A Concept Rejected: New York's Anglican "Establishment," 1693–1715

Cynthia A. Kierner *

The Church/State relationship has received its share of scholarly attention. Within the context of medieval and early modern Europe, historians have portrayed Church and State as complementary, though at times contending, vigilantes, each seeking to control and to discipline society at large. This entailed, among other things, the preservation of social unity. Ideally, it was thought that the nation should be bound together by one ruler, one church, one creed. This European configuration of civil and ecclesiastical authority was, in turn, transported to the New World where it attained varying degrees of success. In colonies such as Catholic New France and Puritan New England where the established church was vigorous and nearly all-inclusive, ecclesiastical authority remained intact, at least for a time. In other colonies, however, the churches fared less well. In some cases, the heterogeneity and religious pluralism of the colonial population undermined the feasibility of an established church modeled upon those currently existing in Europe. At the same time, imperial policies of the home government might deemphasize religion in favor of economic, military, and political considerations. Finally, the expansion of viable religious institutions to the colonial hinterlands might require resources unavailable to the mother country. Such was the case in colonial New York in the decades after the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89. The province's fledgling establishment was beset by every conceivable difficulty. Despite the good intentions of its promoters, in New York the Church of England became a divisive political issue rather than an authoritative political adjunct. Ultimately, the English model could not be duplicated.

** Cynthia A. Kierner completed her B.A. in history and political science at McGill University in 1980 and her M.A. in American history at the University of Virginia in 1982. She is presently working towards her Ph.D. at U.Va. where she has been awarded the President's Fellowship and also serves as a graduate instructor in English history.*

In September 1693, the New York Assembly passed a bill to settle and maintain a ministry in four of the province's counties. Although the statute itself appears to be simply an attempt to provide for the souls of New Yorkers, it created disputes which endured for decades. For Governor Benjamin Fletcher, the Ministry Act represented the beginning of an ambitious project to establish the Church of England in New York. The majority of assemblymen, however, viewed the act as an exercise in ambiguity designed to appease the governor's demand for an establishment, while not explicitly endowing the English Church with special privileges. The story of the subsequent implementation of the Ministry Act of 1693 is that of the religious and political conflict which arose from these two divergent positions.

Governor Fletcher and those who shared his objectives were thoroughly acquainted with the traditional English concept of an established church. The ideal which they sought to reproduce in New York was political and social, as well as religious.[1] In England, the position of the Church was based, above all, upon intimate and mutually reenforcing relations between civil and ecclesiastical authorities. The Church of England was created by the Crown in Parliament in an act of state. Parliament continued to exercise final authority over changes in both doctrine and ritual, while the Crown appointed all bishops and deans, as well as many lesser ecclesiastical officials. Clerical convocations could meet only when summoned by royal writ and the creation and promulgation of new canons required the consent of the monarch. The judicial committee of the privy council was the final court of appeals in ecclesiastical cases.

The Church was not, however, entirely subservient to the civil authority. The English government endowed the Church with certain privileges befitting its status as an establishment. After 1689, the monarch was legally required to be a communicant of the Church of England; in his coronation oath, administered by the Archbishop of Canterbury, he vowed to protect the special position of the established church. The Church also had various political privileges. Its bishops sat as "lords spiritual" in the upper house of Parliament and, in theory, the Corporation Act of 1661 and the Test Act of 1673 limited officeholding to communicants of the Church of England. Under Queen Anne, the Occasional Conformity Act made it more difficult for dissenters to hold political office. The civil authority also recognized the right of the Church to possess large amounts of property and to assess taxes for the maintenance of its ministry. In addition, church courts were protected by the State and their decisions were enforced by civil authorities.

With regard to social functions, the roles of Church and State were equally interdependent. The Elizabethan church settlement had been enacted consciously as as Erastian measure to forge social unity through outward

1. My elaboration of this concept is based primarily upon Cyril Garbett, *Church and State in England* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1950), pp. 121-140.

conformity. Although religious uniformity was a thing of the past by the eighteenth century, the Church still served as an important agent of socialization. Anglicanism was the public religion of the nation and the Church, through its sermons and its educational and social welfare facilities, promoted social cohesion and national integration. On the other hand, the State, by recognizing the Church as a privileged institution, enhanced the authority of the Anglican clergy.

In addition to the privileges and duties entailed in establishment status, the Church was responsible for its own maintenance. The clergy had to be educated, recruited, and ordained. They also had to be paid. Pastoral duties had to be fulfilled regularly in all areas of the nation. Church administration had to be effective and bishops had to be accessible. The episcopacy was responsible for performing the rites of confirmation and ordination and for overseeing various administrative functions.

Despite the proliferation of dissent and the clamor for dissenters' rights in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, few Englishmen sought to abolish the ecclesiastical establishment. Many Anglicans and nonconformists sought reform or comprehension, but most perceived the desirability of an established church. Such an institution could enhance social unity. Furthermore, under Pope or King, England had always had a religious establishment. By 1700, the Protestant Church of England was a traditional institution, symbolizing English nationalism and religious self-determination. In addition, after nearly a century of chaos and disunity, many Englishmen saw unity and toleration, the ideals embodied in the Revolutionary Settlement of 1689, as a bulwark against further upheaval. Finally, at a time when Roman Catholicism was still generally feared as subversive, under King James II the Anglican hierarchy had proven itself capable of saving England from the threat of popery.

Conditions in New York, however, were quite unlike those in England. New Yorkers were particularly disinclined to embrace the concept of a national church because of the ethnic and religious pluralism that pervaded their society. The province was inhabited by Dutchmen, New England Puritans, Englishmen, French Huguenots, and a sprinkling of other European groups, most of whom retained their own religious beliefs and practices. In 1687, Governor Thomas Dongan, himself a Roman Catholic, described the religious complexion of the province:

> 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; Anti-Sabbatarians; some Anabaptists some Independents; some Jews; in short of all sorts of opinions there are some, and in the most part of of none at all. . . . The most prevailing opinion is that of the Dutch Calvinists.[2]

2. *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York,* 15 vols., eds. E.B. O'Callaghan and Berthold Fernow (Albany: Weed, Parsons, & Co., 1853–1887), 3:415. (Hereafter cited as *N.Y. Col. Docs.*)

By 1693, New York had thirty-four congregations: fifteen Dutch Reformed, thirteen English Calvinist, four Huguenot, and two Lutheran. Anglican services were held only in the fort of New York City. They were conducted by the fort chaplain, the colony's sole Anglican minister.[3]

In New York, an established church was not a traditional institution. New Yorkers did not believe that chaos was the inevitable result of religious diversity because their society had been pluralistic almost since its inception. Furthermore, because of a lack of a majority commitment, the welfare of Anglicanism in New York depended heavily upon the active support of the governor and hence, tied to both provincial and imperial political conditions. The success of a religious establishment was also contingent upon the willingness and ability of English civil and ecclesiastical authorities to safeguard its privileges and fill its pulpits. Those who wished to erect a viable establishment were therefore forced to surmount historical, social, political, financial, and geographical obstacles.

An established church had existed in New York under Dutch rule. The New Netherland charter of 1640 established the "reformed" religion as the only permissible type of worship. Ministers were to be certified by the Classis of Amsterdam, inducted by the director general (governor), and maintained by tithes collected from all inhabitants. In practice, however, the commercial and financial interests of the Dutch West India Company moderated provisions for religious uniformity. The reformed establishment was stretched to include English Calvinists in order to attract Puritan settlers. Other religious groups were allowed to worship privately. Despite the attempts of Director General Peter Stuyvesant (1647-1664) to enforce religious uniformity, his stern measures were counteracted by the Company's desire to expand both population and profits. At the time of the English takeover in 1664, New Netherland had a working establishment, but religious pluralism was already a fact of life.[4]

In March 1664, five months before Stuyvesant's surrender, the territory comprising New Netherland was included in a massive colonial land grant issued to James, Duke of York, brother of King Charles II. The Duke was granted the power of government over his new domain with the stipulation that he make no laws contrary to the laws of England. James's involvement in New York, like his previous activities in foreign trading companies, was motivated primarily by his desire for financial gain. His pecuniary interests in the stability and prosperity of the colony, coupled with a genuine aversion to religious persecution, made New

3. R. Townsend Henshaw, "The New York Ministry Act of 1693," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 2 (March 1933): 200.

4. John Webb Pratt, *Religion, Politics, and Diversity: The Church-State Theme in New York History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967), pp. 11-23. See also, George L. Smith, *Religion and Trade in New Netherland: Dutch Origins and American Development* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973); Frederick J. Zwierlein, *Religion in New Netherland: 1623-1664* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1971).

York a haven for religious diversity.[5] The Articles of Capitulation of 1664 guaranteed the liberties of the Dutch church. As proprietor, the Duke instructed his governors to uphold liberty of conscience in matters of religion. Most importantly, James's acquisition of New York in 1664 began a thirty-year period during which that province lacked a religious establishment.

Although there was no established church under James's government, the Long Island Puritans operated under a system of multiple establishment by local option. Former New Englanders accustomed to the practices of their earlier home, the Long Islanders clamored for some sort of a legal code to assure them of their rights. The result was a document known as the Duke's Laws which was ratified by the deputies of the Long Island towns at Hempstead in 1665. The Duke's Laws declared that each parish must support a church whose denomination would be chosen by a majority of townsmen, though all inhabitants would be taxed for its maintenance. This provision notwithstanding, religious liberty was guaranteed to dissenters.[6]

The Duke's Laws initially applied only to Long Island, but they were later enforced in Richmond and Westchester counties. In 1674, after the English re-conquest, the Duke's Laws were extended by proclamation to include the entire province. They remained in effect with some modifications until 1691.[7]

New Yorkers could not help but recognize the religious diversity within their society. The Charter of Libertyes and Priviledges, promulgated by New York's first provincial assembly in 1683, indicates that the majority of the colony's political leaders sought to handle the existing situation in a pragmatic and moderate manner. The Charter granted religious freedom to all who "profess faith in God by Jesus Christ. . . they behaving themselves peaceably and quietly, and nott using this liberty to Licentiousnesse, nor to civill injury or outward disturbance of others." The ministers of Long Island were still to be called by a majority of the townsmen and to be maintained by all inhabitants. Elsewhere, churches were to retain their current privileges and means of support and Christian churches subsequently founded would have the same rights.[8] Although James as King later dissolved the assembly and rejected the Charter, he continued to instruct his governors to permit religious liberty. Similarly, while the absorption of New York into the Dominion of New England in 1688 signalled the dimunition of political liberties, religious freedom was not

5. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 3:296-97; Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period in American History*, 4 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), 3:99.

6. *The Colonial Laws of New York: From 1664 to the Revolution*, 5 vols. (Albany: Weed, Parsons, & Co.), 1:24-26.

7. Thomas F. O'Connor, "Religious Toleration in New York: 1664-1700," *New York History* 17 (October 1936): 226-27.

8. *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York*, 4 vols., ed. Hugh Hastings (Albany: J.B. Lyon Company, 1900-1904), 2: 864-65. (Hereafter cited as *N.Y. Eccles. Recs.*)

abridged.[9] Ironically, it was the Glorious Revolution and the revolt against "slavery and popery" which gave rise to religious restrictions and special privileges in New York.

Even before the English deposed their King, tension and discontent were evident in the province; New Yorkers were divided on political, economic, ethnic, religious, and sectional grounds. In New York, colonial unrest culminated in a rebellion which bears the name of Jacob Leisler, a wealthy New York City merchant of German descent who, for a time, became the *de facto* governor of the province. The rebellion and the subsequent execution of its leaders did nothing to eradicate social cleavages. Indeed, New York's "revolution" exacerbated existing issues and introduced new ones. The most tangible result of Leisler's Rebellion and its aftermath was the creation of factional rivalries which lasted nearly two decades after 1689.[10]

Religious divisions after the Glorious Revolution were but one facet of the bitter factionalism wrought by the Revolution in New York. The Leislerian/anti-Leislerian distinction combined with persistent political, economic, ethnic, and georgraphic divisions, making provincial politics a labyrinth of factional contention. In addition, disunity was compounded by personal conflicts, power struggles, and the superimposition of English party alignments.[11]

New Yorkers themselves, nonetheless, believed that one's stance with regard to the recent rebellion was the most telling dividing point. Leislerians and anti-Leislerians competed for seats in the new assembly, as well as for the support and patronage of the governor and the home government. The Leislerian group was composed primarily of those outside of or opposed to the established provincial political and economic elite; Leislerian support was concentrated in New York City and on Long Island. Anti-Leislerians were normally members or supporters of privileged social groups; most were English or French, but the group included those prominent Dutchmen who had been incorporated into the English elite. With regard to English politics, the Leislerians were likely to be drawn to the Whig party and its principles, while their opponents generally identified with the Tory ideals of prerogative and unity.

Political division, in turn, fed the ensuing religious battles. Most members of New York's embryonic Anglican community had staunchly opposed Leisler's Rebellion and many later became leaders of the anti-Leislerian faction. Because the vast majority of New Yorkers were not Anglicans, however, religion was a

9. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 3:546.

10. For the best account of Leisler's Rebellion, see Michael Kammen, *Colonial New York: A History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975), pp. 118-26. Others exceed Kammen in length and detail, but the latter renders a refreshingly capable and objective interpretation of the Glorious Revolution in New York.

11. Lawrence H. Leder, *Robert Livingston 1654-1728 and the Politics of Colonial New York* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961), p. 77.

cross-cutting cleavage in provincial politics. Non-Anglican anti-Leislerians might be hostile to the Church of England, but they could put aside religious considerations to win the favor of an anti-Leislerian governor who sought to establish the Church. This political/religious corelation was gradually compounded by the conduct of New York's governors. Fletcher and Cornbury, both Tories, were the two executives who did the most to promote the Church of England. Both blatantly allied themselves with the anti-Leislerian political faction.[12]

In both politics and religion, the role of the governor was pivotal. Although the assembly steadily increased its powers, in the early eighteenth century the governor remained the fountainhead of privilege and patronage. During this period, his prerogative was actually expanding due to the emasculation of local government and the increasing centralization of authority. The governor's appointive and discretionary powers were vast. The council was composed of his carefully selected supporters and he often was able to influence legislative elections. He controlled most political decisions either through patronage or persuasion. In short, the governor stood at the apex of power. As a result, many ambitious politicians oriented their behavior to suit his preferences in hopes of future benevolence.[13]

With regard to religion, the governor's functions varied according to the status of his charge. For two decades prior to 1685, New York was a proprietary colony, the personal property of James, Duke of York. James, as proprietor, followed his own inclinations and instructed his governors to grant liberty of conscience in matters of religion. No provisions of any sort were made for the Church of England. When James inherited the throne in 1685, New York became a royal colony. Thomas Dongan, the province's current governor, was recommissioned by James as King in 1686. Since 1679, governors of royal colonies had been endowed with ecclesiastical authority making them representative of the monarch as "Supreme Governor" of the Church of England. Dongan's new commission conformed to current practices. The rights of appointing clergymen to benefices, granting marriage licences, and probating wills were reserved for the royal governor. Dongan and his successors in New York, like their counterparts in other royal colonies, were also theoretically responsible for the welfare of the provincial Church. They received the standard royal instructions:

12. Alison Gilbert Olson, "Governor Robert Hunter and the Anglican Church in New York," in *Statesmen, Scholars, and Merchants: Essays in Eighteenth-Centry History presented to Dame Lucy Sutherland,* ed. Anne Whiteman, *et. al.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), pp. 45-46.

13. Kammen, *Colonial New York,* p. 151; Stanley Nider Katz, *Newcastle's New York: Anglo-American Politics, 1732-1753* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1968), pp. 39-40.

> That God be duly served, The Book of Common Prayer as is now established, read each Sunday and Holy Day, and the Blessed Sacrament administered according to the rules of the Church of England. . . And our will and pleasure is that no Minister be preferr'd by you to any Ecclesiastical Benefice in that Our Colony without a Certificate from the Lord Bishop of London, of his being conformable to the Doctrine of the Church of England.[14]

In religion, as in politics, the governor, though bound by his instructions, was able to use his discretion in dealing with provincial affairs. His position was extremely influential. The interests of the governor himself and circumstances within the province usually helped to determine his priorities and policies. Of at least equal importance, however, were the sentiments of his superiors and patrons in England.

New York politics was Anglo-American; political conditions in the mother country heavily influenced those of the province.[15] The governor received his position through connections in England and he was attuned to the opinions of his patrons. English party politics in particular guided colonial appointments and a change in the ministry was usually followed by new colonial (as well as domestic) appointments. In the event that a governor retained his position despite ministerial changes, he might expect less cooperation from the home government.

Just as the governor had numerous pressing demands and was forced to choose his priorities, so, too, did the imperial authorities in England. Not surprisingly, the concerns of the latter were emphasized in their correspondence with the governor. Between 1689 and 1715, England was intermittently at war with France. The conflict took place on both sides of the Atlantic and the effective prosecution of the war was the governor's primary responsibility. In peacetime, economic policy, trade regulation, and the suppression of piracy were the foremost concerns of imperial authorities.

Religious affairs did, however, preoccupy at least one member of the home government. Henry Compton, Bishop of London, had been long interested in strengthening the colonial Church. After attaining the See of London in 1675, Compton became increasingly active in colonial affairs. In 1679 he induced the government to insert a clause protecting the Church in all subsequent instructions to royal governors. In 1685, at Compton's behest, the Bishop of London was granted ecclesiastical supervision in the colonies. Compton also became a member of the Lords of Trade and Plantations. Although he was suspended from his offices in 1686 for fighting James II's opposition to the Test Act, Compton regained favor under William and Mary and was restored to both

14. Quoted in Arthur Lyon Cross, *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1964), p. 26.

15. For a detailed discussion of New York's Anglo-American politics, see Katz, *Newcastle's New York.*

his see and his position on the colonial committee. He quickly resumed his activities on behalf of the colonial Church, requesting passage and maintenance for two Anglican ministers to be employed in New York. In addition, Compton investigated the state of the colonial Church and sent his commissaries to the plantations. He was later instrumental in the formation and management of the the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.[16]

The ideas of Compton and of others who wished to strengthen the Church in the colonies were influential in the years immediately following the Glorious Revolution, at least among New York governors and their patrons. King William's instructions to Governor Henry Sloughter, issued on 31 January 1689, contained provisions for the Church of England identical to those sent by James II to Dongan and Andros. Significant changes in the governor's instructions with regard to religion were the denial of religious liberty to Roman Catholics and the administration of the Test Act to all office-holders, thereby excluding Catholics from participation in governmental affairs.[17] Although Sloughter's instructions did not include the erection of an ecclesiastical establishment, the provincial assembly was suspicious. Their fears were realized shortly after the assembly convened in April 1691, when Sloughter called the attention of the legislators to the need to provide for the settlement of a ministry. Despite the strongly anti-Leislerian character of the new assembly, Sloughter's suggestion garnered little support. The non-Anglican majority adopted obstructionist tactics, finally passing "A Bill for Settling the Ministry, and allotting a maintenance for them in every Respective City and Town that consists of Forty Families and upwards." Such a wide ranging bill was clearly impracticable; Sloughter rejected it. On 8 May 1691, the assembly passed "An Act declaring what are the Rights and Privileges of their Majesties Subjects inhabiting their Province of New York." Although the Declaratory Act eventually was disallowed by English authorities, it constituted an important enunciation of the assembly sentiments *vis-a-vis* religion. A clause exempting Catholics from religious liberty was added only at the governor's insistence and no provision was made for the maintenance of a ministry.[18]

Sloughter died two months later and his successor, Benjamin Fletcher,

16. Cross, *Anglican Episcopate*, pp. 29-30; Great Britain, *Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies*, 42 vols., ed. W. Noel Sainsbury, *et. al.* (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1860-1953–, 1689-92: 181. (hereafter cited as *Cal. S.P., Col.*) For Compton's protective clause, see above. A commissary was the Bishop's colonial representative.

17. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 3: 688-90. The Test Act of 1673 was not introduced in New York until 1691. The prescribed oath denied Transubstantiation and stated that the adoration of the Blessed Virgin and of the saints and the sacrifice of the Mass are superstitious and idolatrous.

18. New York, *Journal of the Votes and Proceedings of the General Assembly*, 2 vols. (New York, 1764), 1: 1-2, 10-12. (Hereafter cited as *Ass. J.*) *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 4: 263-64; *N.Y. Eccles. Recs.*, 2: 1015-16; Pratt, *Religion, Politics, and Diversity*, p. 38.

arrived in New York on 29 August 1692. The latter was a zealous Anglican intent upon making the Church of England the established church of the province. Fletcher's instructions with regard to religion were identical to those of his predecessor. The new governor, however, would have more time to implement his religious program. Fletcher threw all the power and influence of his office behind the establishment scheme. Soon after his arrival he began to build a political following, filling his council with conservative Tories and ensuring that the assembly chose a speaker to his liking. Within two months, Fletcher initiated proceedings to establish the Church of England, recommending to the council that the assembly pass a bill to provide and maintain a provincial ministry. The council, in turn, instructed the assembly to take the steps necessary to produce such a bill, but the non-Anglican majority procrastinated and continued their discussion of wars and levies. On 22 March 1693, when the assembly returned after a recess, Fletcher personally addressed them on behalf of his religious program. The legislature again failed to act and eventually was dissolved.[19]

When a new assembly convened in September 1693, the "Settling of the Ministry" was Fletcher's foremost concern.[20] Meanwhile, the governor had gained the friendship of elements within the large Dutch community by granting a charter to the Dutch Reformed congregation in New York City. On 12 September 1693, Fletcher upbraided the representatives for the laxity of their predecessors. The passivity of the assembly undoubtedly was deliberate. The vast majority of its members were not Anglicans and the governor had plainly stated his intentions, claiming that, "There are none of you but are bigg with the priviledge of Englishmen, and Magna Charta, which is your right. And the same Law doth provide for the religion of the Church of England."[21] For Fletcher, the Church followed the flag.

The assembly reluctantly complied with Fletcher's demands by appointing a committee to review the matter. For several days, the committee deliberated, reported, and its reports were returned to the committee.[22] A bill was finally introduced on 19 September; two days later the bill passed its third reading and was sent to the governor for approval. Fletcher vetoed the bill and returned it to the house, demanding that it be amended to include his power to appoint and approve ministers. This the assembly refused to do. Fletcher, in turn, summoned the legislators to the council chamber, where he subjected them to an angry lecture. He curtly informed them that by his royal commission he already

19. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 3: 821-22; *Ass. J.*, 1: 28-31; Leder, *Robert Livingston*, pp. 121-122; Morgan Dix, *A History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York*, 4 vols., (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1898-1906), 1: 78-79. Also, New York, *Journal of the Legislative Council of the Colony of New York*, 2 vols. (Albany: J.B. Lyons, 1861), 1:25. (Hereafter cited as *Coun. J.*)

20. *Ass. J.*, 1:32.

21. Henshaw, "New York Ministry Act," pp. 202-3; Dix, *Trinity Church*, 1:80-81; *Coun. J.*, 1:39.

22. *Ass. J.*, 1: 31-32.

possessed the powers in question and that regardless of the text of the bill gubernatorial prerogative would be used to "take care that neither heresy, sedition, schism, nor rebellion be preached" in the province.[23] The assembly was prorogued on 22 September and dissolved soon thereafter. Fletcher allowed the Ministry Bill to become law.

The "Act for Settling a Ministry and Raising a Maintenance for them in the City of New York, County of Richmond, Westchester and Queens County" was a compromise measure. Taken literally, it was an innocuous law. It affected only four of the province's southern counties in which the bulk of the English population resided. New York City and Westchester County already had a small Anglican population, while Richmond County had few religious institutions of any sort. In Queens, the vast majority of inhabitants were English dissenters, though less well organized than their coreligionists on the eastern half of Long Island. The act stipulated that a "good sufficient Protestant Minister" be employed by each parish in the four affected counties. These ministers were to be maintained by a local tax on real estate "in Country Produce at Money Price." Each January, local justices were to issue warrants for the election of ten vestrymen and two churchwardens. All freeholders would participate in the elections; if they refused to vote, the justices were required to levy the tax without the consent of the people. Once elected, the vestry would levy the tax and present the tax roll to the constable. He would collect the money and then remit it to the churchwardens who would pay the minister in quarterly installments. Ministers who were covered by the act were to be called by the vestry. Those ministers beyond the Ministry Act parishes retained their existing liberties.[24]

Although the text of the Ministry Act seemed to be relatively clear as a compromise measure arising from conflicting intentions, the act invited controversy. The assembly had satisfied the governor's demands, while explicitly conceding little. Although a literal interpretation of the act would do nothing to establish the Church of England, Fletcher was not averse to using his powers of clerical appointment to achieve his ends. Fletcher did realize that the Ministry Act was, at best, an ambiguous compromise, but he proudly reported to the Lords of Trade that he had procured the most that the assembly would ever concede.[25]

The Ministry Act faced its first test in New York City where only one in forty inhabitants was a member of the Church of England.[26] The first city

23. *N.Y. Eccles, Recs.*, 3: 1075-76; *Coun, J.*, 1:48.

24. *N.Y. Eccles. Recs.*, 3:1076-79. New York City and Richmond County (Staten Island) each constituted one parish. Westchester County had two (Westchester and Rye), as did Queens County (Jamaica and Hempstead).

25. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 4:57.

26. Carl Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Sceptre: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 117.

vestry, elected on 9 January 1694, contained only three Anglicans. The vestry dutifully voted to levy a tax for the maintenance of a "good sufficient Protestant Minister," but this vestry never called a clergyman.

In January 1695, a second vestry was elected, this one including only one Anglican. Growing impatient, Fletcher threatened to prosecute the vestrymen if they continued to defy his orders. This vestry complied, without any dissenting votes, to call Mr. William Vesey to minister to the city's congregation. Fletcher, however, declined to act upon the vestry's decision. Perhaps the resolution had been introduced by Jeremiah Tothill, the lone Anglican vestryman, and Tothill's might have been the only vote. On 12 April 1695, the city vestry petitioned the provincial assembly for a clarification of the provisions of the Ministry Act. The assembly, not surprisingly, decided that a dissenting minister could be called and maintained under the terms of the act. The next day, Fletcher gathered the assemblymen to present his angry retort: "the laws are to be interpretted by the Judges." The second vestry ultimately accomplished nothing.[27]

The third New York City vestry, elected in 1696, included six Anglicans. This group summoned William Vesey to be their minister. Fletcher approved the choice and Vesey, a lay Anglican preacher, was sent to England to be ordained by the Bishop of London. He returned to New York in December 1697 and the governor inducted him into his living on Christmas day.[28]

William Vesey held his post in New York for nearly half a century. He became the province's most vigorous and influential supporter of the Anglican cause. Vesey, though educated at Harvard under the watchful eyes of Increase Mather, had been among the Anglican minority in Massachusetts. His father was a Jacobite who had been prosecuted for not paying taxes to support the congregational establishment. The younger Vesey also had been accused of Jacobitism, probably because of his connections with King's Chapel in Boston.[29] Vesey's experiences in Massachusetts and his desire to promote Anglicanism prejudiced him against both English dissenters and New York's Leislerian faction. He never forgot that he owed his appointment to anti-Leislerians, nor did he forget the favorable treatment that he and his church received at the hands of anti-Leislerian governors like Benjamin Fletcher.

New York's new Anglican parish obviously needed a church building. The congregation, numbering some one hundred families, previously had been served only by irregularly timed services conducted in the city's fort.[30] After Vesey's induction, Anglican services were held every Sunday in the Dutch Reformed church. Meanwhile, Fletcher allowed the congregation to purchase land and to

27. *N.Y. Eccles. Recs.* 2:1112-15; *Coun. J.*, 1:76.

28. *Ibid.*, 2:1133-34, 1174; Dix, *Trinity Church*, 1:96-97.

29. Dix, *Trinity Church*, 1:100-6.

30. Kammen, *Colonial New York*, p. 150; E. Clowes Chorley, "The Beginnings of the Church in the Province of New York," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 13 (March 1944):15.

collect funds for the erection of a church. In May 1697, he assented to the incorporation of Trinity Church. The act of incorporation included a provision that future New York City vestries be elected by all *communicants* rather than by all *freeholders,* thus ensuring the future orthodoxy of the parish. In August, Fletcher granted Trinity Church the lease to King's Farm for seven years, thereby endowing the Church with both land and revenue. In December, the Governor gave Trinity Church funds which had been collected in 1693 to rescue several New Yorkers who had been taken captive by the Barbary pirates. All but one of the prisoners had escaped or died, so Fletcher decided that the money be used to complete the Anglican church building. The construction of the church progressed rapidly and by March 1698, it was ready for use.[31]

Although Fletcher created a privileged Anglican parish in New York City, he never filled any of the other pulpits provided for in the Ministry Act. In the three remaining counties, either vestries were not elected or those chosen were overwhelmingly dominated by non-Anglicans opposed to the idea of an Anglican establishment. More importantly, the Governor's demands to call clergymen of the Church of England were nearly impossible to fulfill.[32] Perhaps Fletcher failed to realize that there was no available supply of such men in New York and that few, if any, were forthcoming from England. His religious program could not be fully implemented without outside missionary help. In 1698, this was not an immediate prospect.

Furthermore, it was unlikely that Fletcher's policies would be continued by his successor. Richard Coote, Earl of Bellomont, arrived in New York in 1698. The religious provisions of his commission and instructions were identical to those previously issued to Fletcher. Bellomont, however, was a Whig. His connections with the radical "commonwealthmen" in England had led him to lend vocal support to the Leislerians in 1689. Subsequently, Bellomont was active in Parliament's reversal of the attainders against Leisler and his lieutenant, Jacob Milbourne. With regard to religion, Bellomont, unlike Fletcher, was neither zealous nor chauvinistic. He was a tolerant Churchman who claimed that it it was wrong "to quarrel about the modes of worship and the externals of it when the essentials of religion were the same."[33]

31. *N.Y. Eccles. Recs.*, 2:1136; Dix, *Trinity Church,* 1: 96; *The Documentary History of the State of New York,* 4 vols., ed. E.B. O'Callaghan (Albany: Weed, Parsons, & Co., 1849-1851), 3:417-19. (Hereafter cited as *N.Y. Doc. Hist.*) King's Farm in lower Manhattan was formerly the property of Governor Francis Lovelace (1667-1674), but later became the perquisite of the office of royal governor. When a woman occupied the English throne, this tract of land was, appropriately enough, known as Queen's Farm.

32. At this time, James Blair was successfully performing this task in Virginia. Blair, however, had powerful connections in both England and Virginia. He was also a commissary of the Bishop of London and in his own right an influential colonial political figure. Blair's job was made a bit easier by the high incidence of Anglicanism among Virginians.

33. *Cal. S.P., Col.*, 1700:415-16; Leder, *Robert Livingston,* p. 103.

Upon his arrival in New York, Bellomont found the province riven with factional controversy. The new governor attributed New York's deplorable condition to Fletcher's maladministration, corruption, and tactlessness. Not the least offensive to Bellomont was his predecessor's deliberate and unjust elevation of the English Church at the expense of all others. The new governor complained to the Board of Trade that:

> the late Governor made advantage to divide the people by supposing a Dutch and English interest to be different here, and therefore under the notion of a Church of England, to be put in opposition to the Dutch and French Churches established here, he supported a few rascally English who are a scandall to their nation and to the Protestant Religion, and who joyned him in the worst methods of gaine and severely used the Dutch, except some few Merchants, whose trade he favored. . .[34]

Despite his Whig principles and Leislerian sympathies, as governor, Bellomont attempted to avoid factional alliances. This strategy failed miserably. Fletcher had neglected to prosecute pirates and smugglers, made extravagant land grants to personal friends and political allies, and exacerbated bitter social divisions by his anti-Leislerian partisanship and the implementation of the Ministry Act. By attacking and seeking to remedy the abuses of Fletcher's government, Bellomont alienated the latter's Tory and anti-Leislerian supporters. He was forced increasingly to use the Leislerian faction as his political power base.

The whiggish Bellomont did not believe that the assembly had passed the Ministry Act with the intent to establish the Church of England in the four affected counties. Sensing Bellomont's feelings on the matter, in 1699, the predominantly Leislerian and non-Anglican assembly passed a bill to revive the local option method of parochial maintenance. Although the bill was probably agreeable to Bellomont, he was not authorized to undermine the position of the Church of England. The council supported the bill, but advised the governor to reject it on the grounds that it was contrary to his instructions.[35] Therefore, the council rejected the bill, but two days later another was passed and enacted. "An Act to enable the respective towns within this Province to build and repair their meeting houses and other public buildings" allowed towns to raise funds from general taxes to erect and maintain any Protestant facility. This act helped dissenters, but altered neither the financial nor theoretical status of the Anglican Church.[36] Nonetheless, it won Bellomont little admiration from William Vesey.

Relations between governor and pastor had been strained from the beginning. Vesey, after all, was one of Fletcher's staunchest supporters.

34. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 4:325-26.
35. *N.Y. Eccles. Recs.*, 2:1299-1300; *Coun. J.*, 1:138.
36. *Colonial Laws of New York*, 1:427-28; *N.Y. Eccles. Rec.*, 2:1302.

Bellomont also revoked Trinity's lease to King's Farm and deprived Vesey's friend, Domine Dellius, of his Albany benefice for allegedly lewd and corrupt conduct. Vesey retaliated by neglecting to pray for Bellomont as governor (while openly praying for Dellius) and by denouncing the governor in his sermons. Bellomont, in turn, prevailed upon the council to suspend Vesey's salary. Virtually driven from Trinity by the pastor's hostility, Bellomont began to worship at the Dutch church. Meanwhile, both Bellomont and Vesey were corresponding with the Bishop of London and the Board of Trade, each demanding the other's dismissal. Finally, in December 1700, Bishop Compton told Vesey to submit to the governor and asked Bellomont to accept the pastor's submission.[37] Bellomont died shortly thereafter on 5 March 1701 and the agreement was never tested.

Bellomont's attempt to govern moderately and to correct Fletcher's negligence and excesses had polarized provincial politics. While the governor was alive, he had been able to restrain his vengeful Leislerian supporters, but upon his death pandemonium broke loose in New York. William Smith, the eldest member of the council, assumed the titular role of acting governor, but his moderate views were overshadowed by those of his less even-handed colleagues. Leislerian leaders Abraham DePeyster, Samuel Staats, and Thomas Weaver were the only councillors in New York City at the time of Bellomont's death. They essentially controlled the government until Lieutenant Governor John Nanfan returned to New York from Barbados where he was attending to personal business. Nanfan was the nephew of the late Governor Bellomont; he shared the Leislerian views of his kinsman, but lacked any semblance of moderation in dealing with his opponents. Nanfan presided over the most bitter factional conflict that the province had seen since Leisler's Rebellion. During his regime, Leislerian judges and Bellomont's partisans accused and convicted prominent anti-Leislerians of treason. William Vesey was slandered by Leislerian and anti-establishment pamphleteers. The Nanfan disaster lasted until 2 May 1702 when Edward Hyde, Viscount Cornbury, arrived in New York to assume the governorship. Cornbury quickly and emphatically allied with the anti-Leislerian group.

In politics and in religion, Lord Cornbury, Queen Anne's cousin, was a high Tory. He had little respect for colonial rights, believing that their assemblies existed only by the grace of the Crown and that they could not impinge upon the governor's prerogative. Cornbury felt that the colonies were "but twigs belonging to the main tree" and that they "ought to be kept entirely dependent on and subservient to England."[38] This interpretation applied equally to his notion of the religious aspects of colonialism. Although his commission and

37. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 4:526-27, 581-82, 766-67; *Cal. S.P., Col.*, 1699: 362, 384; Olson, "Hunter and the Anglican Church," p. 49.

38. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 4:1121-22; 1151.

instructions included the customary religious provisions, Cornbury believed that the Ministry Act of 1693 had fully established the Church of England, to the exclusion of all others, in the four counties. As a result, he sought to control the religious affairs of all the congregations in the affected areas. A slightly biased Whig historian claims that Cornbury's "talents were, perhaps, not superior to the most inconsiderable of his predecessors; but in his zeal for the Church he was surpassed by none." [39] These liabilities were compounded by utterly reprehensible personal qualities. Unfortunately, Cornbury was chosen to govern a traditionally volatile province during a particularly rancorous period of factional and religious conflict.

Cornbury never feigned moderation in his handling of political and religious questions; the subjugation of the Leislerians and the supremacy of the Church of England were among his foremost priorities. The creation of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts in 1701 enabled Cornbury to pursue realistically his religious policies in New York. One of the goals of the SPG was to provide and maintain an orthodox colonial ministry. The Society was extremely influential. Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, was its president and Bishop Compton of London and other prelates and political figures were active members.[40]

New York quickly became the focal point of SPG activities. New England was obviously not the most promising area for Anglican missionary ventures and the Church was already comparatively strong in the southern colonies. In the middle colonies, the Quakers were politically influential in both Pennsylvania and New Jersey. In New York, however, the Ministry Act, coupled with the zeal of Cornbury, Vesey, and a core of prominent Anglicans, provided the potential for success.[41] The first two permanently assigned SPG missionaries were therefore sent to New York and by 1705, six of the Society's fourteen clergymen were stationed in that province. The SPG was instrumental in filling the pulpits of the parishes created by the Ministry Act. These parishes were overwhelmingly dependent upon the Society for their ministers. Between 1701 and 1776, thirty-three of fifty-eight SPG missionaries sent to New York served

39. William Smith, Jr., *The History of the Province of New York,* 2 vols., ed. Michael Kammen (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1972; first published, 1757), 1:117.

38. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 4:1121-22; 1151.

39. William Smith, Jr., *The History of the Province of New York,* 2 vols., ed. Michael Kammen (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1972; first published, 1757), 1:117.

40. E.B. Greene, "The Anglican Outlook on the American Colonies in the Early Eighteenth Century," *American Historical Review* 20 (October 1914): 66-67.

41. John Kendall Nelson, "Anglican Missionaires in America, 1701-1725: A Study of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts," (Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1962), p. 260.

in the Ministry Act congregations.[42]

Patrick Gordon, the first missionary dispatched by the SPG, was assigned to the parish of Jamaica in Queens County. Jamaica parish included the towns of Jamaica, New Town, and Flushing. Gordon, however, died before he preached his first sermon. In 1704, the Society sent William Urquhart to Jamaica to replace him. That same year, John Thomas was assigned to Hempstead, the other Queens County parish. Ministers were also sent to the two Westchester County parishes. Westchester parish, which included the Manor of Pelham and the towns of Westchester, Eastchester, and Yonkers, was served by John Bartow from 1702 to 1725. The parish of Rye, which encompassed Rye, Bedford, and Mamaroneck, employed a succession of ministers, most of whom were SPG appointees. In 1704, the Society sent Aeneas Mackenzie to Staten Island. Mackenzie retained the Richmond County pulpit until his death in 1722.

The SPG's activities in New York extended beyond merely filling clerical vacancies in the Ministry Act parishes. Missionaries were sent to preach to the Indians in hopes of securing their allegiance against the French in Canada. Elias Neau was employed to catechize the Negro inhabitants of New York City. The SPG also supplied Dutch Common Prayer books to the Dutch Reformed church at Harlem, which seemed temporarily inclined towards conversion. More importantly, when Daniel Bondet, pastor of the Huguenot congregation at New Rochelle, converted to Anglicanism, the SPG placed him on its payroll and furnished him with French prayer books.

Though dependent upon the SPG for ministers, Cornbury was actively promoting the Church by using his gubernational powers to its advantage. Immediately after his arrival, the new governor replaced Bellomont's Leislerian councillors with some attuned to his Tory ideals. An anti-Leislerian majority was also secured in the new assembly. Cornbury promptly informed the assemblymen of his religious position. In his first speech to the legislature, the governor expressed his gratitude for the rights enjoyed by Englishmen and for the "free Enjoyment of the best Religion in the world."[43] The assembly's dissenting majority may have disagreed with Cornbury, but their principles could be temporarily overshadowed by anticipation of political favor.

The governor encouraged Anglican education and sought to ameliorate the material condition of Trinity Church and its pastor. In 1702, Cornbury renewed Trinity's lease to the Queen's Farm. Although the assembly would approve the lease only for the duration of the governor's term, in 1705, at Cornbury's behest, Queen Anne granted the leases to both Queen's Farm and Queen's Garden (another tract of land adjacent to Trinity Church) to the communicants of Trinity and "their successors forever." The governor also persuaded his anti-Leislerian supporters in the assembly to pass a bill increasing Vesey's salary

42. Ibid., p. 249; Pratt, *Religion, Politics, and Diversity,* p. 52.
43. *Ass. J.,* 1:145.

and he prevailed upon the council to set aside funds from the annual provincial revenue for the payment of the rent on Vesey's parsonage. Most importantly, an act was passed 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." This act reincorporated Trinity Church so as to rectify any alleged flaws in its original charter. Most significantly, the right of advowson was explicitly granted to the parish vestry which had been elected by all communicants since 1698, whereas the Ministry Act had stipulated that ministers were to be called by a city vestry elected by all freeholders. Vesey believed that this modification would "establish the Church upon a sure and lasting foundation."[44]

Cornbury also attempted to strengthen the position of the Church in the other parishes designated in the Ministry Act. First, he ascertained that the ministers sent by the SPG were securely installed in their livings. In so doing, the governor often encountered fierce local opposition which was by no means diminished by his frequently objectionable methods of pursuing his ends. The five parishes beyond New York City were overwhelmingly dominated by dissenters whose religious institutions had remained unaffected for nearly a decade after the passage of the Ministry Act. The parish of Westchester refused to give its Anglican minister land to live on until Cornbury procured an order to do so from the privy council. In Rye, the governor had to imprison a dissenting justice of the peace and the pastor at Bedford before the people would submit. On Staten Island, Cornbury replaced several local magistrates to assure Mackenzie's success, and although Hempstead's minister retained his position with the governor's help, he received few converts.[45] In Jamaica, local opposition to the Anglican ministry was the most spectacular and protracted, lasting until mid-century.

The vast majority of the inhabitants of Jamaica parish were descendants of New England emigrants who had already built a church and organized their own congregation. Presbyterians dominated the towns of Jamaica and New Town, while Flushing, also included in the parish, was populated mainly by Quakers. When Cornbury initially sought to install an SPG minister in Jamaica in 1702, the local vestry responded by calling Reverend Hubbard, a dissenting clergyman. Fortunately for the Presbyterian majority, Patrick Gordon, the Anglican minister, died immediately after his arrival in New York. For two years no replacement was sent and Hubbard took up residence in the parsonage and preached regularly. After Gordon's death, however, Cornbury encouraged Vesey

44. Dix, *Trinity Church,* 1:141-46; *N.Y. Eccles. Recs.*, 3: 1566, 1590, 1597-98; *N.Y. Doc. Hist.*, 3:111-12; E. Clowes Chorley, "The Beginnings of the Church in the Province of New York," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 13 (March 1944): 18. "Advowson" is the right to fill a vacant benefice with the candidate of one's own choosing.

45. *N.Y. Eccles. Recs.*, 3:1587-88; Pratt, *Religion, Politics, and Diversity,* p. 53.

and his orthodox colleagues to conduct services in Jamaica. They were not warmly received. In July 1703, when John Bartow, the SPG minister at Westchester, preached in the parish church, a "riot" occurred. Cornbury threatened to jail Hubbard and the rioters and forbade Hubbard to preach again on the grounds that the church had been built by public taxes and was therefore to be used only by the Anglican clergy.[46]

Meanwhile, the SPG had assigned John Honeyman to Jamaica. Honeyman was installed by Cornbury in April 1704, but local opposition and rumors of his bad character and sexual misconduct made his life there extremely difficult. The governor, certain of Honeyman's innocence, arranged his transfer to Newport, Rhode Island.[47] In June, William Urquhart arrived to fill the vacancy at Jamaica.

Urquhart had Cornbury's full cooperation; anything he gained at Jamaica came as a direct result of the governor's intervention. In July, Cornbury ordered Hubbard to leave the parsonage; if he failed to do so, Cornbury threatened to have him forcibly ousted by the Queens County sheriff. In August, the governor inducted Urquhart into his living and demanded that a tax be raised for his maintenance. The vestry feigned compliance for fear of the governor's vengeance, but the tax was never collected. The following year, the vestrymen were summoned to explain their recalcitrance to the governor and council, while Urquhart complained that the dissenting minister still received financial support.[48]

By browbeating and threatening the Jamaica vestry, Cornbury secured at least the partial remittance of Urquhart's salary. The Jamaica controversy and the governor's tactics, however, endeared few dissenters to the Church of England. Affairs in Jamaica were followed by New Yorkers and by some beyond the borders of the province. Cotton Mather of Massachusetts pointed out that while Jamaica had a worthy minister, many towns were in genuine need of a spiritual leader. Mather also argued that support for the Church of England was negligible in Jamaica and that Cornbury unjustly deprived the majority of their church and parsonage. Mather warned that "if such things proceed that noble Society for the Propagation of Religion in America will greatly wound religion and their own reputation also which ought to be forever venerable."[49]

Once the new ministers were installed, however tenuously, in their livings, Cornbury sought to assure them of their maintenance. At his insistence, the assembly passed an act clarifying the provisions of the Ministry Act of 1693. The new law, enacted in July 1705, stipulated that ministerial salaries had to be paid within a stated period of time and recognized the right of the governor to

46. *N.Y. Doc. Hist.*, 3: 115, 211-12; Nelson, "Anglican Misisons," p. 271.
47. *N.Y. Doc. Hist.*, 3:203-4; Nelson, "Anglican Missions," p. 273.
48. *N.Y. Eccles, Recs.*, 3: 1883.
49. Ibid.

bestow benefices. Cornbury's threats to extend the Ministry Act to include Suffolk County on Long Island probably induced the assembly to acquiesce to the governor's main demand in the hope of avoiding more objectionable measures.[50]

Cornbury took his power to bestow benefices very seriously and sought to use this prerogative to solidify the position of the Church. Unlike any other New York governor, Cornbury believed that his gubernatorial powers necessitated that *all* ministers in the province be licensed by the governor. Even Cornbury's supporters on the council protested that the right of collation should apply only to Anglican ministers, but the governor discarded their advice and proceeded to flaunt his authority.[51] In so doing, he seriously impaired the previously harmonious relations with the Dutch Reformed Church and its numerous following.

Cornbury had written to the SPG urging that Anglican ministers be placed in Dutch churches and schools when vacancies occurred. The Society wisely did not adopt the governor's scheme, but Cornbury attempted to implement this policy without the help of the SPG. In 1702, he refused to approve the Dutch minister called to Schenectady, though procuring the approval of the governor had always been a mere formality for the Dutch clergy. In 1705, Cornbury licensed an Anglican minister to preach at the Dutch church at Esopus (Kingston). Esopus was located in Ulster County, beyond the scope of the Ministry Act; there were fewer than six English families in the town. Cornbury, nevertheless, forcibly installed the English minister at Esopus and even secured him an increase in pay. The Esopus congregation proceeded to call Domine Henricus Beys, who was subsequently sent by the Classis of Amsterdam to fill the Esopus post. When the Anglican minister, supported by Cornbury, refused to vacate his benefice, New York's Dutch clergy petitioned the Classis for redress through English authorities. In New York, Beys continued to defend the right of the Dutch church to choose its own ministers. Cornbury finally agreed to allow Beys to preach without his license, but the affair was not fully resolved until Cornbury left office in 1708.[52] His successors did not attempt to control the pulpits of the Dutch congregations.

Cornbury also tried to check the growth of English dissent. In 1707, he ordered the arrest of two unlicensed Presbyterian ministers. John Hampton of Maryland was eventually released without trial, but his colleague, Francis Makemie of Virginia, was tried at Cornbury's insistence. Makemie, who had preached both in New York City and on Long Island, appealed to the Toleration Act of 1689 for protection. He also claimed that his certification in Virginia entitled him to the right to preach throughout the Queen's dominions. Cornbury

50. *N.Y. Eccles. Recs.*, 3:1589-90; *Ass. J.*, 1:200-2.

51. *N.Y. Eccles. Recs.*, 3:1617.

52. Nelson, "Anglican Missions," pp. 348-49; Pratt, *Religion, Politics, and Diversity*, p. 56; *N.Y. Eccles. Recs.*, 3:1617, 1657-62.

argued that the laws of Virginia were invalid in New York and that the Toleration Act was applicable neither to the colonies nor to "strowling Preachers."[53] A grand jury, hand-picked by the governor, dutifully indicted Makemie for disobeying the nonconformist preaching regulations included in the Toleration Act. Makemie's trial aroused a great deal of interest in the province. The minister's lawyers argued that preaching was an offense unknown to common law, the only law pertinent to the case, since the acts of Toleration and Uniformity and the governor's instructions had never been explicitly recognized by the provincial legislature.[54] Despite Cornbury's demand for a guilty verdict, the jury accepted this defense and acquitted Makemie. The victory of common law over gubernatorial instructions and demands illustrated the limitations of the fledgling Anglican establishment.

Cornbury's behavior infuriated Dutch and Presbyterian leaders who helped the governor's detractors to gain control of the assembly in 1708. Cornbury's mismanagement, corruption, and tactlessness catalysed new factional alliances and increased political and social tensions within the province. Shadows of the old Leislerian/anti-Leislerian cleavage, of course, remained, but they were increasingly diluted by new divisions analogous to the English Whig versus Tory dichotomy.[55] By 1708, many in the province were dissatisfied with Cornbury for a variety of reasons. Influential New Yorkers appealed to the new Whig ministry in England and the governor was removed from office. By the time Cornbury stepped down in 1708, the Church of England was heavily involved in provincial factionalism. The governor's excesses also had divided New York's Anglican community. Zealots like Cornbury and Vesey believed that the Church's interests were to be advanced by any available means. A more moderate group, led by Caleb Heathcote of Scarsdale Manor and the promiment Morris family, disliked Cornbury's methods and felt that the authority of the Church should rest less upon the power and opinions of the governor.[56]

It was the latter, more moderate, stance that gained ascendancy during the ensuing years. Cornbury was succeeded in office by John, Lord Lovelace, Baron of Hurley, who died within a few months of his arrival in New York. In the year following Lovelace's death, Lieutenant Governor Richard Ingoldsby acted as the chief executive of the province. Both Lovelace and Ingoldsby essentially maintained the *status quo,* neither dismantling Cornbury's work nor attempting to further enhance the position of the Church. The continuing troubles at Jamaica were handled with moderation. After the brief administrations of Lovelace and Ingoldsby, a new governor, Robert Hunter, cast his lot squarely with Heathcote and the Morrises.

53. *N.Y. Doc. Hist.*, 3:1186-87; Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Sceptre,* p. 123.

54. Pratt, *Religion, Politics, and Diversity,* p. 57.

55. Leder, *Robert Livingston,* p. 200.

56. Pratt, *Religion, Politics, and Diversity,* pp. 57-63; Nelson, "Anglican Missions," pp. 276-82.

Hunter was a choice eminently suited to arrest New York's political and religious conflicts; he far surpassed his predecessors in tact and political ability. Hunter arrived in New York in 1710, bearing the usual commission and instructions issued to royal governors. The new governor, however, contrasted sharply with Cornbury. Politically, he was a Whig and his appointment had been procured through Whig patrons in the home government. In New York, most Anglicans identified with the Tory interest. It was common knowledge that Fletcher and Cornbury, the two governors who had done the most for the Church of England, had owed their jobs to Tory patrons.[57] In religion, Hunter was a devout Anglican and, like Cornbury, a member of the SPG. Unlike Cornbury, Hunter was a moderate churchman of latitudinarian proclivities. Before coming to New York, he had requested that the SPG instruct its missionaries there to be moderate and conciliatory; the new governor believed that fanatical missionaries were largely responsible for New York's current social and political animosities.[58] Hunter apparently believed that the Ministry Act of 1693 had established the Church of England in a rudimentary way, but he did not share Cornbury's willingness to manipulate existing circumstances by excessive use of his executive powers. Furthermore, Hunter would not ignore more pressing issues to devote all of his energy to the enhancement of the Church. He had inherited from Cornbury a province in delporable military, financial, and political condition. Confronted with an imperial war, a distrustful assembly refusing to grant funds, and demands from the home government unaccompanied by sympathy and cooperation, Hunter immediately was faced with an awesome political challenge. As a result, he sought to eliminate factional strife, not to aggravate it. Although Hunter quickly established friendly relations with moderate churchmen like Morris and Heathcote, more zealous Anglicans like William Vesey were suspicious of the governor's politics and anxious to test his sympathies.

At first, harmonious accommodation did not seem likely. Upon his arrival in New York, Hunter granted Queen's Farm to Trinity Church for the duration of his tenure as governor. A perpetual lease had been issued under Cornbury, but its validity was questioned on a technicality. When Vesey requested that Hunter reinstate Trinity's perpetual lease to Queen's Farm, the governor refused, claiming that it was beyond his power to do so.[59]

In religious affairs, the first major challenge faced by Hunter was the seemingly interminable problem of Jamaica. The religious situation there was in a state of disarray when Hunter arrived and was still not resolved by 1719 when he left the governorship.

57. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 5: 95, 124-38; James Edward Scanlon, "A Life of Robert Hunter, 1666-1734:: (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1969), p. 20; Olson, "Hunter and the Anglican Church," p. 48.

58. Nelson, "Anglican Missions," p. 290; Greene, "Anglican Outlook," p. 75.

59. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 5:320.

After William Urquhart died in 1709, Lieutenant Governor Ingoldsby had asked nearby Anglican clergymen alternately to serve the parish. The ministers graciously agreed, much to the consternation of the parishioners who had seized the opportunity presented by the pastor's death to call a dissenting minister. Reverend MacKnish, the congregation's choice, was conveniently the husband of Widow Urquhart's daughter by a previous marriage. These three lived in the Jamaica parsonage after Urquhart's death. In April 1710, however, Thomas Poyer, an SPG missionary arrived in Jamaica, having been commissioned by the Society to undertake pastoral duties there. When Poyer attempted to preach to the Jamaica congregation on 11 April 1710, the parishioners revolted and forcibly repossessed the church.[60]

Shortly after Hunter's arrival, he inducted Poyer into the living at Jamaica, despite the petitions of the dissenters. Although Poyer was able to take over the church, Macknish refused to relinquish the parsonage and the churchwardens continued to pay the dissenting minister. Poyer appealed to the new governor, but Hunter, unlike Cornbury, was unwilling to use his executive powers to force the inhabitants to maintain a minister clearly not of their own choosing. He also was currently enmeshed in tumultuous debate with the assembly over the question of revenue. Hunter was, nonetheless, sympathetic to Poyer's demands. He urged the minister to take his case to court. The governor claimed that he had been advised that it would be a "high crime and misdemeanure. . . to putt him in possession by any other method than a due course of law."[61] He offered to pay Poyer's legal expenses for as many appeals as were required to settle his case.

By February 1711, when Hunter recommended that Poyer pursue judicial redress, Vesey, undoubtedly still seething over Hunter's handling of the Queen's Farm matter, was ready to mobilize the clergy against the governor. Because Poyer feared the partisanship of local juries, he was reluctant to plead his case in court. He was supported by his Anglican colleagues who also feared for their livings.[62] Vesey urged Poyer to continue to resist the governor's wishes. Hunter correctly believed that the Trinity pastor was using the Poyer case to undermind his authority and to portray him as an enemy of the Church.[63]

For over a year, Hunter urged Poyer to initiate legal proceedings and Poyer did nothing. In January 1712, Vesey called a meeting of New York's Anglican clergy who decided to solicit the advice of the Bishop of London and to petition the SPG for the right to appeal any ecclesiastical case to the Queen and the privy council. The SPG presented its case to the Crown and the petition of the clergy was confirmed by an order in council on 8 January 1713. Virtually assured of an

60. *N.Y. Doc. Hist.*, 3: 214, 228, 233.
61. *N.Y. Doc. Hist.*, 3:257.
62. *N.Y. Eccles, Recs.*, 3: 1902-3; *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 5:327.
63. *N.Y. Doc. Hist.*, 3:257; Nelson, "Anglican Missions," p.294.

ultimately favorable verdict, Poyer then filed charges against the Jamaica vestry. His case remained unsettled until 1723 when Chief Justice Lewis Morris ruled that Poyer should receive a salary and a glebe under the act of 1693, but that the dissenters, who had built the parish church, should retain control of that building. Morris's decision did not really end the controversy in Jamaica. Poyer continued there until his death in 1731, but he never obtained the parsonage and was paid only sporadically because of local opposition.[64]

While tempers raged over the Jamaica question, other factors contributed to the increasing animosity between Hunter and Vesey. Most fundamentally, Hunter's appointments to both provincial and local offices further alienated Vesey and his supporters. As governor, Hunter wisely sought to use his powers of patronage to build up a political following and, he hoped, to quell the factional strife perpetuated by the Leislerian legacy and Cornbury's excesses. In removing Cornbury's placemen, Hunter could not avoid dismissing some churchmen. If this was not sufficiently damaging in the eyes of Vesey and his cohorts, their replacement by members of other Protestant denominations seemed to confirm suspicions of Hunter's insincerity in his devotion to the Church.

Other issues compounded the division which was rapidly becoming a power struggle between governor and pastor. Because of Vesey's overt hostility, Hunter had renovated the fort chapel and attended services there with his supporters. This maneuver simply augmented Vesey's anger; he complained of "schism" and the loss of pew rents.[65] The New York City slave revolt of 1712 precipitated yet another divisive issue. After the revolt, Vesey withdrew his support from Elias Neau, the SPG catechist to the city's blacks, though only one or two of Neau's pupils had been involved in the uprising. Hunter defended the catechist and encouraged the continuation of his work among blacks.[66] The following year, when Trinity Church was vandalized, Vesey accused Hunter of neglecting to fully investigate the matter, though the governor eventually offered a reward of £50 for the apprehension of the offenders.[67]

Despite Vesey's claims to the contrary, Hunter was far from being an enemy of the Church. The position he took on religious issues was, however, directly related to his other gubernatorial responsibilities and priorities. Hunter sought to reconcile provincial factions so that he might govern more effectively.

64. *N.Y. Eccles, Recs.*, 3:1963-64, 1971, 1990; William Wilson Manross, *A History of the American Episcopal Church* (New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1950), pp. 120-21; *N.Y. Doc. Hist.*, 3:309; Nelson, "Anglican Missions," p. 306.

65. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 5:311; Nelson, "Anglican Missions," pp. 296-97.

66. Olson, "Hunter and the Anglican Church," p. 55; Frank J. Klingberg, *Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York* (Philadelphia: The Church Historical Society, 1940), p. 133. Olson claims that only one of Neau's students participated in the rebellion, while Klingberg says that two did.

67. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 5:310-12.

New York's involvement in Queen Anne's War and the threat of French Canada to the north made accommodation with the assembly particularly crucial. The assembly, having suffered Cornbury's corruption and extravagance was, not surprisingly, reluctant to grant revenue to Hunter's government. Hunter's struggle to obtain both his own salary and a general revenue for the province preoccupied him throughout the first five years of his governorship. During this travail, politics and religion seemed to intertwine; the governor believed that Vesey was a "constant Caballer with those who have obstructed all settlement of the Revenue in order to starve me out."[68] In view of the pressing political, military, and fiscal problems that he faced, Hunter astutely declined to be intemperate in his handling of religious matters. Yet, despite his disdain for Vesey and his methods, he did not neglect the Church's interests. In 1712, Hunter sponsored a bill to strengthen the taxing provisions of the Ministry Act by imposing harsher penalties on vestrymen who failed to perform their duties promptly. He was also active in the movement to obtain an American bishop, though he hoped that the post would be filled by a "man of prudence," who, unlike Vesey, would not be inclined to faction or excessive zeal.[69] Even in handling the delicate question of Jamaica, Hunter had supported the legal position of the Church of England. Most importantly, the governor was on intimate political and personal terms with moderate churchmen like Heathcote and the Morrises.

The contest between Hunter and Vesey was actually fought more in England than in New York itself. Both men and their adherents repeatedly appealed to English authorities for redress. Until the death of Queen Anne in 1714, Vesey's was clearly the stronger position. He was able to enlist the aid of former governor Cornbury, now Earl of Clarendon, and other influential SPG members. Former lieutenant governor Francis Nicholson, an ardent and influential churchman, was in close contact with Vesey and blatantly aspired to wrest the New York governorship from Hunter. Vesey's connections with Bishop Compton forced Hunter to justify his conduct to English ecclesiastical authorities. Furthermore, Queen Anne was strongly predisposed to favor any person or policy that would advance the position of the Church of England and, after 1710, Hunter's most important Whig patrons had been replaced by a Tory ministry. Vesey was not averse to using political connections and pressure to enhance his authority and that of the Church, if necessary, by securing Hunter's dismissal. By 1714, Vesey had obtained additional statutory guarantees for clerical maintenance, the right to appeal any case concerning the Church to the Queen in Council, and by petitioning the SPG he had effectively halted the work of Elias Neau. In 1715, Vesey returned from a brief sojourn in England with the

68. *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 5:312.
69. Ibid., 5:310-11; Kammen, *Colonial New York*, p. 222.

additional prestige and power of commissary of the Bishop of London.[70]

Despite formidable opposition at home and in England, Hunter was able to avoid being recalled to England. The home government, like the colonial governor, had priorities that easily overshadowed New York's religious squabblings. War, first in Europe, and later in the colonies, absorbed the energies of the home government and the Board of Trade between 1702 and 1713. Hunter's performance in organizing and provisioning the abortive Canada expedition of 1711 and the frontier defenses of the province seemed far more important than his feud with Trinity's pastor.

Hunter's position, nevertheless, did not appear to be secure. The governor was vexed by both the Anglican clergy and the recalcitrant provincial assembly which persistently withheld his salary and refused to vote sufficient revenue. Hunter vented his anger in "Androboros," a scatalogical play published anonymously in 1714.[71] Later that year, however, the embittered governor received two pleasant surprises: in May, the assembly finally passed a revenue act and in July, the death of Queen Anne and the accession of King George I restored Hunter's Whig friends to power. The alteration of political conditions in England, of course, worked to Hunter's advantage. Supported by influential patrons in the home government, his position was less likely to be threatened. Indeed, that he was recommissioned by the new King demonstrated the approval of imperial authorities. Similarly, even in peacetime, the Hanoverian King and his Whig ministers were unlikely to sustain the efforts made on behalf of the colonial Church by Queen Anne and the Tories. At the same time, Hunter's compromise with the assembly with regard to the revenue bill greatly enhanced his prestige and maneuverability within provincial politics.[72]

Therefore, within a short time, the relative strength of Hunter and Vesey had changed drastically. Both men must have recognized the alterations that had occurred. After Vesey returned from England in 1715, an obvious stalemate existed between contending parties; this was followed by a conscious, if tacit, *rapprochement.* Vesey, having met with the clergy every year before 1715, discontinued this practice probably to avoid embarrassing the governor. Hunter

70. Olson, "Hunter and the Anglican Church," pp. 51, 56; *N.Y. Col. Docs.*, 5:310-12; *N.Y. Eccles, Recs.*, 3:1990; Dix *Trinity Church*, 1:192.

71. Scalon, "Robert Hunter," pp. 207-9. "Androboros" was the first play published in America. The play takes place in "Moropolis" (city of morons), which is really New York City, Its second act, "The Consistory," is a thoroughly satirical denunciation of the Anglican clergy of New York and New Jersey.

72. The issue at stake throughout the five-year revenue debate was the power of the assembly to control the disbursal of funds. Hunter insisted that the general revenue be controlled, as usual, by the royal collector, while the assembly argued that its treasurer should control provincial funds. There was also disagreement as to the right of the upper house, the council, to amend money bills. The council insisted on amending such bills, whereas the assembly rejected all bills changed by the council.

appointed Vesey's assistant as chaplain of the fort, thereby making him minister to the congregation which he himself had promoted in opposition to Vesey. Hunter returned to Trinity Church and the pastor supported the reinstatement of Elias Neau as cathechist. Finally, Hunter's leading supporter, Chief Justice Lewis Morris, returned a favorable verdict in the case of Jamaica's Thomas Poyer. Hunter continued as governor until 1719. The last five years of his administration were, in both religion and politics, among the calmest that New York had or would experience.[73]

When Hunter left office in 1719, he left a legacy of religious and politcal accommodation. After 1715, the attitudes of moderate Anglicans clearly supplanted those of their more zealous coreligionists. For governors and provincials alike, toleration became expedient and religion was eclipsed by other issues, at least until the 1750s.[74]

By 1715, however, the Church had made significant gains in New York. While the fort chaplain had been the only Anglican clergyman in the province in 1693, by 1715 nine congregations were being led by men who had taken Anglican orders and conducted services according to the Book of Common Prayer.[75] In 1695, the chaplain of the fort reported that only ninety of the province's nearly three thousand families attended Anglican services. All of these were residents of the city of New York.[76] Over the course of the next two decades, the Anglican faith and access to its rites would extend beyond the City into more remote areas of the province.

New York City, by 1715, had a thriving Anglican parish. Under Vesey's vigorous leadership, Trinity Church grew financially secure and its members included some of the city's most influential citizens. In 1722, Vesey informed the Bishop of London that of New York's sixteen hundred white families,

> many... frequent our church and have been baptized, and some of them have been admitted to the Lord's Table... The Sacrament is administered once in six weeks, and the usual number of Communicants is One hundred and upwards, but on the three great festivals Christmas, Easter and Whitsuntide more than two hundred.[77]

73. Olson, "Hunter and the Anglican Church," p. 62.

74. For a lucid and eminently readable account of New York politics after 1715, see Patricia U. Bonomi, *A Factious People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976).

75. New York's Anglican pastors at this time were: William Vesey (New York City), Christopher Bridge (Rye), John Bartow (Westchester), Aeneas Mackenzie (Richmond), John Thomas (Hempstead), Thomas Poyer (Jamaica), Daniel Bondet (New Rochelle), Thomas and John Sharpe (fort chaplain). Elias Neau served as catechist without orders from 1704 until 1723.

76. John Miller, *A Description of the Province and City of New York,* in *Historical Chronicles of New Amsterdam, Colonial New York and Early Long Island,* ed. Cornell Jaray (Port Washington, N.Y.: Ira J. Friedman, Inc., 1968), p. 37.

77. Quoted in Dix, *Trinity Church,* 1:199-200.

In Westchester County, the Church expanded under the moderate and persuasive guidance of Colonel Caleb Heathcote. By 1715, the parishes of both Westchester and Rye had built their churches. In Westchester, Eastchester, and Yonkers, the three towns included in Westchester parish, 163 of two thousand inhabitants were members of the Anglican congregation; twenty-four of these were communicants. In Rye, 345 of a population of 844 were professing Anglicans; there were thirty-nine communicants.[78]

Similarly, Aeneas Mackenzie progressed steadily, if not dramatically, in his work in Richmond County. Mackenzie set up English schools in order to integrate Staten Island's ethnically heterogeneous population and to provide educational facilities where none had previously existed. Mackenzie conducted services in the French church until his own church building was completed in 1712. Each year, he recorded the baptisms of fifteen to twenty children, but by 1715 only thirty-two of Staten Island's thirteen hundred inhabitants, most of whom were Dutch or French, were communicants of the English church.[79]

Jamaica, in Queens County, continued to be a problem for its pastor, Thomas Poyer. In 1724, a dissenting minister still retained the glebe and parsonage and the schools of the parish were run by Presbyterians and Quakers. Despite intermittent local demonstrations against Poyer and his church, Jamaica's Anglican services were not unattended. Poyer estimated that nearly one-fifth of the inhabitants attended his services and that approximately half of these were communicants.[80] In Hempstead, where English dissenters were less well organized than in Jamaica, John Thomas's relations with the people were cordial, but he received very few converts.[81]

Beyond the parishes created by the Ministry Act, the Church had little success. Elias Neau, despite Vesey's temporary opposition, catechized New York City's blacks for nearly twenty years. His students numbered in the hundreds.

The Huguenot Daniel Bondet of New Rochelle in Westchester County conformed to the Church of England and managed to retain many of his parishioners. Bondet also taught local blacks. In 1709, upon the request of Caleb Heathcote, the French minister was put on the payroll of the SPG; Bondet's adoption of Anglican rites may have been more the result of financial desperation than of religious conviction.

In 1709, the SPG sent Thomas Barclay to Albany. Barclay preached to whites, blacks, and Indians. In 1714, the construction of a stone church was

78. Nelson, "Anglican Missions," pp. 315,336.

79. Ibid., pp. 321-27.

80. *N.Y. Doc. Hist.*, 3:305-6. Poyer told the SPG that 80 of Jamaica's 409 families were attending his services. This is probably an exaggeration. Poyer's reports to his superiors were nearly always optimistic, even when opposition to him and his church was the most violent.

81. Nelson, "Anglican Missions," p. 319.

begun. Since Albany was primarily a Dutch community, the Anglican church there probably was patronized most frequently by the two hundred English soldiers stationed at the city's fort.[82]

Finally, J.F. Haeger achieved striking success in his work among the Palatine refugees. The Palatines, who had accompanied Governor Hunter to New York in 1710, were Lutherans unable to support a minister of their own. The SPG sent Haeger to minister to them. By 1715, 210 of 392 families had conformed to the Church of England and 458 of 1305 persons were taking Anglican communion.[83]

Although the progress made during the decades after the enactment of the Ministry Act created a permanent Anglican presence in New York, Anglicanism remained a minority faith. As the number of the Church's adherents increased, so, too, did the numerical strength of dissent. More importantly, the English conceptual and socio-political model for an ecclesiastical establishment had not been reproduced in New York. Some New Yorkers had committed themselves to the theological beliefs and practices of the Church of England, but the institutional church failed to become a true establishment. What had developed, was neither a clear separation of Church and State nor a fully endowed State Church.

The relationship between the provincial Church and the government of New York did not even approach the degree of intimacy characteristic of the English Church/State system. To be sure, the Anglican ministers in the six Ministry Act parishes had been collated (although not, in most cases, chosen) by the governor. They were also supported by a general tax levied on all the inhabitants of their parish, but these taxes were not always paid in full. At the same time, other non-Anglican ministers were sometimes paid by provincial revenues.[84] Chartered Dutch congregations continued to exercise their legal right to exact financial support from their members, though they were not exempt from Anglican levies, and other dissenting groups could use the Act for Building and Repairing Meeting Houses to raise funds for their parishes. Furthermore, the special status of the Church of England was never extended beyond the four counties mentioned in the Ministry Act.

In addition, in New York the Church did not fulfill the social functions that it did in England. Anglican ministers catechized blacks and Indians and the Church maintained several educational facilities, albeit on a very small scale. Anglican agencies of social welfare were not widespread; those that existed were confined mainly to the New York City. New York's colonial Church was not a source of social cohesion or provincial unity. Unlike in England, Anglicanism did not become the public religion of the majority of the population. Because of its

82. Chorley, "Beginnings," p. 23; Klingberg, *Anglican Humanitarianism,* p. 134.

83. *N.Y. Eccles. Recs.*, 3:2093.

84. It is customary, for example, for the governor to grant an annual pension to the Huguenot minister in New York City. (*N.Y. Doc. Hist.*, 3:412-13; 433-34).

minority status, the Church could, at best, act as a pressure group, but because of the attempt to make Anglicanism the established creed, the Church itself often constituted a divisive political issue. New York's Church was not an adjunct to the State. In so inhospitable a religious climate, political authority and ideals had to look elsewhere for reenforcement. Even sympathetic contemporaries recognized that the pro-establishment interpretation of the Ministry Act could not become reality. Lewis Morris, for example, realized that the benevolence and energy of the governor were crucial to the advancement of the provincial Church. So, too, did the Reverend John Thomas of Hempstead, who claimed that everyone attending his services sought either to win Lord Cornbury's favor or to escape his wrath. In 1711, Morris went so far as to report that the Church would have fared better in New York without the act of 1693, claiming the most of New York's converts were "scum" and that in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, where no such law existed, there were four times as many converts and they were "so most of them upon principle."[85]

The Church of England failed to become a true establishment in New York most fundamentally because the province's heterogeneous population declined to part with their old ways. The establishment scheme also failed, however, because of the dependence of the Church upon the benevolence of authorities both in England and in New York.

First and foremost was the inability of the New York Church to be self-sufficient in its religious affairs. New York's Anglican Church was obviously dependent upon the SPG for its supply of ministers, teachers, and catechists, most of whom were paid or at least subsidized by the Society. It also depended upon the SPG for Prayer Books and catechisms until 1710, when these items began to be printed in New York City. New York lacked the facilities to educate its own ministry and even had such facilities existed, there was no bishop readily available to ordain ministerial candidates. The absence of a bishop also made confirmation impossible.

The bishop's supervisory duties theoretically devolved upon the governor who, as the monarch's representative, served as the head of the provincial Church. In reality, however, the priorities of New York governors varied and they generally faced numerous more pressing issues – imperial wars, Indian relations, problems in finance, politics, and trade – than the state of the Church of England. Similarly, the governor's superiors in England placed more emphasis upon the success of imperial wars and the collection of revenues than upon the advancement of the Church of England. The colonial Church was, nevertheless, dependent upon the goodwill of the governor for any gains it might hope to make. In the final analysis, the Church of England was a dependent institution in New York because, by and large, an established church was not a welcome addition to provincial life.

85. *N.Y. Doc. Hist.*, 3:246-47.