[127]Austin Baxter Keep, History of the New York Society Library, with an Introductory Chapter on Libraries in Colonial New York, 1698-1776 (New York, 1908), 67-77.

> will be sufficient to excite the most Lethargic, to peruse the Volumes purchased for this End, by Means of the Advice and Endeavours of Gentlemen whom we and future Generations, will have Reason, we hope, to praise and extoll; and whom, we cannot help saying, are an Honour to their Country: We finally wish, that New-York, now she has an Opportunity, will take off that Reflection cast on us by the neighbouring Colonies, of being an ignorant People.[128]

Membership in the Society Library was initially over one hundred of the most distinguished men of the province. It cost £5 to join, plus another 10s annually. The membership fees increased sharply over the next few years, and that expense, together with the rather high dues of 4s, 2s, and 1s and stiff fines, made the New York Society Library very elitist in its orientation, despite its original goal of providing books for the public.[129]

If the price of participating in the Society Library was almost prohibitive for the general public, the cost of a share in the New York City Corporation Library revived in 1765 was even more exclusive, being £10 10s per member. In fact, it was not the libraries of New York City that did most to distribute books to the populace. Rather, it was the booksellers, who not only sold books and magazines to the public but also loaned them out, though the latter practice was mostly informal and probably very limited. However, in August 1763, during a time when work on the city hall probably closed the doors of the New York Society Library, Garrat Noel, schoolmaster,

---

[128] New-York Mercury, Oct. 14, 1754; Jacquetta Haley, "Voluntary Organizations in Pre-Revolutionary New York City, 1750-1776," (Ph.D. diss., State University of New York at Binghamton, 1976), 47-51.

[129] New-York Mercury, Oct. 21, 1754.

bookseller, and Spanish interpreter for the colony since his arrival in 1753, opened "A CIRCULATING LIBRARY; Consisting of several Thousand Volumes of choice Books, in History, Divinity, Travels, Voyages, Novels & c." Noel claimed to be responding to the appeal of "sundrry Gentlemen," but his subscription rates were definitely aimed at the middling classes, for he initially charged subscribers five dollars a year and lowered that to four dollars in 1764. Noel's circulating library, the very first institution of its kind in the colonies, lasted at least until the fall of 1765 when the Common Council reopened the Corporation Library. Faced with the competition of the entrenched City Library and the Society Library, Noel's circulating library closed, though its originator continued selling books for another decade.[130]

Although quite clearly a commercial enterprise, Noel's library, like the two so-called public libraries, was part of a larger response to the growing popular desire among New Yorkers for the general diffusion of knowledge. It was simply a manifestation of the emphasis upon self-education. Another continued to be various schemes presented in the newspapers and pamphlets on how-to-work-and-grow rich. The formula was simple and endlessly repeated. "Let a Man be ever so skilful in Merchandize, or anxious in Trade," ran an essay in the Gazette in January 1750, "he must [not] expect to acquire Riches, if he be not thrifty, diligent, and Methodical." The writer urged every reader first to consider the carpenters, shoemakers, tailors,

---

[130]Keep, New York Society Library, 101-6; New-York Gazette, or Weekly Post-Boy, Aug. 25, 1763.

"and other inferior Tradesmen, who by Thrift, have gained the Reputation of rich Men." Having laid up a little sum, such resourceful individuals had usually multiplied their savings by wisely investing in commerce. The young tradesman who did not mind his shop or cultivate his mind but who haunted coffeehouses and taverns, warned the writer, was bound to be rewarded with wrack and ruin. Besides newspaper essays and pamphlets and books, articles in almanacs especially echoed such didactic sentiments.[131]

However important the educational activities of other instititions, education to culture-conscious New Yorkers in the middle of the eighteenth century preeminently meant schooling of one kind or another. In fact, the public discussion of education arose largely as a result of the efforts of New Yorkers to found a college, beginning with legislation to hold a lottery for that purpose in 1746. But the ensuing controversy also touched upon what today we call elementary and high schooling, for New Yorkers saw in schooling the primary means of reforming their society and creating a common cultural identity out of the welter of ethnic and religious groups of the colony. "Our schools are in the lowest order," complained William Smith, Jr., in 1757; "the instructors want instructions, and through a long shameful neglect of all the arts and sciences, our common speech is extremely corrupt, and the evidence of a bad taste, both as to thought and language, are visible in all our proceedings, publick and private." The English language, Smith

---

[131]New-York Gazette, Revived in the Weekly Post-Boy, June 25, 1750, Dec. 12, 1749, Jan. 27, 1752.

noted scornfully, was so corrupted by the Dutch dialect that in some counties it was difficult to find "older persons sufficiently acquainted with the English tongue to serve as jurors in the courts of law."[132]

While popular attention was sharply focused on the issue of what the nature of the college would be, there were others who questioned the utility of establishing a college without reforming the schools of the colony. It was absolutely essential, wrote a New Yorker in December 1752, for students to have a thorough schooling in reading, writing, arithmetic and geometry before progressing to the liberal arts and sciences taught at college. The writer expressed surprise at the neglect of these "first steps," without which the proposed college would be of little use. According to the writer, schools teaching the fundamentals for college education could be erected with little difficulty. "We need only follow the example of a Neighboring Colony," he insisted, "in obliging the inhabitants, by Law, to build a Schoolhouse in every Precinct or Township, and by an easy tax to give encouragement to a School Master, to teach the children of the poorer sort at a modest rate."[133]

The basic curriculum of the college would dictate the nature of the preparatory schools. The advocate of a school in every precinct or township purposely neglected mentioning Greek and Latin as

---

[132]William Smith, Jr., History of the Province of New York, II, 226-27.

[133]New-York Gazette, Revived in the Weekly Post-Boy, Dec. 11, 1752.

patently unnecessary for useful knowledge. "How many children," he asked plaintively, "have been forced to drudge several years in learning Greek and Latin, who after they left School, entirely forgot those Languages, by their being of no manner of use to them in their course of Life." The Greek and Latin languages were excellent in their day for teaching Greeks and Romans, but there was no justifiable reason why learning should not be taught in the mother tongue of the students, just as it was taught in ancient times. Not intending to banish the ancient languages, the writer admitted their utility "for such as intend to make the learned Science the employment of their lives, in the Study of Divinity, Law, or Physicks; and one School of Greek and Latin, at New York, will in our present circumstances, and for some years, be sufficient for there [sic] purposes." However, that school should not be connected with the college, having nothing whatsoever to do with the "general Education of youth in useful knowledge."[134]

Few New Yorkers of influence would approve of the radical removal of Greek and Latin from their entrenched place in liberal arts and sciences curricula. Indeed, writing pseudonymously in that engine of reform, The Independent Reflector, William Smith, Jr., naturally assumed that the Latin and Greek tongues would be enshrined in the proposed college. Therefore, he firmly contended "that good Grammar Schools are absolutely necessary in a course of Education to the Growth and Prosperity of our College, where, instead of

---

[134]Ibid.

studying the Rudiments of those Languages, after one Year's Exercise in them, the Youth enter upon sublimer Employment in Logic, Philosophy, Ethics, etc. in which it is impossible for School Boys, thro' the Immaturity of their Judgments, to make any valuable Proficiency." To secure a steady stream of students to the college, Smith proposed that the General Assembly pass legislation for the establishments of two grammar schools in every county, with guardians to be selected by the populace to regulate the schools and collect the assessment of £50 to be paid each master yearly.[135]

Neither Smith's proposal for the erection of grammar schools nor the anonymous scheme for the creation of schools of useful knowledge was adopted by the provincial government. However, not long after King's College began operation in July 1754, Dr. Samuel Johnson, its first president, admitted the desperate need for at least one good grammar school. To be admitted as fellows of the college, Johnson and the board of governors required that young men know reading, writing, and arithmetic very well. "And as to Latin and Greek," went the requirements, "that they have a good Knowledge in the Grammars, and be able to make Grammatical Latin; and both in construing and parsing, to give a good Account of two or three of the first select Orations of Tully, and of the first Books of Virgil's AEened, and some of the first Chapters of the Gospel of St. John, in Greek." At the same time, however, Johnson

---

[135]William Smith, Jr., "The Advantages of Education, with the Necessity of Instituting Grammar Schools for the Instruction of Youth, Prepatory to Their Admission into Our Intended College," The Independent Reflector, Nov. 8, 1753, 421-22.

revealed his own desire to make learning of the greatest utility to the young:

> . . . it is further the Design of this College, to instruct and perfect the Youth, in the learned Languages, and in the Arts of Reasoning exactly, of writing Correctly, and Speaking eloquently: And in the Arts of Numbering and Measuring, of Surveying and Navigation, of Geography and History, of Husbandry, Commerce and Government, and in the Knowledge of all Nature in the Heavens above us, and in the Air, Water and Earth around us, and the various Kinds of Meteors, Stones, Mines, and Minerals, Plants and Animals, and every Thing useful for the Comfort, the Conveniences, and Elegance of life, in the Chief Manufactures relating to any of these Things. . . .[136]

Despite the embittered controversy over the place of religion in the college, New Yorkers seemed generally to agree that the college would "contribute much to the Piety and Vertue of the next and succeeding Ages, and in some Measure obliterate the Scandal of the present, arising from too great a neglect in forming the Minds and Morals of those whose Stations in the Commonwealth give great Weight and Force to their Examples, in influencing the Lower Ranks and Order of the People."[137] In his furious attack upon ignorant lawyers of 1751, AEsculapius looked to the proposed college to secure the community against such "Pests of Society" as "bad workmen in the Arts and Trades; poor Fools in the Pulpit; Mountebanks and Quacks in Physics, and Pettifoggers in our Courts." In 1763, although King's College had been more or less functioning for almost nine years, John Watts described New York City as beyond

---

[136] New-York Mercury, June 3, 1754.

[137] New-York Gazette, Revived in the Weekly Post-Boy, Jan. 14, 1751.

doubt "the worst School for Youth of any of his Majesty's Dominions," with "Ignorance, Vanity, Dress & Dissipation being the reigning Characteristicks of their insipid Lives." Even so, Watts believed the beleaguered college had at last weathered the storm of religious controversy and might yet "instill into the minds of the rising Generation a proper Spirit . . . of infinite Use to the Publick."[138]

The founding of King's College brought to a climax the cultural self-consciousness that had characterized New York society since the 1730s. As will be discussed in the next chapter, the college became the source of religious controversy and did not completely satisfy any of its initial supporters. But it represented the genuine desire among New Yorkers both to improve and to unify their culture. American colonials generally recognized that they were on the fringe of English culture, country cousins to urbane Londoners, and they wanted to polish their rough-hewed culture so that it might at least be a worthy reflection of British culture.

However, thoughtful New Yorkers did not simply want to ape the British aristocracy. Indeed, the didactic newspaper articles revealed that some New Yorkers took pride in the fact that their culture was simpler and not decadent like Britain's was purported to be. The college would therefore do on a larger and more systematic scale what New Yorkers had been doing for decades, that is, carefully selecting only certain parts of English culture for application in New York. The college was also expected to unify New York culture.

---

[138]John Watts to Moses Franks, Nov. 24, 1763, Watts Letter Book, 200-201.

New Yorkers of English descent were particularly mindful that their provincial culture was much different from that of the mother country because it was the product of peoples of many different ethnic and religious backgrounds. As it educated succeeding generations of community leaders, the college was expected to transform the heterogeneous culture of New York into an Anglo-American culture.

That transformation was already underway, being propelled by New Yorkers whose occupations or professions removed them somewhat from the parochial concerns of the family and extended kinship circle. Such New Yorkers were still very much a part of the ethnic culture from whence they came, but through their work they developed provincial loyalties that made them yearn for a broader community of interests that would transcend narrow ethnic concerns. To a considerable extent, the Great Awakening also led New Yorkers to cooperate across denominational lines. However, the suspicion and competition among the various religious groups made the issue of a college highly controversial and prevented the homogenization of Anglo-American culture in New York.

CHAPTER VII

PARSONS AND PEDAGOGUES: THE GREAT AWAKENING AND EDUCATION IN NEW YORK

In his annual report of 1728 to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, missionary William Skinner of Perth Amboy noted that swarms of stiff-necked Calvinists from New England and Ireland were settling in New Jersey. As if the mere presence of the obnoxious Presbyterians and Congregationalists were not enough, the Anglican parson also indicated that religious frenzy threatened to disrupt his frontier parish. Most of the trouble was caused by so-called preachers "who pretended to be so nicely acquainted with the Almighty's Counsels and Decrees, that at first Sight they can distinguish 'tween Saint and Sinner."[1] Such wild religious notions had proven socially destructive, breaking up not a few families. "Husbands have Separated from their Wives, and Wives from their Husbands," reported Skinner. "Children have thrown off their Duty to their Parents, and Parents have cancell'd the bonds of Nature toward their Children, and that by the particular Advice and injunction of their Teachers, prohibiting (as they word it) Babes of grace to cohabit or have fellowship with Sons of Belial."[2]

---

[1]William Skinner to Secretary, Perth Amboy, Dec. 8, 1728, S. P. G. Letter Books, Series A, B, C (London, 1964), A, XXI, 12, pp. 367-68. (Some of the letters cited in this chapter have neither letter numbers nor page numbers. Citations will be made as precisely as possible.)

[2]Ibid., p. 368.

The religious enthusiasm, as Skinner termed it, swirled around the evangelical preaching of Theodore Frelinghuysen, the Dutch Reformed minister from Holland who for eight years had led emotional revivals in the Raritan Valley. His style of preaching was roundly condemned by many Dutch Reformed clerics and laymen in New York and New Jersey, but the charismatic Frelinghuysen was not without his supporters; Domine Bernhardus Freeman of Kings County, Long Island, was an early one. In fact, much to Skinner's displeasure, Frelinghuysen's methods of preaching were finding favor with "Dissenting Teachers from New England," especially young Gilbert Tennent, who were also spreading the "Contagion" throughout the region, "and when or where it will Stop God only knoweth."[3] For the next eleven years, Protestant clerics in general and Anglican missionaries in particular deplored what they regarded as the very dangerous religious emotionalism that convulsed on occasion first one community and then another. In the Middle Colonies no less than New England, the time was ripening for the religious revivals of the early 1740s that came to be known as the Great Awakening.[4]

As Herbert L. Osgood observed over fifty years ago, the Great Awakening was "the first great and spontaneous movement in the history

---

[3]Ibid.

[4]Joseph Tracy, The Great Awakening: A History of the Revival of Religion in the Time of Edwards and Whitefield (1845; reprint ed., New York, 1969); Edwin Scott Gaustad, The Great Awakening in New England (New York, 1957); Charles Hartshorn Maxson, The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies (1920; reprint ed., Gloucester, Mass., 1958), 1-10. Especially important is Martin E. Lodge, "The Crisis of the Churches in the Middle Colonies, 1720-1750," Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, XCV (1971), 195-220.

of the American people." Thanks in no small part to the controversial peregrinations of the eloquent George Whitefield from England, revivals occurred generally throughout the colonies and touched every social class, economic interest group, and religious sect during the early 1740s. The Awakening had a fundamental impact upon the cultural life of the American colonies because it was as much an educational as a religious movement. Not only were the revivalists themselves instructing the masses first hand, but the controversial political and religious issues provoked by the Awakening were argued in newspapers, pamphlets, magazines, and books printed and sold throughout the American colonies. Equally important, the realignment of the religious groups brought about by the Awakening intensified efforts to perpetuate and propagate the faith through family devotions, catechetical training, and elementary schooling. Finally, New Light Congregationalists, New Side Presbyterians, and other evangelical supporters moved ahead of the Old Lights and Old Sides in establishing grammar schools or academies and colleges to educate laymen and clerics alike in the experiential faith that was forged in the blazing furnace of religious revival.[5]

The educational force of the Great Awakening had a particularly profound impact upon the cultural configuration of the province

---

[5]Herbert L. Osgood, The American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century, 3 vols. (New York, 1904-1907), III, 409. The best analysis of the educational impact of the Great Awakening is found in Lawrence A. Cremin, American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783 (New York, 1970), 303-32. Especially suggestive for further research is Douglas Sloan, ed., The Great Awakening and American Education: A Documentary History (New York, 1973), 1-61.

of New York. Perhaps because of its complex mixture of religions, New York has been largely ignored by scholars assaying the influence of the Awakening, while the revivals in the other Middle Colonies, the Southern backcountry, and especially New England have been studied with considerably more care. But in fact, the evangelical winds of religious revivals blew rather stoutly across New York in the early 1740s, pushing along dark clouds of theological controversy, and fanning for decades the glowing embers of denominational antagonism.[6]

From an institutional point of view, the Great Awakening in New York was the catalyst that helped transform loosely organized religious sects supported by slight subscription into tightly organized and broadly based religious denominations supported by generous voluntary contributions. The educational manifestations of the revivals at once reflected and also influenced that transformation. Between 1720 and George Whitefield's arrival in New York in 1739, Anglican missionaries continued their efforts to instruct blacks, Indians, and dissenters, both British and foreign, in the doctrines of the English Church. The dissenters, for their part, increased their own educational activity as they gained economic and political

---

[6]Maxson, Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies, 69-79. Maxson's work is still the only comprehensive study on the Middle Colonies, but a more recent reappraisal may be found in Lodge, "Crisis of the Churches," 218-20. See also James Tanis, Dutch Calvinistic Pietism in the Middle Colonies: A Study in the Life and Theology of Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen (The Hague, 1967); Leonard J. Trinterud, The Forming of an American Tradition: A Re-examination of Colonial Presbyterianism (Philadelphia, 1949); and John B. Frantz, "The Awakening of Religion among the German Settlers in the Middle Colonies," William and Mary Quarterly, XXXIII (Jan. 1976), 266-88.

power and were able to defend themselves against the Anglican onslaught.

Then came the Awakening, bringing to a climax the contradictory tensions of Anglicization and ethnic diversity that strained provincial New York society. Impelled in part by the controversy surrounding the revivals, polyglot New Yorkers redoubled their efforts to preserve and perpetuate their own respective ethnic and religious traditions. They also found considerable common ground, being either for or against the Awakening. Through both formal and informal methods, education played an important part in the formation of denominations and interdenominational alliances. Indeed, just as economic developments in the eighteenth century had done, religious developments contributed to the slowly emerging personal identity that harnessed ethnic and religious interests. Different concepts of what that provincial identity should be led to the acrimonious debate regarding the founding of King's College. In the aftermath of the Great Awakening, the King's College controversy revealed quite clearly the implicit and volatile relationship between education and denominational politics.

I

William Skinner's response to the revivals of Frelinghuysen and Tennent in 1728 was typical of the reaction of Protestant preachers in general who rightly recognized that religious enthusiasm threatened their own efforts to impose order on already unstable congregations. Interestingly enough, having described what he had done to scotch the "Disorder being in my Neighborhood," Skinner

declared that nothing would assist his mission as much as a worthy schoolmaster. "A pious and Sober man in that Station," he explained, "would by Diligence and a faithful discharge of his Duty lay ye foundation of religion and make Such early impression of Vertue upon the minds of our Youth, that time could hardly wear them out." A schoolmaster was especially necessary, Skinner insisted, because parents neglected to instruct their children properly, whereby "vice and the cant peculiar to this Country commonly get their Start, and it's hard afterwards to rescue them."[7]

Whether Anglican or dissenter, colonial preachers would probably have agreed that pious schoolmasters were essential to protect the rising generation from the Scylla of religious hysteria on the one hand and the Charybdis of atheistical free-thinking on the other, both of which were equally destructive to that quest for stability and order so important among sectarians of every stripe. Indeed, during the twenty years before the Great Awakening, the different religious groups in New York looked to various educational institutions and especially the school to provide the unity of purpose and program for which they yearned.

Such was clearly the case with regard to Anglican educational efforts among New York dissenters. Between 1720 and 1740, Anglicans stepped up their missionary effort in New York, gaining more members for the English Church than ever before and arousing considerable opposition from dissenters, both Calvinists and Quakers. As the

---

[7]Skinner to Secretary, Dec. 8, 1728, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, XXI, 12, p. 368.

S. P. G. missionaries viewed the situation, Presbyterians and Quakers were hellbent on blocking the expansion of the Anglican faith. While missionaries of the English Church watched with an anxious eye, dissenters from New England and Pennsylvania organized the Presbytery of Long Island in 1717. As Presbyterians settled increasingly in the Jersies and the Hudson Valley, the Presbytery of Long Island was joined with the Presbytery of East Jersey to form the Presbytery of New York in 1738. Because preachers were scarce, many Presbyterian congregations were served irregularly by itinerant ministers; at other times, a layman might read a sermon. As in the Dutch Reformed congregations, such Presbyterian lay readers occasionally served the neighborhood as schoolmasters. Quakers from New Jersey and Long Island were also moving into the Hudson Valley, bringing with them their "lay" ministers and teachers whose labors were butressed by the intense cultivation of Quaker beliefs within the family circle. Having little use for dissenters generally, Anglican clerics particularly deplored "Quakerism" as the worst of all dissenting perversions, preparing the way for atheistical heresy and social anarchy. Compared to the Quakers, Anglican clerics believed Presbyterians and Independents were lesser evils, but evils nonetheless.[8]

---

[8]Robert Hastings Nichols, Presbyterianism in New York State, ed. and completed by James Hastings Nichols (Philadelphia, 1963), 25-34; James Wetmore to Secretary, Rye, July 21, 1729, S. P. G. Letter Books, B, LIX, p. 229; Thomas Keeble to Secretary, Oyster Bay, May 24, 1739, ibid., B, VII, 155; Keeble to Secretary, Oyster Bay, Aug. 24, 1741, ibid., B, IX, 78; Flint Dwight to Secretary, Rye, Nov. 12, 1735, ibid., A, XXVI, 14, p. 75; Wetmore to Secretary, Rye, Dec. 21, 1730, ibid., A, XXIII, 19, p. 90; Robert Jenny to Secretary, Hempstead, ibid., A, XXII, 10, p. 351.

Evidence of increasing Presbyterian strength became manifest at Jamaica on Long Island. During a series of trials in the 1720s, the Presbyterians there forced Rev. Thomas Poyer to surrender first the glebe, then the parsonage, and finally the stone church that the Anglicans had claimed since Governor Cornbury's administration. Until his death in 1732, the unfortunate Poyer continued to have trouble collecting his salary from the dissenting vestrymen elected under the terms of the Ministry Act of 1693. His successor, Thomas Colgan, formerly catechist for New York City, likewise found it difficult to convince the unsympathetic vestrymen that public revenues ought to support an Anglican missionary at Jamaica. Indeed, under the vigorous leadership of ministers like George McNish, Robert Cross, and Walter Wilmot, Jamaica Presbyterians provided financial assistance to neighboring brethren in Hempstead for support of a minister and generally encouraged dissenters to oppose Anglican proselytizing throughout the province.[9]

The Anglicans, however, fought back. Receiving funds from wealthy Anglicans in New York City, the diplomatic Thomas Colgan supervised the construction of an Anglican church at Jamaica. He also increased the number of communicants there and organized another congregation at Newtown, making good use of the Anglican primers and tracts regularly sent to him. Colgan arranged for the S. P. G.

---

[9]Horatio Oliver Ladd, Origin and History of Grace Church, Jamaica, New York (New York, 1914), 60-77; Nichols, Presbyterians in New York, 21-23, 30-33; Thomas Poyer to Secretary, Jamaica, 1730, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, XXIII, 4, pp. 328-29; Thomas Colgan to Secretary, Jamaica, June 14, 1734, ibid., A, XXV, p. 15.

to subsidize the school established at Jamaica by Edmund Willett, who taught over sixty children in 1734. Willett was so successful that the Presbyterians set up a rival school in 1735.[10] In fact, pedagogical competition was an important part of religious rivalry.

Next to the missionary, Anglicans recognized that their most effective instrument was the school. As the Reverend Robert Jenny reported from Rye in 1724, the success of the missionary depended very much upon the support he might receive from the local schoolmaster. Without the lure of literacy training in schools, parents at Rye could "not be perswaded to spare their children from their work for learning ye Catechism only & there is not one parent in 20 that can catechize their own children."[11] Succeeding Jenny at Rye, the Rev. James Wetmore urged the Society in 1729 to appoint a recent Yale graduate as schoolmaster and catechist at North Castle in the parish of Rye. His name was Flint Dwight. The people of North Castle desperately needed Dwight, Wetmore insisted, because "their ignorance Exposes them to be an easy prey to the busy Quakers, who spare no pain, to seduce as many as possible, and have their Emissaries among them for that purpose."[12]

Almost with a single voice, Anglicans in New York and New

---

[10]Colgan to Secretary, Jamaica, June 14, 1734, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, XXV, p. 15; Edmund Willett to Secretary, Jamaica, Oct. 10, 1735, ibid., A, XXVI, 11, p. 76.

[11]Jenny to Secretary, Rye, Oct. 9, 1724, ibid., A, XVIII, p. 190.

[12]Wetmore to Secretary, Rye, Nov. 5, 1729, ibid., A, XXII, 13, p. 360.

Jersey denounced "Quakerism" as the bane of Christianity. Compared to dissenters in general, Quakers were especially reluctant to renounce the credo by which they had been raised and which was constantly reaffirmed by their life style (much to the frustration of Anglican clerics). "The Prejudices of Education," wrote Rev. John Standard from Westchester in 1733, with the Quakers doubtless in mind, "are not Easily conquered, and Everybody knows the Prejudices of Religion are most obstinate."[13] What had to be done was obvious: schooling from the Anglican point of view.

Selected by Wetmore in 1733 to be the S. P. G. schoolmaster at Rye, Samuel Purdy promised to instruct his students "in ye Grounds and Principles in ye Christian Religion, according to the Catechism of the Church of England, and what other Learning I am Capable of giving to render them able to know Their Duty to God, by Reading the holy Scriptures, and to practice so much Writing and Arithmetic, as may serve the Common Occasion of vulger [sic] people, which is the most our Country People will aspire after."[14] Unless Purdy were retained, Wetmore warned the Society, "Many Children will have little to distinguish them in their Education from the wild Heathen." Convinced that Quaker principles were thoroughly pernicious, Wetmore carried his crusade against the Friends from the school into print. He argued that their general meetings debauched

---

[13]Jerry W. Frost, "As the Twig is Bent: Quaker Ideas of Childhood," Quaker History, LX (Autumn 1971), 67-87; John Standard to Secretary, East Chester, Nov. 4, 1733, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, XXIV, 13, p. 48.

[14]Samuel Purdy to Secretary, Rye, Aug. 29, 1733, S. P. G. Letter Books, B, I, p. 43.

young people and therefore ought to be suppressed. Responding to such attacks by publishing pamphlets defending themselves, Quakers also set up schools to rival those of S. P. G. teachers like Roland Ellis at Burlington, New Jersey, and Daniel Denton at Oyster Bay.[15]

Presbyterians and Independents responded to Anglican educational efforts much as the Quakers did. In 1734, the Independents at Rye established a school to rival Purdy's, and Flint Dwight, who had moved from North Castle to White Plains in Rye parish, found his school faced with a Presbyterian competitor in 1735. Polemical pamphlets became commonplace. "Some zealous Bigotts among the Independents," reported Wetmore in 1734, were again writing scurrilous pamphlets "Stuffed with vile aspersions and unmannerly reflections upon the Civil & Ecclesiastical Government of the Nation." Wetmore wrote a reply, but in much of colonial New York the dissenting part of the population was so large that Anglican missionaries found it counterproductive, if not simply dangerous, to be so bold.[16]

A careful coordination of parsons and pedagogues was essential to the success of Anglican mission efforts in that stronghold of New England religious dissent, Suffolk County, containing the eastern two-thirds of Long Island. For brief periods between 1723 and 1725, Wetmore and Standard had both ministered at Brookhaven, taking advantage

---

[15]Wetmore to Secretary, Rye, Aug. 20, 1733, ibid., A, XXIV, 12, p. 468; Roland Ellis to Secretary, Burlington, Oct. 2, 1730, ibid., A, XXIII, 14, p. 82; Daniel Denton to Secretary, Oyster Bay, Feb. 17, 1729, ibid., A, XXII, 225, p. 385.

[16]Purdy to Secretary, Rye, June 25, 1734, ibid., A, XXV, p. 23; Dwight to Secretary, Rye, Nov. 12, 1735, ibid., A, XXVI, 14, p. 75.

of religious disputes which led some of the inhabitants to become Anglican. However, Daniel Dwight (1729-1733) and Isaac Brown (1733-1744), both graduates of Yale, schoolmasters, and preachers at Brookhaven, were the first regular Anglican ministers in Suffolk County. Also important in laying the foundation of the Anglican Church in eastern Long Island was Edward Davis, another Yale graduate who taught school at Southampton from 1728 until at least 1734.[17]

Davis was both discreet and competent. Requesting Anglican catechisms by Lewis and English spellers by Dyche in 1733, Davis reported the next year that he had made considerable progress with the children under his care:

> Some [students] began on their Letters in the Primmers, Some on Psalters, & Some in Testaments. I have with care and diligence taught them [so] that most of them can read Tolerably well in the Bible and most of them from Seven Years Old to Thirteen can write a fair hand, to the liking of all Such persons as do come to Visit the School which is very Frequent.[18]

The evidence strongly suggests that Davis soft-pedalled Anglican doctrine, improving the image of the English Church among dissenters

---

[17]Wetmore to Secretary, Rye, June 24, 1734, ibid., A, XXIV, p. 22; Fredrick Lewis Weis, "The Colonial Clergy of the Middle Colonies: New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, 1728-1776," Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, LXVI (Oct. 17, 1956), 189; Isaac Brown to Secretary, Apr. 29, 1734, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, XXIV, 2; Church Wardens and Vestry of Brookhaven to Secretary, Jan. 31, 1729, ibid., A, XXI, 15, p. 378; Edward Davis to Secretary, Southampton, Nov. 6, 1733, ibid., A, XXIV, 21, p. 485; Subscription of the People of Brookhaven for Daniel Dwight, May 16, 1729, ibid., A, XXII, 1, p. 37.

[18]Petition of Inhabitants of Southampton in Suffolk County to Secretary, June 10, 1732, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, XXIII, 11, p. 203; Edward Davis to Secretary, Southampton, Nov. 12, 1734, ibid., A, XXV, p. 40.

because of the valuable services he performed by teaching their children.

But in almost all of the schools sponsored by the S. P. G., the Anglican creed was vigorously taught. Such was clearly the case with regard to the largest of the S. P. G. schools, the one under the direction of Thomas Huddlestone at New York City. Following the death of his father in 1722, Huddlestone, ably assisted by his mother and sisters, assumed direction of the Trinity Church School founded by his father and taught literally hundreds of boys and girls before his own death in 1731. In a letter to the Society in the spring of 1730, Huddlestone acknowledged that the Society's subsidy enabled him to instruct many boys and girls who otherwise would likely "be brought up without knowing whether there is a God or not, and indeed as it is there's too many running the Streets like Sheep going astray."[19]

In 1731, Huddlestone reported that he was teaching "58 poor children" on the bounty of the S. P. G. "Since my last to you," he continued, "Severall having obtained common Learning so far to write and cast accompts, and are bound out to trades." There were still a "great Number of poor Children in this place," he concluded, "who are dayling comeing at the door to be admitted and I shall not refuse any of them, so long as I am able to discharge my duty."[20]

---

[19]Thomas Huddlestone to Secretary, New York City, May 23, 1730, ibid., A, XXIII, 3, p. 37.

[20]Huddlestone to Secretary, New York City, July 20, 1731, ibid., A, XXIII, 10, p. 338; Church Wardens and Vestry of Trinity Church to Secretary, New York City, Oct. 30, 1731, ibid., A, XXIII, 14, p. 343.

Following Huddlestone's death, Thomas Noxon (1731-1743) and Joseph Hildreth (1744-1776) taught Trinity Church school. Like Huddlestone before them, Noxon and Hildreth both recognized that their school served not only to win the young to the Anglican faith but also to preserve social stability among the poor of New York City.[21]

Besides the poor and the perverse dissenters, the Society also directed its educational efforts at blacks and Indians, both of whom were viewed as potentially dangerous to social stability. Remembering the slave uprising of 1712, New Yorkers generally looked askance at the religious instruction of slaves; but blacks, slave and free, were regularly instructed in New York City, where James Wetmore (1724-1725), Thomas Colgan (1726-1730), and Richard Charlton (1730-1744) served as S. P. G. catechists to blacks as well as apprentices and poor children. Outside of New York City and Albany slaves were seldom catechized. In 1729, explaining that few blacks belonged to his church, Standard at Westchester noted that Sunday was the only day slaves were free to fish and hunt game for themselves. But there were other reasons why blacks were not catechized much or encouraged to attend divine services. "Their Scattered position up and down the country some distance from the Church," he observed, without completing the thought, "but above all the Prejudice of their Masters considering them the worse for being taught and more apt to rebel." Recalling how little he had been able to teach

---

[21]Thomas Noxon to Secretary, New York City, May 12, 1732, ibid., A, XXIV, 6, p. 168; Joseph Hildreth to Secretary, New York, ibid., B, XIII, 221; Hildreth to Secretary, New York, Oct. 28, 1752, ibid., B, XX, 59.

his own slaves, Standard believed that very few blacks were capable of being instructed. His fellow missionaries generally agreed with him, and in the face of popular opposition, Anglican clerics did relatively little catechizing among slaves. Dissenting clergymen did even less.[22]

Similarly, while dissenters largely ignored the Indians, Anglicans in New York continued their work to convert the "heathen of the woods." At Albany, the Reverend John Milne (1729-1736), ably assisted by schoolmaster John Beasely, ministered not only to the English but also to blacks and Indians. Reporting to the Society in 1730, Milne claimed that Beasely "contributed not a little to promote my Endeavours towards the Propagating of Christianity in the Place, for he not only brings 50 Children to Prayer twice a week but hath also instructed near twenty Negroes in the catechism whom together with the Children I examine in the Church on Sunday Afternoon."[23] In 1731, Milne baptized 10 black slaves, all catechumens of Beasely, and a few Indian infants.[24]

---

[22]Richard Charlton to Secretary, New York City, June 5, 1733, ibid., A, XXIV, 8, p. 462; Wetmore to Secretary, Westchester, Dec. 3, 1726, ibid., B, I, 72, p. 273; Jenny to Secretary, Rye, Nov. 19, 1725, ibid., B, I, 28, p. 291; Jenny to Secretary, Hempstead, July 30, 1735, ibid., A, XXVI, 9, p. 64. See also Frank J. Klingberg, Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York (Philadelphia, 1940), chap. 4.

[23]John Milne to Secretary, Albany, Nov. 2, 1731, ibid., S. P. G. Letter Books, A, XXIII, 16, p. 85. See also Thomas Beasley to Secretary, Albany, May 1, 1732, ibid., A, III, p. 164.

[24]Milne to Secretary, Albany, Nov. 2, 1731, ibid., A, XXIII, 15, p. 325; Milne to William Vesey, Albany, Nov. 14, 1734, ibid., A, XXV, p. 42; and Nov. 20, 1734, ibid., A, XXV, p. 45.

Besides ministering at Albany, Milne was also missionary to Schenectady and went among the Mohawks four times a year administering communion and baptizing young and old. Unable to speak the Mohawk tongue himself, Milne prevailed upon the young Henry Barclay to become catechist at Fort Hunter and minister to the Indians. Recently graduated from Yale, Barclay (1734-1746), son of the deranged missionary Thomas Barclay, succeeded Milne as rector at Albany and missionary to the Indians. After eighteen months among the Mohawks, Barclay reported his progress to the Society:

> . . . I daily teach above Forty young Men and Children to read and write their own Tongue, most of whom make vast Progress. I also keep a Catechetical School every Evening which all both Young and Old attend. I read an Exposition of the Catechism (translated for the use of Mr. Andrews) every Sunday.[25]

While ministering to the Indians at Fort Hunter, Milne was at first opposed by the Dutch Reformed preacher at Albany, Peter Van Driessen, who wanted the S. P. G. to subsidize his own mission work among the Five Indian Nations. The dispute was settled shortly, and the Society generally took care not to arouse fears of cultural aggression among New Yorkers not of British extraction. For instance, although the Lutherans at Queensbury informed the S. P. G. of their desire to conform to the English Church and support an Anglican minister, the Society did not send the disgruntled Germans a missionary.[26] In fact, William Christopher Berkenmeyer, who between

---

[25]The Inhabitants of the Mohawk Country to Secretary, Fort Hunter, Oct. 15, 1735, ibid., A, XXVI, p. 75; Henry Barclay to Secretary, June 3, 1739, ibid., B, I, New York Letters (no. VII).

[26]Inhabitants of Queensbury in the Province of New York to Secretary, Albany County, ibid., A, XXIII, 1, p. 53.

1725 and 1751 organized the Palatine Lutherans along the Hudson and in the Mohawk and Schoharie Valleys, encountered no opposition from the S. P. G. At Newburg, located in the Highlands precinct of Ulster County, Christopher Knoll, pastor of the Lutheran congregations in the Lower Hudson parish, vigorously protested in 1751 the Anglican takeover of glebe lands given in 1708 to the Lutherans, few of whom still lived at Newburg. But that was a minor matter.[27]

The major problem the Lutherans faced was internal dissension, especially disagreements between Berkenmeyer and other Lutheran ministers who chafed under his supervision. Berkenmeyer was certain that the mixture of religions in New York weakened Christianity in general and Lutheranism in particular. He found the colony settled by "people who either have not a grain of feeling for religion, or, if they have a little bit, they have a different conception of it."[28] The primary enemy was ignorance rather than organized animosity. Although they preached and distributed Lutheran tracts and catechisms, Berkenmeyer believed he and his fellow ministers were making relatively little progress among recent German settlers.

---

[27]Harry Julius Kreider, Lutheranism in Colonial New York (1942; reprint ed., New York, 1972), 78-80, 93-102; John P. Dern, ed., The Albany Protocol: Wilhelm Christoph Berkenmeyer's Chronicle of Lutheran Affairs in New York Colony, 1731-1750, trans. Simon Hart and Sibrandina Geertruid Hart-Runeman (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1971), 42-43.

[28]Wilhelm C. Berkenmeyer to Bishop Jesper Svedberg, New York City, Sept. 1, 1730, Protocol of the Lutheran Church in New York City, 1702-1750, trans. Simon Hart and Harry J. Kreider (New York, 1958), 185.

"Among them are people who have not learned even the rudiments of doctrine," he wrote in 1730, "since most of these immigrants (those who are strangers in origin are described by this word) are stupid, irrespective of sex or age, because of the lack of schools, which we count among the things impossible to obtain." Despite such problems, Berkenmeyer was able to keep the Lutheran congregations in New York holding their own, if not growing much in relative terms.[29]

The only New Yorkers of foreign extraction whom the Anglicans continued to pursue actively were the Huguenots. Succeeding the deceased Bondet as the S. P. G. missionary to the French at New Rochelle, Rev. Pierre Stoupe informed the Society in 1725 that all but thirty families in the village were among his congregation. They too would join, Stoupe believed, were it not for the malevolent influence of the French Reformed preacher at New York, Rev. J. J. Moulinaars. Fighting against conformity with the Anglicans, Moulinaars had declared publicly that the English Church and the Roman Church were essentially the same. "Besides the said Minister & his Party here threatened the yet dissenting French Inhabitants of New York of breaking with them all Commerce & of suspending all acts of Charity & support toward them," Stoupe recounted, "if ever they dare to join themselves at any time to the Church."[30]

Moulinaars moved to New Rochelle in 1726, and according to

---

[29]Ibid., 185-86; Kreider, Lutheranism in Colonial New York, 81-102.

[30]Pierre Stoupe to Secretary, New Rochelle, May 19, 1725, S. P. G. Letter Books, B, I, 100, p. 363.

Rev. Standard at Westchester, while Stoupe still had a sizeable French congregation in 1730, "the greatest number of that nation flock to a Meeting house of their own Erecting, who are particularly fond of the Mahometan [sic] Doctrine of absolute decrees as Dutch of this Country are. . . ."[31] Like their brethren in New York City, French Protestants on Staten Island were for the most part sympathetic to the Anglican faith. The Staten Island French were very much influenced by tolerant S. P. G. missionaries like Aeneas MacKenzie and his successor Francis Harrison (1723-1739) who secured S. P. G. stipends for schoolmasters who otherwise would not have been able to serve the educational needs of Huguenots. In return, the schoolmasters taught the catechism of the Anglican Church as well as reading, writing, and arithmetic.[32]

Like Anglican missionaries, Dutch Reformed domines sought to win French Protestants to their church. Due largely to the early efforts of Dutch domines, Huguenots at New Paltz generally remained in the Calvinistic camp, though the language of the liturgy changed according to the linguistic predilections of available preachers, moving from French, to Dutch, and finally to German. The Dutch Reformed also proselytized among other religious professions.

---

[31]Thomas Standard to Secretary, East Chester, Nov. 5, 1725, ibid., A, XXII, 4, p. 363; Francis Harrison to Secretary, Staten Island, Nov. 20, 1733, ibid., A, XXVI, 16, p. 88.

[32]David De Bonrepos and Consistory of the French Church on Staten Island to Anglican Commissary and Clergy of New York, 1733, ibid., B, I, New York Letters; see also ibid., A, XXVI, 16, pp. 81-88; and William A. Bultmann, "The S. P. G. and the French in Colonial America," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XX (1951), 157-69.

Much to the disappointment of William Berkenmeyer, the Dutch Reformed in New York tried to convert Lutherans rather than to work with them as brothers under Christ. Berkenmeyer was certain that the Dutch Calvinists were fomenting divisions among New York Lutherans. "Their ministers," wrote Berkenmeyer of the Dutch Reformed in 1729, "forbade the school teachers to teach our Lutheran children from Lutheran books."[33] Three years later, still experiencing the hostility of the Dutch Calvinists, Berkenmeyer confessed that the "state of the Lutherans in these parts of America is indeed so sad that not only can little growth be expected in the orthodox faith . . . but also its loss is not merely a threat but an actual reality."[34]

While occasionally trying to convert the Lutherans, Dutch Reformed preachers found it increasingly difficult to protect their religious and ethnic identity from the growing Anglicization of New York society. The fact of cultural displacement--if not cultural aggression--demanded immediate action. As Rev. Standard noted in 1729, the Dutch Reformed usually hired lay readers where they had no minister, thereby hindering "their People from assembling with the English." But lay readers were no substitute for preachers, and one of the most vexing problems that Dutch New Yorkers had to

---

[33]Berkenmeyer to Rev. Andreas Chorne, Loonenburg, May 19, 1727, Protocol of the Lutheran Church, 94. Interesting details concerning the transformation of New Paltz may be found in Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York, ed. Edward T. Corwin, 7 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1901-1916), IV, 3116-18 (hereafter cited as Ecclesiastical Records).

[34]Berkenmeyer to Bishop Jesper Svedberg, Loonenburg, Sept. 1, 1730, Protocol of the Lutheran Church, 187.

deal with was the scarcity of clerics. Reformed clergymen born in the Dutch Republic were increasingly reluctant to come to New York, and Dutch New Yorkers were wary of risking life and limb on a hazardous voyage to Holland for ordination by the Classis of Amsterdam. Should Dutch New Yorkers form a coetus, that is, an ecclesiastical assembly made up of preachers and elders, having the power to ordain ministers, and just what kind of relationship should the Dutch Reformed Church of New York have with the Classis of Amsterdam? Such were some of the questions that Dutch New Yorkers of the Reformed faith tried to answer.[35]

Their task was made doubly difficult because from 1720 until the Great Awakening in 1740 religious controversy divided the Dutch Reformed of New York and New Jersey. The source of the controversy was Theodore Frelinghuysen. His pietistic beliefs and evangelical preaching style were linked by an almost insufferable self-righteousness. He saw himself as God's instrument to bring a wicked generation under conviction of its sin. Arrogating to himself powers not usually allowed Reformed preachers, the unorthodox Frelinghuysen limited communion to the visible saints, excommunicated several members of his Raritan congregation who opposed him, and dared to cast doubt upon the spiritual legitimacy of his fellow domines. At New York, Domine DuBois tried to remain neutral, but his associate

---

[35]Thomas Standard to Secretary, West Chester, Nov. 5, 1729, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, XXII, 4, p. 363; Gerald F. De Jong, The Dutch in America, 1609-1974 (Boston, 1975), 87-97. See also Edward T. Corwin, A Manual of the Reformed Church in America, 1628-1909, 4th ed., rev. and enl. (New York, 1902).

Henricus Boel despised Frelinghuysen from the beginning, as did Domine Vincentius Antonides of Kings County, whose other pastor, Bernardus Freeman, was an early and consistent friend and advocate of the irascible Frelinghuysen. Caught up in their own wrangling, Dutch New Yorkers suddenly found themselves threatened not so much by Anglicans as by the subtler process of Anglicization which weakened the attraction of their faith and culture.[36]

The situation in New York City was indicative of what was happening to the Dutch Reformed colonists throughout the province. In 1726, following many years of neglect, the consistory of the Dutch Reformed Church of New York City began to revitalize its school. Barent De Foreest was hired as schoolmaster to teach "not only in the Dutch language, but also in the element of Christian piety--a school of which the Rev. Consistory should have oversight."[37] Acknowledging the necessity of learning English as the common language of the province, the Consistory still insisted that it was equally necessary for children to be well versed in Dutch as the language of the Reformed faith. Whether out of apathy or impiety, parents had "now for some years neglected to have their children receive

---

[36]F. J. Schrag, "Theodore Jacobus Frelinghuysen: The Father of American Pietism," Church History, XV (Dec. 1945), 239-55. Challenging the traditional view that Frelinghuysen was indeed the father of the Great Awakening is Herman Harmelink, "Another Look at Frelinghuysen and His 'Awakening,'" Church History, XXXVII (Dec. 1968), 423-38. Information on the running battle between Frelinghuysen and his critics is found in Ecclesiastical Records, III, 2201-2308; IV, 2332-35, 2343-74, 2447-68, 2519-44, 2553-59, 2566-71, 2609-12.

[37]Consistory Minutes of the New York City Dutch Reformed Church, Jan. 5, 1726, Ecclesiastical Records, IV, 2337-39.

instruction in the Netherlandish tongue. "Are not our Youth," asked the Consistory rhetorically, "growing up among us, living witness of this?" The Consistory urged parents to send their children to De Foreest, who would teach what was deemed "necessary for the advancement of the youth in the Netherlandish tongue, and in the first principles of the Christian religion."[38]

Serving as schoolmaster until June 1733, De Foreest found himself teaching largely poor children as the years passed. Unlike his initial contract, De Foreest's 1727 agreement with the consistory went to some length to explain how he would be paid for teaching children of impoverished parents:

> For teaching the children of the poor, it is agreed that you draw salary from the Rev. Consistory, according to the instruction they receive, and as is usual with other Dutch Schoolmasters in this City; so much, for one who learns only to read; and so much for one who learns also to write; and so much for one who learns also to cypher. And whether any child of the poor shall learn writing or cyphering must be by the approval of one of the Ministers.[39]

The number of students had increased so much by 1732 that De Foreest had hired as assistant one Isaac Stoutenberg. Despite his apparent success in teaching, De Foreest was jailed for debts in 1732, and the Consistory dismissed him and appointed in his place Gerrit Van Wagenen, formerly the precentor in the Dutch Reformed Church at Kingston. In the contract, the Consistory made it clear that Van

---

[38]Declaration of the Reverend Consistory Regarding the Appointment of Schoolmaster Barent De Foreest, Jan. 9, 1726, ibid., 2340-42.

[39]Second Appointment of Mr. Barent De Foreest as Dutch Schoolmaster, Dec. 27, 1726, ibid., 2374-75.

Wagenen was expected to be "active and diligent" in catechizing and teaching. Nothing was "so absolutely necessary, useful and salutary for the Christian rearing, teaching and training of our youth, in order to gain them, from the earliest period, to the language of our Church, and to a love for the Dutch Reformed worship, that the prosperity of our Church may be furthered, with heartfelt prayer to God for his blessing."[40]

The importance of schools in the preservation of the Reformed faith and Dutch culture was recognized by domines throughout the New York and New Jersey area. Called to congregations at Freehold and Middletown, New Jersey, Domine Gerardus Haeghoort reported that many of his people "had become almost wholly English, and had thus become estranged from the Dutch Reformed Church, of which I have daily experience with the injurious consequence thereof, and to which the lack of Dutch schools has largely contributed."[41] Writing from Poughkeepsie at about the same time in the spring of 1732, Domine Cornelis Van Schie reported that "many people here are like wild horses of the woods which have never yet been broken, and which will not allow the bit to be placed in their mouth till after some time." It was extremely difficult, Van Schie continued, to introduce "any civility into these places where there never has been a minister before." Fortunately, the people responded warmly to the preaching

---

[40]Consistory Minutes of New York Dutch Reformed Church, Dec. 19, 1732, ibid., 2614-15; Commission of Gerrit Van Wagenen as Dutch Precentor and Schoolmaster, Mar. 21, 1733, ibid., 2619-20.

[41]Gerardus Haeghoort to Amsterdam Classis, May 1, 1732, ibid., 2582.

of the Gospel, although they were almost all illiterate, and Van Schie regretted that his congregation was too poor to hire a schoolmaster. The Classis replied that at least one schoolmaster should be secured as soon as possible "for the instruction of the youth."[42]

The Amsterdam Classis was long on advice but short on solutions to the troublesome problems that beset the Dutch Reformed Church in New York. Foremost among these was the inability of the Classis to supply Dutch Reformed New Yorkers with the number of clergymen they requested. Between 1720 and 1740, thirteen new Dutch Reformed congregations were established, several of which were without a full-time preacher, depending instead upon lay readers who also taught school on occasion. Although unable to supply all congregations with preachers or to enforce church discipline in America, the Amsterdam Classis nonetheless tried to sustain its ecclesiastical jurisdiction there. The Dutch Reformed Classis even wanted to bring the German Reformed colonists of New York and Pennsylvania under its authority. During the early 1730s, the Classis urged Dutch Reformed preachers in New York and New Jersey to work together and somehow compromise divisive issues. But the Classis only reluctantly approved of the irregular ordination of an occasional candidate into the ministry by Dutch Reformed domines in New York. When the American clergy took the advice of Reformed leaders in Amsterdam and established a Coetus to ordain ministers and enforce ecclesiastical discipline, the Classis bristled with anger, interpreting the movement for

---

[42]Cornelis Van Schie to Amsterdam Classis, May 7, 1732, ibid., 2590.

the Coetus to be the rebellious act of ungrateful children.[43]

The controversy regarding the legitimacy of the Coetus would bitterly divide Dutch Reformed Domines and their congregations for more than a decade. The primary purpose of the Coetus, so said its defenders time and time again, was "to heal the differences and disturbances which from time to time sprang up among us."[44] As the primary ecclesiastical authority in America, the Coetus was expected not only to license qualified neophytes and ordain candidates into the ministry but also to lead the way in adapting the Reformed faith to American conditions. To Dutch Reformed New Yorkers, the Coetus provided the way to resolve an identity crisis that was especially critical because of the mixture of religions in the middle colonies. Amsterdam was too far away, and the Classis there was simply too uninformed to understand American conditions and deal with such problems as vagabond preachers like John Van Driessen or the unorthodox Frelinghuysen. The Coetus was expected to clarify--indeed, to define--Reformed Calvinism in American terms.[45]

---

[43]Circular Letter of the Consistory of New York to All the Dutch Reformed Churches in New York and New Jersey, May 27, 1737, ibid., 2683; Revs. Haeghoort, DuBois, Freeman and Sandvoord to Amsterdam Classis, June 6, 1737, ibid., 2685; Circular Letter of the Delegates Met in New York to Adopt a Plan for a Coetus to All the Churches, Sept. 12, 1737, ibid., 2689; Draft of a Coetus-Constitution for the Holland Reformed Churches in New Netherland, Apr. 27, 1738, ibid., 2706-8; Amsterdam Classis to Friends of the Coetus, June 9, 1739, ibid., 2712-13; and to the Opponents of the Coetus, June 9, 1739, ibid., 2713.

[44]Gualterus DuBois and Gerardus Haeghoort to Amsterdam Classis, Apr. 27, 1738, ibid., 2708.

[45]Amsterdam Classis to Peter Vas and Rhinehart Erickzon, Dec. 1, 1732, ibid., 2610-11; De Jong, Dutch in America, 92-99.

Between 1720 and 1740, Dutch and German Lutherans, Presbyterians, and the Anglicans themselves in New York underwent an identity crisis similar to that experienced by the Dutch Reformed. For the Lutherans, Wilhelm Berkenmeyer devoted his life to trying to impose order upon the chaos that threatened to engulf him and his congregations. Berkenmeyer saw the falling away from the Lutheran faith as part of the general decline of Dutch and German culture that resulted as children were "lured by the convenience of the strange ruling [English] language or rejoice over the idle hope of certainly becoming happier through it." The next step was inevitable. "They publicly get rid of the pastor of the religion of their fathers or, if shame prevents them in doing this, they give next to nothing [to support the Church], by using the excuse of a mixed marriage."[46] Lutherans who were not ashamed to be known as such were often deceived into supporting vagabond priests like the troublesome John Bernhard Van Diren, the clerical interloper of unofficial ordination who ministered throughout the Hackensack and Hudson Valleys. Determined to save New York Lutherans from the "plague of pietism," Berkenmeyer secured the backing of the two other Lutheran priests in the province and put together a constitution for the New York City congregation in 1735. Based on the constitution of the Lutheran church in Amsterdam, this "protocol" was designed to encourage conformity and orthodoxy of which Berkenmeyer saw too little in America.[47]

---

[46]Berkenmeyer to Bishop Jesper Svedberg, Sept. 1, 1730, Protocol of the Lutheran Church, 186.

[47]Michael Christian Knoll to Swedish Lutherans in Pennsylvania, Nov. 5, 1734, ibid., 81-102.

Presbyterians and Anglicans also had problems preserving their spiritual identity amidst the confusion of religions in New York. If Frelinghuysen aroused dissension among the Dutch Reformed, Gilbert Tennent and the young men graduating from his father's famous Log College aroused the antagonism of Presbyterians who disapproved of evangelical preaching. During the 1730s, although restricted primarily to his pastorate in New Brunswick, Gilbert Tennent preached widely in New York, leading revivals himself on Staten Island and encouraging Silas Leonard who led revivals at Goshen in Orange County and James Davenport who awakened eastern Long Island. The developing controversy over evangelical preaching was superimposed upon the already volatile question of whether Presbyterian ministers should swear allegiance to the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms. Scotch-Irish Presbyterians said yes, but Presbyterians who had migrated from New England fought against tying the conscience of clerics to any dogmatic creed. The Adopting Act of 1729 was a compromise measure, requiring that aspiring ministers merely assent to the Confession and Catechisms. Clerics who had scruples were to explain their objections to a committee of ministers who would reject or accept the applicant into fellowship with the Pennsylvania Synod. But the issue was by no means settled.[48]

Compared to the Presbyterians, the Anglicans of New York were fairly well united. Their number was growing. However, despite their pretensions, Anglicans remained very much a minority, and their

---

[48]Maxson, Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies, 21-39; Nichols, Presbyterianism in New York, 37-39.

dependence upon London for ordained clergymen augured ill for Anglican prospects. In fact, without a bishop in America to ordain and confirm, Anglicans were unable to maintain church discipline. As commissary of the Bishop of London, William Vesey was expected to coordinate Anglican efforts in New York. Just how very limited his power and influence was became clear when he tried to remove Alexander Campbell from the missionary rolls of the S. P. G. An intelligent if unprincipled preacher, Campbell left his parish in Delaware and moved to New York in 1730, preaching occasionally at Brookhaven and New York City and gaining a notorious reputation for hard drinking and chasing women. For over two years, Anglicans were scandalized as Vesey and Campbell waged a pamphlet campaign exposing the less attractive characteristics of both men. Vesey finally convinced the Society to dismiss Campbell, but that did not come until long after it was abundantly clear that the authority of the commissary was negligible. So on the eve of the Great Awakening, the Anglicans, very much like the Dutch Reformed, Lutherans, and Presbyterians, were struggling with problems provoked in large part by the disturbing lack of religious consensus in New York.[49]

---

[49]Affidavits against Mr. Alexander Campbell and Mr. Vesey's Charges Sent to Secretary, Feb. 13, 1733, S. P. G. Letter Books, A, XXIV, 1, pp. 1-11. Additional background material may be found in Campbell to Secretary, Brookhaven, May 1, 1730, ibid., A, XXIII, 2, pp. 55-56; Campbell to Lord Bishop of London, Brookhaven, June 1, 1730, ibid., A, XXIII, 4, p. 59; Campbell to Secretary, Brookhaven, Feb. 9, 1730, ibid., A, XXIII, 21, pp. 94-95; Vesey to Secretary, New York City, July 26, 1732, ibid., A, XXIV, 18, pp. 219-23; Vesey to Secretary, New York City, Dec. 12, 1753, ibid., A, XXIV, 25, p. 495.

II

In the midst of this religious confusion came the revivals. What caused the Great Awakening? Examining religious conditions in the Middle Colonies from 1739 to about 1755, Martin Lodge has claimed that the Awakening in that part of early America was provoked by yearning for religious unity among anxious colonists whose own faith had been called into question by the multiplicity of competing creeds and the paucity of qualified clergymen. Concerned primarily with Pennsylvania, Lodge doubted the applicability of his hypothesis to New York, noting that both the Dutch Reformed Church and the Anglican Church were deeply entrenched at different places in the province. But Lodge would have done well to have examined New York more carefully. For the crisis of the churches that he documented in the other Middle Colonies occurred in New York as well, though its probable cause very likely transcended religious confusion, being based instead upon profoundly personal anxiety regarding ethnic identity and conceptions of self.[50]

Anxious about the past because of the confusion of the present, New Yorkers of various religious persuasions and ethnic backgrounds found solace in the revivals which emphasized the necessity of a heartfelt encounter with the Divine for eternal salvation. The conversion experience itself was faith-affirming and promised

---

[50]Lodge, "Crisis of the Churches," 195-220. Although I think he underestimates the impact of the Great Awakening in New York, much insight into the uncertainty caused by cultural pluralism may be found in Michael Kammen, Colonial New York: A History (New York, 1975), 230-33, 278-80, 358-59.

the creation of a broader personal and intergroup identity which would transcend petty religious differences. But while the Awakening led to considerable interdenominational cooperation, the rise of the different religious denominations was also accompanied in many instances by the revitalization of ethnic traditions. Such was obviously the case with regard to German and Dutch New Yorkers, and less apparently so among English dissenters. Indeed, the Great Awakening was yet another stage in that adjustment to American conditions that New Yorkers had to make. More than any other aspect of colonial life, the educational process itself at once reflected and influenced that cultural accommodation.[51]

George Whitefield was invited to preach in New York shortly after he arrived in Philadelphia in the fall of 1739. The invitation was made by one Mr. Noble, characterized by Whitefield himself as a spiritual man, of whom little else is known except that he was an elder in the Presbyterian congregation at New York City. Having received yet another invitation from Noble, Whitefield recorded in his journal for November 12, 1730, that he found himself in a situation analogous to the disciple Paul, that is "when the man appeared to him, saying, 'Come over to Macedonia, and help us,' I, this morning, set out for that place."[52] On the way to New York, the young English preacher stopped at New Brunswick

---

[51]See Lodge, "Crisis of the Churches," 215-20; also Maxson, Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies, 54-68.

[52]William V. Davis, ed., George Whitefield's Journals, 1737-1741 (Gainesville, Fla., 1969), 343.

and had fellowship with Gilbert Tennent. "He and his associates," wrote Whitefield of the Tennents and other Presbyterian revivalists, "are now the burning and shining lights of this part of America." Beginning a friendship that would last until death, Whitefield was impressed by Gilbert Tennent's preaching. Tennent seemed to his English admirer to be the son of thunder, denouncing the sinful ways of both rich and poor and preaching hell and damnation for all who had not experienced the presence of Christ in their lives. Like Gilbert Tennent, Whitefield resented the ridiculous "partition-wall" that separated Christians one from another and kept them from worshipping God together. His experience in New York convinced him that those partition walls were still very strong in America.[53]

Upon arrival in New York City on November 14, Whitefield found Commissary William Vesey filled with anger and resentment. Refusing to allow him to preach in Trinity Church, Vesey upbraided the self-righteous young revivalist for "making a disturbance in Philadelphia, and sowing and causing divisions in other places." Domine Henricus Boel likewise rejected Whitefield's request to preach in the Old Dutch Church, but Boel's associate, Domine Gualterus DuBois, together with Domine Frelinghuysen, Reverend Ebenezer Pemberton of the Presbyterian church at New York City, and the Tennent brothers, accompanied Whitefield to the outskirts

---

[53]Ibid., 343-44; Joseph Tracy, The Great Awakening: A History of the Revival of Religion in the Time of Edwards and Whitefield (1845; reprint ed., New York, 1969), 52-54.

of town where the polished young orator waxed eloquent before a crowd of two thousand people gathered in the fields. The following evening, Ebenezer Pemberton urged Whitefield to preach from his pulpit in the Presbyterian meeting house. Whitefield accepted and delivered a series of impassioned sermons denouncing ministers and laymen alike "who hold the truth in unrighteousness, contenting themselves with a bare, speculative knowledge of the doctrines of grace, but never experiencing the power of them in their hearts."[54] That was the message Whitefield delivered in Westchester County, at Flatbush, on eastern Long Island, and on Staten Island.[55]

Whitefield's preaching was catalytic, attracting the widespread support of people from every religious group and magnifying the fractures that already existed within every religious coalition into gaping crevices. Whether Anglican, Dutch Reformed, Lutheran, or Presbyterian, the impact was essentially the same. The doctrine of the new birth as Whitefield, Gilbert and William Tennent, Frelinghuysen and other awakeners preached it required immediate rejection or acceptance. Much to the chagrin of religious conservatives who stood for the intellectual affirmation of an objective creed, New Yorkers were showing a decided preference for the conversion experience that everywhere became the hallmark of the Great Awakening. No strangers to religious frenzy, New Yorkers recognized that the emotionalism of the revivals was somewhat different from the

---

[54]Davis, Whitefield's Journals, 344-48.

[55]Ibid.; Tracy, Great Awakening, 101-3, 105-10; Maxson, Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies, 47-53, 65-67.

enthusiasm they had known. "I am very Sorry to Observe to the Honorable Society that a Spirit of Enthusiasm has of late very much prevailed in these Parts," wrote Isaac Browne, missionary of the S. P. G. from Brookhaven, in 1740, "not so much that of Quakerism (which I fear'd Some time past) as a New Sect lately Spring up, who pretend to be followers of Mr. Whitefield, altho they Never Saw him, nor are Much acquainted with his Doctrine."[56]

Undergirding the enthusiasm was considerable dedication, and that dedication soon expressed itself in a systematic program of education for and against the evangelical Christianity of the Great Awakening. Schools were vital instruments in the war between New Light and Old Light Congregationalists, New Side and Old Side Presbyterians, the so-called Methodists and orthodox Anglicans. With remarkable rapidity, Anglican preachers and teachers closed ranks against the disruptive revivalists. Writing in June of 1740, Thomas Keeble, the S. P. G. schoolmaster at Oyster Bay, reported that the religion of dissenting parents was unfortunately passed on to their children. "For many of the People of this [town] Spot and likewise of the Township are so Infatuated with Enthusiasm," continued Keeble, "and say that their inward Guide will teach them all Things and some by the assistance of bad Books [that] they run into Infidelity."[57] Keeble was doing what he could to

---

[56]Isaac Brown to Secretary, Brookhaven, July 11, 1740, S. P. G. Letter Books, B, VII, p. 137.

[57]Thomas Keeble to Secretary, Oyster Bay, June 11, 1740, ibid., B, VII, p. 145.

make the children better "principled in religion" than their misguided parents. "I beg leave to assure you," he reported, "that I do the utmost of my endeavor to Instruct My School in the Principles of Religion after Catechizing and Reading of Prayers and in bringing to Church as often as the Church is in this Place, that the children are expert in Saying their Catechism by heart & in Reading the Responses after the Minister."[58] There were other S. P. G. schoolmasters who followed much the same practice as Keeble.[59]

More than one Anglican missionary recognized that the division among dissenters might redound to the benefit of the English Church if pastor and pedagogue worked together. When the followers of Tennent and Whitefield disrupted the Dutch Reformed congregation on Staten Island, Jonathan Arnold was pleased that some of the formerly deluded Dutch had turned away from the revivals and had asked to take communion in the Anglican faith. To advance the interest of the Church still further, Arnold urged the Society to provide a stipend for Andries Right, one of the local schoolmasters who had distinguished himself by bringing his students to the weekly catechetical lectures and consistently refused to teach children of dissenters the Presbyterian catechism. The dissenters naturally

---

[58]Ibid.

[59]William Forster to Secretary, Westchester, Nov. 27, 1739, ibid., B, VII, no letter number or pagination; Thomas Noxon to Secretary, New York City, Dec. 17, 1741, ibid., B, IX, 64; Joseph Hildreth to Secretary, New York City, Nov. 1, 1743, ibid., B, XI, p. 120.

fought back using schools against each other and especially against Anglicans.[60] The Anglicans at Norwalk in Westchester County lamented in 1744 the fact that they unfortunately had only dissenters teaching school in the village. While asking that the Society sponsor a schoolmaster "to instruct our Youth in the Sound, most rational & orthodox Principles of the Church of England," Thomas Colgan, the Anglican missionary at Jamaica, bitterly complained of schoolmasters tinctured by the Awakening, "whose daily business it is, to instill such notions & Principles into Young People as are destructive of good manners, and of all Religion and government. . . ."[61]

Although usually responsive to impassioned pleas for S. P. G. financial assistance to schoolmasters, the Society doubted the propriety of continuing its support of the Trinity Church School because there were nine other English schools in New York City by 1743. Commissary Vesey vigorously protested that there was only one other school in the city taught by an Anglican. The charity school would not continue without S. P. G. support, and its demise would "be a vast obstruction to the growth of an Infant Church, to which it has been a Nursery over forty years, and to the children whose Parents can hardly give them bread, may be deprived of the

---

[60]Jonathan Arnold to Secretary, Staten Island, May 17, 1742, ibid., B, X, pp. 78-79; also June 10, 1742, ibid., B, X, p. 80; and Nov. 10, 1742, ibid., B, X, pp. 82-83. Andreas Wright to Secretary, Staten Island, 1745, ibid., B, XIII, p. 304.

[61]Inhabitants of Norwalk, New York, to Secretary, Mar. 25, 1744, ibid., B, XIII, p. 262; Thomas Colgan to Secretary, Sept. 30, 1745, ibid., B, XIII, p. 304.

opportunity of Learning to Read and of being instructed in those principles of Christianity which are necessary to their souls." The S. P. G. reconsidered and decided to continue its support of the charity school.[62]

The joint effort of preacher and teacher bore results for the Anglicans. The excesses of the revivals also benefited the Church of England, at least in the short run. "Enthusiasm has indeed of late been very predominant amongst us," wrote Thomas Colgan in December 1741, "but is now in a declining state, several of the Teachers in that way as well as their Hearers being found guilty of the foulest immoral practices & others of them have wrought themselves into the highest degree of Madness." Colgan believed that "these Occurrences, together with the good Books lately sent over by the Society, have taught people what the true Spirit & Temper of Xianity is and what it is not, and that it is to be found in a more Sober Rational Scheme, than that delivered to Mankind by Mr. Whitefield, that Arch-Enthusiast & his adherents."[63] Throughout the 1740s, arguments within Presbyterian and Dutch Reformed congregations brought more hearers to Colgan's church at Jamaica.[64]

---

[62]Vesey to Secretary, New York City, Dec. 7, 1743, ibid., B, XI, pp. 117-18.

[63]Colgan to Secretary, Jamaica, Dec. 5, 1741, ibid., B, IX, 60.

[64]Colgan to Secretary, Jamaica, Mar. 25, 1742, ibid., B, X, p. 92; also Mar. 25, 1743, ibid., B, XI, p. 134; and Sept. 29, 1748, ibid., B, XI, p. 135.

Anglican missionaries throughout New York echoed Colgan's sentiments. The revivals led by Robert Cross, friend of Whitefield and Presbyterian associate of Gilbert Tennent, divided the Dutch Reformed and English dissenters on Staten Island, leading the disgruntled to join the congregation of Jonathan Arnold. Robert Jenny also received discontented Presbyterians at Hempstead, where Thomas Temple taught school and catechized for the S. P. G. Isaac Brown wrote from Brookhaven that no communicant had "left ye Church that I know of; but many Serious and well disposed persons are added to it and Several to our Communion who were most noted for their unblameable lives among Dissenters."[65] Similarly, Thomas Standard found his sermons attracting more listeners than usual in 1743, "though the country swarms with a Parcel of Vagrant Preachers called New Lights, who are only Apes of Whitefield, but who out strip their Master in their Extravagances." From Rye, James Wetmore complained of "Independent Methodist Teachers" who "frequently call people together to instill wild & Enthusiastic Notions into them." But if the exhorters and itinerants were still spreading confusion in the remote parts of his parish, Standard emphasized with considerable satisfaction that more people attended his services than ever before, and some of the early

---

[65]Arnold to Secretary, Staten Island, received May 17, 1742, ibid., B, X, pp. 78-79; and Nov. 10, 1742, ibid., B, X, pp. 82-83. Jenny to Secretary, Staten Island, Dec. 7, 1742, ibid., B, X, p. 86; Temple to Secretary, Hempstead, June 20, 1743, ibid., B, XIII, p. 245. Isaac Browne to Secretary, Brookhaven, June 10, 1741, ibid., B, IX, 79; Browne to Secretary, Brookhaven, Mar. 24, 1742, ibid., B, X, p. 93. Thomas Standard to Secretary, East Chester, Oct. 15, 1745, ibid., B, XIII, p. 225.

followers of the Awakening had since come to their senses and returned to the communion of the English Church.[66]

Not content simply to meet the evangelical threat posed by the Great Awakening, Anglicans stepped up their own proselytizing efforts. Popular antagonism toward instructing slaves in the Christian religion remained, but Richard Charlton infused new life into the Anglican catechizing mission to the blacks of New York City. Farther north, at Albany, Henry Barclay claimed that the Indians under his care had undergone a remarkable change in morals and manners. "I have not seen above ten drunken persons among them this Summer," wrote Barclay of the Indians in 1741, "whereas upon my first coming amongst them almost every day I Saw that & Sometimes double the Number."[67] In 1743, Isaac Brown, who had just converted a particularly sinful Indian woman, hoped that other Long Island Indians might join the English Church. And Commissary Vesey secured the approval of the Society for placing a missionary at New Windsor, located about halfway between New York City and Albany in the Highlands, which were rapidly being settled. As Hezekiah Watkins, a young Yale graduate, began his ministry at New Windsor, the future of

---

[66]Standard to Secretary, East Chester, Dec. 10, 1743, ibid., B, IX, p. 149; Wetmore to Secretary, Rye, 1743, ibid., B, XI, p. 149; Standard to Secretary, East Chester, Oct. 15, 1745, ibid., B, XIII, p. 225.

[67]Henry Barclay to Secretary, Albany, June 7, 1739, ibid., B, VII, New York Letters; Barclay to Secretary, Fort Hunter, Oct. 15, 1740, ibid., B, VIII, 141.

the Church of England in New York looked bright.[68]

As it turned out, Anglican confidence was ill-founded. To be sure, its congregations grew in the rarified religious atmosphere of the Great Awakening. However, while Anglicans increased in absolute numbers, they grew only little relative to dissenters in general. Anglicans remained a distinct minority in New York, representing somewhere between one-eighth and one-sixteenth of the population. Only in New York City, where the Church of England was clearly identified as the religion of public officials and the wealthy, did the number of Anglicans increase markedly. Outside of the city, Anglicans were clearly outpaced by the evangelical dissenters, especially the well-organized Presbyterians. Hezekiah Watkins won some support for the Anglican faith at New Windsor, but most of the settlers were predisposed toward dissent, and so they remained. Despite his best intentions, Isaac Brown found the Long Island Indians generally uninterested in the Anglican creed. Indeed, Anglicans generally found it hard to compete with their dissenting rivals.[69]

Anglican missionaries had much in common with Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Quakers who opposed the revivals. That

---

[68]Browne to Secretary, Brookhaven, Mar. 2, 1744, ibid., B XIII, p. 279; Church Wardens of New Windsor to Secretary, Apr. 15, 1745, ibid., B, XIII, p. 323.

[69]William Livingston and William Smith, Jr., estimated the number of Anglicans in New York at 1/8 and 1/16 of the total population, respectively. See Milton M. Klein, "Church, State, and Education: Testing the Issue in Colonial New York," New York History, XLV (Oct. 1964), 291-303; and Kammen, Colonial New York, 222-24.

common bond of opposition bridged religious and ethnic differences and united conservative Anglicans and dissenters with the Dutch and Germans who likewise opposed pietism. Conversely, German pietists like Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg for German and Dutch Lutherans and Michael Schlatter for the German Reformed had much in common with Gilbert Tennent and George Whitefield. But despite this common ground, Muhlenberg and Schlatter shared with their constituents the desire to retain the language and traditions which connected them to their old world past. As the superintendent of the German Reformed Church in the Middle Colonies, Schlatter went about organizing congregations with little resistance, setting up the Reformed Coetus to coordinate church affairs in 1747. On the other hand, Muhlenberg, organizing the Pennsylvania Ministerium in 1748, gradually became the spokesman for German and Dutch Lutherans in America, first having to overcome a measure of popular antagonism to pietism fomented by Berkenmeyer. But overcome Muhlenberg did, just as the New Lights and New Sides seized the initiative among Congregationalists and Presbyterians respectively.[70]

As with most transforming cultural movements, it is difficult to trace the progress and demise of the Great Awakening in New York. Whitefield returned periodically to America and led revivals into the 1760s. But the Great Awakening had reached its climax by 1746

---

[70]Frantz, "The Awakening of Religion among the German Settlers in the Middle Colonies," 280-84, 286-88; J. H. Dubbs, A History of the German Reformed Church, American Church History Series, vol. VIII (New York, 1895), 278-300; Kreider, Luteranism in Colonial New York, 103-23.

in New York, with the tide of religious battle clearly turning in favor of the evangelical pietists. Tension between the conservatives and evangelicals continued, but the denominational organizations that were emerging were dominated by the friends of the Awakening. The Presbyterians led the way, forging an alliance that included erstwhile Congregationalists, Dutch Reformed, Anglicans, and Quakers. The transformation of the Dutch Reformed faith into a denomination took longer, requiring as it did the further accommodation of Dutch culture to New York conditions. Despite the ecumenical appeal of their faith, the Moravians made little headway in New York. Friend and foe of the Awakening alike questioned the motives of the eccentric Count Zinzendorf, whose Moravian conclaves were suspected of harboring Catholic doctrines. As the case of the Moravians clearly revealed, there were distinct limits to the ecumenical impulse.[71]

III

Although the Great Awakening forced New Yorkers of different religious and ethnic backgrounds into broad alliances either for or against the revivals, New Yorkers still demonstrated increasing concern with perpetuating ethnic and religious distinctions. Not only the Anglicans but also the Dutch Reformed, German and Dutch

---

[71] J. T. Hamilton, A History of the Unitas Fratrum, or Moravian Church, in the United States of America, American Church History Series, vol. VIII (New York, 1895), 431-65. For details of Moravian mission to the Iroquois, see William M. Beauchamps, ed. Moravian Journals Relating to Central New York, 1745-1766 (1916; reprint ed., New York, 1976). See also Maxson, Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies, 21-39; Moravians in Dutchess County, Provincial Council Minutes, July 5, 1744, Ecclesiastical Records, IV, 2847-48.

Lutherans, Scotch-Irish Presbyterians, New England Congregationalists, and Quakers possessed both the heightened desire and the financial means to promote educational efforts aimed at maintaining cultural differences. Paradoxically, education played an important part both in forging an emerging provincial identity based on common experience and in strengthening particular group identities.

Such was clearly the case with Dutch Reformed New Yorkers. They were badly divided over both the issue of the Coetus and the revivals. Like many other colonists of foreign extraction, the Dutch Reformed deplored the decline in the faith and culture of their fathers and looked to education to revitalize respected traditions. A moderate supporter of the Coetus, Rev. Gualterus DuBois complained in 1741 that erstwhile Dutch Reformed Calvinists were increasingly uniting with either the Anglicans or the Independents. The Independents were especially making inroads among the Dutch Reformed, explained DuBois, who was sympathetic toward the Awakening and hoped that the Coetus would shortly be ordaining young Dutch New Yorkers into the Reformed ministry. Visiting New York in 1744, Dr. Alexander Hamilton, the Maryland physician who kept a journal of his extensive travels throughout America, noted that New York City still very much reflected its Netherland heritage, although anglicizing forces were transforming the cultural topography of the colony. "Now their language and customs begin pretty much to wear out," Hamilton noted, "and would very soon die were it not for a parcel of Dutch domines here who, in the education of their children, endeavor to preserve

the Dutch customs as much as possible."[72]

The Coetus and the revivals were vexing issues for the Dutch Reformed of New York. Clergymen and laymen alike who supported the one usually opposed the other. "Because there is here perfect freedom of conscience for all, except Papists," wrote Domine Gualterus DuBois in 1741 to the Amsterdam Classis, "a spirit of confusion is ever blazing up more and more." The result was a plethora of conventicles which further weakened the Reformed faith. Noting that few Reformed preachers were willing to come to America, DuBois implored the Classis to authorize the Coetus to ordain ministers and exercise ecclesiastical discipline in New York and New Jersey. If the people were unable to secure Dutch preachers, DuBois warned, "some will assuredly go over to the Independents, and others to the Episcopalians. This some have already done," he concluded, "either induced by worldly aims, or by hypocritical reasons, or by artful misleadings."[73]

The Great Awakening exacerbated the confusion that already prevailed among the Dutch Reformed. DuBois expected the Coetus to ordain aspiring young preachers into the Reformed faith, thus limiting the opportunity heretofore available to vagabond preachers like John Van Driessen, who disrupted several congregations in the Hudson Valley during the 1730s. But the Amsterdam Classis, having

---

[72]Carl Bridenbaugh, ed., Gentleman's Progress: The Itinerarium of Dr. Alexander Hamilton (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1948), 88-89.

[73]Gualterus DuBois to Amsterdam Classis, May 14, 1741, Ecclesiastical Records, IV, 255-56.

received reports from disgruntled domines who claimed that the Coetus party aimed at nothing short of independence for the American branch of the Dutch Reformed Church, was most reluctant to concede the right of ordination. Taking the initiative on their own, Peter Henry Dorsius, minister of the Dutch Reformed congregation at Neshaminy, Pennsylvania, and Theodore Frelinghuysen ordained John Henry Goetschius, who was subsequently installed by Domine Freeman as the Dutch Reformed minister in Queens County. Two years later, Dorsius and Frelinghuysen ordained Johannes Casparius Fryenmoet, who ministered diligently to congregations in Orange County, New York, and Sussex, New Jersey.[74]

Fryenmoet and Goetschius personified some of the best and some of the worst features of pietism among the Dutch Reformed during the Great Awakening. Fryenmoet was a dedicated cleric whose irregular ordination was subsequently approved by the Amsterdam Classis. But in the language of the day, Goetschius was an "enthusiast" who lured the Reformed congregation of Gravesend away from the Kings County consistory, denounced Domine Antonies for preaching damnable doctrine and intimated that the recently deceased Domine Freeman was already burning in hell. Along with James Davenport, Goetschius was especially guilty of casting doubt upon the spiritual legitimacy of clergymen who differed with him. While generally sympathetic to the Awakening, advocates of the Coetus argued that

---

[74]Henricus Boel, Frederick Mazelius, and Georgius Wilhelmus Mancius to Amsterdam Classis, Apr. 14, 1743, ibid., 2798; Charges Formulated against Goetschius, Apr. 25, 1743, ibid., 2787-88; Henricus Boel and Georgius Wilhelmus Mancius to Amsterdam Classis, ibid., 2812-14.

not until ecclesiastical discipline was exercised in America would the twin problems of vagabond preachers and the paucity of trained preachers be solved.[75]

Orthodox ministers preaching the Reformed creed represented one way of perpetuating Dutch culture. Competent schoolmasters educating children in the faith represented yet another. As among the Anglicans, the Great Awakening stimulated schooling among the Dutch Reformed. In 1743, Mr. Abraham De Lanoy was chosen as the second teacher employed by the Dutch Reformed Consistory of New York City. De Lanoy operated a school near the New Dutch Church on Garden Street, and like Gerrit Van Wagenen who continued to teach near the Old Dutch Church, he was to teach at least ten children of poor parents who professed the faith. De Lanoy was to catechize his students in the New Church, and Van Wagenen in the Old Church. The catechetical instruction of De Lanoy and Van Wagenen was especially important because Domines DuBois and Boel were old and enfeebled. At Albany, where Domine Cornelis Van Schie was pastor from 1733 until 1744, schooling was apparently encouraged even more than in New York City. The name of the teacher is not known, but Dr. Alexander Hamilton visited a school in Albany of "about 200 schollars, boys and girls." Although certainly much smaller, Dutch schools were found wherever Dutch New Yorkers lived, accompanying migrants who

---

[75]Report on Letters from Abroad, Amsterdam Classis Minutes, May 4, 1744, ibid., 2839-40; Committee's Citation to Rev. J. H. Goetschius to Answer Certain Charges, ibid., 2883; Classis of Amsterdam to G. DuBois, N. Antonides, John Arondeus, Ministers, and to Christian Barker, Abraham Van Wyck, and Other Elders at New York and on Long Island, Oct. 29, 1743, ibid., 2826-28.

settled up and down the Hudson Valley and westward along the Mohawk River.[76]

Dutch Reformed culture was especially strong in Kings County and isolated hamlets throughout New York. But in the city of New York, despite the best efforts of parsons and pedagogues, Anglicizing forces were transforming the way of life. Writing in 1749, Peter Kalm, the Swedish botanist, reported that even in Albany children of Dutch New Yorkers were taught both Dutch and English. Ironically, the religious contentions of the Great Awakening stimulated both the realization that the Dutch Reformed faith would have to adjust to peculiarly New York conditions to survive and the desire to preserve Dutch traditions without much change. Shortly after the Coetus was organized in 1754 with almost unanimous support, the apparent harmony was broken by the use of the English language in church and school. Whether Reformed clergymen should preach in English as well as Dutch became the central issue agitating Dutch New Yorkers before the Revolution.[77]

Language was also the divisive issue among New York Lutherans. Except at Loonenburg in Albany County, Lutherans in New York were largely of German extraction, although they continued to look to the Lutheran Consistory at Amsterdam for guidance. Perhaps because of that traditional if tenuous dependence upon Amsterdam, Dutch

---

[76]Consistory Minutes, Dutch Reformed Church of New York City, Nov. 21, 1743, ibid., 2228-30; Bridenbaugh, The Itinerarium of Dr. Alexander Hamilton, 650.

[77]Kalm, Travels in North America, ed. Adolph B. Benson, 2 vols. (New York, 1934), I, 346; De Jong, Dutch in America, 97-108.

remained the language of the worship service not only at Loonenburg but also at New York City, where the German majority was obliged to learn Dutch. Devoted to tradition and fearful of pietism, Rev. Wilhelm Berkenmeyer taught himself Dutch upon his arrival in 1725. Teaching school as well as preaching and organizing Lutheran congregations, Berkenmeyer may well have taught Dutch to the children of German Lutherans in New York City. At any rate, not until the Great Awakening and increased German immigration in the early 1740s did organized resistance to the Dutch language appear. The religious ferment apparently made Germans much more concerned about preserving their own language and customs.[78]

As the Reverend Michael Christian Knoll later explained, the congregations he began ministering to in 1732 at New York City and in the surrounding country were composed of a few Dutch and many Germans:

> Since the province was formerly under the Dutch, and also that as late as 20 years ago most everything was still Dutch, the Germans had little trouble in learning the Dutch language. But since that time everything seems to have turned to English. Then about ten years ago quite a number of people came here from Wurttenberg, etc., followed by more and more, and since they had trouble learning the Dutch, they petitioned the Church Council and congregation for German services.

So it was German rather than English that threatened the customary Dutch language in the Lutheran worship at New York City and Newburgh. Knoll tried to dismiss the language dispute as simply the work

---

[78]Request for German Services, Minutes of Lutheran Church Council, June 5, 1745, Protocol of the Lutheran Church, 259-65; Michael Christian Knoll to Revs. Wilhelm C. Berkenmeyer and Somner, Nov. 5, 1745, ibid., 460-63.

of ungrateful Germans who were too lazy to learn the Dutch language that many established German Lutherans preferred to the use of their native tongue in public worship. But the same kind of cultural self-consciousness that accompanied the Great Awakening and divided Dutch Reformed New Yorkers was also at work among the German Lutherans of New York.[79]

The language question involved not simply German against Dutch but rather orthodox against pietistic Lutherans. Led by Wilhelm Berkenmeyer who ministered to the upper Hudson Valley around Loonenburg, Knoll at New York City and Johann August Wolf at the Raritan in New Jersey labored diligently against pietistic influences among Lutherans and vigorously denounced the "enthusiasm" of the Great Awakening. Tainted with pietism, Johann Spaler in the early 1730s and John Christopher Hartwick in the late 1740s, both of whom served the Central Hudson parish, composed of Rhinebeck and Queensburg, were censored by Rev. Berkenmeyer for allegedly drifting away from orthodoxy. But the leading Lutheran pietist was Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg, who arrived in Pennsylvania in 1744 and whose influence by 1750 had surpassed the orthodox Berkenmeyer.[80]

While sympathetic to the evangelists of the Great Awakening, Muhlenberg withheld his support from Johann Ludwig Hofgoed, the vagabond preacher hired by the Germans who seceded from the Dutch Lutheran congregation at New York City in 1744. In true Awakening fashion,

---

[79]Knoll to Lutheran Consistory at Rathenburg, Germany, Dec. 21, 1749, ibid., 465.

[80]Kreider, Lutheranism in New York, 101-17.

Hofgoed defended his ministry as called by God rather than by man and denounced unregenerate preachers. Scandalized by Hofgoed's intrusion and extravagances, Muhlenberg agreed to preach for several months to the Dutch Lutheran congregation at New York City. Although many of the German seceders refused to rejoin the Dutch Lutheran congregation, Muhlenberg nevertheless brought New York Lutherans under his supervision, preaching alternately in Dutch, German, and English. By 1760 New York Lutherans were under the direction of the Pennsylvania Ministerium that Muhlenberg had set up in 1748.[81]

Like the Germans and Dutch, English dissenters were very much divided by the evangelical preaching of the Awakening. In fact, several years before the arrival of George Whitefield in 1739, Gilbert Tennent and several other graduates of his father's Log College had been preaching the necessity of the conversion experience throughout New Jersey and parts of New York and Pennsylvania. Although Congregationalist by birth and association, the Tennents and many other settlers in the Middle Colonies turned to the already well organized Presbyterian faith. Beginning with the Presbytery of Philadelphia in 1706, Presbyterians in the Middle Colonies had been ordaining candidates into the faith, thus freeing them from debilitating dependence on the mother church abroad for preachers. However, tension developed shortly within Presbyterian ranks between staunch Scotch-Irish defenders of subscription for ministers of

---

[81] Ibid., 115-21; T. G. Tappert and J. W. Doberstein, eds., The Journals of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1942-1958), I, 277-79.

the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms and English or New England immigrants who rejected blind obedience to any dogmatic creed. The Adopting Act of 1729 which allowed prospective preachers to subscribe with qualifications was only a temporary palliative ultimately unacceptable to either side. The forces of the Great Awakening rekindled the controversy to white heat.[82]

The New England influence was strongest in the Presbytery of New York and the Presbytery of New Brunswick, both of which were created in 1738. In the vanguard of the Awakening, the Tennent family and alumni of the Log College dominated the New Brunswick Presbytery, while Jonathan Dickinson at Elizabeth and Aaron Burr at Newark, New Jersey, together with Ebenezer Pemberton of New York City, led the Presbytery of New York and were sympathetic to the revivals of the Awakening. Silas Leonard of Goshen and James Davenport of West Chester and eastern Long Island were members of the New York Presbytery. The Scotch-Irish dominated the Synod of Pennsylvania, and when Gilbert Tennent delivered his famous sermon on "The Danger of an Unconverted Ministry," conservative leaders like Robert Cross and Francis Allison protested against the "censoriousness" of the revivals and expelled the New Brunswick men. Burr, Dickinson, and Pemberton of New York were in sympathy with the New Brunswick preachers, and after four years of close cooperation the Presbyterians of New Brunswick and New York united in 1745 to form the Synod of New York which maintained its independence

---

[82]Tracy, Great Awakening, 60-75; Nichols, Presbyterianism in New York, 37-45.

until it voluntarily merged with the Pennsylvania Synod in 1758.[83]

As historians have noted for many decades, the Great Awakening was a time of remarkable expansion for the Presbyterian faith in the Middle Colonies. Such was certainly true in New York, though the ministry of the evangelical preachers in that colony have been neglected, with the lion's share of the attention going to Pennsylvania and New Jersey. But the fact is that Whitefield preached extensively in New York between 1739 and 1745, and both before and after Whitefield, Gilbert Tennent led revivals in New York City, Staten Island, and Long Island. So did Silas Leonard at Goshen and James Davenport on eastern Long Island and Westchester County, not to mention the equally important if less dramatic ministries of Ebenezer Pemberton at New York, Ebenezer Prime at Huntington, and others as well.[84]

Among the English settlers in New York, the Presbyterians were most thoroughly identified with the evangelical Christianity of the Awakening. While the seventy-four ministers of the New York Synod in 1758 outnumbered the ministers of the Pennsylvania Synod three to one, Presbyterians also wrote articles in newspapers and published pamphlets and established schools as well as churches to set forth and defend Presbyterian tenets. In New York, the

---

[83]Maxson, Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies, 69-79; Minutes of the Synod of New York, June 1, 1741, Records of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1706-1788 (1904; reprint ed., New York, 1969), 157-60 (hereafter cited as Presbyterian Records). See also Nichols, Presbyterianism in New York, 45-56.

[84]Maxson, Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies, 85-103; Samuel Irenaeus Prime, "Early Ministers of Long Island," Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society, XXIII (Sept. 1945), 180-94.

Presbyterian mission extended not only to whites but also to the Indians. In 1741, Dickinson, Burr, and Pemberton, having been authorized by the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge to act as its correspondents, commissioned Azariah Horton, a young Yale graduate and ordained Presbyterian minister, to preach to the four hundred or so Indians who still lived on the southern shore of Long Island. The next year, David Brainerd, another Yale graduate, was similarly appointed to minister to the Indians at the forks of the Delaware. In 1744, Brainerd moved his mission to the tribes of the Susquehanna. Upon his death in 1747, Brainerd was succeeded by his brother John, who continued the mission until his own death eighteen years later.[85]

Other religious groups in New York were variously affected by the Great Awakening. The antagonism among Congregationalists and Presbyterians led to the growth of Baptist congregations. Accused for decades of being "enthusiasts," Quakers found themselves arrayed against the revivalists who drew adherents away from the Society of Friends. Although they were few in number, some New Yorkers joined the Moravian sect, variously denounced by both advocates and detractors of the Awakening. The religious turmoil of the time turned some people away from organized Christianity and toward the secular materialism that had always been nurtured by the commercial atmosphere of the colony. The Awakening began with the promise of

---

[85]Nichols, Presbyterianism in New York, 57-59; Minutes of the Synod of New York, Apr. 15, Oct. 1 and 2, 1756, Presbyterian Records, 274-76.

uniting the different Protestant groups but ended by further factionalizing religion. But between the promise and reality, what had been sects or rather inchoate Christian groups were in many cases transformed into self-sufficient denominations.[86]

IV

Nothing demonstrated better the educational rivalry that grew out of the Great Awakening than the King's College controversy which dominated public discussion in New York during the early 1750s. In 1746, the New Side Presbyterians of the Synod of New York secured a charter for the College of New Jersey, having lost confidence in Harvard and Yale because those institutions publicly opposed the Great Awakening. The very same year, the New York Assembly passed a lottery bill designed to raise money for the founding of a college. Public sentiment for a college may be attributed in part to the growing cultural self-consciousness of New Yorkers. Anglicans, who had only one institution of higher education in colonial America, William and Mary in Virginia, doubtless were keenly interested in the New York scheme. However, popular enthusiasm for the proposed college waned considerably until 1751 when ten trustees were appointed by the Assembly to manage the funds and select the site for the college. Of the ten, seven were

---

[86]William Livingston and William Smith, Jr., "Vindication of the Moravians," The Independent Reflector: or Weekly Essays on Sundry Important Subjects More Particularly Adapted to the Province of New York, by William Livingston and Others, ed. Milton M. Klein (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), 89-95, esp. 95n (hereafter cited as The Independent Reflector); Kammen, Colonial New York, 231-41.

Anglican, two Dutch Reformed, and one Presbyterian. During the next two years, William Livingston, the single Presbyterian among the trustees, became convinced that Anglican clerics and laymen were plotting to make the proposed College of New York into a creature of the English Church. Until the developing French and Indian War forced an end to the controversy in 1756, Livingston, ably assisted by two other young lawyers, John Morin Scott and William Smith, Jr., who together with Livingston made up the Presbyterian "triumvirate," labored to warn the ethnic and religious minorities of New York against Anglican cultural aggression which they claimed threatened both religious dissent and political freedom.[87]

Anglican support for the proposed college in New York came early on. Just how early is a matter of some dispute. In his petition to the King of 1763, Sir James Jay indicated that New York Anglicans had been the primary force behind the movement for a college from the beginning:

> That several Gentlemen in the Province of New York, observing the many inconveniences and Disorders that prevailed in America in General, and that Colony in particular from the different opinions, manner and customs of the Inhabitants, and apprehending that more fatal evils would arise among a people, composed of various Nations, differing in language and in their principles of Religion and Government if left destitute of the proper means of Education endeavoured to establish a seminary for their instruction.[88]

---

[87]Preface, The Independent Reflector, 32-50; David C. Humphrey, From King's College to Columbia, 1746-1800 (New York, 1976), 35-45.

[88]Sir James Jay to King George III, New York, July 17, 1764, Documents Relative to the Colonial History of New York, ed. Edmund B. O'Callaghan and Berthold Fernow, 15 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1856-1887), VII, 643.

To be sure, Anglicans wanted the college to enshrine their beliefs and propagate the kind of cultural unity so desperately lacking in pluralistic New York. But in 1747, Presbyterian William Livingston as well as Anglican John Chambers were both pushing for the establishment of a college. Anglicans very likely began organizing to support the flagging college scheme between 1747 and 1751. The fact that seven of the ten trustees were Anglican strongly suggests that Anglicans had much to do with reviving plans for the college.[89]

Despite their religious differences, the trustees generally agreed upon the functions of the proposed college. In fact, it was because the Presbyterian critics on the one hand and Anglican supporters on the other had such exaggerated expectations of the impact the college would have on the colony that the controversy became so acrimonious. Livingston spoke of education and the college in terms that were agreeable to Dr. Samuel Johnson, shortly to be the first president of King's College and respected spokesman for Anglican preachers in both Connecticut and New York. "The true use of Education," Livingston wrote in early 1753, "is to qualify Men for the different Employments of Life, to which it may please God to call them."[90] Education made men serviceable to the commonwealth, Livingston continued; therefore, the education of youth had always been the concern of enlightened statesmen. Once the college began functioning, its graduates would come to occupy

---

[89]Humphrey, From King's College to Columbia, 18-33, 50-51.

[90]William Livingston, "Remarks on Our Intended College," Mar. 22, 1753, The Independent Reflector, 172.

every office of importance in the province. "They will appear on the Bench, at the Bar, in the Pulpit, and in the Senate, and unavoidably affect our civil and religious Principles." In short, the college was expected to transform New York society into its own image. The rub came in deciding the place religion would have in the college.[91]

Having been frustrated time and time again in their efforts to secure an Anglican bishop for America, Johnson and his fellow clerics looked to the proposed college to buttress sagging Anglican morale. Johnson and his cohorts insisted that the Anglicans should be given preference since the Church of England was the national church. Furthermore, if chartered by the king and if based on the Anglican creed, churchmen in New York maintained that the college would be heavily patronized by both crown and church. But the argument most consistenly used by advocates of an Anglican preferment was that they were trying to save the college from both the bigotry of Presbyterians on the one hand and the atheism of freethinkers on the other.[92]

Trinity Church vestry offered land for the college in 1752. By the end of that year, William Livingston, assisted by Scott and Smith, began publishing The Independent Reflector, a weekly

---

[91]Ibid., 173; Klein, "Church, State, and Education," 296-99.

[92]Carl Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775 (New York, 1962), 116-37; Samuel Johnson to Mr. Tomlinson, Dec. 1, 1742, Samuel Johnson, President of King's College: His Career and Writings, ed. Herbert and Carol Schneider, 4 vols. (New York, 1929), I, 113-14 (hereafter cited as Samuel Johnson).

periodical established primarily to expose Anglican pretensions and to advise the public on matters of manners and morals. Should the Anglicans capture the proposed college, Livingston believed, religious toleration in New York would be seriously endangered because the leaders of the rising generations would be steeped in the Anglican creed and therefore prejudiced against all dissenters. Urging that no religious sect or denomination be given preferred treatment at the college, Livingston explained in Lockean terms that the mind of the typical college student was like "ductile wax," ready to accept as unalterable truth the most prejudicial religious views of their teachers. "Let not the Seat of Literature, the Abode of the Muses, and the Nurse of Science," he warned, "be transformed into a Cloister of Bigots, or Habitation of Superstition, a Nursery of ghastly Tyranny, or School of rabbinical Jargon."[93]

Given the pluralistic nature of New York society, Livingston and his cohorts insisted that the only solution was not to give any sect or denomination "preference" in the college:

> Besides English and Dutch Presbyterians, which perhaps exceed all our other religious Professions put together, we have Episcopalians, Anabaptists, Lutherans, Quakers, and a growing Church of Moravians, all equally zealous for their discriminating Tenets: Which-soever of these has the sole Government of the College, will kindle the Jealousy of the Rest, not only against the Persuasion so preferred, but the College itself. Nor can any Thing

---

[93] The Independent Reflector, 35-36; William Livingston, "The Same Subject Continued and Concluded in an Address to the Inhabitants of This Province," ibid., 214. See also Milton M. Klein, The Politics of Diversity: Essays in the History of Colonial New York (Port Washington, N. Y., 1974), 97-109.

> less be expected, than a general Discontent and Tumult; which, affecting all Ranks of People will naturally tend to disturb the Tranquility and Peace of the Province.[94]

To reconcile the various religious groups to the college, Livingston urged that the college not establish a professorial position in divinity and that daily worship for the students be based on general Protestant doctrine acceptable to all Christians and offensive to none. Furthermore, very much opposed to the Anglican efforts to secure a royal charter for the college, Livingston contended that the legislature alone should charter and regulate the college. Only in the Assembly, insisted the triumvirate, were the interests of the various ethnic and religious groups of the colony represented.[95]

Anglican supporters of the college regarded Livingston and their other critics as either godless freethinkers bent on establishing an atheistic academy or as unprincipled Presbyterians dedicated to forwarding the interests of the college of New Jersey by arousing opposition to the proposed college of New York. Stung by the criticism of the "Reflectors," the advocates of the Anglican preference in the college bitterly attacked the general Protestant prayer that Livingston prepared for the worship services at the college, noting quite seriously that the prayer was shaped much more by the rationalism of the Enlightenment than by primitive Christian thought. Because there were so many different religious groups

---

[94]William Livingston, "A Continuation of the Same Subject," ibid., 179.

[95]William Livingston, The Querist: or, A Letter to a Member of the General Assembly (New York, 1754), 1-14 (Early American Imprints, no. 7228).

in New York, the Anglicans argued that only the national church would be accepted by the others as the creed preferred in the college. Indeed, the vestry of Trinity Church now made it quite clear that the land they had offered for the college was contingent upon the President and the chapel services of the school being Anglican.[96]

Critics of the Anglican plan made the most of popular fears of forced conformity. Livingston and his friends published their arguments in Dutch, German, and French, and petitions protesting "Trinity Church College" were circulated among New York's cultural minorities. The resulting popular antagonism toward Anglican influence was enough to make President Samuel Johnson despair that the Assembly would ever turn over the money raised by the lotteries to the college trustees. Nevertheless, following numerous appeals from Anglican laymen and priests, Lieutenant Governor De Lancey, who was an Anglican himself, and the Provincial Council, among whom were a majority of Anglicans in 1754, issued a charter incorporating King's College. Its president was always to be Anglican, and Anglicans dominated the board of governors. The English Book of Common Prayer was also to be used for chapel services, but dissenting students were welcome and might attend Sunday services wherever their parents wished.[97]

---

[96] New-York Mercury, July 9, 1753; Benjamin Nicoll, A Brief Vindication of the Proceedings of the Trustees Relating to the College (New York, 1754), 1-6 (Early American Imprints, no. 7282).

[97] Humphrey, From King's College to Columbia, 53-56, 60-64; Paul Leicester Ford, The Journals of Hugh Gaine: Printer, 2 vols. (New York, 1902), I, 8-12; II, 221-24.

Anglicans bitterly denounced the triumvirate and associates for trying to turn the different sects against the Church of England. "Their first Aim you Remember," wrote an early Anglican critic of the Reflectors in 1753, "was to pull down the English and Dutch Churches; upon the Ruins of which they hoped to aggrandize the Presbyterian church, and engross the sole Government of our College."[98] Anglican defenders were especially upset because the Reflectors were making inroads among the Dutch, whose votes would decide whether the lottery money would be turned over to the governors of the college as provided by the charter of 1754. Anglican writers wooed the Dutch, referring to the Reformed faith as the sister church established by law and warning of the machinations of English Presbyterians. Anglican laymen like merchant John Watts and lawyers Benjamin Nicoll and Joseph Murray curried the favor of those Dutch Reformed who broke with the reorganized Coetus after 1754, the so-called Conferentie. This group was led by conservative Dutch Calvinists who wanted to remain dependent upon the Amsterdam Classis and who disliked the Anglicizing influences of the Coetus. Domine Johannes Ritzema, supported by prominent Dutch Reformed layment like Philip Verplanck and Paul Richard, cooperated closely with the Anglicans.[99]

Such Dutchmen, however, were the exception rather than the rule.

---

[98] Extract from a Letter from a Gentleman in Queens County to His Friend in New York City, New-York Mercury, Apr. 30, 1753.

[99] Ibid.; Samuel Johnson to Secretary Bearcraft of the S. P. G., Oct. 30, 1752, Samuel Johnson, I, 163; Henry Barclay to Samuel Johnson, Nov. 4, 1754, ibid., IV, 24-25; Samuel Johnson to William Samuel Johnson, Nov. 25, 1754, ibid., 26-27; Humphrey, From King's College to Columbia, 54-57, 100.

Under the impact of the Great Awakening, Dutch Reformed Christians had not only come under the sway of evangelical pietism but had also become much more self-conscious of their own heritage. Led by Theodore Frelinghuysen the younger, the Dutch Reformed who formed the Coetus in 1754 were quite willing to adjust their language and faith to American conditions without compromising what they regarded as the essence of their faith. Writing pseudonymously in a pamphlet published in 1755, Frelinghuysen took the side of the Reflectors and urged the Dutch of New York not to become associated with either the "jersey College or High Church College in this Province." Rather, taking their cue from the aggrandizing Anglicans who seemed to Frelinghuysen bent on annihilating dissent whether English or foreign, the Dutch ought to set their sights on building their own academy where their children might be instructed in the faith of their fathers:

> Let us Men, and Brethren, put our Trust in God, and be unanimous among ourselves, and not harken to domineering Parties, who endeavour to divide us: we have no Business with their Colleges; they may erect as many as they please, and must expect to maintain them to themselves. Let every one provide for his own House.[100]

Not until 1766 would the Dutch Reformed get their academy, Queens College. But in the meantime, Dutch opposition was an important factor in preventing King's College from getting the lottery money until 1756. At that time, the college only got half of the £3,000 raised, the other half going to the city to repair the jail and

---

[100]Theodore Frelinghuysen [David Marion Ben Jesse], A Remark on the Disputes and Contentions in This Province (New York, 1755), 1-12, quotation on 11.

build a new pest house where plague-ridden sailors were quarantined from the general public. Anglicans got their "preference," but not the continuous public revenues that would have made King's College the educational center they envisioned. In fact, being very much dependent upon the private resources of the public, the college muted its distinctly Anglican bias. Even so, both British and foreign dissenters were still suspicious. The fear of Anglican cultural aggression had brought a measure of cooperation if not unity to many of New York's cultural minorities, and that dichotomy in the public mind between the Anglican establishment and dissent profoundly influenced not only religion but also politics in the late colonial period. The shift of the Dutch Reformed away from political alliance with the Anglicans and into cooperation with the Presbyterians set the stage for the controversy that arose later regarding an Anglican bishop for America.[101]

V

The educational impact of the Great Awakening reshaped the cultural contours of provincial New York. On the one hand, the revivals sensitized New Yorkers to their half-forgotten ethnic and religious traditions. This applied to both conservative detractors and liberal defenders of evangelical pietism. In the classic confrontation between the Coetus and Conferentie parties, both sides justified their respective positions as necessary to preserve that which was

---

[101]Humphrey, From King's College to Columbia, 63-75.

precious from the past. Among the Presbyterians, the tension between the New England faction and the Scotch-Irish also had its origin in the desire of both sides to preserve and perpetuate traditions. And as John Frantz has recently pointed out, this same conservative impulse was characteristic of the Great Awakening among the Germans of New York.[102]

But on the other hand, the evangelical and conservative wings of the various dissenting groups found much more in common with like-minded members of other denominations than with those of their own churches who viewed the Great Awakening differently. The cooperation that developed between the Dutch Reformed and the English Presbyterians was portentous of further controversy. When the evangelical wing of the Awakening came to dominate both the Dutch Reformed and Presbyterian faiths, members of these denominations who opposed the Awakening frequently joined the Anglican Church. So despite the increased factionalization on one level, there was also a greater coherence on the denominational level. The Great Awakening thus at once sharpened differences and yet highlighted similarities among New Yorkers of different ethnic and religious backgrounds.

The result was greater concern for education to transmit cherished values to the rising generation. The awakeners and their critics were prime educators, but their respective followers moved swiftly to institutionalize the controversy in churches and schools. For

---

[102]Maxson, Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies, 112-38; Lodge, "Crisis of the Churches," 201-20; Frantz, "Awakening of Religion among the German Settlers," 253-88.

all of its appeal to the emotions, the Great Awakening gave renewed vigor to the concept of living the Christian life, and that required discipline as well as training, both of which were secured at schools sympathetic to the faith. The awakenened Christian met God in a mystical encounter, but he was to learn more of his Creator and of His will for him through study of the Scripture. Therefore, the evangelicals as well as their opponents endorsed education, which had the double responsibility of perpetuating the faith within its particular ethnic context. In short, from the revivals, New Yorkers secured a much more complex conception of themselves and their society. Education was influenced by and in turn helped to shape the changing conceptions New Yorkers had of themselves.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION: CULTURAL PLURALISM AND ETHNIC POLITICS IN COLONIAL NEW YORK

New York at the middle of the eighteenth century defied easy characterization. Travelers noted that at least half the people of New York were Dutch, usually portrayed as successful traders, both industrious and parsimonious. But the Dutch were just the largest of many ethnic groups whose interaction provided New York with its vexing blend of cultures. "Being, however, of different nations, different languages, and different religions," wrote Andrew Burnaby, a young Anglican clergyman who visited the Middle Colonies in 1759-1760, "it is almost impossible to give them [New Yorkers] any precise or determinate character."[1] Out of that cultural cauldron, New Yorkers were emerging with a dualistic identity linking together comfortable ethnic and religious traditions with boundless economic aspirations. To describe an especially intricate process in simplistic terms, New Yorkers had a parochial identity composed of the ethnic and religious traditions of their respective families. Upon that narrow ethnic and religious base, New Yorkers generally imposed yet another broader, provincial identity composed of common experiences ranging from the spiritualism of the Great Awakening to the materialism of everyday life. This two-fold identity was

---

[1] Andrew Burnaby, Travels through the Middle Settlements in North America in the Years 1759 and 1760, ed. Rufus Rockwell Wilson (1798; reprint ed., New York, 1904), 116-17.

present to some extent throughout the colonies, but it was especially pronounced in New York because of the heterogeneity of the people.[2]

The extent to which New Yorkers were concerned with the parochial or the provincial respectively was determined by the educational process. As the eighteenth century wore on, New Yorkers generally began to shed some of their former parochialism and think more in terms of their provincial identity, being encouraged to do so by the cumulative influence of English culture and American experience. New Yorkers shared many common experiences, including several Anglo-French wars, Enlightenment thinking, the revivals of the Great Awakening, and provincial politics and economics. Despite their differing ethnic and religious backgrounds, the colonists found themselves drawn together as New York society became Anglicized. True, ethnic distinctions remained strong and were carefully cultivated. But simply by participating in the political and economic life of the colony, New Yorkers began to see themselves and their neighbors in provincial as well as parochial terms.

The cultural pluralism of New York was the primary reason for the twin identity of its colonists. William Livingston, an advocate of the English language and English common law and political traditions, was one perspicacious New Yorker who believed that the

---

[2]The conservative tendency is discussed in some detail by Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins (1964; reprint ed., New York, 1971), 25-34; see also George De Vos, "Ethnic Pluralism: Conflict and Accommodation," in Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change, ed. George De Vos and Lola Romanucci-Ross (Palo Alto, Calif., 1975), 18-20.

continued existence of certain ethnic and religious differences would help protect civil rights and religious liberties in the province. That was why he so vigorously opposed Anglican control of King's College as the first step in the imposition of religious conformity. His advocacy of a nonsectarian college regulated by the Assembly was based upon his analysis of the political advantages arising from cultural pluralism. "For we are split into so great a variety of opinions and Professions," he wrote in 1753, developing ideas that James Madison would amplify in the Federalist Papers, "had each individual his Share in the Government of the Academy, the Jealousy of all Parties combating each other, would inevitably produce a perfect Freedom for each Particular Party."[3] Such was the perceived beneficial political consequence of cultural pluralism. However, that very same mutual suspicion also obstructed political consensus on ethnic or religious issues and especially on educational policy, which was always extremely volatile because of New York's cultural pluralism.

The reciprocal relationship between education and ethnicity may be illuminated by considering two episodes loosely associated with the King's College controversy. One was the periodic attempt by New York Anglicans to secure an American bishop. The second episode was the movement among the Dutch Reformed for their own independent

---

[3]William Livingston and others, The Independent Reflector: or Weekly Essays on Sundry Important Subjects More Particularly Adapted to the Province of New York, ed. Milton M. Klein (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), 195 (Apr. 12, 1753) (hereafter cited as The Independent Reflector).

Classis in America. Interpreting plans for an Anglican bishop as an overt act of cultural aggression, New York dissenters responded by waging a vigorous campaign denouncing Anglican pretensions. As the largest ethnic minority in New York, the Dutch Reformed were divided against themselves, torn between those who urged cooperation with the Anglicans, continued dependence on the Classis of Amsterdam, and devotion to the Dutch language, and those who argued for cooperation with English dissenters, ecclesiastical independence from Amsterdam, and the founding of a Dutch Reformed college or academy. The cultural competition that ensued shaped the contours of education and spilled over into the politics of New York during the constitutional crisis that culminated in the American Revolution.

I

The Great Awakening prepared the way and the King's College controversy brought to a head the concern for both an Anglican bishopric and a Dutch Reformed Classis in America. The Anglican drive for control of King's College was just part of a much larger, if unorganized, design to strengthen the faith in the northern colonies. The Anglicans made overtures to the Dutch Reformed, and when some of the Dutch led by Domine Johannes Ritzema asked that the college include a professor of divinity selected by the Consistory of the Reformed Dutch Church of New York City, the Anglican advocates of King's College readily agreed, securing much needed support thereby from the Dutch community for a college charter. However,

opposition to what was termed the "English Church College" developed quickly among the Dutch Reformed, due in part to the fears aroused by the Presbyterian triumvirate of Livingston, William Smith, Jr., and John Morin Scott. The popular belief that the Anglicans were trying to dupe Dutch New Yorkers became so strong that the Reformed Consistory of New York City formally rebuked Ritzema, its senior pastor, for endorsing the Anglican college and pressing for the inclusion of a Dutch Reformed professor of divinity.[4]

Although their differences were significant, Anglicans and Dutch Reformed had at least one thing in common: neither had the ecclesiastical authority or structure to ordain ministers in America. Occasionally, the Amsterdam Classis had given special dispensation for Reformed pastors to ordain properly certified candidates. However, Anglican prelates consistently affirmed that Anglican ordination had to take place in England, where the aspiring young divine might at once come to understand his church and its mission much better and in turn be rigorously examined as to education and creed. Similar arguments were set forth by the Amsterdam Classis defending its ordination policy. Nevertheless, pressure increased

---

[4]Personal Petition of Domine Ritzema to the Governor and Council for Additional Charter for a Dutch Professor of Divinity in King's College, May 7, 1755, Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York, comp. Hugh Hastings and Edward T. Corwin, 7 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1901-1916), V, 53; The Additional Charter, for a Dutch Divinity Professor in King's College, Presented and Approved, May 30, 1755, ibid., 3554-55; Rev. Johannes Ritzema Censured by the Consistory of the Collegiate Church, New York, Aug. 11, 1755, ibid., 3574-76 (hereafter cited as Ecclesiastical Records).

among both Anglicans and Dutch Reformed for American ordination.[5]

Although his proposal for a Dutch Reformed professor of divinity at King's College was clearly designed to educate aspiring young men for the ministry in America, Ritzema urged continued subordination to the Classis of Amsterdam. He therefore opposed Frelinghuysen and others who wanted to turn the Coetus--the informal union of American Reformed churches that had been formed in 1737--into a Classis and to set up a Dutch Reformed seminary for educating ministers and laymen alike. Like his famous father, Theodore Frelinghuysen, Jr., was a warm supporter of the Great Awakening, and he shared with the Presbyterians deep fears that King's College might become the instrument of Anglican cultural aggression. Having studied and been ordained in Holland, Frelinghuysen became convinced by 1754 that it was time for the Dutch Reformed Church to direct its own ecclesiastical destiny. His position was influenced by the death of his two younger brothers, Ferdinand and Jacob, both of whom had gone to Holland specifically to be ordained and who were returning to pastorates in New York and New Jersey when smallpox claimed their lives in 1753. Suspicious of the Anglicans and much opposed to the kind of association with them that Ritzema endorsed, Frelinghuysen proposed his ideas for an American Classis and a

---

[5]See Ecclesiastical Records, I, 724-27; IV, 2428, 2472-78, 2681-82, 2902-11, 3028-29. See also Carl Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775 (New York, 1962), 117-37.

purely Dutch Reformed college.[6]

Frelinghuysen received the support of a majority of the ministers in the Coetus. But the Albany domine was not able to bring with him the approval of his own consistory, who regarded his scheme as radical innovation. The New York City Consistory, while chastising Ritzema for associating too closely with the Anglicans, shied away from the idea of an independent classis, preferring instead even to scrap the Coetus and remain dependent upon the Amsterdam Classis.[7] Refusing to recognize the legitimacy of the so-called reconstituted Coetus, Ritzema, joined by his colleague at New York City, Lambertus de Ronde, and two other Reformed domines, constituted themselves as the Conferentie and carried on a separate correspondence with the Amsterdam Classis. Paradoxically, while defending what they termed their own "moderate" policy of cooperation with the Anglicans, the Conferentie vehemently denounced Frelinghuysen and his supporters for preaching in the English language and for allowing Whitefield and other English evangelists to use their pulpits.[8]

---

[6]Alice P. Kenney, Stubborn for Liberty: The Dutch in New York (Syracuse, N. Y., 1975), 132; Gerald F. De Jong, The Dutch in America, 1609-1974 (Boston, 1975), 96-99; Circular Letter of Rev. Theodore Frelinghuysen to Ministers and Consistories, Apr. 17, 1755, Ecclesiastical Records, V, 3541.

[7]Convention Held at New York, at the Call of Theodore Frelinghuysen, for Taking Action in Reference to a Classis and an Academy, May 27-34, 1755, Ecclesiastical Records, V, 3546-55; Coetus of New York to Amsterdam Classis, Apr. 26, 1748, ibid., IV, 3006-97.

[8]Antonius Curtenius and Johannes Ritzema to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 3, 1755, ibid., V, 3582-85; Opponents of an American Classis to Amsterdam Classis, Sept. 30, 1755, ibid., 3589-90; De Jong, Dutch in America, 98-99.

During the early years of the controversy, the ministers in the Coetus outnumbered those in the Conferentie eight to four. Personal prejudices as well as religious convictions and ethnic background influenced their stand. The preachers who endorsed Frelinghuysen all supported and generally partook of the pietism of the Great Awakening. Six of the seven other preachers had studied under either Frelinghuysen or his father. While the quarrel continued, the preachers of the Coetus were especially active teaching their own offspring and other young men who wanted to preach. Frelinghuysen himself was an accomplished classical scholar, as were several of his colleagues. Illustrative of the educational concern of the Coetus faction, John H. Goetschius petitioned the Amsterdam Classis for books:

> Each of my children needs a big Bible with marginal references. Other Dutch books, (I have a few in Latin), a minister also needs, for the better and more efficient performance of his work. This your Revs. very well know. And, in order that I may educate my six sons in languages and in the sciences, I beg of your Revs. liberality, that you could send them over the necessary schoolbooks. I have also many poor catechumens in my churches. To these I should like to give certain question books, like S. de Malenaer's book styled "Spiritual and Pure Milk" . . . I would also like, for some other poor but pious churchmembers, some other edifying books for their increase in truth and godliness.[9]

Their dedication to education assured that Frelinghuysen and his colleagues would be able to perpetuate their views among the rising generation despite the opposition of the Conferentie.

---

[9]John H. Goetschius to Amsterdam Classis, Feb. 1, 1757, Ecclesiastical Records, V, 3693.

II

Like the Dutch domines of the Conferentie, Anglican clerics in New York also held a conservative view of society. King's College was important, but an American bishop was regarded as absolutely essential if Anglicans were ever to bring the colonies north of Virginia into conformity with the Church of England. New York Anglicans were especially angered by the strong opposition mounted by the dissenters against plans for both college and bishopric. First as an Anglican missionary and then as president of King's College, Samuel Johnson had a double portion of disappointment. Johnson blamed irresolute supporters and especially the indolence of Lieutenant Governor James De Lancey for the delay in obtaining the college charter requested from the Provincial Council. Once King's College was chartered in 1754, the Assembly, influenced very much by the Presbyterian triumvirate, balked at turning the lottery money over to the governors of the college, most of whom were Anglican. "Here is indeed a most virulent and active faction of Presbyterians and Freethinkers that do violently oppose such a charter," wrote Johnson in July 1754, several months before the Council incorporated the college, "and do all they can to disaffect the Dutch, without whom they bear but a small portion in the province."[10] Johnson underestimated both the growing numbers and

---

[10]Samuel Johnson to Bishop of London, July 6, 1754, in Samuel Johnson, President of King's College: His Career and Writings, ed. Herbert and Carol Schneider, 4 vols. (New York, 1929), IV, 20-21 (hereafter cited as Samuel Johnson).

the influence of the Presbyterians, who aroused the Dutch and kept King's College from securing any lottery money until the famous compromise was reached in 1756.[11]

Johnson believed that the same perfidious alliance which stymied Anglican plans for King's College was now blocking the establishment of an American bishopric. The dissenters simply had too much power to his liking. "It is a sad omen," he wrote Bishop Secker in October 1754, "that their interest with the ministry should be so much superior to that of the Church, that she cannot be heard in so reasonable and necessary a thing, and when she asks no more than to be upon a par here with her neighbors, in having leave to enjoy the benefit of her own institutions as well as they."[12] The frustration of many years weighed heavily upon his mind as he asked plaintively, "Is it then come to this, My Lord, that she [the English Church] must ask the Dissenters' leave whether she may be allowed to send so much as one bishop?"[13] Indeed, it had come to that. The next few months were even more frustrating, for the triumvirate began publishing the "Watch-Tower" essays in Hugh Gaine's New-York Mercury. The purpose of this latest venture was almost exclusively to expose and challenge Anglican aspirations.[14]

---

[11]David C. Humphrey, From King's College to Columbia, 1746-1800 (New York, 1976), 63-78.

[12]Samuel Johnson to Bishop Secker, Oct. 25, 1754, Samuel Johnson, II, 333.

[13]Ibid., 334.

[14]Milton M. Klein, "The American Whig: William Livingston of New York" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1954), 418-38.

Between December 1754 and November 1755, William Livingston, ably assisted by Smith and others, used the "Watch-Tower" to recount incidents of religious persecution and to warn that a certain set of Anglican clerics in and around New York were endangering religious freedom in the province. In an earlier essay published in The Independent Reflector, Livingston had denied that the Church of England had ever been established in New York, supporting his claim with a deft historical analysis of the shadowy Ministry Act of 1693. Livingston and his associates now discussed at length Cornbury's repressive regime, especially the Makemie affair. The past was cited again and again to arouse New Yorkers to the dangers threatening religious freedom and to the possibility of religious tyranny in the future.[15]

Particularly effective in arousing the public and especially galling to the Anglicans was the "Watch-Tower" for February 3, 1755. Recalling a dream he claimed to have had a few nights before, Livingston told of reading an issue of the New-York Journal for 1755 containing an extract of a letter from an Anglican preacher in Albany County to the Bishop of New York:

> I Make no doubt, but by the Blessing of God, and your Lordship's vigorous Measures, we shall reduce this obstinate Country to the Obedience of the Church. They are a stubborn, contumacious generation, and naturally averse to Prelacy. Hence the Business of Tythes goes much against the grain.[16]

---

[15]William Livingston, "The Arguments in support of an ecclesiastical Establishment in This Province, impartially considered, and refuted," The Independent Reflector, 367-77 (Sept. 27, 1753); New-York Mercury, Apr. 7-July 14, 1755.

[16]New-York Mercury, Feb. 3, 1755.

The letter also mentioned the recent act "against reading calvinistical and other heretical Books" and another prohibiting "all Dissenters from sitting in the General Assembly." As the letter concluded, passing mention was given to the last worship service of the Dutch Reformed Church, shutting its doors for lack of members. The satire was biting; the polemics were calculated to unite the dissenters against the Anglicans.[17]

Staunch Anglicans were enraged by Livingston's felicitous blending of subtle wit and broad humor. Setting up a paper themselves in 1755 called John Englishman, defenders of the English Church tried very hard to argue that an Anglican bishop would simply ordain ministers and confirm young Christians in the faith, not wage unremitting battle against dissent. John Englishman was wont to show the cordial relationship that had traditionally existed between the two "sister churches" of New York, the Dutch Reformed and the Anglican. The Presbyterians of the "Watch-Tower," Anglicans insisted, were trying to frighten the Dutch Reformed into a religious and political alliance. Although it was undoubtedly true, Livingston and his colleagues denied the charge and cautioned that the Anglicans planned to assimilate Dutch New Yorkers by force if necessary.[18]

Samuel Johnson became convinced that only selfishness and sheer perversity made dissenters oppose the establishment of an Anglican bishop in America. When his younger son died of the

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] Klein, "William Livingston of New York," 420-38; Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, 159-68.

smallpox while in England for ordination, Johnson found his frustration turning to bitterness. "This is now the seventh valuable life that has been lost for want of a bishop in America to ordain our youth," Johnson wrote Dr. Philip Bearcroft, Secretary of the S. P. G., in 1757, "all of which according to the course of nature, might have been now alive and doing excellent service to God and the souls of men."[19] Unlike Theodore Frelinghuysen, Johnson did not seek ecclesiastical independence from the homeland. Far from it, he wanted to strengthen the unifying bond of Anglicanism. A bishop was the only means by which the English Church could "be upon a par here with her neighbours, in having leave to enjoy the benefits of her own institutions as well as they."[20] No less than King's College, the bishopric was regarded as vital by Anglicans engaged in the cultural battle for religious hegemony. Blocked time and time again, Anglicans were not about to give up their efforts for an American prelate.

III

The King's College controversy and renewed talk of an American bishop convinced many dissenters in New York that Anglicans were striving for religious domination. There were also other indications.

---

[19]Samuel Johnson to Secretary, Dec. 21, 1757, Samuel Johnson, IV, 42.

[20]Samuel Johnson to Bishop Secker, Oct. 25, 1755, Documents Relating to the Colonial History of the State of New York, ed. Edmund B. O'Callaghan and Berthold Fernow, 15 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1865-1887), VI, 912 (hereafter cited as NYCD).

Anglican congregations were multiplying. The Episcopal congregation at Jamaica secured a charter in 1761, and within a few years, Anglican churches at Schenectady and Newburgh would similarly be incorporated.[21] Although growing rapidly in numbers, Presbyterians in New York petitioned the governor and Council again and again for a charter without success. Anglicans on the Council and lawyers for the Board of Trade in London argued that the benefits of incorporation must not be extended to dissenters from the English Church. Having been the established religion until the English conquest of 1664, the Dutch Reformed faith was exempted from the general prohibition against incorporation for dissenters. Partly because of their favored status, Dutch Reformed clerics and lay leaders at times had cooperated with the Anglicans. For their part, Presbyterians bitterly resented Anglican opposition to their own efforts to obtain charters.[22]

Although a symbolic issue to a considerable extent, incorporation also involved certain real benefits, especially with regard to the ability of a religious denomination to marshal its resources and transmit its doctrines from one generation to another. As a legal entity, the incorporated congregation could own property, accept

---

[21]Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, 127-28, 168, 208, 252, 260-63, 330-31; Episcopal Church of Jamaica to Governor and Council, Apr. 8, 1761, Ecclesiastical Records, VI, 3805-6; Episcopal Church of Schenectady to Governor and Council, Dec. 20, 1765, ibid., 4026; Petition of Episcopal Church of Newburgh to Governor and Council, Apr. 18, 1770, ibid., 4182.

[22]Petition of the Elders and Deacons of the Presbyterian Church of New York City to Governor and Council, 1720, Documentary History of the State of New York, ed. Edmund B. O'Callaghan, 4 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1850-1851), III, 278; Council Report, Mar. 24, 1767, Ecclesiastical Records, VI, 4083-84.

and manage legacies, launch building programs, and go into debt without particular members of the congregation standing surety for the church. Unable to get a charter, Presbyterians in New York City sought to limit their liability by turning church property over to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Highly incensed by this blatant discrimination, New York Presbyterians generally believed that Anglicans were plotting to weaken them. This fear gained credence in part because every royal governor from the 1730s on was instructed not only to Christianize blacks and Indians but also to work out some means of maintaining preachers and schoolmasters throughout the province. The Instructions were vague, but they doubtless meant Anglican preachers and teachers, not dissenters.[23] Given the significant increase in Anglican congregations, Anglican control of King's College, Anglican agitation for a bishop, and the efforts of the S. P. G. to bring colonists as well as Indians and blacks into conformity with the Church of England, New York dissenters believed they had just cause to fear Anglican domination, although Anglicans continued to constitute less than one-eighth of the population in the colony.[24]

Not coercion but rather the cumulative influence of English custom and culture upon New York society made Anglicanism increasingly

---

[23]Instructions to George Clinton, Aug. 20, 1741, Colonial Office Papers, 5/1126, Public Record Office, London, 203; Instructions to Danvers Osborne, July 5, 1753, Colonial Office Papers, 5/1128, 181; Instructions to Sir Charles Hardy, Apr. 3, 1755, Colonial Office Papers, 5/1128, 486.

[24]William Smith, Jr., The History of the Province of New York, ed. Michael Kammen, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), 233-34.

attractive to New Yorkers. Nowhere was that attraction more keenly felt than in the Dutch Reformed community. As late as 1750, Peter Kalm reported that the inhabitants of New York City in particular and the province in general "are still for the greatest part Dutch, who still, and especially the old people, speak their mother tongue."[25] However, the trend away from the Dutch language noted six years earlier by Dr. Alexander Hamilton had continued. Kalm also observed that the young were deserting the Dutch Reformed Church for the Anglican communion. In 1748, Domine DuBois had confessed that his church had fallen upon hard times:

> For the Dutch Churches here are beginning to languish; both on account of internal strife in some of them, and because of the distaste for true piety in others; and not less, on account of the fact that the Dutch language is gradually, more and more being neglected. On this account, in the New York Church several begin to speak of calling a minister after my death, to preach in the English language, but in accordance with our manner and doctrine.[26]

William Livingston attributed the diminished growth of the Reformed Church to its "too long continued use of the Dutch Language." As English influence spread in New York, Livingston insisted, membership in the Dutch Church had dropped proportionately because children of Dutch colonists rightly saw English as the language of the colony and had little desire to learn the Dutch that was spoken in church. Although the Reformed Church had made Dutch schooling readily

---

[25]Peter Kalm, Travels in North America, ed. Adolph B. Benson, 2 vols. (New York, 1934), I, 142.

[26]Gualterus DuBois to Amsterdam Classis, Nov. 2, 1748, Ecclesiastical Records, IV, 3037-38.

available, the decline of both language and church continued unabated. "Their youth, forgetting the religion of their ancestors, wandered in search of new persuasions," remarked Livingston; "and the most diligent labors of those who were set over them, proved ineffectual to attach them to the profession in which they were educated."[27]

Livingston urged the Dutch Reformed to use English as well as Dutch in their preaching and catechizing. In his famous history published in 1757, William Smith, Jr., reiterated Livingston's earlier warning:

> The Dutch congregation is more numerous than any other, but as the language becomes disused, it is much diminished; and unless they change their worship into the English tongue, must soon suffer a total dissipation.[28]

But Domine Ritzema and the Consistory would not hear of such a radical change. In 1755, they sent to Holland for a Dutch schoolmaster, Johan Nicholas Welp. And Domine De Ronde's proposal to translate the Heidelberg Catechism from Dutch into English was tabled for the time being.[29]

The matter of English preaching finally came to a head in 1763 when members of the Dutch Reformed Church of New York City petitioned the Consistory to hire a minister who could preach in English. A committee selected by the Consistory reported that

---

[27]Preface, The Independent Reflector, Jan. 1754, cited in Ecclesiastical Records, V, 3459-60.

[28]Ibid.; Smith, History of the Province of New York, I, 203.

[29]New York City Dutch Reformed Consistory to Jan Dreves, N. N. Schoute, and Christian Bording, Feb. 17, 1755, Ecclesiastical Records, V, 3530-32.

English preaching was essential because "we have daily the mortification to see the offspring of the wealthiest members of our congregation leave our divine worship, not being able to apprehend what is taught, and join themselves to different societies that are among us."[30] There was much opposition. Although the differences were not clear-cut, those who were inclined toward English preaching generally favored the reconstituted Coetus and the revivals of the Great Awakening. On the other hand, those opposed to English preaching generally supported the Conferentie and opposed ecclesiastical independence from the Amsterdam Classis. Despite the protest of a vigorous minority, Archibald Laidlie, a Scotsman who had ministered for several years to an English congregation in Holland, accepted the call to preach in English twice each week and to catechize in English regularly. Ironically, many who had opposed English preaching registered their protest by leaving the Reformed faith and joining the Anglican Church.[31]

An ally of Livingston, Domine Theodore Frelinghuysen of Albany wanted to preserve the best of the past by adjusting the Reformed

---

[30]Consistory Committee to David Longueville and Jasper Brunshall, Jan. 10, 1763, ibid., VI, 3854; William Heard Kilpatrick, The Dutch Schools of New Netherland and Colonial New York, United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin no. 12 (Washington, D. C., 1912), 155-57.

[31]Minutes of the New York City Dutch Reformed Consistory, Aug. 20, 1764, Ecclesiastical Records, VI, 3946; New York City Dutch Reformed Consistory to Amsterdam Classis, May 12, 1764, ibid., 3947-48; Johannes Ritzema and Lambertus De Ronde to Amsterdam Classis, Oct. 29, 1765, ibid., 4020; De Jong, Dutch in America, 104; Charles E. Corwin, "The Introduction of the English Language into the Services of the Collegiate Dutch Church of New York City," Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society, X (Mar. 1920), 175-88.

faith to American conditions. His congregation was much more conservative than he, causing Frelinghuysen no little embarrassment by refusing to endorse his plan for an American Classis and a Dutch Reformed seminary. However, Frelinghuysen and his conservative elders made common cause against the social innovation that accompanied the influx of British troops stationed at Albany during the French and Indian War. Deeply resented by many Dutch Reformed parents, the young English officers of the garrison won quite a following among Albany youth. According to Mrs. Anne Grant who was at Albany in 1759, the Anglomania spread rapidly following the arrival of the soldiers. "A sect arose among the young people," Grant recalled, "who seemed resolved to assume a lighter style of dress and manners, and to borrow their taste in those respects from their new friends."[32]

Already sensitive to charges that the adjustments he recommended had compromised Dutch Reformed tradition, Frelinghuysen lashed out at the young people for disregarding the advice of their elders and turning against the customs and traditions of their forefathers. The tensions vastly increased as the soldiers and their young Albany friends set up a makeshift theater, choosing for their first production the risque Restoration comedy, The Beau Stratagem, complete with young men playing the part of ill-reputed women. As Grant explained, the "simple good people of Albany" were scandalized:

> And by this time, the town, once so closely united by intermarriage and numberless other ties, which could not exist in any other state of society, were divided

---

[32]Anne Grant, Memoirs of an American Lady, ed. James G. Wilson, rev. ed., 2 vols. (New York, 1901), I, 291.

> into two factions: One consisting almost entirely of such of the younger class, as, having a smattering of New York education, and a little more of dress and vivacity, or perhaps levity, than the rest, were eager to mingle in the society, and adopt the manner of those strangers.

Grant insisted that "few of the most estimable" young people joined the revelers, for they "were too much attached to their older relations to give them pain."[33] But for a time, those not of the English faction seemed to be in the minority. When Domine Frelinghuysen denounced their impious activity, renegade youths threatened to beat the indignant cleric and run him out of town. Not the domine but the high-handed impositions of the British officers themselves alienated many of their former admirers.[34]

As the headquarters of the British army, New York underwent rapid Anglicization during the French and Indian War. Even before that conflict, New Englanders were settling in northern New York and challenging the cultural hegemony of the Albany Dutch. Dutch Reformed churches at Albany, Schenectady, and Kinderhook continued to conduct services exclusively in Dutch, but the spread of the English language and English culture was inexorable. The Dutch on Long Island also made concessions to the developing Anglo-American culture. While the six collegiate churches of the Dutch Reformed faith on Long Island did not introduce English until 1787, the local schools of Kings County were regulated by the town governments which had to take into account the impact of English culture. In 1758, not long after Domine Ritzema was importing a Dutch teacher

---

[33]Ibid., 293-95.

[34]Ibid., 297-99.

for the Reformed school in New York City, the magistrates of Flatbush placed the following advertisement in the New-York Gazette, or Weekly Post-Boy:

WANTED

> A Person qualified to teach Dutch and English, both Reading and Writing: Any such Person inclining to keep School may meet with good Encouragement by applying to Philipus Nagel, and Englebert Lott at Flatbush.
>
> And also such another Person wanted for the New Lotts in the Township of Flatbush; but, if this last be well qualified to teach Reading and Writing English only, he may have good Encouragement by applying to John Vanderveer, and Johannes Lott, living in the aforesaid Precinct of Flatbush.[35]

Although such evidence is sketchy at best, schoolmasters were very probably employed by subscription in villages like Jamaica in Kings County and others in Dutchess and Orange Counties where the population was largely a mixture of Dutch and English.[36]

Besides Dutch New Yorkers, the other ethnic minorities of the province were very much affected by Anglicization. Kalm noted that the children of Presbyterians as well as Dutch Reformed were attracted to the Anglican communion. Although their ranks were increasing rapidly, Presbyterians were losing some wealthy members to the more prestigious Episcopal Church. During the college controversy, Archibald Kennedy, a nominal Presbyterian who served

---

[35] New-York Gazette, or Weekly Post-Boy, Apr. 17, 1758.

[36] Daniel J. Pratt, comp., Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, from 1626 to 1746 (Albany, N. Y., 1872), 115-19; Josephine C. Frost, ed., Records of the Town of Jamaica, Long Island, 1658-1751, 3 vols. (Brooklyn, N. Y., 1914), III, 425; Kilpatrick, Dutch Schools, 201-15.

both on the Council and as receiver of the customs, argued that young men ought not to scruple giving up dissent for Anglicanism because all Christian denominations were much the same. Given the legal prohibition against dissenters holding the highest offices of government, Kennedy encouraged his own son to join the English Church for the sake of the latter's career and for whatever contribution he might be able to make to society.[37]

No doubt other New Yorkers were attracted to the Episcopal Church for similar reasons. However, Anglicization did not lead so much to the Anglican faith as to departure from the old faith. Dutch Lutherans attributed their slow growth not to competition from English denominations but from secular and schismatic forces. "The principal causes of these difficulties," wrote the Lutheran Consistory of New York City to the Amsterdam Consistory in 1759, "are in part the general trouble with which the Christian Church everywhere has to contend, but in part they are also special, peculiar only to North America, populated by people from all nations, English, Swedes, Danes, Hollanders, German, Frenchmen, Swiss, etc., and what is the saddest part of it, largely taken from the work houses and penal institutions, the scum of Europe."[38] While wrongly distorting the background of the settlers, the Lutherans rightly identified

---

[37] Archibald Kennedy, A Speech . . . by a Member Dissenting from the Church (New York, 1755), 80.

[38] Lutheran Consistory at New York to Amsterdam Consistory, Dec. 4, 1758, "The Lutheran Church in New York, 1649-1772: Records in the Lutheran Church Archives at Amsterdam, Holland, Part XI," trans. Arnold J. F. Van Laer, New York Public Library Bulletin, L (May 1946), 412.

cultural pluralism as the bane of orthodoxy.

The Lutherans should have added the Jews to their enumeration of peoples. New York had the largest Jewish community of any colonial city, although scarcely numbering more than fifty families as late as the 1750s. Despite the existence of discriminatory legislation, Jewish merchants participated fully in the commerce of the colony, being allied with the leading trading houses of London and New York. Jewish merchants like Jacob Franks and Mordecai Gomez were not only among the wealthiest men in New York City but were generally accepted into the social elite. Indeed, the Franks family was especially influenced by the spread of English culture. Jacob and his wife Abigail practiced their faith, but Abigail was an intelligent woman of the Enlightenment who looked upon the ladies at the synagogue as a "stupid set of people," and Jacob's business led him to associate more with Gentile than with Jew. Their daughter Phila married Oliver De Lancey, and their son David married into the prominent Evans family of Philadelphia. The other children remained practicing Jews, but the influence of English culture was clearly rivaling ancestral traditions in the minds of the Franks family, and the Franks were doubtless not the only Jewish family in New York faced with this dilemma.[39]

---

[39]Jacob Rader Marcus, Early American Jewry: The Jews of New York, New England, and Canada, 1649-1794 (Philadelphia, 1951), 50-52, 54-56; Leo Hershkowitz and Isidore S. Meyer, eds., Letters of the Franks Family, 1733-1748 (Waltham, Mass., 1968), xx-xxiii.

IV

Anglicization was quite clearly a potent force at work among the ethnic minorities of eighteenth-century New York. However, despite the unifying impact of English culture, ethnic distinctions remained strong and were assiduously cultivated. Consider the case of the Jews again. Two of Jacob and Abigail Franks' children married outside the faith, but all of Mordecai Gomez's offspring married other Jews. While Abigail Franks read Voltaire and found the synagogue boring, the Gomez family cultivated the literature of their faith and continued active in the historic Congregation of Shearith Israel. The Gomez clan traded largely with relatives both in America and abroad, and the Gomez children, unlike the Franks', did not leave their ancestral home in New York. Jewish children were also encouraged to remain and marry in the faith because of conditional legacies left by parents or other relatives. By 1750, the Jews of New York were firmly planted, having both a synagogue and school that dated back into the seventeenth century. Although growing very slowly, the Jewish community still possessed the institutional mechanism necessary to transmit its customs and traditions from one generation to the next.[40]

As Anglicization became stronger during the middle of the eighteenth century, New Yorkers seemed to become more solicitous

---

[40]Hershkowitz and Meyer, Letters of the Franks Family, xxiii-xxv; Leo Hershkowitz, ed., Wills of Early New York Jews (Waltham, Mass., 1967), 66, 70, 152, 158.

than before of maintaining ethnic integrity. The reasons for this paradoxical development are not clear. However, the greater pressure to conform to English culture occurred at a time when many New Yorkers had been settled long enough to accumulate the economic means to perpetuate their own ethnic identity in the face of Anglicizing forces. The fear that their ethnic integrity was being lost led German Lutherans to break away from Dutch Lutherans in 1750. Just about ten years later, the German Reformed asked for and got permission from the Dutch Reformed Consistory of New York City to set up their own independent congregation. The German Reformed of New York City were sustained by sister churches in Pennsylvania. The German Lutherans were not so fortunate, having gone against the advice of both Berkenmeyer and Muhlenberg in the language controversy. The Dutch Lutherans, inspired to action by the departure of their German brethren, launched a drive to educate the young of their congregation in the Dutch language, hoping thereby to secure unity in the future.[41]

The very real antagonism among the different ethnic groups encouraged them to work diligently on education. Reflecting the prejudice of the upper class in New York City, Abigail Franks spoke scornfully of the "dumb Dutch," a phrase that Anglican merchant John Watts and Lieutenant General Cadwallader Colden invoked quite often. The Dutch at the same time revealed their resentment of

---

[41] Minutes of the Dutch Reformed Church of New York City, Dec. 20, 1758, Ecclesiastical Records, V, 3724; Lutheran Consistory of New York to Amsterdam Consistory, May 7, 1761, "The Lutheran Church in New York, 1649-1772," 419.

the English. New England immigrants settling in northern New York particularly disturbed the Albany Dutch. Reflecting the prejudices of the Schuyler family with whom she had stayed as a young girl, Mrs. Anne Grant deplored the unconscionable practice of New Englanders who settled on the lands of Dutch patricians without bothering to pay for them. She found the newcomers "very vulgar, insolent, truly disagreeable people" who "flocked indeed so fast, to every unoccupied spot, that their malignant and envious spirit, their hatred of subordination, and their indifference to the mother country, began to spread like a taint of infection."[42] Despite her own biased political opinions, there is no doubt that Mrs. Grant did not exaggerate the dislike between New Englander and Albany Dutchman.

Resentment against New Englanders was especially pronounced among New York Anglicans. Having advocated the interest of Anglicanism against dissenters throughout his life, Lewis Morris, II, continued the battle from the grave. His will, written in 1760, made it clear that he believed very few things were quite as bad as a Yale education:

> It is my desire that my son, Gouverneur Morris, may have the best education that is to be had in Europe or America, but my express will and direction are that he be never sent for that purpose to the Colony of Connecticut, lest he should imbibe in his youth that low craft and cunning so incident to the People of that Colony, which is so interwoven in their Constitution that all their art cannot disguise it from the World; though

---

[42]Grant, Memoirs of an American Lady, II, 137.

> many of them, under the sanctified garb of Religion, have endeavored to impose themselves on the World for honest men.[43]

Other New Yorkers endorsed Anglican education with less dramatic bequests. More often than not, Anglican parents passed on to their children Bibles and Prayer Books or pews in church. Prosperous Anglicans usually left money to Trinity Church and its Charity School. In 1754, Alexander Troup, mariner, left £100 to Trinity Church "for the use of the Charity School." Widow Sharpas left £200 in 1759 "for the benefit of poor children of Trinity Church school."[44] More substantial legacies were left to King's College. Even before the nature of the college had been decided, Paul Richard, merchant, left £50 to Trinity Church and "to the College of the Province of New York by whatever name called, £400." Another Anglican of distinction, Joseph Murray, left his large library and estate valued at £10,000 to King's College.[45]

New York dissenters also left bequests aimed at propagating their respective faiths. The wills of people of virtually every denomination attest the fact. In 1753, Caleb Wright of Oyster Bay

---

[43]Will of Lewis Morris, II, Nov. 19, 1760, Abstracts of Wills on File in the Surrogate's Office, City of New York, 1665-1801, in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Years 1892 to 1908, 17 vols. (New York, 1893-1909), VI, 171-74 (hereafter cited as Abstracts of Wills).

[44]Will of Alexander Troop, May 16, 1751, ibid., V, 14-15; Will of Elizabeth Sharpas, June 18, 1759, ibid., 345.

[45]Will of Paul Richard, Mar. 9, 1749, ibid., 143-46; Richard B. Morris, "Joseph Murray," Dictionary of American Biography, ed. Allen Johnson and others, 20 vols. and 4 suppl. (New York, 1928-), VII, 363-64.

set aside five acres of land to be used by the Baptists of the town to build a parsonage for their pastors. Wright was quite specific. His bequest was not for just any Baptist preacher but for the "particular Baptists holding the Doctrine of Original Sin, justification by Christ alone, final perseverance of the Saints, and Eternal Election."[46] Similarly, in 1765, Henry Gerbeau left £25 to the Reformed French Church of New York City, "during the time that the said Church shall continue to be moderated and governed in Peace, Conformable to the Discipline of the Reformed Churches of France." Concerned Jews, Moravians, Quakers, and Lutherans as well as Dutch Reformed regularly left money and land for the support of their respective churches.[47]

Among the New Yorkers who prepared wills between 1740 and 1763, the Presbyterians distinguished themselves in their concern for the maintenance of their faith. The controversy generated by the Great Awakening, along with the further antagonism produced by Anglican aspirations in New York, prompted Presbyterians to exhibit a vigilant militancy not equalled by other dissenting denominations. The opposition of Presbyterians to the Anglican establishment in Jamaica brought forth many bequests "for the present Presbyterian minister and his successors, in all succeeding ages, for the upholding and maintaining of a standing ministry, for that and no other purpose,

---

[46] Will of Caleb Wright, Oct. 9, 1752, Abstracts of Wills, IV, 421-22.

[47] Will of Henry Gerbeau, Sept. 7, 1765, ibid., VI, 417-18. For other pertinent wills, see ibid., III, 35, 90, 174-75, 300; IV, 228; also Hershkowitz, Wills of Early New York Jews, passim.

to be applied without any evasion or collusion."[48] The battle between Presbyterian and Anglican in Jamaica was extended to the neighboring villages of Newtown in the 1750s and Hempstead in the 1760s.

Careful language was used to state clearly the terms of a bequest. Consider the legacy of John Salmon of Southold, who died in 1762. Upon the death of his wife, Salmon, whose Congregational church was in the process of becoming Presbyterian, willed his estate "for the support of a Godly, Orthodox minister of the Dissenting order, Clear and Sound in the Calvinistical Doctrine, and approved of by at least three Orthodox Ministers of Dissenting order in the Town or next neighboring, and called by at least two-thirds of those which usually pay their proportion of money for the support of the Gospel ministry in this Society."[49] Judging from their wills, Presbyterians were quite determined that the faith of the fathers should prevail in its struggle with Anglicanism.

V

The antagonism between Presbyterians and Anglicans had political implications. Indeed, the cultural pluralism of New York had shaped politics in the colony since the time of the Dutch West India Company,

---

[48]Will of Nehemiah Smith, May 14, 1750, Abstracts of Wills, IV, 290-91; Will of Anne Carle, July 1751, ibid., 343; Will of Mary Crosbie, June 9, 1751, ibid., 352; Will of Sarah Titus, Dec. 2, 1749, ibid., 365-66; Will of David Waters, Sept. 3, 1742, ibid., III, 374-76. See also ibid., V, 36-37, 44, 112-13, 300-30.

[49]Will of John Salmon, July 20, 1762, ibid., VI, 178-79.

and despite the unifying advance of English culture, New York society during the middle years of the eighteenth century remained pluralistic and culturally unstable. The diversity was especially compelling to visitors. In New York City, Burnaby reported in 1759 that there were two Anglican churches, old Trinity Church and the newly constructed St. George's Chapel. "Besides these," he noted, "there are several other places of religious worship; namely, two Low Dutch Calvinist churches, one High Dutch . . . , one French . . . , one German Lutheran church, one Presbyterian meeting-house, one Quaker . . . , one Anabaptist, one Moravian . . . , and a Jews synagogue." Burnaby overlooked the Dutch Lutheran congregation, but he did note that "dissenters of all denominations, particularly Presbyterians, abound in great numbers, and there are some few Roman Catholicks."[50]

As Burnaby's travelogue suggested, New York City was a microcosm of the province as a whole. Traveling from Boston to his mission field among the Iroquois in 1753, the Rev. Gideon Hawley remembered passing from Dutch Schenectady to the German villages in the Mohawk and Schoharie Valleys and then to the German and Scottish settlements on Sir William Johnson's estate. Similarly, the neighborhoods of New York City were usually settled by people of like-minded religious sentiments.[51] Throughout the eighteenth century, this devotion to ethnic identity led New Yorkers of whatever religious

---

[50]Burnaby, Travels through the Middle Settlements of North America, 113.

[51]A Letter from Rev. Gideon Hawley, July 31, 1794, DHNY, III, 613-31; Bruce M. Wilkenfeld, "New York City Neighborhoods, 1730," New York History, LVII (Apr. 1976), 165-81.

background increasingly to become involved in provincial politics, lest by inaction government should fall into the hands of those who would make of it the instrument of cultural aggression. Indeed, without underplaying the importance of imperial politics and the economic interests of individuals and families, it is safe to state that the electorate was highly responsive to ethnic and religious issues.[52]

Public education was a volatile political issue in New York throughout the entire colonial period. Proposals for English schools established in all parts of the province in the 1690s were not supported by Dutch New Yorkers who feared English cultural aggression. Governor Cornbury refurbished the English schools proposal, encountered opposition from both the Dutch Reformed and English dissenters, but secured approval for an English grammar school in New York City which undoubtedly looked sinister because Cornbury pursued a systematic policy of discriminating against the Dutch and English dissenters. This school closed with the end of Cornbury's detested regime in 1708. Not until 1732 did the Assembly approve another public grammar school for New York City, complete with detailed instructions for the selection of students to attend the school

---

[52]Much more study needs to be done, but considerable understanding of ethnicity and politics in colonial New York may be gained from Milton M. Klein, The Politics of Diversity: Essays in the History of Colonial New York (Port Washington, N. Y., 1974), esp. 183-208; also Alice Kenney, "Private Worlds in the Middle Colonies: An Introduction to Human Tradition in American History," New York History, LI (Jan. 1970), 5-31; Patricia U. Bonomi, "The Middle Colonies: Embryo of the New Political Order," in Perspectives on Early American History: Essays in Honor of Richard B. Morris, ed. Allan Vaughan and George Billias (New York, 1973), 63-92.

from the various counties. But after seven years, the New York City Grammar School, directed by the highly recommended Alexander Malcolm, closed because the Assembly refused to continue subsidizing the institution. New Yorkers who lived away from the city or who did not appreciate the school's Anglican slant were not saddened by its passing.[53]

Given this attitude toward government-sponsored educational institutions, it is not surprising that the proposal for a college in New York proved politically disruptive. Its initial supporters recognized just how difficult it would be to maintain any kind of public consensus on the matter. In an effort to keep down partisan bickering, Section 14 of the lottery bill of 1746 contained the following remarkable provision:

> And that the purpose of founding the said college may not be obstructed by any other application of the moneys to arise from the profits of the said lottery, be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that each and every Representative in General Assembly who may move or consent to the applying or appropriating the said moneys to any other purpose whatever, than the founding the college aforesaid, shall be and hereby is declared and made forever incapable of sitting and voting in this or any future General Assembly, and new writs shall issue accordingly.[54]

Despite this injunction to cooperation and compromise, the public debate regarding the place of religion in the college became especially acrimonious, with the Presbyterian triumvirate arguing

---

[53]See above, pages 217-19, 248-51, 360-61.

[54]Excerpted by Elsie W. Clews, comp., Educational Legislation and Administration of the Colonial Governments, Columbia University Contributions to Philosophy, Psychology, and Education, vol. VI (New York, 1899), 249.

that an Anglican preference in the college would endanger religious and civil liberty in the province and with Anglican advocates replying that an Anglican preference was essential to prevent the godless "Reflectors" from turning the college into a freethinking academy.[55]

The college issue was disconcerting enough to play a major role in the realignment of politics in colonial New York. Much has already been mentioned of how Livingston and his cohorts waged an extensive propaganda campaign, publishing broadsides and pamphlets in both Dutch and German as well as English to arouse the people to threatened Anglican religious repression. With their democratic rhetoric and warning of cultural aggression, Livingston and his friends extended the base of political participation in New York. As Gary Nash has explained, aristocratic factions vying for popular support in the colonial cities during the eighteenth century drew into the political arena people who had only played a marginal role in politics before. But the triumvirate did much more than arouse the city; they agitated the entire province and touched ethnic sensibilities that kept the people vigilant.[56]

As for the ethnic groups themselves, the Dutch had always played a vital role in the politics of the colony. Because of the

---

[55]Humphreys, From King's College to Columbia, 47-54; Samuel Johnson to Archbishop Secker, Mar. 1, 1759, Samuel Johnson, I, 282-89.

[56]Gary B. Nash, "The Transformation of Urban Politics, 1700-1765," Journal of American History, LX (Dec. 1973), 605-32, esp. 609-10, 615; Milton M. Klein, "Politics and Personalities in Colonial New York," New York History, XLVII (Jan. 1966), 3-16; and Klein, "Democracy and Politics in Colonial New York," New York History, XL (July 1959), 235-46.

contentious spirit which prevailed in the colony, the other ethnic and religious minorities were quick to grasp the fact that their particular interests were best protected by involvement in the political process. Livingston and associates were able to pry many Dutchmen away from their traditional political alliance with the De Lancey political faction, and by conjuring up the specter of cultural aggression, the triumvirate made the Anglicans highly suspect in the eyes of New York's other ethnic minorities. The Anglicans received their charter for King's College, but the triumvirate seriously weakened the De Lancey coalition, leading to the regrouping of New York politics into rival Livingston and De Lancey camps.[57]

The different issues over which the Livingston and De Lancey factions contended did not always correspond to the interests of the two powerful families who gave their names to the politics of the period. But with regard to religious issues, the De Lancey faction was thoroughly identified with the Anglicans and the Livingston faction was thoroughly identified with dissent, especially Presbyterianism.[58] The King's College controversy, along with Anglican talk of an American episcopate, were pushed out of the public mind by the concerns of the French and Indian War. However, even before that war ended, tensions began to build between Anglicans and dissenters over bringing the message of Christ to the Six Indian Nations.

---

[57]Klein, "William Livingston of New York," 402-38; Patricia U. Bonomi, A Factious People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York (New York, 1971), 17-55.

[58]Klein, "William Livingston of New York," 599-644; Bonomi, A Factious People, 248-54, 265-66.

Disturbed by the mounting pressure from dissenters bent on proselytizing the Indians, Sir William Johnson, the backwoods baronet who served as superintendent of Indian affairs, urged in 1766 that Anglicans close ranks in defense of their faith:

> My ardent desire to promote the Established Religion induces me to Suggest any thing which I think might Answer that End. It is the policy of all Governments (to view it in no other Light) that their Subjects should be of that Religion. [T]he backward State of which here, and the opposition and illnatural Offices it meets with from its inveterate Enemys, demands a Union amongst us to protect, Encourage & Extend it which in these Encreasing parts would be soon Effected by the constant residence of Good Clergymen. . . .[59]

Johnson built a church and subsidized the labors of two Anglican preachers among his German and Scottish tenants. He also offered to arrange a gift of land that might be used to support an Anglican bishop in America. Along with other Episcopal clerics in New York and New England, Samuel Johnson again urged the necessity of an American bishop. So did influential laymen like Cadwallader Colden, who lamented in 1769 that "we live Scattered in a Large Country, Among a Number of Dissenters, who are continually [quarreling] among themselves, have no Regular Plan of Church government and generally in great Confusion and anarchy." However, Colden noted that there was one thing the dissenters "seem to agree in, and the only one in which they do: Namely, a Blind Bigotted [sic] Prejudice, and opposition to the Church of England." It must be the work of

---

[59] Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, 231-65; William Johnson to Samuel Auchmuty, Nov. 20, 1766, The Papers of Sir William Johnson, ed. James Sullivan and others, 14 vols. (Albany, N. Y., 1921-1965), V, 427. See also Frank J. Klingberg, Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York (Philadelphia, 1940), 97-99.

Anglican preachers to remove that awful prejudice, Colden concluded.[60]

New York Anglicans found it difficult to understand why dissenters would continue to oppose the presence of a bishop who was necessary to ordain ministers and confirm the young. Samuel Johnson became convinced that continued opposition to an Anglican bishop in America was the misguided work of warped dissenters who had little Christian charity. William Smith, Jr., defended popular opposition to an Anglican episcopacy, insisting that it was "of the utmost Importance that all Protestant Sects should enjoy a Parity of Privileges." But Anglicans argued that without a bishop to ordain and confirm they were not on an equal basis with other denominations. Smith admitted that under ordinary circumstances moderate men would not object to bishops whose authority was limited to ordaining and confirming. "But in deliberating upon consequences of the Expedient proposed," Smith explained, betraying the suspicion and fear of cultural aggression that pulsated just beneath the surface of New York society, "there appears to be so much Danger of blowing up a Lust for the Dominion of a Party that 'tis feared the Remedy will be worse than the Disease." So New York Anglicans sulked without their bishop, and New York dissenters kept up their guard.[61]

---

[60]William Webb Kemp, The Support of Schools in Colonial New York by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, Teachers College Contribution to Education, no. 56 (New York, 1913), 210-33; Cadwallader Colen to Secretary, Coldenham, June 10, 1769, S. P. G. Letter Books, Series A, B, C (London, 1964), B, II, 120, p. 396.

[61]Samuel Johnson to Archbishop Thomas Secker, Mar. 1, 1759, Samuel Johnson, II, 282-87; Essay on Religion (c. 1768), in Historical Memoirs from 16 March 1763 to 9 July 1776 of William Smith, ed. William H. Sabine (New York, 1956), 43.

While Anglicans were lobbying for an American episcopate, Parliament began to reorganize the British Empire, passing the Stamp Act that touched off the constitutional crisis between England and her North American colonies which culminated in the American Revolution. Not surprisingly, New York dissenters tended to associate Parliament's tightening the reins of empire with efforts for an Anglican bishop in America, and they vigorously opposed both. Although there were important exceptions, New York Anglicans were prone to label critics of both Church and Parliament as Presbyterians, and New York Presbyterians were wont to believe that those who favored Parliament's reorganization policy were primarily Anglicans. As the decision for independence drew near, New Yorkers were bitterly divided, with a majority of the people very probably not wishing to decide. The reluctance of New Yorkers to take sides is better understood when one considers their dualistic cultural identity perpetuated by the educational process.[62]

Andrew Burnaby explained the political weakness of the Middle Colonies in terms that are especially fitting for New York:

> They are composed of people of different nations, different manners, different religions, and different languages. They have a mutual jealousy of each other, fomented by considerations of interest, power, and ascendancy. Religious zeal, too, like a smothered fire, is secretly burning in the hearts of the different sectaries that inhabit them, and were it not restrained by laws and superior authority, would soon burst out into a flame of universal persecution.[63]

---

[62] Samuel Auchmuty to Secretary, New York City, Mar. 29, 1766, S. P. G. Letter Books, B, II, 25, p. 51; Sabine, Historical Memoirs of William Smith, 234; Michael Kammen, Colonial New York: A History (New York, 1975), 338-44.

[63] Burnaby, Travels through North America, 151-52.

Basing his judgment on the inept and uncooperative response of the Americans to the French and Indian War, Burnaby spoke words that proved prophetic for the Middle Colonies in general and for New York in particular.

No colony was less enthusiastic about fighting the American Revolution than New York. Indeed, John Adams bemoaned the province's reluctance to join the drift toward independence. "New York still acts in Character, like a People without Courage or sense, or Spirit," wrote Adams in June 1776. "There is neither Spunk nor Gumption in that Province as a Body. . . . As a Province it will be a dead Weight upon any side."[64] New York's patriotic leaders were mainly men of conservative temperament who had joined the revolutionary cause only reluctantly; in fact, several of them became involved largely because they feared the movement might become too radical and threaten their life and property. And during the course of the war, New York was judged to have the largest loyalist population of any state. If American nationalism were to be measured in terms of the extent of devotion to the patriotic cause, New York would have to be considered the least American of the thirteen newborn states.[65]

The key to understanding New York's behavior during the American Revolution, however, is not its large number of loyalists. Rather,

---

[64]John Adams to Cotton Tufts, June 23, 1776, in The Adams Papers: Adams Family Correspondence, ed. Lyman Butterfield, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), II, 22.

[65]Kammen, Colonial New York, 342-74; Wallace Brown, The Good Americans: The Loyalists in the American Revolution (New York, 1969), 53-58.

it is to be found in the general inability of many New Yorkers to choose sides. However much New Yorkers were united by their provincial identity, their different ethnic and religious interests made them highly suspicious of the motives of each other. Indeed, William Nelson has argued that the loyalists of the American Revolution were "conscious minorities, people who felt weak and threatened" by powerful surrounding majorities. Shedding more light on the subject, John M. Head has explained that not merely cultural pluralism alone but cultural pluralism together with economic prosperity made it difficult for the heterogeneous colonists of New York to opt for the uncertainty of independence.[66]

The revolutionary crisis exacerbated the ethnic antagonism that permeated New York society. Despite the unifying impact of economic expansion, the easy tolerance of religious differences, and the spread of English culture, ethnicity remained potent in New York. Its continuing influence stemmed from the family, which dominated the educational process almost completely, and the family generally continued to perpetuate ethnic traditions. New Yorkers had learned to join together politically as a means of preserving ethnic identity and advancing individual and family interests. But this measure of unity was largely negative, directed against any change that threatened to replace cultural balance and accommodation by cultural aggression. For the most part, New Yorkers saw themselves faced

---

[66]William Nelson, The American Tory (Oxford, 1961), 91-104; John M. Head, A Time to Rend: An Essay on the Decision for Independence (Madison, Wisc., 1968), 14-30.

with an impossible choice: either independence or subservience to an overweening Parliament. So New Yorkers tended toward inaction. However much New Yorkers had begun thinking in terms of their provincial identity, they had generally been educated to preserve and advance the interests of the family and the denomination. As the struggle between England and the colonists forced New Yorkers to act, parochial concerns tended to determine their actions, making them loyalists or patriots according to the immediate threat to their way of life.[67]

Of the representatives in the General Assembly from 1768 to 1771, the Anglicans became loyalists, while all of the Presbyterians joined the revolutionary cause. However, there was no simple religious test for determining loyalism or patriotism. William Smith, one of the Presbyterian triumvirate, at first chose inaction and then loyalism, while William Livingston and John Morin Scott became patriot leaders.[68] But however divisive the war for independence was in New York, the American Revolution itself was one of those historic moments that transcended narrow ethnic and religious concerns, offering people

---

[67]See Michael Kammen, "The American Revolution as a Crise de Conscience: The Case of New York," in Society, Freedom, and Conscience, ed. Richard M. Jellison (New York, 1976), 139-55; Alexander C. Flick, "The Loyalists," in History of the State of New York, ed. Alexander C. Flick, vol. III (New York, 1933-1937), 328-60; and Alice Kenney, "The Albany Dutch: Loyalists and Patriots," New York History, XLII (Oct. 1961), 331-50.

[68]James S. Olson, "The New York Assembly, the Politics of Religion, and the Origins of the American Revolution, 1768-1771," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XLIII (Mar. 1974), 21-28; see also Dorothy R. Dillon, The New York Triumvirate: A Study of the Legal Careers of William Livingston, John Morin Scott, William Smith, Jr. (New York, 1949), passim.

an encompassing identity based on an emergent nationalism. Whether for or against independence from Britain, New Yorkers, like other Americans, began defining themselves in terms of the American Revolution.[69]

The purveyors of American nationalism found it convenient to ignore the ethnic antagonisms of the past. In his American Geography (1789), Jedidiah Morse pointed the way for others who would write about New York. "The effects of revolution have been as greatly, and as happily felt, by this, as by any of the United States," he observed. New York was growing remarkably fast, with numerous new settlements being established by people from New England. "It is remarkable," Morse emphasized with approval, "that the Dutch enterprise few or no settlements." Indeed, New York's regrettable heterogeneous past would give way in the future to a happy conformity. The English language was generally heard throughout the state, though "not a little corrupted by the Dutch dialect, which is still spoken in some counties. But as Dutch schools are almost, if not wholly discontinued, that language, in a few generations, will probably cease to be used at all. And the increase of English schools has already had a perceptible effect on the improvement of the English language."[70]

Morse was correct. Within a few generations, Dutch New York

---

[69] Ways in which ethnic identity may be merged with another transcendant identity are discussed by De Vos, "Ethnic Pluralism," 16-20; and Gordon, Assimilation in American Life, 75-83.

[70] Jedidiah Morse, The American Geography (1789; reprint ed., New York, 1970), 250-51.

was relegated almost entirely to the caricatured world of Washington Irving. But New York remained a very heterogeneous state, and if the Dutch were gone, the Irish and Germans had taken their place. What Morse failed to see--and he was just the first of many--was the unique contribution that New York made to American life because of its cultural pluralism. Ethnic and religious diversity was not a disruptive but rather an integrating force in colonial New York. Although family and denominational interests were usually of first priority, New Yorkers had learned by 1776 that the way to preserve their own particular cultural identity was to protect diversity in general. Hence the fear that public education might fall prey to cultural aggression. The violence of the Revolution repelled New Yorkers who were keenly aware that coercion was a two-edged sword. Yet once the Revolution had spent its course, New Yorkers displayed a wonderful ability to cooperate under the new state government.[71]

Religious tolerance and cultural accommodation became unifying, homogenizing forces of a dynamic society whose people were especially bent on accumulating this world's goods. Economic abundance was critical for the diverse cultural configuration in New York, for without that abundance, the different ethnic and religious groups would scarcely have had the incentive to tolerate and accommodate one another. While very much concerned with perpetuating their

---

[71]The benefits of diversity are explored with insight and sensitivity by several authors in New York: The Centennial Years, 1676-1976, ed. Milton M. Klein (Port Washington, N. Y., 1976).

respective ethnic and religious traditions, New Yorkers were also particularly concerned that their children be educated for economic success. Diversity and materialism thus fostered social unity among New Yorkers, whose dedication to freedom of thought and action contributed much to emergent American nationalism. The educational process in New York State would continue to propagate the traditions of the few and the rights and privileges of the many as the United States became even more diverse than colonial New York had been.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

A. Manuscripts

New-York Historical Society

Alexander Papers.

Allen, Stephen, Letters.

Bancker Family Papers.

Bayard, Nicholas, Papers.

Beekman Family Papers.

Clarkson, David, Letterbook.

Duane, James, Papers.

DuBois, Peter, Letters.

Freeman, Bernardus, Papers.

Ellison, Thomas, Correspondence.

Gaine, Hugh, Correspondence.

Jay, John, Papers.

Kingston School Papers.

Livingston Family Papers.

Moffatt, John, Sermons.

Morse, Jedidah, Correspondence.

Van Shaack, Henry, Correspondence.

Walton Family Papers.

Town Records of Bedford, Westchester County, New York.

New York Public Library

Chalmers Papers Relating to New York.

Cooper, Mary, Diary of, Oyster Bay, Long Island.

Hardwicke Papers.

Livingston, Robert R., Collections.

Yates Family Papers.

Public Record Office, London

Colonial Office Papers, 5/1126, 5/1128 (microfilm).

B. Printed

Andrews, Wayne, ed. "A Glance at New York in 1697: The Travel Diary of Dr. Benjamin Bullivant." New-York Historical Society Quarterly, XL (Jan. 1956), 53-73.

Barck, Dorothy, ed. Papers of the Lloyd Family of Lloyd's Neck New York, 1654-1762. In Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Years 1926 and 1927. 2 vols. New York, 1927-1928.

Bridenbaugh, Carl, ed. Gentleman's Progress: The Itinerarium of Dr. Alexander Hamilton. Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1948.

Burnaby, Andrew. Travels through the Middle Settlements of North America in the Years 1759 and 1760. Edited by Rufus Rockwell. 1798. Reprint. New York: A. Wessells Co., 1904.

Butterfield, Lyman, ed. The Adams Papers: Adams Family Correspondence. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Christoph, Peter R., Scott, Kenneth, and Stryker-Rodda, Kenn, eds. New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch, Kingston Papers. 2 vols. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1976.

Clarendon Papers. In Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1869. New York, 1870.

Colden, Cadwallader. The Letters and Papers of Cadwallader Colden, 1711-1775. In Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Years 1917 to 1923 and 1934 to 1935. 9 vols. New York, 1918-1936.

The Colonial Laws of New York from the Year 1664 to the Revolution. 5 vols. Albany, N. Y.: J. B. Lyon, 1894-1896.

Corwin, Edward T., and Hastings, Hugh, eds. Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York. 7 vols. Albany, N. Y.: J. B. Lyon, 1901-1916.

Cox, John ed. Oyster Bay Town Records. 8 vols. New York: T. A. Wright, 1916-1940.

Crevecoeur, J. Hector St. John de. Letters from an American Farmer. 1782. Reprint. New York: Fox, Duffield & Co., 1908.

Danckaerts, Jasper, and Sluyter, Peter. A Journal of a Voyage to New York, 1679-1680. 1913. Reprint. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1966.

Davis, William V., ed. George Whitefield's Journals, 1737-1741. Gainesville, Fla.: Scholars Study Press, 1969.

De Laet, John. The New World, or A Description of the West Indies. In Collections of the New-York Historical Society. 2d series, vol. I, pp. 281-316. New York, 1841.

Dern, John P., ed. The Albany Protocol: Wilhelm Christoph Berkenmeyer's Chronicle of Lutheran Affairs in New York Colony, 1731-1750. Translated by Simon Hart and Sibrandina Geertruid Hart-Runeman. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1971.

Fernow, Berthold, ed. and trans. The Minutes of the Orphanmasters of New Amsterdam, 1655-1663. New York: Colonial Dames of the State of New York, 1902.

_____. Records of New Amsterdam, from 1653 to 1674. 7 vols. New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1897.

Ford, Paul Leicester. The Journals of Hugh Gaine: Printer. 2 vols. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1902.

Frost, Josephine C., ed. Records of the Town of Jamaica, Long Island, 1658-1751. 3 vols. Brooklyn, N. Y.: Long Island Historical Society, 1914.

Gottesman, Rita S., comp. The Arts and Crafts in New York, 1726-1776. In Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1937. New York, 1938.

Grant, Anne. Memoirs of an American Lady. Edited by James G. Wilson. Rev. ed. 2 vols. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1901.

Hart, Simon, and Kreider, Harry Julius, trans. Protocol of the Lutheran Church in New York City, 1702-1750. New York: Lutheran Synod of New York and New England, 1958.

Hershkowitz, Leo, and Meyer, Isidore S., eds. Letters of the Franks Family, 1733-1748. Waltham, Mass.: American Jewish Historical Society, 1968.

Hershkowitz, Leo, ed. Wills of Early New York Jews. Waltham, Mass.: American Jewish Historical Society, 1967.

Hicks, Benjamin D., ed. Records of the Towns of North and South Hempstead, Long Island. 8 vols. Jamaica, N. Y.: Long Island Farmer Print, 1896-1904.

"Indentures of Apprenticeships, February 9, 1694 to January 24, 1708." In Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1885. New York, 1886.

"Indentures of Apprenticeships, 1718-1727." In Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1909. New York, 1910.

Jameson, J. Franklin, ed. Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1909.

"Journal of a Tour from the City of New York to Canada." New York History, XIII (Apr. 1932), 181-96, 305-22.

Journal of the Legislative Council of the Colony of New York, 1691-1775. 2 vols. Albany, N. Y.: Weed, Parsons, & Co., 1861.

Journal of the Votes and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Colony of New York, 1691-1765. 2 vols. New York: J. Buel, 1820.

Kalm, Peter. Travels in North America. Edited by Adolph B. Benson. 2 vols. New York: Dover Publications, 1934.

Livingston, William, and others. The Independent Reflector: or Weekly Essays on Sundry Important Subjects More Particularly Adapted to the Province of New-York. Edited by Milton M. Klein. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Miller, John. New York Considered and Improved, 1695. 1843. Reprint. Cleveland, Ohio: The Burrows Bros. Co., 1903.

Morris, Richard B., ed. Select Cases of the Mayor's Court of New York City, 1674-1784. Washington, D.C.: American Historical Association, 1935.

Muhlenberg, Henry Melchoir. The Journal of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg. Edited by T. G. Tappert and J. W. Doberstein. 3 vols. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1942-1958.

Munsell, Joel, ed. The Annals of Albany. 10 vols. Albany, N. Y.: J. Munsell, 1850-1859.

_____. Collections on the History of Albany from Its Discovery to the Present Time. 4 vols. Albany, N. Y.: J. Munsell, 1865.

O'Callaghan, Edmund B., ed. Calendar of British Historical Manuscripts in the Office of the Secretary of State: English Manuscripts, 1664-1776. Albany, N. Y.: Weed, Parsons, & Co., 1866.

_____. Calendar of Dutch Historical Manuscripts in the Office of the Secretary of State, Albany, New York, 1630-1664. 1865. Reprint. Ridgewood, N. J.: Gregg Printer, 1968.

_____. Documentary History of the State of New York. 4 vols. Albany, N. Y.: Weed, Parsons, & Co., 1850-1851.

_____ and Fernow, Berthold, eds. Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York. 15 vols. Albany, N. Y.: Weed, Parsons, & Co., 1856-1887.

_____. History of New Netherland. 2 vols. 1846. Reprint. Spartanburg, S. C.: Reprint Company, 1966.

_____. Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland. Albany, N. Y.: Weed, Parsons, & Co., 1868.

Osgood, Herbert L., ed. Minutes of the Common Council of the City of New York, 1675-1776. 8 vols. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1905.

Paltsits, Victor H., ed. Minutes of the Executive Council of the Province of New York, 1668-1673. 2 vols. Albany, N. Y.: New York State Library, 1910.

Pelletreau, William S., ed. Abstracts of Wills on File in the Surrogate's Office, City of New York, 1665-1801. In Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Years 1892 to 1908. 17 vols. New York, 1893-1909.

_____. Early Wills of Westchester County from 1664 to 1784. New York: E. P. Harper, 1898.

_____. Records of the Town of Southampton. 3 vols. Sag Harbor, N. Y.: John H. Hunt, 1874-1878.

Pratt, Daniel J., comp. Annals of Public Education in the State of New York, from 1626 to 1746. Albany, N. Y.: Argus Company, 1872.

Records of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1706-1788. 1904. Reprint. New York: Arno Press, 1969.

S. P. G. Letter Books. Series A, B, C. London: Microfilm Methods, 1964.

Sabine, William H. W., ed. Historical Memoirs from 16 March 1763 to 9 July 1776 of William Smith. New York: Colburn & Tegg, 1956.

Schneider, Herbert and Carol, eds. Samuel Johnson, President of King's College: His Career and Writings. 4 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1929.

Sharpe, John. "Proposals for Erecting a School, Library and Chapel at New York (Mar. 11, 1713)." In Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1880. New York, 1881.

Smith, William, Jr. The History of the Province of New-York. Edited by Michael Kammen. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1972.

Stokes, Isaac Newton Phelps, comp. The Iconography of Manhattan Island. 1915-1928. Reprint. New York: Arno Press, 1967.

Street, Charles R., ed. Huntington Town Records, Including Babylon, Long Island. 3 vols. Huntington, N. Y.: Published by Huntington and Babylon, Long Island, 1887-1889.

Sullivan, James and others, eds. The Papers of Sir William Johnson. 14 vols. Albany, N. Y.: New York State Division of Archives and History, 1921-1965.

Van der Donck, Adriaen. Description of the New Netherlands (1656). Edited by Jeremiah Johnson. In Collections of the New-York Historical Society. 2d series, vol. I. New York, 1841.

Van Laer, Arnold J. F., ed. Correspondence of Jeremias Van Rensselaer, 1651-1674. Albany, N. Y.: University of the State of New York, 1932.

_____. Correspondence of Maria Van Rensselaer, 1669-1689. Albany, N. Y.: University of the State of New York, 1935.

_____. Documents Relating to New Netherland 1624-1626 in the Henry E. Huntington Library. San Marino, Calif.: H. E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, 1924.

_____ and Pearson, Jonathan, ed. Early Records of the City and County of Albany and Colony of Rensselaerswyck. 4 vols. Albany, N. Y.: University of the State of New York, 1869-.

_____, trans. "The Lutheran Church in New York, 1649-1742: Records in the Lutheran Church Archives at Amsterdam, Holland." New York Public Library Bulletin, XLIX (Jan. 1945), 3-29; XLIX (Feb. 1945), 89-113; XLIX (Aug. 1945), 559-86; XLIX (Sept. 1945), 649-70; XLIX (Nov. 1945), 813-51; L (May 1946), 412-26.

_____, ed. Minutes of the Court of Albany, Rensselaerswyck and Schenectady, 1668-1673, 1675-1680, 1680-1685. 3 vols. Albany, N. Y.: University of the State of New York, 1926-1932.

_____. Minutes of the Court of Fort Orange and Beverwyck, 1652-56. 2 vols. Albany, N. Y.: University of the State of New York, 1922.

_____. Minutes of the Court of Rensselaerswyck. Albany, N. Y.: New York State Library, 1922.

_____, trans. New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch. Edited by Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda. 4 vols. Baltimore: Benealogical Publishing Co., 1974.

_____, ed. "Nicasius de Sille to Maximiliaen Van Beeckkerke, May 23, 1653." In New York State Historical Association, Proceedings, XXIII (1923), 101.

_____. Van Rensselaer-Bowier Manuscripts. Albany, N. Y.: University of the State of New York, 1908.

Watts, John. Letter Book of John Watts: Merchant and Councillor of New York. Edited by Dorothy C. Barck. In Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1928. New York, 1929.

Wolley, Charles. A Two Years' Journal in New York. 1701. Reprint. Cleveland, Ohio, 1902.

C. Newspapers and Pamphlets

1. Newspapers

[Philadelphia] American Weekly Mercury.

[New York] Independent Reflector.

[New York] Instructor.

New-York Gazette.

New-York Gazette, or Weekly Post-Boy.

New-York Journal.

New-York Weekly Journal.

New-York Mercury.

New-York Weekly Post-Boy.

2. Pamphlets.

Bradford, William. The Secretary's Guide, or Young Man's Companion in Four Parts. New York, 1698.

Frelinghuysen, Theodore [David Marion Ben Jesse]. A Remark on the Disputes and Contentions in This Province. New York, 1755.

Kennedy, Archibald. A Speech . . . by a Member Dissenting from the Church. New York, 1755.

Livingston, William. The Querist: or, A Letter to a Member of the General Assembly. New York, 1754.

Nicoll, Benjamin. A Brief Vindication of the Proceedings of the Trustees Relating to the College. New York, 1754.

II. BIBLIOGRAPHIES AND GUIDES

Breton, Arthur J., comp. A Guide to the Manuscript Collections of the New-York Historical Society. New York: New-York Historical Society, 1972.

Fifteenth to Eighteenth Century Rare Books on Education: A Catalog of the Titles Held by the Educational Research Library. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Flagg, Charles A., and Jennings, Judson T. "Bibliography of New York Colonial History." New York State Library Bulletin, LVI (Feb. 1901).

Greene, Evarts B., and Morris, Richard B. A Guide to the Principal Sources for Early American History (1600-1800) in the City of New York. 2d ed. New York, 1967.

Jenkins, William Sumner, ed. A Guide to the Microfilm Collection of Early State Records: Supplement. Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress, 1951.

_____. Supplement Check List of Legislative Journals of the States of the United States of America. Boston: National Association of State Libraries, 1943.

Osgood, Herbert L. "Report on the Public Archives of New York." Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1900, vol. II--Report of the Public Archives Commission, 67-250.

Welch, d'Alte A. A Bibliography of American Children's Books Printed Prior to 1821. Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, 1972.

III. SECONDARY SOURCES

A. Books

Archdeacon, Thomas J. New York City, 1664-1710: Conquest and Change. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1975.

Axtell, James. The City upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1974.

Bachman, Van Cleaf. Peltries or Plantations: The Economic Policies of the Dutch West India Company in New Netherland, 1623-1639. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.

Bailyn, Bernard. Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study. Chapel Hill, N. C., University of North Carolina Press, 1960.

Barbour, Violet. Capitalism in Amsterdam in the Seventeenth Century. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1950.

Beauchamps, William M., ed. Moravian Journals Relating to Central New York, 1745-1766. 1916. Reprint. New York: AMS Press, 1976.

Bell, Whitfield J., Jr. The Colonial Physician and Other Essays. New York: Science History Publication, 1975.

Bennett, William Harper. Catholic Footsteps in Old New York: A Chronicle of Catholicity in the City of New York from 1524 to 1808. 1909. Reprint. New York: U. S. Catholic Historical Society, 1973.

Boese, Thomas. Public Education in the City of New York. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1869.

Bonomi, Patricia U. A Factious People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.

Boone, Richard G. Education in the United States: Its History from the Earliest Settlements. International Education Series, vol. XI. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1889.

Bourne, William Oland. History of the Public School Society of the City of New York. 1870. Reprint. New York: Arno Press, 1971.

Bridenbaugh, Carl. Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1625-1742. New York: Capricorn Books, 1964.

_____. The Colonial Craftsman. New York: New York University Press, 1950.

_____. Mitre and Sceptre: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Brown, Elmer Ellsworth. The Making of Our Middle Schools: An Account of the Development of Secondary Education in the United States. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1902.

Brown, Samuel Winslow. The Secularization of American Education: As Shown by State Legislation, State Constitutional Provisions and State Supreme Court Decisions. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, 1912.

Brown, Wallace. The Good Americans: The Loyalists in the American Revolution. New York: Beacon Press, 1969.

Calam, John. Parsons and Pedagogues: The S. P. G. Adventure in American Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.

Calhoun, Daniel. The Intelligence of a People. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1973.

Clews, Elsie W. Educational Legislation and Administration of the Colonial Governments. Columbia University Contributions to Philosophy, Psychology, and Education, vol. 6. New York: Columbia University Press, 1899.

Condon, Thomas J. New York Beginnings: The Commercial Origins of New Netherland. New York: New York University Press, 1968.

Corwin, Edward T. A Manual of the Reformed Church in America, 1628-1902. 4th ed., rev. and enl. New York: Board of Publication of the Reformed Church in America, 1902.

Cremin, Lawrence A. American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

_____. The Wonderful World of Ellwood Patterson Cubberly: An Essay on the Historiography of American Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.

Cubberly, Ellwood P. Public Education in the United States: A Study and Interpretation of American Educational History. Boston Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1919

Davies, Margaret Gay. The Enforcement of English Apprenticeships: A Study in Applied Mercantilism. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956.

De Jong, Gerald F. The Dutch in America, 1609-1974. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1975.

De Vos, George, and Romanucci-Ross, Lola, eds. Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change: Palo Alto, Calif.: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1975.

Dexter, Edwin Grant. A History of Education in the United States. New York: Macmillan Co., 1904

Dillon, Dorothy R. The New York Triumvirate: A Study of the Legal Careers of William Livingston, John Morin Scott, William Smith, Jr. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.

Dix, Morgan, ed. A History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York. 4 vols. New York: Putnam, 1898-1906.

Draper, Andrew S. Addresses and Papers. Albany, N. Y.: State of New York Department of Education, 1911-1912.

_____. American Education. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1909.

_____. Origin and Development of the Common School System of the State of New York. Syracuse, N. Y.: C. W. Bardeen, 1903.

_____. Public School Pioneering in New York and Massachusetts. 1892. Reprint. Rathaway, N. J.: The Mershon Company Press, 1898.

Dubbs, J. H. A History of the German Reformed Church. American Church History Series, vol. VIII. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1895.

Dunshee, Henry Webb. The History of the School of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church in the City of New York, from 1633 to 1883. 2d rev. ed. New York: Print of the Aldine Press, 1883.

Earle, Alice Morse. Colonial Days in Old New York. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.

Edwards, George William, and Peterson, Arthur Everett. New York as an Eighteenth Century Municipality. Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. LXXV. New York: Columbia University Press, 1917.

Eekhof, A. Jonas Michaelius: Founder of the Church in New Netherland. Leyden, Holland: A. W. Sythoff's Publishing Co., 1926.

Eggleston, Edward. The Transit of Civilization from England to America in the Seventeenth Century. New York: D. Appleton, 1900.

Elliott, Emory. Power and the Pulpit in Puritan New England. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1975.

Fox, Dixon Ryan. Caleb Heathcote, Gentleman Colonist: The Story of a Career in the Province of New York, 1692-1721. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

Fried, Marc B. The Early History of Kingston and Ulster County, N. Y. Kingston, N. Y.: Ulster County Historical Society, 1975.

Gaustad, Edwin Scott. The Great Awakening in New England. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

Glazier, Nathan, and Moynihan, Daniel P., eds. Ethnicity: Theory and Experience. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Gordon, Milton M. Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins. 1964. Reprint. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Greene, Evarts B., and Harrington, Virginia D. American Population before the Federal Census of 1790. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.

Greer, Colin. The Great School Legend: A Revisionist Interpretation of American Public Education. New York: Viking Press, 1972.

Greven, Philip J., Jr., ed. Child-Rearing Concepts, 1628-1861: Historical Sources. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, Publishers, 1973.

Griffis, William Elliot. The Story of New Netherland: The Dutch in America. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1909.

Hamilton, J. T. A History of the Unitas Fratrum, or Moravian Church, in the United States of America. American Church History Series, vol. VIII. New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1895.

Hamlin, Paul M. Legal Education in Colonial New York. New York: New York University Law Quarterly Review, 1939.

Hans, Nicholas. Comparative Education: A Study of Educational Factors and Traditions. London: Humanities Press, 1967.

Head, John M. A Time to Rend: An Essay on the Decision for Independence. Madison, Wisc.: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1968.

Humphrey, David C. From King's College to Columbia, 1746-1800. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.

Ironside, Charles Edward. The Family in Colonial New York: A Sociological Study. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.

Jackson, George Leroy. The Development of School Support in Colonial Massachusetts. Teachers College Contribution to Education, no. XXV. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1909.

Jameson, J. Franklin. The History of Historical Writing in America. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1891.

Johnson, Allen, and others, eds. Dictionary of American Biography. 20 vols. and 4 supplements. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928-1941.

Jones, E. Alfred. American Members of the Inns of Court. London: Saint Catherine Press, 1924.

Judd, Jacob, and Polishook, Irwin H., eds. Aspects of Early New York Society and Politics. Tarrytown, N. Y.: Sleepy Hollow Restorations, 1974.

Kaestle, Carl F. The Evolution of an Urban School System: New York City, 1750-1850. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Kammen, Michael. Colonial New York: A History. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975.

Katz, Michael B. The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Keep, Austin Baxter. History of the New York Society Library, with an Introductory Chapter on Libraries in Colonial New York, 1698-1776. New York: De Vinne Press, 1908.

Kemp, William Webb. The Support of Schools in Colonial New York by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Teachers College Contribution to Education, no. LVI. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1913.

Kennedy, John H. Thomas Dongan, Governor of New York, 1682-1688. New York: AMS Press, 1974.

Kenney, Alice P. The Gansevoorts of Albany: Dutch Patricians in the Upper Hudson Valley. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1969.

_____. Stubborn for Liberty: The Dutch in New York. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1975.

Kerlinger, Fred N., ed. Review of Research in Education. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1973.

Kessler, Henry H., and Rachlis, Eugene. Peter Stuyvesant and His New York. New York: Random House, 1959.

Kilpatrick, William Heard. The Dutch Schools of New Netherland and Colonial New York. United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin no. 12. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1912.

Klein, Milton M., ed. New York: The Centennial Years, 1676-1976. Port Washington, N. Y.: Kennikat, 1976.

_____. Politics of Diversity: Essays in the History of Colonial New York. Port Washington, N. Y.: Kennikat, 1974.

Klingberg, Frank J. Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York. Philadelphia: The Church Historical Society, 1940.

Knittle, Walter Allen. The Early Eighteenth Century Palatine Emigration. Philadelphia: Dorrance and Co., 1937.

Kreider, Harry Julius. Lutheranism in Colonial New York. 1942. Reprint. New York: Arno Press, 1972.

Ladd, Horatio Oliver. Origin and History of Grace Church, Jamaica, New York. New York: The Shakespeare Press, 1914.

Leder, Lawrence H. Robert Livingston, 1654-1728, and the Politics of Colonial New York. Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1961.

Leonard, Eugenie A. The Dear Bought Heritage. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965.

Livingston, John H., ed. The Psalms and Hymns with the Catechism, Confession of Faith, and Liturgy of the Reformed Dutch Church in North America. New York: George Forman, 1814.

Lockridge, Kenneth A. Literacy in Colonial New England: An Enquiry into the Social Context of Literacy in the Early Modern West. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1974.

Lovejoy, David S. The Glorious Revolution in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

McKee, Samuel. Labor in Colonial New York, 1664-1776. New York: Columbia University Press, 1935.

McManus, Edgar J. A History of Negro Slavery in New York. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1966.

Marcus, Jacob Rader. Early American Jewry: The Jews of New York, New England and Canada, 1649-1794. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1951.

Martin, George H. The Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System: A Historical Sketch. International Education Series, vol. XX. 1894. Reprint. D. Appleton, 1904.

Maxson, Charles Hartshorn. The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies. 1920. Reprint. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958.

Morais, Herbert M. Deism in Eighteenth Century America. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.

Morgan, Edmund S. The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth Century New England. 1944. Reprint. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Morris, Richard B. Government and Labor in Early America. New York: Columbia University Press, 1946.

Morse, Jedidiah. The American Geography. 1789. Reprint. New York: Arno Press, 1970.

Motley, John Lothrop. History of the United Netherlands: From the Death of William the Silent to the Twelve Years' Truce--1609. 4 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1860-1870.

Murphy, Henry C., ed. and trans. Anthology of New Netherland, or Translations from the Early Dutch Poets of New York. 1865. Reprint. Amsterdam, Holland: N. Israel, 1966.

Nelson, William. The American Tory. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Nichols, Robert Hastings. Presbyterianism in New York State. Edited and completed by James Hastings Nichols. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Historical Society, 1963.

Nissenson, S. G. The Patroon's Domain. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937.

Osgood, Herbert L. The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century. 3 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1904-1907.

Perkinson, Henry J. The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education, 1865-1965. New York: Random House, 1968.

Pirenne, Henri. Early Democracies in the Low Countries. Translated by J. V. Saunders. 1915. Reprint. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963.

Pomfret, John. The Province of East New Jersey. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Pratt, John Webb. Religion, Politics, and Diversity: The Church-State Theme in New York History. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1967.

Raesly, Ellis Laurence. Portrait of New Netherland. 1945. Reprint. Port Washington, N. Y.: I. J. Friedman, 1965.

Randall, Samuel Sidwell. History of the Common School System of the State of New York, from its Origin in 1795 to the Present. New York: J. B. Ford & Co., 1871.

Reich, Jerome R. Leisler's Rebellion: A Study of Democracy in New York, 1664-1720. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Riker, James. Revised History of Harlem: Its Origin and Early Annals. 1904. Reprint. Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Literature House, 1968.

Rothermund, Dietmar. The Layman's Progress. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961.

Sachs, William, and Hoogenboom, Ari. The Enterprising Colonials: Society on the Eve of the Revolution. Chicago: Argonaut, 1965.

Schultz, Stanley K. The Culture Factory: Boston Public Schools, 1789-1860. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Schuyler, George W. Colonial New York: Philip Schuyler and His Family. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885.

Seybolt, Robert Francis. Apprenticeship and Apprenticeship Education in Colonial New England and New York. Teachers College Contribution to Education, no LXXXV. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1917.

_____. The Evening School in Colonial America. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1925.

_____. Source Studies in American Colonial Education: The Private School. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1925.

Shryock, Richard Harrison. The Development of Modern Medicine: An Interpretation of the Social and Scientific Factors Involved. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1936.

_____. Medicine and Society in America, 1660-1860. New York: New York University Press, 1960.

Singleton, Esther. Dutch New York. 1909. Reprint. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1968.

Sloan, Douglas, ed. The Great Awakening and American Education: A Documentary History. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1973.

Smith, George L. Religion and Trade in New Netherland: Dutch Origins and American Development. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1973.

Smith, Helen Evertsen. Colonial Days and Ways: As Gathered from Family Papers. 1900. Reprint. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1966.

Smith, Wilson, ed. Theories of Education in Early America, 1655-1819. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1973.

Stone, Wilbur Macey. The Divine and Moral Songs of Isaac Watts: An Essay Thereon and a Tentative List of Editors. New York: Triptych, 1918.

Storrs, Richard S. The Early American Spirit, and the Genesis of It. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co., 1875.

Strong, Thomas M. The History of the Town of Flatbush in Kings County, Long Island. 1842. Reprint. Brooklyn, N. Y.: F. Loeser & Co., 1908.

Suzzallo, Henry. The Rise of Local School Supervision in Massachusetts, 1635-1827. Teachers College Contribution to Education, no. III. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1906.

Tanis, James. Dutch Calvinistic Pietism in the Middle Colonies: A Study in the Life and Theology of Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1967.

Thompson, Benjamin F. History of Long Island. 3rd ed. 3 vols. New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1918.

Tracy, Joseph. The Great Awakening: A History of the Revival of Religion in the Time of Edwards and Whitefield. 1845. Reprint. New York: Arno Press, 1969.

Trelease, Allen W. Indian Affairs in Colonial New York: The Seventeenth Century. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1960.

Trinterud, Leonard J. The Forming of an American Tradition: A Re-examination of Colonial Presbyterianism. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1949.

Updegraff, Harlan. The Origin of the Moving School in Massachusetts. Teachers College Contribution to Education, no. XVII. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1908.

Van Rensselaer, Mrs. Schuyler. The Goede Vrouw of Mana-ha-ta: At Home and in Society. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898.

_____. History of the City of New York in the Seventeenth Century. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan Co., 1909.

Vaughan, Allan, and Billias, George, eds. Perspectives on Early American History: Essays in Honor of Richard B. Morris. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Vlekke, Bernard H. M. Evolution of the Dutch Nation. New York: Roy Publishers, 1945.

Wabeke, Bertus H. Dutch Immigration to North America, 1624-1860. New York: Netherland Information Bureau, 1944.

Wertenbaker, Thomas Jefferson. Father Knickerbocker Rebels: New York City during the Revolution. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.

_____. The Founding of American Civilization: The Middle Colonies. 1938. Reprint. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1963.

_____. The Golden Age of Colonial Culture. Ithaca, N. Y.: New York University Press, 1949.

White, Philip L. The Beekmans of New York in Politics and Commerce, 1647-1877. New York: New-York Historical Society, 1956.

Whiteman, Anne, ed. Statesmen, Scholars and Merchants: Essays in Eighteenth-Century History Presented to Dame Lucy Sutherland. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Zumthor, Paul. Daily Life in Rembrandt's Holland. New York: Macmillan Co., 1963.

Zwierlein, Frederick J. Religion in New Netherland, 1623-1664. 1910. Reprint. New York: De Capo Press, 1971.

B. Articles

Adams, Herbert Baxter. "The Church and Popular Education." Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, 4th series, XVIII (1900), 403.

Borrowman, Merle L. "The Educational Roots of Polity." Review of American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783, by Lawrence A. Cremin. Teachers College Record, LXXIII (Sept. 1971), 117-20.

Bultmann, William A. "The S. P. G. and the French Huguenots in Colonial America." Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XX (1951), 156-72.

Cohen, Ronald D. "The New England Colonies and the Dutch Recapture of New York, 1673-1674." New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LVI (Jan. 1972), 54-78.

_____. Review of The School upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England, by James Axtell. New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LIX (July 1975), 273-76.

Cohen, Sheldon S. "Elias Neau, Instructor to New York's Slaves." New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LV (Jan. 1971), 7-27.

Cohen, Sol. "New Perspectives in the History of American Education, 1960-1970." History of Education, II (Jan. 1973), 79-96.

Corwin, Charles E. "The Introduction of the English Language into the Service of the Collegiate Dutch Church of New York City." Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society, X (Mar. 1920), 175-88.

De Jong, Gerald F. "Domine Johannes Megapolensis: Minister to New Netherland." New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LII (Jan. 1968), 7-47.

_____. "The Dutch Reformed Church and Negro Slavery in Colonial America." Church History, XL (Dec. 1971), 423-36.

_____. "The Ziekentroosters or Comforters of the Sick in New Netherland." New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LIV (Oct. 1970), 339-49.

DeVries, Jan. "On the Modernity of the Dutch Republic." Journal of Economic History, XXXIII (Mar. 1973), 191-202.

Draper, Andrew S. "Public School Pioneering in New York and Massachusetts: A Final Reply." Educational Review, VI (Apr. 1893), 358-62.

_____. "Public School Pioneering in New York and Massachusetts: A Reply to a Reply." Educational Review, IV (Oct. 1892), 244-48.

Editorial. Educational Review, VI (Apr. 1893), 406-7.

Elting, Irving. "Dutch Village Communities on the Hudson River." Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, 4th series, I (1886), 11.

Flick, Alexander C. "The Loyalists." In History of the State of New York, edited by Alexander C. Flick, vol. III. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933-1937.

Frantz, John B. "The Awakening of Religion among the German Settlers in the Middle Colonies." William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, XXXIII (Jan. 1976), 266-88.

Frost, Jerry W. "As the Twig is Bent: Quaker Ideas of Childhood." Quaker History, LX (Autumn 1971), 67-87.

Gilman, D. C. "Education in America, 1776-1876." North American Review, CXII (Jan. 1876), 191-228.

Hansen, Marcus L. "The Minor Stocks in the American Population of 1790." In Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1931, vol. I. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1932.

Harmelink, Herman. "Another Look at Frelinghuysen and His 'Awakening.'" Church History, XXXVII (Dec. 1968), 423-38.

Harrington, Virginia. "The Colonial Merchant's Ledger." In History of the State of New York, edited by Alexander C. Flick, vol. II. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933-1937.

Henshaw, R. T. "The New York Ministry Act of 1693." Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, II (1933), 199-204.

Hindle, Brooke. "A Colonial Governor's Family: The Coldens of Coldenham." New-York Historical Society Quarterly, XLV (July 1961), 233-50.

Johnson, Herbert A. "The Advent of Common Law in Colonial New York." In Law and Authority in Colonial America, ed. George Billias. Barre, Mass.: Barre Publishers, 1965.

Kaestle, Carl F. "Social Reform and the Urban School: Essay Review II." History of Education Quarterly, XII (Summer 1972), 211-28.

Kammen, Michael. "The American Revolution as a Crise de Conscience: The Case of New York." In Society, Freedom, and Conscience, edited by Richard M. Jellison. New York: Norton, 1976.

Kenney, Alice P. "The Albany Dutch: Loyalists and Patriots." New York History, XLII (Oct. 1961), 331-50.

_____. "Patricians and Plebeians in Colonial Albany: Part IV--Community Analysis." De Halve-Maen, XLV (Jan. 1971), 13-14.

_____. "Private Worlds in the Middle Colonies: An Introduction to Human Tradition in American History." New York History, LI (Jan. 1970), 4-31.

Klein, Milton M. "Church, State, and Education: Testing the Issue in Colonial New York." New York History, XLV (Oct. 1964), 291-303.

_____. "The Cultural Tyros of Colonial New York." South Atlantic Quarterly, LXVI (Spring 1967), 218-32.

_____. "Politics and Personalities in Colonial New York." New York History, XLVII (Jan. 1966), 2-15.

_____. "The Rise of the New York Bar: The Legal Career of William Livingston." William and Mary Quarterly, 3d series, XV (1958), 334-58.

Krout, John A. "Behind the Coat of Arms: A Phase of Prestige in Colonial New York." New York History, XVI (Jan. 1935), 42-52.

Kupp, Jan. "Aspects of New York-Dutch Trade under the English, 1670-1674." New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LXII (Apr. 1974), 139-47.

"Law in Colonial New York: The Legal System of 1691." Harvard Law Review, LXXX (1967), 1757-72.

Leder, Lawrence H. "Dongan's New York and Fletcher's London: Personality and Politics." New York Historical Society Quarterly, LV (Jan. 1971), 28-37.

_____. "Robert Livingston's Sons: Preparation for Futurity." New York History, L (July 1969), 235-49.

_____. "The Unorthodox Domine: Nicholas Van Rensselaer." New York History, XXXV (Apr. 1954), 166-76.

Lodge, Martin E. "The Crisis of the Churches in the Middle Colonies, 1720-1750." Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, XCV (1971), 195-220.

Lovejoy, David S. "Equality and Empire: The New York Charter of Libertyes, 1683." William and Mary Quarterly, 3d series, XXI (Oct. 1964), 493-515.

McKinley, Albert E. "The English and Dutch Towns of New Netherland." American Historical Review, VI (Oct. 1900), 1-18.

_____. "The Transition from Dutch to English Rule in New York." American Historical Review, VI (July 1900), 693-724.

Martin, George H. "Compulsory Education in Massachusetts." In National Education Association, Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, 1891. Washington, D. C., 1891.

_____. "Public School Pioneering: A Final Statement of the Massachusetts Claim." Educational Review, IV (Mar. 1893), 239-42.

_____. "Public School Pioneering: A Reply." Educational Review, IV (June 1892), 34-46.

Mayo, Amory Dwight. "Public Schools During the Colonial and Revolutionary Periods in the United States." Report of the United States Commissioner of Education, 1893-94, I (Washington, D. C., 1896), 639-738.

Narrett, David E. "Preparation for Death and Provision for the Living." New York History, LVII (Oct. 1976), 417-37.

Nash, Gary B. "The Transformation of Urban Politics, 1700-1765." Journal of American History, LX (Dec. 1973), 605-32.

Olson, James S. "The New York Assembly, the Politics of Religion, and the Origins of the American Revolution, 1768-1771." Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XLIII (Mar. 1974), 21-28.

Osgood, Herbert L., ed. "The Society of Dissenters Founded at New York in 1769." American Historical Review, VI (Apr. 1901), 498-507.

Parsons, Talcott. "The School Class as a Social System: Some of its Functions in American Society." Harvard Educational Review, XXIX (Fall 1957), 197-318.

Powell, Arthur G. Review of American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783, by Lawrence A. Cremin. Harvard Educational Review, XLI (Summer 1971), 251-55.

Prime, Samuel Irenaeus. "Early Ministers of Long Island." Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society, XXIII (Sept. 1945), 180-94.

Putnam, Ruth. "The Dutch Element in the United States." In Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1909, 205-18. Washington, D. C., 1910.

Rainbolt, John C. "The Creation of a Governor and Captain General for the Northern Colonies." New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LV (Jan. 1971), 28-37.

_____. "A 'great and usefull designe': Bellomont's Proposals for New York, 1648-1701." New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LIII (Oct. 1969), 333-51.

Rothman, David. "A Note on the Study of the Colonial Family." William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, XXIII (Oct. 1966), 627-34.

Runcie, John D. "The Problem of Anglo-American Politics in Bellomont's New York." William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, XXVI (Apr. 1969), 191-217.

Schrag, F. J. "Theodore Jacobus Frelinghuysen: The Father of American Pietism." Church History, XV (Dec. 1945), 239-55.

Seward, Ray. "The Colonial Family in America: Toward a Socio-Historical Restoration of Its Structure." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXV (Feb. 1973), 58-70.

Seybolt, Robert Francis. "The Evening Schools of Colonial New York City." In Fifteenth Annual Report of the [New York State] Education Department (1919), I, 630-52.

_____. "The S. P. G. Myth: A Note on Education in Colonial New York." Journal of Educational Research, XIII (Feb. 1926), 129-37.

Smith, Elizur Y. "Captain Thomas Willett: First Mayor of New York." New York History, XXI (Oct. 1940), 404-17.

Smith, Timothy L. "Immigrant Social Aspiration and American Education, 1800-1930." American Quarterly, XXI (Fall 1969), 523-43.

_____. "New Approaches to the History of Immigration in Twentieth-Century America." American Historical Review, LXXI (July 1966), 1272-94.

Solberg, Winston U. Review of The School upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England, by James Axtell. Journal of American History, LXII (June 1975), 106.

Spalletta, Matteo. "Divorce in Colonial New York." New-York Historical Society Quarterly, XXXIX (Oct. 1955), 422-40.

Stern, Steve J. "Knickerbockers Who Asserted and Insisted: The Dutch Interest in New York Politics, 1664-1691." New-York Historical Society Quarterly, LVIII (Apr. 1975), 113-38.

Van der Woude, A. M. "Variations in the Size and Structure of the Household in the United Provinces in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." In Household and Family in Past Times, edited by Peter Laslett and Richard Wall. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Weis, Frederick Lewis. "The Colonial Clergy of the Middle Colonies: New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, 1728-1776." Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, LXVI (Oct. 17, 1956), 167-351.

Wilkenfeld, Bruce M. "New York City Neighborhoods, 1730." New York History, LVII (Apr. 1976), 165-81.

Zuckerman, Michael. "The Fabrication of Idnetity in Early America." William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, XXXIV (Apr. 1977), 183-214.

C. Dissertations

Goodfriend, Joyce Diane. "'Too Great a Mixture of Nations': The Development of New York City Society in the Seventeenth Century." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1975.

Haley, Jacquetta Mae. "Voluntary Organizations in Pre-Revolutionary New York City, 1750-1776." Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1976.

Johnson, Ronald Mulberry. "Captain of Education: An Intellectual Biography of Andrew S. Draper, 1848-1913." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1970.

Klein, Milton M. "The American Whig: William Livingston of New York." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1954.

Luidens, John P. "The Americanization of the Dutch Reformed Church." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1969.

McAnear, Beverly. "Politics in Provincial New York, 1689-1761." Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1935.

Murray, Sean Collins. "The Reverend Samuel Johnson, 1696-1772: Anglican Protagonist in Colonial America." Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1976.

Murrin, John M. "Anglicizing an American Colony: The Transformation of Provincial Massachusetts." Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1966.

Ritchie, Robert C. "The Duke's Province: A Study of Proprietary New York, 1664-1685." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1972.

Thomas, John Z. C. "Printing in Colonial New York, 1693-1763." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1974.

Wilkenfeld, Bruce M. "The Social and Economic Structure of the City of New York, 1695-1796." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1973.

Wright, Langdon G. "Local Government in Colonial New York, 1640-1710." Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1974.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

Registrants by Nationalities

	1695-1707		1718-1727	
	#	%	#	%
Dutch	18	17	33	16
English	71	66	154	76
Other	19	17	17	8
Total	108	100	204	100

Schooling Specified in Indenture Agreements--Dutch

	1695-1707		1718-1727	
	#	%	#	%
Schooling Mentioned	9	50	29	88
No Schooling	9	50	4	12
Total	18	100	33	100

Schooling Specified in Indenture Agreements--English

	1695-1707		1718-1727	
	#	%	#	%
Schooling Mentioned	25	35	76	50
No Schooling	46	65	78	50
Total	71	100	154	100

Indentures & Family Background

	1695-1707		1718-1727	
	#	%	#	%
Children Probably Orphaned	30	28	24	12
Mother of Children Probably a Widow	21	19	56	28
Cannot Tell	26	24	58	28
Father or Both Parents Mentioned	31	29	66	32
Total	108	100	204	100

VITA

Ronald William Howard was born in Jefferson County, Tennessee, on July 6, 1946. He attended elementary school at Piedmont, Tennessee, and later graduated from Maury High School, Dandridge, Tennessee. He received his B. A. degree from Carson-Newman College in Jefferson City, Tennessee, in 1968, graduating magna cum laude. He received his Master's Degree from the University of Tennessee in 1971 and the Ph.D. in 1978.

While at the University of Tennessee, Ronald Howard was an NDEA Title IV fellow, a recipient of two University of Tennessee Non-Service Fellowships, and served as a teaching assistant in the Department of History. He was Visiting Assistant Professor of History at Tennessee Technological University in the fall of 1972. In 1977, he taught American History for Roane State Community College and Walters State Community College. In the fall of 1977, he became an Assistant Professor of History at Mississippi College, Clinton, Mississippi.

The author is a member of Alpha Chi, national honor society; Phi Alpha Theta, international honor society in history; the History of Education Society; the Mississippi Historical Society; the New York State Historical Association; and the American Historical Society.

He is married to the former Kathleen Krulac of Nashville, Tennessee.