

**Gospel Order among Friends:
Colonial Violence and the Peace Testimony in Quaker Pennsylvania, 1681-1722**

BY

MICHAEL JOHN GOODE
B.A., Goshen College, 1996
M.A., University of Illinois at Chicago, 2006

THESIS

Submitted as partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Chicago, 2012

Chicago, Illinois

Defense Committee:

James Sack, Chair and Advisor
Corey Capers
James Searing
John Smolenski, University of California at Davis
Robert Bucholz, Loyola University Chicago
John Donoghue, Loyola University Chicago

Acknowledgments

Anyone who has written a dissertation or some other lengthy academic project will readily affirm how utterly indebted the author is to the many people who make such an undertaking possible. During the course of my academic career as a graduate student, I have accumulated so many debts, both personally and professionally, that I could not possibly name every person who contributed to this dissertation, in one way or another, in this limited space. For the countless graduate students, scholars, faculty, family, friends, and acquaintances that I have left off the page, I still offer my heartfelt thanks.

It has been a true gift and a unique privilege to have Jim Sack, from the Department of History, University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), as my advisor and chair of my dissertation committee. Jim has a well-deserved reputation for his ecumenical knowledge and his generosity of his time and talents, of which I received more than my fair share. I learned from him the importance of asking seemingly simple questions (“What is a Puritan?”) and exploring their complex answers. Jim was selfless as an advisor, and I could always count on him for advice and support. Has my deep gratitude.

Corey Capers, also from UIC, is my advisor in early American history. By sheer coincidence, Corey arrived in our department the same year I was taking my preliminary exams. That summer, even before his appointment began, he met with me on numerous occasions for what turned into informal independent studies seminar. That summer was the start of a very productive collegial relationship that I deeply value. Corey is a gifted scholar, and a warm, generous person. I cannot adequately communicate my gratitude for everything he has taught me, both personally and professionally. This dissertation bears his imprint in many ways.

I also would like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee. Jim Searing, an Africanist, taught me Atlantic history (along with Kirk Hoppe – whom I owe appreciation as well!), and his advice and insight on my work was, and is, most welcome. I had an independent studies seminar with Bob Bucholz at Loyola University ahead of my preliminary exams, and then I lucked out again when he agreed to serve on my dissertation committee. Bob is a talented scholar, and I have benefited enormously from his deep knowledge of early modern British history and his enthusiasm for teaching. John Donoghue, also of Loyola, is a scholar of early America and the Atlantic world. In addition to our academic pursuits, we share many common interests, including our commitment to peace and social justice. He endlessly supported me and my work and encouraged me throughout my dissertation writing. I truly value and have greatly benefitted from his scholarly advice, insight, and above all our friendship. By a stroke of luck (a running theme!), I became acquainted with John Smolenski, of UC Davis, while he was finishing his book manuscript on – of all things – early Quaker Pennsylvania. Needless to say, our scholarly interests overlap considerably. John is a model of collegiality. He selflessly shared many of insights from his work, and I have thoroughly enjoyed our many, many engaging conversations. John’s constant support, advice, and insight made this dissertation possible. I cannot thank him enough.

In addition to the history department at UIC, there were several institutions that supported me during me research and writing. I would like to thank the McNeil Center for Early American Studies for my fellowship during the 2010-2011 academic year. I know this has been said many times before, but there is no place like the McNeil Center, especially for the early American studies community. I had a wonderful fellowship, and the time there allowed me to do more research in Philadelphia-area archives than otherwise would be possible. I would especially like

to thank Daniel Richter, and Laura Keenan Spero, who served admirably as interim director that year, as well as Christopher Bilodeau, Joseph Rezek, Katherine Gaudet, Whitney Martinko, Felicity Donohoe, Jayne Ptolemy, Matthew Karp, Simon Gilhooly, Cheryl Collins, Alea Henle, Nicole Ivy, and Rob Gamble for looking at drafts or helping me with my project in various ways. Thank you also to Roderick McDonald, Michelle McDonald, George Boudreau, Cassie Good, William Tatum III, Matt Allison, Melissah Pawlikowski, Pinar Kemerli, Matthias Köhler, Wayne Bodle, Simon Finger, David Silverman, and Michael Zuckerman for their advice, encouragement, and support during my time there. Special thanks Barabara Natello and Amy Baxter-Bellamy for keeping the McNeil Center running smoothly during my time there.

I also received support in the form of a Margaret W. Moore and John M. Moore Research Fellowship from the Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College and a short-term Andrew W. Mellon Foundation fellowship from the Library Company and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania (HSP). I would like to thank Christopher Densmore and the entire helpful staff at Friends Historical Library. I would also like to thank Jim Greene and the wonderful staff at the Library Company, most especially Connie King, Rachel D'Agostino, Edith Mulhern, Linda August, and Sarah Weatherwax, who arranged to have me look at many maps of early Pennsylvania. During my time at the Library Company, I really enjoyed hanging out with my friends Alice Taylor, Beverly C. Tomek, and the inestimable Jonathan Nash. At the HSP, I would like to thank Tammy Gaskell, publications and scholarly programs director, and Sarah Heim and Ron Medford, research librarians. A special thank you goes out to Stephen Smith, research librarian at the HSP, for helping me navigate the William Penn Papers.

In Chicago during the 2011-2012 academic year, I was a graduate scholar-in-residence at the Newberry Library. The Newberry afforded me space to finish writing my dissertation, but far

beyond that, I thoroughly enjoyed getting to know the excellent librarians and staff there, as well as the vibrant academic community of fellows, all of whom helped me shape and refine my project in and outside our many seminars. There are too many names to include here, but I would above all like to thank Daniel Greene and Diane Dillon, for putting such a wonderful program together, as well as Anna Brenner and Molly Fletcher for their administrative support. I would also like to thank Chris Cantwell and Liesl Olson of the Scholl Center and Scott Stevens, director of the D'Arcy McNickle Center, for his input on Chapter 4. Michael Lansing, a dear friend and colleague, provided editorial assistance and encouragement during my time there. Thanks also to fellows Randy Head, Leon Fink, and Bruce Calder for feedback on my professional development. Since I cannot possibly name everyone else here, I will simply say thank you to the other fellow graduate scholars-in-residence, scholars-in-residence, and the staff and librarians at the Newberry Library.

Much appreciation and thanks to the graduate students and faculty at the Department of History at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Thanks to Mark Podlesnik, Josh Fennell, Tom Dorrance, John Rosen, and Dan Harper for early advice and assistance on my work, as well as Benn Williams, Cat Jacquet, Lara Kelland, Mark Bulloch, and Peter Strickland. Special thanks to the Special Collections department at the UIC library for keeping students like me employed during their graduate tenure. Thank you to Ina Zweiniger-Bargielowska for suggesting that I study Quakers in the first place.

For invaluable feedback on my writing and dissertation work, Geoffrey Plank deserves a special note of thanks. A special thank you also to Allen McDuffee for all the advice and moral support. Jenna Nigro, my partner, provided tireless editorial assistance and feedback on my work, in addition to her constant emotional support and encouragement. She has my thanks and

my love. Thank you to David, Jocelyn, and Lia Nigro for giving me a second home in Western Pennsylvania on my way to and from Philadelphia. Many thanks to Perry Clark, Phil Oswald Christano, and Peter Andriotis for technical assistance.

Finally, much love and thanks to my mother, Sharon Goode, for making it all happen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction	1
I. 'The Eyes of Many Are On Us': The Struggle for Gospel Order in Quaker Pennsylvania.....	25
II. 'The Weapons of Warfare are not Carnal': The Keithian Schism and the Violence of Peace.....	68
III. 'Husbands from Wives, Children from Parents:' Gospel Order and Antislavery in Pennsylvania.....	115
IV. 'Filthy Lucre': Indians, Alcohol, and Violence on Pennsylvania's Borderlands.....	141
V. We Shall Not Be "Dipt in Blood": The Quaker Peace Testimony and Sovereignty on the Anglo-Atlantic Margins of Empire.....	176
Conclusion.....	223
Cited Literature.....	231
Vita.....	249

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AHR	American Historical Review
APS	American Philosophical Society
CSPC	Calendar of State Papers, Colonial
FHL	Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College
HSP	Historical Society of Pennsylvania
LLP	Lawmaking and Legislators in Pennsylvania
MPCP	Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania (1851-2 edition)
PMHB	Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography
PWP	Papers of William Penn
QSCHC	Quaker & Special Collections Department, Haverford College
WMQ	William and Mary Quarterly

Summary

This dissertation examines the development of gospel order and the Quaker peace testimony within the political and cultural milieu of Pennsylvania during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. My project uses Quaker peace discourse as a lens to explore the negotiation of colonial violence in early America. Rather than viewing Quaker peace discourse in isolation, I contend that it cannot be understood apart from the violence that underpinned the European settlement of Pennsylvania. Provincial Quakers were heavily implicated in slavery and the Atlantic slave trade, and their refusal to establish a militia and promptly remit war taxes to the Crown galvanized non-Quaker opposition in the colony and attracted the opprobrium of royalist officials. The cultural construction of Pennsylvania on Native lands also set off a contest for power in which neither Indians nor Friends could dominate the other.

“Gospel Order among Friends” argues that the Quaker intimacy with colonial violence touched off a serious debate among Friends about the social, cultural, and religious meanings of peace. Provincial Quakers struggled to limit the economy of violence operating within their households, and by extension, for the colony at large. I use the term “gospel order” to describe the moral language provincial Friends employed to negotiate their collective relationship to violence. Quaker debates over gospel order culminated in the Keithian schism, one of the most serious religious and political controversies to engulf early Pennsylvania. My project treats slavery, settler-Indian conflict, and imperial warfare as interrelated forms of colonial violence and challenges the historical tendency to view peace rhetoric in isolation from the broader Anglo-American discourse on violence and social order.

Introduction

Pennsylvania was founded on high expectations. William Penn, the colony's original proprietor, called the Quaker experiment in peaceful government a "holy experiment," an expression later generations of Friends and historians made famous. Penn wrote the phrase only once, but in another letter addressed to his "dearly beloved Friends," elaborated on his hopes for the colony. The letter was written in London sometime after he published his first promotional tract, *Some Account of the Province of Pennsylvania* (1681).¹ At that point, "Pennsylvania" was more of an aspiration on a map than reality, with barely over a thousand settlers living in the Delaware River Valley. The region's Native inhabitants, the Lenni Lenape, watched warily as their new Quaker neighbors built a small town called Philadelphia along the west bank of the Delaware River in an area known to the Lenape as Coaquannock. To get Philadelphia off the ground, Quaker settlers imported several hundred African slaves in chains from the West Indies. In his letter to Friends, Penn, a slave owner, did not trouble himself with the morality of slavery. Instead, he relayed his desire to "establish a just & righteous" colony, one that "others may take Example by" and where "Vice & corrupt manners be impartially rebuked & punished" and "Virtue & Sobriety be cherished." Framing his call for a moral government in eschatological terms, Penn reminded Friends that "the Wrath of God will hang over Nations" until good order was established in Pennsylvania.²

Friends shared in Penn's excitement at the prospects of founding a colony that was destined to be a peaceable kingdom, a light unto the nations. Similar to Winthrop's "city on a hill" metaphor for Puritans in New England, Friends believed the "eyes of many" were on Pennsylvania, which they believed God had granted to them as their New Canaan in America. Over time, the founding of Pennsylvania came to be enshrined in myth, celebrated in Benjamin West paintings and by

¹ William Penn, *Some Account of the Province of Pennsylvania in America; Lately Granted under the Great Seal of England to William Penn ...* (London, 1681).

² [William Penn to Friends in Pennsylvania], [n.d.], p. 3, "Memorandum & Copies of Original Letters &c from William Penn and Others," Box 4, Parrish Collection, HSP.

Enlightenment figures like Voltaire, who lauded Penn as a virtuous counterpoint to despotic European monarchs, bloodthirsty conquistadors, and intolerant clergymen. To Friends and many non-Friends alike, the myth of Pennsylvania symbolized a more benevolent, peaceful form of European colonialism in America.

At the time of Pennsylvania's founding, Friends wanted to build a provincial society governed by the moral discourse of "gospel order," a metaphor that English and American Quakers used at the time to refer to their system of religious discipline, but which also connoted a peaceful form of governance that "rightly" ordered Friends and their households without resort to coercion or the threat of violence. As a language of peace, gospel order was intimately connected to the Quaker peace testimony. In the seventeenth-century, Friends defined themselves through a series of "testimonies" that were not so much confessions of faith as discourses meant to guide moral behavior in a manner that would mark them off distinctly from outsiders.³ Quaker testimonies were not timeless or universal – Friends at different times and places interpreted them variously. This was especially true of the Quaker peace testimony, which rejected warfare and armed conflict as sinful and contrary to divine law and the example of Jesus in the New Testament. George Fox, the acknowledged founder and leader of the Society of Friends, gave definitive expression to the peace testimony in 1660 when he proclaimed to Charles II that Quakers had always rejected killing and the "carnal" weapons of warfare.

In reality, the response of Friends to the problem of violence was far more complex. This dissertation examines Quaker gospel order and the peace testimony in Pennsylvania during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. My central claim is that Quaker peace discourse cannot be understood apart from the violence that turned "Penn's woods" into a colonial reality. My project views the concepts of "peace" and "violence" in a dialogical relationship. Quaker peace discourse in early Pennsylvania was fundamentally concerned with the regulation of violence, both at the level of the

³ For an overview of Quaker testimonies, see Hugh Barbour and J. William Frost, eds., *The Quakers* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988).

household and in the colony at large. Quakers, like other early Americans, sought to channel and thus limit their relationship to violence according to a particular set of moral parameters. Peace discourse was the primary means by which Quakers legitimated their authority in early Pennsylvania. This dissertation therefore connects peace to the problem of government and encourages scholars to view early modern peace discourse in relationship to violence and the struggle over sovereignty and authority in early America.

Peace and violence have been long-running themes in the scholarly literature on colonial Pennsylvania. Usually one or the other theme is emphasized. Traditional historical accounts, often written by Quakers themselves, praise the colony for its supposedly exceptionally pacific character, which allowed settlers to prosper.⁴ In the words of James T. Lemon, provincial Pennsylvania was the “Best Poor Man’s Country” in America.⁵ Modern accounts sympathetic to William Penn emphasize his avocation of religious toleration and protection of political liberties.⁶ A recent biographer argues for Penn’s inclusion as a Founding Father.⁷ With an eye toward the American Revolution, scholars portray colonial Pennsylvania as the cradle of American democracy and religious freedom and credit Quakers with forging a distinctive brand of liberal constitutionalism.⁸ Colonial-era Quaker families in the Delaware Valley, according to Barry Levy, pioneered the American domestic ideal of loving parenting and relative equality between spouses.⁹

Scholarship focusing on Quaker abolition modifies this relatively sanguine picture by

⁴ Robert Proud, *The History of Pennsylvania, in North America* (Philadelphia, 1797–98); Isaac Sharpless, *A Quaker Experiment in Government; History of Quaker Government in Pennsylvania, 1682-1783* (Philadelphia: Ferris & Leach, 1902); Rufus Jones, *The Quakers in the American Colonies* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1911); William Braithwaite, *The Second Period of Quakerism* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1921); Edwin Bronner, *William Penn's “Holy Experiment” : The Founding of Pennsylvania, 1681-1701* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962).

⁵ James T. Lemon, *The Best Poor Man’s Country: A Geographical Study of Early Southeastern Pennsylvania* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1976).

⁶ J. William Frost, “Pennsylvania Institutes Religious Liberty, 1682-1860” *PMHB* (July 1998): 323-47.

⁷ John Moretta, *William Penn and the Quaker Legacy* (New York: Pearson Longman, 2007).

⁸ Alan Tully, *Forming American Politics: Ideals, Interests, and Institutions in Colonial New York and Pennsylvania* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994); J. William Frost, *A Perfect Freedom: Religious Liberty in Pennsylvania* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993); Jane Calvert, *Quaker Constitutionalism and the Political Thought of John Dickinson* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

⁹ Barry Levy, *Quakers and the American Family: British Settlement in the Delaware Valley* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).

emphasizing the violence of slavery that undergirded Penn's "Holy Experiment" in America. Jean Soderlund and Gary Nash argue that Quakers and other settlers were so dependent on slavery for their economic prosperity that freedom for African Americans in Pennsylvania only came "by degrees."¹⁰ To better understand Quaker slavery and abolition in Pennsylvania, scholars look to the Caribbean context, particularly Barbados, where many Friends settled in the seventeenth century and from where many ultimately left for Pennsylvania with their slaves in tow. Kristen Block's recent work underscores the depth of violence that pervaded plantation slavery in the Caribbean, enabling slaveowning Quaker planters to grow wealthy but in the process compromising their ability to follow the more radical moral implications of their faith.¹¹ The Barbadian Quaker planters and merchants who migrated to Pennsylvania took their knowledge and experience of plantation slavery with them. Yet, as the work of Brycchan Carey and J. William Frost suggest, Fox's missionary trip to Barbados and the experience of Caribbean Friends more broadly were crucial to the development of Quaker antislavery in Pennsylvania.¹²

Among the best work on colonial Pennsylvania in recent years focuses on the region's Native inhabitants. Pennsylvania features prominently in Francis Jennings' groundbreaking work on the Iroquois and the Covenant Chain.¹³ James Merrell's *Into the American Woods* and Peter Silver's *Our Savage Neighbors*, both Bancroft Prize-winning books, focus on the seemingly inexorable conflict and mistrust that led to the Seven Year's War and ultimately the full dispersal of Natives out of Pennsylvania.¹⁴ For Merrell, intercultural "go-betweens" on both sides were unable to overcome

¹⁰ Gary Nash and Jean Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees: Emancipation in Pennsylvania and Its Aftermath* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); see also Jean Soderlund, *Quakers and Slavery: A Divided Spirit* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985); and Gary Nash, *Forging Freedom: The Formation of Philadelphia's Black Community, 1720-1840* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988).

¹¹ Kristen Block, *Ordinary Lives in the early Caribbean: Religion, Colonial Competition, and the Politics of Profit* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012).

¹² J. William Frost, *The Quaker Origins of Antislavery* (Norwood: Norwood Editions, 1980); Brycchan Carey, "The Power that Giveth Liberty and Freedom': The Barbadian Origins of Quaker Antislavery Rhetoric, 1657-76," *ARIEL*, 38(1), 27-48.

¹³ Francis Jennings, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies from Its Beginnings to the Lancaster Treaty of 1744* (New York: Norton, 1984).

¹⁴ James H. Merrell, *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (New York: WW Norton, 1999); Peter Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America* (New York: WW Norton, 2008).

mutual misunderstanding or prevent European settlers from displacing Native Americans off their lands. Silver argues that Euroamerican ethnic and religious toleration in Pennsylvania was achieved through warfare with their Indian neighbors. William Pencak and Daniel Richter's edited collection of essays on the racial construction of Pennsylvania's frontier offers a more ambiguous picture; peaceful coexistence intermingled with violent encounters. As Pencak and Richter point out in the introduction, "the eras of peace and war shared much in common."¹⁵

This dissertation explores more deeply the interconnections between peace and violence in early Pennsylvania. Several works are especially important to my project. Gary Nash, and more recently, John Smolenski, wrote compelling narratives of the first four decades of Pennsylvania's history, with differing emphases.¹⁶ Nash's work focuses on class conflict and the rancorous politics of the period, arguing that the relative absence of landed aristocracy in early Pennsylvania made room for an unusually populist brand of political culture dominated by mostly Quaker merchants, small landowners, and, to a lesser extent, artisans. Smolenski, taking an anthropological-cultural approach, uses the founding generation of Pennsylvania Quakers as an exemplar of how colonial European "charter groups" creolized in a manner analogous to what Sidney Mintz and Richard Price described for enslaved African-Americans.¹⁷ Both works provide my project with much of the political and cultural background of the period.

My project frames gospel order and the Quaker peace testimony as methods of government that structured the interactions of early Pennsylvania Friends in relationship to each other and to the region's African, Native, and non-Quaker settler inhabitants. While my dissertation uncovers the depth of violence that made Pennsylvania's existence possible, it also takes Quaker peace discourse seriously,

¹⁵ William Pencak and Daniel Richter, "Introduction," in *Friends and Enemies in Penn's Woods: Indians, Colonists, and the Racial Construction of Pennsylvania*, eds. William Pencak and Daniel Richter (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004), x.

¹⁶ Gary Nash, *Quakers and Politics: Pennsylvania, 1681-1726* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968); John Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers: The Making of Creole Culture in Colonial Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010).

¹⁷ Sidney W. Mintz and Richard Price, *The Birth of African-American Culture: An Anthropological Perspective* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992).

emphasizing its role in the creation of a provincial legal and religious culture that attempted to limit violence. Paradoxically, it was Quaker complicity in colonial violence in Pennsylvania that generated a wide-ranging debate about the meaning and contours of peace. In the first three decades alone, provincial Friends (and their detractors) debated the morality of war taxes, the death penalty, traffic in human slavery, and the sale of alcohol to Indians, among other issues. Despite taking measures to preserve their own wealth and power, early Friends retained deep anxieties about their relationship to violence. In the eighteenth century, those anxieties would eventually lead Friends to abolition and advocacy on behalf of Native Americans.

Gospel order is the central organizing concept of my project. As I argue throughout my dissertation, gospel order was at once a Quaker discourse on peace and a method of noncoercive government. It began as a response to a need to impose order and coherence in the Quaker movement.¹⁸ Quakerism began as a charismatic and radical sect in the 1640s. Led by Fox, an itinerant lay minister from the north of England, Friends preached that the “inward light” of salvation was available to anyone, male or female, without the need for a paid clergy or any other “outward” form of religious authority. Fox’s message appealed to the lower orders of the English laity at a time of deep political anxieties and religious experimentation. Assisted by a network of male and female itinerant preachers, the movement soon gained adherents around the Anglo-Atlantic. There were around 60,000 Quaker converts by the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy.¹⁹ In the face of this spectacular growth, Fox, Margaret Fell (a wealthy early convert who supported Fox financially and later became his wife), and other leading ministers, known as “public Friends,” organized a hierarchy of meetings for business and worship and developed a method of religious discipline to arbitrate internal disputes. Their goal was to preserve the unity of Friends in the face of state-sanctioned persecution, especially in England after the

¹⁸ My summary of early English Quakerism and its growth as an Atlantic movement follows Rosemary Moore, *The Light in Their Consciences: Early Quakers in Britain, 1646-1666* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000); Rebecca Larson, *Daughters of Light: Quaker Women Preaching and Prophesying in the Colonies and Abroad, 1700-1775* (New York: Knopf, 1999); and Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640-1661* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 130-1.

¹⁹ Estimate from Barry Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (London: Temple Smith, 1985), 27.

Restoration, and to stamp out internal dissent, mainly from ministerial rivals who challenged Fox's authority for the leadership of the movement.²⁰ Gospel order gave the Society of Friends a more formalized and hierarchical church order, yet enveloped it within a discourse of love and mutuality.

At the heart of Quaker gospel order was a gendered notion of peaceable government, rooted in family and household harmony. Regulating sexuality and Quaker marriage practices, as well as structuring male and female religious authority, preoccupied Friends on both sides of the Atlantic. Friends did not seek to overturn contemporary patriarchal assumptions about family order, but, to a greater degree than other religious groups, they emphasized loving relations and mutual respect between parents and children, masters and servants, and fellow members of the meeting. Fox likened Friends to an extended household, often exhorting them in his epistles to become "as one family, building up one another, and helping one another."²¹ Especially after the Restoration, male ministers dominated the meetings for business, approving the publication of tracts and administering policy on behalf of all Friends. But Fox also organized separate women's meetings in the 1670s, giving them authority to discipline Quaker females, care for orphans, manage poor relief, apprentice children, and approve Quaker couples for marriage. As Phyllis Mack argues, Fox preserved male control of the movement but at the same institutionalized female Quaker religious authority, despite opposition from some male ministers.²² Men's monthly meetings disciplined errant male Friends for household-related offenses such as bad debts, fornication, marrying a non-Quaker, or suing another Friend in court. As religious dissenters in England, Friends distrusted secular courts. In their place, monthly meetings established arbitration proceedings to resolve disputes among Friends, away from public view. If a wayward Friend committed an offense, the monthly meeting applied "noncoercive" pressure (usually through shame) to secure his or her admission of guilt or to obtain any redress of grievances. Friends

²⁰ See H. Larry Ingle, *First Among Friends: George Fox and the Creation of Quakerism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

²¹ George Fox, "To Friends, to take care of such, who suffer for owning truth," [1656] in *A Collection of Many Select and Christian Epistles*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia and New York, 1831), 117.

²² Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 265-304.

who failed to cooperate with the arbitration faced “disownment,” or expulsion from the meeting.²³

Gospel order discipline helped Friends maintain unity and a collective sense of identity as they rapidly settled the Anglo-Atlantic.

My dissertation is divided into five chapters that trace how gospel order provided a framework for facing the various forms of violence that existed in the colony. Chapter One explores the development of gospel order as a discourse on peaceable government in late seventeenth-century Pennsylvania. The term “gospel order” does not appear in early Pennsylvania’s promotional literature or provincial law codes, but it underpinned the entire civic and religious culture of the colony. No militia or armed force was established in Pennsylvania, a virtually unprecedented move for any government, then or now. Provincial courts, packed with Quaker magistrates, remanded litigants to appointed “peacemakers” for legally-binding arbitration or imposed “peace bonds” on defendants to ensure their future good behavior. Up until the turn of the eighteenth century, the criminal code was extraordinarily lenient by English common law standards of that time. The death penalty was restricted to homicide (and treason, by default) and was almost never implemented. Physical mutilation, such as ear cropping, was rejected in favor of “lighter” corporal punishments, like whipping, or shaming rituals, like forcing the accused to stand in public and display a written placard or some other sign of self-condemnation.²⁴

While Penn famously guaranteed religious toleration in the colony, ruling Friends used the legal system and the power of the courts to promote a Quaker-inflected moral order among a diverse settler population. The provincial courts became the primary venue by which Friends hoped the non-Quaker

²³ My understanding of the disciplinary practices of men’s monthly meetings draws from Jack Marietta, *Reformation of American Quakerism, 1748-1783* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984), which is the best treatment of the subject.

²⁴ My summary of the Quaker imprint of the early Pennsylvania criminal code follows Jack Marietta and G. S. Rowe, *Troubled Experiment: Crime and Justice in Pennsylvania, 1682–1800* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), especially chapters 1-2.

population would internalize Quaker norms of governance and thereby become peaceable subjects.²⁵

The first chapter examines quarter sessions cases in Chester, Bucks, and Philadelphia Counties for the pre-1700 period, when the Quaker presence in the law codes was greatest.²⁶ The provincial courts were dominated by Quaker magistrates who adjudicated cases in a manner analogous to the way overseers in monthly meetings arbitrated disputes. Morals offenses, such as public drunkenness and Sabbath-breaking, were punished, though relatively lightly, especially if defendants admitted guilt and plead the mercy of the court. Even in cases of assault and battery, Quaker magistrates were more interested in securing defendants' future peaceable conduct than in meting out punishment. The use of corporal punishments in early Pennsylvania reflected the Quakers' gendered assumptions about family order and sexuality. Female defendants accused of fornication and bastardy were more likely to be whipped than male defendants. While this trend was not unique to early Pennsylvania, Quaker courts were also more willing to subject female defendants accused of sexual crimes to public shaming rituals as a "nonviolent" alternative to corporal punishments. Quaker magistrates were also lenient with non-married couples, even in fornication cases, if the defendants agreed to marry and form a household.

Chapter One concludes by surveying gospel order as a disciplinary mechanism in Quaker meetings. Just as Friends did elsewhere, monthly meetings in Pennsylvania resorted to what they termed "gospel order discipline" to enforce Quaker norms in marriage, sexuality, and other household-related affairs, as well as arbitrate disputes among members. These disciplinary practices take on a particular importance because they served as an unofficial court of arbitration for Friends, serving a complimentary role to the colony's provincial courts. Theoretically, monthly meetings disciplined Friends, while the provincial law courts, packed with Quaker justices and juries, handled non-Quaker litigants and defendants. But the lines between the two realms blurred considerably. Arbitrators in

²⁵ In addition to Marietta and Rowe's *Troubled Experiment*, my argument draws from the work of William Offutt, *Of 'Good Laws' and 'Good Men': Law and Society in the Delaware Valley, 1680-1710* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995).

²⁶ After 1700, the provincial government's adoption of slave codes, along with other judicial and common law reforms, gradually eroded the Quaker character of Pennsylvania's civic culture.

monthly meetings served as justices in provincial courts, while meetings occasionally handled criminal cases of assault and sexual violence. Despite their best efforts, however, overseers in monthly meetings were unable to prevent members of meetings from suing each other in court. And provincial Friends accused of sexual assault or other forms of domestic violence were still subject to provincial law and could appear as defendants in criminal courts. The case of William Boulding, which serves as the coda to Chapter One, examines how the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting intervened in a case of domestic violence and used shame as a disciplinary technique to stop the abuse.

Chapter Two examines the Keithian schism, one of the most serious religious and political crises in Pennsylvania's early history. My project breaks new ground by examining the schism as a watershed moment in the Quaker debate over peace and violence in early Pennsylvania.²⁷ It shattered the Quakers' public image of unity, pitting Friends against each other and eventually drawing in Quakers from other colonies and across the Atlantic. It also nearly brought down the provincial government. The Keithian schism began in 1692 as a religious debate over the nature of Christ's resurrection and atonement. George Keith, a Scottish Quaker and university-trained theologian who was a leading minister of the Society of Friends in Britain, antagonized his Philadelphia ministerial colleagues by accusing them of holding doctrinal errors and displaying a shocking ignorance of the Bible. Keith also circulated a manuscript, "Gospel Order and Discipline Improved," which challenged the right of wealthy Philadelphia Quaker ministers to dominate meetings for worship at the expense of rank and file members. Keith argued that all confessing members, regardless of gender or social status, ought to share in the governance of the church.

²⁷ Scholars have interpreted the Keithian schism from many vantage points. J. William Frost, ed., *The Keithian Controversy in Early Pennsylvania*, argues the schism centered on the atonement and bodily resurrection of Christ. Jon Butler, "'Gospel Order Improved': The Keithian Schism and the Exercise of Quaker Ministerial Order in Pennsylvania," *WMQ* 31 (1974): 431-452, maintains that it was a conflict over ministerial authority. Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, contends the Keithian schism was a class conflict pitting early Pennsylvania's ruling oligarchy of wealthy Quaker politicians against the middling sort of shopkeepers and artisans who comprised the bulk of Keith's supporters. Barry Levy, *Quakers and the American Family*, focused on the Keithians' attitudes toward family and child-rearing. More recently, John Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, contends that Keith viewed Pennsylvania Friends as "bastard Quakers" who had culturally degenerated from British Quakerism, and Andrew Murphy, *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), examines the controversy from the vantage point of religious toleration.

Keith's arguments about voluntary church discipline led him to directly confront the rationale of "noncoercive" Quaker government in Pennsylvania. Keith and his supporters attacked Quaker magistrates in print, questioning their moral right to arm Indian allies, sanction the death penalty, and use armed force to suppress piracy. Because the political and religious invocations of gospel order were intertwined, the Keithians compared the oligarchic authority of Quaker ministers in the monthly meetings to the Quaker magistrates in the colony who resorted to armed force and physical punishments to maintain civil order. In support of their arguments, the Keithians appealed to the peace testimony, arguing that true Christians should shun political office since governments by their very nature used violence to maintain order. State-sanctioned violence, they reasoned, was inherently corrupting to a religious people who ought to govern themselves in loving mutuality, thus rendering the need for "carnal" weapons unnecessary.

The Keithian schism attracted the attention of moral commentators and royalist officials across the Atlantic. Quaker magistrates, desperate to contain the damage, unsuccessfully tried to prosecute Keith and four of his allies for sedition. The trial backfired. Out of sympathy for the defendants, the mostly Quaker jury refused to convict the Keithians, but the greater injury to the reputation of provincial Friends had been already done. The Keithian schism occurred just as Anglo-French imperial warfare and Indian raids and captive taking erupted on the New England and New York frontier. Word of the disorder in Pennsylvania reached London, along with the Keithians' print tracts. The Crown government responded by dissolving Penn's proprietary charter and royalizing the colony from 1692 to 1694. Despite Keith's expulsion from the Society of Friends, the schism refused to die. From 1702-4, Keith crisscrossed the Atlantic as the first missionary of the SPG, haranguing Friends wherever he went. Well into the eighteenth century, Quaker rule in Pennsylvania was the target of hostility from Anglicans and royalist officials who used Keith's own arguments to portray Friends as dangerous pacifists and traitorous subjects who coddled French and Native American interests in their colony.

The next two chapters consider the racial limitations of gospel order in early Pennsylvania.

Chapter Three covers the Quakers' complicated relationship to slavery. The narrative of Quaker abolition is well known. Most of the scholarly emphasis has focused on the later eighteenth century, in an era Jack Marietta has termed the "Quaker reformation."²⁸ In the later eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Quakers were among the leading abolitionists in the Atlantic world. British Friends played a prominent role in the campaign to abolish the slave trade, and Philadelphia was home to Anthony Benezet, the French-born Quaker of Huguenot origin whom one scholar has dubbed "the father of Atlantic abolitionism" for pioneering the transatlantic campaign to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the eighteenth century.²⁹ Benezet was not alone, however. Beginning in the 1740s, Quaker reformers like John Woolman, among many others, began pushing Friends in the Delaware Valley toward divesting from slavery and slave trafficking.³⁰ Although it would take them the rest of the century to do so, the reformers eventually succeeded in part by seizing control of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting and making slavery a disownable offense.

While scholars have paid significant attention to Quakers' turn toward abolition, less studied (though certainly not ignored) is the earlier history of Quaker antislavery in Pennsylvania. My dissertation follows the scholarly convention of distinguishing "antislavery" from "abolition."³¹ Historians conventionally reserve the terms "abolition" and "abolitionism" for the later eighteenth and nineteenth-century efforts to eradicate slavery and the slave trade through legal, military, and political action. By contrast, antislavery advocates criticized the violence of slavery and the cruelty of masters without necessarily calling for an end to the institution itself. While the distinction between antislavery and abolition is important, the concerns and contradictions that animated antislavery in the seventeenth

²⁸ Marietta, *The Reformation of American Quakerism*, p. xi, xiii-xiv, describes the Quaker reformation as a "transformation [that] occurred in the Society of Friends ... between 1748 and the end of the American Revolution," leading to "the withdrawal of American Friends from the mainstream of American society and government," but also to the "growth of Quaker philanthropy and, most conspicuously, the birth of Quaker abolition."

²⁹ Maurice Jackson, *Let This Voice Be Heard: Anthony Benezet, Father of Atlantic Abolitionism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).

³⁰ Geoffrey Plank, *John Woolman's Path to the Peaceable Kingdom: A Quaker in the British Empire* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), offers the best and most recent account of Woolman within the context of the commercial integration of the British Empire and the transatlantic network of Quaker reformers in which he circulated.

³¹ On the contested historical distinction between "antislavery" and "abolition," see David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823* (Oxford, 1999), 21-2.

century set important moral precedents that abolitionists later appropriated.³² The narrative of Quaker abolitionism, my dissertation argues, makes little historical sense without uncovering early Friends' deep ties to slavery in the Caribbean and without retracing their ambivalence towards the violence of slavery and racial mixing in their households in early Pennsylvania.

Chapter Three highlights the significance of gospel order in the development of antislavery in early Pennsylvania. George Fox established the moral parameters of the debate when he visited Barbados in 1671. The trip was Fox's first real experience with the horrors of plantation slavery, and after he returned to London, he wrote *Gospel Family Order* (1676) to implore Quaker masters to treat their slaves as well as they would their own white Christian servants.³³ Wealthy slaveowning Friends in the colony pointed to Fox's injunctions in *Gospel Family Order* to argue that they could legitimately own slaves and be good Christian masters. A dissenting faction of Friends, however, argued that slavery was not compatible with the Quaker ideal of orderly and peaceable households. They deployed a range of arguments with gospel order rhetoric as the underlying theme: slavery encouraged violence in the household, turning Quaker masters into cruel tyrants; the introduction of African slaves into Quaker households threatened the sexual purity of white servants; and the Atlantic slave trade violently tore apart African families. Early Pennsylvania Friends were also fearful of slave revolt taking place in Pennsylvania, a troubling scenario in a colony with no organized militia and a high concentration of pacifists. Those fears were amplified after New York experienced a minor slave revolt in 1712.

As Chapter Three argues, there were long-term consequences of these early antislavery debates. The Keithian dissidents lent antislavery an even more radical tinge after publishing the *Exhortation & Caution to Friends* in 1693, a tract that condemned Quaker slaveholding in unequivocal, piercing

³² This argument follows John Donoghue, "Out of the Land of Bondage: The English Revolution and the Atlantic Origins of Revolution," *AHR* 115 (2010): 943-974. Donoghue locates the origins of abolition in the network of radical republicanism in the mid-seventeenth century English Atlantic.

³³ George Fox, *Gospel Family Order: Being a Short Discourse Concerning the Ordering of Families, Both of Whites, Blacks, and Indians* (London, 1676).

language.³⁴ As a consequence, later would-be Quaker abolitionists in monthly meetings were marginalized, threatened with disownment, or otherwise silenced. Yet while wealthy slaveowning Friends engineered their post-Keithian *thermidor*, they shared with their antislavery counterparts a fear of slave revolts and importing too many Africans into the region. To wit, the Quaker Assembly's enactment of slave codes, modeled on the Caribbean example, included measures to limit slave importation into the colony. The legal institutionalization of slavery by the turn of the eighteenth century also marked the beginning of the end of gospel order as a legal discourse in Pennsylvania. Yet unlike their rationalization that slaveowning was compatible with gospel order, Quaker masters were unwilling to justify their involvement in the slave trade on moral grounds. Over time, the trope of the Atlantic slave trade violently tearing apart African families gained ground in Quaker antislavery rhetoric, setting an important moral precedent for later eighteenth-century Quaker abolitionism, as the slave trade, then slavery itself became a target of reform and eventually a matter of religious discipline in monthly and yearly meetings.

Chapter Four explores the undercurrent of force that structured Quaker-Indian alliances in early Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania was touted – then and later – as a model of peaceful relations between settlers and Natives. In his promotional material, William Penn cultivated the image of the Lenni Lenape as peaceable and amendable to Quaker authority. Penn wanted to reassure potential settlers and investors that Pennsylvania would be free from the settler-Indian violence that plagued other colonies, but he and other Friends genuinely believed that Lenape culture was fully compatible with Quaker notions of gospel order. The Lenape proved to be willing allies, but for reasons that had nothing to do with Penn's magnanimity. Knowing the Susquehanna was available for hunting and resettlement, Lenape sachems gave Penn what he so badly needed: Indian lands on which to establish a foothold for his new colony. In return, the Lenape asked for continued access to the manufactured goods they had

³⁴ [George Keith and the Keithian Monthly Meeting], *An Exhortation and Caution to Friends concerning Buying or Keeping of Negroes ...* [New York, 1693].

long exchanged peltry for with European traders in the Delaware Valley.³⁵ Among the many European-manufactured items the Lenape desired, alcohol (particularly rum) and firearms, along with powder and shot, were especially significant. The Quaker-Lenape alliance, which allowed Friends to settle Pennsylvania without resort to armed conquest, and which laid the foundation for the myth of Penn as the founder of a colony that enjoyed unparalleled peaceful relations with Native Americans, was nourished by a lively trade in arms and liquor.³⁶

But it was alcohol, and not the arms trade, that destabilized Pennsylvania's frontier during the 1690s and early 1700s. This dissertation singles out alcohol as a major force for violence and destabilization in the Quaker-Indian alliance.³⁷ In focusing on the alcohol trade as an important vector for colonial violence, my dissertation is *not* disregarding the power struggle over land as the primary locus of conflict between European settlers and Natives in Pennsylvania, a province that, like every other Anglo-American colony, was created from Indian country – sometimes by force, sometimes through negotiation. That the Lenape and other Native groups in the region willingly traded land use rights to the provincial government for alcohol and other European goods demonstrates how inextricably linked issues of land and trade were in early Pennsylvania.

My comparative analysis of the Indian trade in guns and alcohol challenges the notion of a seemingly inexorable Indian declension in the face of European colonial expansion. Throughout the early history of Pennsylvania, Natives retained a strong presence in the region and were a force that could neither be dominated, nor easily ignored by settlers. For the Lenape and other Native groups that began to settle in the Susquehanna Valley in the 1690s, defeat at the hands of European colonizers was

³⁵ The best recent account the Lenape for this period, from which my summary is drawn, is Amy Schutt, *People of the River Valleys: The Odyssey of the Delaware Indians* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).

³⁶ Fred Anderson and Andrew Cayton, *The Dominion of War: Empire and Liberty in North America, 1500–2000* (New York: Penguin Books, 2005), argues for the significance of the arms trade for Quaker Pennsylvania's frontier security. My work adds to this insight by placing it within the context of the settler-Indian trade in alcohol, which highlights the extent of the latter's destabilizing effect.

³⁷ Peter Mancall, *Deadly Medicine: Indians and Alcohol in Early America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), remains the definitive work. Mancall's book, however, is a broad-ranging survey of the topic in colonial North America. My project adds to this work by examining the operation of alcohol on Pennsylvania's frontier in significantly greater detail for the early period.

not inevitable. With a government dominated by pacifists and no militia, Pennsylvania was militarily weak and dependent on its Native allies for its frontier security. This situation lasted well into the eighteenth century, even though by then, James Logan had begun to steer Pennsylvania toward an alliance with the Iroquois, who still claimed the Susquehanna Valley and its Native inhabitants by right of conquest.

Alcohol, though, had a different dynamic than weapons. For Natives, it was a European-manufactured trade good of special significance, carrying cultural and spiritual properties that made it unique in comparison to other items, including guns. Firearms were a practical necessity. Indian consumers used firearms not only for warfare but also for hunting, which brought in food for Indian communities and peltry to trade with settlers. Alcohol, by contrast, had no such practical value for the Lenape and other Native groups in the region. Indians drank for the same reasons Quakers and other European settlers did – to get intoxicated. Indians also drank because they believed alcohol gave them medicinal and religious power. But alcohol also caused major problems for both Indians and Quakers. Quakers struggled against immoderate drinking, and Native leaders from the Delaware and Susquehanna Valleys consistently complained to provincial government officials that European traders used alcohol to cheat Indian customers and that rampant Indian intoxication was weakening their communities. Indian complaints about the trade in alcohol dominated treaty sessions, at times outweighing other diplomatic concerns. Quaker reformers agreed with Native leaders that the trade promoted excessive drunkenness, and the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting made the selling of rum and other strong drinks to Indians a disciplinary offense. Perhaps more troubling from the provincial government's point of view, alcohol also facilitated drunken trading sessions between Indian and European settlers that frequently led to violent encounters, and occasionally even murder.

As Chapter Four suggests, Indian complaints about alcohol underscore the limitations of gospel order as a Quaker discourse on noncoercive government. Indians continued to demand it, and European traders were all too happy to meet that demand in exchange for furs. The lucrative fur trade guaranteed

that alcohol would continue to flow into Pennsylvania's frontier, regardless of the protests of Native leaders and Quaker reformers. While monthly and yearly meetings pressured Quaker merchants to refrain from selling Indians alcohol, they were powerless to stop non-Quaker traders from doing so. Neither, seemingly, could the provincial government, despite the many promises to Native leaders that the trade would be curbed. Ironically, the one man largely responsible for expanding the supply of alcohol into Pennsylvania's frontier was James Logan – a Quaker. Using his position as provincial secretary land agent for the provincial government, Logan made a fortune supplying traders with alcohol and other goods on credit to obtain pelts at a very favorable price. Besides indebting traders to himself, Logan used his supply of alcohol to Indians as a weapon to obtain lands he coveted in the Susquehanna Valley, lands he parceled out to speculators for personal profit. Logan was never disciplined by Friends for his actions, even though the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting repeatedly sanctioned the sale of liquor to Natives. Many of Logan's colleagues from the yearly meeting were also complicit in displacing their Native allies through land speculation, buying up tracts in the Susquehanna Valley. While Friends recognized Indian and Quaker intoxication as a moral problem, they were unable or unwilling to see alcohol as a symbolically violent weapon advancing the European colonization of Pennsylvania's frontier. And even if they had, they were even less willing to acknowledge their own role in it.

The final chapter, Chapter Five, situates the Quaker peace testimony within the broader framework of British imperial authority in America. By the time of Pennsylvania's founding, Friends on both sides of the Atlantic had achieved a rough consensus on the peace testimony. Many Friends, perhaps most, eschewed killing and direct participation in warfare as sinful and were willing to suffer fines, distraint of property, and imprisonment in lieu of military service. Yet Friends at this time generally did not object to *indirect* complicity in armed conflict, such as paying taxes earmarked for military purposes by a government in wartime. Because Friends affirmed the right of government as an institution to use force to keep civil order, they did not expect magistrates, even Quaker ones, to follow

a strict pacifist ethic. In contrast to modern variations of pacifism, early modern Friends seemed to care more about their own salvation and less about how the violent actions of others caused human suffering. Before the mid-eighteenth century, Friends generally refused to make the peace testimony a matter of discipline. If a Quaker bore arms and participated in some military action (as some did in colonial America), the monthly meeting to which he belonged generally refused to intervene, reserving judgment for God alone. Not all Friends were pacifists, and even those who did take the peace testimony seriously interpreted its meaning variously.³⁸

The peace testimony in Pennsylvania should have caused little problem in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Quakers were firmly in control of the government, there was no compulsory militia, and for the period of this study, the colony suffered no enemy incursions, Native or French Canadian. When the royalist Governor of New York or the Crown government demanded war taxes from Pennsylvania, as they did during King William's War (1689-1698) and Queen Anne's War (1702-1713), Quaker magistrates collected and paid the imposts with little fuss. The Assembly even came up with its own rationale, designating the war taxes for the "King's use" or the "Queen's use," implying that whatever the monarchy or the Governor of New York did with the money was on their souls. And that was that.

Except that was not quite the end of the story. Even with the general consensus on the peace testimony along the lines described above, it still caused Friends in early Pennsylvania considerable grief and anxiety. George Fox and other early Friends gave the peace testimony a dualist framework that relativized the authority of "carnal" temporal governments in favor of Friends' spiritual authority. Such rhetoric made sense in Restoration England or Barbados, where political authorities viewed Quakers with suspicion or hostility. In Pennsylvania, however, Friends *were* the government and Quaker civic and religious authority were hopelessly intertwined. Thus, the meaning and context of the

³⁸ This is a summation of interpretations forwarded by Hermann Wellenreuther, "The Political Dilemma of the Quakers in Pennsylvania, 1681-1748," *PMHB* 94 (April 1970): 135-72; and Meredith Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace: Quaker Pacifism in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

peace testimony changed, by necessity, as Friends assumed the mantle of state power. Not surprisingly, Keithians and other disaffected Quakers in the colony turned the carnal/spirit dualism of the peace testimony against Friends in government, arguing they had betrayed Quaker peace principles by inflicting corporal and capital punishments, sending armed men to capture pirates, and raising taxes in support of the imperial war effort.

Accused by the Keithians of betraying their pacifist principles, provincial Friends were maligned by their other enemies as too pacifist. Friends may have wanted Pennsylvania to be free from the entanglements of organized warfare, but this was impossible. The Protestant coup d'état that put William III and Mary on the English throne in 1689 accelerated the Crown's efforts to centralize the commercial and military administration of the empire and to reign in the independence of proprietary and charter colonial governments in North America.³⁹ Anglicans and royalist officials used the peace testimony and the absence of a formal militia in Pennsylvania as a wedge issue to undermine Quaker authority. Indian raids along the New York and New England frontier, and the perception that French Canada was behind them, also motivated metropolitan and colonial administrators to organize a coordinated military response from all the Anglo-American colonies north of the Chesapeake. Pennsylvania's distinctive legal culture, which the militia issue both epitomized and symbolized, was in tension with the expansion of British imperial authority.

Provincial Friends, beset by challenges to their authority from all sides, stubbornly clung to a rather narrow interpretation of the peace testimony – yes to war taxes, no to the militia – but that position had to be cultivated and maintained; it was not preordained. By the early eighteenth century, they had succeeded, but at a price. While there was still no militia in the colony, most of the Quaker-inflected laws that gave Pennsylvania its distinctive legal culture were gradually replaced by a common law system more in line with British imperial standards. The institutionalization of slavery, the gradual

³⁹ See Ian K. Steele, "The Anointed, the Appointed, and the Elected: Governance of the British Empire, 1689-1784," in in *Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. 2: *The Eighteenth Century*, ed. P.J. Marshall (Oxford, 1998), 105-127.

withdrawal of the Lenape and other Native groups from the Susquehanna Valley, and the silencing of reformers and dissenters within Quaker meetings would all come back to haunt later generations of Friends, especially at the outset of the Seven Years' War, when global imperial conflict finally came crashing down on Pennsylvania.

My work routinely employs the term “discourse” to mean a rationale or logic that shapes institutions, human thinking, and behavior. Gospel order, as the “logic” of noncoercive Quaker government, encompassed how Friends attempted to order themselves and others in a manner conducive to their peace principles. It was manifested in their political and religious texts, in their speech, in their manner of worship, and in the operation of the provincial government. My dissertation also employs the term “noncoercive,” but it is not intended to connote “without force.” Instead, the term is intended to convey the Quakers' belief that they could ultimately govern themselves and others without resort to killing and physical violence.

In using the term “noncoercive,” this dissertation does not ignore the fact that early Pennsylvania courts imposed the death penalty (though extremely rarely), and inflicted corporal punishments on those convicted of breaching the colony's legal-moral code. While it could be argued that ruling Friends were simply acting from considerations of *realpolitik*, my dissertation views the entire spectrum of force that defined Quaker governance in early Pennsylvania, with all its limitations and contradictions, as part of their discourse on noncoercion. Context is important. From the early modern Quaker standpoint, whipping was more “noncoercive” as a punishment than physical mutilation. And while early Pennsylvania had the death penalty, the infrequency of its application became another facet of this logic. The racial and gendered dimensions of Quaker noncoercion are crucial. For early modern Friends, “noncoercive” governance did not preclude whipping women for sexual offenses, or enslaving Africans in the colony, though it did come to mean limiting the growth of slavery in Pennsylvania by restricting slave importations.

As a critical model, my dissertation makes use of Foucault's theory on governmentality.

According to Foucault, governmentality is the “art of governing men” that gradually displaced monarchical forms of power and authority beginning in the eighteenth century. Unlike monarchical forms of authority, in which kings or queens impose their will on subjects from “above,” governmentality, as Foucault describes it, cultivates subjects from *within* a population, deploying a plurality of disciplinary techniques in multiple institutions, such as prisons, hospitals, and schools. Because its operation of power is diffuse, governmentality renders centralized forms of authority, particularly the monarchy, obsolete. Crucially, Foucault argues that governmentality renders brute force unnecessary because the subjects within its jurisdiction will ultimately internalize its discursive logic through self-discipline and self-scrutiny.⁴⁰

Foucault’s theory on governmentality is relevant to a study of early modern Quaker governance and its relationship to sovereignty. Through household discipline, monthly meetings attempted to cultivate peaceable Quaker subjects, while ruling Friends, mostly through the provincial courts, encouraged Pennsylvania’s non-Quaker subjects to internalize gospel order discourse. Gospel order, supported by a rhetoric of peace, formed the basis of Quaker sovereignty in early Pennsylvania. Foucault conceived governmentality as separate from sovereignty, which he associated with the monarchy. Recently, however, Andrew Neal argues that Foucault’s theory of governmentality offers a more complex way of viewing the problem of sovereignty, challenging the traditional “Hobbesian” model that posits a totalizing “system of power with a single center.”⁴¹ This dissertation lends support to that contention. Sovereignty – understood here to mean that which ultimately held sway in the hearts, minds, bodies, and souls of early Pennsylvanians – was at stake in the moral debates over the militia, the peace testimony, the death penalty, slavery, and the Indian alcohol trade. As Friends grappled with their relationship to peace and violence, they gradually staked out the parameters of

⁴⁰ Foucault’s theories on governmentality are explored in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality: With Two Lectures by and an Interview with Michel Foucault*, ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, Peter Miller (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 87-104.

⁴¹ Foucault explored the concept of sovereignty in *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College De France, 1975-1976* (Picador, 2003); Andrew Neal, “Cutting Off the King’s Head: Foucault’s ‘Society Must Be Defended’ And the Problem of Sovereignty,” *Alternatives* 29 (2004): 373-98; quotation on p. 375.

Pennsylvania's sovereignty, setting the colony apart from other colonies, and even the British Empire itself. Although seemingly ethereal, the struggle over gospel order, and thus sovereignty, had real-world consequences for how Friends governed the colony, their relations with each other, and with their African, Native, and European settler neighbors.⁴²

Beyond critical theory, this dissertation engages with several historiographical fields. This project would not have been possible without the pioneering field of Atlantic history, and particularly the scholarship on slavery and the slave trade, which made much of Atlantic history possible.⁴³ My work is also equally indebted to New Indian history scholarship, which established the centrality of Native perspectives to North American history.⁴⁴ Susan Amussen's work on early modern English households is especially influential. Amussen underscored the prevalence of household and familial metaphors in early modern discussions of political and social order, and her work highlights the importance of violence regulation in maintaining the legitimacy of patriarchal authority in early modern English households.⁴⁵ Kathleen Brown's *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, Anxious Patriarchs* guides my understanding of the relationship between gender and race in early America.⁴⁶ Even more influential for this dissertation is Philippe Rosenberg's October 2004 article, "Thomas Tryon and the Seventeenth-Century Dimensions of Antislavery" in the *William and Mary Quarterly*. Drawing on Amussen, Rosenberg argues that pre-Enlightenment early moderns were capable of identifying and

⁴² My framing of sovereignty as a set of discursive practices differs from Lauren Benton's recent conception of colonial sovereignty following geographic conduits to transmit European law to extra-European spaces; see Lauren Benton, *A Search for Sovereignty: Law and Geography in European Empires, 1400–1900* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

⁴³ The literature on slavery and the creation of the Atlantic World is too massive to rehearse here, but several key works include Sidney W. Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Penguin, 1985); Philip Curtin, *The Rise and Fall of the Plantation Complex* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990); John Thornton, *Africa and Africans in the Making of the Atlantic World, 1400–1800*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); see also Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic* (Boston: Beacon, 2000); and Alison Games, "Atlantic History: Definitions, Challenges, and Opportunities," *AHR* 111(2006): 741-757.

⁴⁴ For an assessment of the field of New Indian History, see Daniel Richter, "Whose Indian History?" *WMQ* 50 (1993), 379-93.

⁴⁵ Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988).

⁴⁶ Kathleen Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

condemning cruelty on their own terms and that seventeenth-century moral commentators fused their patriarchal concerns about orderly households into a coherent and wide-ranging critique of plantation slavery in the Americas.⁴⁷

On the relationship between violence and governance, this dissertation takes seriously the interpretive framework of John Smolenski and Thomas Humphrey's edited anthology, *New World Orders: Violence, Sanction, and Authority in the Colonial Americas* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005). In the introduction, "The Ordering of Authority in the Colonial Americas," Smolenski usefully defines the problem of violence regulation as "conceptions of which forms of violence were appropriate (and when) and of who were appropriate objects of violence."⁴⁸ This dissertation follows their contention that the regulation of violence was central to the production of colonial authority (and by implication, sovereignty) in America.

My work engages centrally with Meredith Weddle's definitive work on the Quaker peace testimony. Focusing on the experience of Rhode Island Friends during King Philip's War (1675-6), Weddle concludes that Quakers interpreted the meaning of their peace testimony in the seventeenth century variously. Quaker responses to the problem of violence, according to Weddle, fell along a spectrum of belief and behavior, ranging from pacifism to more direct complicity in warfare. Her work also demonstrates that Quaker pacifism was individualistic, as each Friend had to work out the meaning of the peace testimony for themselves. Early modern Quaker pacifists, she contends, were not humanitarians. Instead, they looked to their own salvation and did not worry about how the actions of others, or even their own indirect actions, contributed to violence. Weddle's work is revisionist, taking issue with what she calls the traditional "pietistic" interpretation of Quaker scholars who assume that Friends had always embraced pacifism and that the meaning of that pacifism was always universally

⁴⁷ Philippe Rosenberg, "Thomas Tryon and the Seventeenth-Century Dimensions of Antislavery," *WMQ* 61 (October 2004), 609-42.

⁴⁸ John Smolenski and Thomas J. Humphrey, eds. *New World Orders: Violence, Sanction and Authority in the Early Modern Americas, 1500-1825* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press); Smolenski, "Introduction: The Ordering of in the Colonial Americas," 14.

understood and practiced.⁴⁹

This dissertation accepts these claims but seeks to move scholarly discussions about the peace testimony in Pennsylvania beyond the issue of whether or not Friends were consistently pacifist (they were not) or whether their pacifism was “modern” or humanitarian (it was not). Quaker peace discourse was crucial to early Pennsylvania governance, just as their complicity in colonial violence was. The two were deeply interconnected, and as this dissertation argues, uncovering the operation of peace and violence in early Pennsylvania is critical for the broader historical understanding of colonialism in America and for understanding the relevance of Quaker pacifism to the themes of race, gender, and empire in early American history.

⁴⁹ See Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace*, 3-11; quotation on p. 8.

Chapter One

‘The Eyes of Many Are On Us’: The Struggle for Gospel Order in Quaker Pennsylvania

On March 4, 1681, Charles II granted William Penn 45,000 square miles of strategic North American territory situated between New York and the Chesapeake. It was one of the largest land grants ever awarded by an English monarch to a non-royal subject. The grant was all the more striking because the proprietor was a Quaker, a member of a reputedly heretical pacifist sect that refused to swear oaths or take up arms in wartime. Charles II was indebted to Penn’s father, William Penn, Sr., a Royal Navy admiral who once served under Oliver Cromwell, a fact the Stuart monarch conveniently overlooked. Admiral Penn had served Charles during the Anglo-Dutch wars of the 1660s, spending £11,000 of his own money to keep the Royal Navy provisioned. When the elder Penn died in 1670, the younger Penn inherited the king’s debt. But Penn was also seriously indebted. Despite his affirmation of simplicity as a Quaker, Penn lived like an aristocrat, and his lavish spending outstripped the income he earned from his father’s estates in England and Ireland. Penn likely used the king’s debt as leverage to obtain Pennsylvania.⁵⁰ But Charles also gained in the bargain. Not only did he conveniently eliminate a debt without spending hard currency, Charles included sufficient provisions in the charter that guaranteed Penn would be beholden to his strategic interests in America at little cost to his own purse.⁵¹

Whatever his promises to Charles, William Penn had other interests in Pennsylvania. Although he advertised widely for settlers, Penn envisioned Pennsylvania as a Quaker colony, one that would be governed according to Quaker notions of “gospel order.” Gospel order was a language of peace and a

⁵⁰ Richard S. Dunn, “William Penn and the Selling of Pennsylvania, 1681-1685,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 127 (October 1983): 322-9; Mary Maples Dunn, “The Personality of William Penn,” in *The World of William Penn*, eds. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 3-14. For Admiral Penn’s naval career, see Granville Penn, *Memorials of the Professional Life and Times of Sir William Penn*, 2 vols. (London, 1833).

⁵¹ Stephen Saunders Webb, “‘The Peaceable Kingdom’: Quaker Pennsylvania in the Stuart Empire,” in *World Of William Penn*, eds. Dunn and Dunn, 173-194.

discourse on family and household government. In the seventeenth century, Friends valued patriarchy and deference, but they tempered this with the conviction that husbands and wives, parents and children, and masters and servants should conduct their relations with each other in spirit of love.⁵² If peaceful relations governed the household, Friends reasoned, gospel order would radiate outward and by degrees redeem the larger world, thus eventually rendering violence and coercion in all its forms superfluous. To achieve gospel order in their families and households, Friends instituted disciplinary practices in their religious meetings based on arbitration. Friends who resisted the intervention of their peers and elders in the meeting faced “noncoercive” sanctions, including “disownment,” or expulsion from the meeting. The resolution of conflict to achieve collective harmony was the quintessential expression of Quaker gospel order.⁵³

In early Pennsylvania, gospel order was a discourse on governing peaceable subjects, and it was inflected throughout Pennsylvania’s legal culture. If the Quaker meeting was the primary site for regulating Friends’ households, provincial law and the court system became the primary means for Friends to inculcate gospel order in the colony. This was especially critical since non-Quaker settlers would eventually outnumber Friends by the turn of the eighteenth century. By then, Pennsylvania’s laws more closely conformed to British imperial standards, especially the provincial criminal code. But for as long as Friends retained their dominant position in government, gospel order discourse remained the *de facto* moral law in the colony. By fashioning Pennsylvania as a gospel order colony, Friends cultivated a form of Quaker sovereignty in the late seventeenth century that stood at the margins of English imperial forms of authority in early America.

Pennsylvania Quakers, like other settler groups, were deeply complicit in colonial violence, and they struggled to define their relationship to that violence. As a discourse on peaceable government,

⁵² Barry Levy, *Quakers and the American Family: British Settlement in the Delaware Valley* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

⁵³ John Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers: The Making of Creole Culture in Colonial Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 29-30, defines gospel order as “a process clarifying particular points of Quaker theology and establishing a set of practices through which local meetings could promote piety and discipline wayward Friends.”

Quaker gospel order was above all else an attempt to regulate violence, at the level of the household and for the colony at large. The first half of this chapter explores the ways in which gospel order discourse underpinned the early promotional literature of Pennsylvania and the founding constitutional texts of the colony in the late seventeenth century. In the second half, this chapter will examine gospel order as a disciplinary practice that Friends wielded in their meetings and in the provincial county courts. In both their meeting and in provincial courts, Friends dealt with the problems of intimate and domestic violence, particularly sexual violence and spousal abuse. Understanding how Friends dealt with the problem of intimate violence is crucial to understanding how they negotiated their relationship to other forms of colonial violence.

The origins of gospel order lay not in Pennsylvania, but rather in the English Quaker movement's transformation from a loose sect to a formal denomination.⁵⁴ When George Fox began his public ministry in the late 1640s, the charismatic founder of the Society of Friends attracted hundreds of religious separatists in the northern regions and Midlands of England who shared his vision for spiritual egalitarianism. Early Quaker preachers in the late 1640s and early 1650s preached a form of universalism, arguing that all humans, regardless of gender or social distinctions, could experience the saving inward light of Christ without recourse to Scripture, paid ministers, and church sacraments such as baptism and communion. The belief in spiritual equality led early Friends to embrace lay female preachers and reject paying deference to established political and religious leaders. This meant Friends refused to pay church tithes, support an ordained clergy, swear oaths before magistrates, or participate in any established or liturgical forms of worship. Friends also wore unadorned "plain style" clothing and refused to doff their hats before magistrates. In speech, Quakers spoke to each other simply and directly and addressed their social betters using the familiar "thee" and "thou" instead of the more

⁵⁴ The following summary is taken from Rosemary Moore, *The Light in Their Consciences: Early Quakers in Britain, 1646-1666* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000). The classic account of Quakerism's origins is William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1912).

deferential “you.” By openly rejecting worldly authority and fashions, early Friends cultivated a socially-leveling and spiritually-egalitarian religious society.⁵⁵

The spiritual egalitarianism of Friends won them many converts throughout England (over 35,000 by the time of the Restoration) as well as in Scotland and Ireland, but the movement’s dramatic growth – and persecution – prompted the Quaker leadership to structure individual meetings into a more tightly controlled, hierarchical network.⁵⁶ Seventeenth-century English Friends straddled the tension between their affirmation of individual revelation and their need to retain a collective identity. That tension was worsened by external pressure from magistrates and religious authorities who loathed Quakers and their refusal to show them proper deference. The problem of persecution escalated dramatically after the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660. Seeking to distance itself from the radical republicanism of the English Commonwealth era, the royalist-dominated Parliament enacted a series of statutes against religious separatists, known as the Clarendon Code, which aimed to reassert the episcopal authority of the Church of England. One of the statutes -- the Quaker Act of 1662 -- directly targeted Friends by outlawing their religious gatherings and penalizing those who scrupled against swearing oaths in court.⁵⁷ The Clarendon Code spurred an episodic but intense persecution of Friends during the Restoration. Thousands of Quakers suffered jail, fines, and the distraint of their property for refusing to pay tithes and for failing to disperse their public religious gatherings. Magistrates often employed brutal tactics to break up Quaker meetings. Quakers responded to the persecution by denouncing their religious enemies in prophetic fashion, such as going naked as a sign and interrupting church services, public rituals that often invited further persecution.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ In addition to Moore, my summary of early Quaker beliefs draws from Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, and Hugh Barbour and J. William Frost, *The Quakers* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988).

⁵⁶ The figure is taken from Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 20.

⁵⁷ Newton Key, “Clarendon Code,” in *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England 1603-1689*, ed. RH Fritze and WB Robison (Westport CT, Greenwood, 1996), 98-9; Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685* (London: Penguin Books, 2006), 52-55.

⁵⁸ On the persecution of English Quakers, see John Miller, ““A Suffering People’: English Quakers and their Neighbours, 1650-1700” *Past and Present* 188 (August 2005): 71-103.

Almost inevitably, internal cleavages fractured the movement's spectacular growth and hampered the ability of Friends to combat their persecution. Early Quakers elevated the authority of inward revelation, but individual religious experience had to be tested against the collective "sense of the meeting." Without their organized hierarchy of meetings, the Society of Friends would have likely dissipated or disappeared altogether, much like the Ranters and many other Interregnum-era religious sects did after the Restoration. Although early Friends acknowledged Fox as their leader, his authority, and that of his "First Publishers of Truth," the itinerant preachers who supported him, did not go unchallenged.⁵⁹ James Nayler, a former Parliamentarian soldier and charismatic lay Quaker preacher, garnered a large following that almost overshadowed Fox's leadership until Parliament ordered him whipped, branded, and imprisoned in 1656 for riding into Bristol on a donkey in imitation of Christ's entry into Jerusalem.⁶⁰ In the 1670s, a faction led by John Wilkinson and John Story, in defiance of Fox's authority, held meetings in private and refused to form separate women's meetings. A decade earlier, John Perrot, another itinerant Quaker preacher, objected to Friends taking their hats off during prayer and decried the practice of Friends meeting for worship at preordained times on Sundays, arguing that they should hold services whenever they were led. Both the Wilkinson-Story and Perrot factions were roundly condemned by Fox and other leading ministers, resulting in their acrimonious split from the main body of Friends, but the schism refused to go away as both sides continued the debate in print.⁶¹

In order to mitigate persecution and to prevent the Society from disintegrating, Fox organized meetings for worship and business into a more centralized hierarchy of monthly and quarterly meetings (so named for the number of times they met), with the London Yearly Meeting serving as the

⁵⁹ On the "First Publishers of Truth," see Richard T. Vann, *The Social Development of English Quakerism, 1655-1755* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), 58.

⁶⁰ For Nayler's importance as a rival to Fox's leadership, see Moore, *Light in Their Consciences*, 35-48; Leo Damrosch, *The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus: James Nayler and the Puritan Crackdown on the Free Spirit* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996).

⁶¹ My summary of the Perrot and Wilkinson-Story controversies is from Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 37-8.

overarching executive body.⁶² Fox characterized the centralization of Quaker meetings as “gospel order.”⁶³ The centralization of Quaker meetings began as early as the 1650s, when Fox’s companion and wealthy patron Margaret Fell, whom he later married, supervised and funded the publication of Quaker tracts and arbitrated disputes from her estate at Swarthmore in Lancashire. On the eve of the Restoration, the administrative center of Quakerism shifted to London, where a new generation of influential ministers and elders would emerge to dominate the life of subordinate meetings throughout Britain. The London Yearly Meeting, vested with executive authority over all other meetings, began meeting annually in 1668. The Second Day (Monday) Morning Meeting, established around 1673, oversaw the editing and publication of Quaker tracts, a not insignificant power to shape the public image of Friends. The Meeting for Sufferings, which began two years later, convened to address the persecution of Friends, especially those languishing in prison, and lobbied the Crown government for relief from the legal mandate to pay tithes and swear oaths.⁶⁴

The organization of Quaker meetings furthered the development of an internal system of governance that profoundly shaped the collective identity of the Society of Friends. By systematizing meetings, Fox and the London Quaker elite attempted to stamp out internal challenges to their authority, as well as rein in on extravagant displays of piety, such as Naylor’s march to Bristol, which threatened to unravel the movement. The ordering of Friends into a hierarchy of monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings did more than mitigate persecution, it also played a major role in defining who was a “Friend” and what set of practices constituted “legitimate,” or orthodox, Quakerism.⁶⁵ In 1672, the London Yearly Meeting, speaking on behalf of Fox and the Quaker ministerial elite, warned Friends everywhere not to engage in “imagined, unseasonable, and untimely prophesyings [sic]; which tend not

⁶² On the organization of Quaker meetings, see H. Larry Ingle, *First Among Friends: George Fox and the Creation of Quakerism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

⁶³ Moore, *Light in their Consciences*, 129.

⁶⁴ William C. Braithwaite, *Second Period of Quakerism* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1919), 253-81; Ingle, *First Among Friends*, 256; Bonnelyn Kunze, *Margaret Fell and the Rise of Quakerism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994).

⁶⁵ Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 38-43.

only to stir up persecution, but also to the begetting [of] airy and uncertain expectations.”⁶⁶ London Friends also issued a “Testimony of the Brethren” that proclaimed their authority in the “public business” of Friends and restricted the right to preach and print tracts on behalf of the Society to those who remained in unity with them.⁶⁷

Internal Quaker governance extended to household relations and the resolution of disputes, refining disciplinary procedures that had evolved alongside the organization of Friends’ meetings. Quaker meetings regulated members’ speech and dress, and sanctioned errant Friends for behavioral infractions that ranged from public drunkenness to incurring bad debts.⁶⁸ Despite the Quakers’ affirmation of patriarchy, Fox insisted on the inclusion of separate women’s meetings, giving them authority over the care of orphans, poor relief, and the oversight of female Friends. Women’s meetings also played a prominent role in regulating Quaker marriage practices. Quaker couples engaged to be married had to be “cleared” by their respective meetings, but Fox insisted that the male suitor had to seek further approval from his partner’s local women’s meeting as well.⁶⁹ Friends also developed a system of arbitration in their meetings designed to take the place of the secular and ecclesiastical English courts, where they were unlikely to get a fair hearing. In lieu of a magistrate, Monthly meetings appointed elders, or “overseers,” to ensure conformity with Quaker discipline and arbitrate disputes that arose between and among members. Stubborn Friends who resisted the advice and discernment of their elders risked censure by their meeting, and in severe cases, disownment.⁷⁰ The threat of banishment from the Society of Friends was the ultimate sanction overseers and meetings wielded to

⁶⁶ Quotation in Rebecca Larson, *Daughters of Light: Quaker Women Preaching and Prophesying in the Colonies and Abroad, 1700-1775* (UNC Press Books, 2000), 36.

⁶⁷ Moore, *Light in Their Consciences*, 224-5.

⁶⁸ For gospel order as a disciplinary practice, see Jack Marietta, *Reformation of American Quakerism, 1748-2783* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984), 4-31; Frederick Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia, 1682-1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948), 75, 251-2.

⁶⁹ Larson, *Daughters of Light*, 31.

⁷⁰ My argument that gospel order arbitration was an alternative to the legal system follows Offutt, *Of 'Good Laws' and 'Good Men'*, 146-152. For the English Quaker hostility to courts, see Craig Horle, *The Quakers and the English Legal System, 1660-1668* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988).

compel recalcitrant members into reconciliation with those whom they had aggrieved. Over time, Friends would use the term “gospel order” most often in reference to this system of dispute resolution.

Penn was an aristocratic convert to Quakerism, and as one of the leading figures among the second generation of Friends, he played a central role in shaping gospel order discourse.⁷¹ Penn joined the Society of Friends in 1667 while he was in Ireland managing his father’s estates. He had already experimented with nonconformity earlier that decade when he was expelled from Oxford for refusing to attend Church of England services. His conversion to Quakerism enraged his father, but it proved to be a boon to Friends. Penn was wealthy, literate, religiously devout, and possessed a good legal education. A gifted political thinker and theologian, Penn ably defended Quaker principles in numerous books, pamphlets, and treatises. He argued for the right of religious dissenters to worship openly in court and preached before large crowds in London, and his personal connections to the Stuart monarchy secured the release of many Friends from jail. Penn was active in both the Second Day Morning Meeting and the Meeting for Sufferings, and in 1677 he accompanied Fox on his missionary trip to Holland and Germany.⁷² While at the Friends’ general meeting in Amsterdam, he carefully transcribed their deliberations “concerning Gospel Order,” which outlined procedures for “honest friends” to arbitrate and resolve disputes.⁷³ Upon his return to England, Penn continued work on behalf of Friends, arbitrating disputes, serving as an overseer, and at the personal request of Fox, authoring a printed rebuttal to the Wilkinson-Story faction.⁷⁴

As proprietor, Penn believed he was fulfilling a divine purpose in colonizing Pennsylvania. Only months after receiving his charter in 1681, Penn wrote to James Harrison, an English Quaker shoemaker from Lancashire who would himself emigrate to Pennsylvania only a few years later, and

⁷¹My summary of Penn’s biography draws from Mary Maples Dunn, *William Penn, Politics and Conscience* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967); Melvin Endy, *William Penn and Early Quakerism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973).

⁷²William Penn, *An Account of W. Penn’s Travails in Holland and Germany* (London, 1694); See William Hull, *William Penn and the Dutch Quaker Migration to Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: Patterson & White Co., 1935), 1-52.

⁷³ William Penn, “An Account of My Journey into Holland and Germany,” Penn Manuscripts 1680-1715, p. 5-6 in Penn Family Papers, Collection 485A, Historical Society of Pennsylvania (hereafter HSP).

⁷⁴ William Penn, *A Brief Examination and State of Liberty Spiritual ...* (London, 1681).

gushed over the prospect that his colony would become “an example ... Sett up to the nations. [That] there may be room there, tho not here [in England], for such an holy experiment.”⁷⁵ Penn’s remark that Pennsylvania would become an example to the nations, a claim he repeated in another letter, referenced the “root of Jesse” prophecy in Isaiah 11:10 (“him shall the nations seek, and his dwellings shall be glorious”), which many Christians at the time read as a foretelling of the Gospel narrative of Christ’s incarnation and salvation of humanity.⁷⁶ In making these references, Penn was literally inserting Pennsylvania’s founding into the larger biblical narrative of salvation.

The language Penn used to convey his religious vision for Pennsylvania often carried millennial overtones. In another 1681 letter addressed to Thomas Janney, for example, Penn wrote, “God will plan[t] Americha & it shall have its day: the 5th kingdom or Glorious day of Christ in us Reserved to the last dayes.”⁷⁷ Penn’s “5th kingdom” was an allusion to a biblical prophecy in Daniel, in which the author described a vision of four great empires, represented metaphorically as four beasts terrorizing the earth. Medieval and early modern Christian commentators have traditionally interpreted Daniel’s four beasts to represent the Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman empires. The “fifth” empire was understood to be the final kingdom, or dominion, when the saints would rule for a millennium with Christ, an event associated with the apocalypse.⁷⁸ Penn’s allusion to Pennsylvania as the “5th kingdom” was a not-so-subtle reference to his conviction that, with the Society of Friends at the helm, his colony would play a pivotal role in the cosmic salvation of humanity. Even the name Penn gave his chief port city, Philadelphia, aside from the Greek meaning of “brotherly love,” alluded to the church of

⁷⁵ Penn to James Harrison, “Extracts of Letters, Memorandums Relative to Pennsylvania,” August 25, 1681, Parrish Family Papers, 1614-1874, Box 4, p.13, (Phi) 1653, HSP. Also quoted in *The Papers of William Penn* (hereafter *PWP*), vol. 2, eds. Mary Dunn and Richard Dunn (University Park, Pa., 1982), 108.

⁷⁶ J. William Frost, “William Penn’s Experiment in the Wilderness: Promise and Legend,” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (hereafter *PMHB*) (October 1983): 584.

⁷⁷ Frost, “William Penn’s Experiment,” 580.

⁷⁸ Leo F. Solt, “The Fifth Monarchy Men: Politics and the Millennium,” *Church History* 30 (September 1961): 314-321; Bernard Capp, *Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism* (London: Faber, 1972).

Philadelphia, one of the seven churches in Revelations 3:8, “the city of my God, the New Jerusalem which comes down from my God out of heaven.”⁷⁹

Penn was hardly alone in seeing Pennsylvania as a “holy experiment,” and his colony generated excitement among Quakers in Europe and America. To encourage settlement and attract investors, Penn published promotional tracts that trumpeted the availability of land for sale, and he relied on the epistolary network of Quaker meetings to help get the word out.⁸⁰ Several of Penn’s promotional tracts were published in several editions and circulated throughout the British Isles and on the European continent. Penn’s skill in promoting his new colony stemmed from his previous success in promoting colonies in America. In 1674, John Fenwick and Edward Billing, two English Quaker investors, purchased Lord Berkeley’s proprietary share of New Jersey, thus splitting the colony into two and carving out for themselves the western portion. By 1676, Billing’s debts became so unmanageable that three Quaker investors, including Penn, took over as trustees. Penn and the trustees promoted the West Jersey colony widely, successfully attracting investors and drawing as many as 1,400 colonists, mostly Quaker, by 1681.⁸¹

Interest in West Jersey paled in comparison to Pennsylvania. Numerous writings from Quakers at the time make adulatory references to Pennsylvania, even from those who never settled there. William Loddington, a Quaker convert and prominent overseer from Buckinghamshire, enumerated the spiritual and material benefits of removing to the American plantations in a widely-circulated tract, *Plantation Work the Work of This Generation* (1682), and though his tract addressed the English colonies broadly, he clearly had Pennsylvania in mind.⁸² Loddington actually never emigrated to

⁷⁹ Frost. “William Penn’s Experiment,” 584-5.

⁸⁰ Richard S. Dunn, “William Penn and the Selling of Pennsylvania, 1681–1685,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 127 (October 1983): 322-329.

⁸¹ John Pomfret, *The Province of West New Jersey, 1609-1702: A History of the Origins of an American Colony* (Octagon Books, 1976); Ned Landsmen, *Crossroads of Empire: The Middle Colonies in British North America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010), 45, 60.

⁸² [William Loddington], *Plantation Work the Work of this Generation ...* (London, 1682); Loddington appears in the monthly meeting minutes for Uppeside Buckinghamshire; see *The Minute Book of the Monthly Meeting of the Society of Friends for the Uppeside of Buckinghamshire, 1669-1690*, vol. 1 (Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society, 1937).

Pennsylvania, but he wrote a poem about Philadelphia in 1685 that praised the city as a “Brother & Friend” and “Pensilvania’s blest Metropolis.”⁸³ James Harrison was a Lancashire shoemaker who followed his neighbors to Pennsylvania with family and servants in tow, purchasing 5,000 acres of land from Penn, mostly in Bucks County, where he worked as a steward at Penn’s estate in Falls Township. Harrison trusted Penn’s “good intentions” and believed he was working to build a “blessed govern[en]t” in Pennsylvania, “according to the will of god.”⁸⁴

Pennsylvania attracted the attention of thousands of English Friends and non-Quaker Europeans. Francis Daniel Pastorius, a German lawyer from Frankfurt, emigrated to Pennsylvania in 1683 to found the Germantown settlement near Philadelphia as a religious refuge for his fellow Pietists back home. Pastorius lauded Penn as a man of “Love & Peace”⁸⁵ and begged his parents to leave the “Babylonian vanities” of their native Germany and join him in Pennsylvania.⁸⁶ A 1684 epistle from English Friends referred to Pennsylvania as their “new British Canaan” in America.⁸⁷ Even as late as 1698, when the initial euphoria over obtaining a colony had worn off, the itinerant English Quaker preacher Thomas Chalkley could still remind “Friends of Philadelphia” that “the Eyes of many In sundry parts of the World [are] on you.”⁸⁸

The founding of Pennsylvania instigated the first significant wave of voluntary mass migration to the Anglo-American plantations since the Puritan emigration to New England.⁸⁹ In the first two

⁸³ “W[illiam] L[oddington], “Verses on Philadelphia,” July 1, 1685, James Logan Papers, 1670-1749, (PHi)2011, HSP.

⁸⁴ Quotation in Craig Horle, et al., eds., *Lawmaking and Legislators in Pennsylvania: A Biographical Dictionary* (hereafter *LLP*), vol. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991), 410.

⁸⁵ Francis Daniel Pastorius, “Epibaterium Or a hearty Congratulation to William Penn,” in Marion Dexter Learned, *The Life of Francis Daniel Pastorius: The Founder of Germantown* (Philadelphia: W.J. Campbell, 1908), 211.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, *Umständige Geographische Beschreibung ...* (Frankfurt, 1700) in Alfred L. Brophy, “The Intellectual World of a Seventeenth-Century Jurist: Francis Daniel Pastorius and the Reconstruction of Pietist Thought,” in *German? American? Literature?: New Directions in German-American Studies*, Winfried Fluck and Werner Sollers, eds. (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2002), 45.

⁸⁷ George Whitehead, et. al., Epistle to Friends in “new British Canaan” [Pennsylvania], (July 2, 1684), transcribed in Pastorius, *The Young Country Clerk's Collection ...* [1692-1719], Ms. Codex 89, Rare Book and Ms. Library, Van Pelt Library, University of Pennsylvania.

⁸⁸ Thomas Chalkley, “To Friends of Philadelphia,” July 12, 1698, Jonah Thompson Collection, 1683-1854, (Phi)655, vol. 2, p. 61, HSP.

⁸⁹ Landsmen, *Crossroads*, 64-5; David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

decades of settlement, almost 18,000 colonists, nearly half of them Quaker, settled in Pennsylvania.⁹⁰ In addition to Friends, Pennsylvania attracted non-Quaker settlers from the British Isles and Germany, besides the Swedish and Dutch population already present in the Delaware Valley before 1681. In North America, Friends and non-Quaker settlers came from the surrounding colonies of New York, New Jersey, and Maryland, as well as farther afield, such as the Caribbean.⁹¹ Many of these settlers, Quaker or otherwise, came to Pennsylvania as indentured or free labor in search of cheap land to farm or to pursue mercantile and artisanal opportunities in Philadelphia.⁹² But migration to the colony was more often than not driven by a combination of religious sentiments and economic motivations. In the late seventeenth century, a diverse group of non-Quaker Europeans ascribed great religious and philosophical meaning to the founding of Pennsylvania. Pastorius's Germantown settlement, for example, attracted German Pietist immigrants, including a group of mystics who retired to Wissahickon Creek to await the apocalypse.⁹³ Thomas Tryon, a Restoration-era London hatter and antislavery writer who famously advocated for a vegetarian diet, implored the "Country-men of Pennsylvania" to hold fast to the "*Peaceable Life*" by embracing virtue and sobriety and eschewing violence.⁹⁴ Penn's policy of religious toleration opened the door to a dizzying array of religious groups, producing a truly pluralistic colony that later garnered the admiration of Voltaire and other Enlightenment thinkers.⁹⁵ As Allen Tully argues, when eighteenth-century Europeans looked to the New World, "their eyes frequently came to rest, not on Massachusetts or Virginia, but on the newer

⁹⁰ Landsmen, "Middle Colonies," 360-1.

⁹¹ In 1693, New York Governor Benjamin Fletcher complained that "more Families are dayly removing for Pensilvania ... to be eased from Taxes and detachments." See E.B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York* (Albany: Weed Parsons & Co., 1853-1887), vol. 4, 292; quoted in Cheesman Herrick, *White Servitude in Pennsylvania: Indentured and Redemption Labor in Colony and Commonwealth* (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969), 25.

⁹² James T. Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country: A Geographical Study of Early Southeastern Pennsylvania* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1976).

⁹³ Elizabeth Fisher, "Prophecies and Revelations": German Cabbalists in Early Pennsylvania," *PMHB* 109 (July 1985): 299-333.

⁹⁴ Thomas Tryon, *The Planter's Speech to His Neighbors & Country-Men of Pennsylvania, East and West Jersey* (London, 1684), 4-5.

⁹⁵ Frost, "William Penn's Experiment," 577-9.

colonies of New York and Pennsylvania.”⁹⁶

Despite Pennsylvania’s positive reception, not all Quakers supported their co-religionists’ decision to move there. Disaffected Friends occasionally suspected émigrés of abandoning them to escape persecution at home. At the time of Pennsylvania’s founding, Friends in England and Scotland were experiencing a renewed wave of persecution, the worst since the beginning of the Restoration, when popular anti-Quaker hysteria had boiled over into mob violence. Between 1681 and 1710, around five thousand English and Welsh Quakers left for Pennsylvania and the Delaware Valley. The outflow of Friends to Pennsylvania in these areas was so stark that some meetings almost entirely disappeared, leaving the remaining members bereft of ministers and elders.⁹⁷ Upon learning that John Pennington intended to migrate to Pennsylvania in 1683, William Sewel, the Dutch historian of Quakerism, confided to his friend that he could not predict “a happy outcome” for those “who change their country, and run across the sea, [so] that they may escape persecution.”⁹⁸ Persecution of Quakers in Ireland also caused resentment toward those leaving for Pennsylvania. A monthly meeting in the province of Leinster, for example, granted a “certificate of removal” to Nicholas Newland in 1682, despite their reservation that his primary reason for relocating to Pennsylvania was either out of “fearfulness of sufferings here for the testimony of Jesus” or for “courting worldly liberty.”⁹⁹ Without mentioning Pennsylvania by name, Loddington’s *Plantation Work* implicitly addressed Friends’ doubts by arguing that the Biblical injunction in Matthew 10:23 (“If they persecute you in one city, fly to another”) did not apply to “our circumstances.” Addressing the question over whether colonies like Pennsylvania enabled Friends and other religious dissenters to flee persecution, Loddington simply retorted that those who escaped the “Religious Test” in England faced a far greater “Pagan Test” from unconverted Native

⁹⁶ Alan Tully, *Forming American Politics: Ideals, Interests, and Institutions in Colonial New York and Pennsylvania* (Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 3.

⁹⁷ Jon Butler, *Becoming America: The Revolution Before 1776* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), 33.

⁹⁸ William Sewall to John Pennington, July 9, 1683, in Hull, *William Penn and the Dutch Quaker Migration*, 384.

⁹⁹ Mountmellick Monthly Meeting, Certification of Removal for Nicholas Newland, February 25, 1882, in *Ibid*, 385.

Americans.¹⁰⁰

Regardless of whether Loddington's logic persuaded his readers, Penn's promotional tracts sold many potential colonists and investors on the merits of Pennsylvania. Penn's talents at advertising equaled his theological and political abilities, and his nine promotional tracts, which he published between 1682 and 1685, circulated in England, Scotland, Ireland, Holland, and Germany.¹⁰¹ Penn's tracts generated over 500 principal investors, or so-called "First Purchasers," who bought over 700,000 acres in Pennsylvania during that time.¹⁰² Of the nine promotional tracts Penn authored, his first, *Some Account of the Province of Pennsylvania* (1681), is the most significant.¹⁰³ Penn published *Some Account* to attract non-Quaker settlers as much as win over Friends. For that reason, he omitted any specific reference to Quakerism in the tract.¹⁰⁴ And because Penn wrote the tract a year before his voyage to America, his description of the colony's topography was brief and by necessity vague. Instead, Penn devoted most of *Some Account* to outlining his vision for how Pennsylvania was to be governed and what kind of settlers he imagined would be needed to transform the colony into a prosperous and virtuous society.

Throughout the text, Penn resorted to gospel order language to argue that harmonious and productive families were at the root of good government. Penn himself did not distinguish economic rationales from religious ones, and accordingly, *Some Account* linked the promotion of commerce in Pennsylvania to the cultivation of godly households. If Pennsylvania were to become a model Christian society, Penn believed, it would have to attract virtuous patriarchs, "Industrious Husbandmen and Day-Labourers" who yearned to improve their families' welfare.¹⁰⁵ Anticipating metropolitan-oriented

¹⁰⁰ See Loddington, *Plantation Work*, 6-7.

¹⁰¹ Dunn, "Penn and the Selling of Pennsylvania," 323; see also Hope Francis Kane, "Notes on Early Pennsylvania Promotion Literature," *PMHB* 63 (April 1939): 144-168.

¹⁰² Dunn, "Penn and the Selling of Pennsylvania," 325.

¹⁰³ William Penn, *Some Account of the Province of Pennsylvania in America* (London, 1681), in Jean Soderlund, ed., *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania: A Documentary History* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983), 58-66.

¹⁰⁴ The editor's introduction makes this point on p. 58.

¹⁰⁵ Penn, *Some Account*, in *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, Soderlund, ed., 63.

criticism that Pennsylvania would sap England of its population and wealth, Penn noted that ancient Rome declined not because of its colonies but rather because ancient Romans embraced sinful “*Luxury and corruption of Manners.*” Decadent urbanized English aristocrats, Penn argued, and not colonization, were to blame for “effeminating” England’s economy, turning men into soldiers and gamblers and women “*dress themselves for a bad market.*” In an increasingly urbanized, market economy, rural Englishmen, he reasoned, were forced “to put their Children into Gentlemens Service, or sent to Towns to learn Trades,” neglecting the nation’s agricultural productivity.¹⁰⁶ In keeping with his agrarian idealism, Penn argued that Pennsylvania had room for productive artisans and farmers who could, though the cultivation and export of the province’s abundant natural resources, enrich England and its overseas empire.

Penn believed the moral economy of productive labor and well-regulated households was the basis for sound government. With a virtuous, self-governing citizenry, Pennsylvania could “Enact what Laws we please for the good prosperity and security of said Province.” On the contrary, Penn argued, the true ground of “*Plague and Wars*” was “Debauchery.” Penn needed to look no further than Restoration England for an illustration. In cities, like London, the people were rendered unfruitful for marriage because they exhausted all their time catering to the whims of “Great men,” and whatever meager savings they accrued, was usually “pine[d] away ... in some petty Shop.” This, according to Penn, prevented the “vigorous execution of our good Laws against the corruption of manners.”¹⁰⁷ While Penn’s *Some Account* offered up a vision of gospel order in Pennsylvania, Thomas Budd’s *Good Order Established in Pennsilvania & New-Jersey in America* (1685) outlined practical suggestions on how to achieve it.¹⁰⁸ An English Friend, Budd had moved to Burlington, West Jersey in 1678, two years after Penn had promoted the colony for Quaker settlement. Budd quickly grew to local political prominence in West Jersey, having served on the provincial Council and Assembly. In 1684, the

¹⁰⁶ Penn, *Some Account*, in *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, Soderlund, ed., 59-60.

¹⁰⁷ Penn, *Some Account*, in *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, Soderlund, ed., 60-2.

¹⁰⁸ Thomas Budd, *Good Order Established in Pennsilvania & New-Jersey in America* (Philadelphia, 1685).

Assembly sent Budd and Samuel Jennings to meet with George Fox and petition English Friends for their right to self-government without Edward Billing, a prominent London Quaker who ruled the colony as an absentee governor. After Friends in London ruled against his petition, Budd published *Good Order* in order to discredit Billing and his supporters.¹⁰⁹ While the tract upset Fox, Penn noted that it was “universally liked in American matters.” Indeed, Budd’s *Good Order* was noteworthy for its practical advice on colonial education and was one of the earliest Anglo-American tracts to discuss proposals for the cultivation of gospel order in Pennsylvania. To an extent, the tract paralleled Penn’s *Some Account* in its promotional survey of Pennsylvania’s abundant land, natural resources, and commercial opportunities, and Budd similarly contrasted that potential for wealth to the “distressed Condition that many thousand Families lie under in my Native Country.”¹¹⁰

Yet Budd went even further than Penn in tying Pennsylvania’s potential for commercial productivity to the welfare of households and families, infusing his practical and economic suggestions with religious import. If Pennsylvania were to prosper, he contended, schools ought to be erected throughout the province to teach “Boys and Girls in all the most useful Arts and Sciences,” where they could learn practical trades such as clock-making, shoemaking, and weaving. Budd’s proposals in *Good Order* outlined a detailed plan for classroom instruction, including his recommendation that students be examined weekly by teachers and that “the Children of poor People, and the Children of *Indians*” be enrolled and maintained free of charge, so they may have the “good Learning with the Children of Rich people.”¹¹¹ Budd then went on to describe in precise detail how he could earn eight percent interest on 5,000 acres of land by renting out to ten families one-hundred lots each and divide the remaining four thousand acres among fifty indentured servants, with every five indentured servants each getting four hundred acres. Besides the interest earned, he calculated that he would over time be able to liberate twenty families (the original ten plus their children) “from that extream Slavery that

¹⁰⁹ John Pomfret, *Colonial New Jersey: A History* (New York: Charles Scribners’s Sons, 1973), 46.

¹¹⁰ Budd, *Good Order*, 2.

¹¹¹ Budd, *Good Order*, 14-5.

attende them, by reason of great Poverty that they endured in *England*.”¹¹²

In order to underscore the religious significance of these proposals, Budd concluded *Good Order* by reprinting a 1684 epistle he had written to Friends in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. In the epistle, Budd reminded his Friends that “The Eyes of many are on us, some for Good, and some for Evil,” and he admonished them to “give a good Understanding to those that are in Authority amongst [you].” Budd understood that authority to be vested in the “Masters of Families,” enjoining provincial Quaker patriarchs to “be careful to ... keep down all Vice ... and incourage [sic] Virtue, not only in the general, but every one in his particular Family.”¹¹³

Restraining vice and promoting virtue was exactly what Penn had in mind when he drafted Pennsylvania’s constitutional “Frame of Government” in 1681. In drafting the colony’s founding legal texts, Penn drew from his significant experience in English common law. Penn was educated at Lincoln’s Inn and at Oxford, where he likely met John Locke.¹¹⁴ In 1670, London constables arrested Penn and fellow Quaker William Mead for preaching at an outdoor meeting in Gracechurch Street in violation of the Conventicle Act. Representing themselves in court, Penn and Mead secured an acquittal, and in the process, defended the right of juries to render verdicts without interference from the presiding judge. The Penn-Mead trial became a landmark case in English legal history, and Penn’s arguments during his trial were canonized and memorialized in numerous printed accounts, helping to cement the proprietor’s reputation for his legal acumen.¹¹⁵ Penn associated with some of the Restoration era’s leading figures in law and government, including the radical Algernon Sidney, whom he recruited to help draft early versions of his Frame of Government.¹¹⁶

Penn’s prior experience with proprietary government in New Jersey also prepared him for

¹¹² Budd, *Good Order*, 27.

¹¹³ Thomas Budd, Epistle to Friends in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, October 29, 1684, reprinted in Budd, *Good Order*, 37-39.

¹¹⁴ Dunn, *William Penn, Politics and Conscience*, 5-20, PWP 3: 471, n. 3.

¹¹⁵ Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 45-6; Dunn, *William Penn, Politics and Conscience*, 5-20.

¹¹⁶ See Penn’s letter to Algernon Sidney, 13 October 1681, in *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, Soderlund, ed., 111-2.

writing Pennsylvania's constitution. While his dealings with East Jersey were limited, Penn played a more extensive role in West Jersey, where the settler population in the late-seventeenth century was more predominately Quaker.¹¹⁷ Although Penn was not the sole author of the document, his name was among the signatories to the 1677 "Concessions and Agreements" of West Jersey, which laid out the colony's fundamental constitutional guarantees. The Concessions has been celebrated as one of the most radical constitutions to appear in American history. Its provisions reflected Quaker concerns, especially the concern for liberty of conscience. Accordingly, West Jersey settlers could worship freely – or not worship at all – and the colony enjoyed near universal male suffrage with minimal property restrictions and an annually-elected unicameral legislature.¹¹⁸ Reflecting Quaker peace concerns, no provision was made for an established militia in West Jersey, a more strident posture of pacifism than East Jersey's exemption of conscientious objectors from military service.¹¹⁹

In the final, published version of his *Frame of Government*, Penn amplified his concern for gospel order while he retreated from the more radical elements of the West Jersey Concessions.¹²⁰ Unlike in West Jersey, Pennsylvania was to have a bicameral legislature, with an upper house consisting of seventy-two councilors and governor, and a lower house, or "General Assembly," of two hundred members. The power of the legislature rested in the upper house, which retained the right to initiate legislation and execute the laws, establish courts, and regulate other public matters, such as trade, treaties, and establishing roads.¹²¹ Penn, as proprietor and governor, retained the right to appoint all county and provincial officeholders, including the sheriff and justices of the peace. There would be an annually-elected General Assembly, but only one-third of the Provincial Council, reserved for men of property and the "most eminent for virtue Wisdom and Substance," was slated for election every

¹¹⁷ Ned Landsmen, *Crossroads of Empire* 45-6; John Pomfret, *Colonial New Jersey*, 34-50.

¹¹⁸ Caroline Robbins, "Laws and Governments proposed for West New Jersey and Pennsylvania, 1676-1683" *PMHB* (October 1981): 373-392; Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 54-5.

¹¹⁹ J. William Frost, "Religious Liberty in Early Pennsylvania," *PMHB* (October 1981): 430-1.

¹²⁰ "The Frame of Government and Laws Agreed Upon in England," in *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, Soderlund, ed., 118-33.

¹²¹ "Frame of Government," in *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, Soderlund, ed., 118.

year.¹²² The franchise in Pennsylvania was also restricted to males who paid scot and lot taxes, owned or rented one hundred acres, or earned fifty acres through indentured servitude.¹²³

Pennsylvania, as it was conceived by Penn, was not to embrace the radical egalitarianism implicit in early Quaker spirituality. Although generous by seventeenth-century standards, the colony's franchise was far more restrictive than the near-universal suffrage guaranteed in the West Jersey Concessions. Even Penn's famous inclusion of religious liberty in the *Frame of Government* was a retrenchment in comparison to West Jersey. Pennsylvania guaranteed religious freedom for those who publically acknowledged one God (thus implicitly making room for Jews and Catholics), but the *Laws Agreed Upon in England*, which supplemented the *Frame*, restricted provincial office to those who "profess[ed] faith in Jesus Christ."¹²⁴ And unlike in West Jersey, Pennsylvania's constitutional framework did not protect public displays of irreligion, such as non-observance of the Sabbath.¹²⁵ While Pennsylvania's constitution retained a basic English common law framework, there were significant omissions and inclusions. The changes reflected Penn's belief in the power of government to fashion peaceful subjects in a pluralistic society without resort to coercion and repression, especially in matters of conscience. The most significant omission of all was the militia. No provision was made in Pennsylvania for the maintenance of a militia though taxation and the compulsory mustering of able-bodied men. The militia system was the backbone of defense in the Anglo-American colonies, especially given the relative absence of Crown troops in the late seventeenth century. Following the English political tradition of equating standing armies with tyranny, many colonists viewed local militias as an essential part of their "ancient" constitutional and Protestant liberties, even if they resented militia taxes and mustering as an unwanted imposition. With the ever-present threat of frontier violence, colonial militias were also sometimes seen as bulwark against Indian "savagery" and an

¹²² Quoted in Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 33-42; Quotation on p. 39. See also Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 65-70.

¹²³ Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 42.

¹²⁴ "Laws Agreed Upon in England," in *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, Soderlund, ed., 132.

¹²⁵ Frost, "Religious Liberty in Early Pennsylvania," 424-34; for the longevity of Sabbath laws in Pennsylvania, see J. William Frost, "Pennsylvania Institutes Religious Liberty, 1682-1860" *PMHB* (July 1998): 323-47.

important racial marker of “Englishness.”¹²⁶ Put in stark terms, the absence of an organized militia in Pennsylvania and West Jersey placed those colonies politically, militarily, and culturally out of step with the rest of Anglo-America.

There were two other important omissions. The first was a marked reduction in capital offenses and in the severity of corporal punishments. In December 1682, after William Penn arrived in the colony, the Quaker-dominated Assembly passed its first criminal code. It significantly revised the Duke of York’s laws, which had been operable in the Delaware Valley since the English conquest of 1664. The Duke’s laws were relatively punitive, with a dozen felonies defined as capital offenses and physical mutilation permitted for offenses such as burglary (branding on the forehead) and perjury by falsely denying bigamy (tongue bored). Capital crimes included not only murder and treason but also denial of God, bestiality, sodomy, and even striking a parent (if deemed unprovoked). While the Duke’s laws were draconian by modern standards, they were comparable or lenient in comparison to other colonies (such as the New Haven colony) and in England, where the number of capital offenses in 1680 had reached fifty.¹²⁷ The Quaker Assembly’s first set of criminal statutes, by contrast, sanctioned only murder as a capital offense. (Because no mention is made of treason, it remained a capital offense under English common law.) It virtually eliminated physical mutilation, such as branding and boring of the tongue, in favor of whippings, fines, forfeiture of property, and imprisonment for lesser, non-capital offenses. By the standards of the seventeenth century, Quaker legislators drafted one of the mildest

¹²⁶ John Shy, “Armed Force in Colonial North America,” in *Against All Enemies: Interpretations of American Military History from Colonial Times to the Present*, eds. Kenneth J. Hagan and William R. Roberts (Westport, Conn., 1986), 3-20; Lois Schwoerer, *No Standing Armies!: The Antiarmy Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England* (Baltimore, 1974); Jeffery Dorwart, *Invasion and Insurrection: Security, Defense, and War in the Delaware Valley, 1621–1815* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008); Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip’s War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York, Knopf, 1998). More recently, Kyle Zelner, *A Rabble in Arms: Massachusetts Towns and Militiamen during King Philip’s War* (New York, 2009), argues that New England “citizen soldier” militia model was more theory than reality, as town elites avoided military service and sent “undesirables” and outsiders in their place.

¹²⁷ Lawrence Henry Gibson, “The Criminal Codes of Pennsylvania: The Laws of the Duke of York, the Laws of Chester (1682), the Code of 1701, the Law of 1718” *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology*, vol. 6 (September 1915): 323-44.

criminal codes anywhere in the English Atlantic.¹²⁸

The second major omission was religious in nature. Although Pennsylvania's constitutional protection of religious liberty did not go as far as the West Jersey Concessions, the lack of a formal religious establishment in the colony, akin to Massachusetts Bay, eliminated the need for a host of criminal laws to enforce religious conformity.¹²⁹ Because of the Quaker testimony on oaths, nonconformists could affirm in place of swearing in legal proceedings. Since there was no established church, no tithes were levied to support a parish minister, and marriages were a civil affair. In the *Laws Agreed Upon in England*, which Penn drafted to supplement the *Frame of Government*, provincial officeholders were required to profess a faith in Jesus Christ, which excluded potential Jewish settlers from government, but the law implicitly allowed Roman Catholics to serve, a provision that would cause the Penn and the Quaker government in Pennsylvania much trouble after the "Glorious" Revolution of 1688-9.¹³⁰

Penn's inclusions in the *Frame of Government* were as significant, if not more so, than his omissions. Perhaps more than any other Quaker leader, Penn believed in the noncoercive power of government to fashion peaceable and orderly subjects. As he indicted in the preface to the *Frame*, Penn viewed government as a divine instrument, "a part of religion itself, a thing sacred in its institution and end." Although government has an obligation to "[crush] the effects of evil," it also has a duty to promote "kindness, goodness, and charity."¹³¹ Good government for Penn depended on the ability of its subjects and rulers to knit together a unified society based on love and mutuality. Penn did not intend to create an egalitarian society – Penn's *Frame of Government* concentrated power in the hands of the governor and Provincial Council, after all – but he did mean to foster an internal compact between the Quaker ruling elite and the colony's subjects that rendered coercion and other externalized modes of

¹²⁸ Jack D. Marietta and G. S. Rowe, *Troubled Experiment: Crime and Justice in Pennsylvania, 1682–1800* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 9-13.

¹²⁹ Marietta and Rowe, *Troubled Experiment*, 14.

¹³⁰ Frost, "Religious Liberty in Early Pennsylvania," 434.

¹³¹ "Frame of Government," in *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, Soderlund, ed., 121.

authority unnecessary. Like overseers in Quaker meetings, Quaker rulers would govern with the civic and religious cooperation of the people. And like gospel order discipline, the sovereign power and authority of Pennsylvania law reached only insofar as provincial subjects accepted and internalized its sanctions. As Penn argued elsewhere in the *Frame*'s preface, "Government, like clocks, go from the motion men give them ... [and] though good laws do well, good men do better; for good laws may want good men, and be abolished or evaded by ill men; but good men will never want good laws nor suffer ill ones."¹³²

To better inculcate gospel order in Pennsylvania, Penn and the Assembly passed morals-based laws that structured the provincial legal system around the Quaker values of outward piety and collective harmony. The thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh sections to the *Laws Agreed Upon in England* mandated the observance of the Sabbath and worship of God "according to their understandings" and prohibited, among other things, "swearing, cursing, lying, profane talking, drunkenness ... stage plays, cards, dice, revels, bull-baitings, cock-fightings, bear-baitings, and the like, which excite the people to rudeness, cruelty, looseness, and irreligion."¹³³ The inaugural sessions of the Pennsylvania Assembly largely accepted this moral code, proscribing a relatively mild schedule of fines, corporal punishment (mostly whipping), and short-term imprisonment that aimed at reform and reconciliation instead of retribution.¹³⁴

In so doing, Quaker lawmakers had ironically woven into the provincial legal system the very system of meetinghouse arbitration that Restoration-era English Friends had developed in opposition to the secular courts. Beginning in 1683, the Pennsylvania Assembly empowered three provincial "peacemakers" in each county to arbitrate disputes.¹³⁵ Their authority was made as legally binding as the county courts. Quaker magistrates used "peace bonds" as a way of ensuring a subject's good

¹³² Ibid, 122.

¹³³ "Laws Agreed Upon in England," in *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, Soderlund, ed., 132.

¹³⁴ Marietta and Rowe, *Troubled Experiment*, 11-2.

¹³⁵ *Charter to William Penn, and the Laws of the Province of Pennsylvania Passed between the Years 1682 and 1700* (hereafter *Laws of Pennsylvania*), eds. Staughton George, Benjamin Mead, and Thomas McCamant (Harrisburg, 1896), 128.

behavior. Peace bonds were not just another form of bail to ensure a defendant's appearance in court. Magistrates could impose them on any individual for any reason, whether the recipient was formally charged with a crime or not. Peace bonds required the accused (or their sureties) to remit a predetermined amount of money to the court if they failed to abide by agreed-upon terms, usually a promise to remain peaceable or to refrain from some injurious action. Peace bonds required no cash up front, and they could be imposed for any length of time, though magistrates usually let them expire if the defendants demonstrated compliance with the terms by the following court session. Like arbitration, provincial magistrates used them to encourage disputants in court to settle their differences with minimal legal intervention and to steer potential litigants away from the law courts altogether. Even more than arbitration, however, peace bonds gave the accused and especially their sureties a financial incentive to seek a quick resolution with the aggrieved party and remain in the good graces of the court.¹³⁶

In fashioning a Quaker legal code, ruling Friends attempted to shape Pennsylvania's subjects according to Quaker norms of behavior. This was a tall order for a colony that was, almost from the beginning of settlement, culturally and ethnically diverse. Penn's promotional pamphlets, liberal naturalization laws for non-English subjects, low taxation in the colony, no mandatory militia service, abundant land for settlement, and (seemingly) amicable relations with Natives drew colonists from virtually every corner of the Anglo-Atlantic world (and beyond).¹³⁷ Consequently, Pennsylvania boasted a heterogeneous settler population that was majority non-Quaker by the turn of the eighteenth century, if not before.¹³⁸ Even as early as the 1680s, only a third of the settler population had arrived from England and elsewhere as Friends in good standing with their respective monthly meetings. By implication, the majority of "Quaker" settlers at the time were either adult converts or born and raised

¹³⁶ Paul Lermack, "Peace Bonds and Criminal Justice in Colonial PA," *PMHB* 100 (1976): 173-190.

¹³⁷ Gary Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 136, 206-7; Landsmen, *At the Crossroads*, 126-34.

¹³⁸ In 1702, James Logan estimated that only half of the settler population in Pennsylvania was Quaker; see Fischer, *Albion's Seed*, 424.

as Friends in Pennsylvania. Put simply, Pennsylvania Quakerism was not “born” on arrival; it had to be “made.”¹³⁹

Yet the proliferation of civic petitions in early Pennsylvania attests to the colonists’ gradual acceptance and internalization of Quaker norms of governance. In the first two decades of Pennsylvania’s history, many petitions focused on the problem of crime and the lack of public morality, which colonists frequently linked together. Pennsylvania’s lenient criminal code probably alarmed some and generated rumors of lawlessness and licentiousness that reached Penn after he returned to London in 1684. In an undated letter to the Provincial Council, Penn complained from England that he was hearing “a Cry come over into these pts agt the number of the drinking houses & Looseness that is committed in the caves” where throngs of newly-arrived settlers had presumably set up temporary housing.¹⁴⁰ Throughout the 1680s and 1690s, Penn repeatedly pleaded with Friends in Pennsylvania to “exhort the magistrates of Philadelphia to diligence in suppressing disorders & keeping peace between [the] people.”¹⁴¹

The Quaker government, for its part, took Penn’s injunctions seriously. In April 1687, the Provincial Council issued a proclamation for the “Suppression of Profaneness” in the colony. The proclamation reiterated the “Laws of this Government” against those “Crimes & Offenses by which men directly dishonour God, Scandalize Christianity & bring a greater reproach upon this province.” The Council complained that “notwithstanding such provisions ... given to the Magistrates, [the province’s] wholesome [laws] have been neglected and such vices too frequently escaped unpunished to the greate Grief of many” and promised that swearing, drunkenness “& other Immoralities” would

¹³⁹ Richard T. Vann, “Quakerism: Made in America?,” in Richard S. Dunn and Mart Maples Dunn, eds. *World of William Penn* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986): 157-170; Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 175.

¹⁴⁰ Penn to Provincial Council, ca. 1685, Etting Collection #193, Box 54, f. 3, HSP.

¹⁴¹ Penn to Harrison, December 4, 1685, Penn Manuscripts, Domestic and Miscellaneous Letters, (1682-1794), p. 22, in Penn Family Papers, Collection 485A, HSP.

be severely punished.”¹⁴² Around the same time the Council issued the proclamation, Phineas Pemberton reassured the proprietor in a letter that the “pestiferous apostates & runagadoes [renegades]” that threatened to “flow over” the colony were “now marked.” He concluded his letter with “I hope things will be better.”¹⁴³ As Pemberton’s letter suggests, Quaker magistrates took the religious and moral responsibilities of their office seriously. When Philadelphia reformer John Churchman exhorted Israel Pemberton in the 1740s to not bear “the sword” of his office “in execution against the evil doers,” he spoke for a generation of Friends that saw government in Pennsylvania as an instrument for the promotion of moral order as much as for the suppression of vice and crime.¹⁴⁴

In the late seventeenth century, the Pennsylvania government was repeatedly bombarded with petitions about crime and vice. In 1695, over fifty colonists submitted a petition asking the Provincial Council to ensure that officeholders “are of good Repute & Christian conversation.” The petitioners also demanded that “a Check [be] putt to Horse [Racing] w^{ch} begett Swearing, blasphemeing [sic] Gods holy name, drawing youth to [vanities]” and that “[fiddling] Dancing Gameing [sic] and what else may tend to debauch ye Inhabitants & blemish Christianity” be censured as well.¹⁴⁵ Most if not all of the petitioners were Quakers, but non-Quaker colonists petitioned the government over issues of crime and morality as well. At the Philadelphia County Court of Quarter Sessions in March 1695, the grand jury presented “the want of a pair of Stocks and a Cage wch wee think necessary for the Suppressing of Vice.”¹⁴⁶ The following year, the Philadelphia grand jury received a petition from citizens demanding that the provincial government prevent young people from “gaming and playing for money” in the streets. If parents and masters were enjoined to educate youth “in ye good Nurture & Admonition of ye

¹⁴² Provincial Council, Proclamation Regarding the Suppression of Profaneness, 13 April 1687, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, 1665-1801, vol. 1, p. 200, Mss.B.P38, American Philosophical Society (hereafter APS).

¹⁴³ Phineas Pemberton to Penn, April 3, 1687, Pemberton Papers, 1654-1806, vol. 1, Box 42, f. 20, Etting Collection, HSP.

¹⁴⁴ John Churchman, *An Account of the Gospel Labours and Christian Experiences of a Faithful Minister of Christ ...* (London, 1780), 92.

¹⁴⁵ Petition to the Governor and Provincial Council, 21 May 1695, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, 1665-1801, vol. 3, p. 10, Mss.B.P38, APS.

¹⁴⁶ Minutes of the Court of Quarter Sessions and the Court of Common Pleas, 5 March 1695, in Court Proceedings, 1686-1696, vol. 2, (Phi) Am.30365, collection 1855, HSP.

Lord,” the petitioners argued, it would “be an honor & great Credit to ye Government, And ye way to Bring a Blessing from ye God of heaven upon all.”¹⁴⁷ The petition’s language affirmed the basic assumptions Pennsylvania Quakers made about crime and violence: morally “polluted” households compromised public order. Because non-Quakers served on grand juries, especially in areas like Philadelphia, where there was a more diverse settler population, the above petitions also suggest that a broad spectrum of Pennsylvania’s citizenry, and not just Friends, engaged in the moral language of gospel order in late-seventeenth century Pennsylvania.

Despite colonists’ anxieties about crime and vice, there were evidently little of both before the mid-eighteenth century, judging by court records and later historians’ assessments. According to Jack Marietta and G.S. Rowe, a sizeable population of Quaker pacifists kept the violent crime rate low during the first thirty years of Pennsylvania’s existence.¹⁴⁸ From 1682 to 1719, Pennsylvania courts indicted only sixteen for homicide, of whom only two were executed for murder. In Chester County, where there was a majority Quaker population, the assault rate for 1700-1710 was seventy-five indictments per 100,000 people, relatively low compared to the modern aggravated assault rate of 205 per 100,000 for all of Pennsylvania during the early 1990s.¹⁴⁹ Other forms of violent crime in the colony, including burglary and robbery, were similarly low before 1720. And according to Marietta and Rowe, convictions for morals-based offenses in Pennsylvania, so-called victimless crimes against public propriety, such as profanity and Sabbath breaking, were relatively modest. The highest conviction rate was in the period before 1700; morals-based convictions dropped markedly after 1710. Marietta and Rowe contend that in comparison to seventeenth-century Puritan New England, “Pennsylvania’s effort at enforcing moral standards was brief and arguably faint.”¹⁵⁰

Nevertheless, violent crime *was* a problem in late-seventeenth century Pennsylvania, and Quaker

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, 4 June 1695.

¹⁴⁸ Marietta and Rowe, *Troubled Experiment*, 50.

¹⁴⁹ GS Rowe and Jack D. Marietta, “Domestic Violence in a ‘Peaceable Kingdom:’ Pennsylvania, 1682-1801,” in *Over the Threshold: Intimate Violence in Early America*, eds. Christine Daniels and Michael V. Kennedy (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 23-27.

¹⁵⁰ Marietta and Rowe, *Troubled Experiment*, 40-2; quotation on. p. 40.

magistrates were keen to prosecute morals offenses, as they were defined in the provincial law code. Immorality and violence were inextricably linked in the minds of Friends. Sometimes, as in the case of drunkenness, the connection was quite literal. William Orion, a blacksmith, for example, was indicted at the Philadelphia Court of Quarter Sessions in 1685 for “being twice drunk” and “for fighting, quarrelling, and challenging his neighbors ... in the night and [at] unseasonable times.”¹⁵¹ In March 1695, Charles Goss, a mariner, was similarly indicted for “abusing John Willkeson boath by Words and Blows.” When he appeared before the court, he pleaded mercy on the grounds that “he was much in Drink and was not Sensible of what he did.”¹⁵² In other cases, the connection between violence and immorality was less clear, at least at first glance. The court dockets for Philadelphia, Chester, and Bucks Counties are full of indictments for assault (verbal threat of violence) and battery (physical violence) in addition to morals-related offenses like fornication and bastardy. Given the potential for disruption violent crimes posed to a small provincial community, the concern to curb physical violence in Quaker Pennsylvania seems understandable. Less comprehensible, from a modern perspective perhaps, is the existential threat that “victimless” morals crimes perpetrated by an individual or consenting individuals posed to a community’s well-being (as with fornication, swearing, and Sabbath breaking).¹⁵³

Yet an analysis of criminal accusations from the period reveals how seriously Quaker magistrates regarded breaches of moral order. In a recent study, William Offutt found that offenses against morality topped the list of eight categories of criminal accusations in Pennsylvania courts from 1680 to 1710. Morals offenses comprised over twenty-two percent of the docket. The most frequent charge were sexual offenses like bastardy and fornication (forty-five percent of the morals docket), followed by alcohol-related charges (thirty-nine percent) and then finally offenses against piety, such as

¹⁵¹ Records of the County Court of Philadelphia, 1685-86, p. 9, #3492, HSP.

¹⁵² Minutes of the Court of Quarter Sessions and the Court of Common Pleas, 5 March 1695, in Court Proceedings, 1686-1696, vol. 2, (Phi) Am.30365, collection 1855, HSP.

¹⁵³ The work of William Offutt, *Of 'Good Laws' and 'Good Men'* has greatly enhanced this dissertation’s research of early Pennsylvania court dockets.

Sabbath-breaking, swearing, and gambling (sixteen percent). Closely following morals offenses, according to Offutt's study, were accusations related to contempt, either contempt of a court's authority or civic contempt (such as failing to appear for jury duty). Contempt cases comprised over twenty-one percent of the criminal docket. Cases involving violence and property-related crimes (such as theft) trailed a distant fourth and fifth, each category comprising just over twelve percent of overall criminal accusations.¹⁵⁴

Peace bonds -- the third highest category in Offutt's study -- both literally and symbolically linked the Quaker legal system's preoccupation with public morality and mitigating violence. Their widespread use in early Pennsylvania courts underscored the extent that provincial Friends used the legal system to manage conflict and inculcate Quaker norms of behavior among a diverse settler population. With peace bonds, Quaker justices possessed a powerful violence management tool that favored a speedy resolution of conflict over retributive punishment. In the case of William Orion, the blacksmith indicted for drunkenness and fighting, the Philadelphia Court of Quarter sessions imposed a £10 peace bond upon his submission to the court "& promise of better behavior."¹⁵⁵ The pugnacious mariner Charles Goss was similarly assessed a £30 bond by the court and fined 5 shillings for fighting. The fine imposed on Goss was a pittance relative to the value of the peace bond assessed to ensure he would not appear in court for fighting again.¹⁵⁶

In many cases involving conflict between individuals, determining guilt and meting out punishment took secondary importance to the primary goal of cultivating orderly and peaceable subjects. In one striking instance involving an unnamed dispute between Andrew Johnson and Hanse Peterson in 1684, the Provincial Council simply ordered the disputants to simply "shake hands and to forgive one another" and had the records pertaining to their case burned.¹⁵⁷ Quaker magistrates and

¹⁵⁴ Offutt, *Of 'Good Laws' and 'Good Men'*, 192-3.

¹⁵⁵ Records of the County Court of Philadelphia, 1685-86, p. 9, #3492, HSP.

¹⁵⁶ Minutes of the Court of Quarter Sessions and the Court of Common Pleas, 5 March 1695, in Court Proceedings, 1686-1696, vol. 2, (Phi) Am.30365, collection 1855, HSP.

¹⁵⁷ John Watson, *Annals of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania in the Olden Time*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia, 1887), 302-3.

juries were especially lenient with non-repeating offenders who admitted guilt and pleaded for mercy. In September 1685, John Hurst stood before the Chester Court of Quarter Sessions accused of beating his master, Francis Stanfield, a Quaker. James Stanfield, Francis's son, was also accused of drawing his knife at Hurst, presumably in defense of his father. Rather than pursue the case, the court simply discharged all three on their promise to "live peaceably and quietly."¹⁵⁸ The court took a similar action in a June 1695 case involving Patrick Kelly and Edward Downing, both of whom were presented for "Breach of the King's Peace to the shedding [sic] of Blood." Upon their both submitting to the court for mercy, the two were merely ordered to pay their fees and "behave themselves peaceably for the future."¹⁵⁹ When the Chester grand jury presented William Taylor and two other defendants for "maliciously tumultuously Assaulting and Presenting a Gunn against the Body of John Bristoll" in 1686, the court released Taylor without a peace bond simply "upon his Promise to doe soe no more."¹⁶⁰ Despite their relative leniency, Quaker courts and juries in late-seventeenth century Pennsylvania inflicted judicially-sanctioned violence, often in the form whipping, for perceived breaches of moral order. The pattern of corporal punishment in the colony, moreover, reinforced the Quakers' gendered assumptions about family and sexuality. As Offutt observes, the Quaker enforcement of "sin" based crimes, such as Sabbath breaking, were barely enforced in comparison to sexual crimes like bastardy and fornication.¹⁶¹ In the rare instances that defendants were charged with religious offenses, the punishment was often a token fine or nothing at all. In Chester County, George Stroud was indicted in 1691 for "swearing by the name of God ... Contrary to the Law of this Province," but no fine was ever recorded.¹⁶² Even more serious speech crimes perpetrated by women occasionally netted nothing more than a fine, as in the case of Ann Van Culin, who was indicted in 1690 for "Giving out evell [evil] words against some magistrates" in Chester County. Despite her charge of slander that bordered on

¹⁵⁸ *Record of the Courts of Chester County Pennsylvania, 1681-1697* (Philadelphia, 1910), 58-9.

¹⁵⁹ *Record of the Courts of Chester County*, 348.

¹⁶⁰ *Record of the Courts of Chester County*, 67-8, 70.

¹⁶¹ Offutt, *Of 'Good Laws' and 'Good Men'*, 192.

¹⁶² *Record of the Courts of Chester County*, 235-6.

sedition, Van Culin was freed, paying only court fees, after submitting herself to the court.¹⁶³

Women charged with fornication or bastardy rarely enjoyed such courtesies. Because of the potential financial burden that an unwanted or abandoned child posed to the public treasury, the crime of bastardy was considered especially heinous if a father could not be identified or located. At the Philadelphia Court of Quaker Sessions in 1695, for example, Mary Hopkins received the sentence of “Twenty One Stripes well laid on” for the crime of bastardy.¹⁶⁴ That same year, Mary Duke was also sentenced to “Fifteen Stripes” and assessed a £3 fine at the quarter sessions in Philadelphia for confessing “that she was lately brought to Bedd of a Feamale [sic] Bastard Child.” Duke was whipped despite having identified the absentee father, Peter Goit, whom the court ordered a writ of attachment instructing the Sherriff to seize £100 of his goods and chattels “towards the maintenance & indemnifying the County from a Bastard Child.”¹⁶⁵

As Duke’s case suggests, the gendering of judicial punishments against bastardy were most apparent in the differing treatment of male and female defendants. In short, men were usually fined, while women were whipped. To a certain extent, the discrepancy can be explained by the fact that men, as heads of households (or potentially so), were presumed capable of paying for fines and the maintenance of a child, whereas women, as “dependents” occupying the same status in the household as children and servants, were assumed unable to pay. As with indentured servants, female defendants typically received corporal punishment in place of fines. But economic rationales alone do not explain why the Chester County court in 1692 was “pleased to show” Robert Brown mercy by fining him only 40 shillings for fornication.¹⁶⁶ Quaker justices and juries respected patriarchal authority, so long as the male defendants in bastardy and fornication cases admitted guilt, pleaded mercy, and took responsibility by rectifying the situation as the court saw fit. In the eyes of Quaker magistrates,

¹⁶³ *Record of the Courts of Chester County*, 217.

¹⁶⁴ Minutes of the Court of Quarter Sessions and the Court of Common Pleas, 5 March 1695, in Court Proceedings, 1686-1696, vol. 2, (Phi) Am.30365, collection 1855, HSP.

¹⁶⁵ Minutes of the Court of Quarter Sessions and the Court of Common Pleas, 5 March 1695.

¹⁶⁶ *Record of the Courts of Chester County*, 260.

whipping females was also a more desirable (or put alternately, less violent) alternative to branding and other forms of physical mutilation.

Corporal punishment, however, was not the only option in sexual offenses, and Quaker magistrates often implemented noncoercive punishments when the transgressing couple appeared ready to marry and form a permanent household. In 1688, for example, the Chester County court imposed a £40 peace bond on Thomas Eveson for fornicating with Elizabeth Woodward. The only stipulation was that Eveson marry Woodward within a month.¹⁶⁷ The Philadelphia Court of Quarter Sessions charged Gerte [Gertrude?], identified only as the “Daughter of Lace Bore,” with bastardy in June 1695, but the magistrates took no further action after determining “that the reputed or supposed Father of the said Child had married her.”¹⁶⁸ Shame was also an effective tool in a close-knit community such as Pennsylvania, where the settler population in 1690 was around 12,000.¹⁶⁹ The Chester court in January 1693 indicted Thomas Poe and Sarah Buller for fornication. The two evidently married, either willingly or under duress, for Thomas reappeared in the docket later that March with “Sarah his wife” submitting to the Court for mercy. The justices ordered them to “stand at the Comon [sic] whipping post and for the officer to declare their [sic] offence to the People” and levied a very modest 40 shilling fine. At the very same session of court, John Clewes was presented for fornication with Elinor Arme, but the docket noted that Arme “was now his wife.” After begging the court for mercy, Arme was sentenced to stand at the common whipping post for fifteen minutes with a paper affixed “upon her Breast [reading] thus I heare stand for an Example to all others for Comiting [sic] the most wicked & notorious sin of fornication.”¹⁷⁰

Like any colonial society, Friends in late-seventeenth century Pennsylvania confronted the problem of rape and sexual violence. As Sharon Block argues, rape cases were rarely prosecuted in

¹⁶⁷ *Record of the Courts of Chester County*, 127-8.

¹⁶⁸ Minutes of the Court of Quarter Sessions and the Court of Common Pleas, 5 March 1695, in Court Proceedings, 1686-1696, vol. 2, (Phi) Am.30365, collection 1855, HSP.

¹⁶⁹ Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 136.

¹⁷⁰ *Record of the Courts of Chester County*, 280.

early American courts because of patriarchal assumptions about the inferiority of women and female sexuality. In colonial America, a certain degree of violence or aggression was expected in heterosexual encounters. Men were assumed to be naturally sexually aggressive, while women were expected to be chaste and resist their advances, at least to a point. By the standards of the day, “consensual” sexual activity included many encounters where females were unwilling partners. In the rare instances when women accused men of sexual violence and rape in court, they faced all male juries prone to acquitting the defendants.¹⁷¹ Hence the relative infrequency of prosecutions is a poor indicator in determining the actual incidence of rape in early America. In Pennsylvania as elsewhere, many cases of sexual violence simply went unacknowledged or unreported.¹⁷²

While incidents of sexual violence in late-seventeenth century Pennsylvania went underreported, rape and sexual assault was a serious problem, as evidenced in the earliest extant court records. The first formal rape case in Pennsylvania occurred in 1700 (resulting in an acquittal), but many cases of rape and sexual violence before then appear in the dockets in some other guise, such as a fornication charge.¹⁷³ In 1689, for example, Francis Smith of Chester County was indicted on the charge of fornication and assault “upon Mary, wife of James Bayless.” Smith, according to the indictment, “did violently force [Mary] to y^e Bed Side in her s^d Husbands House with an intent to have Comitted [sic] fornication.” Although Smith faced charges of fornication and assault, there is little doubt that this was actually a rape case.¹⁷⁴

In some cases, however, insufficient details in court records sometimes make it difficult to determine conclusively that an act of sexual violence or rape occurred. The case of John Rambo in the Philadelphia Court of Quarter Sessions strongly suggested that rape and sexual assault may have occurred, though the families involved treated it as a courtship issue. In 1685, John Rambo, the son of

¹⁷¹ Sharon Block, *Rape and Sexual Power in Early America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

¹⁷² Rowe and Marietta, “Domestic Violence in a ‘Peaceable Kingdom,’” 25. Marietta and Rowe aptly characterize the underreported nature of sexual violence as the “dark figure” in criminal statistics; see Marietta and Rowe, *Troubled Experiment*, 138.

¹⁷³ Marietta and Rowe, *Troubled Experiment*, 144.

¹⁷⁴ *Record of the Courts of Chester County*, 163.

Peter Rambo, a former assistant to the governor of New Sweden, was indicted on the charges of fornication with Bridget Cock, the sister of Lasse Cock, another prominent Swedish colonist and longstanding member of the Provincial Council. According to witness testimony, John Rambo snuck into Bridget's room by lowering himself from the roof and climbing into bed with her and her two sisters. After demanding that the two other sisters vacate the bed, John remained with Bridget all night until she consented to marry him. The Cock family later pressed charges, not because they believed he raped her but rather because he reneged on his promise to marry her after it became clear she was pregnant. The jury in the case sided with the Cock family, and the court ordered John to marry Bridget before she delivered the baby, plus provide for the future maintenance of the child. Bridget and John were also each fined £10 for fornication. The fine levied on Bridget for fornication, moreover, meant that the court implicitly regarded their sexual encounter(s) as consensual. What Bridget actually thought of her "courtship" with John is unknown.¹⁷⁵

Just as Quaker magistrates sometimes used shame as an effective judicial punishment, women threatened with sexual assault occasionally fought back by exposing the perpetrator to public shame and opprobrium. In 1694, witnesses in Chester County testified in court that they heard Ruth Colvert give out a great cry calling Owen Daniel "a Dog and said that he would have forced [sic] her." Even though Daniel pleaded for mercy, the court sentenced him to eleven lashes and imposed a peace bond "for his good behavior for the future." That Daniel was found guilty at all was remarkable considering the strong judicial bias in favor of male defendants accused of sexual assault. His sentence suggests that Colvert succeeded in convincing the (presumably) male witnesses and an all-male jury that Daniel had exceeded communally-defined norms of "appropriate" patriarchal aggression and committed an act of sexual violence.¹⁷⁶ In another case, Philip Yarnell, a Chester County Quaker, sued Moses Musgrove in 1693 for defamation. Musgrove must have accused Yarnell of rape because Elizabeth Woodyard, on

¹⁷⁵ Records of the County Court of Philadelphia, 1685-86, p. 1,6, #3492, HSP. The background to this case is discussed in Watson, *Annals of Philadelphia*, vol. 1, 304.

¹⁷⁶ *Record of the Courts of Chester County*, 328.

behalf of Musgrove, testified that Yarnell grabbed her hand “and put [it] Into his Codpise [codpiece] and would have her to feele his members how they went limber or stifer.” Woodyard also testified that in another encounter with Yarnell in bed she felt “her cloaths to goe up and her feete [began] to move.” Startled by his actions, she scolded him, exclaiming “how he could [act] so wickedly and come from such a good meeting [i.e., a Quaker meeting].” According to Woodyard, Yarnell “wept and asked her for forgiveness.” Yarnell found a male witness that testified he did not “forse her,” but the mostly Quaker jury awarded him only a pyrrhic victory – two pence for defamation.¹⁷⁷

Yarnell suffered an unspoken judgment against his defamation case, even though he technically “won” the legal dispute. The judgment was a moral one levied by his fellow Quaker jurors who operated on a two-tiered system of government: the provincial law courts and the disciplinary mechanisms of gospel order. As Offutt argues, gospel order in Pennsylvania effectively functioned as an “adjunct” legal system to the courts.¹⁷⁸ Upon settling in Pennsylvania, provincial Quakers quickly turned their system of meetinghouse arbitration, which had been developed in opposition to English secular law, into a mode of government that reinforced the sovereignty of Quaker authority in the colony. Theoretically, Friends eschewed taking each other to court without first resorting to gospel order arbitration in monthly meetings, and even in Pennsylvania, where Quakers dominated the government, many meetings regarded the law courts as a “worldly” and therefore undesirable. At one of the earliest sessions of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, in August 1681, the minutes stipulated that Friends “do not go to Law One with Another, before Endeavours have been made & used for the Ending thereof by the particular Monthly Meetings they belong to.”¹⁷⁹ The disciplinary procedures of gospel order were outlined at the yearly meeting in 1687. Noting the Perrot and Wilkinson-Story controversies, Friends affirmed that they should “avoid all Tokens of Open Division amongst us ...

¹⁷⁷ *Record of the Courts of Chester County*, 289-91.

¹⁷⁸ Offutt, *Of 'Good Laws' and 'Good Men'*, 256-7.

¹⁷⁹ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph469, August 31, 1681, p.2, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore (hereafter FHL).

[and] Evil speaking and backbiting one of another upon any Offence.” In the case of disputes, the yearly meeting recommended arbitration with the aim of reconciliation, “according to the wholesome Order of the Gospell.”¹⁸⁰ The juridical spheres of law and gospel order were supposed to be kept separate and distinct.

In reality, Quakers, like other early Americans, were very litigious, and they pursued legal action sometimes without regard to their meetings’ discipline. In 1695, the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting appointed two elders to “speak to Richard Sutton concerning his forwardness in proceeding at law & Casting Joseph Ranstead into prison without giving him Gospel Order.” The nature of the dispute was not disclosed in the meeting minutes, but within two months, the elders reported that Sutton rejected the meetings’ attempt to persuade him to reconsider his legal action. As the elders noted, Sutton’s “answer was [that] he looked on him [Ranstead] to be no friend.”¹⁸¹ In fact, Joseph Ranstead, a Philadelphia cordwainer, was a Friend in good standing, and his name’s inclusion in Quaker burial records for 1714 – almost twenty years after his quarrel with Sutton – attests to this fact.¹⁸² Despite having pursued legal action against the advice of his meeting, Sutton implicitly acknowledged the authority and legitimacy of gospel order by denying Ranstead as a Friend. Sutton surely knew Ranstead was a Friend, as everyone else in his meeting did. His denial was not a statement of fact but rather a personal disownment, announcing, in effect, that he no longer regarded Ranstead a Quaker and was therefore free to pursue “worldly” means of justice, including having him thrown in prison. Had Sutton continued to acknowledge Ranstead as a Friend, he would have considerably weakened his moral position because he understood as much as his meeting that gospel order was the appropriate sovereign power governing relations among “legitimate” Friends.

Although Friends kept the two spheres of governance distinct, the line between gospel order and the legal system in Pennsylvania blurred considerably. Quaker merchants, for example, preferred to

¹⁸⁰ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph469, 1687 epistle, p.14, FHL.

¹⁸¹ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, June 28 and August 30, 1695, p. 136-7, FHL.

¹⁸² Anna M. Watring, *Early Quaker Records of Philadelphia*, vol. 1 (Westminster: Family Line Publications, 1997), 36, 92.

have their contract disputes resolved in court, where they could use legal coercion and the threat of incarceration to obtain satisfaction. But Quaker meetings in Pennsylvania also attempted to resolve business and labor-related disputes among Friends. In 1685, Joshua Tittery, a glassmaker, complained to the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting that his employers, also members of the meeting, denied his wages. Because Friends valued scrupulous honesty in business dealings, and the taint of cheating threatened the public image of Friends as “honest merchants,” Tittery’s charge, if deemed legitimate by the meeting, would have been a serious breach of gospel order. The meeting minutes did not record anything further on the matter, which suggests the elders appointed to speak with Tittery’s employers applied moral pressure to get the dispute resolved rather quickly (and probably in favor of Tittery).¹⁸³ Although far from egalitarian, Friends believed that the loving household was the cornerstone upon which a religious society should be based.¹⁸⁴ As Barry Levy argues, Pennsylvania Quaker families emphasized more loving and less hierarchical relations between parents and children and husbands and wives than other Anglo-American settler groups. Quaker ideas about family government originated with George Fox and Margaret Fell, who instituted men’s and women’s meetings to examine and regulate every aspect of Quaker family life, especially in the domain of marriage, sexuality, and parenting. In the 1680s and 1690s, the London Yearly Meeting routinely circulated epistles exhorting Quaker parents “to be good examples ... in a sober and godly conversation,” raising their children and servants to value plain speech and to avoid ostentatious clothing and other “vain fashions of the world.”¹⁸⁵ By instilling conformity in Quaker norms in speech, dress, and conduct at the level of the household, Friends believed they could better maintain their cohesiveness and corporate identity. Following the example of London Friends, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting also issued epistles for Delaware Valley Quakers, enjoining “Parents, Masters, & Mistresses to be good Examples in their

¹⁸³ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, May 4, 1685, p. 23, FHL.

¹⁸⁴ Barry Levy, *Quakers and the American Family: British Settlement in the Delaware Valley, 1650–1780* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).

¹⁸⁵ *Epistles from the Yearly Meeting of the People Called Quakers, Held in London to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings in Great Britain, Ireland, and Elsewhere: From the Year 1675 to 1759...* (London, 1760), 47-8.

Familys [sic],” helping them to avoid the “vanities, fashions and evil customs of the world.” The Philadelphia meeting, following the English Quaker practice, also mandated that engaged couples needed their monthly meeting’s permission to marry, “it being usual & orderly to Propose their Intentions with Consent of Friends.”¹⁸⁶

The elevation of Quaker domesticity as a model of government meant that Quaker families and households came under intense scrutiny by monthly meetings. Friends convicted of fornication or other sexual offenses in provincial courts faced potential recriminations from their meetings, or alternately, if they escaped sanction in the one, they were likely not as fortunate in the other. Monthly meetings were intensely preoccupied with vetting engaged couples, ensuring both partners were Friends in good standing and verifying the absence of other encumbrances, such as out-of-wedlock pregnancy or undisclosed prior marriages. When John Gooden proposed to Sarah Kitchen in March 1684, the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting appointed two overseers to “inquire into his manner of Life and Conversation and his Clearness from Engagements ... [so that] a certificate may accordingly be granted him or Refused.”¹⁸⁷ Minutes from other monthly meetings in the Delaware Valley were littered with similar notations about engaged couples.

Once the engaged couple married, the monthly meeting made it their business to reconcile any spousal differences to ensure that they stayed married. The case of Thomas Fitzwater and his wife is particularly revealing. Fitzwater was a prominent English Quaker minister who immigrated to Pennsylvania in 1682 on the ship *Welcome* with William Penn. His first wife having died, he married Elizabeth Palmer in 1684. In addition to being a minister, Fitzwater served in the Pennsylvania Assembly three times representing Bucks County, where he had settled with his new family.¹⁸⁸ Beginning in 1695, the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting hinted at Thomas and Elizabeth’s separation, though the meeting minutes are pointedly silent about the cause of it. Perhaps rashly, the meeting

¹⁸⁶ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph469, September 16-19, 1694, p. 41, FHL.

¹⁸⁷ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, March 4, 1684, p. 9, FHL.

¹⁸⁸ *LLP* 1:352-3.

enjoined Fitzwater “to get an [additional?] house in order to entertain her, that she may have no excuse to stay from him.”¹⁸⁹ It is not known whether Fitzwater followed this advice, or what subsequent action he or the meeting took in the following months.

Three years later, the separation apparently was still ongoing, for the meeting again recorded in its minutes that Fitzwater and two other elders “could not prevail upon” Elizabeth. This time, the meeting deputed four elders along with “women friends” presumably from Elizabeth’s meeting “to endeavour to bring [the couple] to a reconciliation ... that they do in the future live together in love.” The following month, the elders reported back that there was cause for hope. The meeting noted somewhat satisfactorily that “Tho: Fitzwater and his wife report that they are in hopes they will live in love together for the future.”¹⁹⁰ Whether or not they achieved that aspiration, Thomas and Elizabeth Fitzwater remained married to each other for the remainder of their lives. More importantly, the reconciliation also points to how seriously Friends regarded the maintenance of gospel order discipline within Quaker families and households.

Like the provincial legal system, monthly meetings in early Pennsylvania dealt with problems of intimate violence. While the quarter sessions records contain references to rape and sexual violence, meeting minutes, by contrast, are silent on the issue. Philip Yarnell’s case demonstrates that Quakers were not immune to charges of rape or sexual assault, even if such instances were rare. It is very likely that monthly meetings in Pennsylvania simply deferred to the authority of the provincial courts in cases of sexual assault, but as with other forms of conflict, the line separating extra-judicial forms of governance and the law courts was permeable. If the meeting records are silent on rape, references to domestic violence, though rare, surface periodically. The Philadelphia Monthly Meeting’s handling of domestic violence allegations in the case of William Boulding highlights the strengths and limitations of gospel order as a mechanism for violence regulation.

¹⁸⁹ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, March 29, 1695, p. 134, FHL.

¹⁹⁰ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, January 27 and February 24, 1699, p. 161-2, FHL.

Unfortunately, the historical records do not tell us much about Boulding's life. *Colonial Philadelphians* lists him as a tailor in that city with two alternate spellings of his name (Bowling, Bowlin). He was apparently an artisan of middling means, as his estate along the Schuylkill River was assessed at £100 in 1693.¹⁹¹ He also appears periodically in the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting records as an elder and overseer. The meeting occasionally deputed him for various tasks, including "clearing" George Smedley's engagement to Sarah Gooden in 1687.¹⁹² Boulding was himself married, first to Anne (surname unknown), who died in 1691, and then to Elizabeth Evan, his second wife, who died in 1710. Boulding did not remarry, and he died seven years later.¹⁹³

Boulding's courtship with his second wife, Elizabeth, occasioned a small controversy within the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting. Apparently, shortly after his first wife Anne died, William began courting Elizabeth. In July 1692, an unnamed person lodged a complaint against Boulding in the meeting.¹⁹⁴ The nature of the complaint was unspecified, but in the following month Boulding sent a paper to the monthly meeting, which Friends rejected because they found him insufficiently contrite over his "Evill" action.¹⁹⁵ In October of that year, the meeting again warned Boulding that he must give "Satisfaction" or Friends would issue a "Paper of Condemnation Against him."¹⁹⁶ Finally, in January 1693, the meeting finally revealed the nature of the offense when they recorded their dissatisfaction "with William Boulding concerning his keeping the women in his house," despite having "formerly given a paper of Condemnation against himself for & persisting still in the same." The meeting once again deputed overseers to entreat with him about his unmarried cohabitation "that he may give further satisfaction, and take away the Cause thereof."¹⁹⁷

By March 1693, Boulding finally submitted to the meeting's pressure. The meeting minutes

¹⁹¹ Hannah Roach, *Colonial Philadelphians* (Philadelphia: Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania, 1999), 27, n. 45.

¹⁹² Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, May 27, 1687, FHL.

¹⁹³ Watring, *Early Quaker Records of Philadelphia*, vol. 1, 20, 32, 39.

¹⁹⁴ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, July 29, 1692, p. 117, FHL.

¹⁹⁵ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, August 26, 1692, p. 117, FHL.

¹⁹⁶ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, October 28, 1692, p. 119, FHL.

¹⁹⁷ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, January 27, 1693, p. 121, FHL.

recorded his paper of self-condemnation, which was presumably read aloud by him in front of everyone attending that session. In the paper, Boulding admitted that he had been “overtaken by the enemy of my Souls peace, and Captivated ... to Committ uncleanness [i.e., fornication] with Elizabeth Evan” and acknowledged that his actions had threatened to tarnish the public reputation of “honest” Friends, “giving occasion to the Enemies of the Truth and Gods people.” The degree to which Friends were concerned about the damage Boulding’s actions would do to their reputation is evident in the conclusion to his paper. “I doe freely and willingly Condemn myself,” he wrote somberly, “and take the Shame to myself, and leave this to be made publick so farr as you see meet.”¹⁹⁸ At some point, the meeting’s actions against Boulding yielded a desirable result: William and Elizabeth eventually married, thereby forming a legitimate household and sexual union in the eyes of its members. Gospel order prevailed, or so it would seem.

Four years later, the meeting’s problems with Boulding resurfaced. This time the issue was domestic violence. As they did in the earlier case, the monthly meeting in Philadelphia initially refrained from specifying the cause of concern in their minutes. The first sign of trouble occurred in August 1697, when the meeting noted a “reproach cast upon Truth and friends” by reason “of the differences ... betwixt William Boulding and his wife.”¹⁹⁹ Two elders were sent to meet with the couple to resolve the matter. After that, the minutes remain silent for the next two years. In December 1699, however, the meeting once again confronted William Boulding, and this time they disclosed the fact that they “have often dealt with Wm Boulding for his beating & abusing of his wife & other scandalous conversation & dealings.” (The “scandalous conversation” was most likely Boulding’s visible displeasure with the meeting’s intrusions into his domestic life.) Although Friends expressed “little or no hopes of reclaiming him,” the meeting demanded he appear before them, “which he accordingly did.” Incredibly, the shaming action moved Boulding to finally confess “what was charged upon him.”

¹⁹⁸ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, March 31, 1693, p. 123, FHL.

¹⁹⁹ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, August 27, 1697, p. 151, FHL.

After he admitted fault, the meeting resolved to disown (banish) him as an “esteemed ... Member of ye Society of Friends” unless he “speedily Issue forth a paper” condemning his actions in the strongest language possible.²⁰⁰ The threat of disownment, the ultimate sanction the meeting had as its disposal, worked. The following monthly meeting minute was recorded on January 26, 1700:

Wm Boulden’s paper condemning his Evil practices was read and It’s ordered that ye same be read ye next first day by himself or some other [Friend] for him ... copies thereof be spread in his neighbourhood for clearing Truth & friends which [overseer] pentecost Teague is desired to see performed.²⁰¹

The meeting’s condemnation of William Boulding is a striking illustration of the extent that gospel order disciplinary practices regulated Quaker households. Boulding’s case never appeared in the Philadelphia quarter sessions dockets, though he was criminally liable for assault and battery. Instead, the meeting handled the case entirely on its own. Viewed one way, Friends used the disciplinary procedures of gospel order as a juridical substitute for the provincial legal system. Yet gospel order *was* the law in unwritten form that undergirded Quaker rule in Pennsylvania. It was an unwritten law that sought to govern all provincial households and families according to Quaker norms of domesticity. Non-Friends, by participating in the provincial legal system, internalized this unwritten law in court, while Quakers usually enacted gospel order discipline in their monthly meetings. In Boulding’s case, the threat of incarceration and corporal punishment by the court was substituted for communal moral pressure and shame by the meeting. And Boulding’s shame must have been intense. It does not take much imagination to appreciate the amount of embarrassment he must have endured to read aloud his self-condemnation in front of a gathered assembly of Friends, people he worshiped with and knew intimately, to say nothing of having copies of his paper “thereof be spread in his neighbourhood” for all to see. Given the low literacy rates in early America, the circulation of Boulding’s paper of self-condemnation was mostly a symbolic action anyway. His Friends and neighbors were well aware of its contents well before it was written.

²⁰⁰ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, December 29, 1699, p. 171, FHL.

²⁰¹ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, January 26, p. 172, FHL.

Boulding's case also raises questions about gospel order and violence regulation. Did the meeting's actions and Boulding's paper of self-condemnation effectively end his alleged perpetuation of domestic violence? The meeting minutes do not say, of course. The public nature of the meeting's condemnation – and the fact that they made domestic abuse an issue in the first place – probably exerted considerable pressure on Boulding. But how far did that pressure go? By condemning Boulding, the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting effectively ruled out his domestic violence as unacceptable behavior for orthodox Quakerism. The meeting rejected what most other early moderns understood to be natural – and therefore acceptable – patriarchal violence. In doing so, they constructed an alternate vision of “peace” based on Quaker norms of domesticity that helped define what it meant to be a Friend.

The ability of gospel order to shape Quaker household relations, however, greatly depended on Friends' acceptance of the meeting's authority to wield “noncoercive” discipline over them. To the extent that Friends internalized gospel order discourse on “peaceable” Quaker behavior, the meeting succeeded in legitimizing a form of sovereignty more powerful than “external” modes of authority that relied on exacting obedience through coercion and the threat of punishment. When one or more Friends rejected the meeting's authority, the foundation of gospel order correspondingly weakened. The meeting's grip on Boulding reached only so far as he internalized and accepted their authority to discipline him. That he did, to the great damage to his public reputation, speaks volumes to the strengths of gospel order as a disciplinary apparatus, a language of peace, and a discourse on government.

Friends' concerns about their public reputation in Boulding's case hinted at its weaknesses. As the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting noted, Boulding's actions gave “occasion” to the enemies of Friends eager to portray them in the worst possible light. And who exactly were these enemies of “God's people?” The timing of the case – 1693 – provides a clue. Just a year before, in the summer of 1692, provincial Friends split into two opposing camps over conflicting interpretations of gospel order,

Quaker pacifism, and the legitimacy of Quaker government in Pennsylvania. Within the span of six months, the controversy developed into a full-blown schism, one that shook the foundations of Quakerism to the core and called into question the very nature of the movement's claim to be a peaceable people set apart from the "carnal" world. The reverberations of the schism would echo far and wide, reaching Friends and enemies alike on both sides of the Atlantic. The schism laid bare the contradictions of gospel order as a discourse on peace that nonetheless sanctioned colonial violence, a violence perpetrated by Friends as settlers and magistrates. Still despised by their enemies as religious heretics in the late seventeenth century, the Quaker movement was already vulnerable to withering criticism. But the one person responsible for the schism, who did more than anyone to expose the fissures and contradictions of Penn's "Holy Experiment," was not an outsider. He was a Friend. That man was George Keith.

Chapter Two

‘The Weapons of Warfare are not Carnal’: The Keithian Schism and the Violence of Peace

One Saturday night in January 1693, George Keith and several of his supporters sneaked into the Bank meetinghouse in Philadelphia, located on Front Street alongside the Delaware River, and erected a makeshift gallery. The Bank meeting was an important civic and religious symbol for Pennsylvania Quakerism. The provincial Assembly met there on occasion, as did the yearly meeting for Delaware Valley Friends.²⁰² The Keithians positioned their structure directly across the meeting’s gallery reserved for “public Friends,” or the prominent ministers that dominated the religious life of the meeting. The improvised gallery was crude, but its symbolic challenge to Quaker provincial authority was clear. When word reached the meeting’s elders about what was happening, they arrived at the meetinghouse in time to confront the intruders. Robert Turner, a member of the Provincial Council, also arrived wielding an axe. While the meeting’s elders struggled to knock down the improvised gallery, Turner, a Keithian, began chopping away at the minister’s permanent gallery, which prompted a brawl between the two rival factions.²⁰³ According to one contemporary account, George Keith, the man on whose behalf the makeshift gallery was built, stood nearby and looked on with smug amusement.²⁰⁴

The image of supposedly pacifist Quakers physically fighting each other, though perhaps bordering on farcical, is a fitting metaphor for the serious and bitter controversy that engulfed Pennsylvania and the Delaware Valley in the late seventeenth century. Known by historians as the “Keithian schism,” the controversy ostensibly began in 1691 as a theological debate between George

²⁰² Edwin Bronner, “Quaker Landmarks in Early Philadelphia,” *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 43 (1953): 210-216.

²⁰³ Gary Nash, *The Urban Crucible: Social Change, Political Consciousness, and the Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), 51; Ethyn Kirby, *George Keith: 1638-1716* (New York: Appleton-Century Company, 1942), 87.

²⁰⁴ Thomas Ellwood, *A Further Discovery of that Spirit of Contention & Division which Hath Appeared of Late in George Keith ...* (London, 1694), 49-50.

Keith, a Scottish-born Quaker minister and one of the leading lights among British Friends, and the ministerial Quaker elite in Philadelphia. The theological debate centered on, among other things, the question of whether Friends needed confessions of faith and the doctrinal importance of Christ's atonement and bodily resurrection for salvation. Animating these religious differences were conflicting interpretations of gospel order. Keith argued that Quaker disciplinary practices implied a form of household and church governance that was both egalitarian and spiritually pure. To achieve this ideal, he contended, the Quaker "church" would have to be purged of all lukewarm and uncommitted membership, leaving a faithful remnant that governed itself without spiritual corruptions or interference from the outside "carnal" world. The Quaker ministerial elite in Philadelphia, for their part, rejected Keith's assertion that they had unduly appropriated power for themselves at the expense of rank-and-file members. By 1692, Keith had accumulated hundreds of Quaker sympathizers, many drawn from the lower ranks and resentful of their social betters in the meeting. When Keith and his supporters began meeting separately that summer, they printed a series of tracts that turned the religious controversy into a debate about the morality of state-sanctioned violence. At stake in the debate was the legitimacy of Quaker authority in the colony and the nature and limits of Quaker pacifism.²⁰⁵

The Keithian schism shattered the Quakers' foundational narrative of Pennsylvania as a peaceable colony. It also undermined gospel order as a rationale for Quaker rule in the colony. The power of ruling Friends over Keith extended only insofar as he accepted their authority. Yet this was no longer possible when the Philadelphia Yearly meeting disowned him in September 1692.²⁰⁶ In a desperate bid to contain the schism, Quaker magistrates tried Keith and four others on charges of

²⁰⁵ My summary of the Keithian schism follows Ethyn Kirby, *George Keith*; "Introduction," in J. William Frost, ed. *The Keithian Controversy in Early Pennsylvania* (Norwood, Pennsylvania: Norwood Editions, 1980), i-xx; Nash, *Quakers and Politics*; Jon Butler, "'Gospel Order Improved': The Keithian Schism and the Exercise of Quaker Ministerial Order in Pennsylvania," *WMQ* 31 (1974): 431-452; Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*; and Andrew Murphy, *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America* (Penn State Press, 2003).

²⁰⁶ Keith's disownment is found in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph469, September 7, 1692, p. 33-4, FHL.

sedition and slander that December.²⁰⁷ Their attempt to silence him failed, however. Keith exposed the limits of gospel order as a noncoercive discipline and method of government to produce orderly and peaceable subjects. In print and at his trial, Keith argued that state power, which by necessity relied on coercion and violence, inherently corrupted the moral purity of gospel order and Quaker peace principles. In arguing that pacifist Quakers had no business holding political office, he forced Friends to confront their ambiguous relationship to state power. Almost as an unintended consequence, he also raised the profile of Pennsylvania as a military liability in the English empire. The schism and trial attracted widespread attention and notoriety in the Anglophone world, and the controversy directly led to the colony's temporary royalization in early 1693.²⁰⁸

The controversy also profoundly altered the governance of Pennsylvania. In the aftermath of the schism, provincial Friends tightened their religious discipline and began weeding out potential deviants from their own ranks. Ironically, Keith would have endorsed this, seeing it as an attempt to purify the meeting of corruption, but over the longer term, the schism made it harder for would-be reformers to challenge the Quakers' complicity in colonial violence. Prominent Friends, especially ministers, feared disunity, and they reacted strongly to any perceived threat to their authority as well as the meeting's sense of gospel order. Pennsylvania Quakers eventually embraced Keith's view that political power inherently corrupted moral authority – but only after the Seven Year's War forced Friends from their longstanding political domination of the colony. The moral positions that came to define Friends on both sides of the Atlantic in the later eighteenth century – antislavery, Native rights, and pacifism, above all – became possible only when Quakers yielded up the government of Pennsylvania to

²⁰⁷ George Keith and Peter Boss printed an account of their trial before the Philadelphia Court of Quarter Sessions in Keith and Boss, *New England's Spirit of Persecution Transmitted to Pennsylvania ...* ([New York], 1693), reprinted as *The Tryals of Peter Boss, George Keith, Thomas Budd, and William Bradford ...* (London, 1693). Because the records for the Quarter Sessions court in Philadelphia are no longer extant for that year, the Keithians' account is the sole written source for the trial.

²⁰⁸ Penn's proprietorship was dissolved on October 21, 1692, but Benjamin Fletcher, the newly-appointed royal governor, did not arrive in Philadelphia with his commission until April 1693. See "1739 Copy of Commission to Benjamin Fletcher, from William and Mary at the Court of Westminster, October 21, 1693, Penn Manuscripts, vol. 8: Charters and Frame of Government (1683-96), p. 39-45, in Penn Family Papers, Collection 485A, HSP; *MPCP* 1: 364-5.

outsiders. By then, the collective memory of the schism had faded enough that it no longer mattered that Friends finally embraced many of the moral positions of their former arch nemesis. It was an irony that Keith himself would have appreciated.²⁰⁹

From the beginning, Quakers accepted the authority of the state as legitimate. Although they were religious dissenters, English Friends were not radical separatists. Quakers, like the majority of early modern Christians, affirmed that government was ordained by God to keep civil order and to “punish evildoers.” In the 1670s, George Fox reminded Friends in the Caribbean “to give Caesar his due,” which included “custom and tribute” to support the magistrate’s ability to defend “against foreign enemies and protect everyone in their estates and keep down thieves and murderers.”²¹⁰ This formulation was echoed by the Quaker theologian Robert Barclay, a close associate of Keith’s who legitimized the right of the government to engage in defensive warfare, and William Penn, who instituted moral laws in Pennsylvania with the expectation that provincial magistrates – primarily Quakers – would bear the metaphorical “sword” to enforce them.²¹¹

Though Friends viewed the institution of government as legitimate, there were underlying tensions between their own embrace of magistracy and their obedience to God’s laws, as they understood them. Quakers refused to swear oaths, following Jesus’s injunction in Matthew 5:34 to “swear not at all,” but English magistrates often interpreted this as seditious behavior. Oath swearing was a critical legal ritual to ascertain truth and to bind subjects to their monarch. The Quaker Act of 1662, in fact, made the refusal to swear oaths in court a criminal offense. By not swearing, Friends were in effect placing limits on their recognition of the Crown’s sovereign authority.²¹²

²⁰⁹ See “Introduction,” in *Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost, xx, “Not until Friends had forgotten George Keith were they willing to endorse his reforms.”

²¹⁰ Herman Wellenreuther, “The Political Dilemma of the Quakers in Pennsylvania, 1681-1748,” *PMHB* 94 (1970): 135-72. Fox quotation on p. 141-2.

²¹¹ Wellenreuther, “The Political Dilemma of the Quakers in Pennsylvania,” 142, 145-7.

²¹² On the Quaker testimony against the swearing of oaths, see Richard Bauman, *Let Your Words Be Few: Symbolism of Speaking and Silence among Seventeenth-Century Quakers* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 98–101; Ted Underwood, *Primitivism, Radicalism, and the Lamb’s War: The Baptist-Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England*

The peace testimony also compromised the ability of Friends to render full deference to the state. Neither a doctrine nor a purely abstract “pacifism,” the peace testimony was a Quaker discourse on violence that broadly rejected weapons, fighting, and warfare as sinful and morally corrupt. Quakers based their opposition to fighting and warfare on biblical grounds, especially New Testament accounts of the life of Jesus and the Sermon on the Mount. During the early years of the Interregnum, English Friends enthusiastically served in Cromwell’s New Model Army, believing the Lord Protector to be God’s instrument in the final battle against the forces of the antichrist, which were conflated with popery and the monarchy. Yet there were also a number of Quaker pacifists who rejected violence and military service as inconsistent with Jesus’s example in the New Testament. As Friends grew disaffected with Cromwell’s autocratic rule, the peace testimony gained ground as an alternative discourse to militant republicanism.²¹³

By the time of Pennsylvania’s founding, a growing number of Friends rejected direct participation in warfare as sinful. Not all Quakers were pacifists, of course, and some Friends mustered for military service in the American colonies without scruple. However, Quakers in colonies like Barbados and Massachusetts sometimes endured fines, the distraint of their property, and even imprisonment for refusing to serve in the militia. Like oaths, military service was an act of fealty to the state. Conscientious objection in the American colonies, although occasionally tolerated, was at other times construed as potentially treasonous behavior, especially during wartime. Quakers did not have to achieve a universal consensus on the meaning or parameters of their peace testimony for them to develop a reputation for pacifism. To unsympathetic observers, Quaker pacifism was as heretical as it was foolish, even dangerous, and seditious. The Quaker peace testimony, simply put, alienated Friends from many of their neighbors, and in the colonial locales where Friends did not enjoy political power, it

(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 96-7; for the centrality of oaths to English legal culture, see Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 194-5. On the Quaker Act, see chapter 1, p. 28.

²¹³ Meredith Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace: Quaker Pacifism in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 56-7.

put them on a potentially adversarial footing with the state.²¹⁴

Because Friends, as sanctioned religious dissenters, were often in opposition to secular authority, the peace testimony functioned as an alternative discourse on government. In 1660, on the eve of the Restoration, George Fox and eleven other leading Friends in London published *A Declaration from the Harmless & Innocent People of GOD, Against All Plotters and Fighters in the World*, a tract that became the definitive collective expression of the peace testimony.²¹⁵ The *Declaration* was intended to distance Friends from the recent Fifth Monarchy uprising in London, as well as from their past association with Cromwell and militant republicanism.²¹⁶ If the aim was to reassure the Charles II that Friends would be loyal subjects, the language in the petition provided no grounds for such confidence. The *Declaration* begins disingenuously by stating that Friends “have always” rejected “All bloody Principles & Practices ... with all outward Wars, and Strife, and Fightings with outward Weapons.”²¹⁷ More potentially troubling, from the Crown’s standpoint anyway, was the two-kingdom theology that Fox employed to justify Quaker pacifism. Throughout the text, the *Declaration* repeatedly associates violence with the “carnal” realm, while linking Quaker pacifism to the spiritual: “Our weapons are *spiritual*, and *not carnal*.”²¹⁸ By itself, the formulation was hardly incriminatory. But such dualism easily bled into antinomian perfectionism. Fox routinely conflates the notion of morally perfected Quakers with the spiritual realm, while consigning the “carnal” law to the secular, which of course was reserved for the unredeemed: “the [secular] Law was not made for, *i.e.*, *the Righteous*, but for the Sinners and Transgressors, to keep them down.”²¹⁹ The intent of this logic was to reassure the new king that he did not have to worry about the Quakers because they, as a morally perfected people, had been redeemed out of the realm of “carnal” violence. Such an assertion,

²¹⁴ On the Quaker peace testimony, see Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace*; Peter Brock, *The Quaker Peace Testimony: 1660-1914* (York: Sessions Book Trust, 1990); Margaret Hirst, *Quakers in Peace and War* (London: The Swarthmore Press Ltd., [1923]).

²¹⁵ [George Fox, et al.], *A Declaration from the Harmless & Innocent People of God called Quakers ...* ([London, 1660]).

²¹⁶ Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace*, 43-44.

²¹⁷ [Fox, et al.], *A Declaration*, 1-2.

²¹⁸ [Fox, et al.], *A Declaration*, 5.

²¹⁹ [Fox, et al.], *A Declaration*, 5.

though, hinted that the secular law did not apply to Friends. Fox came perilously close to implying that Friends had no need of temporal government when he claimed in the *Declaration* that “as for the Kingdoms of this World, *we cannot covet them*, much less can we fight for them.”²²⁰ By associating magistracy with “carnal” violence, the 1660 *Declaration* placed Quaker spiritual authority above the sovereign authority of the Crown.

Decades later, the Keithians appropriated the dualist language of the 1660 *Declaration* to cast Quaker magistrates as the “carnal” power, akin to persecuting English magistrates, and to make them appear as moral hypocrites. Keith and his followers sought every opportunity to remind the magistrates in print, to great effect, that they had betrayed the “ancient” peace testimony of Friends. While provincial Quakers mostly avoided the issue in public, the charge that Friends were bad pacifists, and more specifically, that Quaker magistrates were violent persecutors, stung. The Keithians who made these accusations *were* Quakers after all, at least until the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting expelled them, and their moral critiques flowed logically, almost seamlessly, from the very peace testimony that Friends were unable to fully agree on in practice.

Scholars have yet to fully explore the Keithian schism in relationship to Quaker pacifism and the problem of colonial violence. Part of the reason for this relative inattention may lie in Keith’s ambiguous relationship to Quakerism. During the schism, Friends in Pennsylvania were quick to distance themselves from Keith. Philadelphia Friends protested in 1693 that “he hath long objected against our discipline,” even though at that point Keith had only been expelled a year and London Friends had yet to disown him.²²¹ Later accounts, mostly from Quaker chroniclers, also emphasized Keith’s distance from the Quakers.²²² Keith’s sole biographer suggested his erudition and doctrinaire

²²⁰[Fox, et al.], *A Declaration*, 3.

²²¹[Thomas Budd], *A True Copy of Three Judgments Given Forth by a Party of Men, Called Quakers at Philadelphia, against George Keith ...* ([Philadelphia, 1692]), 4; Murphy, *Conscience and Community*, 198, f. 132.

²²²For example, Robert Proud, *A History of Pennsylvania*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia, 1797), 370, argues Keith’s “conduct [during the schism] was so glaringly inconsistent with his former pretensions; and his behavior towards the *Quakers* so manifestly arising from a malignant disposition in his mind, and a disappointed malice, notwithstanding all [his] superior abilities ... he was universally despised by sober and thinking people of all societies.”

personality made him more authentically “Calvinist” Presbyterian or Anglican than Quaker.²²³ Keith’s conversion to Anglicanism in 1700 seems to lend credence to this point. Most accounts, then, agree that there was a deep gulf separating Keith and his supporters from the mainline body of Friends. Indeed, when Keith accused Pennsylvania Quaker magistrates of being bad pacifists, he took an extreme and even novel position with regard to the peace testimony, one that did not garner public support from the majority of Friends on either side of the Atlantic.

But it was also a position impossible for Friends to ignore, precisely because the differences separating him and his Quaker antagonists were a matter of degree, not one of kind. By the time Keith arrived in the Delaware Valley in the 1680s, he had already established himself as a renowned Quaker minister in Britain. Keith was a native of Aberdeen, Scotland, where he converted to Quakerism in the 1660s. Aberdeen was home to a small but thriving Quaker community that counted among their ranks Robert Barclay, a gifted theologian who wrote the defining expression of “orthodox” Quakerism, *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity* (1676).²²⁴ Keith was a graduate of Marischal College and a gifted theologian in his own right. He and Barclay were longtime associates, and together they helped Fox, Penn, and the other Quaker ministerial elite in London establish a uniform system of gospel order discipline throughout the hierarchy of monthly and quarterly meetings in Britain. A talented polemicist, Keith vigorously defended English Friends in print and at public debates, arguing for the theological legitimacy of Quakerism. Like other leading Quaker ministers, Keith served time in jail for his faith, and he accompanied Penn and Fox on their missionary journey to the European continent in 1667. In sum, Keith played a major role in creating a standardized, uniform British Quaker movement in the Restoration period. Ironically, that role included helping to stamp out internal Quaker challenges to the authority of Fox and the ministerial elite in London, most notably during the Wilkinson-Story

²²³Kirby, *George Keith*, 157, argues “against the formalism of his religious background and education he revolted ... [but] while he argued against the precision of Calvinism, he himself was essentially a precisian.”

²²⁴Robert Barclay, *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity* . . . ([Aberdeen?]: 1678). For Keith’s early years in Aberdeen, see Kirby, *George Keith*, 1-18; for a good summary of Keith’s biography, see also J. S. Chamberlain, “Keith, George (1638?–1716),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004).

schism.²²⁵

As a minister, Keith expected he would play a similar leading role among Friends in Pennsylvania. He first arrived in America in 1684 to work as a surveyor for the colony of East Jersey. Four years later, he left for Philadelphia to serve as the headmaster of the Latin school. Almost as soon as he arrived, he resumed his vocation as a Quaker minister, occupying a prominent position in the monthly and yearly meetings in Philadelphia. For a few years, Keith served the meeting as an overseer, itinerant preacher, theologian, and debater, taking on some of the Quakers' most formidable foes in print, including Boston's Cotton Mather.²²⁶ Undoubtedly Pennsylvania Friends appreciated his services as much as Friends in London did. It did not take long, however, for Keith to discover that Pennsylvania Quaker ministers were not the same as their London counterparts. In Keith's view, many of them appeared woefully ignorant of the basics of Christian doctrine. Even worse, they seemed to him indifferent about it. Keith took great offense at Pennsylvania Friends' suggestion that salvation was not dependent on an "outer" knowledge (literal reading) of Scriptures or sufficiently acknowledging the "outer" (historical) death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.²²⁷ As Keith knew well, English Friends had suffered fines, beatings, and imprisonment for maintaining the distinct practices in speech, dress, and worship that marked them publicly as "Quakers." In Pennsylvania, being a Quaker cost nothing, at least in terms of persecution. Since most provincial Friends were born or converted in America, they lacked the direct experience with British Quakerism that Keith had. As John Smolenski argues, Pennsylvania Quakers' creole social makeup and experience in America made it impossible for itinerant ministers like Keith to simply "transplant" British Quakerism to Pennsylvania intact.²²⁸ Of course, the fact that British Friends remained outside of state power, while Pennsylvania Friends were

²²⁵ For Keith's influence in shaping the religious discipline and administrative structure of English Friends, see Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 36-8.

²²⁶ Kirby, *George Keith*, 52-3.

²²⁷ "Introduction," in *Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost, x-xi.

²²⁸ Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 151-2; see also Michael Zuckerman, "The Fabrication of Identity in Early America," in Zuckerman, *Almost Chosen People: Oblique Biographies in the American Grain* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 21-54.

the very embodiment of it, constituted perhaps one of the most significant differences.

For a while at least, Keith and provincial Friends were able to accommodate their theological differences. And since Quakers generally privileged direct spiritual revelation over clerical and scriptural authority in matters of doctrine, it was far easier, and far more desirable, for Keith and his ministerial counterparts to focus on social and sexual behavior as visible markers of Quaker identity. Maintaining the moral purity of Quaker households was a goal that Keith and the ministers of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting shared. In 1689, the yearly meeting deputed Keith, Samuel Jennings, and several other ministers to draft an epistle for “the Keeping of Godly and Christian Discipline, & more especially a Tender Inspection over Youth.” The published broadside, *A Loving Exhortation to Friends* (1689), enjoined Quaker meetings in the Delaware Valley to maintain a “Christian Watchfulness” over those who “walk disorderly, or are Unsavoury, and of a Bad Report in their Callings, Stations or Neighbourhood.” For those who “who are scattered and gone astray from among you,” the yearly meeting advised, Friends should take care that “Gospel Order ... be expressed and given unto them.” In other words, in cases of bad debt, abusive behavior, public drunkenness, or sexual infractions such as fornication or marrying a non-Quaker, the yearly meeting advised its constituent monthly meetings to offer a clear path toward reconciliation, normally by having the wayward Friend admit guilt and submit a paper of self-condemnation, as in the case of William Boulding. If recalcitrant Friends refused “gospel order,” they faced expulsion or disownment. *A Loving Exhortation* also recommended that Friends “mind ... the Virtuous and Christian Education of your Youth and Children, that they be bred up in Sobriety.” The proper oversight of Quaker children, the meeting believed, would ensure that they would grow up to be model Friends in adulthood, thus sparing the meeting disciplinary problems in the future.²²⁹

In calling for enhanced oversight of Quaker households, the yearly meeting claimed it was

²²⁹ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, *A Loving Exhortation to Friends ...* (Philadelphia, 1689), broadside, Quaker & Special Collections Department, Haverford College (hereafter QSCHC).

following the “useful Instructions and that Good Order established among us in our Native Land.” In reality, there were no standardized or uniform Quaker disciplinary practices in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. And though the yearly meeting’s approach to discipline was based on English Quaker precedent, provincial Friends were innovating in practice.²³⁰ Far from the metropolitan Quakerism of London, leading ministers of the Society of Friends in Pennsylvania worried about cultural degeneration. In 1690, “Pennsylvania” was more an aspiration than a fully-fledged colony. Philadelphia’s population was near 4,000 at the time, with Indian Country not even a day’s journey from the center of town. While many of the province’s 11,000 people identified as Quaker, non-Quaker settlers were arriving at a rate that would make Friends a minority within a decade.²³¹ Ironically, freedom of worship posed another problem. By law, Pennsylvania protected religious worship for monotheists. Provincial Friends did not have to worry about crafting a common theology to meet statutory requirements, as English Friends did under the Toleration Act. But Keith and the other ministers worried that Friends would lose their way amidst the relative ease and openness of worship in Pennsylvania. In systematizing their religious discipline, Pennsylvania Quakers ironically had gone even further than Friends in their “Native Land” of England, or elsewhere.²³²

George Keith wanted to make conformity in discipline inseparable from uniformity in doctrine. In Keith’s mind, one could not be achieved without the other. To an extent, the Philadelphia ministerial elite supported him, especially when Keith defended Quakers as theologically orthodox Christians on his itinerant missionary travels to New England, New York, and New Jersey. In 1688, while visiting Quaker meetings in Rhode Island, Keith engaged an ex-Quaker and physician named Christian Lodowick in a dialogue about Christian doctrine. In his printed account of their conversation, Lodowick acknowledged that “semi-Foxians” like George Keith, William Penn, and Robert Barclay

²³⁰ I am here following Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 86-7.

²³¹ John McCusker, “Colonial Statistics,” in *Historical Statistics of the United States*, vol. 5, Millennial edition, ed. Susan B. Carter (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 5-651, 5-655.

²³² Quotation from Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, *A Loving Exhortation ...* [broadside].

did not confuse the Quakers' "inward light" with salvation, but he argued that Fox himself, along with most other Friends, rejected the belief that Christ "shall come down from Heaven to Raise and Judge the dead."²³³ Keith later printed a rejoinder, signed by Rhode Island Friends, affirming that Quakers believed "the Man Christ Jesus to be the Judge of the Quick and the Dead" in the last days, which "we do believe [has] not come."²³⁴ In reality, there was hardly agreement among Quakers on this point, but Keith, perhaps sensing the urgency of the matter, compiled *A Plain Short Catechism for Children & Youth* (1690) to help young Quakers achieve a greater standard of behavioral and doctrinal conformity.²³⁵ The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, for its part, published a tract that same year affirming their acceptance of basic mainline Protestant doctrine, such as the Trinity and salvation through grace alone.²³⁶ Up until this point, any tensions over differences in theology remained submerged.

But trouble loomed on the horizon. In March 1690, Keith circulated his "Gospel Order and Discipline Improved" manuscript to the Philadelphia Meeting of Ministers. "Gospel Order and Discipline Improved" was a radical reconceptualization of Quaker discipline that advocated for a public confession of faith from all members of the Society. In making his appeal, Keith argued that Friends should retain their sectarian identity, akin to the purity of the ancient church, as he imagined it, before it became wedded to the Roman Empire. Extending the metaphor further, Keith reminded his fellow ministers of the Quakers' own sectarian origins. "Did we not separate from other Societies," he asked, "not only because of bad Doctrine ... but also ... because of their vicious life, & evil Conversation & Practices [?]" If Friends were to maintain their sectarian identity in Pennsylvania, as they did in England, Keith argued that Friends would have to "purge out all the old Leaven, that we may be wholly a new Lump ... where no weeds or Tares should grow." To achieve this goal, Keith recommended that Friends require a confession of faith from prospective adult members and the

²³³ Kirby, *George Keith*, 51-57; Quotations from "Introduction," *Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost, iv.

²³⁴ George Keith, et al., *The Christian Faith of the People of God, Called in Scorn Quakers, in Rhode-Island ...* (Philadelphia, 1692), 4-5.

²³⁵ George Keith, *A Plain Short Catechism for Children & Youth ...* (Philadelphia, 1690).

²³⁶ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, *The Christianity of the People Commonly Called Quakers, Asserted by Them, Against the Unjust Charge of Their Being No Christians* (Philadelphia, 1690); see also Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 85.

children of members in order to ensure that all Friends were in accord “in the most principal & necessary Doctrines of the Christian Religion.”²³⁷

Keith’s colleagues in the ministry might have entertained his call for a minimal confession of faith as a precondition of membership, though it was a clear departure from usual Quaker practice, but they did not appreciate his ideas about church discipline. As Jon Butler argues, Keith challenged the hierarchical authority of public Friends who dominated the meetings for business and worship. “Gospel Order and Discipline Improved” smacked of leveling because Keith wanted to vest more decision-making authority in rank-and-file members of the meeting, not just the ministers.²³⁸ Keith reasoned that “tho all the faithful are not Elders [i.e., public Friends and overseers], yet they are all Members of Christ’s Body.” Because “every true member of the said Body hath a Measure of the Spirit of Christ,” decisions taken in “the Men’s & Women’s Meetings ... should have the Consent of the whole Church.” To press his point, Keith compared the ministers to “Provincial Assemblies” who were “commissioned by the People [to] represent the People” yet only advocated on behalf of a privileged few. Keith argued that it was not sufficient “to say the Elders are the Representatives of the Church, & therefore whatever the Elders do ought to be binding & obliging to the whole.” To him, the “Church of God” existed separately from “worldly Governments,” and therefore he believed Friends ought to govern themselves with “the Consent of the Elders & [all members of the] Church assembled together.”²³⁹

By accusing his fellow ministers of aggrandizing power to themselves, Keith opened a breach that could not be repaired. The Philadelphia Meeting of Ministers, not surprisingly, refused to endorse

²³⁷ Quotations from “G. Keith’s Articles of Church Fellowship, or Gospel Order, Copied from an Old Paper, partly Obliterated,” Robert Proud, *Extracts of Letters, Memorandums Relative to Pennsylvania (1785)*, Parrish Family Papers, 1614-1874, Parrish Collection, vol. 1. Case 61, [Box 4], HSP. An earlier manuscript copy, likely dating from the late-seventeenth-century, is titled “Gospell Order & Discipline Improved in Men & Women’s Meetings of faithful friends of Truth;” see Vaux Collection of Correspondence and Documents, Collection no. 1167, Box 3, QSCHC.

²³⁸ As Butler, “Gospel Order Improved,” 439-440, argues, “Public Friends were ministers not in the usual Protestant fashion, for Friends thoroughly decried ordination and clerical ceremonies.” While Friends tended to “emphasize the verb ‘to minister’ rather than the noun when discussing their service ... very early Public Friends began to exercise an authority in church discipline that paralleled their power in preaching.” In England, the term “Public Friends” was synonymous with the “First Publishers of Truth,” or the ministerial elite who supported Fox as he implemented uniform system of gospel order discipline in Friends’ meetings throughout Britain.

²³⁹ “G. Keith’s Articles of Church Fellowship,” Parrish Collection, HSP.

Keith's "Gospel Order and Discipline Improved," deferring to the judgment of the yearly meeting instead. The yearly meeting also deferred judgment on the issue until the following year. By then, however, the simmering debate over theology and church governance, intertwined as it was with personal attacks, invariably turned more acrimonious. The schism worsened in the summer of 1691, when the Quaker minister William Stockdale, at a session of the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, accused Keith of preaching two Christs, one historical and the other spiritual. Keith in turn accused Stockdale of heresy for allegedly denying the historical Christ. The yearly meeting failed to settle the dispute, and in January 1692, Thomas Fitzwater, another minister of the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, accused Keith of denying the sufficiency of the inward Light for salvation. The dispute divided provincial Friends, with most prominent ministers lining up against Keith, while many artisans and lesser merchants in the meetings defected to the other side.²⁴⁰ Keith, not given to backing down, published his side of the dispute in *Some Reasons and Causes of the Late Separation* (1692).²⁴¹ Keith's decision to take the dispute into print angered his opponents. The monthly meeting in May condemned Keith for claiming the "Light is not sufficient without something else," and in June twenty-eight of the colony's leading public Friends, meeting as the Philadelphia Meeting of Ministers, similarly condemned him for his "violent Provocations," "ungodly Speeches," and "disorderly behavior."²⁴² At this point, Keith's supporters began meeting separately, calling themselves "Christian Quakers." Hoping to win over Friends in the upcoming yearly meeting that September, the Keithians published *An Appeal from the Twenty-Eight Judges* (1692), which outlined twelve propositions for debate, and *The Plea of the Innocent against the False Judgment of the Guilty* (1692).²⁴³

The tracts exploited the hitherto latent tensions in the Quaker testimonies on peace and

²⁴⁰ Kirby, *George Keith*, 60-9; Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 154-8.

²⁴¹ [George Keith], *Some Reasons and Causes of the Late Separation That Hath Come to Pass at Philadelphia Betwixt Us ...* (Philadelphia, 1692).

²⁴² "Introduction," in Keithian Controversy, ed. Frost, xiv; transcription of "the Friends in the Ministry," in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Minutes, MR-Ph469, June 20, 1692, p. 30-30b, FHL.

²⁴³ [George Keith], *An Appeal from the Twenty Eight Judges: To the Spirit of Truth & True Judgment in All Faithful Friends, Called Quakers ...* (Philadelphia, 1692); George Keith and Thomas Budd, *The Plea of the Innocent against the False Judgment of the Guilty Being a Vindication of George Keith and His Friends* ([Philadelphia, 1692]).

government. In *Plea of the Innocent*, Keith and coauthor Thomas Budd criticized Samuel Jennings, a Quaker justice and minister in Philadelphia for his alleged “proud and lofty Carriages” and his “imperious” attitude “in Friends meetings, and worldly Courts.”²⁴⁴ The twelve points for debate that Keith laid out in *An Appeal* were even more provocative. The first eight of the twelve queries rehearsed the theological aspects of the schism. Keith’s theological arguments during the schism were intended to establish doctrinal standards for membership, just as his vision for gospel order discipline was meant to keep Quaker meetings, consisting of believing members only, separate from the corruptions of “worldly government.”

The final four points of *An Appeal* expressed Keith’s notion that Quaker ministers, acting as magistrates, were unduly conflating gospel order with political power, to the detriment of the Society of Friends. Queries nine through eleven explicitly addressed Quaker magistrates’ complicity in using force to uphold laws, arming Native Americans, and exercising the death penalty. The twelfth query summed up the entire issue by asking “Whether ... that Ministers should engross [i.e., embrace] the Worldly Government, as they do here?”²⁴⁵ The question highlighted tensions and contradictions in Quaker rule that had already been identified by external critics of Quakerism. These contradictions were also the source of anxieties within Quakerism itself. Since the final queries of *An Appeal* contained enough elements of truth to make them appear credible and therefore difficult to dismiss as out of hand, Quakers were forced to confront the challenge from Keith.

Keith’s ninth query asked whether three unnamed Quaker justices of the peace, “one whereof being a Preacher among them,” ought to have recovered a stolen sloop “by Force of Arms.” Here, Keith referred to an incident in early 1692 when a pirate named Peter Babit stole Samuel Carpenter’s sloop, which was docked in the Philadelphia harbor, and sailed down the Delaware River raiding and looting as they went. Three Quaker magistrates, including one who was also a minister, raised the hue

²⁴⁴ Keith and Budd, *Plea of the Innocent*, 3.

²⁴⁵ [Keith], *An Appeal*, 7.

and cry and mobilized a search party, while Samuel Carpenter offered a £100 reward for the successful recapture of his ship. According to Caleb Pusey, who provided a retrospective account, the commission captured the sloop “in their own way,” by which he meant “[with] neither gun, swords, nor spear.” Pusey also denied the magistrates had “searcht the Town for arms” since, according to him, Philadelphians had none to offer except one or two fowling pieces (hunting guns).²⁴⁶ Whether true or not, Pusey’s version of events did nothing to temper the notion that unarmed Quakers were incapable of fending off attack by privateers and pirates. Keith’s account, which probably distorted the truth as much as Pusey’s, was no better at dispelling the idea that even an armed Quaker response to an attack could never be anything but weak, disorganized, and ineffectual. Regardless of what actually occurred, the competing narratives played right into the hands of the Quakers’ many critics.

The tenth query inquired “whether hiring men thus to fight & also to provide the *Indians* with Powder & Lead to fight against other *Indians*, be not a manifest Transgression of our Principle against all use of the carnal Sword.” It was indisputable that the supposedly pacifist Quaker government in Pennsylvania supplied its Indian allies with weapons. Raising this issue in print, however, was potentially inflammatory, especially for non-Quaker settlers in the colony who resented having no organized militia to protect them against armed Indian neighbors.²⁴⁷

The eleventh query asked whether “it be according to the Gospel, that Ministers [acting in their capacity as magistrates] should pass the *Sentence of Death on Malefactors*.”²⁴⁸ Compared to other American colonies at the time, or even compared to England, where the schedule of capital offenses numbered in the dozens, the legal sanction for the death penalty in Pennsylvania was almost nonexistent.²⁴⁹ Pennsylvania law allowed for capital punishment, but only in cases of murder and treason, and Quakers magistrates seemed reluctant to use that power. There were a total of five

²⁴⁶ Caleb Pusey, *Satan’s Harbinger Encountered*, 78-9. The Babit incident is recounted in Joseph Kelley, *Pennsylvania: The Colonial Years, 1681-1776* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1980), 69.

²⁴⁷ This issue is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

²⁴⁸ [Keith], *An Appeal*, 7.

²⁴⁹ See Chapter 1, p. 44.

indictments for homicide in Pennsylvania between 1682 and 1700, and yet the provincial courts executed only two individuals during the same period, in 1688 and 1693, respectively.²⁵⁰ The first prisoner to be executed in Pennsylvania was a woman named Judith Roe, though her case was actually tried in Kent County, Delaware (then under Pennsylvania jurisdiction), where the crime occurred. Roe was convicted of killing a man who probably was boarding in her home. Roe's children were forced to testify against her in court, having witnessed their mother "fighting with a Man and had Cutt his head with an Ax[e]" before dumping his body in a river.²⁵¹ John Simcock, a Quaker justice presiding over the trial, sentenced Roe to death, while acquitting her husband, who was allegedly not with her at the time. John Richardson, Roe's brother and a Kent County official of some importance, then lodged an appeal with the Provincial Council in Philadelphia to have her sentence reduced. The Council deliberated for several months before voting to deny the appeal and ordering the sheriff to proceed with the execution. The Council's decision was nearly unanimous. Of the seven members present (besides Governor Blackwell), four were Quakers, with the sole dissenting vote cast by William Markham, the provincial secretary who, in addition to being Penn's cousin, was an Anglican.²⁵²

On the surface, it would appear that the Quaker-dominated Council was little troubled by imposing the death penalty in Roe's case. Yet an extant letter from William Penn, addressed to Friends in Pennsylvania and written around the time of the Council's deliberations, suggests there may have been at least some hesitation about carrying out the execution. Writing from England, Penn admonished the Quaker members of the Council to not interrupt the operation of "Just laws" in the case of the "murderous woman" because the "barbarity [of her offense] is Crying." In a revealing comment,

²⁵⁰Marietta and Rowe, *Troubled Experiment*, 34-5, see esp. table 2.1 on p. 35. From 1682 to 1699, there were a total of five homicide accusations, all of which yielded indictments. If the period of analysis is extended to 1719, at the tail end of Quaker influence in the provincial law code, the number of indictments only rises to sixteen. According to the authors, the homicide rate, as proportionate to the colony's population during the period in question, was among the lowest rates "in the most admired nonviolent nations today." Quotation on p. 35.

²⁵¹Quotation in Rowe, *Embattled Bench: The Pennsylvania Supreme Court and the Forging of a Democratic Society, 1684-1809* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994), 42. The case is discussed on pp. 42-3.

²⁵²*MPCP* 1: 227, 252-3. The Quaker members voting in favor of the death penalty were: Samuel Carpenter, Griffith Jones, Arthur Cook, and William Clark. The non-Quaker members present were: Robert Turner, William Darvall, and William Markham. The reasons for Markham's dissenting vote are not given in the minutes.

Penn added that the execution was the only “natural Justice” available since Friends lived in a “Mixed State [i.e., in a colony with non-Quakers] and he could not “see how it is to be amended” anyway.²⁵³ Penn’s letter suggests that some of the Quaker members of the Council presumably expressed moral difficulty with carrying out their legal obligations in death penalty cases.

Roe’s execution, if it in fact took place, probably occurred in late 1688, just a few years before the schism began and around the same time Keith’s arrived in Philadelphia.²⁵⁴ Keith must have been aware of the trial and the Council’s ambiguous response to it. By raising the issue in print, as he did with the stolen sloop incident, Keith put Friends in a very difficult position. Most non-Quaker inhabitants in the Delaware Valley blamed the presence of violent crime in their communities on the seeming reluctance of Quaker justices to sentence convicted felons to death. The Quaker-inspired lenient criminal code seemed to lend credence to this belief, even if actual incidents of violent crime at the time were relatively low. Keith’s pointed query asking whether Quaker ministers acting in their capacity as magistrates “should pass the *Sentence of Death on Malefactors*” was inflammatory, and not only because it exposed a potential contradiction between the Quakers’ testimonies on peace and government.²⁵⁵ It was inflammatory because it gave non-Quaker subjects in the colony, and the Crown government for that matter, another reason to dissolve Quaker rule in Pennsylvania.

Because *An Appeal* and *Plea of the Innocent* called the legitimacy of Pennsylvania’s government into question, especially in matters of security and defense, the provincial Quaker elite moved quickly to suppress Keith and his supporters. Unfortunately for Friends, one of those supporting Keith was William Bradford, the colony’s only printer. On August 24, 1692, less than a month before the yearly meeting convened, Philadelphia magistrates issued a warrant for the arrest of Bradford and his assistant John McComb for printing *An Appeal*, which they characterized as a paper tending “to

²⁵³ William Penn to Friends in Pennsylvania, June 24, 1688, Folder 6, Box 54, Frank M. Etting Collection, HSP.

²⁵⁴ Rowe, *Embattled Bench*, 43, argues that, in spite of the Council’s order, “the record of her judicial fate leaves room to doubt that she met her end at the hands of the hangmen.”

²⁵⁵ [Keith], *An Appeal*, 7.

sedition & the disturbance of the peace & the subvertion [sic] of the present frame of govermt.”²⁵⁶ The following day, Philadelphia magistrates issued a public proclamation by town crier accusing Keith of calling deputy governor Thomas Lloyd “an impudent Man, telling him he was not fit to be Governour, and that his Name would stink, with many other slighting and abusive expressions.” The proclamation also noted that Keith and Bradford had printed tracts “to possess” their readers with the notion that “it is inconsistent for those who are Ministers of the Gospel to act as Magistrates.” The magistrates warned Pennsylvania’s subjects not to give “Countenance to any Revilers and Contemners of Authority, Magistrates, or Magistracy.”²⁵⁷

They had cause for concern. John McComb, Bradford’s assistant, circulated *An Appeal* to customers in his Philadelphia tavern, while the Keithians affixed copies of it “upon the Posts of [the] Town of Philadelphia and elsewhere.”²⁵⁸ Worse yet, the Keithians were busy publishing more tracts critical of the Quaker government. Thomas Budd, an outspoken supporter of Keith, published two such tracts around the same time Philadelphia magistrates issued an arrest warrant for Bradford and McComb. One of them, *A Brief Answer to Two Papers Procured from Friends in Maryland* (1692), recycled almost word for word the same accusations he and Keith had made in *An Appeal*.²⁵⁹ Refuting the idea he was impulsively following “bad spirits,” Budd asserted in *A Brief Answer* that he had joined Keith only after a “diligent search and enquiry into the matter.”²⁶⁰ Budd contended that it was Pennsylvania Friends, and not the Keithians, who held “dangerous doctrines,” and as evidence, he pointed to Quaker magistrates in Philadelphia “hiring men to fight, and signing [the] Commission so to do, and furnishing the Indians with Powder & Lead to go to war with other Indians.” Quaker ministers serving as “worldly Judges,” according to Budd, had sentenced people to death and fined and imprisoned “some of their Brethren” for asserting that Friends were acting contrary to the “antient [sic]

²⁵⁶Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Miscellaneous Papers, 1662-1883, MR-Ph 477, p. 33b, FHL.

²⁵⁷ The public proclamation is reprinted in Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 7-8.

²⁵⁸ Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 161-2; Quotation on p. 161.

²⁵⁹ Thomas Budd, *A Brief Answer to Two Papers Procured from Friends in Maryland ...* ([Philadelphia, 1692]).

²⁶⁰ Budd, *A Brief Answer*, 2.

Principles of Truth.”²⁶¹

Of course, the persecuted “brethren” that Budd had in mind were his fellow Keithians. In September, at the annual gathering of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, provincial Friends disowned Keith and his supporters in the strongest of terms. The yearly meeting noticeably avoided addressing Keith and Budd’s charge that Friends had violated their “ancient” testimony by taking up the mantle of government and concentrated instead on Keith’s “vile abuses and ungodly speeches against Gods people.” In their annual epistle, the yearly meeting referred to the Old Testament trials of Jacob (“fear not worm Jacob I am with thee”) and addressed themselves as “Zion,” thus implicitly locating Friends within the eschatology of God’s final punishment of the wicked and liberation of the oppressed. The same epistle concluded by warning Delaware Valley Friends to heed their “own everlasting welfare” and to “beware of being taken or defiled with that spirit.” The epistle testifying to Keith’s disownment included over two hundred signatures, many of which belonged to the most eminent ministers and magistrates of the colony.²⁶² That same day, the yearly meeting also drafted another epistle justifying their actions to Keith’s ministerial colleagues at the London Yearly Meeting. The epistle warned that “our late friend George Keith doth continue with great violence his separation [and] ... have signed some papers against us, with which they intend to blind the world & friends; as if given forth by [our] Yearly Meeting.”²⁶³ One of the papers the epistle referred to, *A Confession of Faith in the Most Necessary Things of Christian Doctrine* (1692), was published by William Bradford and signed by “*the Yearly Meeting at Burlington*,” which misleadingly gave the impression – perhaps intentionally – that it was issued by the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, since both the yearly meeting and the Keithians’ rival meeting had convened in Burlington, West Jersey, that year.²⁶⁴ Most likely written by Keith, the *Confession of Faith* articulated twelve doctrinal statements on Christology, the resurrection, atonement,

²⁶¹ Budd, *A Brief Answer*, 4.

²⁶² Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph469, August 31, 1681, p. 33-4, FHL.

²⁶³ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph469, August 31, 1681, p. 35-6, FHL; Quotation on p. 36.

²⁶⁴ [Keithian Yearly Meeting], *A Confession of Faith In the most Necessary Things of Christian Doctrine, Faith and Practice According to the Testimony of Holy Scriptures, Given Forth from the Yearly Meeting at Burlington...* (Philadelphia, 1692), Library Company of Philadelphia.

Scriptures, and baptism and communion, among other things. Perhaps sensing the imminent legal danger he and his followers were in, Keith reserved the twelfth statement for their position “Concerning Magistracy,” arguing that “We believe, That it is the Duty of all *Christians*, to give a ready Obedience to Magistrates in all lawful things.”²⁶⁵

Provincial Friends did not find Keith’s overture all that comforting. Within weeks of the yearly meeting, epistles condemning the Keithians arrived from Friends in Maryland and Barbados.²⁶⁶ On October 5, 1692, the Philadelphia grand jury indicted Peter Boss for speaking “scandalous, reproachful and malicious Expressions” against the Quaker justice Samuel Jennings. That same day, Keith and Thomas Budd were also presented by the grand jury for defaming Samuel Jennings by claiming he acted “too high and imperious in Worldly Courts” and calling him “Ignorant, Presumptuous and Insolent” in *The Plea of the Innocent*.²⁶⁷ Keith was also presented for defaming Samuel Richardson, a Quaker bricklayer from Jamaica who had moved to Pennsylvania in 1687 and served as justice of the peace and member of the provincial Assembly for Philadelphia County, among other political offices. Richardson attended the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting and had joined Friends in condemning Keith at the yearly meeting. He had also co-signed the arrest warrant for Bradford and McComb. The trial brought to light moments that reveal the acrimonious nature of the schism, like Keith telling Richardson “before some hundreds of people” to “go home to his whores And calling him [a] Lacivious [sic] old man [who] ... took up maids Petticoats.”²⁶⁸

However inflammatory, Keith’s insults were not the only reason Friends moved so quickly against him and his supporters. The controversy attracted the attention of the Crown government, and worse, the opprobrium of colonists and royalist agents eager to see the end of Quaker rule in Pennsylvania. The Keithian schism coincided with the dramatic expansion and consolidation of English

²⁶⁵ [Keithian Yearly Meeting], *A Confession of Faith*, 20.

²⁶⁶ Epistles of condemnation from Bridgetown, Barbados meeting, September 12, 1692, and Maryland Yearly Meeting at Treadhaven, October 4, 1692, Keithian Controversy MSS, FHL.

²⁶⁷ *The Tryals*, 14, 24.

²⁶⁸ *LLP* 1:632; Grand Jury presentment, October 5 1692, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, 1665-1801, vol. 1., p. 216, APS.

imperial authority that followed the “Glorious” Revolution of 1688-9. The revolution began in England with the deposition of the Catholic James II by the Dutch Protestant stadholder William of Orange, but it soon spread to the American colonies, as Anglo-Protestant subjects toppled proprietary and royalist governments in New York, New England, Maryland, and in the Caribbean. As the newly coronated monarch, William III thrust his dominions into a decades-long struggle against his arch nemesis, Louis XIV of France. The fiscal and bureaucratic reforms in government, necessitated by the demands of war, modernized England’s political economy and greatly expanded the Crown’s oversight of military and imperial affairs. Provincial governments in the mainland American colonies jostled to strengthen their position in the new political environment, with partial success. Colonial assemblies in Maryland and Massachusetts, for example, gained a measure of legislative autonomy, even though royal governors were installed in both provinces and Massachusetts became a royal colony in 1691.²⁶⁹ Pennsylvania avoided a coup d’état but still fared worse in the short run, as Penn’s relationship with the ousted James II put him and his colony in an awkward position with the new Crown government.

The relatively defenseless military posture of the colony exacerbated the situation. In May 1690, Sir William Phips, an Anglo-American military commander, led a major expedition against the French Acadian capital of Port Royal, resulting in its momentary capture. The success of the Acadia campaign prompted Phips to attempt another hastily-planned expedition that August against the French Canadian military post in Quebec. The assault failed miserably, and the New England and New York frontier remained wide open to raids and captive-taking by French Canadian militia and allied Indian war parties. Native-led assaults on Schenectady, New York and at the Anglo-American fort at Falmouth, Maine that year resulted in hundreds of settlers dead or captured and left Maine largely depopulated and New Hampshire vulnerable to further attack. Benjamin Fletcher, the royal governor of

²⁶⁹ Richard S. Dunn, “The Glorious Revolution and America,” in *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. 1: *The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Nicholas Canny (Oxford, 1998), 445–66; John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783* (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1989). On the role of colonial warfare in facilitating imperial consolidation, as well as the initial reluctance of the Crown to send military resources to the American colonies, Bruce Lenman, “Colonial Wars and Imperial Instability, 1688-1793,” in *Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. 2: *The Eighteenth Century*, ed. PJ Marshall (Oxford, 1998), 151-168.

New York, was determined to stop the incursions. His military offensive in 1692 near Schenectady won him acclaim, but it accomplished little else.²⁷⁰ Non-Quaker colonists in Pennsylvania and the Delaware Valley similarly clamored for military preparations, fearing that a French fleet would easily sail up the Delaware Bay and wreak havoc on coastal towns. One such petition to the Provincial Council, in April 1690, noted anxiously that “our Enemies, the French, have barbarously murdered many of his [Majesty’s] subjects, very near the Confines of this Province, wch have struck no Small terrour in us and our ffamilies.” The petitioners, which included Markham, pleaded with the Council to put the colony “in such a posture that we may ... be able by force of Armes, to Defend it against any assault.”²⁷¹

The Crown government was well aware of Pennsylvania’s lack of military preparedness, and when it received word of the Keithian controversy, which by late 1692 seemed to have spiraled out of control, metropolitan officials acted swiftly to restore order. On October 21, 1692, only weeks after the Philadelphia grand jury indicted Keith and four of his supporters, officials at Whitehall appointed Fletcher the royal governor of Pennsylvania, effectively terminating Penn’s proprietary rule. The commission authorized Fletcher, as governor and captain general of New York, to “Levy arme muster Command and Employ all persons whatsoever ... for the resisting and withstanding of all Enemies Pirates and Rebels both at Sea and at land and to transport such forces to any of our Plantations in America as occasion shall Require.” The commission granted Fletcher sweeping powers, including the right to enforce martial law during a time of invasion or insurrection and even simply to compel the building and equipping of military fortifications as he saw fit. Fletcher was also authorized to demand assistance from “any part of the Militia of our Colonies of East and West New Jersey” and “all Officers

²⁷⁰Evan Haefeli and Kevin Sweeney, *Captors and Captives: The 1704 French and Indian Raid on Deerfield* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 2003), 191; Howard Peckham, *The Colonial Wars: 1689-1762* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), 27-38; Guy Chet, *Conquering the American Wilderness: The Triumph of European Warfare in the Colonial Northeast* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003), 82.

²⁷¹*MPCP* 1:334. Besides Markham, the petition was signed by Lasse Cock, Swan Swanson, Jon Holme, and Andrew Binkson. Holme, a leading Philadelphia Baptist and justice of the peace, refused, along with Lasse Cock, to endorse the Quaker magistrates’ prosecution of the Keithians. Despite his misgivings, he sat on the bench during Keith’s trial in December 1692; see *LLP* 1: 440-1.

and Ministers Civil and Military” in Pennsylvania and the lower counties of Delaware.²⁷²

The Crown commission singled out the Keithian schism as a causal factor in terminating Penn’s proprietary rights, noting “the Disorder and Confusion by meanes whereof not onley the publick Peace and Administration of Justice ... is broken and violated but there is also want of Provision for the Guard and Defence of [the colony] against our Enemies.” Because the Delaware Valley “are much exposed and in Danger of being lost [to the enemy],” officials from Whitehall argued, “Wee find it absolutely necessary to take the Government ... into our owne hands.”²⁷³ Fletcher was partially responsible for putting the Keithians’ tracts in the hands of Crown officials. In a letter to Daniel Finch, the secretary of state for the northern department, the Governor of New York wrote, “I find by some prints that there is a separate and dissenting party among them. I have sent some of their fiery books to Mr. Blathway [the Privy Council secretary for the Lords of Trade.]”²⁷⁴

Fletcher and his commission did not arrive in Pennsylvania until April 1693, but the Quaker government was already on trial by the time Keith and his four associates first appeared before the Philadelphia Court of Quarter Sessions on December 9, 1692.²⁷⁵ The trial would last four days. Keith was fully aware of the wider implications of the legal proceedings, as were ruling Friends. The Keithians’ success in the trial was predicated on their ability to demonstrate they were victims of religious persecution. The prosecution, led by David Lloyd acting as Pennsylvania’s Attorney General, argued the Keithians were in open defiance of the proprietary government. Both sides could not afford to acknowledge that their respective claims were in fact two sides of the same coin: since gospel order discourse underpinned Quaker religious discipline *and* civic culture in Pennsylvania, it was impossible to invoke the one without implicating the other. While the Keithians insisted they spoke solely about

²⁷²Copy of October 21, 1692, Commission to Benjamin Fletcher, from William and Mary at the Court of Westminster (1739), Penn Manuscripts, vol. 8: Charters and Frame of Government, HSP.

²⁷³Commission to Benjamin Fletcher, Penn Manuscripts, vol. 8, HSP.

²⁷⁴Benjamin Fletcher to the Earl of Nottingham, April 22, 1693, *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series: America and West Indies, 1574–1739* (hereafter *CSPC*), vol. 14 (London, 1903), 89.

²⁷⁵Fletcher’s arrival in Pennsylvania is recorded in *MPCP* 1:364; a transcript of the opening day of the trial is found in Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 13-42. My summary of the trial also follows Kirby, *George Keith*, 80-6; and Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 163-168.

religious matters, they invariably argued that Friends in the ministry should not hold positions in “worldly government.” With Friends comprising the majority of the colony’s justices, jurors, assemblymen, and provincial councilors, such a claim unavoidably presented itself as an affront to Quaker rule in Pennsylvania. Similarly, it was impossible for Quaker justices (particularly Samuel Jennings, the target of many of the Keithians’ attacks) to prosecute Keith and the other four defendants for sedition without it appearing religiously motivated. Of the ten justices who presided over the Keithians’ trial, seven were Quakers, of whom six were public Friends who served in the Philadelphia Meeting of Ministers.²⁷⁶

Almost inevitably, the trial damaged the reputation of ruling Friends. The proceedings began with Peter Boss acknowledging he wrote a letter accusing Samuel Jennings of gambling and drunkenness. Boss insisted that he spoke only as an elder in the meeting, giving Jennings gospel order discipline, “as is usual for one Church member to do to another.” David Lloyd, the prosecutor, countered that Boss could not so easily separate Jennings from his political office, “for take away Samuell Jennings, and where will the Magistrate be?” Jennings also immediately objected, adding that if Boss took away “Sam. Jenings the Magistrate ... where will Sam. Jenings the Quaker be?”²⁷⁷ While the Quaker justices conflated their religious and political authority, Keith pressed the distinction, arguing that Boss, “being a Member of the Quakers Church,” should not appear in court “until they had proceeded orderly with him in the mens Meetings, and given him Gospel Order.” Keith characterized the Quaker disciplinary process of gospel order as a “Spiritual Court,” and he argued that Boss, as a Friend, should be tried in a monthly meeting and not in the Philadelphia Court of Quarter Sessions. Lloyd, rather inadvisably, asserted that they were in fact being tried in “a Spiritual Court; for in

²⁷⁶ The seven Quaker justices were Samuel Jennings, Arthur Cook, Robert Ewer, Henry Wady, Samuel Richardson, Griffith Owen, and Anthony Morris. All except Henry Wady were Public Friends. Three of the justices – John Holme, Robert Turner, and Lasse Cock – were non-Quakers, but Robert Turner presided for only two of the trial’s four days and Lasse Cock only one; see Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 13 and Butler, “Gospel Order Improved,” 450.

²⁷⁷ Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 15.

England they can try Atheism in this Court.”²⁷⁸ The comment provoked outrage from spectators, many of whom, as Quakers, had been the target of state-sanctioned religious persecution in England.²⁷⁹ Shrewdly, Boss had his letter read in court as evidence, and while it did not serve to exonerate him of defamation, it certainly worsened Jennings’ reputation through a public airing of his character flaws. Besides relating numerous incidents of drunkenness, Boss’s letter also alleged that Jennings was a violent master who grabbed one of his servants by the throat and made the other crawl “almost Naked” in the snow when the latter complained about his abusive behavior. Even more damaging was Boss’s allegation that Jennings cruelly whipped “his Servant Maid naked in her Bed, the manner and circumstance of which [was omitted in court] for modesties sake.”²⁸⁰ The public reading of Boss’s letter worked as a legal tactic; the Quaker-packed jury found him guilty of only “speaking slightly of a Magistrate,” but the bench assessed him a £6 fine anyway.²⁸¹ The damage to Jennings’ reputation as a Quaker, of course, was far greater.

During his trial, Keith argued that the Quaker justices had no moral or legal authority to try him and his codefendants. Keith, like Boss, maintained, “I am not presentable by the Grand Jury for any thing alledged against me, they being no Offences against the King, Governor nor Country.” Lloyd and Keith parried over whether calling a man “Proud and Imperious” was legally actionable or presentable, but the latter insisted along with Thomas Budd that their comments were not directed at Jennings “as he was a Magistrate, but as he professed himself to be Christian and Minister of Christ.”²⁸² It was, in other words, a gospel order matter, which Keith argued was no business of a secular court. The Keithians pressed the distinction between political and religious modes of authority, trying to safely stay on the latter side of the dichotomy while accusing the Quaker justices of using their political

²⁷⁸Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 17.

²⁷⁹ According to the transcript, one spectator, Ralph Ward, rebuked Lloyd by asking him, “May not sin be reproved in a Bishop or Magistrate?” Lloyd and the other Quaker justices, “greatly offended,” directed a constable to have him removed from the court; see Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 17.

²⁸⁰Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 17-22; quotations on p. 21.

²⁸¹Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 22.

²⁸²Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 26-7.

authority to oppress them in matters of religious conscience. The prosecution argued the opposite – it was the Keithians who used religious liberty as a pretext to undermine the government. When William Bradford was called before the bench, Samuel Jennings instructed the jury to find “whether or not that Paper, call’d the Appeal, had not a tendency to the weakening the hands of the Magistrates, and encouragement of Wickedness.”

Of the five Keithian defendants, it was Bradford, the printer, who faced the most serious charge, that of printing seditious material against the government. Bradford freely admitted he had printed *An Appeal* but rejected the prosecution’s assertion that he had committed sedition. Since the tract dealt with a religious matter, he argued, and not a political one, he had broken no law by exercising his right to liberty of conscience. The argument strongly echoed William Penn’s defense of religious liberty during his Old Bailey trial in 1670, and Bradford more than likely intended for the jury to make the association.²⁸³ Yet the political implications of *An Appeal* were evident, and not surprisingly, the Quaker government’s recovery of Jennings’ stolen sloop repeatedly surfaced as an issue during the trial. Bradford objected to James Fox sitting as a juror because he had overheard him threaten another Friend that he would mark him as an enemy to the government for criticizing the actions of the Quaker magistrates on that day. Lloyd countered that Quaker magistrates in Philadelphia had not commissioned an armed posse to hunt down Babit and his crew and that raising the hue and cry “to fetch back the Sloop” in any case was done “of great necessity.” Rather than debate Lloyd on that point, Bradford wisely responded that what he had printed in *An Appeal* was solely intended for the yearly meeting to consider “whether it was not a Transgression of the Quakers Principles to hire and [commission] men to fight?”²⁸⁴

At first glance, the attention accorded to the recovery of a stolen sloop, which amounted to nothing more than a minor security incident, seems wholly out of proportion. But Babit and his crew

²⁸³Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 34; Smolenksi, *Friends and Strangers*, 168.

²⁸⁴Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 33-4.

were never caught. And if the search party had recovered the sloop unarmed, as the Quaker apologist Caleb Pusey insisted, it was probably because the pirates had already abandoned the ship by the time they came aboard.²⁸⁵ Regardless of what actually took place, the debate played right into the hands of the Quakers' many critics who believed Pennsylvania was ill-equipped to defend the colony from pirates and foreign enemies. Neither did debating Quaker pacifist scruples in relation to Friends serving in government appear opportune at a time when the Pennsylvania's proprietary charter teetered on the brink of collapse. Keith appealed to "ancient" (and by implication timeless) principles when he referred to the peace testimony, but the trial made it very evident that Friends were not in agreement about the meaning of Quaker pacifism or what it meant in practice, especially where it concerned the moral obligations of magistrates in government – an ambiguity that their imperial enemies later seized on. Compounding the difficulty for the Keithians was that, despite their claim to be speaking as ministers and not as rebels in defiance of the established government, they could not so easily separate the religious from the political implications of their arguments. Fortunately for them, Quaker justices could not either, as much as they wanted to avoid looking like religious persecutors. The language of gospel order inflected the entire edifice of religious and political Quaker power in Pennsylvania, and hence both sides were unable to retreat from the dual implications of their opposing claims to authority.

In the end, the Keithians won their case, even if they technically lost their trial. While the jury found Keith, Boss, and Budd guilty of asserting that Jennings behaved "too high and imperiously in Worldly Courts," it stopped short of identifying their actions as slander or any other breach of law. The Quaker justices, not content with the jury's verdict, slapped a £5 fine on both Keith and Budd (Boss was assessed a £6 fine for the same offense.)²⁸⁶ Keith and Budd appealed their fines to the Provincial Council, but that body denied the appeal on the grounds that their petition was legally invalid. Perhaps

²⁸⁵ There is no extant record of Babit's arrest or capture. Given the attention accorded this incident, had Babit been captured, it certainly would have been noted in the Provincial Council minutes or in retrospective accounts. Caleb Pusey's account of the stolen sloop incident in *Satan's Harbinger Encountered*, 78-9, is silent on the fate of Babit.

²⁸⁶ Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 22, 31.

out of desperation or a desire to embarrass the justices, or both, Keith and Budd then appealed their case that same day “to the King and Queen and thiere councell in England.”²⁸⁷ With the Philadelphia Court of Quarter Sessions firmly in control of their petition, however, there is no indication it ever left the colony.

The justices’ overzealous prosecution of Bradford, moreover, had unwittingly turned the Keithians into religious martyrs. Because Bradford had published *An Appeal* without his name on the title page, the justices tried to convict him on an obscure, unenforced English statute that barred the printing of such tracts, but the jury failed to go along with the strategy. When the jury proved unable to render a unanimous guilty verdict on the charge of sedition, the justices in frustration locked them in a room “without Meat, Drink, Fire, or Tobacco,” a move that could not but invite comparisons to the infamous jury sequestration during the Penn-Mead trial. When the jurors still refused to tender a unanimous guilty verdict, the magistrates dismissed them in anger and seized Bradford’s press. But this draconian maneuver only succeeded in making the Quaker magistrates look like religious persecutors. In the end, the Quaker justices yielded whatever authority they had in the case. As a result, the Keithians’ fines were never collected, and Bradford’s press was eventually returned to him.²⁸⁸

The Keithians’ arguments in court may have swayed the mostly Quaker jury from rendering a guilty verdict, despite the Keithians’ later claim that it was only the intervention of three non-Quaker jurors that saved Bradford from a sedition conviction.²⁸⁹ The jury’s verdict was not a preordained outcome. At least nine of the twelve jurors were Friends who opposed the Keithians and very likely blamed them for the political turmoil caused by the schism. Peter Boss objected to the mostly Quaker jury during his trial because “they are such as I know to be deeply prejudiced against G.K.”²⁹⁰

²⁸⁷ George Keith and Thomas Budd, “To this present Court of Quarter Sessions held at Philadelphia,” December 12, 1692, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, vol. 1, p. 218, APS.

²⁸⁸ Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 35-6; Smolenksi, *Friends and Strangers*, 168.

²⁸⁹ According to Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 37, the three non-Quaker jurors “stood upon the Nicety (as they call’d it) of Evidence that *W.B.* [Bradford] printed that Paper; whereas the other Jurors called *Quakers* said, they believed that *W.B.* printed it, and that it was a seditious Paper, &c. and they would not acquit him.”

²⁹⁰ Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 15.

Whatever their resentments against George Keith, members of the jury had other prejudicial concerns. Bradford objected to Joseph Kirl as a juror because the latter had allegedly told Quaker justice Arthur Cook that “merchants would be discouraged of coming here [to Pennsylvania] with their vessels, &c.” if the magistrates were “found fault with” by Keithians who told them “that they must not defend themselves against Thieves and Robbers.”²⁹¹ Kirl, a Philadelphia-based merchant and ship’s captain, viewed the Keithians as an economic threat to his livelihood, but his fears easily dovetailed with the larger concern, probably shared by other jury members, that the schism would damage Pennsylvania’s reputation and undermine Quaker authority in the colony.²⁹²

To convince a skeptical or even an initially hostile jury, the Keithians appealed to the “ancient” peace testimony of Friends, articulating its ramifications for the broader Quaker diaspora in the English Atlantic. Like the refusal to swear oaths, the peace testimony implicated Friends everywhere, despite the complex and widely varying Quaker responses to the problem of violence and warfare. Not all Friends in the American colonies objected to militia service in the late seventeenth century, but a significant number either opposed it outright or sought alternatives to it, such as mustering or conducting a watch “in their own way,” which usually meant unarmed.²⁹³ The absence of an organized militia in Pennsylvania shielded Quaker pacifists from compulsory military service and the sanctions that went along with its refusal. Conscientious objection was also at times protected in Rhode Island,

²⁹¹ Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 33.

²⁹² Joseph Kirl (sometimes Kirl) captained the brigantine *Reformation*, which was shipwrecked off the coast of Florida in 1696. Jonathan Dickinson, a prominent Philadelphia Quaker merchant and slave trader, was aboard. He later wrote an account of their shipwreck and subsequent rescue in *Gods Protecting Providence: Man’s Surest Help and Defence in the Times of the Greatest Difficulty* (Philadelphia, 1699); see Harold Gillingham, “The Estate of Jonathan Dickinson, 1663-1722,” *PMHB* 59 (October 1935): 420; *PWP* 3:469, f. 19.

²⁹³ The quotation is taken from an epistle Fox wrote advising Friends in the Caribbean to muster for the militia “in their own way,” by which he meant unarmed. The epistle reads in part, “So Friends have always proffered the magistrates though they could not join with them in carrying arms swords and pistols yet to watch in their own way against the evil doer.” See George Fox, “To Friends in Nevis and the Carribee Islands,” [1675], reprinted in *A Collection of Many Select and Christian Epistles, Letters and Testimonies*, vol. 2 (New York: Isaac Hopper, 1831), 89. An official on the island of Nevis told Irish Quaker missionary William Edmundson in 1671 that “there are seven hundred of our militia turned Quakers; and the Quakers will not fight;” see *A Journal of the Life, Travel, Sufferings ... of that Worthy Elder and Faithful Servant of Jesus Christ, William Edmundson* (London, 1829), 55-7. Quotation on p. 57. Not all Friends refused to serve in the militia. For seventeenth-century Friends’ complex responses to militia service in New England, see Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace*, 91-7, 200-11.

where Friends could hold political office. In other locales, however, Friends were a sanctioned religious minority, and their refusal to muster for the militia exposed them to legal sanctions as well as ridicule and opprobrium. This was especially true in the Caribbean, where a settler militia was vital for defending against privateering and piracy attacks, as well as to prevent slave revolts. On the island of Nevis, settlers blamed Quaker missionaries for converting their neighbors and causing their militia rolls to suffer as a result. Provincial governments in the Anglo Caribbean, dominated by an Anglican planter elite, sometimes imposed heavy fines and imprisonment on Friends to dissuade them from refusing militia service. On Barbados, which had a sizeable Quaker community in the late seventeenth century, the penalties were considerable. Larry Gragg estimates that between 1674 and 1693, the Barbadian government arrested three hundred Friends and assessed over £10,000 in fines for their militia refusal, as well as for non-payment of parish tithes and evangelizing to the island's enslaved African population.²⁹⁴

It would be impossible for the Quaker members of the jury not to be painfully aware of the considerable hardship their co-religionists abroad endured on the account of the peace testimony, especially in the Caribbean. Many of jurors were merchants or artisans with extensive commercial and religious links to the Caribbean. Humphrey Waterman, one of the jurors, had emigrated to Pennsylvania from Barbados sometime in the late 1680s. Although he was apparently not a Quaker, his wife was, and after settling in Philadelphia they continued to maintain their longstanding commercial and familial ties to Friends in Barbados. Moreover, as a captain of a militia unit in Barbados, Waterman would have been keenly aware of the Quakers' precarious political position on the island, particularly regarding their conscientious objection.²⁹⁵ Joseph Kirle, like Waterman, also maintained close ties to the Quaker community in Barbados. In addition to running a sizeable merchant shipping interest there,

²⁹⁴Larry Gragg, *The Quaker Community on Barbados: Challenging the Culture of the Planter Class* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2009), 5.

²⁹⁵*PWP* 3: 204, f. 35; William Wade Hinshaw, ed., *Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy*, vol. 2 (Ann Arbor: Edwards Bros., 1936), 679. For evidence of Waterman's service as a militia captain, see James C. Brandow, *Omitted Chapters from Hotten's Original Lists of Persons of Quality* (Baltimore, 1982), 167.

he sailed to Barbados from Philadelphia in 1689 to marry his wife, Mary Brett, in Bridgetown with many Friends in attendance.²⁹⁶ Another juror, Abraham Hardiman, was brother-in-law to Samuel Carpenter, one of the most prominent Quaker merchants in Philadelphia. Carpenter had immigrated to Pennsylvania from Barbados and his vast wealth derived from his close business connections to the West Indies.²⁹⁷

Peace testimony considerations for the jury were not just limited to the Caribbean. Pennsylvania Friends had close ties to their coreligionists in England, and particularly London, the center and metropole of Atlantic Quakerism. As their counterparts in Pennsylvania were very much aware, English Friends, even after the Toleration Act of 1689, were prohibited from holding public office. Without the political influence that came with government service, obtaining relief from sanctions against conscientious objection proved difficult. Throughout the late seventeenth century, especially in London and the southeastern portion of England, where the threat of foreign invasion was perceived to be the greatest, Quakers faced fines, distraint of property, and even imprisonment for refusing mandatory militia service.²⁹⁸ Friends everywhere were acutely aware of the political situation in England, and a few of the jurors in the Keithian trial, such as John Whitpaine, were Quaker merchants with direct commercial and family ties to London.²⁹⁹ Closer to home, the Keithian jurors were also very aware of what was at stake in preserving the absence of a military force in Pennsylvania. By far, the most politically prominent juror was James Fox, whose alleged animus toward any criticism of the Quaker government had prompted Bradford's objections. Fox was a staunch Quaker and a former cloth maker from Plymouth, England. Representing Philadelphia County in the Assembly, he contended with Benjamin Fletcher's repeated demands for Pennsylvania's financial assistance with the military defense

²⁹⁶ Walter Lee Sheppard, ed., *Passengers and Ships Prior to 1684*, Publications of the Welcome Society of Pennsylvania, no. 1 (Welcome Society of Pennsylvania, 1985), 112, f. 140; Hinshaw, ed., *Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy*, vol. 2, p. 574.

²⁹⁷ Edward Carpenter and Louis Henry Carpenter, *Samuel Carpenter and His Descendants* (Philadelphia, 1912), 9-10; Gary Nash, "The Early Merchants of Philadelphia: The Formation and Disintegration of a Founding Elite," in *World of William Penn*, eds. Dunn and Dunn, 344.

²⁹⁸ See chapter 5, p. 181-2.

²⁹⁹ *PWP* 3:51, f. 6.

of New York, weighing the conflicting demands of the peace testimony against the need to make necessary concessions in order to preserve the colony's autonomy.³⁰⁰

Since Friends abroad suffered penalties for eschewing military service, the Quaker jurors were particularly sensitive to the accusation that the Pennsylvania government undermined the peace testimony. Three days before they went to trial, Keith and Budd submitted a petition to the court decrying "the great declension" of Pennsylvania Friends "from their antient principal against the use of Carnal Weapons."³⁰¹ An abbreviated version of it was included in the Keithians' published narrative of the trial's proceedings, but the manuscript version, which was submitted to the court, is even more compelling in its argumentation.³⁰² Although the Keithians addressed their petition to the court, it was clearly intended for jurors, provincial Friends, and through the published version, a wider Anglo-American audience. In the manuscript version, the Keithians argued that they were "ready to answer according to the law ... our paper called the appeal." Drawing particular attention to the fate of Friends in the West Indies, the petition noted that it was the "testimony of our friends in old England, and Barbadoes, &c. ... [that] it is not lawfull for the people called Quakers to take ... nor to make use of the carnal sword or outward violence & force in our own defense." The petition then outlined a series of "testimonies faithfully collected out of our friends books & writings," beginning with George Fox's *Declaration*. The petition quotes from a 1686 letter by Thomas Cox, a London Quaker, to Thomas Budd, written in response to the latter's *Good Order Established in Pennsilvania & New-Jersey in America* (1685). According to petition, Cox chided Budd for "owning it to be necessary upon occasion [for magistrates] to use the Sword," reminding him that in England "friends shipmasters have deneyed to this day to carry gunes [sic] & other ammunition of war." The petition also quoted another letter by Cox reminding George Hutchinson, who later became a Keithian, that Friends in Barbados "doe now

³⁰⁰ *LLP* 1: 356; *PWP* 3: 377, f. 1.

³⁰¹ Keith and Boss, *The Tryals*, 37.

³⁰² The manuscript version is found in George Keith and Thomas Budd, "To the County Court of the County of Philadelphia," December 6, 1692, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, 1665-1801, vol. 1, p. 218, APS.

suffer there because they cannot beare Armes.” The letters were a warning: if Friends in the Delaware Valley did not adhere more closely to a strict interpretation of the peace testimony, Quakers everywhere would stand accused of moral inconsistency, especially where the provincial government was concerned, and the Crown government would conclude “if [Friends] can use the outward Sword in New Jersey why should they not beare Armes here in England [?]”³⁰³

In appealing to the moral precedents of “ancient” Quaker tradition, the Keithians were in fact inventing new forms of Quaker peace discourse to fit a novel cultural context.³⁰⁴ Pennsylvania was not Barbados, nor was it England, though the colony had deep ties to both places. Pennsylvania Friends were freed from the constraints of religious dissent. They avoided the fines and other punitive sanctions their coreligionists routinely suffered in England and most other American colonies. While political power liberated provincial Friends in that regard, it also created new moral problems, particularly the problem of state-sanctioned violence, which was an avoidable consequence of governing a colony and enforcing a criminal code. Pennsylvania Friends believed they could reconcile their dual roles as ministers and magistrates, and they similarly employed gospel order discourse to articulate a seamless harmony between their religious and political modes of discipline. Yet in reality provincial Quakers were divided over the relevance or meaning of the peace testimony as a discourse on the moral limits of violence, a fact that the Keithian schism made painfully clear. And there was of course no universal agreement among Friends or even as a guideline on the proper relationship between church and state.

Soon after the trial, the Keith and his followers published an extended treatise on the moral corruptions of state power, arguing that secular and religious modes of authority ought to be mutually exclusive. The tract, *A Testimony and Caution ... That [Friends] Should Not Be Concerned in Worldly*

³⁰³ Keith and Budd, “To the County Court of the County of Philadelphia,” 218, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, APS.

³⁰⁴ In arguing for the novel cultural context of Pennsylvania Quakerism, I am following the work of John Smolenski. Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 11, argues that “the identities, habits, symbols, and language surrounding civic life in early Pennsylvania were both products and drivers of a historical process of creolization,” which he characterizes as an “an interplay between tradition and novelty, even as [Quaker] colonists so frequently resisted the latter and proclaimed their love of the former.” I would argue the Keithians’ use of the Quaker peace testimony during their trial was itself a dialectical interplay between tradition and novelty, creating in the process novel forms of Quaker peace discourse.

Government, expanded on the Keithians' earlier arguments about the complicity of Pennsylvania Friends in state-sanctioned violence.³⁰⁵ Unlike their petition to the court, the Keithians this time aimed for a much broader audience in the Delaware Valley and beyond. By arguing that government power inherently corrupted religious purity, the Keithians again took an extreme position relative to the Quakers' long-standing acceptance of government.

But in many ways, the "classical" Quaker position on government was the product of the Restoration era. Before 1660, Friends generally embraced the republican government and served in its armed forces, at least before the Protectorate era. The final collapse of the Commonwealth and the imminent restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1659-60 convinced most Friends the English state could no longer be an instrument of moral regeneration. The language of Fox's carnal/spirit dualism in his 1660 *Declaration* conveyed a stark separation between the spiritual authority of Friends and the "carnal" authority of the state. This framework of course assumed that Friends, as a morally redeemed religious sect, would remain in opposition to political power. With the nascent promise of Pennsylvania in hand, William Penn articulated a new theology that persuaded Friends of the merits of government's productive power. With Friends in office, Penn reasoned, government could become an instrument of redemption rather than a force for persecution. Yet Fox's carnal/spirit metaphor, which suggested a more ambiguous relationship to the state, still powerfully shaped Quaker discourse.³⁰⁶

Keith employed this carnal/spirit framework in *A Testimony and Caution* to make Quaker magistrates look like moral hypocrites and bad pacifists. References and allusions to the *Declaration* appear throughout the text. When Keith affirmed in the text that pacifist Christians posed "no danger ... of being guilty of any Plots or Conspiracies against the Government," his wording deliberately echoed

³⁰⁵[Keithian Monthly Meeting], *A Testimony and Caution ... That [Friends] Should Not Be Concerned in Worldly Government*, in *The Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost, 201-212.

³⁰⁶ Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 52-3. According to Smolenski, Penn's "beliefs on governance distinguished Penn from other earlier Quaker reformers. Authors such as Edward Billing, Edward Burrough, and Isaac Penington argued for reforms intended to check the influence of legal and political institutions on English subjects' rights, particularly with respect to religion ... Penn, on the other hand, argued for government's productive power, blurring the line between spiritual and civil modes of authority as a means of expanding the power the latter." Quotation on p. 52.

Fox's denial that Friends were "Plotters against KING CHARLES." While the phrasing of *A Testimony and Caution* evoked "ancient" English Quaker traditions, the tract was in fact innovating on them by adapting peace testimony discourse to address the moral legitimacy of Quaker government in Pennsylvania. The Keithians argued that government, though legitimate, belonged to the "carnal" realm, where "there may be found men that are more fitted and qualified." The "men" Keith had mind were "Heathens or Gentiles," not Quakers. The reasoning was simple, almost inarguable. Government, even a Quaker one predicated on gospel order, was inherently violent, or at least violence was an inescapable part of governing.³⁰⁷

According to Keith, state-sanctioned violence inevitably took two forms. The first was judicial violence. Keith argued that Friends could not escape the problem of violence in the courts – even Quaker courts – because "all rational men will judge, that a pair of Stocks, Whipping Post and Gallows, are Carnal Weapons, as [much] as [a] Sword or Gun." The second inevitable form of state-sanctioned violence of course was warfare, and Keith did not hesitate to raise the specter of Indian attacks and imperial warfare overtaking Pennsylvania, a not entirely implausible scenario at the time (and one that would be proved correct by the Seven Year's War). "And if any Invasion ... should happen by *French* or *Indians* against the Inhabitants in these parts," he argued, Quakers in government cannot expect to "discharge the trust and duty belongeth to them ... without raising force of Arms against [their enemies]; which would be a plain contradiction to the former [peace] Testimony of our Friends."³⁰⁸ The meaning of *A Testimony and Caution* was clear: Quakers could try to build a noncoercive colony in Pennsylvania, but a truly nonviolent government was a contradiction in terms and impossible to achieve in reality.

Keith's primary metaphor for state violence was "carnal" – or fleshly. George Fox had routinely

³⁰⁷[Keithian Monthly Meeting], *A Testimony and Caution ... That [Friends] Should Not Be Concerned in Worldly Government*, in *The Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost, 208-9.

³⁰⁸[Keithian Monthly Meeting], *A Testimony and Caution ... That [Friends] Should Not Be Concerned in Worldly Government*, in *The Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost, 204.

used the “carnal” metaphor in reference to violence and warfare, and contrasted it with the spiritual authority of Friends. Keith extended that metaphor to the state, as if to claim that politics is warfare by other means, organized and channeled through the provincial courts and legal culture. In the words of a legal scholar Robert Cover, “legal interpretive acts,” by necessity, “signal and occasion the imposition of violence upon others.” By “interpretive acts,” Cover means the “violence that judges deploy as instruments of a modern nation state.”³⁰⁹ His insight could just as well apply to early Quaker Pennsylvania.

The Keithian controversy refused to go away. Following his trial, Keith prepared to leave for England to lodge an appeal with the London Yearly Meeting. In June 1693, he presented William Markham, who was acting on behalf of the royal governor Benjamin Fletcher, and two other members of the Provincial Council with a petition seeking their official certification acknowledging his “good behavior.” Keith probably believed a certificate would help establish his innocence with London Friends, and at any rate, his odds of obtaining it were good because three members of the Council, including Markham, were non-Quakers. In the petition, Keith denied he was “a decryer [sic] of magistracy and a notoriously evil instrument in Church, and State” and insisted that his criticisms of Jennings and the other Quaker justices were not directed at them as magistrates but rather as “pretended ministers.”³¹⁰ The Council granted him the certificate.³¹¹ Keith made his voyage to England in December, leaving from Maryland. According to Samuel Jennings, who happened to witness his departure, Keith spent the remainder of this time “disturbing friends meetings heer crying ... for Justice ... [saying he would] use all endeavours by Gods help ... [and] would Kindle a fire in Maryland [and]

³⁰⁹ Robert Cover, “Violence and the Word,” *Yale Law Journal* 95 (July 1986): 1601-1629. Quotations on p. 1601, 1601, f. 1. Appropriately enough, Cover emphasizes the fleshly or “carnal” implications of judicial violence, and his summation in many ways mirrors Keith’s own arguments: “The normative world-building which constitutes ‘Law’ is never just a mental or spiritual act. A legal world is built only to the extent that there are commitments that place bodies on the line ... It reminds us that the interpretive commitments of officials are realized, indeed, in the flesh.” Quotation on p. 1605.

³¹⁰ George Keith, “To the Lieutenant Governor & Counsell,” June 20, 1693, Hazard Family Papers, HSP.

³¹¹ *MPCP* 1: 378.

leave it burning.”³¹²

Keith surely counted on getting a more sympathetic audience in Britain. He was, after all, formerly closely associated with many leading Friends, including William Penn, who had once called him a “dear brother.”³¹³ Initially, when word of the schism reached England, London Friends, unaware of the magnitude of what was transpiring across the ocean, counseled patience and encouraged both sides to reconcile.³¹⁴ Even as late as November 1692, Penn wrote to Robert Turner from London somewhat naively relaying his hopes that both sides could “meet together as before.” At that point, Penn still believed “the difference is more in Spirit then [sic] words or matter.”³¹⁵

After the trial, however, the severity of controversy – and the ensuing damage to Pennsylvania’s reputation – was evident even to English Friends, and most of all to Penn, who had been in hiding since he had lost his colony. Just weeks before Keith departed for England, Penn, writing from London, informed provincial Friends that the “Tryall of G. Keith has been Industriously spread all about the nation Especially at Lond: [London] at the Court, Westminster hall, & the parliament house.” The “odium it has contracted in some [and] stirred up in others ... against Frdshaveing power, [against] me, & [you] in perticular,” he warned them, “are great & Lamentable.” Penn was exasperated at the state of affairs, and he felt helpless to contain the controversy: “The Lord put an holy stop by his wise power to this evil work.”³¹⁶ Penn’s longtime association with James II made it difficult for him to convince the new monarchs that he was loyal to the regime and that the revocation of his proprietary charter was unwarranted.³¹⁷ The schism compounded his problems. In another letter written around the same time, Penn again confided to Pennsylvania Friends about the bad publicity caused by the “troublesomTryall,

³¹² Samuel Jennings to Phineas Pemberton, December 26, 1693, Folder 50, Box 42, Frank M. Etting Collection, HSP.

³¹³ William Penn, “To G[eorge] Keith Robert Berkley and the Rest of the Brethren Imprison’d at Aberdeen for the Testimony of Jesus,” [n.d.], p. 1, Miscellaneous Manuscripts of William Penn (1674-1716), vol. 6: Ford vs. Penn, Penn Manuscripts, #485A, HSP.

³¹⁴ Kirby, *George Keith*, 95-7.

³¹⁵ William Penn to Robert Turner, November 29, 1692, *PWP* 3:354-5.

³¹⁶ William Penn to Friends in Pennsylvania, December 11, 1693, *PWP* 3:382-3.

³¹⁷ Joseph Illick, *William Penn the Politician: His Relations with the English Government* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965), 123.

which exceeds in mischeife, all G Ks books, both wth [the] state & all Churches here.”³¹⁸

Keith’s arrival in London in early 1694, followed by Samuel Jennings and Thomas Duckett, who came to defend the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting’s actions, only made the breach worse. Keith briefly enjoyed a warm reception from some Quaker leaders in London, including Penn, who had remembered him as a ministerial ally. The London Yearly Meeting, rather than taking sides in the controversy, censured both Keith and Pennsylvania Friends for their failure to reconcile and for allowing the dispute to become public.³¹⁹ Predictably, Keith refused to back down or even acknowledge that he had done anything wrong. He began associating with a London separatist group of former Quakers at Harp Lane. The move alienated Keith’s erstwhile allies, and in the following year, in 1695, the London Yearly Meeting at last disowned him. With that, Keith was no longer in communion with the Society of Friends.³²⁰

After Keith’s disownment, Friends finally published their narrative of events in two tracts approved by Quakers in London: Samuel Jennings’ *State of the Case* (1696) and Caleb Pusey’s *Modest Account* (1696). Both tracts were published in London and circulated in Pennsylvania. Besides being the first printed accounts of the Quakers’ side of the dispute, the tracts are significant in what they reveal and what they choose to omit. In *State of the Case*, Jennings gave a blow-by-blow account of the schism – from his point of view, of course. He also methodically (and rather self-servingly) refuted many of the Keithians’ personal allegations against him, especially the accusation that he was a drunk and beat his servants. Much of his account rehearsed the theological aspects of the schism. Jennings paid particular attention to Keith’s combative personality and allegedly disorderly behavior, which he and other Friends blamed for causing the schism. Yet *State of the Case* devoted scant attention to Keith’s “Gospel Order and Discipline Improved” manuscript, or the Philadelphia ministers’ reaction to it, even though both arguably played a larger role in the schism than did dysfunctional personalities.

³¹⁸ William Penn to Thomas Lloyd’s Supporters, April 24, 1694, *PWP* 3:389-90.

³¹⁹ Kirby, *George Keith*, 99-100.

³²⁰ Kirby, *George Keith*, 104.

The tract also avoided altogether the question of Friends' involvement in "worldly" government, even though the Keithians devoted an entire tract to that subject.³²¹

Pusey's *Modest Account*, by contrast, took up the matter "concerning Christians and Preachers being Magistrates," but rather than address the problem of government coercion directly, the tract sought to shift the blame on Keith.³²² Pusey derided Keith as "unmanly" and claimed the latter commended the Quaker government for recovering Jennings' stolen sloop until he found it politically expedient to broadcast his disapproval. Pusey denied that the magistrates had armed a search party, but he tacitly conceded that governments must use force to preserve social order. He supported this point somewhat obliquely by referring to an earlier print debate Keith had with Cotton Mather about a woman going naked as a sign of public protest. According to Pusey, Keith argued that such an action deserved corporal punishment, "yet this Woman pretended Religion for what she did." The implication was clear. Keith argued during his trial that his criticisms of Samuel Jennings and Thomas Lloyd were religious in nature and directed at them as Friends and not as magistrates, but Pusey countered that calling Lloyd an "Impudent Man, telling him he was not fit to be a Governor," was an attack on the civic order of the colony, necessitating corrective legal action. "For if that might be allowed," he argued, "might not Magistrates at any time be abused at the pleasure of every idle person [?]"³²³

In defending the Pennsylvania government's actions, Pusey's *Modest Account* resorted to moral casuistry, but just like Jennings' *State of the Case*, it avoided the larger question of Quaker complicity in state-sanctioned violence. Pusey split hairs on the question of whether Quakers magistrates commissioned an armed posse to recover Jennings' sloop: there were two magistrates, not three, and neither of them were ministers; it was a local civil action undertaken by magistrates who did not have

³²¹ Samuel Jennings, *The State of the Case, Briefly but Impartially Given Betwixt the People Called Quakers, Pensylvania, &c In America, Who Remain in Unity, and George Keith . . .* (London, 1694), reprinted in *The Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost, 219-303; Caleb Pusey, *A Modest Account from Pensylvania of the Principal Differences in Point of Doctrine, between George Keith, and Those of the People Called Quakers ...* (London, 1696), reprinted in *The Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost, 304-370.

³²² Pusey, *A Modest Account*, in *Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost, 311.

³²³ Pusey, *A Modest Account*, in *Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost, 321,342, 345.

the authority to execute a military operation; and Quaker ministers had not “ingrossed [sic] the Worldly government” anyway since most officeholders in the colony were not ministers and more than a few of them were non-Quakers.³²⁴ At first blush, Pusey’s rationalizations seem unnecessary. Given the security pressures the colony was under, he had good reason to affirm the right of governments to use whatever force was necessary to suppress piracy and other criminal acts, a proposition that most moral and legal commentators of the day took as self-evident. It would seem like an obvious counterpoint to make against anyone who would challenge the right of a Quaker government to use force against perceived social disorders.

Yet by skirting this point, Pusey avoided having to contend with thornier issues. Chief among them was the fact that violence, or the use of force, was an inherent part of governing a colony. For Pusey, the peace testimony provided no clear moral guidance for running a colony, nor could it be used unambiguously to vindicate the actions of Quaker magistrates. By refusing to grapple with the Keithians’ contention that government power inherently corrupted religious authority, Pusey evaded a more fundamental problem that dogged Pennsylvania from the beginning: Religious and political authority in the colony occupied distinct but ultimately inseparable realms. Gospel order, originally a Quaker discourse on church governance, undergirded the civic and legal culture of the colony. It was, in fact, the very justification of Quaker rule in the colony. Thus in Pennsylvania, the “carnal” and “spiritual” realms were fused together, rendering it difficult for Quaker apologists to apply two moral standards, one for “ministers” and one for “magistrates.” The peace testimony was also implicitly a part of gospel order rhetoric, and it too implicated the actions of Quaker magistrates, whether Pusey chose to acknowledge it or not. It was in Pusey’s interest in fact *not* to address these questions directly, for they had real-world consequences. As Andrew Murphy argues, in the wake of the Keithian schism provincial Friends faced a vexing moral dilemma.³²⁵ On the one hand, the Keithians portrayed the

³²⁴ Pusey, *A Modest Account*, in *Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost, 343.

³²⁵ Murphy, *Conscience and Community*, 204.

Pennsylvania government as inherently coercive, and therefore morally corrupt, while on the other hand the Quakers' many other detractors, including Crown agents, accused them of being insufficiently coercive in their province. Pusey could argue that the peace testimony had no bearing on Quaker government in Pennsylvania, but arguing this point in public risked undermining Friends' efforts to keep an organized militia out of the colony, not to mention the deleterious effect on Quakers abroad who continued to suffer state persecution for refusing to serve in local militias. The best option for Pusey was silence, at least on the issue of Quaker government and state-sanctioned violence.

Pennsylvania Friends wished the schism would go away, and for a time it appeared as if it would. Auspiciously, in August 1694, almost two years after the Keithians' trial, Penn received his charter back from the Crown government.³²⁶ In appealing to have his charter restored, Penn addressed his petition to the Queen, Mary II, coregent and spouse to William III. Mary, the daughter of King James II, probably retained some sympathy for Penn, who was once close to her ousted father. Whatever her reason, Mary granted the appeal. Her intervention was timely – she died four months later. Through Sir John Trenchard, the Secretary of State for the Crown government in England, the Queen relayed her pleasure “to restore [Penn] to ye: adminstracon [sic] of the Government of our Said province [of Pennsylvania] ... not doubting of your Ready & Cheerfull Obedience to our Royall pleasure” regarding “the Security and Preservation as well of our good Subjects.”³²⁷ Penn was more than willing to make concessions to the Crown in exchange for his colony, hoping in vain that provincial Friends would find some “speedy remedy” to the nagging issues of war taxes and military defense.

Keith made things easier on provincial Friends by leaving the colony. Shortly after his departure, the Keithian movement began splintering, with some drifting into Baptist churches and

³²⁶ William Penn, [ca. July 4, 1694], “Breviate of Petition to Queen Mary and the Privy Council,” *PWP* 3:395-6.

³²⁷ Abstract of Queen Mary to William Penn, August 21, 1694, f. 1, box 3, vol. 3, Subseries B: Official Letters Collected and Created by James Logan, Documents of the Provincial Government, Series 1: Logan and Dickinson Family Papers, Logan Family Papers, HSP. Mary II died on December 28, 1694.

others forming their own sectarian congregations.³²⁸ Beginning in 1695, the same year Keith suffered his final disownment in London, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting could barely contain its *schadenfreude* at the turn of events. In their annual epistle to the yearly meeting in London that year, provincial Friends smugly reported that the Keithians were “much divided among themselves,” with “some of their preachers” joining Baptists and German Pietists, while “one of them having been at York [England] lately was there sprinkled [i.e., baptized] by an episcopal priest.”³²⁹ By 1697, the yearly meeting in Philadelphia assured their London counterparts that the Keithians’ “Time is short, and they are Falling apace.”³³⁰ The following year, the yearly meeting epistle noted that the “Seperates [sic] grow Weaker and Weaker, and in 1699, Friends recorded their satisfaction that the Keithians “do Moulder& come to Nothing” and that “their Name is now scarcely heard.”³³¹ Without a charismatic leader to replace Keith, the movement seemingly floundered. But as Jon Butler argues, the fracturing of the Keithian movement had more to do with the fluidity of religious identities in this period, which lent itself to religious hybridity and innovation. In the words of Butler, the movement did not “die out” as much as move “beyond its old base, losing some early adherents, holding others, but most importantly winning new members whose connection with the original schism ... was nonexistent, remote, or even distinguished by opposition to it.”³³²

For all its fluidity, the Keithian schism nevertheless dramatically influenced the shape of governance in Pennsylvania for years to come. If the Keithians were divided among themselves, as the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting had hoped, their diverse makeup and aims still presented a multifaceted threat to Quaker rule in the colony. The Keithians’ religious challenge to Friends persisted for years. In 1695, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting singled out Thomas Budd and “some others” for their continual

³²⁸ Jon Butler, “Into Pennsylvania’s Spiritual Abyss: The Rise and Fall of the Later Keithians, 1693–1703,” *PMHB* 101 (1977): 151-170.

³²⁹ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR Ph-469, Epistle to London, September 15-8, 1695, p. 52a, FHL.

³³⁰ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR Ph-469, Epistle to London, September 22, 1697, p. 64, FHL.

³³¹ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR Ph-469, Epistle to London, September 21, 1698, p. 70; Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR Ph-469, Epistle to London, September 16-20, 1699, p. 73. FHL.

³³² Butler, “Into Pennsylvania’s Spiritual Abyss,” 164-5.

“publishing, printing, and spreading abroad wicked and abusive papers.”³³³ The following year, George Hutchinson, a Keithian and former Quaker, stormed into the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting with a few supporters “calling for Justice against Publick Friends, and Strangers [non-Friends], to whom he said he had divers things against.”³³⁴ Around the same time, Budd joined Hutchinson in challenging Friends to a public debate to answer for “divers false unsound & [pernicious] things contrary to the truth & doctrine of [our] Lord Jesus Christ.”³³⁵ Friends refused to take the bait, of course, but they reacted swiftly to any perceived threat to gospel order in their meetings. In 1693, for example, the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting demanded that John Philley immediately “condemn himself” for publishing a poem that was a thinly-veiled attack on Samuel Jennings. Philley wrote the poem because he was engaged in some kind of personal dispute with Jennings, but it was obviously reminiscent of the printed attacks Keith and Budd made against Quaker magistrates less than a year before. Though the meeting minutes do not disclose what the dispute was about, Friends moved quickly to quash it and clear Jennings from any “false charges” leveled by Philley.³³⁶

The Keithians were a political problem that refused to go away. Much to the chagrin of Friends, many former Keithians joined ranks with the Anglicans, a growing political power in the colony that threatened the hegemony of Quaker rule in Pennsylvania.³³⁷ Some former Keithians ended up in the provincial Assembly. Isaac Norris, a prominent Quaker merchant and longtime member of the provincial legislature, observed in 1710 that “most of [the] sticklers in the Assembly [opposing Quaker

³³³Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR Ph-469, Epistle to London, September 15-8, 1695, p. 52a, FHL.

³³⁴Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR Ph-469, 1696 Epistle to London, p. 57-8, FHL.

³³⁵ Thomas Budd to Jonathan Tyler, August 29, 1696, box 1, Vaux Collection of Correspondence and Documents, Collection no. 1167, QSCHC.

³³⁶Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, September 1 and October 7, 1693, p. 127, FHL. According to the Philadelphia meeting minutes, the poem was “printed by G Keith, wherein [Philley] defames Samuel Jennings.” Joshua Fisher, “Some Account of the Early Poets and Poetry of Pennsylvania,” *Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia, 1827), p. 58, notes that the poem was published anonymously as *A Paraphrastical Exposition on a Letter from a Gentleman in Philadelphia to His Friend in Boston, Concerning a Certain Person who Compared Himself to Mordecai* [(Philadelphia, 1693)]. Fisher characterizes the poem as “a bitter attack upon Samuel Jennings, and that the lines are destitute of the spirit and almost without the form of poetry.”

³³⁷ Butler, “Into Pennsylvania’s Spiritual Abyss,” 168, notes “Anglicans also gained converts among Keithians,” though “at least half of these converts had not been Friends since 1692.”

political power] are either Keithians, or such as stand loose from Friends.”³³⁸ James Logan, Penn’s proprietary secretary, would later recall how the Keithian movement ran “into a spirit of Licentiousness or Libertinism in respect to Governmt.”³³⁹ Even into the 1720s, the Philadelphia artisans and small merchants who supported Governor William Keith against the still-powerful Quaker oligarchy in the Assembly were known, not surprisingly, as “Keithians.”³⁴⁰ The term was a clever pun, but for Quakers it was virtually synonymous with “troublemakers.” The fact that the very word “Keithian” had such political currency in Pennsylvania well into the eighteenth century is indicative of the enduring power of the schism in the collective memory of Friends.

Keith kept the memory of the schism alive by returning to America at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Following his disownment by the yearly meeting, he spent the remainder of the 1690s haranguing Friends and running a separatist meeting at Turner’s Hall in London. In 1700, he surprised the Anglophone world by becoming an ordained member of the Church of England. One English satirist called Keith’s conversion to Anglicanism the “Eighth Wonder of the World.”³⁴¹ Keith’s conversion coincided with an organizational renaissance within the Church of England, spearheaded by Dr. Thomas Bray, an Anglican cleric who worked to reestablish episcopal authority in England and abroad. In 1699, Bray founded the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge (SPCK) in London, an organization dedicated to boosting doctrinal orthodoxy and promoting moral reform among the English laity. In 1701, Bray founded the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG) as the foreign mission arm of the SPCK. The SPG’s aim was to support Anglican congregations in the American colonies and bring more settlers to the Church of England.³⁴² One year after its

³³⁸ Isaac Norris to Joseph Pike, February 18, 1710, *Penn-Logan Correspondence 2*: 422-23.

³³⁹ James Logan to Hannah Penn, March 29, 1720, p. 89, vol. 1, Official Correspondence, (1683-1727), Penn Manuscripts, HSP.

³⁴⁰ Tully, *Forming American Politics*, 261.

³⁴¹ Kirby, *George Keith*, 95-124; [Anonymous], *One Wonder More, Added to the Seven Wonders of the World, Verified in the Person of George Keith ...* [London, ca. 1701].

³⁴² On the formation of the SPG and its American missions, see Travis Glasson, *Mastering Christianity: Missionary Anglicanism and Slavery in the Atlantic World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 17-31; John Butler, *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), 34, 99-105.

founding, the SPG commissioned George Keith as its first missionary to North America. From 1702 to 1704, Keith and an SPG missionary companion traveled from New England to the Chesapeake, winning converts to the Anglican faith and soliciting support from wealthy patrons. Keith's return to America was a nightmare come true for American Friends, and the SPG missionary took every opportunity to harangue them in Pennsylvania and up and down the Atlantic seaboard.³⁴³

There was another, more enduring aspect to the Keithian schism that greatly troubled Friends. It troubled them so much, in fact, they initially responded with a silence so profound it was deafening. In October, just a few months before Keith's departure for London, the Keithians' separatist monthly meeting in Philadelphia drafted *An Exhortation & Caution to Friends Concerning the Buying or Keeping of Negroes* (1693), which Bradford shortly thereafter published in the city of New York, where he had been recently appointed by Benjamin Fletcher as the royal printer.³⁴⁴ The *Exhortation* was the first printed antislavery tract in North America. Its emergence was not inevitable, but in the context of the schism, it was a logical development. The problem of violence, and how to appropriately define and limit it within the parameters of gospel order discourse, had been a recurring theme ever since Keith and Budd published *An Appeal*. Up until the *Exhortation*, the Keithians had framed the problem in terms of the Quakers' complicity in state-sanctioned violence. Ironically, provincial Friends found it difficult to answer the charge publically because the Pennsylvania government, in the eyes of its critics, suffered from a *lack* of violence with no organized militia and a rather lenient criminal code. There was no way for Penn and ruling Friends to respond without playing into the hands of Keithians (by appealing to the peace testimony) or their royalist critics (by promising concessions in military matters).

But slavery was another matter altogether. Friends in Pennsylvania were far more deeply complicit in slavery than any other form of colonial violence, save that of forcing the Lenape off their

³⁴³ See chapter 5, p. 207-9.

³⁴⁴[Keithian Monthly Meeting], *An Exhortation & Caution to Friends Concerning Buying or Keeping of Negroes ...* [(New York, 1693)].

lands through “peaceful” settlement. The printing and public circulation of the *Exhortation*, a stark, denunciative act against the moral crime of Quaker slaveholding, rattled Friends. There would be no printed rejoinder like Pusey’s *Modest Account*, however. In the wake of the Keithian schism, Quakers would debate among themselves more intensely than ever before the moral propriety of slaveholding, but only behind closed doors and out of public view. This debate took place as provincial Friends began tightening gospel order discipline in their meetings and scrutinizing their households and families more intensely than ever before. As it turned out, these two developments – the Quaker debate over slavery and the enhanced scrutiny of Quaker households – went hand in hand.

Chapter Three

'Husbands from Wives, Children from Parents:' Gospel Order and Antislavery in Pennsylvania

In November 1684, Quaker settlers in Philadelphia unloaded approximately 150 African slaves from a Bristol merchant ship. The “seasoned” slaves arrived via the Caribbean sugar plantations, imported by Quaker merchants in Philadelphia and sold to settlers just barely three years after Penn founded his “Holy Experiment” in America. This was the earliest shipment of slaves to arrive in the colony, and its size was unusual; slaves were normally imported into Pennsylvania two or three at a time in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Despite the fact that traders did not normally import slaves in large numbers, as in the Caribbean, the founding of Pennsylvania as a Quaker colony was inseparable from its reliance on slavery. Slave labor built Philadelphia’s wharves and shops and performed essential work for the city’s merchants, artisans, and craftsmen. Enslaved Africans grew crops on Pennsylvania farms in the surrounding countryside, which would then be shipped to the Caribbean slave plantations, among other destinations, at great profit. Like other Anglo-American colonies north of the Chesapeake, Pennsylvania’s economic development was inextricably tied to the provisioning trade in the West Indies.³⁴⁵

Violence and the threat of violence undergirded slavery in late seventeenth-century Pennsylvania. Slavery necessitated the application of violent force; it was simply not possible to keep human beings in perpetual bondage otherwise. And while slavery in Pennsylvania was arguably less harsh than on Caribbean and Chesapeake plantations, African slaves in the province endured inadequate shelter, exposure to harsh weather, and poor nutrition. As slaveowners and slave traders, Friends were deeply complicit in the violence of slavery. Quaker masters not only claimed slaves as their human property, they beat them and sometimes restrained them with chains. And though the

³⁴⁵ Nash, *Forging Freedom*, 8-10; Nash and Soderlund, *Freedom By Degrees*, 3-40,

province suffered no organized slave revolts during this time, Quaker legislators in the Assembly enacted punitive slave codes to minimize its risk.³⁴⁶

The Quaker debate over slavery originated with George Fox. In 1671, while on a missionary trip to Barbados and Jamaica, Fox witnessed firsthand the horrors of Caribbean-style plantation slavery. Five years later, in London, he published *Gospel Family Order ... Concerning the Ordering of Families, Both of Whites, Blacks, and Indians* in which he implored slaveowning Friends to treat their slaves with as much compassion and Christian charity as they owed their white servants and children in their households. The title of Fox's tract conveyed his anxiety that plantation slavery, particularly the violent form it took in the Caribbean, would undermine the foundation of gospel order he had labored to establish in Quaker meetings on both sides of the Atlantic.³⁴⁷

In calling for the compassionate treatment of slaves in Quaker households, Fox laid the groundwork for an ambiguous yet profoundly significant moral framework that Friends later appealed to in confronting the problem of slavery. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Pennsylvania Friends debated whether slavery could be reconciled with gospel order. The moral language of gospel order was fluid enough that it appealed to both proslavery and antislavery elements within the meetings. Antislavery reformers argued that slavery and slave trading morally corrupted Friends' households. Slavery, they argued, promoted laziness and avarice in the master's household, and the violence required to keep slaves in perpetual subjugation, moreover, similarly corrupted the master's soul. The reformers' concern for the physical wellbeing of slaves was secondary or absent, with one exception: Friends worried about the impact of slavery, and especially the slave trade, on the imagined sanctity of African families and households. For their part, the slaveowning merchant elite who controlled the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting attempted to appease critics by arguing that slavery

³⁴⁶ Susan E. Klepp, "Seasoning and Society: Racial Differences in Mortality in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia," *WMQ* 51 (July 1994): 473-506; see also Nash and Soderlund, *Freedom By Degrees*, 26-7.

³⁴⁷ George Fox, *Gospel Family Order: Being a Short Discourse Concerning the Ordering of Families, Both of Whites, Blacks, and Indians* (London, 1676) See also, Carey, "'The Power that Giveth Liberty and Freedom,'" 27-47.

and gospel order were compatible – as long as Friends adhered to Fox’s demands that masters treat their slaves with charity and kindness.³⁴⁸

The Keithian schism had a significant, if not immediately apparent, influence on the Quaker debate over slavery in early Pennsylvania. The Keithians were not the first religious group to question slavery in the colony, but the printing and circulation of their *Exhortation & Caution to Friends Concerning the Buying or Keeping of Negroes* (1693) had a paradoxical effect on Friends. On the one hand, would-be reformers found it even more difficult to raise the issue of slavery without provoking a severe backlash from the wealthy, powerful slaveholding Quaker elite who conflated antislavery notions with Keithian disorder. On the other hand, the schism and the printing of the *Exhortation* drove Friends to confront slavery more intensely than before – but within their meetings, away from public view. In the wake of the Keithian schism, Friends debated the issue of slavery in connection with violence, alcohol abuse, and avarice, such as masters wearing ostentatious clothing and displaying lace curtains in windows. Several Friends, not coincidentally, also raised the issue of slavery in connection with the peace testimony. Gospel order, as a discourse on household governance, served as the overarching metaphor in these debates.

Gospel order discourse continued to shape the direction of Quaker antislavery long after the collective memory of the Keithian schism had faded. Scholars have long appreciated the important role Quakers played in the history of abolition in Britain and America during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Although it would take a full century and more for Friends to divest from their complicity in slavery, by the late eighteenth century, the word “Quaker” was virtually synonymous with abolition. John Woolman and Anthony Benezet, two of the leading Pennsylvania Quaker abolitionists of the mid-eighteenth century, lead the effort to pressure slaveowning Friends in Philadelphia and elsewhere to divest from their ownership and trading of enslaved Africans. In print and at sessions of the

³⁴⁸ My argument here follows J. William Frost, “George Fox’s Ambiguous Anti-Slavery Legacy,” Michael Mullett, ed., *New Light on George Fox, 1624-1691* (York, England: William Sessions, 1994), 69-88.

Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, they invoked many of the gospel order themes of their antislavery predecessors, including the Keithians.

Slavery, more than anything else, undermined the Quakers' attempt to fashion a civic culture of gospel order in Pennsylvania. Importing enslaved Africans helped ease an acute labor shortage in the new colony, and it also made a lucrative investment for Quaker merchants. Friends routinely imported two or three "seasoned" African slaves from their business contacts in Jamaica and Barbados.³⁴⁹ By 1690, there were approximately 270 slaves in Philadelphia, around 2 percent of the total settler population in the colony. By 1710, the number of slaves in Philadelphia jumped to over 1,500.³⁵⁰ Gary Nash estimates that one in fifteen Philadelphia families owned slaves between 1682 and 1705.³⁵¹ Around 70 percent of the Quakers who ran the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting during the same period owned slaves, a rate proportionally higher than the percentage of slave owners in the colony at large.³⁵²

Slavery transformed Pennsylvania's legal culture. Before the eighteenth century, provincial courts generally accorded black slaves and white indentured servants similar, if not equal, treatment. In 1688, for example, the Bucks County Quarter Sessions court prosecuted George, a "Runn a way negro" from Virginia, where he undoubtedly had been enslaved, for stealing goods. The court ordered him whipped and sold into temporary servitude to compensate for the value of the stolen property. While the judgment may appear to be motivated by race, white defendants convicted of a similar crime during this time also faced servitude, especially when they were unable to pay their fines.³⁵³ Even as late as 1703, a Spanish "mulatto" identified as Antonio Garcia, who escaped to Pennsylvania after being taken

³⁴⁹Gary Nash, *Forging Freedom: The Formation of Philadelphia's Black Community, 1720-1840* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), 8; Darold Wax, "Quaker Merchants and the Slave Trade in Colonial Pennsylvania," *PMHB* 86 (April 1962): 143-159.

³⁵⁰ Slave population figures taken from John McCusker, "Colonial Statistics," in *Historical Statistics of the United States*, vol. 5, Millennial edition, ed. Susan B. Carter (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), table 5-653; Nash and Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees*, table 1.3, p.15.

³⁵¹ Gary Nash, "Slaves and Slaveowners in Colonial Philadelphia," *WMQ* 30 (April 1973): 223-256.

³⁵² Soderlund, *Quakers and Slavery*, 34.

³⁵³ *Records of Quarter Sessions and Common Pleas of Bucks County Pennsylvania, 1684-1700* (Tribune Publishing, 1943), 94-5, 99;

prisoner by an English privateer and enslaved in Barbados, convinced the provincial council that he was “a freeman & a Christian” and not “in ye quality of a slave.”³⁵⁴

By that time, however, the racial institutionalization of slavery in Pennsylvania was already well entrenched. Quakers who purchased and imported slaves generally held them for life, and manumissions were few. Quaker magistrates also sanctioned violent punishments in order to prevent the growing numbers of Africans in the colony from escaping or finding other means to resist their enslavement.³⁵⁵ The provincial council in 1693 responded to reports about the “tumultuous gatherings of the negroes” in Philadelphia on Sundays by ordering that slaves found “gadding abroad” without consent from their masters be whipped thirty-nine times “well Laid on, on their bare backs.”³⁵⁶ In 1700, Pennsylvania passed its first slave code, which, among other things, defined perpetual slavery in racial terms and stipulated that those of African descent, whether slave or free, would be tried in special courts without benefit of juries. Blacks convicted of the attempted rape of a white woman faced castration on the first offense. The law was part of the Quaker-dominated assembly’s attempt to placate imperial officials by writing harsher punishments into the provincial criminal code.³⁵⁷ Ironically, the Crown’s Attorney General, in his report to the Board of Trade, objected to the penalty of indentured servitude for white defendants convicted of arson and burglary because “selling a man is not a punishment allow’d by the Law of England.”³⁵⁸ On the subject of Pennsylvania’s slave codes, however, the Attorney General was mute. Undeterred, the assembly passed another law in 1705 that made

³⁵⁴*Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania*, vol. 1 (Harrisburg, 1838), 112-3, 121.

³⁵⁵ From the 1690s through the early 1700s, Pastorius assembled various legal documents into a training manual for aspiring provincial lawyers. Included among the documents is an undated copy of a notice for a runaway “Negro boy about 18 years of age ... named Sam belonging to JW.” Sam was described as wearing “a leather Waist Coat, a pair of linen breaches a black hat.” “JW,” the master, promised “reasonable Satisfaction” in compensation for Sam’s apprehension; the notice can be found in Pastorius, “Young Country Clerk’s Collection,” 24; see also Alfred L. Brophy, “IngeniumestFateri per quos profeceris’: Francis Daniel Pastorius’ Young Country Clerk’s Collection and Anglo-American Legal Literature, 1680-1720,” *University of Chicago Law School Roundtable 3* (1996): 637-742.

³⁵⁶*Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania*, 341-2.

³⁵⁷Marietta, *Troubled Experiment*, 17-20; Herbert Fitzroy, “The Punishment of Crime in Provincial Pennsylvania,” *PMHB* 60 (1936): 248-50.

³⁵⁸ Edward Northey, “Attorney General to the Council of Trade and Plantations, Report on the Acts of Pennsylvania,” [Oct. 13, 1704], *CSPC* 22:276-281.

“buggery,” burglary, and the rape of white women a capital offense for blacks. In 1725, provincial legislators finally prohibited inter-racial marriages.³⁵⁹

In the late 1690s and early 1700s, much of Pennsylvania’s wealth was derived, either directly or indirectly, from provisioning the Caribbean sugar plantations. Quaker merchants in Philadelphia also grew wealthy by importing slaves on consignment and then selling them to buyers in the province. Though they could not match the ostentatious consumption of most Caribbean planters, many of the wealthiest Quaker merchants, flush with earnings gleaned from the slave trade, imported European-made luxury items as markers of their status. By the early eighteenth century, many Quaker grandees lived in stately brick town houses adorned with furniture, imported draperies, and other fine accoutrements. Among the wealthiest Quakers, observance of “plain dress” meant wearing fine velvet wardrobes shorn of cuffs and lace trimmings.³⁶⁰

Despite their embrace of wealth, Pennsylvania Friends worried that their material prosperity was incongruent with their notions of gospel order. The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in 1694, for example, expressed alarm over the “Looseness & Vanity” among Friends and admonished Quaker “Parents, Masters, & Mistresses” to watch over their children and servants.³⁶¹ Four years later, the meeting sent an epistle to London Friends instructing them not to send over “Flowerd Striped or Gaudy Stuffs Tinged Curtains Ribbon ... nor anything else that may not Suit the Plainness of our Profession.” In the very same letter, the Meeting also reiterated their hope that Pennsylvania would “shine over the Beauty & glory of Babilon.”³⁶² Isaac Norris, one of the colony’s leading slave traders, exemplified the Quaker ambiguity toward wealth. In 1713, Norris ordered an English coach decorated with an elaborate

³⁵⁹ On Pennsylvania’s slave code in 1700, see Marietta, *Troubled Experiment*, 19-20; Soderlund and Nash, *Freedom by Degrees*, 12-13; Edward Turner, *The Negro in Pennsylvania* (Washington, D.C.: American Historical Association, 1911), 26-29.

³⁶⁰ Wax, “Quaker Merchants and the Slave Trade,” Nash, *Quakers and Politics*; Tolles, *Meeting House, Counting House*, 126-7;

³⁶¹ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Minutes, MR Ph469, 1681-1746, 39-41, FHL.

³⁶² Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Minutes, MR Ph469, 1681-1746, 70-71, FHL.

coat of arms. The idea of a such an elaborate display gave him pause, however, and a few weeks later, he amended the order to “1 N in Cypher the rest all plaine.”³⁶³

Gospel order was the Quaker language of antislavery, but it intersected with a much broader Protestant discourse on family order and household government. During the 1640s and 1650s, Anglophone Protestants grappled with the ideological contradictions that underpinned the expansion of English imperial power in the Atlantic. The royalist defeat in the British Civil Wars, culminating with the regicide of Charles I, paved the way for a short-lived but revolutionary experiment in republican government throughout the English Atlantic. Seeking to advance godly reform and to curtail the “popish” practices of the Church of England, colonial assemblies from Massachusetts Bay to Bermuda enacted legislation to promote moral piety and ensure regular Sabbath observance. Under the banner of Protestant liberties, however, merchants and planters also supervised the transportation of thousands of convicts, indentured servants, and prisoners of war from Britain and Ireland to toil as “bond slaves” on plantations in the Caribbean and the Chesapeake.³⁶⁴ Cromwell’s conquest of the Spanish Caribbean, which resulted in the acquisition of Jamaica in 1654, propelled further English and Anglo-American investments in sugar cultivation and transatlantic slavery. By the restoration of the monarchy in the 1660s, the rhetoric of Christian liberty in the English Atlantic was inextricably bound up with the exploitation of indentured labor and the enslavement of Africans.³⁶⁵

In America, not all Protestants uncritically accepted these developments. Opposition was mostly centered in New England, where slavery did not develop as extensively as in the plantation economies of the Chesapeake and Caribbean. Equating economic slavery with political tyranny, religious radicals in Rhode Island’s assembly abolished chattel slavery in 1652, limiting African

³⁶³Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House*, 131.

³⁶⁴Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic*, esp. 132-142 and Donoghue, “Out of the Land of Bondage,” esp. 950-5 for an explanation of the mid-seventeenth-century term “bond slavery” to describe the brutal treatment that white servants endured on the Chesapeake and Caribbean plantations.

³⁶⁵Pestana, *English Atlantic*, 183-212.

servitude to the same terms of service as English servants.³⁶⁶ In seventeenth-century Massachusetts, Puritans struggled to balance the demands of building a successful colony with forging a religious community governed, as John Winthrop put it, by a “bond of love.” Winthrop migrated to the Bay Colony in 1630 because he was repulsed by the poverty and economic inequalities of his native England. In New England, he believed, economic opportunity would be commensurate with a godly reformation.³⁶⁷ Yet prosperity in Massachusetts, like other colonies in America, was built on the conquest of Native lands, and Bay Colony merchants traded in African slaves and sold Indian prisoners of war to Caribbean planters. Puritan magistrates, though, attempted to erect legal barriers to prevent slavery from overtaking the New England Way. The Massachusetts Body of Liberties in 1641 outlawed “bond slavery,” and Richard Saltonstall, a leading Bay Colony magistrate, charged two New England slave traders in 1645 with “manstealing,” “Sabbath breaking,” and “murder,” arguing before the General Court that “stealing negers” was against the “law of God.”³⁶⁸ While Rhode Island’s 1652 abolition law reflected the religious radicalism of its authors, the attempts by Bay Colony magistrates to limit the chattelization of their society derived more from orthodox Puritan attempts to make slavery conform to the ideals of Christian servitude.

With the further institutionalization of slavery in New England, Bay Colony Puritans struggled to define their relationship to enslaved Africans. During the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, despite previous legal attempts to limit the spread of chattel slavery, Bay Colony ties to slave trading and provisioning the Caribbean sugar plantations strengthened, and consequently the number of

³⁶⁶ *Records of the Colony of Rhode Island*, vol. 1, 242-243; Donoghue, “Out of the Land of Bondage,” 964.

³⁶⁷ John Winthrop used the phrase “bond of love” throughout *A Modell of Christian Charity* (1630). His famous reference to New England as a “City upon a Hill” in the same sermon appears only once; for Winthrop’s conviction that settling New England would serve a morally redemptive purpose, see Francis Bremer, *John Winthrop: America’s Forgotten Founding Father* (Oxford University Press, 2003), 147-170.

³⁶⁸ Statute 91, “The Body of Liberties,” in *Colonial Laws of Massachusetts ...* (Boston, 1889), 53. Saltonstall’s petition against slave trading was received by the General Court on October 7, 1645; see Nathaniel Shurtleff, ed., *Records of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay in New England* (Boston, 1854), vol. 3, 46. The contents of the petition is reprinted in Robert Moody, *The Saltonstall Papers, 1607-1815* (Massachusetts Historical Society, 1972), vol. 80, 138; see also Donoghue, “Out of the Land of Bondage,” 961-2.

African slaves living in or around Boston increased dramatically.³⁶⁹ While many slaves in New England worked as domestic servants, intimate relations did not prevent masters from beating their slaves, and as in Quaker Pennsylvania, fear of slave revolts and racial intermingling motivated Bay Colony legislators to pass a series of slave codes, including the 1706 law prohibiting miscegenation.³⁷⁰ The majority of Puritan clerics approved of slavery as Christian, and some, like Cotton Mather, were slaveowners. Because Puritans viewed slavery through the lens of patriarchal Christianity and household order, many of their sermons and moral tracts exhorted servants and slaves to remain faithful and obedient to their masters. These tracts proliferated during the 1690s and early 1700s, when concerns about slavery in New England were linked to the social and economic anxieties caused by imperial war with France, piracy and privateering, captivity raids by French-allied Indians on the frontier, and the massive influx into Boston of war orphans, widows, and Huguenot refugees fleeing Louis XIV.³⁷¹

To Puritan commentators, the moral obligations of masters constituted the other half of the Christian ideal of servitude. Many seventeenth-century Puritan leaders, including slaveowners like Cotton Mather, repeatedly denounced masters for their cruel abuse of slaves. Samuel Willard, the pastor of Boston's Third Church and President of Harvard University, affirmed that masters had the "right of command" over servants and slaves but argued that such a right did not give them "Arbitrary Power" to inflict "unjust Threatenings which carry in them the indication of fury and unbridled

³⁶⁹ Albert J. Von Frank, "John Saffin: Slavery and Racism in Colonial Massachusetts," *Early American Literature* 29 (1994); Mark A. Peterson, "The Selling of Joseph: Bostonians, Antislavery, and the Protestant International, 1689-1733," *The Massachusetts Historical Review* 4 (2002).

³⁷⁰ Lorenzo Greene, *The Negro in Colonial New England* (New York: Atheneum, 1968); Lawrence Towner, *A Good Master Well Served: Masters and Servants in Colonial Massachusetts, 1620-1750* (New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1998). Bay Colony slave codes are reprinted in *The Acts and Resolves, Public and Private, of the Province of Massachusetts Bay* (1692-1714), vol. 1; see for example p. 130, 154, 535. The 1705 anti-miscegenation law, "'An Act for the Better Preventing of a Spurious and Mixt Issue,'" appears on p. 578.

³⁷¹ Cotton Mather's slave, Onesimus, was a gift from his congregation; see Kenneth Silverman, *The Life and Times of Cotton Mather* (New York: Harper & Rowe, 1984), 263-5. Owen Stanwood, "Protestant Moment: Antipopy, the Revolution of 1688-1689, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire," *Journal of British Studies* 46 (July 2007): 481-508, argues that the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688-89, in which the Catholic King James II was deposed by the Dutch Protestant William III, was crucial to the construction of a transatlantic, Anglo-Protestant imperial identity. Peterson, "Selling of Joseph," contends that the antislavery concerns of Puritans like Samuel Sewall and Cotton Mather were embedded within a broader Christian social reform agenda linking New England to a global Protestant community.

Passions.” In short, he argued, “they must avoid all Cruelty, both in words and blows.”³⁷² Cotton Mather similarly warned masters to “be not a tyrant,” setting them “upon cries and Groans, which God will hear in Heaven.”³⁷³ The failure of masters to demonstrate adequate care for their slaves, both spiritually and physically, continually vexed Mather, even though he failed to understand that slavery itself precluded the possibility of humane treatment. Samuel Sewall, the Bay Colony magistrate known for his scathing antislavery tract, *The Selling of Joseph* (1700), which set him apart from his slaveowning Puritan colleagues, shared with Mather and Willard a deep belief that New England’s fate was bound up in the spiritual welfare of its households and families.³⁷⁴ For these Puritan moralists, conversion to Christianity, not violent whippings and beatings, would turn African slaves into ideal, obedient servants. Mather, Willard, and Sewall performed slave marriages, and Mather organized religious education classes for Africans at his home, the first to do so in New England, assuring masters that such a move would transform them into model servants.³⁷⁵

Fit into this wider history of antislavery, George Fox’s view of the question suggests that from the start, Quaker anxieties about slavery mirrored those of non-Quakers in their preoccupation with gospel order. In 1671, Fox began a three-year missionary trip to North America visiting Quaker meetings and ensuring that Friends in the colonies were following the “order of the gospel.”³⁷⁶ His first stop was Barbados, the center of Quakerism in the Caribbean. What he saw there shocked him. Disease and violence were endemic. Large numbers of settlers succumbed to disease, and an even greater number of African slaves died from disease and abuse at the hands of white planters who literally worked them to death. With relatively few white females on the island, Barbadian settlers condoned

³⁷²Sam Willard, *A Compleat Body of Divinity* (Boston, 1726), 615;

³⁷³Cotton Mather, *A Good Master Well Served* (Boston, 1696), 11-12.

³⁷⁴David Hall, *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), argues that “Sewall could not separate the welfare of his wife, and children from the welfare of New England. Family, church, town, and country, all shared a collective destiny.” Quotation on p. 217.

³⁷⁵Mather, *Rules for the Society of Negroes, 1693* (Boston, 1714); Greene, *Negro in Colonial New England*, 201, 265-6.

³⁷⁶Ingle, *First Among Friends*, 234-6. Quotation from 234.

interracial sex, and mixed-race children were not an uncommon sight on plantations.³⁷⁷ By the time of Fox's visit, many Quaker converts, including wealthy planters, counted slaves and mixed-race children as part of their households.

Fox's concern for the spiritual well-being of Africans led him to criticize the cruelties he witnessed on the plantations of Barbados. Christianizing Africans had been on Fox's mind at least since 1657, when he wrote an epistle to "Friends Beyond [the] Sea" urging them to be "merciful" to their slaves and reminding them that the freedom of the Gospel extended to "every captivated creature under the whole of heaven."³⁷⁸ While on Barbados, Fox preached to large numbers of slaves. Impiety and racial intermixing were chief among his concerns. Worried about racially-mixed Quaker households, he chided masters for their "evil custom" of fornicating with African slaves.³⁷⁹

Fox's preaching stirred Friends to action but left the Anglican planter elite nervous about slave revolts. Eleven Barbadian Quakers manumitted twenty slaves in their wills between 1674 and 1720, and considerably more included provisions to improve slaves' living and working conditions.³⁸⁰ William Edmundson, an Irish Quaker convert, was one of the preachers who had accompanied Fox on his missionary travels to the Caribbean. Returning to Barbados in 1675, Edmundson again preached to throngs of slaves. Fed up, the colony's magistrates threatened him with arrest and accused him of fomenting a slave revolt. Before leaving the island, Edmundson met with the Governor of Barbados to assuage fears that he and his fellow Quakers were a threat to the social and racial order. Protesting his innocence, he asserted to the governor and council that the real danger was allowing slaves the liberty to take "common" sexual partners, "like brutes," while "restraining them in that which God allowed," such as "meat and clothes." Unmoved by these arguments, the Barbadian assembly, following Edmundson's hasty departure, voted to prohibit Quakers from assembling for worship and banned them

³⁷⁷ Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 252-255.

³⁷⁸ George Fox, "To Friends Beyond the Sea, That Have Blacks and Indian Slaves," in *A Collection of Many Select and Christian Epistles, Letters and Testimonies* (London, 1698).

³⁷⁹ Quotation from Ingle *First Among Friends*, 234.

³⁸⁰ Gragg, *Quaker Community*, 139-140.

from evangelizing to the island's slaves.³⁸¹

A year after Edmundson preached in Barbados, Fox published *Gospel Family Order* in London. Although the tract was based on a sermon he gave in Barbados, the printed version reflected a more critical tone that Fox likely acquired once he returned to England. In *Gospel Family Order*, Fox outlined his vision for Barbadian Quaker masters acting as model Christian patriarchs who treated their African slaves as they would their own white servants and children. He contended that Quaker masters sinned when they neglected to bring their slaves the liberty of the Gospel. By this he meant more than the slaves' spiritual freedom to worship as Christians. Like Edmundson, Fox associated polygamous, non-Christian households with violence, and not just because it offended Quaker sensibilities about monogamous relationships. Masters who allowed their slaves to take "Husbands and Wives at their Pleasure," he believed, undermined the sanctity of African households, thus legitimizing their abuse as "heathens." Implicit in this argument was the belief that the legitimation of Christianized African households would present a moral obstacle for Quaker masters looking to break them up at a slave auction for profit.³⁸²

Fox's criticisms of Barbadian slavery, rooted in the language of gospel order, resurfaced during the antislavery debate in late seventeenth-century Pennsylvania. Francis Daniel Pastorius, a Bavarian-born, university-trained lawyer who founded the Germantown settlement near Philadelphia, labored intensely to make Pennsylvania a beacon of "righteous government."³⁸³ During the early 1680s, Pastorius practiced law in Frankfort, where he developed a close relationship with Philip Spener, a fiery Pietist minister who preached that God's faithful would soon usher in the millennium. Greatly influenced by Spener's eschatology, and wanting to escape the "Babylonian vanities and disorderd laws" of European society, Pastorius agreed to serve as a land agent for a group of Frankfort Pietists,

³⁸¹William Edmundson, *A Journal* (Harvey and Darton, 1829), 78; see also Frost, "George Fox's Ambiguous Anti-Slavery Legacy," in *New Light on George Fox*, ed. Mullett, 69-88.

³⁸²George Fox, *Gospel Family Order: Being a Short Discourse Concerning the Ordering of Families, Both of Whites, Blacks, and Indians* (London, 1676), in *The Quaker Origins of Antislavery*, ed. Frost (Norwood Editions, 1980), 35-55.

³⁸³Francis Pastorius, *Circumstantial Geographical Description*, 409; Quotation taken from Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 81.

and in 1683, he arrived in Pennsylvania and established Germantown as a refuge for persecuted Protestants back home.³⁸⁴

Pastorius promoted Pennsylvania as a religious haven, but he worried that the expansion of slavery in the colony would deter further German immigration.³⁸⁵ In 1688, Pastorius and three other Germantown Quakers petitioned their monthly meeting. The Germantown petition, as it is now known, centered many of its arguments on the violence Quaker masters performed on the bodies of Africans. The petition characterized the Quaker participation in the slave trade as “theft” and “adultery” because it tore African families apart and forcibly separated husbands from their wives. Although Friends stood for “liberty of conscience,” Germantown Friends argued, in Pennsylvania there was no “liberty of the body.” Questioning the Quakers’ commitment to their peace testimony, the Germantown petition pointedly asked if “these negers [have] not as much right to fight for their freedom, as you keep them slaves?”³⁸⁶ That September, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting leadership received the petition but refused to approve it, reasoning that the subject of Quaker slaveholding implicated too “many other parts.”³⁸⁷ By endorsing the petition, the Yearly Meeting would be effectively condemning Friends anywhere they owned or trafficked in slaves.

In 1693, less than a year after the trial, Keith and his supporters, including one of the signers of the Germantown petition, published *Exhortation and Caution to Friends, Concerning the buying or keeping of Negroes*. One of the first printed antislavery tracts to circulate in colonial America, the *Exhortation* condemned slavery in such unequivocal terms that David Brion Davis considers its language more resonant with nineteenth-century abolitionism than late seventeenth-century

³⁸⁴ Alfred L. Brophy, “Ingeniumestfateri per quos profeceris;” Quotation on p. 14 from the online version of the article, accessed at <blurblawg.typepad.com/files/young_country_clerks_collection.pdf>.

³⁸⁵ Katharine Gerbner, “We Are Against the Traffik of Men-Body: The Germantown Quaker Protest of 1688 and the Origins of American Abolitionism,” *Pennsylvania History* 74, no. 2 (Spring 2007): 149-172, esp. 157-158.

³⁸⁶ Francis Pastorius, et.al., “From our meeting at Germantown,” [April 18, 1688], reprinted in Gerbner, “We Are Against the Traffik of Men-Body,” 168-169.

³⁸⁷ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Minutes, 1681-1746, MR Ph469, 18, FHL.

antislavery.³⁸⁸ Yet the *Exhortation* did not break new ground as much as it made an already-extant gospel order discourse public, using much stronger language for effect. Taking their cue from the words of George Fox, the Keithians advocated for the Christianization of slaves and asserted that “*Blacks, and Tawnes* [i.e., Native Americans] are a real part of Mankind ... and are capable of Salvation, as well as *White Men*.” They boldly argued that Friends should not purchase Africans “unless it were on purpose to set them free” and implored masters to free their slaves “after some reasonable time of moderate Service.” Going further, the *Exhortation* argued that runaway slaves should not be “delivered into Bondage again” but rather “have the liberty to dwell” in Pennsylvania.³⁸⁹ The *Exhortation* excoriated Pennsylvania Quakers for the violence they inflicted on the bodies and souls of Africans. Using gospel order language, the Keithians argued that the slave trade robbed Africans “from their kindred” and enslaved them “against their Wills.” They compared the trafficking of slaves to purchasing of “Prize or Stolen goods” taken in wartime. If Friends “in our Native Country” scrupled against war profiteering, they reasoned, then “no more are we to buy stollen Slaves.”³⁹⁰ The Keithians elaborated by detailing the cruelties of slavery in the “American plantations,” particularly in the Caribbean, where masters separated “Husband from the Wife, and the Children from the Parents” and subjected them to innumerable punishments, cruelties, and depravations. The rhetorical exposition of cruelty was intended to shame readers, but more importantly, it also linked provincial Quaker merchants and slave owners in a chain of complicity that worked its way back to the violence of the Caribbean sugar plantations and even further back to the West African coast, where the sin of enslavement, or “manstealing,” originated. The Keithians concluded the *Exhortation* by tying the

³⁸⁸ Davis, *Problem of Slavery*, 311, argues that Keith “went well beyond the Germantown petitioners in foreshadowing the major religious themes of nineteenth-century abolitionism.”

³⁸⁹ *Exhortation and Caution to Friends Concerning Buying or Keeping of Negroes*, in *The Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost (Norwood Editions, 1980), 213-18.

³⁹⁰ In 1693, the London Yearly Meeting warned Friends not to outfit their merchant ships with guns because it undermined pacifist Quakers who resisted naval impressment. Although the Meeting claimed that Quakers who armed their ships acted “contrary to their former principle and practice,” this was in fact a novel application of the peace testimony; [London Yearly Meeting], *Epistles from the Yearly Meeting of the People Called Quakers, Held in London ...* (London, 1760), 66-67; See Hirst, *Quakers in Peace and War*, 88-91.

apocalyptic fate of Pennsylvania to the Quakers' complicity in the slave trade. "Because Slaves and Souls of Men are some of the *Merchandize of Babylon*," they warned, the wealth that Quakers accrued through the continued oppression of Africans "will be a means to draw Gods Judgments upon them." The metaphor of Babylon, evoking the Biblical narrative of Jewish captivity and exile, also carried apocalyptic overtones. The equation of violence with the moral corruption of avarice must have resonated with readers who worried, as the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting did, about the presence of "tinged curtains" in Quaker households.³⁹¹

The Keithian schism left an indelible mark on later Quaker antislavery, although its influence is hardly straightforward. Keith, the driving force behind the *Exhortation*, never addressed the issue of slavery again, having left the colony for England shortly after its publication. When he finally returned to Pennsylvania in 1703, he came not as a Quaker preacher but rather as the first ordained missionary for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG). As an SPG missionary, Keith's overriding preoccupation was haranguing Friends at public meetings, not ending slavery. The record of his former followers is similarly ambiguous. Some Keithians manumitted their slaves in their wills, and they were among the first in the colony to do so, while others, like Robert Turner, an important magistrate and officeholder, kept their slaves in bondage.³⁹²

The *Exhortation*, though indelibly linked to the schism, spurred Friends to debate the issue of slavery in the latter half of the 1690s, albeit behind closed doors. In an effort to reassert their authority, provincial Friends sought to build collective unity within their own ranks. Quaker ministers encouraged overseers to sanction members for household-related offenses or for acting outside the authority of the monthly meeting. Ironically, the enhanced power of overseers, as lay members of the meeting,

³⁹¹Keith, *Exhortation*, in *The Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost, 214-218.

³⁹²Soderlund and Nash, *Freedom by Degrees*, 43-44; George Keith, *A Journal of Travels from New-Hampshire to Caratuck, On the Continent of North-America* (London, 1706), reprinted in *Collections of the Protestant Episcopal Historical Society for the Year 1851* (New York: 1851).

accorded with what Keith had originally called for during the schism.³⁹³ Between 1696 and 1710, the number of disciplinary cases appearing before monthly meetings nearly doubled, with over a quarter of those cases ending in disownment for the period 1700-1705.³⁹⁴ In 1701, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting reminded provincial Friends to keep to the “discipline of the church,” and in 1704, the Meeting reinforced this admonition by compiling, for the first time anywhere, a disciplinary rule book for gospel order.³⁹⁵ The “Book of Discipline” standardized the various Quaker gospel order practices of monthly meetings, regulating marriages and families and establishing a clear system of dispute resolution with the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting acting as the highest court of appeal. The 1704 discipline played a major role in clarifying and enforcing gospel order, helping to achieve through its circulation and adoption by monthly meetings a more coherent provincial Quaker identity. The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting reaffirmed its importance in 1710, urging Friends to avoid those who have been “factious & troublesome in the Government” and to hew closely to the “Advice given therein in our Books of Discipline.”³⁹⁶ That October, a rejuvenated pro-proprietary Quaker party won provincial elections by a landslide.³⁹⁷

Ironically, the renewed effort to achieve unity spurred Quaker reformers to question slavery all the more ardently. In the wake of the Keithian schism, nobody epitomized the relationship between gospel order and antislavery more than William Southeby. A Quaker convert from Maryland, Southeby worked as an overseer for the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting during the 1690s and early 1700s.³⁹⁸ During the schism, Southeby remained adamantly loyal to provincial Friends, endorsing the Monthly Meeting’s condemnation of the Keithians. Keith, in return, accused Southeby of denying the

³⁹³ Butler, *Awash in a Sea of Faith*, 120, makes this point.

³⁹⁴ Offutt, *Of 'Good Laws' and 'Good Men'*, 254.

³⁹⁵ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 1704 Book of Discipline, PYM Disciplines, Box 1, collection 976, QSCHC.

³⁹⁶ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Minutes, MR-Ph 469[1710], 128-136. The epistle was aimed at David Lloyd, the Quaker leader of the antiproprietary faction in the provincial Assembly, whom Penn implicitly blames for causing “divisions and Contentions” in his letter to “Friends in Pennsylvania” earlier that year; see *PWP*, 4: 675-680, quotation on p. 676.

³⁹⁷ For the influence of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting on the 1710 elections, see Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 240; Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 307-8.

³⁹⁸ Kenneth Carroll, “William Southeby, Early Quaker Antislavery Writer” *PMHB* 89 (1965): 416-427.

resurrection of the dead. Southeby was sufficiently bothered by the charge of heresy that in 1702, almost ten years after the fact, he confronted Keith during a SPG gathering in Burlington, West Jersey and demanded that he make a retraction.³⁹⁹

As overseer, Southeby worked tirelessly to promote gospel order. He was present when the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting debated the Germantown petition. Later that year, he wrote a petition reminding Friends not to sue each other in court “Before they have Gospel Order given.” Throughout the 1690s, Southeby arbitrated disputes, assisted widows and orphans, settled estates of deceased Friends, and admonished members for incurring bad debts, getting drunk at funerals, and in the case of John Jennet, for “giving way to his daughter marrying one that was not a friend.”⁴⁰⁰ In 1698, Southeby also petitioned the provincial government demanding those holding office be of “good Repute & Christian conversation” and pleading with the governor to abolish horseracing and to ameliorate the “deplorable [drunken] condission of our neighbors ye Indians.”⁴⁰¹ In 1700, the Philadelphia Meeting approved the publication of his written testimony against “prophaneness in Philadelphia & parts adjacent.” Southeby also admonished Quaker tailors for corrupting youths with “fashionable” clothing and warned Friends against “Superfluous furniture in houses and superfluous apparel.”⁴⁰² Southeby repeatedly petitioned Friends and the provincial government to abolish slavery. In 1696, he presented a paper “in relation to Negroes” to the Philadelphia Quarterly Meeting. While the meeting did not record the contents of his appeal, Philadelphia Friends submitted it to the Yearly Meeting along with George Fox’s *Gospel Family Order* for consideration.⁴⁰³ During the 1710s, the Philadelphia

³⁹⁹Southeby’s loyalties during the schism is evidenced by his signature on a 1692 epistle from the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting condemning the Keithians, see “Extracts from the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting,” in *Keithian Controversy*, ed. Frost, 134; Thomas Ellwood, *An Epistle to Friends...* (London, 1694), 41-42; George Keith, *A Journal of Travels from New-Hampshire to Caratuck, On the Continent of North-America*, reprinted in the *Collections of the Protestant Episcopal Historical Society for the Year 1851* (New York: 1851), 37.

⁴⁰⁰Philadelphia Monthly Meeting Minutes, MR-Ph383, 74, 108-09, 144, FHL. Quotation on p. 144. See also Kenneth Carroll, “William Southeby, Early Quaker Antislavery Writer” *PMHB* 89 (1965): 416-227.

⁴⁰¹William Southeby, “To the Governor & them of ye Counsel Inhabitation of this town And to all in Authority to all godly minded people haters of vice & lovers of virtue,” June 23, 1698, Parrish Collection, HSP. Southeby’s petition is mentioned in *Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania*, Vol. 1, 497-500.

⁴⁰²Philadelphia Monthly Meeting Minutes, MR-Ph383, 182.

⁴⁰³Philadelphia Monthly Meeting Minutes, MR-Ph383, 142.

Monthly Meeting admonished him several times – to the point of disownment – for publishing and circulating “disorderly” papers (presumably against slavery) without permission.⁴⁰⁴ Unmoved by their threats, Southeby submitted a petition for “the Enlargement [i.e., the manumission] of the Negroes” to the provincial Assembly in 1712. Although Quaker legislators, motivated by the recent slave revolt in New York that year, passed “by many hands” a £20 import duty to discourage the importation of African slaves into Pennsylvania, the Assembly dismissed Southeby’s petition explaining that “it is neither just nor convenient to sett [the slaves] at liberty.”⁴⁰⁵

While Southeby’s abolitionism was unusual, other Friends worried about the violence of keeping human beings in bondage. Friends occasionally linked this violence to issues of race and household purity. Cadwalader Morgan, a minister from Merion, believed that owning a slave threatened the racial and religious purity of his family. In his 1696 petition to Philadelphia Friends, Morgan acknowledged the temptation to own slaves but changed his mind after considering the deleterious consequences:

If I should have a bad one of them, that must be Corrected, Or would Run away, Or when I went from home, & leave him with a woman or Maid, and he Should desire or Seek to Comitt Wickedness ... [then] it would be more Loss and Trouble to me.⁴⁰⁶

Morgan worried that “correcting” his slave would morally pollute his household, akin to the threat Africans posed to the sexual purity of his white daughters and servants. Morgan also claimed that he knew of others who were similarly “not fully Satisfied” with incorporating slaves into their households.⁴⁰⁷

One recurring objection was that slavery compromised the peace testimony of Friends. In his 1698 petition to the Chester County Monthly Meeting, Robert Pyle confessed that he wanted to “buy a negro” so his family “might have ye more liberty.” According to the petition, Pyle changed his mind after dreaming about climbing a great ladder to heaven. In the dream, Pyle was carrying a “black pott”

⁴⁰⁴ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting Minutes, MR-Ph383, 15-17, 37 (repaginated).

⁴⁰⁵ *PA Archives*, 8th Ser., II, 1012-13.

⁴⁰⁶ Cadwalader Morgan, “Petition to Philadelphia Monthly Meeting” (1696), in *Quaker Origins of Antislavery*, ed. Frost, 70.

⁴⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

that made it difficult for him to make his ascent. Pyle concluded from this dream that he must “lett black negroes or pots alone.” Having decided to forgo owning slaves, he warned Friends that slavery would implicate them in “wicked work,” including the crime of manstealing. If slaves in the colony rebelled, he reasoned, it would “doe us much mischief; except we keep a malisha [sic]; which is against our principles.” Pyle also contended that it was “not lawfull” to purchase slaves in this “gospel time” and reminded Quaker slave owners that Christ died “for all mankind, [the Africans] being a part, though yet ungathered.” While Pyle could not tolerate the idea of owning a slave himself, he urged Quaker masters to bring their slaves to meetings for worship and suggested that Friends free their slaves only if they “bee not too much [at a] loss.”⁴⁰⁸

While few advocated for abolition, as Southeby did, many Friends registered serious doubts about the moral rectitude of the slave trade. Pentecost Teague was a successful Quaker merchant who, like Southeby, worked assiduously to cultivate orderly Quaker households in the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting. In 1699, at the behest of the Monthly Meeting, Teague circulated a paper of self-condemnation from William Boulding for “beating & abusing” his wife, Elizabeth. Philadelphia Friends had shamed Boulding into marrying Elizabeth after they discovered them living together outside of wedlock. When Teague and the Monthly Meeting heard rumors of his domestic abuse, they shamed him into submitting a paper condemning his behavior.⁴⁰⁹ Teague used his position as an overseer in the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting to shame wealthy Friends for dominating the meetings for worship and business, arguing, much like George Keith had, that all Quakers, “whether poor or rich,” ought to participate in congregational affairs.⁴¹⁰ In September of 1698, Teague submitted a paper to the Monthly Meeting related to the violent treatment of slaves at the “publick marketplace & outcry.” As a merchant, Teague had personally engaged in and profited from slave trading, and he

⁴⁰⁸Robert Pyle, Petition to Chester Monthly Meeting, reprinted in *Quaker Origins of Antislavery*, ed. Frost, 71-72.

⁴⁰⁹*Philadelphia Monthly Meeting Minutes*, 171. Southeby was one of the overseers who visited with Boulding about his living with Elizabeth unmarried in 1692. He married her sometime after he condemned his actions before the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting in 1693. See *ibid*, 117, 119, 121, 123.

⁴¹⁰ Pentecost Teague petition to the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting (February 27, 1699), Parrish Collection #1653, Box 3, HSP.

undoubtedly witnessed Africans being whipped and beaten on the auction block. While the contents of his paper are unknown, the Philadelphia Meeting frankly conceded that Friends “ought not to sell [their slaves] after that manner,” leaving little doubt that even slaveowning Quakers were hard pressed to morally justify the intimate violence associated with the slave trade.⁴¹¹

Reconciling slavery with gospel order, however, proved to be an elusive goal, particularly when economic interests collided with religious ideals. Unwilling to treat slave trading as a disciplinary offense, provincial Friends tried to limit the growth of slavery in Pennsylvania. Prompted by Teague’s paper, the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting directed Southeby and eight other members to write to Friends in Barbados, asking them not to send more African slaves “to these parts.” Among those who signed the letter were wealthy merchants whose financial interest in slavery did not preclude them from worrying about slave revolts and other moral hazards associated with policing a large enslaved African population.⁴¹² William Penn, a slave owner whose concern for religious liberty and Native Americans did not translate into abolitionist sympathies, nonetheless tried to legalize slave marriages in 1700. Quakers in the Assembly defeated Penn’s bill, passing the first round of slave codes instead.⁴¹³ The Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, acting on Penn’s insistence, charged Southeby with establishing a separate religious meeting for Africans and admonished Quaker masters to discharge “a Good conscience” in dealing with their slaves. Although a separate meeting for blacks never materialized, Philadelphia Friends reprinted George Fox’s *Gospel Family Order* hoping that the antislavery critics within their own ranks would be assuaged.⁴¹⁴

⁴¹¹*Philadelphia Monthly Meeting Minutes*, 159.

⁴¹²The letter is reprinted in H. J. Cadbury, “Another Early Quaker Anti-Slavery Document” *The Journal of Negro History* 27, no. 2 (April 1942): 210-215. Samuel Carpenter, one of the signers, was an English-born Quaker convert who established himself as a prosperous sugar merchant in Barbados before immigrating to Pennsylvania in 1683. Although he experienced financial setbacks, he died in 1714 with a sizeable estate that included white servants and at least eight African slaves valued at £115; see *LLP*, 1:257-264.

⁴¹³*Votes and Proceedings*, vol. 1, 120-1; *Col. Rec.*, vol. 1, 598, 606, 610

⁴¹⁴*Philadelphia Monthly Meeting Minutes*, 175-6; see also Frost, “George Fox’s Ambiguous Anti-Slavery Legacy,” in *New Light on George Fox*, ed. Mullett, 69-88.

The compromise measures failed. Quaker objections to slavery continued, led by those who took gospel order discourse seriously. After the pro-proprietary faction of Quakers swept the 1710 provincial elections, Friends from Chester County near Philadelphia lobbied the Yearly Meeting to end slavery in the province. Caleb Pusey, a prominent Quaker politician and key overseer of the Chester meeting, spearheaded this effort. Pusey acted as a public spokesman for Pennsylvania Friends, having written almost a dozen printed tracts against the Keithians, including one of the first published narratives of the schism. As an overseer, he arbitrated disputes, cleared engaged couples for marriage, and disciplined members for a variety of offenses against Quaker morality. Most important, he played a major role in compiling and circulating the 1704 Book of Discipline. In 1711, Pusey and the Chester Quarterly Meeting added their own provisions to the discipline against “Superfluity in Apparell” and warning Friends “against selling Rum &c: to ye Indians and against buying Indian slaves.”⁴¹⁵ The Chester meeting also noted its dissatisfaction with Friends “buying” and encouraging “ye bringing in of Negroes.” That year, the following year, and again in 1715, Chester Friends petitioned the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting to condemn the practice of holding slaves and “their Posterity ... without any Limitation or Time of Redemption.” Southeby alluded to these petitions in 1714 when he reminded the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting that his antislavery position enjoyed “the countenance and unity of some of the best of men” in the Society. The Yearly Meeting, in response, only reiterated its position that Friends should not import any more slaves into the region.⁴¹⁶

Despite their unwillingness to condemn slavery itself, leading Friends in the province tacitly admitted that the slave trade was too violent to justify on moral grounds. In their 1712 epistle to London that year, Philadelphia Friends related their efforts to slow the importation of slaves from Barbados, but they disingenuously blamed the growth of slavery in Pennsylvania on non-Quaker

⁴¹⁵ The reference to buying Indian slaves likely referred to Pennsylvania’s legal prohibition on the Indian slave trade, which at that time originated from Carolina.

⁴¹⁶ Soderlund and Nash, *Freedom by Degrees*, 66-67; Soderlund, *Quakers and Slavery*, 20-21. Southeby’s address to the 1714 Yearly Meeting, which was not included in the meeting minutes, is reprinted in “William Southeby,” *The Friend* XXVIII, no. 38 (Philadelphia, 1855), 301.

traders who “flocked in among us over whom we had no Gospel authority.” The epistle elided the fact that Isaac Norris and other Quaker merchants were heavily involved in the trade.⁴¹⁷ In response, the London Meeting agreed the following year that importing slaves violated the “Peaceable Principle” of Friends and encouraged provincial Quakers to “consider whether your Children and white servants may not be Injured” by holding Africans in “a Domineering Spirit ... extending Cruelty to them at their Pleasure.” The Philadelphia Meeting again protested to London in 1714 that they were not “bringing [Africans] out of their own Country and are of the same mind with you.”⁴¹⁸ This was, at best, a half-truth: provincial Quaker merchants were not importing slaves *directly* from Africa – they were mainly importing them from the Caribbean – but the disingenuous response reveals the extent to which the Quaker elite demonstrated its willingness to profit from a trade in slaves that they recognized as inherently immoral.

In 1719, Friends took a major step in confronting slavery as a gospel order issue. That year, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting issued a revised disciplinary book for its subordinate meetings.⁴¹⁹ In keeping with the 1704 version, the 1719 discipline affirmed the strict regulation of Quaker households, admonishing Friends not to engage in excess drinking, keep “company with Women or any other scandalous persons,” or marry outside “of our profession or with any bound Servant without ye leave of her Master or Mistress.” Using the regulation of Quaker households as a moral precedent, the 1719 discipline introduced novel provisions sanctioning Indian slavery, the rum trade, and the Quaker engagement in the slave trade:

It is desired that friends so not buy or Sell Indians Slaves, also that none among us be concern'd in the fetching or Importing negro Slaves from their Country or Elsewhere – And it is the advice of this meeting that all friends who have any of them do treat them with Humanity and in a Christian manner – And as much as in them lyes make them acquainted with the principles of truth and inculcate morality in them.⁴²⁰

⁴¹⁷Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Minutes, MR-Ph469, 145-6, FHL.

⁴¹⁸ *Ibid*, 163.

⁴¹⁹ The quotation is from the *Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Book of Discipline* (1704), MS, PYM Disciplines, Box 1, collection 976, QSCHC.

⁴²⁰*Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, Book of Discipline* (1719), Transcription of original, FHL.

While no specific penalties were outlined for those who violated these prohibitions, the 1719 Book of Discipline established a crucial moral precedent, one that reformers used decades later to sanction slavery as a practice contrary to “ancient” Quaker principles and traditions.

In the eighteenth century, Quaker reformers repeatedly linked the motifs of slavery, violence, and household corruption together, forming a coherent antislavery narrative. In his *American Defence of the Christian Golden Rule* (1715), John Hepburn, a West Jersey tailor and a former Keithian, denounced masters for wearing “fine powdered Perriwigs” while their wives painted “their Faces, and Puff, and powder their Hairs” and their children grow up in “Idleness and Wantonness.” Hepburn also noted in his fictional dialogue between a “Negro Master” and a “Christian” that Pennsylvania Quakers’ alleged “innocence” from the “Wars of Albany” did not preclude them from owning slaves and embracing political power, “like the rest of the World.”⁴²¹ Benjamin Lay, a former slave owner in Barbados, smashed teacups in Philadelphia to protest the Quakers’ consumption of West Indian sugar and stabbed a bladder of pokeberry juice to demonstrate their “blood” guilt in slavery. His antislavery tract referenced George Fox’s *Gospel Family Order*, as did John Hepburn’s *American Defence*. In the 1750s, the relationship between gospel order and antislavery strengthened as Quaker reformers in the Delaware Valley and beyond enforced a more rigorous discipline of Quaker households. Anthony Benezet and John Woolman, the two leading abolitionists of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, both viewed slavery as a problem they linked to household piety. Woolman and Benezet wore plain clothing as a testimony against vanity, and both associated alcohol consumption with slavery as vices of immoderate consumption. Woolman, a onetime successful tailor and clothing merchant, argued that a “too liberal ... use of spirituous liquors” and the wearing of “costly apparel” undermined family order and that slavery was a “snare” that entrapped Quaker masters and their children in corrupting wealth.⁴²² Benezet similarly employed gospel order language to condemn the “Ease and Plenty” that was gained

⁴²¹ John Hepburn, *American Defence of the Christian Golden Rule* (1715), reprinted in Frost, ed., *Quaker Origins of Antislavery*, 82-122.

⁴²² John Woolman, *Some Considerations on the Keeping of Negroes* (Philadelphia, 1753), 7, 13.

through “the Toil of those whom Violence and Cruelty have put in our power,” tainting “pure and sober” Christianity.⁴²³

In Britain and America, gospel order discourse profoundly shaped abolitionist rhetoric in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In the 1770s, Dr. Benjamin Rush in Philadelphia argued that “Slavery and Vice are connected together” and condemned the slave trade as immoral because African “Husbands have been forced to prostitute their wives, and mother their daughters to gratify the brutal lust of a master.”⁴²⁴ The British abolitionist Thomas Clarkson also denounced the avarice of slave owners who sent “whole families, fathers, brothers, husbands, wives, and children ... in chains to the merchants.”⁴²⁵ In the nineteenth century, Frederick Douglass, William Lloyd Garrison, and Harriet Beecher Stowe reiterated similar charges that slavery inflicted violence and cruelty on African households. The discourse connecting slavery to avarice and household violence was so commonplace it became a veritable trope that appeared even in catechismal form, such as in Thomas Fisher’s *Negro’s Memorial* (1825):

[Question:] How does the system of West Indian slavery affect the morals of the subjects of it?
[Answer:] It demoralizes them ... [in their] disregard of, and disinclination towards the domestic relations of life; a forgetfulness of moral obligation; and a mean subserviency to the passions and lusts of their employers.⁴²⁶

Gospel order tropes appeared most profoundly in legal petitions to end slavery. Perhaps not surprisingly, Quakers deployed such language in their petitions to the United States Congress in Philadelphia in the 1790s. In their 1797 petition, for example, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting protested the re-enslavement of 134 “of our brethren of the African race” in North Carolina that Friends there had recently manumitted. In making their appeal, the Yearly Meeting expounded on the evils of

⁴²³ The quotation is taken from *An Epistle of Caution and Advice, Concerning the Buying and Keeping of Slaves*, reprinted in *Quaker Origins of Antislavery*, ed. Frost, 168. Woolman may have drafted the epistle with Benezet, or Benezet may have written it himself. Either way, Benezet presented the epistle to the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in 1754; on the epistle, see *Jackson, Let This Voice Be Heard*, 53-54.

⁴²⁴ Benjamin Rush, *An Address to the Inhabitants of the British settlements in America, upon Slave-Keeping...* (Philadelphia, 1773), 16, 18; on Rush’s religious influences and their relationship to his advocacy for prison reform, temperance, and abolition, see John M Kloos, *A Sense of Deity: The Republican Spirituality of Dr. Benjamin Rush* (Brooklyn, N.Y: Carlson Pub, 1991).

⁴²⁵ Thomas Clarkson, *An Essay on the Slavery and Commerce of the Human Species...* (London, 1786), 48-9.

⁴²⁶ Thomas Fisher, *The Negro’s Memorial, or, Abolitionist’s Catechism* (London, 1825), 65.

slavery, arguing that the re-enslavement amounted to “cruel bondage ... husbands and wives, and children, separated, one from another, which we apprehend to be an abominable tragedy.”⁴²⁷ Quakers were far from alone in making these appeals. In 1774, enslaved African-Americans in Massachusetts petitioned to the Governor Thomas Gage and the House of Representatives for their freedom, peppering their arguments with the language of natural rights and gospel order. The petitioners, whose fate is unknown, made emotional appeals to the bonds of family and the domestic obligations that blacks and white patriarchs were supposed to have in common:

We were unjustly dragged by the cruel hand of power from our dearest friends and sum of us stolen from the bosoms of our tender Parents ... the endearing ties of husband and wife we are strangers to ... Our children are also taken from us by force and sent many miles from us ... How can a slave perform the duties of a husband to a wife or a parent to his child? ... How can the wife submit themselves to there [sic] husbands in all things/ How can the child obey thear parents in all things?⁴²⁸

The slave petition, written on the eve of the American Revolution, easily harkened back to the gospel order rhetoric of seventeenth-century Protestant antislavery opinion. In the words of Philippe Rosenberg, abolitionists often invoked “themes that made as much sense within the ideological context” of such seventeenth-century commentators as Thomas Tryon, Morgan Godwyn, and Richard Baxter.⁴²⁹ Like their antislavery predecessors, abolitionists in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries invoked gospel order language to argue that slavery was inconsistent with Protestant Christianity, household harmony, the moral order of the British Empire, and the evangelical mission of the new American republic. Perhaps Benjamin Franklin intuited this continuity when he wrote to British Friends in 1789 congratulating them on their efforts to abolish the slave trade. “The epistle from your [1758] Yearly Meeting,” he reminded them, “was not the not the first sowing of the good seed you

⁴²⁷Peter M. Bergman, ed., et al., *The Negro in the Congressional Record*, vol. 2 (New York: Bergman Publishers 1969), 166.

⁴²⁸Petition reprinted in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll. Fifth Series*, III, 432-3.

⁴²⁹Rosenberg, “Thomas Tryon,” 641.

mention, for I find by an old pamphlet in my possession, that George Keith ... wrote a paper against the practice.”⁴³⁰

⁴³⁰B. Franklin to John Wright, 4 November 1789, reprinted in *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, vol. 10 (Macmillan Company, 1907), 61.

Chapter Four

‘Filthy Lucre’: Indians, Alcohol, and Violence on Pennsylvania’s Borderlands

In July 1686, Zachariah Whitpaine, a Philadelphia merchant who supplied the Quaker government in Pennsylvania with the “blankitts and Gunns” they needed to exchange with their Indian partners for more land, greeted Governor William Markham with some disturbing news. The evening before, Whitpaine had attended an Indian “cantico,” or ceremonial dance that usually involved heavy drinking, near his home. Around 11 p.m., after he had retired to his bed for the night, he was suddenly awakened by one of Nicholas Scull’s servants, who “Came Running to his house Crying his [master] ... and all the rest in the House were Kill[ed]” by a group of intoxicated (and presumably male) Indians. The servant warned Whitpaine that the Indians were “Coming with Fyrebrands” to set his house on fire. Alarmed, Whitpaine fled to Philadelphia to warn Markham of the attack.⁴³¹

Later that day, Markham and the Provincial Council received word that Scull was in fact alive, but a struggle between him and a group of Indians from the cantico had taken place. The conflict started when the Indians (most likely Lenni Lenape, the dominant Native group in the area) ran out of alcohol at the cantico and decided to visit Scull, who “used to sell them Rum.” Scull, perhaps out of fear, flatly refused them any. According to the surveyor, the Indians returned later that night and entered his house through a window. After a brief altercation with Scull, they managed to acquire his rum “by Force.” Looking to punish the offending Indians “according to Law,” Markham and a delegation of Indian traders went in search of them. Although they never found the alleged attackers, the delegation did run into a group of Lenape sachems who threatened to kill one of their provincial surveyors if he continued to survey more land in Bucks County without their permission.⁴³²

⁴³¹ *PWP* 3: 106-7, 190.

⁴³² *PWP* 3: 107; *MPCP* 3:187-8; James O’Neil Spady, “Colonialism and the Discursive Antecedents of Penn’s Treaty with the Indians,” in *Friend & Enemies in Penn’s Woods: Indians, Colonists, and the Racial Construction of Pennsylvania*, eds. William A. Pencak and Daniel K. Richter (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004), 36-7.

Alcohol and in particular rum lay at the root of the altercation at Nicholas Scull's residence. In early Quaker Pennsylvania, settlers and Natives alike consumed great quantities of alcohol. Despite the seemingly vast cultural gulf separating them, colonists and Indians drank for similar reasons. Both groups drank to get intoxicated, but they also drank for ceremonial, social, and religious reasons. Alcohol became central to treaty negotiations. Indians and colonists frequently drank together in Philadelphia taverns and public ordinaries, as well as in Indian country, where settlers like Nicholas Scull and their Native partners socialized and imbibed together during trading sessions.⁴³³

Alcohol greatly troubled both Native peoples and early Pennsylvanians. Natives experienced alcohol as a serious problem in their communities, one that was woven into the very fabric of colonialism itself. For the provincial government, it sowed disorder on Pennsylvania's frontier, where Native military and trading alliances were especially crucial for the Quaker colony's expansion and security. For Quaker reformers, the alcohol trade was a "filthy lucre" to be eradicated from the bodies and souls of Friends. The alcohol trade with Natives posed far more of a moral problem for Pennsylvania Friends, in fact, than pacifist Quakers regarded supplying their Indian allies with firearms, which, as it turned out, never really bothered them much. It was the trade in rum, far more than firearms in fact, that destabilized the fragile "long peace" of Quaker-Indian relations during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.⁴³⁴

Identifying alcohol as a destabilizing force on the frontier casts the early period of Pennsylvania's colonization in a new light. Pennsylvania occupies a unique space at the intersection of early American and Native scholarship. As Pencack and Richter point out, an ahistorical reading of early Pennsylvania history looks like a "set piece" bookended by a pacific William Penn on one side

⁴³³ Peter Mancall, *Deadly Medicine: Indians and Alcohol in Early America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995); Sharon Salinger, *Taverns and Drinking in Early America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).

⁴³⁴ Historians have traditionally characterized the seven decades of Indian relations in Pennsylvania prior to the Seven Year's War as the era of the "long peace" because of the relative absence of outright hostilities during that time. The term suggests that William Penn and pacifist Quakers were responsible for Pennsylvania's supposedly benevolent policies toward their Indian neighbors. On the historiography of the "long peace," see Jane T. Merritt, "The Long Peace in Pennsylvania," *History Compass* 2 (2004), 1-4.

and the militant Paxton Boys on the other.⁴³⁵ Framed in this way, the history of Pennsylvania's colonization fits easily within a longer narrative of Indian declension. According to James Merrell, there was no "middle ground" in early Pennsylvania, akin to what Richard White described for the Great Lakes *pays d'en haut*. Merrell, moreover, dismissed the possibility that his "go-betweens" were able to create anything mutually comprehensible in Penn's woods.⁴³⁶

Yet if Penn sowed the seeds of Paxton, Indian declension looked far from inevitable in 1700, or even in 1710. And while cultural misunderstandings certainly pervaded the Pennsylvania frontier, Quakers and Native groups forged a mutually comprehensible alliance, built on an arms trade, that clearly benefitted both groups.⁴³⁷ For pacifist Quakers, armed Indian allies helped protect their colony. For Natives, the alliance enabled them, at least temporarily, adapt to and even resist the pace of colonization. Whether that alliance was actually a "middle ground" or not, both groups clearly understood the mutually-beneficial arrangement. As I argue, it was alcohol, not mutual incomprehension, that undermined the Quaker-Native alliance.⁴³⁸

Ultimately, the Euro-Indian alcohol trade in Pennsylvania functioned as a form of colonial violence. As such, it was a moral problem and a problem of governance that intersected in the struggles over sovereignty and space between Natives and colonials. Alcohol both signified the creation of "frontier" space and enabled the advance of colonialism, undermining Native sovereignty well before the first wave of settlers arrived into the Susquehanna Valley. Although that violence was largely

⁴³⁵ Daniel Richter and William Pencak, "Introduction," in *Friends and Enemies*, eds. Pencak and Richter, x.

⁴³⁶ James H. Merrell, *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (New York: WW Norton, 1999), see esp. p. 26-7; see also Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region*, 20th anniversary ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011). Daniel Richter has more broadly argued that "in most times and places of American history, Indians and Europeans failed to create a lasting Middle Ground;" see Daniel Richter, "Whose Indian History?," *WMQ* 50 (April 1993): 379-93. Quotation on p. 390.

⁴³⁷ For the Quaker-Indian arms trade in 1680s Pennsylvania, see Fred Anderson and Andrew Cayton, *The Dominion of War: Empire and Liberty in North America, 1500–2000* (New York: Penguin Books, 2005).

⁴³⁸ In the preface to the 20th anniversary edition of *The Middle Ground*, White argues that Merrell's "go-betweens" seemed "incapable of generating anything beyond misunderstanding and mistrust ... [In Merrell's interpretation] there was no possibility of mutually comprehensible worlds ... The path through the woods led nowhere." White, by contrast, is convinced that at least partial "mutual comprehension and accommodation, although hardly without quarreling and violence, has been historically possible between Indians and Europeans and their descendants." Quotation from White, *Middle Ground*, 20th anniversary ed., xx, xxii.

symbolic, it could be as visceral and destructive as warfare itself. This was especially the case in early Quaker Pennsylvania.⁴³⁹

Any discussion of drinking in early America must address long-standing racial stereotypes. As scholars have noted, the myth of the “drunken Indian” was a recurring colonizing discourse, one that endures in modern-day popular culture and to a certain extent is replicated in the scientific literature examining whether Indians have a genetic predisposition to alcoholism.⁴⁴⁰ Alcohol was a European import virtually unknown in much of precontact North America. Yet during the colonial era Indians shaped their own drinking patterns in ways that did not necessarily correlate with European norms or depend on interaction with settlers. Natives, for example, believed intoxication unleashed great spiritual powers, and for that reason they incorporated alcohol into their mourning ceremonies and religious rituals. As Peter Mancall argues, North American Indian drinking was “not random but often integrated into a web of social relations associated with other aspects of [Native] public life.”⁴⁴¹

But alcohol was clearly an intractable problem. From the beginning of European settlement in the Delaware Valley, rum dominated the alcohol trade, and it was an inherently imperial drink. Rum was the creation of West Indian plantation slavery and sugar production, with molasses, a sugar by-product, as its key ingredient. By the time of Pennsylvania’s founding in 1681, the American colonies were already enmeshed in an imperial economy with rum serving as a critical medium of exchange.

⁴³⁹ According to Pierre Bourdieu, “symbolic violence” occurs when marginalized individuals or groups “willingly” participate in their own subjugation through misrecognition. For misrecognition to take place, a marginalized group must believe their domination is part of the “natural” order. Violence is said to be “symbolic” when a subordinated group becomes so thoroughly enmeshed in the power relations oppressing them they no longer objectively see the violence constraining their actions; see Pierre Bourdieu, “Gender and Symbolic Violence,” in *Violence in War and Peace: An Anthology*, eds., N. Scheper-Hughes & P. Bourgois (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 339-42. Although I am borrowing the term from Bourdieu, my use of “symbolic violence” to characterize alcohol is intended to convey a more complex notion of violence that is embedded in a web of colonial relations that ties the struggle over land in early Pennsylvania, via a frontier exchange economy, to the Atlantic slave trade and the production and transportation of rum from the West Indies to North America. For the notion of a frontier exchange economy, see Daniel Usner, *Indians, Settlers, and Slaves in a Frontier Exchange Economy: The Lower Mississippi Valley Before 1783* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992).

⁴⁴⁰ Gilbert Quintero, “Making the Indian: Colonial Knowledge, Alcohol, and Native Americans,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 25 (2001): 57-71.

⁴⁴¹ Mancall, *Deadly Medicine*, 71. Precontact Natives inhabiting parts of what became Mexico and the American Southwest drank a fermented juice that was incorporated into their religious ceremonies. Alcohol was virtually unknown elsewhere in North America prior to European contact; see Mancall, *Deadly Medicine*, 16, 132-3.

Pennsylvania farms sold grain to Caribbean slave plantations, which in return shipped sugar and molasses to distillers in New England and Pennsylvania, where traders carried it to the frontier, trading it with Natives in exchange for furs and peltry destined for European markets. Wherever Indians and colonists traded, rum was present. Traded alongside weapons and other European manufactured items, rum was a staple of Indian land deals with settler governments. Rum, though the mechanism of colonial exchange, became a tool of colonial expansion, flowing like many rivulets into Pennsylvania's interior.⁴⁴²

In the Delaware and Susquehanna Valleys, Indians may have consumed rum and other forms of alcohol on their own terms, but they could not as easily extract themselves from the violence it engendered in their communities. Long before William Penn arrived, Lenni Lenape groups interacted with Europeans, beginning with Dutch and Swedish colonists and traders in the early 1600s, and then with the English after 1664.⁴⁴³ Dutch and Swedish settlements in the Delaware Valley were no more than small military and trading outposts, with relatively few settlers inhabiting them.⁴⁴⁴ While European disease epidemics took their toll on the Lenape, the relatively modest numbers of Dutch and Swedish settlers meant they remained utterly dependent on Native groups for their survival. Unfortunately, even the modest European presence in the Delaware Valley did not prevent William Kieft, the Director General of the New Netherlands, from starting an ill-advised and brutal war against

⁴⁴² Richard S. Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972); 195-7; Sidney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Penguin Books, 1985), 43; and Peter Thompson, *Rum Punch & Revolution: Taverngoing & Public Life in Eighteenth Century Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999). As John McCusker, *Rum and the American Revolution: The Rum Trade and the Balance of Payments of the Thirteen Colonies* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1989), 444, argues, "there is no reason to suspect that the Quaker settlers of Pennsylvania were in any way slow to begin distilling their own rum." On the fur trade in the Delaware and Susquehanna Valleys, see Lorraine E. Williams, "Indians and Europeans in the Delaware Valley, 1620-1655," in *New Sweden in America*, ed. Carol E. Hoffecker (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1995) 112-20; Francis Jennings, "The Indian Trade of the Susquehanna Valley," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 110 (1966):406-24.

⁴⁴³ At the time of European contact, the Algonquin-speaking "Lenni Lenapes" ("Original Peoples") were living in the Hudson and Delaware Valleys as loosely affiliated kin-based groups. Though historians have classified them into three major clans – the Munsee, the Unami, and the Unalachtigo – in reality they were more socially and politically decentralized.

⁴⁴⁴ The peak of the pre-English settler population in the 1650s was less than 1,000; see Thomas Sugrue, "The Peopling and Depeopling of Early Pennsylvania: Indians and Colonists, 1680-1720," *PMHB* 116 (January 1992): 14.

the Lenape in the late 1630s that led to the deaths of hundreds of Europeans and more than one thousand Indians.⁴⁴⁵

Relations between Lenapes and European settlers fared not much better after the English militarily usurped Dutch and Swedish claims to the Delaware Valley in 1664. The source of Lenape discontent around this time was undoubtedly the marked increase of European settlers moving into the region, particularly after the colonies of East and West Jersey were established in the 1670s. Undoubtedly, conflicting cultural assumptions about land use greatly exacerbated tensions. When the Lenape “sold” Delaware Valley land to English settlers, they were likely negotiating shared usage rights, rather than exclusive ownership, in keeping with Algonquian understandings of how to properly manage a territory with multiple stakeholders. For the Lenape, shared land use required the maintenance of relationships among all the stakeholders that were periodically renewed through gift exchange and a distribution of goods. By contrast, English settlers, following European notions of property, expected Lenapes to vacate their rights to the land they “sold” them. Thus when English settlers “bought” land from Lenape groups, they viewed their exchange of trade goods for that land as a final purchase, whether the distribution of goods occurred as a lump sum or as a series of payments. Even if English settlers implicitly recognized the existence of a relationship behind these land deals, they certainly did not view their payment of trade goods as a form of gift exchange requiring periodic renewal in return for shared usage rights.⁴⁴⁶

Settler encroachment fueled conflict in the Delaware Valley, but deeply interwoven into the power struggle between Indians and colonists was a thread of mutual dependency centered on firearms

⁴⁴⁵ For the impact of disease epidemics on the Lenape, see Schutt, *Peoples of the River Valleys*, 40-1; In the 1640s, there may have been as many as 4,000 Lenape Indians in the Delaware Valley; see Francis Jennings, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies from its Beginnings to the Lancaster Treaty of 1744* (New York: W.W. Norton Co., 1984), 118. For Kieft’s war, see Jeffrey Dowart, *Invasion and Insurrection: Security, Defense, and War in the Delaware Valley, 1621-1815* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), 22. By the 1655, there were still only about 400 European settlers and traders in the Delaware Valley; see Landsmen, “Middle Colonies,” 354.

⁴⁴⁶ Schutt, *People of the River Valleys*, 32-5; Jennings, *Ambiguous Iroquois Empire*, 325-8; Sugrue, “The Peopling and Depeopling of Early Pennsylvania,” 19-22.

and alcohol, both of which were intimately connected to the fur trade. Disease and the increased migration of settlers into the Delaware Valley caused the Lenape population to rapidly decline in the 1670s. One Quaker settler, arriving in 1678, observed “such a sore distemper among the Indians that they died so fast that, in some places, their bodies wasted above ground.” While the Lenape suffered a serious decline in population, Delaware Valley colonists nevertheless depended on the goodwill of Indians for their safety and economic security.⁴⁴⁷ As a potential ally or formidable opponent, the Lenape could not be safely ignored. The provincial government at New Castle faced serious difficulties from rebellious Swedish colonists who resented English rule and from incursions by Maryland settlers who believed the entire Delaware Bay belonged to them. With good reason, New York Governor Francis Lovelace ordered Captain John Carr, garrisoned at New Castle, to maintain good diplomatic and trading relations with local Lenape groups. But Carr invented a story involving a Swedish-Lenape plot to overthrow the government as a pretext to seize more land by force to enrich himself and his fellow business partners, a foolish scheme that accomplished nothing but raise alarms throughout the Delaware Valley that a general war was looming.⁴⁴⁸

The weakness of the English position became apparent in October 1670, when a delegation from New Castle met with Lenape sachems to discuss the unsolved murders of ten settlers. The English blamed the Lenape for the murders and held the sachems responsible for finding the killers. The sachems seemed eager not to upset their English fur trading partners, assuring the delegation that “they did not seek war and that they desired to go out hunting and trade up and down among the Christians just as before.” After an exchange of gifts, the Lenape reiterated they had no interest in starting a war with the English, which would cut off their access to “gunpowder and lead, along with many more

⁴⁴⁷ For the general decline in the Lenape population over the course of the seventeenth century, see Sugrue, “The Peopling and Depeopling of Early Pennsylvania,” 12. The Susquehannocks, whom the Lenape were allied to, were even a more formidable armed presence in the region. Jennings, *Ambiguous Iroquois Empire*, 124, argues that had the Dutch made a stronger alliance with the Susquehannocks, New Netherland would have easily repelled the English takeover of the Delaware Valley in 1664.

⁴⁴⁸ Dowart, *Invasion and Insurrection*, 37-41.

similar things.”⁴⁴⁹ Those reassurances must have rang hollow when threats of Indian warfare filtered back to New Castle that same year, including one group of Lenapes who reportedly told settlers they “would do [the Dutch and Swedish] no hurt but for the English and all new Castll they would kill man woman and Child and burne the howll plase.”⁴⁵⁰ Another report stated the Lenape threatened war because “where the English come they drive them from [their] lands.”⁴⁵¹ New Castle ignored the reasons for Lenape discontent and instead made plans for a preemptive military offensive in 1672. The purported military campaign was pure fantasy; while the New York governor and officials from New Castle and New Jersey attempted to organize their militias, they privately conceded their planned offensive would not work without Indian allies. As one Delaware official revealed in a dispatch to Governor Lovelace, New Castle needed to recruit at least “fifty or sixty North Indyans” (Iroquois?) because they would “doe more than 200 [of our] men in such a warr.”⁴⁵²

While the English settlers of New Castle could not afford to disregard Native military power, Indians in the region found it increasingly difficult to disentangle themselves from the European trade goods they desired. As the Lenape admitted in 1670, they feared war with the English would cut off their access to gunpowder, lead bars (to cast into shot), and “similar things.” Those “similar things” included rum, a key item in the Native fur trade with settlers. Rum facilitated convivial social encounters, but its destructive side was also apparent early on. In the 1660s, the Dutch colonist Jan Becker regularly hosted Indians and settlers together in his Fort Nassau tavern, but Becker’s drinking establishment was also linked to the burning of an Indian canoe by drunken soldiers.⁴⁵³ Reflecting the symbolically violent nature of the alcohol trade, Indians repeatedly complained about its destructive

⁴⁴⁹ “Report of a Meeting with Indians on the Delaware about a Murder,” October 6, 1670, in *New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch*, vol. 20-21: *Delaware Papers: English Period*, ed. Charles Gehring (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1977), 17-8.

⁴⁵⁰ “Letter to Capt. Carr about Threats Uttered By Some Indians,” [n.d., ca. 1670], in *New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch*, ed. Charles Gehring, 19.

⁴⁵¹ “William Tom and Peter Alrichs to Gov. Lovelace about Indian Affairs,” March 9, 1670, in *New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch*, ed. Charles Gehring, 11.

⁴⁵² “Magistrates of Delaware to Gov. Lovelace Concerning War with the Indians,” [1671], in *York Historical Manuscripts Dutch*, ed. Charles Gehring, 49-50; Dowart, *Invasion and Insurrection*, 41-3.

⁴⁵³ Schutt, *Peoples of the River Valleys*, 57-8.

aspects, even as they consumed European-supplied liquor in great quantities. As one Lenape elder would later recall to the Quaker Thomas Budd, “strong liquor” made his people “mad,” causing them to “not know what we do ... [and to] abuse one another ... [and to] throw each other into the fire.”⁴⁵⁴

Dutch and English magistrates also worried intensely about the destabilizing effects of the alcohol trade. But unlike the Lenape, who were concerned about their own communities, colonial magistrates linked the problem of alcohol to frontier security. Because they could not overwhelm the Lenape militarily, and because they needed Indian trading partners to access the continental fur trade, provincial officials proscribed the sale of rum and other liquors to prevent alcohol-related trouble from escalating out of control. Dutch magistrates in New Amstel took the issue seriously enough that they indicted Jan Becker in 1660 for illegally selling rum to Indian customers. Becker was fined 500 guilders and removed from his position as clerk of his local church.⁴⁵⁵ In his defense, Becker claimed he acted as a commissary and diplomat, providing local Indian sachems with alcohol in return for the gifts of “fowl and deer” they brought to him. Gifting alcohol was a customary part of Indian diplomacy, and as Becker argued in court, “neither Dutchmen nor Swedes disdain openly to provide with liquor to drink at the tavern, which is done so free, frank and open, as anything, that is allowed.”⁴⁵⁶

After 1664, English authorities similarly attempted to regulate the rum trade, though in seemingly contradictory ways. The Duke of York’s laws, which governed the provincial legal system in the Delaware Valley outside of New Jersey, included a statute that prohibited the selling of “any Strong Liquores” to Indians without a license approved by the Governor of New York, under a fine of forty shillings per pint.⁴⁵⁷ Crucially, the governor made an exception for New Castle, allowing vendors to sell Indians a *minimum* of a quarter of an anchor of alcohol, which was the equivalent to about ten

⁴⁵⁴ Thomas Budd, *Good Order Established in Pennsylvania & New-Jersey in America* (Philadelphia, 1685), 28-9.

⁴⁵⁵ Salinger, *Taverns and Drinking in Early America*, 101.

⁴⁵⁶ Quotation from Mancall, *Deadly Medicine*, 47.

⁴⁵⁷ “Duke of York’s Laws,” in *Charter to William Penn*, 32.

gallons. The law's intent was to discourage Indian customers from drinking in taverns, where liquor was consumed in smaller amounts. The loophole allowed colonists to profit from alcohol sales, yet encourage Indians to drink far away from New Castle.⁴⁵⁸ The ban on alcohol sales was coupled with another statute prohibiting traders from furnishing Natives with "Guns Powder, Bullet, shott, Lead."⁴⁵⁹ A third law forbade settlers from participating in the fur trade without an annual license. All three regulations demonstrated just how integrated alcohol was to the trade in fur and weapons. Despite these laws, or more accurately, because of the intentional loopholes left in, the trade in alcohol continued apace, and so did the anxieties about its potential for disorder.

In 1680, on the eve of Pennsylvania's founding, Delaware Valley colonists petitioned the governor of New York about Gilbert Wheeler's "selling of strong liquor to the Indians."⁴⁶⁰ Wheeler owned property on both sides of the Delaware River and operated a tavern in present-day Bucks County. Wheeler's tavern became a center for Indian trading, which made him far more prosperous than many of his neighbors.⁴⁶¹ The petitioners, though, were not concerned about his wealth; they worried about his Indian customers, whom they claimed gathered nearby his house "by great numbers" to drink and "revill and fight together." Like the Dutch authorities in New Amstel, Wheeler's neighbors were not so much concerned about the Indians' welfare as they were about their own safety. In their petition, they complained to the governor that Wheeler's intoxicated Native customers "com furiously and break our fences and [steal] our corne, and [break] our windows and dores and [carry] away our goods ... which oppression if it continue will force som of us from our Plantations."⁴⁶²

Wheeler's neighbors may have exaggerated the threat to their safety to win the governor's sympathy, but they also may have been telling the truth, or at least their version of it. According to

⁴⁵⁸ Weslager, *Delaware Indians*, 138-9.

⁴⁵⁹ *Charter to Penn*, 32.

⁴⁶⁰ "Complaint of the Inhabitants of Crewcorne against Gilbert Wheeler for Selling Liquor to the Indians," September 13, 1680, in *New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch*, ed. Gehring, 340.

⁴⁶¹ *LLP* 1:745-6.

⁴⁶² "Complaint of the Inhabitants of Crewcorne against Gilbert Wheeler," 340-1.

Mancall, “Indians drank at least in part because the world they knew was eroding around them.”⁴⁶³

Drinking was also a mechanism of resistance, enabling Native men to use one symbol of colonialism – alcohol – as a weapon to attack other symbols, such as Wheeler’s neighbors’ corn, fences, windows, and doors. The violence that Wheeler’s neighbors must have felt was as “real” as guns and bullets, for they feared for their lives. The fear was great enough that the Delaware colonists who petitioned the governor of New York about Wheeler’s tavern believed the intoxicated Indians capable of driving them “from our Plantations.” In the end, Wheeler’s neighbors’ efforts to shut down his drinking establishment failed. Wheeler was indicted for violating the law against selling alcohol to his Indian customers, but the censure did not prevent him from continuing his tavern operations, even though several years later courts in Pennsylvania and across the Delaware River in West Jersey indicted him repeatedly for the same offense.⁴⁶⁴

The arrival of William Penn did not resolve the seemingly intractable disorders associated with alcohol and colonialism. Penn’s treaty with the Lenape at the Indian village of Shackamaxon in 1682 has captured the imagination of generations of Europeans and Americans. Penn was still alive when the British historian John Oldmixon decreed in 1708 that the “friendship and civility of the Pennsylvania Indians are imputed to [Mr. Penn’s] extreme humanity and bounty to them.” The passage of time only bolstered Penn’s image as a benevolent colonizer. Voltaire famously quipped in 1733 that the treaty at Shackamaxon was “the only [one] between these [Indians] and the Christians that was never sworn to and has never been broken.”⁴⁶⁵ Benjamin West’s 1771 painting of that treaty quickly became an iconographic symbol of Quaker and Indian harmony. Of course, the myth greatly distorted the historical reality. Pennsylvania was not a *tabula rassa* upon which a new era of colonization was written, no matter how benign the intentions of some Friends who believed they had the best interests

⁴⁶³ Mancall, *Deadly Medicine*, 8.

⁴⁶⁴ *LLP 1: 745*; for Wheeler’s indictment for selling rum to Natives in Bucks County, see *Records of the Courts of Quarter Sessions and Common Pleas of Bucks County Pennsylvania, 1684-1700* (Meadville, PA: Tribune Publishing Company, 1943), 77.

⁴⁶⁵ Voltaire, *Philosophical Letters: Letters Concerning the English Nation*, ed. and trans. Ernest Dilworth (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2003), 18.

of their Indian neighbors at heart. From its meager start on the west bank of the Delaware River above New Castle, the colony of Pennsylvania was built on shifting networks of Native trading relationships that Penn intended to take full advantage of, especially the ones that yielded land for his colony and lucrative furs for European markets. Pennsylvania's merchants, traders, and government agents subsequently intertwined themselves in those exchange networks. Alcohol, as before, was a crucial component of this exchange, and the eagerness of its participants, Native and settler, to circulate and consume it amplified the force of its symbolic violence.

The founding of Pennsylvania coincided with dramatic changes for middle-Atlantic Indians. For most of the seventeenth century, Natives in the region made ever-shifting alliances with Indian and European groups, usually to gain better access to the trade in furs, which were exchanged in return for more European goods, including guns and alcohol. Beginning in the 1640s, the Lenape made a strategic alliance with their former enemies, the Iroquoian-speaking Susquehannocks who inhabited a major river valley that now bears their name. The Susquehanna River served as a veritable highway linking Iroquois and Algonquin-speaking groups from New York to the Chesapeake. Via the western branch, it provided easy access to the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. In the Delaware Valley, the number of beaver and other fur-bearing animals available for commercial hunting were already going into steep decline by the mid-seventeenth century. By allying with the Susquehannocks, the Lenape could position themselves as intermediaries between Delaware Valley settlers and Indian trading networks further in the continental interior.⁴⁶⁶

But the alliance would not endure. For a time, the Susquehannocks benefitted from on again, off again alliances with Dutch and Swedish colonists in the Delaware Valley, as well as English settlers from Maryland and Virginia and Iroquoian-speaking peoples in the Great Lakes. But European disease epidemics, land pressures from colonization, and near-constant warfare took their toll. During mid-century, the Iroquois, armed with Dutch weapons at Fort Orange, sought to replace their numbers in

⁴⁶⁶ Jennings, *Ambiguous Iroquois Empire*, 116-9; Schutt, *People of the River Valleys*, 54-5.

mourning wars that stretched from Quebec to the Great Lakes region. The Susquehannocks were able to repel a Seneca assault in 1663, but war and disease further decimated their numbers by the 1670s. After a bloody assault by Virginia and Maryland settlers in 1676 had defeated their surviving remnants, Governor Andros, as part of his “Covenant Chain” alliance with the Iroquois, resettled most of the remaining Susquehannocks in New York. By the time Penn arrived on the banks of the Delaware in 1682, the Susquehanna Valley, although still important passageway for the fur trade, had been largely emptied of Native inhabitants.⁴⁶⁷

William Penn believed Pennsylvania would usher in an unprecedented era of peaceful relations between Indians and colonists. Penn knew he needed Native allies to ensure his colony would be successful. Above all, he needed their lands. Although he ultimately undermined Native autonomy by encouraging a massive migration of settlers to the Delaware Valley, Penn wanted to avoid the kinds of violent conquest that marked much of the previous history of European colonization of North America. His attitudes reflected the peace testimony concerns of Friends to avoid direct engagement in warfare, whether against Native or European enemies. Shortly before leaving for America, Penn wrote a letter addressed to “the King of Kings of the Indians” in the Delaware Valley, in which he greeted his imagined Native readers with salutations attesting that “God hath written his Law in our hearts by which wee are taught and commended to Love & help and Doe good to one another and not to Doe Harm.”⁴⁶⁸ The letter, written a mere five years after the pan-Indian uprising known as King Philip’s War had decimated the New England frontier, reflected Penn’s fervent desire to avoid having a similar destructive confrontation with Natives in his planned colony.

Early Pennsylvania ethnographies portrayed the Lenape as a peaceful people whose culture and ways of government were compatible with the Quakers’. Certain ethnographic accounts, such as

⁴⁶⁷ Jennings, *Ambiguous Iroquois Empire*, 89-112, 128-157; Daniel Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 145.

⁴⁶⁸ William Penn, “For the King or Kings of the Indians in Pennsylvania,” London, October 18, 1681, Parrish Collection (#1653), Pemberton Papers, Box 2, HSP. Facsimile of original.

Gabriel Thomas's *Historical and Geographic Account of the Province and Country of Pennsylvania* (1698), provided readers with a lexicon of the Lenape language to grammatically illustrate how the "English and they live very peaceably." Thomas, for example, praised Lenape speech as "high and lofty," but his lexicon focused instead on peaceful exchange. Juxtaposing a pidgin form of Lenape alongside its English translation, Thomas constructed a fictive dialogue between a "Christian" and Indian trader meeting "in the Woods." In the dialogue, the imagined Indian informs the Christian trader he has "good strong Skins, with very good Turkeys," to which the latter promised he had "good Powder, and very good Shot, with red and blue [match coats]" at his house.⁴⁶⁹ The dialogue's aim was to highlight the peaceful nature of Lenape trading relationships with Pennsylvania colonists (even though part of that trade consisted of powder and shot, as Thomas had unwittingly revealed). Pastorius, the founder of the Germantown settlement, praised the Lenape for their peaceable character, viewing them as "much averse to war and the shedding of human blood, and would far rather be at peace with all men."⁴⁷⁰ By portraying the Lenape as a single people with a uniform and pacific culture, early Pennsylvania ethnographic accounts were more aspirational than anthropological. As John Smolenski argues, provincial Quakers "saw in their [Native] neighbors a people with similar methods of constructing public order, which in their minds explained the harmonious nature of Quaker-Indian relations."⁴⁷¹

To attract investors, Penn portrayed the Lenape as an eminently governable people to colonize. In his 1683 letter to the Free Society of Traders, a London-based chartered company of Quaker merchants, he praised the Lenape for their stately appearance, though he resorted to using ethnographic stereotypes, such as comparing their eyes to "a straight-look't Jew" and their noses to "East-Indians

⁴⁶⁹ Gabriel Thomas, *Historical and Geographic Account of the Province and Country of Pennsylvania* (London, 1698), in *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania, West New Jersey and Delaware, 1630–1707*, ed. Albert Cook Meyers (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1912), 342.

⁴⁷⁰ Francis Daniel Pastorius, *Circumstantial Geographical Description of Pennsylvania* (Frankfurt, 1700), in *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, ed., Meyers, 419–20; Quotation from Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 94–5.

⁴⁷¹ Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 95.

and Blacks.”⁴⁷² Penn’s ethnography is generally sympathetic, and he pays particular attention to their family patterns and method of “government.” Of the latter, he describes their justice as “pecuniary” and notes that in “case of any wrong or evil fact, be it murder itself, they atone by feasts and presents of wampum, which is apportioned to the quality of the offence or person injured.”⁴⁷³ Penn believed in the compatibility of Lenape and Quaker notions of justice, and he touted an agreement with the Lenape that Pennsylvania courts would include mixed juries of Natives and colonists. Although there is no evidence this actually occurred, Penn was sincere in his belief that his government in Pennsylvania would be scrupulously fair in dealing with them.⁴⁷⁴ Penn’s letter to the Free Society of Traders in fact contains what is probably his most succinct rendering of his philosophy on the importance of maintaining peaceful relations with Natives in the service of advancing colonial ends: “Do not abuse them, but let them have Justice, and you win them.”⁴⁷⁵

Though Penn sincerely wanted to establish peaceful relations with the Lenape, his ambitions to populate their land with settlers risked undermining that proposition from the outset. As proprietor, Penn wanted his colony to become the trading “*Center* of all the English Colonies upon the Continent of *America*.”⁴⁷⁶ In 1690, Penn announced his intentions to build a second city along the Susquehanna River that would provide him access to the Chesapeake Bay. Although the planned city never materialized, Penn sold advance subscriptions to land in the Susquehanna Valley in 1696, raising over £4,000 from approximately 450 investors, even though he had not yet managed to extinguish rival claims to the region, particularly from New York and their Iroquois allies. Penn knew the Susquehanna

⁴⁷² *Letter from William Penn to the Committee of the Free Society of Traders* (London, 1683), in *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, ed. Meyers, 230.

⁴⁷³ *Letter from William Penn*, in *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, ed. Meyers, 236.

⁴⁷⁴ *Letter from William Penn*, in *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, ed. Meyers, 236. According to John Smolenski, “The Death of Sawantaeny and the Problem of Justice on the Frontier,” in *Friends and Enemies*, eds. Pencak and Richter, 116, “There is no evidence ... that [a mixed jury of Indians and settlers] was ever called” from 1683 to 1722.

⁴⁷⁵ *Letter from William Penn*, in *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, 236.

⁴⁷⁶ William Penn, *Some Proposals for a Second Settlement in the Province of Pennsylvania* (broadsheet, [London], 1690), William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, 1665-1801, vol. 3, p. 7, APS.

Valley was a critical Native route in the fur trade, and he wanted to build an entrepôt there that would draw Indian furs away from Albany, his main competitor in the trade.⁴⁷⁷

In the Delaware Valley, where the pace of colonization proceeded more quickly, Native tensions with settlers occasionally boiled over into outright violence. As with the sachems who threatened to kill one of Governor Markham's surveyors in Bucks County, Lenape groups vented their frustration at settlers who sometimes took land without permission. Penn's treaty negotiations frequently involved several groups of Lenape who held overlapping claims to the same territory.⁴⁷⁸ Negotiating on Indian terms slowed the pace of proceedings. If Penn appreciated the nuances of Indian protocols, many of his colonists eager to farm outside of Philadelphia did not bother to wait for the negotiations to conclude before taking up lands. Settler claims to exclusive ownership of land also provoked Native groups. In December 1684, Nicholas More informed the proprietor that "Indians are Mutch displeased at our English settling upon their Land, and seeme to Threaten us, saying that William Penn hath deceived them."⁴⁷⁹ Thomas Holme, a provincial land surveyor in Bucks County, also reported that Tamanen hindered "our people to plant & seat" upon lands he granted to Penn the previous year. Tamanen, according to Holme, threatened to burn some houses in the area, causing frightened settlers to flee across the Delaware River into New Jersey. Holme called Tamanen a "rogue" who betrayed his promises, but in all likelihood it was the Lenape sachem who felt betrayed by Penn's assurances that Native interests in his colony would be protected.⁴⁸⁰

Although Tamanen threatened his settler neighbors with violent action, most Lenape groups, faced with their own dwindling numbers due to disease and colonization, turned to Pennsylvania as a

⁴⁷⁷ *PWP* 3: 671-8; Gary Nash, "The Quest for the Susquehanna Valley: New York, Pennsylvania, and the Seventeenth-Century Fur Trade," *New York History* 48 (January 1967): 3-27.

⁴⁷⁸ In June 1683, for example, Tamanen granted Penn lands between Pennypack and Neshaminy Creeks (situated between lower Bucks and upper Philadelphia Counties). That same day, Swanpees and three other sachems granted Penn the same tract of territory; see Alden Vaughan, ed., *Early American Indian Documents: Treaties and Laws, 1607-1789*, vol. 1: Pennsylvania and Delaware Indian Treaties, 1629-1737, ed. Donald Kent (Washington, DC: University Publications of America, 1983), 61-4; Schutt, *People of the River Valleys*, 33.

⁴⁷⁹ Nicholas More to William Penn, [December 1, 1684], *PWP* 2: 608.

⁴⁸⁰ Thomas Holme to James Harrison, et al., March 8, 1684, Frank M. Etting Collection (#193), Vol. 1: Pemberton Papers, box 42, f. 7-8, HSP.

trading partner. For the Lenape, the choice was a strategic one born out of necessity, but it led to an alliance with the Quaker-dominated government, one that put the colony on a stable (if ultimately ephemeral) footing. The Quaker-Indian alliance forged in the 1680s was the basis for Pennsylvania's "long peace" in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Unlike the mythic "long peace" celebrated by Voltaire and commemorated in Benjamin West's painting, the Quaker-Indian alliance in early Pennsylvania was underpinned by a lively exchange of European trade goods for Indian lands. If Native leaders offered land, what they asked for in return was the European manufactures upon which they increasingly depended. Throughout the 1680s, the Lenape received numerous trade items in exchange for more land, including beads, duffels (blankets), match coats (duffels Indians fashioned into outer garments), and metal tools, in addition to wampum, alcohol, and firearms. When the Quaker government was slow to provide what was promised, Natives sometimes demanded more, as Nanacussey did in 1684 when he asked for more goods than "was agreed before because [Penn] has not paid him" for lands he previously granted to the government near the Schuylkill River.⁴⁸¹

Even Tamanen could not stave off the need to trade with his Quaker interlocutors. Long after he threatened to burn settler homes, his name appears in provincial land "deeds" in 1692 and again in 1697.⁴⁸² The latter deed was signed by Tamanen, his sons, his brother, and Wehequeckhon (another brother or nephew), whom Tamanen claimed through an interpreter "would be king after my death." Tamanen and his clan received a bounty of trade goods in exchange for ceding much of the same territory in Bucks County that he had originally granted to Penn in 1683. The re-granting of territory was probably intended to coincide with Tamanen's announcement of an heir, but it also reflected the Lenape insistence on shared usage rights and signaled to Euroamerican neighbors that their recently "purchased" territory neither gave them exclusive nor perpetual rights. The grant also reflected Tamanen's need for those goods, which as sachem he undoubtedly redistributed through his own

⁴⁸¹ *PWP* 2: 608; for Nanacussey's original land grant, see *PWP* 2: 261-3.

⁴⁸² Samuel Hazard, ed., *Pennsylvania Archives*, 1st. Ser., (Harrisburg: 1852), 1: 116-7, 124-5.

patronage networks. Among the items the Lenape sachem received were “Twenty Matchcoats, Twelve White Blankets, Ten Kettles, Twelve Guns, Thirty yards of Shirting Cloth, one Runlett of Powder, Ten Barrs of Lead, Forty yards of Stroud Waters, Twenty pair of Stockins One Horse, Fifty pounds of Tobacco, Six dozen Pipes, and Thirty Shillings in cash.”⁴⁸³ In return, Tamanen promised his Quaker neighbors more than land to settle on – he was also willing to forget past animosities. As he reminded provincial Friends in 1694, “We and the Christians ... have alwayes had a free road to one another; and though sometimes a tree has fallen across the road, yet wee design to continue the old friendship that has been between us and you.”⁴⁸⁴

The firearms trade undergirded the Quaker-Indian alliance. The success of this alliance can be seen in provincial government treaty records from 1682 to 1687, when Penn and his agents bought up much of the in the land in the Delaware Valley, along with prime acreage adjacent to the Susquehanna River. In return, the Quaker-dominated provincial government handed their Lenape allies over 130 firearms (probably smoothbore matchlocks), 140 pounds of gunpowder, and 380 lead bars to cast into shot (not counting the thirty barrels of lead bars given in one treaty in 1683).⁴⁸⁵ As these figures are compiled from extant sources only, the actual size of the trade was probably far greater, and moreover do not reflect the weapons supplied by Euroamericans or Natives operating at the margins of the officially-sanctioned trade. And the flow of military supplies to Indian customers continued into the eighteenth century. In 1715, for example, the Pennsylvania Governor Charles Gookin presented the “chiefs of the Delaware and Schuylkil [sic] Indians” visiting Philadelphia dozens of pipes, stroud and duffel match coats, blankets, and fifty pounds of powder.⁴⁸⁶ While Natives certainly used firearms and gunpowder for hunting and the fur trade, military needs drove this exchange as much as commercial ones.

⁴⁸³ *Pennsylvania Archives*, 1st Ser. 1:124.

⁴⁸⁴ *MPCP* 1: 447.

⁴⁸⁵ These figures are compiled from treaties reprinted in *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, ed. Soderlund, 156-60; *Early American Indian Documents*, vol. 1, eds. Vaughan and Kent, 63, 65, 76-7, 78-9; and *Pennsylvania Archives*, 1st Ser. 1: 116-7, 124.

⁴⁸⁶ *MPCP* 2: 599-602. Quotation on p. 599.

The Quaker-Indian arms trade thrived because both sides sought security and stability in the emerging frontier space of Pennsylvania's woods. In a colony governed by a pacifist Quakers with no organized militia during a time of imperial conflict, the provincial arms trade effectively created a *de facto* Indian militia that protected Pennsylvania's frontier region from potential incursions by the French or their Native allies. While early Pennsylvania Quakers argued over the morality of the death penalty, war taxes, temperance, and slavery, the Indian arms trade elicited almost no debate. The Keithian schism was the exception that proved the rule. During the schism, George Keith and his supporters pointedly asked in print whether Friends ought to "provide the *Indians* with Powder and Lead, to fight against other *Indians*."⁴⁸⁷ After that one instance, the issue never surfaced again as a point of contention among Friends. Part of the reason had to do with the particularities of the peace testimony itself. Arming Indian allies would not have been generally perceived as a transgression for early modern Quaker pacifists.⁴⁸⁸ But the deafening silence from provincial Friends on this issue was also a testament to just how beneficial the arrangement was for a provincial government dominated by a pacifist sect under intense pressure from the Crown and neighboring colonies to provide for the common defense of the Anglo-American frontier.

Lenape groups also benefitted from the arms trade. With the Susquehanna largely open for resettlement in the 1680s, they could afford to yield up more land in the Delaware Valley in exchange for much-needed weapons and trade goods. Penn boasted in a *Further Account of the Province of Pennsylvania* (1685) that Quaker benevolence "has obliged [the Indians] so far, that they generally leave their guns at home, when they come to our settlements."⁴⁸⁹ What he failed to mention, but surely knew, was that his Lenape trading partners needed those guns. The Susquehanna Valley was a strategic

⁴⁸⁷ [George Keith], *An Appeal from the Twenty Eight Judges: To the Spirit of Truth & True Judgment in All Faithful Friends, Called Quakers ...* (Philadelphia, 1692), 7.

⁴⁸⁸ For most of the seventeenth century, the consensus position among Quakers was that they should only avoid direct participation in war; see Meredith Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace: Quaker Pacifism in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

⁴⁸⁹ William Penn, *A Further Account of the Province of Pennsylvania* (London, 1685) in *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, ed. Meyers, 276.

territory for hunting and fur trading coveted by settlers and Indians alike. The Lenape would certainly not be alone by relocating there. Although the Iroquois were hardly in a position to enforce their will unilaterally, they nonetheless asserted their rights over the region and any Indians residing within it.⁴⁹⁰

But the Iroquois were not the only and probably not even the worst threat. Strategically located between New York and the Chesapeake, the Susquehanna Valley remained vulnerable to Indian raiding. In June 1696, Governor Markham advised Penn that twenty “Strange Indians raided the recently settled Indian village of Conestoga, “where our Indians live that removed from Schoolkill.” The “strange Indians,” according to Markham’s Indian informant, were Tawetawe, or Miami Indians from the Ohio River Valley. Evidently looking for slaves or mourning war captives, the Tawetawe seized an “Indian man and his wife” in their corn fields. After they “took away the man and Scalpt the Woman,” the Tawetawe raiders promised the Conestoga village that they would return to “take all their men and Scalp all their women.”⁴⁹¹ For good reason the Lenape relocating to the Susquehanna desired all the firearms, powder, and shot they could muster from their provincial Quakers allies.

The Lenape were not the only ones to benefit from the Quaker-Indian alliance. Beginning in the 1690s, other Native groups began settling in the Susquehanna Valley and forming new Indian identities with and alongside the Lenape. Just as Pennsylvania would boast a diverse settler population, the Susquehanna Valley attracted what Francis Jennings once called “a veritable united nations of Indians,” including Shawnees, Tutelos, Cayugas, Senecas, Tuscaroras, and Nanticokes, among others.⁴⁹² Even a remnant of Susquehannocks returned from New York with the Seneca to reestablish a community in their old hunting grounds. The Indian village of Conestoga, raided by the Tawetawes in 1696, was itself a polyglot community comprised of Senecas, Susquehannocks, and Lenape. Their identity as

⁴⁹⁰ For the weakened position of the Iroquois at the end of the seventeenth century, see Jennings, *Ambiguous Iroquois Empire*, 204-213. Though they would never be able to unilaterally impose their will on “subordinate” Native groups, the Iroquois remained a formidable military and political force in the Middle Atlantic, see John Parmenter, “After the Mourning Wars: The Iroquois as Allies in Colonial North American Campaigns, 1676-1760,” *WMQ* 64 (January 2007): 39-76.

⁴⁹¹ William Markham to William Penn, June 25, 1696, *PWP* 3:451-2

⁴⁹² Francis Jennings, “Iroquois Alliance in American History,” in Jennings, et al., *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy* (Syracuse, 1985), 41; quoted in Eric Hinderaker, *Elusive Empires: Constructing Colonialism in the Ohio Valley, 1673-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 26.

“Conestoga” Indians was partially a colonizing nomenclature given to them by settlers, but it also reflected their reality as a newly-constituted Native group. To the north of Conestoga lay Paxtang, a Shawnee and Lenape village that formed around the turn of the eighteenth century, and Pequea, a Shawnee town that was settled in the mid-1690s.⁴⁹³

If Pennsylvania was a religious sanctuary for Quakers, many Native groups viewed the Susquehanna as “a last, delightful asylum.”⁴⁹⁴ Many Indian groups in the Susquehanna were refugees fleeing settler and Indian violence in the Chesapeake and Carolina backcountry, or elsewhere. The immigration of Indians into Pennsylvania’s backcountry in the 1690s and early 1700s stood in marked contrast to the displacement and dispersal of Natives in other Anglo-American colonies, especially in the wake of previous violent conflicts like King Philip’s War and Bacon’s Rebellion. United by common interests, these newly-formed Susquehanna Indian communities comprised an alternate “covenant chain” alliance with Penn and the Quaker-dominated provincial government. Penn needed these Indians groups to legitimate his claims on the Susquehanna Valley over rival claims from Maryland, New York, and the Iroquois. Native groups in the Susquehanna equally needed Pennsylvania for trade goods and to fend off Iroquois pretensions to rule over them. Penn cemented this alliance with a major treaty in 1701, while the Iroquois merely watched as bystanders.⁴⁹⁵ The 1701 treaty, from Penn’s point of view, extended Pennsylvania’s sovereignty over the Susquehanna Valley and its Native inhabitants, who vowed to “behave themselves Regularly & Soberly according to the Laws of this Governmt.” The treaty also mandated that the Susquehanna Indians “not sell or dispose of any of their Peltry or furr” with none but those authorized by the Pennsylvania government. In return, Penn promised that he and “his heirs and successors shall take Care to have ... [the] Indians duly

⁴⁹³ Hinderaker, *Elusive Empires*, 19-20, 25-6. On the Native migration into the Susquehanna Valley, see Barry Kent, *Susquehanna’s Indians* (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1984), 58-61; Schutt, *Peoples of the River Valleys*, 65-70. See also Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 203-4, for the cultural implications of this resettlement.

⁴⁹⁴ Charles Thompson, *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Alienation of the Delaware...* (1759), 61.

⁴⁹⁵ Francis Jennings, “Brother Miquon: Good Lord!” in *The World of William Penn*, ed. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 195-214.

furnished with all sorts of necessary Goods for their use at reasonable rates.”⁴⁹⁶ Whether or not the Susquehanna Valley Indians ever really intended to yield up their sovereignty and lands, the offer of protection, weapons, and other trade goods was exactly what they wanted.

The 1701 treaty marked in ritual political form the high water mark of an alliance that began to unravel after Penn’s departure from the colony six months later. Yet for the period roughly spanning from the late 1680s to around 1710 the Susquehanna Valley came as close to reaching a cultural “middle ground” as it ever would. Contrary to what the term may suggest, the middle ground that White described for the Great Lakes region in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries was a violent place. And just as importantly, it described a forced accommodation between Natives and French traders that led to a novel political and cultural synthesis because neither side could wholly dominate the other nor dictate the outcome of events.⁴⁹⁷ The Pennsylvania frontier certainly differed from the *pays d’en haut* – the most important difference being that the latter region did not attract anywhere near the number of settlers as the former. But until around 1710, when the pace of settler migration to the Susquehanna Valley quickened, Indian declension and dispersal looked far from inevitable, and Pennsylvania Friends and their Indian allies remained locked in a mutual interdependence that resulted, at least temporarily, in a new political order. That alliance would be tested by violence and threats of violence in the Susquehanna Valley, but it was the alcohol trade, as a force of symbolic violence, that proved the key to its undoing.⁴⁹⁸

Though Pennsylvania escaped the French-allied Indian raids that New England and New York endured in the late seventeenth century, tensions remained high, abetted by frequent rumors of Indian discontent and possible French infiltration into the Susquehanna Valley. Even before the onset of King William’s War (1689-97), the provincial government in Pennsylvania showed great concern for its

⁴⁹⁶ The treaty is reprinted in *MPCP* 2: 14-18; quotations on 16-17.

⁴⁹⁷ White, *The Middle Ground*, 20th anniversary ed., see esp. 50-93.

⁴⁹⁸ When Pennsylvania Governor Gookin traveled to Conestoga to meet with the Shawnee sachem Opessa in 1711, he brought gifts from William Penn “to acquaint you that he is about to settle some people upon the branches of [the] Potowmack” and asked him to extend his “friendship to the Palatines settled near Pequea.” Quotation from *MPCP* 1: 533.

frontier security. The Quakers' unwillingness to organize or legally establish a provincial militia left the colony especially vulnerable to attack, whether by French colonials or from Natives. For the Pennsylvania government, maintaining good diplomatic relations with Indian allies was not merely prudent – it was a matter of survival. In 1688, responding to a rumor about an “Indian insurrection,” the Provincial Council immediately dispatched a delegation to Chester County, where settlers near Marcus Hook feared over one hundred Indian warriors were gathering to attack them. The rumor turned out to be false, but when the delegation confirmed this at the Lenape community of Brandywine, the sachem there used the rumor – or more precisely, the fear of an Indian attack – as an opportunity to remind his Quaker visitors that he had not yet been paid for the land that William Penn had negotiated for.⁴⁹⁹

The Pennsylvania government worried incessantly about losing the loyalty of “their” Indians to French saboteurs. In July 1689, Governor John Blackwell, a staunch English Puritan who loathed Pennsylvania's non-defensive military posture, reminded the Provincial Council of the recent “Crueltyes and barbarous usage of ye French Indians upon ye people of New England” before informing them of the “severall Rumors of danger” from “Papists in Maryland” who were allegedly “tampering with ye french & Northern Indians” in order to surround their colony.⁵⁰⁰ A few months later, John Hill, an Anglican planter from Delaware, suggested the Council forbear arming the colony for fear the “Indians would rise against us suspecting we intended harm.” In response, the Council sent Lasse Cock to the Schuylkill to enquire “ye store and quantity of Ammunition” in the hands of the several known French traders operating there and to remind “ye Chief Sachem” that he “may be assured of our good Intention towards them.”⁵⁰¹ Rumors of a French plot resurfaced in 1693, when “Polycarpus Rose” informed the Council that “a certain Indian king called Hickoqueen” told him that

⁴⁹⁹ Robert Proud, *The History of Pennsylvania, in North America* (Philadelphia, 1797), 335-8.

⁵⁰⁰ *MPCP* 1: 299.

⁵⁰¹ *MPCP* 1: 334.

the French “would come in the spring ... [and] Burne the English, and take the Countrey for themselves.”⁵⁰²

Pennsylvania’s Indian allies also worried about getting pulled into a destructive war with the French or the English. Hickoqueen, a Lenape sachem, returned to Philadelphia the following year with a Susquehanna delegation complaining that the New York Senecas were pressuring them “to be partners with them to fight against the French, but wee [being] ... a peaceable people ... [and] weak, and verie few number, cannot assist them.” The delegation also confronted Markham, then governor, about rumors of “a great number of men [assembling] with drums and guns, &c., and the same at New Castle.” The delegates from Conestoga also reported that some Cayuga visitors travelling through the Susquehanna were attacked by “nakees [naked] Indians [i.e., Miami from the Ohio Valley].” Markham, then governor, quickly assured the delegation that “it is not our design thereby to make war upon you.”⁵⁰³ Though rumors of war persisted into the eighteenth century, the Quaker-Indian alliance, marked in ceremonial form by Penn’s 1701 treaty, provided a mechanism for ensuring frontier security, as far as imperial conflict was concerned.

Not so with alcohol. For Pennsylvania Friends, the alcohol trade was a gospel order problem, a spiritual violence that had to be rooted out of the collective Quaker body. This proved immeasurably difficult to accomplish, if for no other reason than Friends drank alcohol, sometimes heavily. Drinking was also tied to medicinal practices, and Friends drank at funerals, suggesting a strong parallel to Native drinking at mourning ceremonies.⁵⁰⁴ It was hardly coincidental that the Quakers’ effort to remove themselves from the Indian alcohol trade coincided with their attempts to enforce temperance within their Society. The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting’s circulated epistle for 1694 cautioned Quaker

⁵⁰² Thomas Jenner, Information on Indian Affairs, 12 December 1693, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, 1665-1801, vol. 1, p. 242, APS; also reprinted in *MPCP* 1: 357.

⁵⁰³ *MPCP* 1: 447-9; quotation on p. 449.

⁵⁰⁴ In 1729, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting implored members of monthly and quarterly meetings in the Delaware Valley to “observe decency and moderation in their internments ... [and that] when wine and other strong liquors are served (which many sober-minded amongst us think needless) that it be but once.” Quotation from Ezra Michener, *A Retrospect of Early Quakerism* (Philadelphia, 1860), 235.

youth against “Looseness & Vanity,” which included “Drinking to One another, Rideing or going from House to house, to drink Rum or other Strong Liquors to Excess ...” The yearly meeting equated the sin of drunkenness with such disorders as “corrupt Language, Manners & Vain needless Things & Fashions in Apparel [sic] & Immoderate & Indecent Smoaking of Tobacco ...” For early Quaker reformers, activities like consuming alcohol, smoking tobacco, and wearing fashionable apparel were all vices rooted in addiction and vanity that left their physical marks in different ways on the bodies of wayward Friends, thus undermining the collective spiritual unity of the corporate Quaker body. Despite early efforts to sanction drinking, the problem, if anything, worsened in the eighteenth century, as evidenced by the yearly meeting’s repeated warnings that Friends drink moderately and refrain from serving “rum and other strong liquors” at public auctions.⁵⁰⁵

Another barrier to temperance was that taverns and alehouses dotted Pennsylvania’s landscape. In keeping with his idealism, Penn initially wanted to ban all drinking establishments from his colony, but this idea was never taken seriously by most settlers. Since the civic culture of Pennsylvania was inseparable from Quaker religious culture, many prominent Friends nevertheless periodically called on the provincial government to rid the colony of public drunkenness. In 1695, dozens of prominent Friends signed a petition demanding that only men of “good Repute & Christian conversation” hold provincial office. The petition, addressed to the governor and Provincial Council, also observed with dismay the “many Ordnaries [sic] & Tippling houses in this Towne of Philadelphia, kept by such as are not well Qualified for that undertaking, rending to the Debaucherie & corrupting of Youth.” Perhaps recognizing that closing all the taverns in Philadelphia was quixotic, the petitioners suggested instead that “only Sober, honest conscientious persons be suffered to keep [public] houses.”⁵⁰⁶

Similar efforts by early Quaker reformers to prevent their coreligionists from selling rum to Natives proved difficult if not impossible to enforce. Many early Quaker merchants were deeply

⁵⁰⁵ Ezra Michener, *A Retrospect of Early Quakerism*, 312.

⁵⁰⁶ Petition to the Governor and Provincial Council, 21 May 1695, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, 1665-1801, vol. 3, p. 10, APS.

implicated in the liquor trade. When the Provincial Council passed an excise tax on alcohol in March 1684, nine Philadelphia merchants, protesting that the tax would ruin them, proposed a voluntary subscription “upon reasonable terms” instead. Seven of the nine merchants who signed the petition were Quakers, the majority of whom were leading members of the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting. As with the issue of slavery, the prominence of these merchants in Quaker meetings comprised reformers’ efforts to ban the sale of alcohol as a lucrative trade item with Natives.⁵⁰⁷

Nevertheless, provincial Friends struggled to divest themselves from the trade. Even before Pennsylvania’s founding, the Burlington Monthly Meeting inquired in 1679 whether it was morally “lawful” for Friends to sell rum to Natives.⁵⁰⁸ The question was taken up with greater force in 1685, when the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting declared “that it is not Consistent with the Honor of Truth ... to sell Rum or other Strong Liquors to the Indians,” reasoning that Natives “use them not to Moderation, but to Excess & Drunkenness.”⁵⁰⁹ The yearly meeting reissued the caution in 1686 and again in 1687, a good indication that the problem was deeply rooted in the political and economic life of early Pennsylvania Quakerism. The caution in 1687, in fact, expressed dismay that Friends, especially merchants, remained “not wholly clear of it.” This time, the yearly meeting greatly broadened the scope of its sanction, cautioning against the “Selling Rum or other Strong Liquors to the Indians directly or Indirectly or Exchanging [alcohol] ... for any Goods or Merchandises ...”⁵¹⁰ By “indirect” means of exchange, the meeting was likely targeting Quaker merchants who outfitted traders with rum and other goods, which were then transported to the frontier to be exchanged with Native customers. The sanction established an important moral precedent, which Quaker reformers in the meeting used to

⁵⁰⁷ *PWP* 2: 558.

⁵⁰⁸ Michener, *A Retrospect of Early Quakerism*, 308.

⁵⁰⁹ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph469, August 5, 1685, p. 11, FHL.

⁵¹⁰ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph469, September 8, 1686, p. 12, FHL; Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph469, September 7, 1687, p. 14-6, FHL. Quotations on p. 15-6.

pressure several members to finally stop – or at least promise to stop under the threat of disownment – their involvement in the Indian rum trade.⁵¹¹

While the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting was concerned the Indian alcohol trade would compromise the moral and spiritual purity of Friends, Quaker magistrates attempted to balance moral and strategic concerns. Following their Dutch predecessors in the Delaware Valley, the Pennsylvania government attempted to strictly regulate the trade in order to prevent alcohol-related disorders from overtaking a frontier region they largely had no control over. The “Great Body of Laws” passed by the Quaker Assembly in December 1682 included an outright ban that forbade any colonist from selling or exchanging “Rum or Brandy, or any strong Liquors, at any time, to any Indian within this Province.” The preamble of the statute acknowledged that “Divers persons, as English, Dutch, Swedes, &c. have been wont to sell to the Indians rum and Brandy” in the past, but the Assembly also partially laid the blame on Indians’ inability “to govern themselves in the use thereof,” which, as the legislature claimed, “makes them sometimes destroy one another, and grievously annoy and Disquiet the people of this Province.”⁵¹² In addition to concerns about frontier security, the Assembly was likely responding to pressure from Quaker constituent groups who were around the same time complaining to the provincial government about the “disorder in publick houses.”⁵¹³

Contrary to the designs of Quaker reformers, Native allies in the region pressured the Pennsylvania government to repeal the ban. The political pressure reflected the extent to which Indian customers willingly demanded alcohol, both as prestige trade good, and to an increasing degree, a commodity they were dependent on. In March 1684, not even two years after the comprehensive ban on the alcohol trade was enacted, the Provincial Council introduced a bill about “letting [Indians] have

⁵¹¹ In 1687 the Falls Monthly Meeting pressured merchant William Biles to stop selling rum to Native customers. After several visits from overseers, Biles protested that it was not “any evil; however, if Friends desire him not to do it, he will for the future forbear it.” It is not known whether or for how long he desisted; Michener, *A Retrospect of Early Quakerism*, 309.

⁵¹² *Charter to William Penn*, 111.

⁵¹³ *MPCP* 1: 74.

Rum.”⁵¹⁴ That May, Penn informed the Council that he had met with several unnamed Indian groups and promised he would repeal the ban on the rum provided “they would be Contented to be punished as ye English were; which they did agree to.”⁵¹⁵ On paper, the agreement Penn reached with his Indian allies ratified a formula that seemingly worked to the provincial government’s advantage. Natives exchanged their sovereignty for continued access to the rum trade. In practice, Indians had ready access to markets in the Chesapeake and elsewhere and thus could manage without Pennsylvania’s official sanction. But the demand for rum was already great enough that the Indian delegation meeting with Penn pressured him to repeal the law. The Assembly accordingly amended the law to allow Penn and the Provincial Council to suspend the comprehensive ban on the rum trade as they “shall think fit.” The amended law, of course, was predicated on the sachems’ agreement to punish any Indians that “abuse themselves with those Drinks unto Drunkenness” according to “the Laws of this government.”⁵¹⁶

Almost as soon as the law was amended, however, several Lenape groups began protesting the destructive intrusion of alcohol on their frontier communities. One delegation in July 1685 complained to the Provincial Council that servants of Jasper Farmer were “making ye Indians drunk [and] Lying with their and of their beeting [sic] both men and wives.”⁵¹⁷ The delegation also complained that the provincial government had not fully paid them for the 5,000 acres of land allotted to Farmer, which was situated along the Schuylkill River near present-day Conshohocken. Jasper Farmer died at sea en route to Pennsylvania with his household in 1685. His son, Edward, would later become a prominent Indian trader and interpreter for the provincial government. The Farmer estate was located near the home of John Steelman, a long-time Swedish settler and prominent Indian trader.⁵¹⁸ Jasper Farmer’s servants probably drank with Steelman’s Indian customers on numerous occasions. The Lenape delegation blamed alcohol for the perceived sexual transgressions and violent altercations between

⁵¹⁴ *MPCP* 1: 98.

⁵¹⁵ *MPCP* 1: 105.

⁵¹⁶ *Charter to William Penn*, 169.

⁵¹⁷ *MPCP* 1: 147.

⁵¹⁸ *PWP* 2: 485

Farmer's servants and their Indian neighbors, and they demanded the provincial government take appropriate action. A week later, Farmer's servants appeared before the Provincial Council to answer their summons, but as the Council noted, because their Indian neighbors were "drunk in ye woods," the servants were afraid to return home until the matter of their unpaid land was settled with the Lenape delegation.⁵¹⁹

Only two months after meeting with the Lenape delegation, the Provincial Council issued a proclamation reinstating the prohibition on the sale of "Rum, brandy, & other strong Liquors to ye Indians."⁵²⁰ Following the proclamation, quarter sessions courts indicted several colonists for illegally trading alcohol with local Indians, with mixed results. In Bucks County, Gilbert Wheeler was indicted twice "for selling Rum to the Indians" in 1687 but convicted only on the second count, with a £5 fine.⁵²¹ In Chester County, Thomas Colborne was also indicted that same year based on eyewitness testimony that a "drunken Indian" returned from the defendant's home with "two Bottles which he saw full of rum."⁵²² Despite the witness's testimony, the jury deemed the evidence insufficient and found Colborne not guilty. By comparison, the predominately-Quaker juries were far more severe when alcohol consumption led to violent encounters. In 1693, a grand jury indicted John Powell of Chester County for drunkenness and "Attempting to Ride over severall Indian women and being with held [by the women] Drew his knife [and] thretned to rip them up."⁵²³ Powell was fined five shillings for public intoxication, but the court imposed a hefty £40 peace bond to ensure his future good behavior. The provincial government periodically reaffirmed the ban on trading or exchanging alcohol with Indians in the 1690s, but its lackluster enforcement allowed the consumption and open exchange of alcohol to continue unimpeded, so long as outright violence was minimized. Yet both Natives and colonists continued to acknowledge alcohol as a problem. Public intoxication among both groups was apparently

⁵¹⁹ *MPCP* 1: 148.

⁵²⁰ *MPCP* 1: 154.

⁵²¹ *Records of the Courts of Quarter Sessions and Common Pleas of Bucks County Pennsylvania, 1684-1700* (Meadville, PA: Tribune Publishing Company, 1943), 77-8.

⁵²² *Record of the Courts of Chester County*, 96-7.

⁵²³ *Record of the Courts of Chester County*, 287-8.

sufficient enough that the 1695 Quaker petition demanding “sober and honest” ordinaries in Philadelphia also called for measures to bring Indians “to more sobriety and not to goe Reeling and bauling in the streets, Especially by night, to the disturbance of the peace of this town.”⁵²⁴

By the turn of the eighteenth century, Native complaints about alcohol intensified, no doubt owing to weak enforcement of existing regulations and the expansion of the liquor trade in the frontier. In 1706, then governor John Evans met with a delegation of Conestoga Indians in Philadelphia and promised them that he would “prevent any injuries” done to them “from Christians” by “laying greater Punishments on [those] that should Committ them, than if they were done to the English themselves.”⁵²⁵ Governor Evans then referred to a bill he introduced to the Provincial Council the previous year that would give the Indians “the advantage of all our Laws,” including a £5 penalty on those illicit traders operating without a license.⁵²⁶ The bill was meant to replace a similar law that had recently lapsed because the Crown government failed to ratify it.⁵²⁷ Whatever his sympathies to Native problems, Governor Evans, an Anglican, was primarily motivated by a concern for Pennsylvania’s frontier security. With Queen Anne’s War (1702-1713) resurrecting the specter of French imperial sabotage and Indian raiding, the governor spent the good part of 1705 and 1706 meeting with Susquehanna Valley Indian communities in an effort to secure their loyalty “in this dangerous time of War.”⁵²⁸

Indian complaints about alcohol during this time revealed a far greater and more deeply rooted problem, one that would not be resolved with Evans’ empty reassurances. Lenape and Shawnee leaders at Conestoga captured the essence of the problem in a meeting with Pennsylvania Governor Charles Gookin in May 1710. At the conference, Governor Gookin, much to his satisfaction, “found the Indians very well inclined to the English, & to the Proprietary, & this Govmt in particular.” The sachems at

⁵²⁴ Quotation in *Hazard’s Register of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1830), vol.5, 8.

⁵²⁵ *MPCP* 2: 247

⁵²⁶ *MPCP* 2: 212

⁵²⁷ The lapsed statute “Against Selling Rum and Other Strong Liquors to the Indians” is found in *Statutes at Large*, vol. 2, 168-9.

⁵²⁸ *MPCP* 2: 251.

Conestoga, for their part, complained that unscrupulous traders were waylaying their hunters “making them drunk with rum, & then Cheat[ing] them of their Skins.” The charge was a familiar one, but the delegation further warned the governor that unless “some method be not taken to prevent” alcohol-related disorders, their community would soon be “forced to remove themselves or starve, their dependence being intirely upon their Peltry.”⁵²⁹ By linking alcohol abuse, unscrupulous traders, and the fur trade together, the Conestoga delegation, in a single moment recorded by European observers, laid bare the ways in which the consumption and circulation of liquor, especially rum, facilitated their own destruction. Alcohol, in other words, was more than just an item of conspicuous consumption, and its abuse had little or nothing to do with the Indians’ lack of self-control. When Governor Gookin lectured the Shawnees in 1715 “to forbear Excessive Drinking ... since it disorders them so very much & ruins their health,” he completely missed the point.⁵³⁰ Alcohol was a visceral and symbolic form of imperial violence, inextricably tying Indian communities into webs of dependence that hampered their ability to resist colonization. Alcohol, by itself, was not the problem. The problem was that alcohol could not be separated from empire.

In the early eighteenth century, no person embodied the violence of alcohol more than James Logan. Logan was a Scots-Irish trader from Ulster whom William Penn recruited to be his provincial secretary. He first arrived in Pennsylvania in 1699 with William Penn on the latter’s second and final trip to the colony. He accompanied Penn on his landmark treaty with Susquehanna’s Indians in 1701. And almost as soon as Penn left for England later that year, he began to undermine that treaty, and Susquehanna Valley Indians in general. Logan parlayed his position as provincial secretary to the Penn family and as member of the Provincial Council to amass a fortune by controlling the fur trade in the Susquehanna Valley. At the center of Logan’s operations was a cohort of French traders centered on James Le Tort and Peter Bizailon, who traversed with Indian hunters and traders through the

⁵²⁹ *MPCP* 2: 511.

⁵³⁰ *MPCP* 2: 603.

Susquehanna Valley to trading destinations in the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys. Logan amassed his fortune by lending his traders goods on credit, which were then exchanged with Native traders in return for skins and furs that were transported to Philadelphia – at the trader’s expense – on wagons owned by Logan. Logan operated like a one-man company store, ensnaring his traders – and by extension, his Native customers – through debt. While his traders and Indian customers became indebted to him, Logan accumulated vast profits. Between 1715 and 1725, Pennsylvania’s fur and skin exports to London remained well over £1,000 per annum. A good portion of this wealth, of course, accrued to Logan’s personal estate.⁵³¹

From the start, alcohol played a significant role in Logan’s operations. In describing Logan’s fur trading operations in the early 1700s, Eric Hinderaker argues that “Guns were not yet articles of trade in Pennsylvania, and rum changed hands in only token amounts.”⁵³² While the trade in alcohol was certainly much larger by the mid eighteenth century, its presence is recorded for the earlier period in official government account books that Logan personally maintained. The government ledger for 1701-1710 was littered with references to beer and rum, just as Logan was beginning his fur trading operations.⁵³³ And while the number of firearms accounted for in the government ledger was far less than the quantity of weapons traded during the early 1680s, when Penn went on a land buying spree and was busy arming his Indian militia, military supplies also made an appearance, especially gunpowder. For government business, Logan occasionally recorded sizeable amounts of both alcohol and military supplies. In March 1704, for example, Logan noted that the Indian delegation at Pennsbury received six blankets, eight gallons of rum, and ten pounds of powder. Twelve gallons of rum travelled with government agents to Conestoga in October 1705.⁵³⁴ In June 1706, the provincial secretary

⁵³¹ Hinderaker, *Elusive Empires*, 22-5.

⁵³² Hinderaker, *Elusive Empires*, 23.

⁵³³ Pennsylvania Journals, vol. 1: 1701-1710, Penn Family Papers, ser. 4: Government Records, 1687-1790, Collection 0485A, HSP.

⁵³⁴ Pennsylvania Journals, 80, 116.

recorded ninety pounds of lead (for casting into shot) and two-and-a-half gallons of brandy “given to the Conestoga Indians the 8th Inst.”⁵³⁵

Ultimately, the size of the alcohol trade matters less than how it functioned in the ledger. Throughout the “official” account book, Logan intertwined his personal fur trading operations with government business, mixing both accounts. The “account of Indian treaties” for September 1706, ostensibly official government business, directed almost over 100 pounds of lead, worth over £2, to Conestoga for skins given to the governor, who was “lately there [with] Martin Chartier,” one of Logan’s key French fur trading partners.⁵³⁶ The names of other key traders operating in the Susquehanna Valley – Peter Bizaillon, Nicole Godin, and Edward Farmer among them – also appear as suppliers or carriers of Logan’s goods in “official” government treaties or negotiations.⁵³⁷ In almost mundane detail, Logan recorded his business of supplying traders with the weapons of empire, blanketing the Susquehanna Valley with match coats, iron tools, and of course, gunpowder and alcohol. Many of the day-to-day exchanges of liquor with traders were not significant in of themselves – one gallon of ale here, two gallons of rum there – but collectively, over the ten years the account book records, they add up to a material and symbolic conquering of the Susquehanna Valley through an expansion of Native debt in the fur trade, lubricated by rum, well before the first German settlers arrived in Conestoga by the second decade of the eighteenth century.

Logan’s provincial government account book is the key to explaining why efforts by Quaker reformers, Native allies, and provincial government agents to tackle the problem of alcohol and frontier violence were in vain. Logan’s cohort of French traders in the Susquehanna occupied an ambiguous position, alternately serving as “go-betweens” between the Pennsylvania government and their Native allies or as a threat to frontier security. In 1704, Provincial Council employed James Letort, a key

⁵³⁵ Pennsylvania Journals, 134.

⁵³⁶ Pennsylvania Journals, 144.

⁵³⁷ See for example, Logan’s peltry account for August 20, 1703, in which he paid £15 to Peter “Bezalion” for his bear skins; Pennsylvania Journals, 63.

figure in Logan's trading ring, as an interpreter to the Iroquois delegation visiting Philadelphia that year. Yet Letort and Peter Bizaillon, another key Logan figure, also came under suspicion for harboring treasonous associations with French saboteurs. Letort was jailed at a time when news of the Deerfield massacre had just reached Philadelphia, and Bizaillon was similarly jailed off and on around this time.⁵³⁸ When Nicole Godin was called in to inform the Provincial Council about rumors of Indian raiding in the Susquehanna, the French trader relayed without irony the Conestoga sachem Ortyiagh's concern about "great Quantities of Rum" flooding their town, "insomuch that they [were] ruined by it, having nothing left [after laying out] even their Cloaths [for it.]"⁵³⁹ Antiproproprietary factions in the Assembly blamed Logan for the problem in December 1706, singling out the provincial secretary's dubious connections to traders who "exact upon or Defraud the Indians & Committ such vile abominations with them ... to the great Scandal of Christianity."⁵⁴⁰

Christianity aside, the Quaker Assembly had good cause for concern. Logan bailed out Bizaillon and Letort numerous times, both literally and figuratively. Taking advantage of his influence with the land commissioners, Logan granted Bizaillon prime land "above Conestoga" and in March 1712 had his official license to trade furs with Natives reinstated "as he had formerly done."⁵⁴¹ When the Lenape sachem Sasoonan complained once again about the great "Quantities of Rum brought amongst them" and demanded that the Pennsylvania government do something about it in June 1715, Governor Gookin, with James Logan standing at his side, responded by pleading ignorance. Because "it was impossible for us to know who came thither into the woods," Gookin suggested that Sasoonan remedy the problem by acting as an informant for the government and "stave all the rum that came amongst them."⁵⁴² Sasoonan's reaction to Gookin's suggestion was not recorded, but one wonders if he was tempted to finger Logan as the responsible culprit. Not surprisingly, in 1722, when John and

⁵³⁸ Jennings, "The Indian Trade of the Susquehanna Valley," 411-2; Merrell, *Into the American Woods*, 112.

⁵³⁹ *MPCP* 2: 141.

⁵⁴⁰ *MPCP* 2: 301.

⁵⁴¹ Jennings, "The Indian Trade of the Susquehanna Valley," 413.

⁵⁴² *MPCP* 2: 604.

Edmund Cartlidge, two fur traders connected to Logan, murdered a Seneca man named Sawantaeny during a fight over rum after an all-night drinking and trading session, the Pennsylvania government, with the diplomatic cooperation of the Iroquois, eventually let the white traders go free.⁵⁴³

By the time of Sawantaeny's death, the Pennsylvania government, under Logan's direction, had already made strategic alliances with the Iroquois at the expense of their old Native allies in the Susquehanna Valley. With Penn gone, and Logan directing events, the Quaker-Indian alliance was rapidly giving way to a new era predicated on direct conquest of the Susquehanna Valley through Native land dispossession and European settlement.⁵⁴⁴ That story, which in many ways began with the Walking Purchase of 1737 and ended tragically with the Paxton Boy's murder of twenty Susquehannock Indians at Conestoga, depended on the symbolic and material conquering of frontier space through alcohol. Not coincidentally, in 1722, the same year Sawantaeny was killed by two of Logan's business partners, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting issued an epistle condemning in strong terms the "filthy lucre" of the rum trade. Without mentioning names, the Meeting lamented that, despite repeated warnings, "some people" within their own ranks have "continued in this evil Practice."⁵⁴⁵ Ironically, the best efforts put forward by Quaker reformers to divest from the Indian alcohol trade were undermined by one of their own.

⁵⁴³ Smolenski, "The Death of Sawantaeny and the Problem of Justice on the Frontier," 104-128; Merrell, *Into the American Woods*, 115-121. James Logan and John Cartlidge had several hundred acres of adjacent property surveyed south of the Indian town at the mouth of the Conestoga and Susquehanna Rivers; see the Taylor survey map of Conestoga, dated February 1, 1718, Penn Family Papers, ser. 5: Land Grants, Surveys, and Deeds, 69-70, Collection 0485A, HSP. In March 1722, the Provincial Council sent James Logan and John French to Conestoga in order to conduct an official inquiry into the matter of Sawantaeny's murder. Given his connections to the Cartlidges, Logan could hardly be considered an impartial arbiter.

⁵⁴⁴ Jennings, "'Pennsylvania Indians' and the Iroquois," in *Beyond the Covenant Chain: The Iroquois and Their Neighbors in Indian North America, 1600-1800*, eds. Daniel Richter and James Merrell (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), 82-87.

⁵⁴⁵ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 1722 epistle, *A Collection of Christian and Brotherly Advices ... For Pennsylvania & New Jersey* (vol. 1), Collection 129, HSP, call# AM .704.

Chapter Five

We Shall Not Be “Dipt in Blood”: The Quaker Peace Testimony and Sovereignty on the Anglo-Atlantic Margins of Empire

On February 24, 1681, the Privy Council’s Lords of Trade and Plantations committee submitted a revised version of Penn’s charter to Charles II for his approval. The original draft of the charter, which Penn’s lawyer had forwarded to the committee a year before, asked for sweeping powers to be granted to the proprietor. The draft charter was modeled on Charles I’s proprietary grant to Lord Baltimore in 1632 for the province of Maryland. Had Penn received a grant similar to Baltimore’s, his sovereign authority within Pennsylvania would have rivaled the king’s, such as possessing the power to pardon treason and murder and issue writs in his own name. But the charter Penn received from Charles II in March of that year, based on the amended version drawn up by the Lords of Trade, granted the Quaker proprietor far less than what he had asked for.⁵⁴⁶ The revised charter retained provisions that ensured sufficient imperial oversight of the colony’s juridical and commercial affairs, including requiring Penn to admit all royal customs “officers and their deputies” in Pennsylvania’s “ports, creeks, and quays ... for the time being.” The provision reflected the Crown government’s desire to assert greater administrative control over its overseas colonies. Significantly, the charter also granted Penn a power he never asked for – the power to “levy, muster, and train all sorts of men ... and to make war, and to pursue [the king’s enemies] by sea as by land, even without the limits of the said province.”⁵⁴⁷ Pennsylvania, by order of the king of England, was to establish a militia, the backbone of imperial defense in early Anglo-America.

Yet Penn never formally established a militia in Pennsylvania. Neither the original Frame of Government in 1682 nor the revised Frames in 1683, 1696, and 1701, which remained in effect until

⁵⁴⁶ Webb, “‘The Peaceable Kingdom:’ Quaker Pennsylvania and the Stuart Empire,” in *World Of William Penn*, eds. Dunn and Dunn, 173-94; see also “Charter of Pennsylvania, 4 March 1681,” in *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, ed., Soderlund, 39-50.

⁵⁴⁷ “Charter,” *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, ed. Soderlund, 46-7.

the end of the colonial period, provided for a militia.⁵⁴⁸ Remarkably, Pennsylvania would not establish a provincial militia until 1777, one year after it had entered the American Revolution as a new state.⁵⁴⁹ Only once – during the Seven Year’s War – did the colony come close to forming a compulsory, provincial-wide militia. But the colony’s first militia law passed in 1755 exempted Quakers from service, and non-Friends suffered no penalties for refusing to muster.⁵⁵⁰ Another militia bill surfaced in 1757, but it was allowed to die because Penn’s son, Thomas, then proprietor, and the Assembly could not agree on the particulars.⁵⁵¹ On another occasion, in 1747, during King George’s War, Benjamin Franklin organized a militia known as the “Associators,” but it was an all-volunteer paramilitary force, albeit ten thousand strong within a year of its formation.⁵⁵² During William Penn’s own lifetime, the ruling Quaker majority made no attempt to formally establish a militia. Pennsylvania is probably one of the only extant states in world history to have operated for as long as it did without a legally-established military force.

The peace testimony’s connection to early Pennsylvania government has a relevance that extends well beyond questions of Quaker pacifism. Most studies on the Quaker peace testimony revolve around the question of warfare and whether Friends were sufficiently “pacifist” in their response to it.⁵⁵³ During the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Pennsylvania experienced relatively little of the warfare and captivity raiding that New York and New England endured at the time. Yet the Quaker-dominated government was under tremendous pressure from all sides to provide adequate military measures in support of the imperial war effort. And the Keithian schism provided

⁵⁴⁸ See “The Frame of Government *and* Laws Agreed Upon in England,” in *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania*, ed. Soderlund, 118-33; *Laws of Pennsylvania*, 245-256; *MPCP* 2:56-8.

⁵⁴⁹ Hannah Benner Roach, “The Pennsylvania Militia in 1777,” *The Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine* 23 (1964): 161-230.

⁵⁵⁰ Jeffery Dowart, *Invasion and Insurrection: Security, Defense, and War in the Delaware Valley* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), 84.

⁵⁵¹ Jack Marietta, *Reformation of American Quakerism*, 175-7.

⁵⁵² Dowart, *Invasion and Insurrection*, 71-3.

⁵⁵³ See for example, Brock, *The Quaker Peace Testimony*, passim; More recent work, however, has begun to examine the broader cultural and social dimensions of the peace testimony, see Jack Marietta, “‘The Things That Make for Peace’: The Context of Pacifism in Quaker Pennsylvania,” *The Pacifist Impulse in Historical Perspective*, ed. Harvey L. Dyck (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1996), 159-181.

fresh opportunities for royalist and Anglican critics to raise the peace testimony repeatedly as a wedge issue to question the legitimacy of Quaker government in Pennsylvania. More than just pacifism was at issue. Max Weber contends that the state's monopoly on violence derives from its claim to be the sole legitimate arbiter of force.⁵⁵⁴ The legitimization of sovereignty, to frame Weber's thesis in another way, depended on the state's ability to regulate violence. And if the regulation of violence is central to the production of political authority, then the Quaker peace testimony, as a form of gospel order discourse, played a pivotal role in the construction of Quaker sovereignty in early Pennsylvania.

Framing the peace testimony in terms of sovereignty and authority helps explain why it generated contention at a time when there were few "pacifists" (in the expansive, modern sense) in Pennsylvania and Quaker pacifism itself was still (and would remain) in flux. The expansion of English rule in North America depended in part on the Crown's sovereign right to regulate violence on multiple fronts – through the conquest of Native lands; through the development of slavery and other forms of unfree labor; and through military conflict with imperial and Native rivals. The peace testimony, in all its permutations, was a form of gospel order discourse, predicated on an ideal of noncoercive government. As such, it posed a challenge to the Crown's monopoly on violence, and thus its claim on absolute sovereignty. The absence of a militia and the debate over war taxes in early Pennsylvania were then not simply logistical problems; they became symbols and metaphors for the incongruence between English imperial and Quaker modes of authority.

From its inception, the Quaker peace testimony was a multifaceted and complex discourse that regulated individual and collective behavior in relationship to violence. Because Quaker pacifist expression fundamentally addressed issues of governance and the nature and limits of authority, it was never apolitical or merely "passive" in accepting or rejecting the political order that it was engaged with. Fox's *Declaration*, written shortly after the Fifth Monarchist revolt to assure the newly-restored

⁵⁵⁴ Max Weber, "Politics as Vocation," From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, eds. Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Routledge, 1991), 77-128.

King Charles II that English Friends had no revolutionary intentions, exemplifies this point.⁵⁵⁵

Historians enamored of the Quakers' militant republicanism during the Interregnum argue that Fox's 1660 *Declaration* inaugurated the Quakers' wholesale embrace of pacifism and simultaneous withdrawal from politics – and by implication, from historical relevance.⁵⁵⁶ But Fox's carnal/spirit dualism, which fundamentally shaped peace testimony discourse, implicitly relativized the sovereign authority of temporal governments in favor of the Quakers' own authority, whether individually or collectively.

That pacifist dualism was evident even when most Friends were still committed to militant republicanism. During the 1650s, the Quaker movement drew many of its ranks from soldiers and sailors who had served the Commonwealth and Protectorate regimes.⁵⁵⁷ Quakers attracted Leveler converts, most notably John Lilburne, the Leveler leader who served prominently as an officer in the Parliamentary army during the English Civil War. When Lilburne converted in 1656, he swore that he would “never hereafter be an user of temporal sword [any] more, nor a joiner with those who do.”⁵⁵⁸ Lilburne's embrace of pacifism as a Quaker convert occurred long after he had retired from his militant career as a Parliamentary soldier and Leveller. Though the timing of Lilburne's conversion did not lessen the sincerity of his convictions, Quaker pacifism did not always appear at such politically expedient moments.

In locales where Friends remained outside the bounds of religious and political orthodox, the peace testimony often conflicted with established authority. The extent and nature of the conflict depended on local circumstances. In Restoration England, as John Miller notes, persecution of Quakers

⁵⁵⁵ See chapter 2, p. 74.

⁵⁵⁶ The classic articulation of this interpretation is found in Alan Cole, “The Quakers and the English Revolution,” *Past and Present* 10 (1956): 39-54; see also Barry Reay, “The Quakers, 1659, and the Restoration of the Monarchy,” *History* 63 (1978): 193-215; and Christopher Hill, *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries* (New York: Viking, 1984): 129-69. An excellent discussion of this line of interpretation is found in Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace*, 7-11, 245-53.

⁵⁵⁷ Barry Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (New York: St. Martin's, 1985).

⁵⁵⁸ John Lilburne, *The Resurrection of John Lilburne, Now a Prisoner in Dover Castle* (London, 1656); Quotation in Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace*, 41.

depended heavily on the willingness and collaboration of local officials and non-Quaker neighbors.⁵⁵⁹ In areas where Quakers were especially hated, the persecution could be severe. In Colchester around 1663, the mayor called out the local militia to break up a Quaker meeting. According to an eighteenth-century account, the militia beat the Quakers in attendance and sacked the meetinghouse, smashing the windows and destroying the seats.⁵⁶⁰ When the mayor subsequently blocked their access to their now badly-damaged building, the Colchester Friends gathered to worship in the street. Royal troopers, arriving in the following weeks, beat the Quakers with swords and clubs, some of the latter equipped with iron spikes. The troopers spared no one, beating men and women, young and old alike, including an “aged widow.”⁵⁶¹ One man died from his injuries. At first, the troopers embraced their task with relish, but the Quakers persisted in meeting, testing the endurance of their persecutors. Eventually, the troopers grew tired of the whole affair and the persecutions stopped.

As the Colchester Quakers’ experience suggests, the willingness to suffer and invite persecution for the sake of conscience became the basis for the peace testimony’s potential to challenge temporal authority. Seventeenth-century Friends around the English Atlantic suffered fines, distraint of property, and in some cases imprisonment for refusing to serve in the militia or send substitutes in their place. The persecutions varied according to locality and circumstance. In England, Quaker meetings were especially hard hit in Kent and Sussex, where fears of foreign invasion by sea were the greatest.⁵⁶² Despite their willingness to suffer persecution, English Friends were still working out the parameters of the peace testimony in the late seventeenth century. In 1693, the London Yearly Meeting chided Quaker “ship-masters” for “carrying guns in their ships, supposing thereby to defend and secure

⁵⁵⁹ Miller, “A Suffering People’: English Quakers and their Neighbours,” 71-103.

⁵⁶⁰ William Sewel, *The History of the Rise, Increase, and Progress of the People called Quakers ...* (London, 1722), 385-6; The incident is referenced in Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1985), 212.

⁵⁶¹ Sewel, *History*, 386.

⁵⁶² Hirst, *Quakers in Peace and War*, 75.

themselves and their ships.”⁵⁶³ The practice of arming merchant ships was a common defense against piracy and privateering attacks, in addition to fighting off Barbary corsairs, but Friends in London may have been concerned about impressment. Quaker mariners often resisted impressment into naval service by pleading pacifist scruples – a tactic that could be employed regardless of the sincerity of conviction.⁵⁶⁴ As the yearly meeting noted, Quaker merchants arming their ships gave “occasion of more sever[e] hardships and sufferings to be inflicted on such Friends as are pressed into ships of war.”⁵⁶⁵ The London Yearly Meeting’s warning to Quaker ship owners underscores the growing relevance of the peace testimony, even as Friends sharply disagreed over its proper scope and limits.

In the West Indies, Quaker missionaries had attracted many converts, and island governments worried that a growing Quaker population in their midst would compromise their security. An official on Nevis barred the entry of Irish Quaker missionary William Edmundson in 1671 on the grounds that “there are seven hundred of our militia turned Quakers; and the Quakers will not fight.”⁵⁶⁶ The pressure on Friends to perform military duties was at times considerable. Anglo-Caribbean plantations always faced the possibility of attacks by rival navies, privateers, and pirates, and militias were needed to temper the ever-present threat of slave revolts. During the second half of the seventeenth century, the Barbados government jailed hundreds of Quakers and levied tens of thousands of pounds in fines, mostly assessed in the value of sugar, for the refusal of Friends to serve in the militia.⁵⁶⁷ A stricter militia act was passed in 1675 following the discovery of a planned slave revolt, which the Barbadian planters blamed on Friends’ evangelization efforts.⁵⁶⁸ In 1693, persecution of Friends intensified

⁵⁶³ [London Yearly Meeting], *Epistles from the Yearly Meeting of the People Called Quakers, Held in London to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings in Great Britain, Ireland, and Elsewhere: From the Year 1675 to 1759...* (London, 1760), 66-67.

⁵⁶⁴ Hirst, *Quakers in Peace and War*, 78-91. As early as 1678, the Meeting for Sufferings in London was inundated with cases of Friends “being impressed into the King’s ships of war;” Quotation from Hirst, *Quakers in Peace and War*, 78.

⁵⁶⁵ [London Yearly Meeting], *Epistles from the Yearly Meeting*, 66-7.

⁵⁶⁶ *A Journal of the Life ... of that Worthy Elder and Faithful Servant of Jesus Christ, William Edmundson* (London, 1829), 57; also quoted in Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace*, 62.

⁵⁶⁷ For a meticulous record of the persecution Caribbean Friends suffered for refusing to muster in the militia, see Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers*, vol. 2 (London: L. Hinde, 1753), 278-351.

⁵⁶⁸ Katharine Gerbner, “The Ultimate Sin: Christianising Slaves in Barbados in the Seventeenth Century,” *Slavery & Abolition*, 31 (March 2010): 57-73

following fears of another slave revolt, coupled with the threat of attack by French fleets. When one Barbadian Friend refused to muster that year, a militia officer shot back, “God damn your conscience, if I cannot make your conscience bow, I’ll make your stubborn dog’s back to bend.”⁵⁶⁹ In the estimation of one historian, had it not been for the militia issue, the Quakers presence on Barbados would have been tolerated.⁵⁷⁰ By the turn of early eighteenth century, the climate was so poisoned that Friends began leaving the island for Pennsylvania and other locales in North America.

On the North American mainland, the Quakers’ relationship to colonial militias was far more varied. In northern colonies where Friends comprised a relatively small proportion of the overall settler population, the Quakers’ refusal to serve in the militia was seen as less threatening than in the Caribbean and therefore could be more readily accommodated, even unofficially tolerated, especially during times of relative calm. During extended periods of imperial conflict and Indian attacks, however, colonial governments proved more willing to punish refusal.⁵⁷¹ In New England, contempt for Quakers was supported by the enforcement of mandatory militia service laws. Two Quakers from Bristol, Rhode Island, John Smith and Thomas Maccomber, were imprisoned in 1704 for failing “to appear in Arms against the French and Indians in the present War.”⁵⁷² Sometime before their trial began, Thomas Story, a prominent itinerant English Quaker preacher who lived in Philadelphia at the time, met with the justice to privately make an appeal on behalf of the two men. The judge, though cordial, wanted to make an example of the prisoners because, he claimed, Friends in New England refuse “to fight against a common Enemy so barbarous as are the *Indians*; wishing us all in the Front of the Battle until we had learned better.” For their refusal, the two defendants received a £7 fine, in default of which they were to be transported to Castle Island in Boston to work as bound labor.⁵⁷³

⁵⁶⁹ Hirst, *Quakers in Peace and War*, 313.

⁵⁷⁰ Simon Smith, *Slavery, Family, and Gentry Capitalism in the British Atlantic: the World of the Lascelles, 1648-1834* (Cambridge University Press, 2006), 28, f. 70.

⁵⁷¹ Arthur Worrall, *Quakers in the Colonial Northeast* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1980) 131-5.

⁵⁷² Emily Moore, *Travelling with Thomas Story: The Life and Travels of an Eighteenth-Century Quaker* (Letchworth, England: 1947), 72-3; Quotation from *A Journal of the Life of Thomas Story ...* (Newcastle, 1747), 266.

⁵⁷³ *A Journal of the Life of Thomas Story*, 266-270; Quotation on p. 266.

Toward the end of Queen Anne's War, in 1712, the Rhode Island Yearly Meeting reported in an epistle to their yearly meeting counterparts in Philadelphia that "friends in several places [in New England] Since ye Last Year have suffered Deeply on Acct: of not Paying ye Presbyterian Priests [i.e., mandatory church tithes] and for their Refusing to Bear Arms."⁵⁷⁴

Complicating the Quakers' refusal to serve in the militia was the fact that not all seventeenth-century Friends were pacifists, and the peace testimony was far from codified in the late seventeenth century. This is most evident in the ambiguous response of Rhode Island Quakers to the pan-Indian uprising known as King Philip's War (1675-6). At the time of the war, Friends held prominent positions in the Rhode Island government. The governor and the deputy governor of the colony were Friends, and Quakers comprised the majority of the provincial council. As Meredith Weddle argues, the Quaker-dominated government in Rhode Island decisively assisted the United Colonies, a loose confederation of New England militias, in their military offensives against the Wampanoag and Narragansett, including the notorious "Great Swamp Fight," a December 1675 assault on a Narragansett fort that killed around 600 men, women, and children, some burned alive.⁵⁷⁵ At the same time, the Rhode Island General Assembly in 1673 passed a resolution against compelling pacifists "to fight or kill any person nor persons by Reason of ... this Collony civill nor military." The Assembly intended the exemption for "divers persons of severall societies," but it was clearly meant to accommodate the large Quaker population in the colony.⁵⁷⁶ A monthly meeting in Rhode Island, moreover, circulated a "testimony" directed against Quaker magistrates in August 1675, just a few months before the United Colonies offensive against the Narragansetts. The testimony employed the familiar Quaker carnal/spirit dualist language to condemn "watching with Guns or Swords to kill ... [and] Offending, or defending with Carnal weapons."⁵⁷⁷ Directed at Friends in the wartime

⁵⁷⁴ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Miscellaneous Papers, MR-Ph 477, p. 14, FHL.

⁵⁷⁵ Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace*, 153-7.

⁵⁷⁶ Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace*, 238-9.

⁵⁷⁷ Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace*, 242.

government, the 1675 testimony provides further evidence for Weddle that the “peace testimony was ambiguous, variously interpreted, and variously applied.”⁵⁷⁸

By the time of Pennsylvania’s founding, the peace testimony had shifted significantly, though it still remained ambiguous. In Pennsylvania, the peace testimony played an important role in shaping the colony’s governance, particularly around the issue of war taxes and the militia. Like their co-religionists elsewhere, Pennsylvania Friends generally affirmed the right of magistrates to use force to keep civil order, including those in Quaker governments. Presumably, a majority of Pennsylvania Friends also affirmed the right of magistrates to collect taxes in support of the government, even if a portion of those taxes helped finance the Crown’s military campaigns in *other* colonies. This is the traditional “narrow” interpretation of the peace testimony, what scholars identify as the unwillingness of Friends in this era to question their *indirect* complicity in warfare, in contrast to the presumably more uncompromising pacifist stance taken by Pennsylvania Quaker reformers in the mid-eighteenth century or later.⁵⁷⁹ And yet, as the Keithian schism made evident, not all Friends agreed with the “narrow” interpretation of the peace testimony. And Friends still had to work out whether or how their peace testimony should govern Pennsylvania’s relations with the Crown government.

Despite these ambiguities, the peace testimony’s legacy in Pennsylvania was far more profound than in Rhode Island, where Friends only briefly held power. Aside from Native affairs and religious toleration, Penn’s opposition to having a militia in his own colony, contrary to the express mandate given to him by the Crown’s charter, was one of his most lasting legacies. Penn’s pacifism was complex – he was far too much of an aristocratic statesman like his admiral father for it not to be. He clearly abhorred warfare, and there was plenty of it in the Europe of his day. After William III nullified his proprietary charter in 1692, Penn went into hiding, during which time he wrote and anonymously

⁵⁷⁸ Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace*, 195.

⁵⁷⁹ Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace*, 228, contrasts early modern and modern Quaker pacifism as a shift “from the vertical concern with the personal transaction between God and the believer to a more horizontal concern with the lives of others,” which she characterizes as a “feminization of peace principles.” See also Wellenruether, “Political Dilemma,” 135-72; Marietta, *Reformation of American Quakerism*, 138-42.

published *An Essay Towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe* (1693), a work that has been reprinted more than any other of his writings.⁵⁸⁰ In it, Penn proposed a diet, or an annual league of European powers, through which international conflict would be resolved by a complex system of voting. Penn argued that the combined strength of the league would encourage member nations to cooperate and compel recalcitrant ones to submit without resort to military action. Penn's plan for a league of nations reflected his belief in the productive power of governments to fashion peaceable conduct. Without princes spending their treasury on armies or worrying about invasions, he contended, the resources of nations would be better secured for promoting the commercial prosperity and the moral good of their subjects.⁵⁸¹

As in his imagined league of nations, Penn believed a military would not be necessary in Pennsylvania, so long as his government passed just laws and his subjects internalized the moral precepts of Quaker rule. Penn, as an English subject, retained a deep suspicion of standing armies, and he knew all too well how powerful and dangerous militias potentially were. As a religious dissenter, Penn witnessed firsthand the destructive power of local English trained bands violently breaking up Quaker meetings. Militias were not technically standing armies, but Penn feared a militia in Pennsylvania would function like one. He was also wary of militia acts that in other Anglo-American colonies created *posses comitati* that armed every able-bodied male over the age of fifteen. As proprietor, he knew the potential always existed for armed mobs to turn against the government, as disgruntled settlers did during Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia.⁵⁸² Thus, beyond the peace testimony, Penn had practical reasons not to establish a militia in Pennsylvania. In lieu of a militia, Penn reassured those who invested in his colony that civilian officials – such as the sheriff and justices of the peace – would preserve order. To Friends, he boasted that any remaining guns found in Pennsylvania “would

⁵⁸⁰ William Penn, *An Essay Towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1983; originally published 1693).

⁵⁸¹ The above summary of Penn's essay follows Mary M. Dunn, *William Penn: Politics and Conscience* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), 164-6.

⁵⁸² Dorwart, *Invasion and Insurrection*, 46, 52.

goe to new york, for they belong to that place.” As far as he knew, there was “not one soldier, nor arm born, or malitia man seen, since I was first in Pennsilvania.”⁵⁸³ With Philadelphia and most the surrounding counties almost 100 miles upriver from the mouth of the Delaware Bay, Penn (and many Quaker settlers) believed Pennsylvania’s greatest defenses were natural. As he reassured Queen Mary in 1694, “there can be no danger from the French ... [because] there is not any one Province [other than Pennsylvania that] lyes higher from the Ocean.”⁵⁸⁴ Penn’s assessment of his colony’s natural defenses contrasts markedly from his earlier claim to the Free Society of Traders that Pennsylvania’s tributary rivers, such as the Schuylkill, were deep enough “to lay up the royal navy of England.”⁵⁸⁵

There were limitations to Penn’s pacifism. While he failed to provide for a militia in the colony, he had no problem supplying his Indian allies with firearms. Natives, of course, appropriated the firearms for their own purposes, but provincial government officials, acting on Penn’s behalf, certainly envisioned using their Indian allies as a potential military force to protect the colony’s western and northern flanks. Responding to the demand that the colony be put in a better military posture, the Provincial Council in April 1690 charged Markham, then acting as provincial secretary, Robert Turner, and Lasse Cock, the fur trader and Indian interpreter, to recruit “trusty” Natives from the Schuylkill River “to Range along the most likely parts ffor ye Discovering of any Designs of ye ffrench, or their Indians, against the peace.”⁵⁸⁶ Penn himself was not immune to imperial visions of grandeur. In a revealing 1709 letter to John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, commander of the allied forces during the War of the Spanish Succession, Penn relayed his hopes that the “English Empire on the [North American] Continent” would eventually extend from the “North Bounds” of the “St. Lawrences [sic] River yt feeds Canada to ye River Mississipp[i] ... whereby we may Secure 1000 miles of ye River Down to ye bay of Mexico.” Penn conceded to Marlborough that it would be necessary for the English

⁵⁸³ William Penn to Stephen Crisp, [February 28, 1685], in *PWP* 3: 28-9.

⁵⁸⁴ Breviate of Petition to Queen Mary, [ca. July 4, 1694], in *PWP* 3: 395-6; an undated and unsigned manuscript copy also found in p. 76, vol. 1, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, APS.

⁵⁸⁵ *Letter from William Penn to the Committee of the Free Society of Traders* (London, 1683), in *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, ed. Meyers, 238.

⁵⁸⁶ *MPCP* 1:334.

to conquer everything east of the Mississippi because “without such a Settlement of our American Bounds we shall be in hazard in being Dangerously Surprised by the French and their Indians Especially if they send but 12 Ships of War to [attack] us by Sea.”⁵⁸⁷ It is doubtful that Penn, in arguing for the necessity of English expansion in America, expected the French to be removed by anything other than armed force.

Penn’s flexibility with his pacifism was also evident in his appointment of John Blackwell, a Boston Puritan, as lieutenant governor of Pennsylvania in the summer of 1688. Blackwell was an ex-soldier who served under Cromwell as his war treasurer in Ireland during the 1650s. He also was one of the first proprietary governors of the Anglo-Bahamas and held government positions in his home colony of Massachusetts. Penn had many strategic reasons to appoint Blackwell governor, aside from the latter’s extensive government experience. In London, where he was residing at the time, Penn could see James II’s hold on power steadily slipping. Anticipating (correctly) the political trouble his association with James would soon cause him, Penn probably calculated (incorrectly) that commissioning a militant Puritan to govern his colony would temper accusations that he was a crypto-Catholic and Tory sympathizer. Penn also believed (incorrectly) that Blackwell would be able to suppress the powerful antiproprietary Quaker faction in Pennsylvania government, led by the Welsh Quaker leader Thomas Lloyd, president of the Provincial Council.⁵⁸⁸ In a letter to Hugh Roberts in December 1689, shortly before Blackwell’s dismissal from office, Penn praised the Puritan governor as “a wise & virtuous man.” But the letter also hinted at another reason for Blackwell’s commission. “Being not a [Friend],” Penn reasoned, Blackwell “could better deal with those yt were not & stop their mouths & be stiff without our neighbors upon occasion.”⁵⁸⁹

Although left unstated in Penn’s letter, there was only one overriding concern that kept many

⁵⁸⁷ William Penn to the Duke of Marlborough, May 22, 1709, p. 102, vol. 1, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, APS.

⁵⁸⁸ Nicholas Wainwright, “Governor John Blackwell,” *PMHB* 74 (October 1950): 457-72; Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 114-23.

⁵⁸⁹ William Penn to Hugh Roberts, December 6, 1689, p. 62, vol. 1, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, APS.

non-Quaker settlers from “stopping their mouths” – the relatively defenseless posture of the Delaware Valley. For most of the 1680s, Pennsylvania enjoyed relatively peaceful relations with Native allies, and the threat of attack by privateers or other hostile armed forces seemed remote. Blackwell’s appointment as governor, however, came only months before the Revolution of 1688-9 put English colonies on a war footing with France and its dominions. In April 1689, the Lords of Trade announced the Crown’s declaration of war and notified the American colonies “to take the necessary measures for defence.” That November, Governor Blackwell introduced to the Provincial Council a separate letter from the Crown directing the Pennsylvania government to take “all necessary Preparations to be made for a speedy warr with the ffrench king.”⁵⁹⁰ With the onset of King William’s War (1689-97), Pennsylvania Friends would no longer be able to blithely ignore the issue of military defense in their colony.

With the declaration of war in hand, Governor Blackwell ordered the Provincial Council to draw up a declaration of loyalty to William and Mary and demanded a response to the Crown government’s request for military assistance. The Provincial Council’s response to Blackwell’s demands reflected the political divisions already present in Pennsylvania, divisions worsened by the ever-loudening drumbeats of war. Dominating both the Provincial Council and Assembly was a strong antiproprietary faction, comprised chiefly of prosperous Quaker merchants and landowners who took advantage of Penn’s prolonged absence from the colony to maximize their own political power. As Penn’s appointee for governor, Blackwell raised the ire of the Quaker antiproprietary faction in government, opposing him at every step. Intra-Quaker divisions intersected with a widening split between Pennsylvania Friends and non-Quaker settlers from the lower counties of Delaware. Up until 1701, when Penn finally granted the province its own legislature, the three Delaware counties were under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania government. Settlers from the lower counties elected representatives to the Provincial Council and Assembly. While their political presence in Pennsylvania

⁵⁹⁰ *CSCP* 13: 20-33; *MPCP* 1:302.

government was significant enough to cause Quakers trouble, Delaware representatives were never able to dictate their own affairs, much to the great consternation of their constituents. Non-Quaker inhabitants of the lower counties greatly resented Pennsylvania Friends for ignoring their need for defensive fortifications. The royal charter for Delaware, which was long claimed by Lord Baltimore for Maryland but was hastily granted to Penn one day before James II was forced to vacate his throne, empowered the proprietor to “make War and pursue the Indians or other Enemies ... by Land as by Sea.”⁵⁹¹ The lower counties, with the Delaware Bay and the Atlantic Ocean forming its eastern border, stood greatly exposed to attack by enemy privateers. Yet during Penn’s absence from the colony, the Quaker-dominated government in Pennsylvania provided Delaware with no military assistance whatsoever, whether in the form of militias or building defensive fortifications.⁵⁹² On the Quakers’ part, this was not simply a matter of pacifism; it was also a stubborn unwillingness from a ruling party to recognize the needs of settlers they regarded as cultural outsiders.

After approving a proclamation declaring the province’s loyalty to William and Mary, the Provincial Council debated what measures, if any, the colony should take in response to the Crown’s declaration of war against France. Predictably, the political rift between Quakers and non-Quakers on the Council, as well as between the Quakers and Governor Blackwell, steered the debate. With ten present, the Council was divided evenly between Quaker and non-Quaker members, the latter mostly representing the lower counties.⁵⁹³ The non-Quaker members of the Council urged immediate action. Johannes De Haes, a Dutch settler from New Castle, Delaware, recommended the Council give “notice ... to all the people to get powder & shott, and their armes in a readiness against [should] there be

⁵⁹¹ Manuscript Copy of James II’s Delaware Charter to William Penn, p. 16 (p. 17 in bound volume), vol. 8, Penn Manuscripts: Charters and Frame of Government (1683-96), HSP; see also William Shepherd, *History of Proprietary Government in Pennsylvania* (New York: Columbia University, 1896), 122.

⁵⁹² My summary of the tensions between Delaware settlers and the Quaker antiproprietary faction in Pennsylvania government follows Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 68-70, 130-2, 235-6.

⁵⁹³ The Council’s deliberated over two sessions that took place on November 2-4, 1689. The non-Quaker members present at the first session were William Markham, John Hill, Luke Watson, Peter Alrichs, and Johannes De Haes. The Quaker members present were John Simcock, John Bristow, Griffith Jones (later a Keithian), and Bartholomew Coppock. Markham was absent from the second session, giving the Quaker members a 5-4 majority that day; see *MPCP* 1:304-11.

occasion.” Markham concurred that “we ought to have our armes well fixed ... for we know not how soon warr may come upon us.”⁵⁹⁴ Luke Watson, another non-Quaker councilor from the lower counties, voted in favor of organizing a militia “for I do not think ourselves safe.”⁵⁹⁵ Watson also worried “if the thing be not done, & any hurt come the Contrey, ... [the King] may require our Lives and Estates.” “Twenty men, as things are now,” he warned, “may come & do what they will.” The Quaker members of the Council, however, demurred. John Simcock, a Quaker from Chester County, bluntly told the meeting he saw “no danger but from the Bears & wolves ... For my part I am against it clearly: and, Governor, If we refuse to do it, Thou wilt be excused.” Other Quaker members of the Council agreed with Simcock. Griffith Jones suggested “Every one that will may provide his armes ... [but] that [the matter] be left to the discretion of the Governor to do what he shall judge necessary.” Samuel Carpenter concurred that he was “not against those that will put themselves into defence, but it being contrary to the judgm[en]t of a great part of the people, & and my owne to, I cannot advise to the thing.”⁵⁹⁶ Finally, after conferring separately from the rest of the Council, the Quaker members reported back to Governor Blackwell that they “would not tye others’ hands, But We cannot Act.” Blackwell, resigned, promised he “would consider what was his duty,” and with that, the Council dropped the matter.⁵⁹⁷

In the short run, it looked like the Quakers had won, but appearances were deceiving. Shortly after his confrontation with the Council, Blackwell resigned his commission as lieutenant governor, writing to Penn that Friends “have not the principles of government amongst them” and that the mosquitos in Philadelphia were worse than armed men, though not nearly as troubling as “men without Armes.”⁵⁹⁸ The Quaker councilors’ intransigence won them a reprieve on the issue of defense, but it proved to be a pyrrhic victory. Even before the war began, Natives began attacking English settlements

⁵⁹⁴ *MPCP* 1: 306.

⁵⁹⁵ *MPCP* 1: 310.

⁵⁹⁶ *MPCP* 1: 306.

⁵⁹⁷ *MPCP* 1: 310-11.

⁵⁹⁸ Quotation from Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 122.

in Maine, looking to settle old scores with the colonists since King Philip's War had displaced many of them from their former homes and hunting grounds.⁵⁹⁹ The French in Canada were all too willing to assist their Indian allies with supplies, and occasionally, soldiers. By the early 1690s, the New England and New York borderlands regions were once again devastated by Indian raiding and captive taking, made worse by the political confusion following the ouster of James II's appointed governor for New York, New England, and New Jersey, Sir Edmund Andros, in 1689. Without a unified military command, the northern colonies were left to defend themselves, with meager resources at their disposal.⁶⁰⁰ A 1691 petition to the king from "divers inhabitants of Charlestown, Boston, and places adjacent" complained the "late Revolution" has divided the region into separate colonies, "thereby debilitating all and giving great advantage to our enemies." The petition lamented that "many hundreds of people have been murdered or captured. Pemaquid [an English garrison decimated by the Wabanaki], all Maine except three towns, and Senectady [sic] have been destroyed, and depredations [i.e., Indian raids] have been made in New Hampshire and Massachusetts to the imminent danger of the frontier towns." The petitioners also reported that "many died" on the ill-fated Anglo-American assault on Quebec, which would "leave Massachusetts in further arrears of £50,000."⁶⁰¹

Despite the great logistical need for military coordination, many northern colonies refused to look beyond their own borders. Faced with the imminent danger to his own colony, Governor Sloughter of New York, whom the Crown appointed to replace Andros after 1689, requested the immediate assistance of every province north of Carolina. Sloughter asked each colony, including Pennsylvania, for 150 men. "I need not tell you how important the preservation of Albany is," the governor hastened to add. "Only Albany keeps the Indians [i.e., the Iroquois] faithful to us; the loss of

⁵⁹⁹ Jenny Hale Pulsipher, *Subjects Unto the Same King: Indians, English, and the Contest for Authority in Colonial New England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 254.

⁶⁰⁰ Owen Stanwood, "The Protestant Moment: Antipopy, the Revolution of 1688-89, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire," *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007): 481-508; Peckham, *The Colonial Wars*, 25-76; Craig Yirush, *Settlers, Liberty, and Empire: The Roots of Early American Political Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 84-5, esp. f. 4.

⁶⁰¹ CSPC 13: 409.

it means the loss of them, and the loss of them [as military allies] means the loss of the English territory on this Continent.”⁶⁰² Despite this grave warning, and the implicit acknowledgment that Anglo-America could not win any military engagements without Native allies, New York’s neighboring colonies refused to help, especially those colonies that faced their own security problems. Simon Bradstreet, governor of the newly-royalized Province of Massachusetts Bay, pleaded with Governor Sloughter for understanding. “[W]e have strengthened the out-garrisons and are keeping rangers constantly on the frontier against surprise,” he informed Sloughter, but “Our efforts in the King’s service have been a vast expense to us ... and our own preparations make it impossible to give any help Westward.”⁶⁰³ Rhode Island’s governor complained of French privateering attacks on Block Island and extended Sloughter no more than his best wishes. “Far from giving [you] help,” he relayed to the governor, “we rather expect it from our neighbors.” Not surprisingly, Pennsylvania, along with other colonies farther away from the theater of war, was blamed for not contributing their fair share. Nehemiah Blakiston, the leader of Maryland’s short-lived Protestant Associators, informed Sloughter that he had been “ill informed as to the true state of this province since you equalise [sic] us with Virginia, which has four times our wealth and population, and prefer us to Pennsylvania, which much excels us in either.”⁶⁰⁴ Yet the government in Pennsylvania proved no more willing than any other colony to assist New York.

Pennsylvania’s unwillingness to contribute money or men to the war effort must be viewed within the wider struggle over sovereignty in the English Atlantic. Scholars have traditionally assumed the peace testimony was the primary reason the Pennsylvania government temporized on the issue of defense in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, but Friends had other related reasons for

⁶⁰² CSPC 13: 503; Winfred Root, *Relations of Pennsylvania with the British Government, 1696-1765* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1970), 259.

⁶⁰³ CSPC 13: 475.

⁶⁰⁴ CSPC 13: 515; Root, *Relations of Pennsylvania*, 260.

resisting the Crown's demands for military support.⁶⁰⁵ Far from the center of metropolitan power in London, Pennsylvania's ruling Quaker oligarchy of merchants and landowners feared losing their political autonomy to proprietary or imperial interests, the latter of which grew increasingly resurgent in the 1690s. Following the Revolution of 1688-9, the Crown made serious attempts to subordinate the American colonies under its centralizing authority. The need for military coordination coincided with an increased emphasis by metropolitan officials on regulating overseas commerce as a vehicle for the expansion of metropolitan and imperial power. Hence, the Crown government imposed a series of regulations designed to curb the colonies' independence, the most important of which was the Navigation Act in 1696. The Act empowered royal customs officials to inspect colonial seaports in order to stamp out illegal smuggling and tax evasion, and it imposed vice-admiralty courts to try offenders without the benefit of a jury. Coordinating imperial policy was the Lords of Trade, reformulated as the Board of Trade after the passage of the Navigation Act in 1696. In addition to overseeing military matters and enforcing customs regulations, the Board of Trade also attempted to curb piracy by policing the colonial seaports that provided safe harbors for pirates to fence cheap goods and spend hard currency.⁶⁰⁶ In Pennsylvania, the imposition of Crown authority was increasingly noticeable by the turn of the eighteenth century, most visibly in the presence of customs officials in Philadelphia and the establishment of a vice-admiralty court in 1698. Though David Lloyd, as attorney general and the leader of the Quaker antiproprietary faction, thwarted the imposition of imperial laws at every turn, the hegemony of Quaker rule in Pennsylvania was seriously threatened. Customs officials, royal agents, and sympathetic provincial officials in other colonies all pointed to the Quaker civic and religious culture of gospel order in Pennsylvania as the main obstacle preventing the colony's

⁶⁰⁵ Isaac Sharpless, *Quaker Experiment in Government*; Jones, *Quakers in the American Colonies*, Brock, *Quaker Peace Testimony*

⁶⁰⁶ Yirush, *Settlers, Liberty, and Empire*, 84-5; Ian K. Steele, *Politics of Colonial Policy: The Board of Trade in Colonial Administration* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968); Robert Ritchie, *Captain Kidd and the War Against the Pirates* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986), 144-7.

integration with the empire.⁶⁰⁷

The peace testimony, as part of gospel order culture, thus became a crucial site of debate in the Pennsylvania Quakers' fight to preserve their sovereignty. When Benjamin Fletcher demanded Pennsylvania contribute its share in the imperial war effort in 1693, the Quaker members of the Assembly and Council sought a compromise that would satisfy his demands while still preserving their autonomy and avoiding as best they could giving direct military assistance. Theoretically, the peace testimony ought to have posed few constraints for ruling Friends. For moral precedents, the Quaker government could look to the example of Rhode Island Friends during King Philip's War, or they could refer to the longstanding consensus position among Friends that accepted the magistrates' right to use force, so long as oaths, compulsory militia service, or other laws that violated Quaker consciences were avoided. The peace testimony, moreover, was at the time still insufficiently codified to be a formal matter of religious discipline, like the regulation of fornication or marrying a non-Quaker were. Yet none of that eased the difficult moral dilemma provincial Quaker rulers faced. If they conceded too much to imperial interests, they risked sparking opposition from among their own coreligionists in the colony. Give too little, they risked losing their colony to their political enemies.

Their solution was a politically ingenious compromise, although one that was not arrived at as easily as scholars might assume. Less than a month after his arrival in April 1693, Benjamin Fletcher set out to undermine Quaker authority and wrest from the Pennsylvania Assembly military support for his own colony in New York. Fletcher probably knew he would not get a militia, but he also knew he could pressure the Quaker members of the provincial government to provide him with financial assistance. To strengthen his hand, he appointed William Markham as lieutenant governor and packed the Council with non-Quakers and other placemen he believed sympathetic to his interests.⁶⁰⁸ Meeting with the representative of the Assembly that May, Fletcher reassured the Quaker members of the

⁶⁰⁷ Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 192-8; For Lloyd's attempts to thwart the imposition of royal authority, particularly via Robert Quay and the vice-admiralty courts, see Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 182-5.

⁶⁰⁸ Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 183-5.

Council and Assembly that those who “Scruple [against] the giving of money to support waar, ther [sic] are a great many other charges ... for the support [of government].” Fletcher also promised them that their money “shall not be dipt in blood” but rather would be used for the building of defensive fortifications, which he compared to “the wall about yor gardens & orchards; yor doors & Locks of yor houses; Mastiff dogs and such other things as you make use of to defend yor goods & propertie agt theeves & robbers.”⁶⁰⁹ The Assembly subsequently passed a levy “towards the support” of the province at the assessed rate of a penny per pound of all rated estates, with half the total amount earmarked for “the protection of this Government,” but it weakened Fletcher’s control over the tax by assuming responsibility for its collection.⁶¹⁰ The legislature also considered a militia bill, presumably introduced by non-Quaker members, but it failed to pass.⁶¹¹ Fletcher, before leaving for New York, found the tax bill not to his liking and upbraided the Quaker members of the Assembly for not including more specific language acknowledging the Crown’s renewed demand for “assistance to New yorke tho proposed in Such a way as is agreeable to the most tender Consciences among you.”⁶¹²

As they had with Blackwell, the provincial Quaker government had found a way to stymie the imposition of royal authority, and with it, Fletcher’s demand for military assistance, but the exigencies of war kept the pressure on ruling Friends for the remainder of the 1690s. The urgency with which Friends maneuvered to balance their sovereignty with not unduly compromising their peace principles can be seen in an undated (and probably unsent) petition to William III “for the restoring this Government to W: Penn,” which was probably written shortly after Fletcher had left for New York. The petition, written by provincial Friends, though unsigned, credits Quaker settlers for turning the Delaware Valley “from uncultivated wilderness to a well frequented Country with town and villages & Plantations,” and it reminded the king that Pennsylvania performed an invaluable economic service by

⁶⁰⁹ *MPCP* 1: 400

⁶¹⁰ *Laws of Pennsylvania*, 221-4. Quotation on p. 221.

⁶¹¹ *Votes and Proceedings of the House of Representatives of the Province of Pennsylvania*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia, 1752), 148.

⁶¹² Governor Fletcher to the Pennsylvania Assembly, [June 9, 1694], p. 384, vol. 2, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, APS.

“send[ing] many vessels to yr Kings Plantacions with bread flour beef pork beer & other Provisions.” Having justified their governance of the colony, the unnamed Quaker petitioners then begged the king to keep the province “distinct from [new] york in respect of its conveniency of our religious perswasion,” most especially “in respect of wars swearing & other things of the like nature.” The petitioners promised William III that if he preserved their colony’s autonomy from outside political interference, they would “answer the King & Queens desires ffor ye support of Govermt to ye utmost of our Ability.”⁶¹³ Around the same time, ruling Friends drafted another revealing proposal to the Crown government for “what may be done for the ffuture good of the Province in respect of the Govermt.” The proposal, which was never sent, expressed the Quakers’ willingness to “perfectly adjust the method of Govermt” with Penn “to prevent all future disputes between ye people & him.” If Penn’s proprietary could not be restored, the proposal’s authors continued, Penn should be allowed to find another governor “committed to a person who may reside among us” and – more importantly – “be gratefull to us.” The proposal concluded by reiterating Penn’s assurances that Pennsylvania possessed natural defenses that would thwart foreign enemy attack, which the Quaker authors believed would justify the king allowing them to have a “Civill Govermt ... in manner of a corporacon ... [with] magistrates of their own choosing.” According to the proposal’s authors, Maryland could then take responsibility for the military defense of the region, while Pennsylvania would annually “rayse a Supply ffor the King & Queens occasions.”⁶¹⁴ By “occasions,” of course, the unnamed Quakers who drafted the proposal meant taxes in support of military operations along the New York frontier.

The euphemism revealed a certain anxiety on the part of ruling Friends to acknowledge the compromises they made in negotiating their imperial responsibilities during wartime. When the Lords of Trade recommended to the Queen the restoration of Pennsylvania’s proprietary status in August

⁶¹³ Petition to William III, “for the restoring this Government to W: Penn” [ca. 1693], f. 120, box 14, Etting Collection, HSP; reference to petition originally found in *LLP* 1:40.

⁶¹⁴ “Some Proposals what may be done for the ffuture good of the Province in respect of the Govermt,” [ca. 1693], f. 122, box 14, Etting Collection, HSP.

1694, Penn promised he would “dutifully comply” with royal orders for the “supplying such Quota of men or the defraying their part of such Charges ... for the safty and preservation of their Ma^{ties} Dominions in that part of America.”⁶¹⁵ The Crown government knew the risks involved in reinstating Penn’s proprietary charter. In February of that year, the Lords of Trade “agreed to represent to the King the danger from the number of Quakers in North America, and the little help that they contribute towards defence.”⁶¹⁶ But metropolitan officials gambled Penn was better suited to persuade Friends in military matters than Fletcher or some other royal official.⁶¹⁷ Penn at first apologized to the Council for the “Streitness of time [and] the Circumstances” he had put them under by agreeing to the Crown’s stipulations.⁶¹⁸ But within a year he lost his patience and began imploring his “Loveing Frds” in several letters to consider how “your not only refuseing to send men ~~or~~{but} mony to N.Y. for a common defence” would once again imperil his charter. In England, he lectured them, Friends “pay [taxes] to carry [on] a vigorous war agst France,” while they “admire at the difficulty of [Friends in Pennsylvania] to pay, saying it seems to Contradict us here; especially, sinc[e] It may be given under the Style [of] Peace & Safety, or to defray the exigencies of Governmt. & deposit it in such hands as may keep frds cleer from th[e] breach of their [peace] Testimony.”⁶¹⁹

Penn’s admonishment betrayed little sympathy for Pennsylvania Friends, and it also hinted at the possibility that Friends were not entirely in agreement over even the issue of war taxes. Prohibited by law from serving in government, English Friends believed they could safely remit their taxes to other “hands,” as Penn put it, and thus morally absolve themselves of responsibility for any military uses it might be put to. Provincial Friends in Pennsylvania government tried a similar tack with Fletcher and the Lords of Trade, shifting the blame onto those who used their tax money for military purposes. Penn’s letter indicated that the peace testimony theoretically should have caused little trouble

⁶¹⁵ *PWP* 3: 397. Penn’s charter was restored on August 9, 1694; see *CSPC* 14: 321.

⁶¹⁶ *CSPC* 14: 245.

⁶¹⁷ Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 187.

⁶¹⁸ *PWP* 3: 405.

⁶¹⁹ *PWP* 3: 416.

for Friends on the issue of war taxes. But English and Pennsylvania Quakers' cultural expectations about behavior were divergent, owing in part to the vast political differences between the two groups. In the 1690s and early 1700s, English Friends worried about impressment, piracy on the high seas, and securing tolerations for themselves.⁶²⁰ On the other side of the Atlantic, Pennsylvania Friends *were* the established political order, and they confronted slavery and other colonial forms of violence in a manner English Friends rarely had to confront.

As Penn's letter suggests, Friends in Pennsylvania also balked at paying monies assessed for war taxes. The reasons for doing so were complex, politically motivated, and cannot be satisfactorily explained solely in terms of "pacifism." Instead, the peace testimony became an integral part of a much larger debate over sovereignty and government, which ruling Friends found politically expedient to use in their negotiations with royalist officials to preserve their political autonomy. In April 1695, Benjamin Fletcher, writing from New York, once again demanded military assistance from Pennsylvania. This time, in addition to money, Fletcher told Markham, who was serving as governor at the time, he needed "Eighty men and their officers with armes Ammunition and pay ffor one year."⁶²¹ Fletcher needed the military assistance to placate his Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) allies, who were engaged in a long-running battles with the French. At a treaty conference with the Mohawk in August of that year, Fletcher's Indian allies exhorted the governor to "give notice ... [to] all the brethren that are in covenant with us and come up with five hundred men and Cannon and let us go hand in hand to see what the enemy do at Cadaracqui [Fort Frontenac]."⁶²² Fletcher, who could ill afford to ignore his Native alliances, pressed Markham in September for military assistance and sternly reminded him of the "ill consequences of the ffrench so neere [the] neighbourhood [of] the five Nations and that they

⁶²⁰ The Act of Toleration, despite repealing penal laws on Protestant dissenters, nevertheless retained a number of restrictions which negatively affected English Friends. The Test Act mandated oaths swearing, which effectively barred Friends from holding public office, and Quakers and other dissenters were also required to pay tithes and obtain a license for their meetings from bishops in the Church of England; see Murphy, *Conscience and Community*, 159-60. For the continued sufferings of Quakers in the post-1689 era, see Braithwaite, *Second Period of Quakerism*, 179-87.

⁶²¹ Benjamin Fletcher to William Markham, April 15, 1695, p. 15, vol. 1, Penn Manuscripts: Official Correspondence, Penn Family Papers, HSP.

⁶²² Treaty at Albany, August 28, 1695, p. 298, vol. 2, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, 1665-1801, APS.

have easyre & nearer access to Pensilvania than New yorke.”⁶²³ The provincial Assembly, however, under the antiproprietary leadership of David Lloyd, rebuffed Markham, using Fletcher’s urgent need for military aid as an opportunity to enhance their own constitutional power at the expense of the Provincial Council and governor. The committee proceedings of the Assembly indicated that “money may be raised to answer the Queens Letters [i.e., demand for military assistance]” on the condition of winning a “Salvo to the Proprietary and the People” of the province.⁶²⁴ By that, the Assembly meant altering property requirements for suffrage in favor of rural areas (where Quakers enjoyed a demographic majority) at the expense of urban ones (where Friends were increasingly in the minority), thereby ensuring the electoral supremacy of Friends in the province. Most importantly, the Assembly sought the right to initiate legislation and adjourn at its own accord.⁶²⁵ The proposed changes were a bold gamble on the part of the Assembly to wrest power from the Provincial Council and governor. Markham initially resisted, complaining to the Quaker members of the legislature that they had “forced me into [a] Channell you have now made.”⁶²⁶ But Markham knew as well as the Assembly that if he could not obtain military assistance from the colony Penn risked losing his charter again. The political blackmail worked. Quakers in the legislature won a new constitutional settlement in 1696 that buttressed their power at the expense of the executive branch and the burgeoning non-Quaker settler population in the colony. In return for the new constitutional framework, the Assembly remitted £300 in tax revenues to Fletcher.⁶²⁷

In their negotiations with the governor, the Assembly used the peace testimony as a political expedient to win concessions from the governor, but that fact does not preclude the possibility of genuine moral anxieties, even among powerful Quaker legislators, about supporting military operations

⁶²³ Benjamin Fletcher to William Markham, September 3, 1695, p. 302, , vol. 2, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, 1665-1801, APS.

⁶²⁴ General Assembly of Pennsylvania, Committee Proceedings, October 31, 1696, p. 334, vol. 2, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, 1665-1801, APS.

⁶²⁵ Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 202-3.

⁶²⁶ Markham Speech to Assembly, September 9, 1695, p. 388, vol. 2, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, 1665-1801, APS.

⁶²⁷ Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 204-5; *Laws of Pennsylvania*, 253.

in neighboring colonies. Around the time negotiations for the new settlement were being finalized, the Quaker members of the Assembly dispatched a message to Markham and the Provincial Council noting their willingness “to performe our Dutyes [sic] therein soe farr as in us lyes.”⁶²⁸ The phrase, “so far in us lies,” suggests there were limits to how far at least some Quaker assemblymen were willing to concede to Fletcher, no matter how politically expedient it was to base their objections in pacifist discourse. For one, the Assembly remitted money in lieu of the eighty men Fletcher asked for. Taken by itself, such a move is not necessarily evidence of pacifism, as many other colonies besides Pennsylvania were also reluctant to send Fletcher troops. But in another, more revealing letter to Penn shortly after passing the tax, Friends betrayed a hint of reluctance about the bargain they were about to make. In the letter, the Quaker members of the Assembly reassured Penn that they were “alwaies ready to Answer [Fletcher’s demands for military assistance] according to our Abilities Considering the Religious perswasion of the Major part of us.” After rehearsing a brief history of their alleged cooperation with Fletcher’s demands for money, the authors of the letter announced they had passed a new tax “for the support of Government Three Hundred pounds.” Inserted below that remark, almost as an afterthought, was the rationale that Friends gave for the money: instead of it going for military purposes, the tax would go “towards Relieving the distressed Indians Inhabiting above Albany.”⁶²⁹ It was a bald-faced lie. The Quaker authors of the letter, which included such prominent Friends as Samuel Carpenter, Caleb Pusey, John Blunston, and Nicholas Waln, knew the money was for Fletcher’s military operations, and they probably knew the “distressed Indians” in New York were Fletcher’s Iroquois allies who had asked for the military assistance in the first place. Penn probably knew Friends were lying as well. Yet, at first blush, there was no apparent reason to lie, especially in a private letter addressed to Penn, who expected nothing less than full compliance with Fletcher’s demands. The Quaker authors of the letter were in all likelihood lying to themselves, or at least

⁶²⁸ General Assembly, Message to Governor and Council, October 7, 1696, p. 326, vol. 2, William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, 1665-1801, APS.

⁶²⁹ Assembly letter to William Penn, November 7, 1696, f. 7, Box 54, Etting Collection, HSP.

rationalizing their compliance with levying a war tax to other Friends, rehearsing a narrative that Fletcher had previously given them, which was that their hands would not be “dipt in blood.”

Whatever their motivation, the Quakers’ instrumental use the peace testimony to either forestall royal demands for military assistance or gain political concessions from the governor ironically raised Pennsylvania’s profile as a “pacifist” colony. It did not matter that not all Friends were pacifists, that Friends were not in agreement about the peace testimony, and that Friends generally excused themselves when, acting in the capacity as magistrates, they supported indirect support of war measures such as levying taxes. When other northern colonies, such as Massachusetts, balked at giving the governor of New York his due in money or troops, no one accused their leaders of pacifism. This was true even of Rhode Island, which had a sizeable Quaker population on Aquidneck Island and for a time in the late seventeenth century legally exempted pacifists from military service.⁶³⁰ Yet numerous political actors, from royalists, Anglicans, and neighboring colonial officials, accused Quakers in Pennsylvania of holding their peace testimony above their loyalty to the Crown and the empire. The peace testimony was, in the eyes of the Quakers’ many political enemies, a dangerous pacifism that bordered on treason.

The absence of a militia was the most salient aspect of gospel order culture in late seventeenth century Pennsylvania, and it inspired either fear or derision from many contemporaries. In the early 1690s, almost as soon as King William’s War began, reports about dangerous Quaker pacifists circulated around Anglo-America. Francis Nicholson was a former military commander under Sir Edmund Andros whose patronage connections with Crown officials and Anglican bishops in London won him appointments to the office of lieutenant governor of Virginia in the early 1690s and the governorship of Maryland in 1693.⁶³¹ Nicholson, a devoted Anglican and high royalist, despised the Quakers and warned the Lords of Trade in 1691 that “Pennsylvania being in the hands of Quakers and

⁶³⁰ Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace*, 100-1.

⁶³¹ Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 187-9; Randy Dunn, “Francis Nicholson’s Empire,” in *English Atlantics Revisited: Essays Honouring Ian K. Steele*, ed. Nancy L. Rhoden (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2007), 59-80.

having few or no militia for defence if attacked by an enemy, may be a retreating place” for what he characterized as a “mob” of “debtors and slaves.” If Pennsylvania settlers “be of William Penn’s pernicious principles,” Nicholson complained, “they may hold correspondence with the French and Indians by land with the French by sea.” Nicholson assured the Lords of Trade that he had issued a proclamation about Quakers in Virginia and that he would be “very watchful of them and of all the loose Governments.”⁶³² Nicholson’s fear of “loose governments” was understandable given that the Revolution of 1688-9 cut short his own career as the lieutenant governor of the Dominion of New England.⁶³³ In Nicholson’s Virginia, as in many other colonies, fears of Indian attacks were compounded by fears of political insecurity and instability that followed the toppling of Andros’s Dominion regime and the proprietary government in Maryland in 1689. Pennsylvania escaped the Revolution of 1688-9 with its government intact, but the Provincial Council in Virginia heard rumors that the Quakers in Pennsylvania “have given out, that if the French and Indians come against them, they will go out and meet them without arms, and acquaint them they had no quarrell with them, nor would not fight.”⁶³⁴ The rumor alarmed members of the Virginia Council, who worried that an intercolonial alliance of Quakers and hostile Indians were descending into their region.⁶³⁵

In the Delaware Valley, opposition to Quaker rule in Pennsylvania centered on the issue of defense. Non-Quaker settlers in the lower counties especially resented Quakers for leaving Delaware homes and plantations exposed to attack by pirates and French privateers. Rumors of war and the threat of invasion fueled anxieties. In April 1689, the sheriff of Sussex County alerted the Provincial Council “touching a Rumor of an invasion made on Maryland by 9000 Sennekers [Senecas] & ffrench.” The Council assured the sheriff the report was “groundless” and cautioned lower county officials not to

⁶³² CSPC 13: 473; Root, *Relations of Pennsylvania*, 261.

⁶³³ Steven Saunders Webb, “The Strange Career of Francis Nicholson,” *WMQ* 23 (October 1966): 513-548.

⁶³⁴ Minutes of Council at James Town, January 15, 1691, reprinted in *Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania*, vol. 4, part 1 (1840).

⁶³⁵ April Lee Hatfield, *Atlantic Virginia: Intercolonial Relations in the Seventeenth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 210-1.

“presume to raise the Contrey without more manifest cause.”⁶³⁶ By the early 1690s, Delaware settlers had formed private militia companies in lieu of waiting for an actual invasion to take place. When Fletcher visited New Castle in 1693, the local militia “went to the Townhouse” to publish his royal commission and greeted the new governor with “firing of guns, great Shouting and joy.”⁶³⁷ Security considerations were foremost on the minds of settlers. Before returning to Philadelphia that day, Fletcher and other newly sworn-in officials “spent the rest of the forenoon in finding the most convenient place at New Castle to build a fort.”⁶³⁸ The seeming indifference on the part of ruling Friends to the plight of Delaware settlers’ security concerns hastened the lower counties’ secession from Pennsylvania, which Penn reluctantly authorized in 1701.⁶³⁹

The need for defense became most pressing when the Delaware Valley was attacked by pirates and privateers. One such attack caused great alarm at the end of the seventeenth century. In September 1698, the Provincial Council received word from officials in Sussex County that a pirate sloop had attacked a coastal town with “about 50 men well armed” who “plundered almost every house ... breaking open doors & Chests and taking away all money or plate to be found.” The Council learned that a pirate named Canoot stole a sloop from a man named Jonathan Redwood in Philadelphia. Canoot and his men took Redwood and “His Boy” prisoner while they commandeered the sloop. Besides sacking the town and taking “about eleven of ye Chief of [our] town prisoners,” the pirates “killed several Sheep and Hogs” and remained at anchor in the Delaware Bay unmolested until an unknown brigantine sailed nearby and frightened them off. One of the settlers who reported the event was Luke Watson, the former Provincial Councilor who argued for militia establishment during Governor Blackwell’s tenure. After recounting the events of the attack, Watson and the others bluntly told the

⁶³⁶ *MPCP* 1: 277.

⁶³⁷ *MPCP* 1: 369.

⁶³⁸ *MPCP* 1: 370.

⁶³⁹ In 1701, Penn authorized a separate assembly for the lower counties, but not a separate governor, as that would have nullified his proprietary rights to Delaware; see Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 131-3, 235-6.

Provincial Council, “This place is verie open to danger & verie naked for defence.”⁶⁴⁰

Pennsylvania’s growing Anglican community, centered in Philadelphia, also lent its voice to the growing chorus of resentment over the issue of defense in the colony. Beginning in the mid-1690s, the Anglican population in Pennsylvania grew significantly, as Quakers slowly lost their demographic majority by the turn of the eighteenth century. The presence of Anglicans in the colony coincided with the fourfold increase in Pennsylvania’s non-Quaker settler population overall during the fifteen year period spanning from 1685 to 1700. The influx of Anglicans and other non-Quaker settlers contributed greatly to the growing commercial prosperity of the colony, helping Philadelphia outpace New York to become the second largest city in Anglo-America by century’s end. Ironically, given the Anglican opposition to Quaker rule, the lack of a militia in Pennsylvania, along with low taxes, attracted many non-Quaker settler families from neighboring colonies.⁶⁴¹ The erection of Christ Church in Philadelphia in 1695 was a fitting symbol of Anglican ambitions for the colony. Christ Church also had two important imperial benefactors: Robert Quarry and Francis Nicholson. Nicholson, as governor of Maryland, successfully lobbied the Privy Council in London to provide Church with a £50 annual stipend for a minister. Robert Quarry, another founder of Christ Church, was a committed Anglican who once served as deputy governor in South Carolina.⁶⁴² In 1698, the same year as Canoot’s pirate attack, Quarry arrived in Philadelphia appointed by the Board of Trade to serve as judge of the powerful vice-admiralty court for Pennsylvania, West Jersey, and Maryland. As vice admiralty judge, Quarry was charged with the task of enforcing the Navigation Act and suppressing illegal smuggling.⁶⁴³

The sovereignty of Quaker rule in Pennsylvania lay at the heart of Anglican complaints about the absence of a militia in the colony. At stake in the contest between Quakers and Anglicans in the colony were two competing visions of sovereignty. The former was rooted in gospel order, while the

⁶⁴⁰ *MPCP* 1: 539-40.

⁶⁴¹ Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 205-9.

⁶⁴² Deborah Gough, *Christ Church, Philadelphia: The Nation's Church in a Changing City* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995), 10-11.

⁶⁴³ Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 195-6; Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 181.

Anglican vision was decidedly imperial. The peace testimony became a locus of debate, as did other Quaker-inflected provincial laws, such as those allowing for affirmation in lieu of oaths in court. The Quaker-Anglican debate demonstrated the extent to which Pennsylvania was situated within a contested imperial space. Pennsylvania was quite literally “in the kingdom but not of it,” a colony positioned at the margins of imperial rule, yet claimed by the Crown government as one of its dominions. Because violence regulation was fundamental to the perception of public order and a vital to a state’s legitimacy, Anglicans and imperial officials (who were often one and the same) seized on the militia issue, even when the actual threat of warfare was far more pressing in New York or New England. Sometime around 1695, as Christ Church made its first appearance in Philadelphia, several prominent Anglicans submitted a petition to William III. Styling themselves as “Loyall Protestant Subjects,” the Anglican petitioners complained to the Crown that “the whole Government [of Pennsylvania] is putt into ye hands of the Quakers who not only refuse to [settle] ye Malitia but give all [discouragement] they can to so good A worke.” The petitioners begged the Crown to abrogate Penn’s charter so they could be “Governed by the laws of England [so that] the Mallitia of this province may be settled as to secure this Contry an all his Majes. subjects therein from all their Enimies [sic].”⁶⁴⁴ Tellingly, the Anglican petitioners equated Quaker pacifism with disloyalty, as their reference to themselves as “loyal Protestant subjects” implied that the Quakers by contrast were neither loyal, nor Protestant, nor properly good English subjects.

The issue of defense in Pennsylvania intersected with a host of other issues related to the Quaker governance of the colony. Robert Quarry, Francis Nicholson, Edward Randolph, surveyor general of customs, and other royalist officials strenuously lobbied the Board of Trade to annul Penn’s proprietary charter. By the turn of the eighteenth century, as the House of Lords considered a bill for the revocation of all proprietary charters in America, complaints that Friends in Pennsylvania were not

⁶⁴⁴ “The Humble Address & Petition of his Majesties: Loyall Protestant Subjects living in the Province of Pennsylvania, [ca. 1695], p. 33, vol. 1, Penn Manuscripts, Indian Affairs; also reprinted in PWP 3:443-9. Quotations from original manuscript.

fit to govern intensified.⁶⁴⁵ Reports filtered back to England that “pennsylvania is become ye greatest refuge & Shelter for pirats & Rogues in America.”⁶⁴⁶ Pirates reputedly roamed Philadelphia without fear of arrest. Randolph and Quarry claimed that Governor Markham took protection money from pirates. Another local non-Quaker official informed the Board of Trade that Markham had married his daughter to James Brown, a reputed member of Henry Every’s crew.⁶⁴⁷ Pennsylvania’s alleged toleration of pirates symbolized the Quakers’ indifference to royal authority. For officials like Quarry, piracy, illegal smuggling, and the issue of defense in Pennsylvania were all interrelated problems underpinned by the Quakers’ irresponsible governance of the colony. Matters pertaining to defense, however, took prominence even in official reports detailing a much broader survey of the Quakers’ alleged derelictions. On April 16, 1702, the Board of Trade received a report from Quarry outlining several “irregular proceedings” and “undue practices” of Friends in Pennsylvania. While Quarry focused on illegal smuggling and Penn’s alleged flouting of the Navigation Act, his report to the Board emphasized that “the country [is] left defenceless” for lack of a militia and that Penn invited “foreign and French Indians, known to be villains” to trade with his colony. Quarry also targeted the Quaker Assembly’s unwillingness to raise a “small quota” of £350 “towards the defence of New Yorke,” and he railed at the “hainous” crimes that Friends allegedly got away with, including “the son of an eminent Quaker” accused of rape but “gott off without tryall.”⁶⁴⁸

As if the unwanted attention from imperial officials were not enough, George Keith returned to the Delaware Valley in 1702, this time as an SPG missionary. Keith’s mission to America was an ambitious undertaking, financially supported by a host of wealthy benefactors and prominent local

⁶⁴⁵ Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 222-3. The Board of Trade’s efforts to lobby for the annulment of proprietary charters would be stymied by Queen Anne’s Privy Council, who proved less sympathetic than William III’s ministers had been. As a result, the House bill for the resumption of proprietary charters in 1701 was as close as the Board of Trade came at the time to effecting the royalization of Pennsylvania and the other remaining colonial charters in America; see Ian K. Steele, “The Board of Trade, The Quakers, and Resumption of Colonial Charters, 1699-1702,” *WMQ* 23 (October 1966): 596-619.

⁶⁴⁶ *MPCP* 1:551; Quoted in Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 179.

⁶⁴⁷ Root, *Relations of Pennsylvania*, 64.

⁶⁴⁸ *CSPC* 20: 226-7; also reprinted in “Copy of Col. Quarry’s Information against the Government of Pennsylvania,” reprinted in *Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia, 1830), 193-195. In the report, Quarry does not name the individual who stood accused of rape.

officials. During his time in America, Keith's benefactors included Francis Nicholson, who once supported Dr. Bray while he was organizing Church of England parishes in Maryland, Colonel Lewis Morris of New York, the wealthy, slaveowning Quaker convert, formerly of Barbados, Colonel Joseph Dudley, the despised Anglican royal governor of Massachusetts Bay, and the equally hated Edward Hyde, Lord Cornbury, then governor of New York. With the support of such eminent officials, Keith and his companion John Talbot traversed the Atlantic seaboard from New England to North Carolina from 1702 to 1704.⁶⁴⁹ Keith visited his former supporters, whom he counted "above Five hundred persons" in about fifteen congregations in West Jersey and Pennsylvania, and he worked to establish multiple Anglican parishes and convert "a considerable number of People that were formerly Quakers, and other Dissenters in a good disposition."⁶⁵⁰ Keith's SPG mission demonstrated the profound links between sacral and temporal forms of sovereignty, as Anglicans and sympathetic provincial officials worked together to build a Church of England parish system that would internalize both royal and ecclesiastical authority among Anglo-American subjects.

Not surprisingly, Keith was eager to settle old scores with Friends, and he used the peace testimony as a trope to undermine Quaker authority in Pennsylvania. Keith and Talbot wrote numerous reports to John Chamberlayne, the secretary of the SPG, Henry Compton, the Bishop of London, and Dr. Bray appraising them of their missionary work and urging them to send more ministers, prayer books, catechisms, and anti-Quaker tracts like Charles Leslie's *Snake in the Grass* (1697), which Talbot believed had "given Quakerism a deadly wound, I hope never to be healed."⁶⁵¹ In November 1702, at the beginning of their missionary journey, Keith and Talbot convened a meeting in New York with Evan Evans, the rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia, and several Anglican dignitaries, including Edmond Mott, the royal chaplain for the Queen's regiments stationed in the colony. Together, they

⁶⁴⁹ Keith's missionary journey with the SPG is recounted in Kirby, *George Keith*, 125-147.

⁶⁵⁰ "A Letter from Mr. George Keith to the Secretary of the Venerable Society about the State of Quakerism in North America," [n.d.] *Collections of the Protestant Episcopal Historical Society for the Year 1851* (New York, 1851),

⁶⁵¹ John Talbot to Richard Gillingham, May 3, 1703, *Collections of the Protestant Episcopal Historical Society*, p. xxxviii. The tract Talbot refers to is Charles Leslie, *The Snake in the Grass, or Satan Transform'd into an Angel of Light* (London, 1697).

compiled an “An Account of the State of the Church in North America,” which was sent to the SPG in London. With some exaggeration, the report blamed Friends and other dissenters for the “chief opposition and discouragement” of winning over converts to the Church, and it singled out the Quakers’ “refusing to swear and fight” in Pennsylvania as the primary means “by which many [other settlers] come over to them, to excuse themselves from being jurymen and serving in the Militia.”⁶⁵² In subsequent letters, Keith and Talbot warned SPG officials that Pennsylvania “lyes very naked and open at present to both French and Indians” because of Friends who “pretend they can’t fight so much as in self-defence.”⁶⁵³ As the SPG’s first missionary, Keith labored to demonstrate that Friends were moral hypocrites. “Where they have the Government,” he wrote in his journal, Friends profess not “to fight with a Carnal Weapon,” yet Quaker magistrates in Pennsylvania had “put several Persons to Death judicially, for suspected Murthers.”⁶⁵⁴ Keith was no longer interested in convincing Friends that they had deviated from their “ancient principles,” as he had during the schism. He was now broadcasting to an Anglo-Atlantic public that Friends, and not the Crown, were the real arbitrary power in America, having “set up their own Traditions, to throw down the Commands of Christ”⁶⁵⁵

A broader, transatlantic network of moral commentary followed Keith’s lead in denouncing Pennsylvania Quakers for their moral hypocrisy and inept governance. On the American side, one of the most prolific anti-Quaker polemicists was Daniel Leeds, a former Quaker turned Keithian who in the late seventeenth century penned several scathing tracts against Friends, including *The Great Mystery of Fox-Craft Discovered* (1705).⁶⁵⁶ Leeds amplified Keith’s charges that Quakers were at best borderline seditious subjects of the Crown, promising fealty but refusing to swear oaths or disavow fighting – though only when it suited them politically. In *The Great Mystery of Fox-Craft Discovered*,

⁶⁵² “An Account of the State of the Church in North America, by Mr. George Keith and Others,” [ca. 1703], *Collections of the Protestant Episcopal Historical Society*, p. xviii-xx.

⁶⁵³ George Keith to John Chamberlayne, Secretary of the SPG, September 4, 1703, *Collections of the Protestant Episcopal Historical Society*, p. xxxi.

⁶⁵⁴ A Journal of Travels from New-Hampshire to Caratuck, On the Continent of North-America, by George Keith, A.M. (London, 1706), in *Collections of the Protestant Episcopal Historical Society*, 24.

⁶⁵⁵ George Keith, *Power of the Gospel ...* (Annapolis, 1703), 17.

⁶⁵⁶ Daniel Leeds, *The Great Mystery of Fox-craft Discovered ...* (New York, 1705).

Leeds rhetorically asked his readers whether “such Equivocators as these be fit Persons to be trusted in the Government?”⁶⁵⁷ As evidence that Pennsylvania Friends cried pacifism when it only suited them, he pointed to the May 1706 security incident that rattled Philadelphia and embarrassed the government. Pennsylvania Governor John Evans, frustrated with Quaker Assemblymen who consistently obstructed his efforts at organizing a provincial militia, rode around Philadelphia warning of impending attack by six French vessels in the Delaware Bay. In reality, there was no French attack – Evans made it up – but he threw the city into a panic. Much to the disgust of private militia volunteers, some provincial Friends attempted to flee Philadelphia, while a few mustered with arms.⁶⁵⁸ Leeds exaggerated events, implying that more than a few Friends had responded “in a Military posture, with their Guns charged,” and arguing rather smugly that they had either done so either to save themselves or join the French.⁶⁵⁹

Across the Atlantic, religious controversialists recycled many of Keith and Leeds’ attacks on Quaker authority. Edward Cockson, a rector writing from Oxfordshire, wrote *Rigid Quakers, Cruel Persecutors* (1705) ostensibly in response to a local debate between an Anglican and a Quaker, but the tract makes repeated references to “Friends in *Pensilvania*: who hired men to fight, tho they themselves declared fighting to be Sinful.”⁶⁶⁰ Invariably, polemical commentary on the peace testimony turned to attacks on Quaker-inflected laws and Quaker authority in Pennsylvania. Bugg, an ex-Quaker who like Keith later joined the Church, could barely contain his invective. Pennsylvania’s weak defenses, he claimed, “are a fair Road into other of His Majesties Colonies.” According to Bugg, French privateers reportedly told a group of English captives that they intended to “plunder” Philadelphia “in hopes of a good Prey, since there were none but Quakers, and so consequently no Opposition.”⁶⁶¹ Bugg also resorted to gendered attacks, impugning the authority of Pennsylvania Quaker magistrates with innuendo and allusions of sexual impropriety. In one instance, Bugg accused Pennsylvania magistrates

⁶⁵⁷ Leeds, *Great Mistery*, 11.

⁶⁵⁸ James Logan recounted the events to William Penn in *PWP* 4: 534; see also *MPCP* 2: 241-3; Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 190-1.

⁶⁵⁹ Leeds, *Great Mistery*, 13.

⁶⁶⁰ Edward Cockson, *Rigid Quakers, Cruel Persecutors ...* (London, 1705), 15.

⁶⁶¹ Francis Bugg, *News from Pensilvania ...* (London, 1703), 18.

of whipping non-Quaker women for trivial offenses while allowing a certain male Friend, “being found upon a Quaking Woman,” to get away with nothing more than a token fine. From Bugg’s point of view, when Friends, whom he called “this Lunatick sort of People,” settled Pennsylvania, they “were resolved ... that the Arbitration of Friends should serve instead of Laws,” but those laws were the very cause of disorder in the colony.⁶⁶² Gospel order, in other words, was to blame.

Yet Friends deftly used gospel order discipline and rhetoric to dramatically reverse their political fortunes. In 1710, after years of political instability and infighting, the pro-proprietary faction of wealthy Quaker merchants and landowners in Pennsylvania swept provincial elections, driving out the antiproprietary politicians, led by David Lloyd, who had dominated the Assembly for much of the previous decade. The landslide elections in favor of the proprietary party spelled the end of an era of rancorous politics (and according to Gary Nash, relatively democratic rule) that had begun with the Keithian schism.⁶⁶³ The election’s timing could not have been more fortuitous for Friends. While imperial authorities were making common cause with Anglicans and non-Quaker settlers in the Delaware Valley, William Penn was negotiating to sell his proprietorship back to the Crown government in order to pay off his enormous debts.⁶⁶⁴ In June, only a few months before the election, Penn sent a letter addressed to “Friends in Pennsylvania,” enjoining them one last time in the language of gospel order to pursue “the amicable wayes of Peace Love & Unity,” by which he meant that Friends should abandon David Lloyd and embrace his proprietary rule. Echoing the same language Thomas Chalkley used ten years before, Penn reminded Friends that the “eyes of many are upon you,” but he also warned them that he was “answerable to the Crown if the Administration [of the province] shou’d fail.”⁶⁶⁵

Although Penn’s letter failed to reach Friends before the election, the Philadelphia Yearly

⁶⁶² Bugg, *News from Pensilvania*, 22-3, 26.

⁶⁶³ Nash, *Quakers and Politics*, 307.

⁶⁶⁴ See “To Queen Anne” and “Queries Concerning the Surrender of Pennsylvania,” *PWP* 4:681-4.

⁶⁶⁵ William Penn, “To Friends in Pennsylvania,” June 29, 1710, in *PWP* 4: 675-80; quotation on pp. 676-7.

Meeting intervened to convince voters of the merits of Quaker rule and to reassert their authority over subordinate meetings in the Delaware Valley. In September of that year, one month before the elections, the meeting sanctioned the publication of Isaac Norris's *Friendly Advice to the Inhabitants of Pennsylvania* (1710).⁶⁶⁶ Norris, a wealthy merchant, used *Friendly Advice* to convince non-Quaker voters in Pennsylvania that proprietary rule, as mediated through the a ruling class of Quaker gentry, would best secure their lives and liberties. To bolster internal Quaker support for Norris's party, the yearly meeting circulated an epistle reminding Friends in the Delaware Valley "to be of one mind: that so our Enemies may not see any Divisions amongst us, & Reproach us therewith." The meeting also stepped up its enforcement of gospel order discipline, assigning "Substantial Friends" to "Visit every Family amongst us" to inquire about their "Worldly Estate" and to "& See how things are with them." For those who "will not take the Advice of Friends," the meeting promised it would "give them Gospel Order & proceed therein against them."⁶⁶⁷ The actions taken by the yearly meeting helped the proprietary party of Friends win the election, and just as importantly, shored up the loyalty of Friends to their rule through their reassertion of gospel order discipline.

The consolidation of power within a powerful clique of Quaker merchants and ministers was timely, and not just because they had narrowly avoided Penn's sale of the colony to the Crown government. In 1711, one year after the elections, Pennsylvania faced its most serious request for wartime assistance yet. The formal end to King William's War in 1697 did not put a stop to ongoing settler-Indian conflict along the New England and New York borderlands region, and it hardly slowed the pressure on Friends to provide for their own defense, as well as to offer military assistance to neighboring colonies. In 1701, during what turned out to be his last stay in the colony, Penn received at least three petitions from settlers in the lower counties complaining French privateers were about "to fall on us naked & defenceless, being without Militia fort powder or shott tho' wee are the Frontiers of

⁶⁶⁶ [Isaac Norris], *Friendly Advice to the Inhabitants of Pensilvania* (Philadelphia:1710); On Norris's influence in the 1710 elections, see Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers*, 240-243.

⁶⁶⁷ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph469, p. 128, FHL.

this River.”⁶⁶⁸ Penn recognized that the issue of defense was a serious political liability for Friends. The “Malitia,” as he wrote to James Logan in 1702, “is all they have to hitt us with.”⁶⁶⁹ When Penn addressed the Assembly for the final time the year before, he relayed the Board of Trade’s request for £350 toward the building of fortifications in New York, but the legislature refused to budge. The Assembly pled poverty as its rationale for withholding tax support for New York’s defense, but this was hardly pacifism; other colonial assemblies offered up the same flimsy excuse when imperial officials approached them with the same request.⁶⁷⁰ By 1709, however, the stakes became much higher. With Queen Anne’s War and the resumption of Anglo-French imperial hostilities fully under way, the Crown government announced a planned two-pronged military offensive into Canada involving five regiments of British troops, augmented by provincial militia from the northern colonies, Pennsylvania included. Then deputy governor Gookin requested from the Pennsylvania Assembly an eyebrow-raising £4,000 in support of the expedition, most likely to compensate for the legislature’s expected unwillingness to pass a militia bill. The Assembly, still in the hands of Lloyd and the antiproprietary party, passed a tax bill for £500 “for the Queen’s use,” stipulating that the money could not be used for military purposes. The planned expedition failed to materialize until 1711, when a joint Anglo-American assault on Quebec was attempted with over 12,000 soldiers and sailors. Under the imperial war plan, Pennsylvania was to contribute 240 men. This time, Gookin requested £2,000. Because of the magnitude of the offensive, and the involvement of Crown troops, the Assembly could ill afford to play games with the governor or stall for time. Instead, Quaker legislators joined with non-Friends in the

⁶⁶⁸ Quotation from PWP 4: 165, f. 4. Although settlers feared privateering attacks, piracy was a far more considerable problem. In August 1699, the Provincial council received a petition from Delaware settlers complaining that in addition to Canoot’s pirate attack the year before, a “Compa[ny] of sailors & others, to ye number of 13, piratically [sic] taken away” the brigantine “Sweepstakes,” which was docked at Newcastle “mounted with six guns, ritchly loaden, ready the next day to sail for England.” The owner of the vessel was Robert Webb, a vice admiralty court officer responsible for, among other things, suppressing piracy; see *MPCP* 1: 563-4.

⁶⁶⁹ William Penn to James Logan, July 28, 1702, p. 6, f. 2, Series 1: Penn Family to James Logan, vols. 1 and 2, (ca. 1700-1715), Penn Family Papers, HSP.

⁶⁷⁰ Root, *Relations of Pennsylvania*, 269.

Assembly and voted for the full amount.⁶⁷¹

The expedition failed miserably, but for Pennsylvania Friends, the 1711 campaign left a different legacy. While Friends' affirmation of magistracy made room for the payment of war taxes, especially when someone else was conducting the war, there was nevertheless a certain anxiety behind the Assembly appending rationalizations like "so far in us lies" and "for the Queen's use" to the appropriations, as it was when Quaker legislators qualified the support with demands that it go "towards Relieving the distressed Indians Inhabiting above Albany." Why the rhetorical fictions? It was not as if all Friends were pacifists, as John Evans so dramatically had demonstrated during the French invasion he faked in 1706. The Quaker members of the Assembly, moreover, could have justifiably paid war taxes to the Crown without the fanfare of presenting it to "the Queen's use." They were acting in their capacity as magistrates, after all. But Friends were not operating in a vacuum. Indeed, Penn was right. The "eyes of many" on both sides of the Atlantic were on provincial Quakers, both Friends and foes alike. Quaker legislators faced a difficult dilemma. Faced with such a pressing demand for military support, as they did in 1711, they knew some sort of compliance with the Crown's mandate was inevitable, or else their colony would face further recriminations from imperial agents and their provincial American allies. Too much eagerness in complying, however, risked drawing opposition from the Quakers' own ranks. Whatever the ambiguities of their peace testimony, Pennsylvania Friends had a reputation for pacifism and that reputation substantiated the efforts of Friends in other colonies to resist militia service and impressment for reasons of religious conscience. And Quaker sovereignty depended on Pennsylvania's not having a militia. Without it, the colony's public culture of gospel order, by which Quaker authority was legitimized, would be severely undermined.

Hence, on the issue of war taxes and the militia, ruling Friends moved to protect their political interest, and in the process, they defined on behalf of all Friends in the colony, and to a degree, Friends

⁶⁷¹ Root, *Relations of Pennsylvania*, 272-4.

everywhere, the acceptable parameters of peace testimony discourse. Because the peace testimony was inextricably bound up with Quaker assertions of sovereignty in the empire, ruling Friends moved quickly to police the boundaries of Pennsylvania's no militia policy. In October 1702, the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting recorded a disciplinary action against one of its own members. The meeting minutes are brief, but they speak volumes, for this was no ordinary member; the object of the meeting's scrutiny was none other than James Logan, William Penn's provincial secretary and, save for the proprietor himself, the most important political official in the colony.⁶⁷² And this was no ordinary disciplinary inquiry either. Earlier that year, Logan and the sheriff of Sussex County, Delaware, responding to reports from "Spanish and Indian runaways" that the French military were at Cohacksink, escorted an armed posse to the Reed Islands to investigate. The rumors proved to be false, as they had so many other times. The monthly meeting at Burlington swiftly reprimanded four New Jersey Friends for joining another armed posse in response to the rumors. New Jersey had been royalized in 1702, and not long after that a militia bill was passed through the provincial legislature. Friends were technically exempted from the law, but as religious dissenters, their political footing in the colony was already tenuous at best. The meeting at Burlington could not take any chances, and thus it compelled the four Friends to give an account of their actions. The Friends in question lamely protested that although they had no "design to hurt, much less to kill, man, woman, or child," they went armed anyway on the chance that "the sight of [their] guns" might scare off the enemy.⁶⁷³ Incredibly, overseers at the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting also demanded that James Logan "give satisfaction for going with armed men to the reed Island." Logan, according to the meeting minutes, "brought a Cobby of a Letter that he had writ to the Governour which he [hoped] would give satisfaction." When the overseers decided that the letter did not sufficiently "answer what friends Expected from him," the meeting demanded the provincial secretary "give out something from under his hand to condemn his ... going

⁶⁷² Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, October 30, 1702, p. 215, FHL.

⁶⁷³ Jones, *Quakers in the American Colonies*, 392-3; Quotation on p. 393.

with armed men ... when he ought to have gone in a peaceable manner according to the profession he makes.”⁶⁷⁴ And thus the Philadelphia meeting, using the power of gospel order discipline, intervened to admonish a powerful Quaker politician for actions he took while executing his duties as a public official. The disciplinary action was noteworthy. Logan advocated for the necessity of defensive war, and as a pragmatic politician, he clearly saw his actions on Reed Island as morally justifiable at the minimum, not to mention prudent. But Logan the Quaker was unwilling to test the monthly meeting’s resolve, and he accepted their authority to intervene in an action that he took as a public official. Gospel order discipline, behind the closed doors of the meetinghouse and away from public view, once again steered public policy in Pennsylvania.⁶⁷⁵

After the Assembly passed the war levy in 1711, Friends moved quickly to ensure compliance within their own ranks. The pro-proprietary party had reason to feel confident, having won elections in a landslide the year before. And besides, paying taxes, even war taxes, to the representatives of sovereign power was not without precedent in Quakerism, as in Christianity more broadly.⁶⁷⁶ Not only had Fox affirmed this principle, the London Yearly Meeting reiterated it in 1693 in an epistle urging Friends to remember their “Christian principle and profession ... with respect to God and Caesar, that because we are subjects of Christ’s kingdom, which is not of this world, we cannot fight ... yet, being subjects of Caesar’s kingdom, we pay our taxes, tribute, &c. according to the example of Christ.”⁶⁷⁷ Yet, despite this affirmation, the fact that London Friends felt compelled to issue such a reminder, at a time when England was at war and their political standing as religious dissenters remained tenuous, implied the existence, or at least the possibility, of tax resistance. When Isaac Norris informed James

⁶⁷⁴ Logan complied with the meeting’s demand for “a Cobby of a Letter that he had writ to the Governour which he helped would give satisfaction.” When the meeting determined it “did not answer what friends Expected from him,” the meeting sent Nicolas Waln, Pentecost Teague William Hudson and Anthony Morris “to condemn his proceedings therein (viz:) his going with armed men ... when he ought to have gone in a peaceable manner according to the profession he makes.” Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, MR-Ph383, October 30, 1702, p. 215, FHL.

⁶⁷⁵ On Logan’s acceptance of the political necessity of armed force, see “James Logan on Defensive War, or Pennsylvania Politics in 1741,” *PMHB* 6 (October, 1882): 402-411.

⁶⁷⁶ For a broader survey of Quakers and war taxes, see Brock, *The Quaker Peace Testimony*, 184-196.

⁶⁷⁷ [London Yearly Meeting], *Epistles from the Yearly Meeting of the People Called Quakers* ... (London, 1760), 67.

Logan that the Assembly “£2,000 to the Queen’s use,” he hinted that not all Friends in Pennsylvania accepted the logic of London’s epistle, either. Before voting on the tax bill, he informed Logan, Quaker members of the Assembly “advised with the most substantial of Friends, foreseeing the clamours and uneasiness.” After “much thought and consideration, as well as argument,” Norris continued, “we did not see it inconsistent with our principles to give the Queen money, notwithstanding any use she might put it to, *that* being nor our part, but hers.”⁶⁷⁸ While Norris and the other member of the Assembly argued that paying war taxes did not violate Quaker principles, they expected that their decision would not be met with universal accord.

Norris and the Assembly were right. To deal with resisters, Friends once again relied on gospel order religious discipline to enforce compliance with the provincial law. The tax resistance is only hinted at in the minutes of the Concord quarterly meeting, suggesting that compliance elsewhere was widespread. In May 1712, the Darby Monthly Meeting requested assistance from their quarterly meeting in Chester to deal with some of their members “Refusing to pay their Assessments to the Queens use.” In response, the quarterly meeting “advise[d] the [Darby] meeting to Proceed against all Such offenders according to our Gospell order & the Rule and Discipline Established amongst us.”⁶⁷⁹ And with that, the meeting records went silent. Not even the yearly meeting minutes that September commented on the Darby incident or any other incidence of tax resistance in their records. Yet there is evidence to support the contention that resistance to the tax law was far more serious than the Chester meeting records would allow. Sometime after the Assembly passed the levy, William Rakestraw anonymously published under the pen name “Philaethes” (“lover of truth”) *Tribute to Caesar* (ca. 1713), which criticized leading Friends for their support of the “vigorous expedition against Canada.”⁶⁸⁰ In the tract, Rakestraw particularly targeted Thomas Story, who had close ties to William

⁶⁷⁸ Isaac Norris to James Logan, August 28, 1711, Penn-Logan Correspondence 1: 436.

⁶⁷⁹ Chester Quarterly Meeting Minutes, MR Ph448, May 5, 1712, p. 77, FHL.

⁶⁸⁰ [William Rakestraw], *Tribute to Caesar, How Paid by the best Christians and to What Purpose ...* [Philadelphia, ca. 1713], Newberry Library Special Collections.

Penn. Story wrote a rebuttal to Rakestraw's tract, which he entitled, somewhat fittingly, "Tribute against Caesar discovered under a false title of Tribute to Caesar, &c."⁶⁸¹ While the manuscript was probably intended for printing, it was undoubtedly based on sermons Story gave at the time in support of the levy. The sermons were undoubtedly intended to bring recalcitrant Friends into line. At the very least, the wartime tax elicited some debate. As Story claimed in his manuscript, he "found [himself] concerned to speak" about the issue at the yearly meeting in 1712, despite there being no mention of it in the official meeting minutes.⁶⁸²

The Story-Rakestraw debate illustrated the clear limits of how far Friends' peace principles would go in the face of imperial pressures. It was not, however, as the historian Hermann Wellenruether suggests, a simple matter of the Assembly remitting a hefty sum in support of the Canadian expedition in 1711 and Friends accepting it because the peace testimony did not preclude the payment of war taxes.⁶⁸³ Rather, the Assembly, once they "advised with the most substantial of Friends," as Norris put it, relied on Thomas Story and other public Friends in the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting to guard against nonconformity, as in the case of the Darby meeting, and ensure the unanimity of gospel order and Quaker rule in the colony. It was the mechanism of gospel discipline, in other words, that shaped the parameters of Quaker pacifism with regard to war taxes in Pennsylvania, not the other way around.

At the center of the debate was William Rakestraw, a Philadelphia brickmaker and maltster who also regularly attended the monthly meeting. Rakestraw, according to Jack Marrietta, "might have been a sincere pacifist," but he was "a poor apostle for the cause of peace" because *Tribute to Caesar* was not much more than a thinly veiled, self-interested attack on Thomas Story, James Logan, and

⁶⁸¹ Thomas Story, "Tribute against Caesar discovered under a false title of Tribute to Caesar ..." [n.d. ca. 1713], reprinted in Moore, *Travelling with Thomas Story*, 124-7.

⁶⁸² Story, "Tribute against Caesar," reprinted in Moore, *Travelling with Thomas Story*, 126.

⁶⁸³ Wellenruether, "Political Dilemma," 155, argues that "The money grants of the Assemblies of 1693, 1709, and 1711 ... represent the Quaker politicians' [unproblematic] translations of their religious testimonies into political terms." Responding to this assertion, Peter Brock, *The Quaker Peace Testimony*, 96, counters that Friends in the Assembly passed the war levies "with a certain uneasiness and even reluctance yet regarded as the best possible solution in the existing political situation."

other members of the ruling Quaker oligarchy, against whom he had borne personal grudges for some time.⁶⁸⁴ To be sure, Rakestraw's name appears many times in the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting minutes, oftentimes in connection with unnamed disputes with other Friends. Since 1702, Rakestraw had been engaged in a land dispute with Penn and James Logan, seeking title to lots in Philadelphia he coveted or squatted on without official sanction. Shortly after his appointment as clerk of the Assembly in 1707, he joined Lloyd and the anti-proprietary faction then in power in impeaching Logan, for among other things, the provincial secretary's alleged misconduct as of head of the Land Office. After the pro-proprietary party swept the provincial elections in 1710, Rakestraw lost clerkship of the Assembly, and the political influence that went with it, to the same faction that voted for the war levy in 1711.⁶⁸⁵ The Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, for their part, had sternly warned Rakestraw in 1708 to cease his "Scurrilous Language & Abusive & Wicked Rimes [rhymes] against our Worthy friend & Governor Wm Penn," apparently in reference to some verses he had written possibly in response to the alleged mistreatment he received at the Land Office.⁶⁸⁶ In May 1713, the Philadelphia meeting again censured Rakestraw for breaking "ye discipline of Truth," this time for attending his son's wedding to a non-Quaker (a violation of gospel order) and "Exposeing" Thomas Story.⁶⁸⁷ The meeting did not elaborate, but the date of the disciplinary action makes it likely that the negative "exposing" of Story's reputation was a manuscript copy of *Tribute to Caesar*, among other things. For months, the meeting warned Rakestraw "that he must make satisfaction or Friends will move against him."⁶⁸⁸ Finally, in September of that year, Philadelphia Friends, having decided that Rakestraw's few attempts at reconciliation were not sufficient, disowned him.⁶⁸⁹

⁶⁸⁴ Jack Marietta, "William Rakestraw: Pacifist Pamphleteer and Party Servant," *PMHB* (January 1974): 53-57; Quotation on p. 57.

⁶⁸⁵ For the meetings' dealings with Rakestraw, see Philadelphia Monthly Meeting Minutes, 1682-1705, MR-Ph383, pp. 89, 95, 126, 130, 132, 134, 138, 139, 150-1, 188, 189, 192. On Rakestraw's dispute with Logan, see Marietta, William Rakestraw: Pacifist Pamphleteer," 55-57.

⁶⁸⁶ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting Minutes, 1705-1714, MR-Ph383, p. 43, FHL.

⁶⁸⁷ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting Minutes, 1705-1714, MR-Ph383, p. 161, FHL.

⁶⁸⁸ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting Minutes, 1705-1714, MR-Ph383, p. 166, FHL.

⁶⁸⁹ Philadelphia Monthly Meeting Minutes, 1705-1714, MR-Ph383, p. 171-2, FHL.

Rakestraw's *Tribute to Caesar* capitalized on the Pennsylvania Quakers' reputation for pacifism in the empire to make them appear as hypocrites. By taking an extreme position with the peace testimony to score political points, his actions bore strong resemblance to a similar tack taken by the Keithians during the schism. Just as George Keith's pacifism was self-interested and politically-motivated, so too was Rakestraw's. In *Tribute to Caesar*, Rakestraw appealed to Friends, "whose known Principles from the beginning have been against Coercive Power and Force."⁶⁹⁰ Like the Keithians, he claimed to represent the founding principles of Friends, or "such as were called *Quakers* Fifty or Sixty years ago." Rakestraw, of course, unfavorably contrasted the "ancient principles" of Friends to his fellow Pennsylvania Quakers, whom he believed engaged in moral declension when they paid war taxes to the Crown. In reality, it was Rakestraw who engaged in moral innovation, by refusing to endorse the traditional moral distinction Friends made between their religious obligation to eschew war and the duty of a magistrate to enforce civil order, even by force if necessary. Rakestraw challenged Friends to consider whether their affirmation that God ordained the institution of government meant even "Wicked Princes, and Popes too, [all of whom] Tyrannize over their Subjects." If "Caesars Weapons are for Punishment of Evil doers," he queried, "I wonder how this made for the Cause in hand, to pay Tribute for a vigorous War against Canada."⁶⁹¹ According to Rakestraw, Thomas Story preached throughout the Delaware Valley in support of the war tax, holding little regard for the death and destruction it helped pay for. Crucially, Rakestraw called Norris and the Assembly to account for their "Queen's use" formulation, asking them why it was necessary to obfuscate the tax's real purpose. In New Jersey, he noted, the royal government passed "a larger Fond [fund], directly and in express words for the Expedition in *Canada*; and all the Country (some few excepted) pay'd it, and no body to call them to account." And yet, he wryly noted, Friends "to a Nicety, scruple, and will not pay Caesars Militia, nor the Poor Parson, a civil Minister." Why then, would Friends not scruple

⁶⁹⁰ [William Rakestraw], *Tribute to Caesar*, preface.

⁶⁹¹ [William Rakestraw], *Tribute to Caesar*, 2-3.

against the war tax? According to Rakestraw, “all this happens, because the Pulpit Sets up too near the Chair of State.”⁶⁹² Rakestraw’s reasoning strongly echoed the Keithians’ claim that the “carnal” state morally corrupted Quaker gospel order.

Thomas Story’s rebuttal, which was never published, revealed a different set of priorities on the part of ruling Friends. Story, of course, attempted to discredit Rakestraw by portraying him as representative member of a factious group of antiproprietary settlers who were “very averse to all Taxes & support of Government.” Pennsylvania’s low taxes and lack of a militia attracted settlers from neighboring colonies, and Quaker or not, most were loathe to pay Penn his quitrents. The antigovernment sentiments of late seventeenth-century Friends were also well known, and Story put many of their complaints in the mouth of William Rakestraw: “[W]e did not come over here into a wilderness to make a country & then pay Taxes. We have no need of a Government for we can govern our own familys. They who want a Governor let them pay him themselves.”⁶⁹³ Story also rejected Rakestraw’s contention that Friends were responsible for the action of the Crown government during wartime, claiming that the Caesar “to whom Christ paid that Tax was a heathen idolator” and that tyrants like Nero forced Christians to pay “Tributes and customs to war.” English Friends, he went on, “paid taxes to the King to support the war against the Dutch.” If Dutch and English Friends ended up getting killed during the course of the war, that according to Story was the “business of the king and not of subjects.”⁶⁹⁴ In arguing for the Christian obligation to pay taxes, even to “tyrants,” Story failed to acknowledge that the Biblical and English Quaker precedents he cited all assumed a sectarian view of church-state relations, in which Friends were not in government and therefore, according to this logic, not morally responsible for how public funds were used. He did acknowledge, however, that the Assembly paid the £2,000 tax to supply the Canadian expedition with “Bread & flour” so that “we might not offend the Queen & governmt of Great Britain but show our readiness to assist in any way

⁶⁹² [William Rakestraw], *Tribute to Caesar*, 5-6.

⁶⁹³ Story, “Tribute against Caesar,” reprinted in Moore, *Travelling with Thomas Story*, 125.

⁶⁹⁴ Story, “Tribute against Caesar,” reprinted in Moore, *Travelling with Thomas Story*, 126.

we could.” It was a concession that at least tacitly acknowledged the Assembly’s dilemma: how to preserve Quaker sovereignty in Pennsylvania given that, as Story put it, “Friends, could not, upon their principles, raise any men for warr.”⁶⁹⁵

In the end, Story and the ruling Quaker oligarchy had secured a victory. The Quaker war tax debate of the 1710s, such as it was, turned out not to be another Keithian moment. What kept the events of the early 1710s from spiraling into another 1692 was the Quakers’ gradual reassertion of gospel order discipline, which began in the wake of the Keithian schism and culminated with the 1710 proprietary Quaker party’s sweeping victory in the elections. With the mechanisms of gospel order in place, the Quaker-dominated Assembly, working in tandem with public Friends in the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, squelched whatever meager resistance there was to the imperial war levy before it had any chance to turn into serious opposition. Ruling Friends thereby preserved a compromise position that helped keep them in power and forestall, at least for a time, Pennsylvania’s cultural and legal assimilation into the Anglo-Atlantic empire. The motivations behind the war tax resistance hinted at in the Rakestraw-Story debate were complex and not simply attributable to unadulterated Quaker pacifism. As Story was quick to point out, Rakestraw and others like him opposed the war tax because they opposed the regime in power, bore personal grudges against provincial officials, or were simply unwilling to pay any levy, seeing them as unjust impositions on their liberties as settlers. But ruling Friends nevertheless felt compelled to rationalize that the “Queen’s use” formula was in keeping with Friends’ “ancient principles” – even though the traditional justifications of rendering taxes unto Caesar said nothing about a Quaker government collecting wartime taxes –and they dispatched Thomas Story on a preaching tour of Delaware Valley Quaker meetings to ensure full compliance with the levy. Hence, through the application of gospel order discipline, ruling Friends ensured that the “traditional” contours of Quaker pacifism – payment of war taxes, while holding the line on no militia – became normative in Pennsylvania. Friends thus achieved a compromise position that allowed them to answer

⁶⁹⁵ Story, “Tribute against Caesar,” reprinted in Moore, *Travelling with Thomas Story*, 125.

just enough of the imperial war demands while preserving their sovereignty until the Seven Year's War permanently ended the era of Quaker rule in Pennsylvania.

Conclusion

In September 1687, Theodore Eccleston, a prominent London Quaker, wrote to his cousin, James Harrison, in Pennsylvania. In most regards, the letter was like many that English and American Friends wrote to each other from across the Atlantic. Eccleston provided Harrison with the latest news about English Friends, and he also queried about life in Pennsylvania, including asking his cousin whether he had “Just Dealings from ye Indians.” Speculating that a “pair of Breeches of duffels or a Jerkin should greatly please” Native Americans, Eccleston suggested that if his cousin only “bestowed such a Sute on one or two of the chiefs,” it would “be like to make it a fashion.” “If I were a tailor,” he advised Harrison, “I believe I would venture an Experiment.” Besides the subject of Indian fashion trends, Harrison’s cousin in London inquired about another grand experiment, that of the Quaker government in Pennsylvania. His tone was unusually pointed and skeptical, especially given the general optimism of Friends about the colony at the time. What would Harrison and other Pennsylvania Friends do, he wondered, with the “Obstinate” among them? Would Friends then require a “Constable with a Carnall Club & a Staff & watchman &c.[?]” Without answering his own question, Eccleston sounded a pessimistic note. “I fancy People might be Governed very well by friends whom they are fit for friends government,” he wrote to Harrison, “but Where that is I cant tell[.]”⁶⁹⁶

Eccleston’s skepticism was prescient. Despite Penn’s initial optimism and the fervent hopes of the colony’s most ardent supporters, Pennsylvania’s government did not live up to cosmic expectations of many Friends. Within the first decade alone, the ideals of the “founding generation” of Friends began to buckle under the weight of a contentious political atmosphere that pitted pro- and anti-proprietary Friends against each other, and Friends against a rebellious Anglican population in the lower counties of Delaware. Whatever hopes remained for Pennsylvania’s experiment in noncoercive government suffered a serious blow in the wake of the Keithian schism and the colony’s temporary

⁶⁹⁶ Theodore Eccles, from London, to James Harrison, September 10, 1687, Pemberton Papers, 1654-1806, vol. 1, Box 42, f. 25, Etting Collection, HSP.

royalization under Governor Fletcher. Friends won their colony back in the short run, but in the ensuing two decades, they faced unrelenting pressure from Crown officials to bring Pennsylvania's laws and law courts into conformity with British imperial standards. Pennsylvania Friends avoided establishing a militia, to the great consternation of their detractors, but they could ill afford to tolerate dissent within their own ranks on the issue of paying war taxes. When the Governor of New York demanded military assistance from Pennsylvania's neighboring colonies, their political leaders pleaded poverty, just like the Quakers did. But nobody accused Pennsylvania's non-Quaker neighbors of pacifism, a charge that always seemed to carry overtones of treason. Slavery and the colony's provisioning trade with the West Indies was a critical source of Quaker wealth, but Friends worried about importing too many Africans into the colony. A growing number of Friends argued with their wealthy slaveowning counterparts about the morality of keeping slaves in their households, but they remained a minority faction. Even the "long peace" with Pennsylvania's Native allies was deceptive, as westward migrating settlers continued to uproot Indians from the Susquehanna Valley, sowing the seeds of racial conflict that would lead to the Paxton Massacre and the Seven Year's War.

By the early eighteenth century, Friends maintained their hold on provincial government, but Pennsylvania's early idealism seemed to be a fading memory. The institutionalization of slavery in the colony was a harbinger of times to come, as the relative decline in the slave trade at the turn of the eighteenth century would be followed by periods of heavier importation in later decades. Demographic realities outside of slavery also changed the political climate. Friends were already a minority in their own colony by 1700. Over the next two decades, their numbers relative to other settlers would rapidly shrink, as more and more German and Scotch-Irish migrants, many of them indentured servants, poured into the Delaware and Susquehanna Valleys, squeezing out not just Friends, but also the region's Native inhabitants. Though an increasingly affluent, ruling class of Friends managed to convince the colony's propertied, non-Quaker subjects to vote for them in election after election, there was no longer any interest in using the provincial government as an instrument to foster gospel

order.⁶⁹⁷

In 1710, the same year pro-proprietary Friends won the provincial elections by a landslide, Isaac Norris presented his fellow Quakers in Pennsylvania with three scenarios. Faced with the growing numbers of German and Scotch-Irish settlers coming into Pennsylvania, Norris argued, Friends could remain “independent and entirely by ourselves [or] if mixed [i.e., with a non-Quaker population], partial to our own opinion, and not allow liberty to other[s]; [or] to be dissenters in our own country.”⁶⁹⁸ Since the first option was unrealistic, and the third option was wholly undesirable, provincial Friends more or less chose the second option, though by cobbling together enough German and antiproprietary votes to keep them in power. The results were a mixed blessing. By the 1740s, the “Quaker party” in control of the Assembly had secured Friends’ political hegemony in the colony, but Friends grew wealthy and complacent.⁶⁹⁹ Monthly meetings were less willing to enforce strict disciplinary standards. Quaker abolitionism had stalled, and during “King George’s War,” ruling Friends continued to assess war taxes, using the “King’s use” rationalization that by then had become rather a cliché.⁷⁰⁰ Pennsylvania Friends survived the many challenges that had confronted them in the late seventeenth century, but they were a far cry from the sectarian idealism that George Keith envisioned in his “Gospel Order and Discipline Improved” manuscript.

Historians have emphasized a general declension narrative for early eighteenth-century Friends. “The first half of the eighteenth century is not a period to which any religious body in England can look back with satisfaction,” wrote Margaret Hirst.⁷⁰¹ While Hirst was speaking of English Friends, her observation mirrored perfectly Jack Marietta’s assessment of early eighteenth century Quakerism in Pennsylvania. When Marietta called William Rakestraw, the anti-war tax Quaker who published

⁶⁹⁷ On the influx of Scotch Irish and German immigration into Pennsylvania in the early eighteenth century, see Landsmen, *Crossroads of Empire*, 126-134.

⁶⁹⁸ Quotation from Robert Davidson, *War Comes to Quaker Pennsylvania, 1682–1756* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), 23.

⁶⁹⁹ On the Quaker party, see John Zimmerman, “Benjamin Franklin and the Quaker Party, 1755-1756” *WMQ* 17 (July 1960): 292-313; Marietta, *Reformation of American Quakerism*, 134-5.

⁷⁰⁰ Root, *Relations of Pennsylvania*, 287-92.

⁷⁰¹ Hirst, *Quakers in Peace and War*, 177.

Tribute to Caesar in 1712, a “poor apostle for peace,” his benchmark for comparison was not Rakestraw’s Quaker contemporaries but rather the later eighteenth century “Quaker radicals who repeated his arguments in later wars.”⁷⁰² In Rakestraw’s own time, Friends’ religious complacency in Pennsylvania could be attributed to their wealth, political power, and laxity in the marriage discipline. For Marietta, the latter point is especially pertinent. During the early eighteenth century, children of “mixed” parents – in other words, a Quaker and a non-Quaker – were considered Friends regardless of their religious commitments, even when they became adults. This practice sustained the Quaker population at a time when the era of proselytizing and conversions had long ago waned, but it came at the cost of losing much of the religious zeal that seventeenth-century Quaker converts usually brought to their adopted faith.⁷⁰³

Beginning in the 1740s, however, Delaware Valley Friends began scrutinizing their households more rigorously. Many reform ministers and elders in monthly and yearly meetings were concerned about the flood of luxury goods that bedecked the homes and bodies of wealthy Friends, but they also concentrated their hopes on the children of Friends, whom they believed would become the “saving remnant” of a revitalized church.⁷⁰⁴ To that end, they tightened the discipline against exogamous marriages, on the theory that if Friends marry only Friends (with the monthly meeting’s sanction), then the children of such households will more willingly follow the religious discipline that the reformers hoped would gradually revitalize Pennsylvania Quakerism. The revitalization of the marriage discipline marked the beginning of what Marietta calls the Quaker “reformation” era, a period of reform and religious renewal that would continue through American Revolution.

Many different yet related reform efforts followed on the heels of the renewed marriage discipline. Quaker reformers were a diverse group, but they had as a larger goal ridding the Society of Friends of perceived moral corruptions through enhanced religious discipline and a general purging of

⁷⁰² Marietta, “William Rakestraw: Pacifist Pamphleteer,” 57.

⁷⁰³ Marietta, *Reformation of American Quakerism*, 58-64.

⁷⁰⁴ Marietta, *Reformation of American Quakerism*, 73

lukewarm members. Quaker abolitionism was an outgrowth of this effort, but so was the push toward a more aggressive pacifism, as imperial warfare and settler-Indian violence consumed Pennsylvania's western frontier following Braddock's defeat in 1755. The Quaker Assembly, in response, passed the colony's first militia law, and raised the not inconsiderable sum of £50,000 for the defense of the frontier.⁷⁰⁵ The very next year, under great pressure from reformers, six Quaker members of the Pennsylvania Assembly resigned their seats, rather than face disciplinary sanctions from their meetings for their complicity in the war effort. Other Quaker members of the Assembly followed, and those that remained faced greater isolation and pressure from reformers, who by now controlled key ministerial positions within the monthly and yearly meetings in the Delaware Valley. By 1758, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting issued an epistle announcing that Quakers should no longer hold positions "in civil society or government" that compel other Friends to violate their "liberty of conscience" with regard to the peace testimony.⁷⁰⁶

Pennsylvania Friends had long given up on using the provincial government as an instrument of gospel order, but by the time the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting issued its epistle in 1758, Quaker reformers began to turn actively against it. For many Quaker historians, this was a positive development. The "sectarian" turn of mid-eighteenth century Quakerism, historians have argued, was more than just a rejection of their comprised past with state power; it marked the beginning of their embrace of humanitarianism. Sydney James framed this transition as a paradox. In search of religious purity, Friends rejected state power and gradually withdrew from public politics to become just another, albeit the most significant, religious sect in Pennsylvania. Yet by the American Revolution, when the transition to sectarianism had largely been accomplished, Friends found themselves more politically relevant than ever, as they became the leading social reformers of their time, particularly in the realm of abolitionism, making common cause with like-minded religious reformers in other

⁷⁰⁵ Barbour and Frost, *The Quakers*, 124-5.

⁷⁰⁶ Plank, *John Woolman's Path to the Peaceable Kingdom*, 123-4, 147-8.

denominations.⁷⁰⁷ Marietta framed his own work on the Pennsylvania Quaker reformation as a revision of Sydney James's, seeing the Friends' later eighteenth-century embrace of abolitionism and other humanitarian causes not in paradoxical relationship to sectarianism but rather as a logical consequence of their decision to tie religious renewal with a revival in discipline.⁷⁰⁸ In any case, both historians, and many others, have pressed the distinction between what came before the 1740s and what followed it. Private Quaker philanthropists made for better humanitarians than public Quaker politicians.

Yet, as this dissertation suggests, the theme of gospel order, as a discourse on peaceable government, spanned the earlier and later periods of colonial Pennsylvania Quakerism, and the significance of that connection goes far beyond the narrow confines of Quaker historiography. Imperial warfare, and finally the American Revolution, forced Friends from provincial government in Pennsylvania, but Friends did not – and could not – turn from the problems of violence that warfare, slavery, and settler colonialism created. To confront these problems, Friends turned once again to gospel order discipline. Though by the Seven Years War the social and political context had radically shifted since the days of William Penn, many of the problems of violence that Natives, Africans, and Euroamericans confronted in Pennsylvania had as their origins a late-seventeenth century context. Conflicts over land, the alcohol trade, war taxes, imperial warfare, the slave trade, slavery, and conflicts within Quakerism itself were persistent themes interwoven into the very fabric of Pennsylvania's colonial history, from the time of William Penn to the demise of Quaker government in the mid-to-later eighteenth century.

No wonder then, when confronted with their own violence, and the violence of others, Quaker reformers in the mid-eighteenth century turned to the yearly meeting's Books of Discipline to appropriate the older disciplines for their own age. In 1704, when the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting endorsed its first disciplinary book, Friends justified the action on the grounds that “ye Church is ye

⁷⁰⁷ Sydney James, *A People Among Peoples: Quaker Benevolence in Eighteenth-Century America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963).

⁷⁰⁸ Marietta, *Reformation of American Quakerism*, 309, f.36.

body of Christ and that the members thereof should have ye same care one of another that there be no schism in ye body.”⁷⁰⁹ With the Keithian schism still in the not too distant past, the discipline was as backward-looking as forward, with the aim of preventing another George Keith from threatening the provincial Quakers’ imperative of maintaining collective unity. The revised 1719 Book of Discipline outlined a series of queries that included a litany of Friends’ anxieties about the Indian alcohol trade, slavery, and Keithian-style disorders. “It is the Business of the Overseers, or other weighty Friends,” the discipline declared, to deal with those who “write, print, or publish any Books, or writings tending to raise contention,” as well as those who “sell, Barter, or exchange directly or indirectly, to the Indians ... strong Liquors,” as well as prevent Friends from involvement “in the fetching or Importing negro Slaves from their Country or Elsewhere.”⁷¹⁰ The same queries appeared in modified form again in another disciplinary book in 1743, along with the added proviso that Friends should not “deprive the king of his duties.”⁷¹¹ During the Seven Year’s War, when the Quaker reformer and abolitionist John Woolman traveled to Virginia and Rhode Island to visit the yearly meetings there, he brought with him the disciplinary queries that he helped draft just a few years previously for the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting.⁷¹²

By Woolman’s time, the disciplinary emphasis was modified yet again to fit the new circumstances, but the function of the Books of Discipline, as part of gospel order discourse, remained the same. Although Friends slowly yielded up the reins of provincial government, they retained their impulse to discipline, define, and regulate Quaker households against what reformers considered worldly excesses and worldly violence. Gospel order, in other words, remained a discourse on peaceable government, even if by the mid-eighteenth century the concern for governance had shifted to reforming the Society of Friends, and away from the institutions of Pennsylvania government. The

⁷⁰⁹ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 1704 Book of Discipline, PYM Disciplines, Box 1, collection 976, QSCHC.

⁷¹⁰ Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 1719 Book of Discipline (Transcription), FHL.

⁷¹¹ Barbour and Frost, *The Quakers*, 109.

⁷¹² See Planck, *John Woolman*, 69-70.

inquiries contained within the Books of Discipline that reformers used to prod Friends away from the coercive state, however, were rooted in the late-seventeenth-century Quakers' attempt to use the Pennsylvania government as an instrument of peace and moral redemption. Gospel order gave early Pennsylvania a distinctive form of sovereignty. When that died, it gave Friends in the later eighteenth century a distinctive "humanitarian" identity. Both were deeply preoccupied with violence.

CITED LITERATURE

Primary Sources

Manuscript Collections

American Philosophical Society

William Penn Miscellaneous Papers and Documents, 1665-1801, vols. 1-3.

Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College

Concord Quarterly Meeting (men's), minutes (includes Chester Quarterly Meeting minutes), 1684-1813

Keithian Controversy MSS

Philadelphia Monthly Meeting (men's and joint), 1681-1756

Philadelphia Yearly Meeting (men's and joint), 1681-1821

Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Philadelphia County (Pa.) Court proceedings, 1686-1696, vol. 2: Minutes of the Court of Quarter Sessions and the Court of Common Pleas, 1695

Frank M. Etting Collection, 1588-1917

Hazard Family Papers, 1770-1818

James Logan Papers, 1670-1749

Parrish Family Papers, 1614-1874

Pemberton Papers, 1654-1806

Penn Family Papers, 1629-1834

Records of the County Court of Philadelphia, 1685-86

Jonah Thompson Collection, 1683-1854

Quaker & Special Collections Department, Haverford College

Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Disciplines, collection no. 976

Vaux Collection of Correspondence and Documents, Collection no. 1167

Print Collections

Library Company of Philadelphia

The Colonial Laws of Massachusetts ... Containing also, the Body of Liberties of 1641. Boston, 1889.

Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania. Vol. 1. Harrisburg, 1838.

[Keithian Yearly Meeting], *A Confession of Faith In the most Necessary Things of Christian Doctrine, Faith and Practice According to the Testimony of Holy Scriptures, Given Forth from the Yearly Meeting at Burlington.* Philadelphia: 1693.

John Russell Bartlett, ed., *Records of the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence and Providence Plantations, in New England*. Vol. 1. Providence, R.I.: 1856.

Shurtleff, Nathaniel, ed. *Records of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay in New England*. Boston, 1854.

Newberry Library

Besse, Joseph. *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers ... Taken from Original Records and other Authentick Accounts*. Vol. 2. London: L. Hinde, 1753.

Collections of the Protestant Episcopal Historical Society for the Year 1851. New York: 1851.

Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania. Vols. 1-3. Philadelphia, 1851-2.

Philalethes [William Rakestraw], *Tribute to Caesar, How Paid by the Best Christians and to What Some Remarks on the Late Vigorous Expedition to Canada*. [Philadelphia, ca. 1713].

Record of the Courts of Chester County Pennsylvania, 1681-1697. Philadelphia, 1910.

Records of the Courts of Quarter Sessions and Common Pleas of Bucks County Pennsylvania, 1684-1700. Meadville, PA: Tribune Publishing Company, 1943.

Staughton, George, Benjamin Mead, and Thomas McCamant, eds. *Charter to William Penn, and the Laws of the Province of Pennsylvania Passed between the Years 1682 and 1700*. Harrisburg, 1896.

Published Quaker Meeting Minutes

The Minute Book of the Monthly Meeting of the Society of Friends for the Upperside of Buckinghamshire, 1669-1690, vol. 1. Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society, 1937.

Published State Papers

The Acts and Resolves, Public and Private, of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, Vol. 1 (1692-1714). Boston, 1869.

Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series: America and West Indies, 1574-1739. London, 1903.

Published Books, Pamphlets, and Collected Documents

Barclay, Robert. *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity . . .* [Aberdeen?]: 1678.

Boss, Peter, William Bradford, and Thomas Budd. *The Tryals of Peter Boss, George Keith, Thomas Budd, and William Bradford, Quakers ... Before a Court of Quakers at the Sessions Held at Philadelphia ... December 1692, Etc*. London: Richard Baldwin, 1693.

Brodhead, John, et al. *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York: Procured in Holland, England, and France*. Albany: Weed, Parsons, 1853.

- Budd, Thomas. *A Brief Answer to Two Papers Procured from Friends in Maryland, the One Concerning Thomas Budds Favouring John Lynam, &C. The Other Concerning His Owning George Keith's Principples and Doctrines.* [Philadelphia: W. Bradford, 1692]..
- Budd, Thomas. *Good Order Established in Pennsylvania & New-Jersey in America Being a True Account of the Country.* Philadelphia, 1685.
- [Budd, Thomas]. *A True Copy of Three Judgments Given Forth by a Party of Men, Called Quakers at Philadelphia, against George Keith ...* [Philadelphia, 1692].
- Bugg, Francis. *News from Pensilvania, or, a Brief Narrative of Several Remarkable Passages in the Government of the Quakers, in That Province Touching Their Proceedings in Their Pretended Courts of Justice, Their Way of Trade and Commerce: With Remarks and Observations Upon the Whole.* London: Printed, and sold by the Booksellers, 1703.
- Churchman, John. *An Account of the Gospel Labours, and Christian Experiences of a Faithful Minister of Christ, John Churchman.* London, 1780.
- Clarkson, Thomas. *An Essay on the Slavery and Commerce of the Human Species...* London, 1786.
- Cockson, Edward. *Rigid Quakers, Cruel Persecutors...* London, 1705.
- Dickinson, Jonathan. *Gods Protecting Providence: Man's Surest Help and Defence in the Times of the Greatest Difficulty.* Philadelphia, 1699.
- Edmundson, William. *A Journal of the Life, Travel, Sufferings ... of that Worthy Elder and Faithful Servant of Jesus Christ, William Edmundson.* London, 1829.
- Ellwood, Thomas. *A Further Discovery of that Spirit of Contention & Division which Hath Appeared of Late in George Keith ...* London, 1694.
- Ellwood, Thomas. *An Epistle to Friends...* London, 1694.
- Fisher, Thomas. *The Negro's Memorial, or, Abolitionist's Catechism.* London, 1825.
- Fox, George. *A Collection of Many Select and Christian Epistles, Letters and Testimonies.* London, 1698.
- [Fox, George, et al.] *A Declaration from the Harmless & Innocent People of God called Quakers ...* [London, 1660].
- Fox, George. *Gospel Family Order: Being a Short Discourse Concerning the Ordering of Families, Both of Whites, Blacks, and Indians.* London, 1676.
- Franklin, Benjamin. *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin.* Edited by Albert Henry Smythe. Vol. 10. Macmillan Company, 1907.

Gehring, Charles, ed. *New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch*, vols. 20-21, *Delaware Papers: English Period*. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1977.

Hazard's Register of Pennsylvania. Vol. 5. Philadelphia, 1830.

[Keith, George]. *An Appeal from the Twenty Eight Judges: To the Spirit of Truth & True Judgment in All Faithful Friends, Called Quakers ...* Philadelphia, 1692.

Keith, George. *A Plain Short Catechism for Children & Youth: That May Be Serviceable to Such Others Who Need to Be Instructed in the First Principles and Grounds of the Christian Religion*. Philadelphia, 1690.

———. *The Power of the Gospel, in the Conversion of Sinners in a Sermon Preach'd at Annapolis in Maryland*. Annapolis, 1703.

[Keith, George]. *Some Reasons and Causes of the Late Separation That Hath Come to Pass at Philadelphia Betwixt Us ...* Philadelphia, 1692.

Keith, George, and Thomas Budd. *The Plea of the Innocent against the False Judgment of the Guilty Being a Vindication of George Keith and His Friends*. [Philadelphia, 1692].

[Keith, George and the Keithian Monthly Meeting]. *An Exhortation & Caution to Friends Concerning Buying or Keeping of Negroes ...* [New York, 1693].

Keith, George, and Thomas Budd. *The Plea of the Innocent against the False Judgment of the Guilty Being a Vindication of George Keith and His Friends ...* Philadelphia: W. Bradford, 1692.

Keith, George, and Edward Thurston. *The Christian Faith of the People of God Called in Scorn, Quakers in Rhode-Island (Who Are in Unity with All Faithfull Brethren of the Same Profession in All Parts of the World) Vindicated from the Calumnies of Christian Lodowick*. Philadelphia, 1692.

Leeds, Daniel. *The Great Mystery of Fox-craft Discovered ...* New York, 1705.

[Loddington, William]. *Plantation Work the Work of This Generation Written in True-Love to All Such as Are Weightily Inclined to Transplant Themselves and Families to Any of the English Plantations in America*. London, 1682.

[London Yearly Meeting]. *Epistles from the Yearly Meeting of the People Called Quakers, Held in London to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings in Great Britain, Ireland, and Elsewhere: From the Year 1675 to 1759...* London, 1760.

Mather, Cotton. *A Good Master Well Served*. Boston, 1696.

Mather, Cotton. *Rules for the Society of Negroes, 1693*. Boston, 1714.

Meyers, Albert Cook, ed. *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania, West New Jersey and Delaware, 1630–1707*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1912.

[Norris, Isaac]. *Friendly Advice to the Inhabitants of Pensilvania*. Philadelphia, 1710.

One Wonder More, Added to the Seven Wonders of the World, Verified in the Person of George Keith ... [London, ca. 1701].

Penn, William. *An Account of W. Penn's Travails in Holland and Germany*. London, 1694.

———. *A Brief Examination and State of Liberty Spiritual...* London, 1681.

———. *An Essay Towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1983; originally published 1693.

———. *The Papers of William Penn*. Edited by Mary Maples Dunn and Richard S. Dunn. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.

———. *Some Account of the Province of Pennsylvania in America; Lately Granted under the Great Seal of England to William Penn ...* London, 1681.

Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. *The Christianity of the People Commonly Called Quakers, Asserted by Them, Against the Unjust Charge of Their Being No Christians*. Philadelphia, 1690.

———. *A Loving Exhortation to Friends ...* Philadelphia, 1689.

Pusey, Caleb. *A Modest Account from Pensylvania of the Principal Differences in Point of Doctrine, between George Keith, and Those of the People Called Quakers ...* London, 1696.

———. *Satan's Harbinger Encountered ...* Philadelphia, 1700.

[Rakestraw, William]. *Tribute to Caesar ...* Philadelphia, [ca. 1713].

Rush, Benjamin. *An Address to the Inhabitants of the British settlements in America, upon Slave-Keeping...* Philadelphia, 1773.

Sewel, William. *The History of the Rise, Increase, and Progress of the People called Quakers...* London, 1722.

Story, Thomas. *A Journal of the Life of Thomas Story ...* Newcastle, 1747.

Thompson, Charles. *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Alienation of the Delaware...* 1759.

Tryon, Thomas. *The Planter's Speech to His Neighbors & Country-Men of Pennsylvania, East and West Jersey*. London, 1684.

Voltaire. *Philosophical Letters: Letters Concerning the English Nation*. Edited and translated by Ernest Dilworth. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2003.

Votes and Proceedings of the House of Representatives of the province of Pennsylvania. Volume 1. Philadelphia, 1752.

Willard, Sam. *A Compleat Body of Divinity*. Boston, 1726.

Woolman, John. *Some Considerations on the Keeping of Negroes*. Philadelphia, 1753.

Secondary Sources

Books

Amussen, Susan Dwyer. *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England*. Oxford, UK; New York, NY, USA: B. Blackwell, 1988.

Anderson, Fred, and Andrew Cayton, R. L. *The Dominion of War: Empire and Liberty in North America, 1500-2000*. New York: Viking, 2005.

Barbour, Hugh, and William J. Frost. *The Quakers*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1988.

Bauman, Richard. *Let Your Words Be Few: Symbolism of Speaking and Silence among Seventeenth-Century Quakers*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Benton, Lauren A. *A Search for Sovereignty: Law and Geography in European Empires, 1400-1900*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Bergman, Peter M. et al. *The Negro in the Congressional Record, 1789-1801*. Vol. 2. New York: Bergman Publishers, 1969.

Block, Kristen. *Ordinary Lives in the Early Caribbean: Religion, Colonial Competition, and the Politics of Profit*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012.

Block, Sharon. *Rape and Sexual Power in Early America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Braithwaite, William. *The Beginnings of Quakerism*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1912.

———. *The Second Period of Quakerism*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1919.

Brandow, James C. *Omitted Chapters from Hotten's Original Lists of Persons of Quality*. Baltimore, 1982.

Bremer, Francis. *John Winthrop: America's Forgotten Founding Father*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Brewer, John. *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783*. London: U. Hyman, 1989.

Brock, Peter. *The Quaker Peace Testimony: 1660-1914*. York: Sessions Book Trust, 1990.

Bronner, Edwin. *William Penn's "Holy Experiment": The Founding of Pennsylvania, 1681-1701*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.

Brown, Kathleen. *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

- Burchill, Graham, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller. *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality with Two Lectures by and an Interview with Michel Foucault*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.
- Butler, Jon. *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Butler, Jon. *Becoming America: The Revolution Before 1776*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Calvert, Jane E. *Quaker Constitutionalism and the Political Thought of John Dickinson*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Capp, Bernard. *Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism*. London: Faber, 1972.
- Carey, Brycchan. *From Peace to Freedom: Quaker Rhetoric and the Birth of American Antislavery, 1657-1761*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- Carpenter, Edward, and Louis Henry Carpenter. *Samuel Carpenter and His Descendants*. Philadelphia, 1912.
- Cheesman, Herrick. *White Servitude in Pennsylvania: Indentured and Redemption Labor in Colony and Commonwealth*. New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969.
- Chet, Guy. *Conquering the American Wilderness: The Triumph of European Warfare in the Colonial Northeast*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003.
- Curtin, Philip. *The Rise and Fall of the Plantation Complex: Essays in Atlantic History*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Damrosch, Leopold. *The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus: James Nayler and the Puritan Crackdown on the Free Spirit*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Davidson, Robert. *War Comes to Quaker Pennsylvania, 1682-1756*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.
- Davis, David Brion. *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Dorwart, Jeffery. *Invasion and Insurrection: Security, Defense, and War in the Delaware Valley, 1621-1815*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008.
- Dunn, Mary Maples. *William Penn: Politics and Conscience*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1967.
- Dunn, Richard, S. *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1642-1713*. Williamsburg, Virg.: University of North Carolina Press, 1973.

- Endy, Melvin, B. *William Penn and Early Quakerism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1973.
- Fischer, David Hackett. *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Foucault, Michel. *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the College de France 1975-76*. London: Penguin Books, 2004.
- Frost, J. William, ed. *The Keithian Controversy in Early Pennsylvania*. Norwood, Pa.: Norwood Editions, 1980.
- . *A Perfect Freedom: Religious Liberty in Pennsylvania*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990.
- , ed. *The Quaker Origins of Antislavery*. Norwood, Pa.: Norwood Editions, 1980.
- . *William Penn's Experiment in the Wilderness: Promise and Legend*. Philadelphia, 1983.
- Glasson, Travis. *Mastering Christianity: Missionary Anglicanism and Slavery in the Atlantic World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Gough, Deborah. *Christ Church, Philadelphia: The Nation's Church in a Changing City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.
- Gragg, Larry. *The Quaker Community on Barbados: Challenging the Culture of the Planter Class*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2009.
- Greene, Lorenzo. *The Negro in Colonial New England*. New York: Atheneum, 1968.
- Haefeli, Evan, and Kevin Sweeney. *Captors and Captives: The 1704 French and Indian Raid on Deerfield*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003.
- Hall, David. *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England*. Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Harris, Tim. *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685*. London: Penguin Books, 2006.
- Hatfield, April Lee. *Atlantic Virginia: Intercolonial Relations in the Seventeenth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Hill, Christopher. *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries*. New York: Viking, 1984.
- Hinderaker, Eric. *Elusive Empires: Constructing Colonialism in the Ohio Valley, 1673-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Hinshaw, William Wade, ed. *Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy*. Vol. 2. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Edwards Brothers, 1936.

- Hirst, Margaret. *Quakers in Peace and War*. London: The Swarthmore Press Ltd., [1923].
- Horle, Craig W. *The Quakers and the English Legal System, 1660-1688*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.
- Horle, Craig et al., eds. *Lawmaking and Legislators in Pennsylvania: A Biographical Dictionary*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.
- Hull, William. *William Penn and the Dutch Quaker Migration to Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: Patterson & White Co., 1935.
- Hutton, Ronald. *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Illick, Joseph. *William Penn the Politician: His Relations with the English Government*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965.
- Ingle, H. Larry. *First among Friends: George Fox and the Creation of Quakerism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Jackson, Maurice. *Let This Voice Be Heard: Anthony Benezet, Father of Atlantic Abolitionism*. Philadelphia; Bristol: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- James, Sydney. *A People among Peoples: Quaker Benevolence in Eighteenth-Century America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Jennings, Francis. *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Iroquois and with English Colonies from Its Beginnings to the Lancaster Treaty of 1744*. New York: Norton, 1984.
- Jones, Rufus M., Isaac Sharpless, and Amelia M. Gummere. *The Quakers in the American Colonies*. London: Macmillan Press, 1911.
- Kelley, Joseph. *Pennsylvania: The Colonial Years, 1681-1776*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980.
- Kent, Barry. *Susquehanna's Indians*. Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1984.
- Kent, Donald, ed. *Pennsylvania and Delaware Indian Treaties, 1629-1737*. Vol. 1, *Early American Indian Documents: Treaties and Laws, 1607-1789*, edited by Alden Vaughan. Washington, DC: University Publications of America, 1983.
- Kirby, Ethyn. *George Keith (1638-1716)*. New York, London: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1942.
- Kloos, John M. *A Sense of Deity: The Republican Spirituality of Dr. Benjamin Rush*. Brooklyn, NY: Carlson Pub, 1991.
- Kunze, Bonnelyn. *Margaret Fell and the Rise of Quakerism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press,

1994.

- Landsman, Ned, C. *Crossroads of Empire: The Middle Colonies in British North America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010.
- Larson, Rebecca. *Daughters of Light: Quaker Women Preaching and Prophesying in the Colonies and Abroad, 1700-1775*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Learned, Marion Dexter. *The Life of Francis Daniel Pastorius: The Founder of Germantown*. Philadelphia: W.J. Campbell, 1908.
- Lemon, James T. *The Best Poor Man's Country: A Geographical Study of Early Southeastern Pennsylvania*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1976.
- Lepore, Jill. *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity*. New York, Knopf, 1998.
- Levy, Barry. *Quakers and the American Family: British Settlement in the Delaware Valley*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Linebaugh, Peter, and Marcus Rediker. *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2000.
- McCusker, John. *Rum and the American Revolution: The Rum Trade and the Balance of Payments of the Thirteen Colonies*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1989.
- Mack, Phyllis. *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Mancall, Peter. *Deadly Medicine: Indians and Alcohol in Early America*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Marietta, Jack, D. *The Reformation of American Quakerism 1748-1783*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984.
- Marietta, Jack D., and G. S. Rowe. *Troubled Experiment: Crime and Justice in Pennsylvania, 1682-1800*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Merrell, James. *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier*. New York: Norton, 1999.
- Michener, Ezra. *A Retrospect of Early Quakerism*. Philadelphia, 1860.
- Mintz, Sidney Wilfred. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Penguin Books, 1985.
- Mintz, Sidney Wilfred, and Richard Price. *The Birth of African-American Culture: An Anthropological Perspective*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1992.

- Moody, Robert. *The Saltonstall Papers, 1607-1815*. Vol. 80. Massachusetts Historical Society, 1972.
- Moore, Emily. *Travelling with Thomas Story: The Life and Travels of an Eighteenth-Century Quaker*. Letchworth, England: 1947.
- Moore, Rosemary, Anne. *The Light in Their Consciences: Early Quakers in Britain, 1646-1666*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000.
- Moretta, John. *William Penn and the Quaker Legacy*. New York: Pearson Longman, 2007.
- Murphy, Andrew, R. *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003.
- Nash, Gary B. *Forging Freedom: The Formation of Philadelphia's Black Community, 1720-1840*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- . *Quakers and Politics; Pennsylvania, 1681-1726*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- . *The Urban Crucible: Social Change, Political Consciousness, and the Origins of the American Revolution*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Nash, Gary B. and Jean R. Soderlund. *Freedom by Degrees: Emancipation in Pennsylvania and Its Aftermath*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Offutt, William, M. *Of "Good Laws" and "Good Men": Law and Society in the Delaware Valley, 1680-1710*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995.
- Peckham, Howard. *The Colonial Wars: 1689-1762*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Pencak, William, and Daniel K. Richter. *Friends and Enemies in Penn's Woods: Indians, Colonists, and the Racial Construction of Pennsylvania*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004.
- Penn, Granville. *Memorials of the Professional Life and Times of Sir William Penn*. 2 vols. London, 1833.
- Pestana, Carla. *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640-1661*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Plank, Geoffrey Gilbert. *John Woolman's Path to the Peaceable Kingdom: A Quaker in the British Empire*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
- Pomfret, John, E. *Colonial New Jersey: A History*. New York: Scribner, 1973.
- . *The Province of West New Jersey, 1609-1702: A History of the Origins of an American Colony*. Octagon Books, 1976.
- Proud, Robert. *A History of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia, 1797.

- Jenny Hale Pulsipher, *Subjects Unto the Same King : Indians, English, and the Contest for Authority in Colonial New England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.
- Reay, Barry. *The Quakers and the English Revolution*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.
- Richter, Daniel. *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Ritchie, Robert. *Captain Kidd and the War Against the Pirates*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Roach, Hannah. *Colonial Philadelphians*. Philadelphia: Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania, 1999.
- Root, Winfred. *The Relations of Pennsylvania with the British Government, 1696-1765*. 1912. Reprint, New York: Burt Franklin, 1970.
- Rowe, G.S. *Embattled Bench: The Pennsylvania Supreme Court and the Forging of a Democratic Society, 1684-1809*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994.
- Salinger, Sharon. *Taverns and Drinking in Early America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- Schutt, Amy. *Peoples of the River Valleys: The Odyssey of the Delaware Indians*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Schwoerer, Lois. *No Standing Armies!: The Antiarmy Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England*. Baltimore, 1974.
- Sharpless, Isaac. *A Quaker Experiment in Government; History of Quaker Government in Pennsylvania, 1682-1783*. Philadelphia: Ferris & Leach, 1902.
- Shepherd, William. *History of Proprietary Government in Pennsylvania*. New York: Columbia University, 1896.
- Sheppard, Walter Lee, ed. *Passengers and Ships Prior to 1684*. Publications of the Welcome Society of Pennsylvania, no. 1. Welcome Society of Pennsylvania, 1985.
- Silver, Peter. *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2008.
- Silverman, Kenneth. *The Life and Times of Cotton Mather*. New York: Harper & Rowe, 1984.
- Smith, Simon. *Slavery, Family, and Gentry Capitalism in the British Atlantic: the World of the Lascelles, 1648-1834*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Smolenski, John. *Friends and Strangers: The Making of Creole Culture in Colonial Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.
- Smolenski, John, and Thomas J. Humphrey. *New World Orders: Violence, Sanction, and Authority in the Colonial Americas*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

- Soderlund, Jean R. *Quakers and Slavery: A Divided Spirit*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- , ed. *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania: A Documentary History*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.
- Steele, Ian K. *Politics of Colonial Policy: The Board of Trade in Colonial Administration*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Thompson, Peter. *Rum Punch & Revolution: Taverngoing & Public Life in Eighteenth Century Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
- Thornton, John. *Africa and Africans in the Making of the Atlantic World, 1400-1800*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Tolles, Frederick, B. *Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia 1682-1783*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948.
- Towner, Lawrence. *A Good Master Well Served: Masters and Servants in Colonial Massachusetts, 1620-1750*. New York; London: Garland Publishing, 1998.
- Tully, Alan. *Forming American Politics: Ideals, Interests, and Institutions in Colonial New York and Pennsylvania*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Turner, Edward Raymond. *The Negro in Pennsylvania: Slavery—Servitude—Freedom, 1639-1861*. Washington: The American Historical Association, 1911.
- Underwood, Ted. *Primitivism, Radicalism, and the Lamb's War: The Baptist-Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Daniel Usner, *Indians, Settlers, and Slaves in a Frontier Exchange Economy: The Lower Mississippi Valley Before 1783*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Watring, Anna M. *Early Quaker Records of Philadelphia*. Vol. 1. Westminster: Family Line Publications, 1997.
- Watson, John. *Annals of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania in the Olden Time*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia, 1887.
- Weddle, Meredith Baldwin. *Walking in the Way of Peace: Quaker Pacifism in the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region*. 20th anniversary ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Worrall, Arthur. *Quakers in the Colonial Northeast*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1980.
- Yirush, Craig. *Settlers, Liberty, and Empire: The Roots of Early American Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Articles and Book Chapters

- Bourdieu, Pierre. "Gender and Symbolic Violence." In *Violence in War and Peace: An Anthology*, eds., N. Scheper-Hughes & P. Bourgois, 339-42. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Bronner, Edwin. "Quaker Landmarks in Early Philadelphia." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 43 (1953): 210-216.
- Brophy, Alfred L. "Ingenium est Fateri per quos profeceris': Francis Daniel Pastorius' *Young Country Clerk's Collection* and Anglo-American Legal Literature, 1680-1720." *University of Chicago Law School Roundtable* 3 (1996): 637-742.
- . "The Intellectual World of a Seventeenth-Century Jurist: Francis Daniel Pastorius and the Reconstruction of Pietist Thought." In *German? American? Literature?: New Directions in German-American Studies*, edited by Winfried Fluck and Werner Sollers. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2002.
- Butler, Jon. "'Gospel Order Improved': The Keithian Schism and the Exercise of Quaker Ministerial Order in Pennsylvania." *William and Mary Quarterly* 31 (1974): 431-52.
- . "Into Pennsylvania's Spiritual Abyss: The Rise and Fall of the Later Keithians, 1693–1703." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 101 (1977): 151-70.
- Carroll, Kenneth. "William Southeby, Early Quaker Antislavery Writer." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 89 (1965): 416-27.
- Chamberlain, J. S. "Keith, George (1638?–1716)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Cole, Alan. "The Quakers and the English Revolution." *Past and Present* 10 (1956): 39-54.
- Cover, Robert. "Violence and the Word." *Yale Law Journal* 95 (July 1986): 1601-29.
- Donoghue, John. "'Out of the Lands of Bondage': The English Revolution and the Atlantic Origins of Abolition." *The American Historical Review* 115, no. 4 (2010): 943-74.
- Dunn, Mary Maples. "The Personality of William Penn." In *The World of William Penn*, edited by Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, 3-14. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.
- Dunn, Randy. "Francis Nicholson's Empire." In *English Atlantics Revisited: Essays Honouring Ian K. Steel*, edited by Nancy Rhoden, L, 59-80. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007.
- Dunn, Richard S. "The Glorious Revolution and America." In *The Oxford History of the British Empire. Vol. 1: The Origins of Empire*, edited by William Lewis, 445-66. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- . "William Penn and the Selling of Pennsylvania, 1681-1685." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 127, no. 5 (1983): 322-29.

- Fisher, Elizabeth. "Prophecies and Revelations': German Cabbalists in Early Pennsylvania." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 109 (July 1985): 299-333.
- Fisher, Joshua. "Some Account of the Early Poets and Poetry of Pennsylvania." In *Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania*. Vol. 2. Philadelphia, 1827.
- Fitzroy, Herbert. "The Punishment of Crime in Provincial Pennsylvania." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 60 (1936): 242-69.
- Frost, J. William. "George Fox's Ambiguous Anti-Slavery Legacy." In *New Light on George Fox, 1624-1691*, edited by Michael Mullett, 69-88. York, England: William Sessions, 1994.
- . "Pennsylvania Institutes Religious Liberty, 1682-1860." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (July 1998): 323-47.
- . "Religious Liberty in Early Pennsylvania." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (October 1981): 419-51.
- . "William Penn's Experiment in the Wilderness: Promise and Legend." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (October 1983): 577-605.
- Games, Alison. "Atlantic History: Definitions, Challenges, and Opportunities." *The American Historical Review* 111 (2006): 741-57.
- Gerbner, Katharine. "The Ultimate Sin: Christianising Slaves in Barbados in the Seventeenth Century." *Slavery & Abolition* 31 (March 2010): 57-73.
- . "We Are Against the Traffik of Men-Body: The Germantown Quaker Protest of 1688 and the Origins of American Abolitionism." *Pennsylvania History* 74, no. 2 (Spring 2007): 149-72.
- Gibson, Lawrence Henry. "The Criminal Codes of Pennsylvania: The Laws of the Duke of York, the Laws of Chester (1682), the Code of 1701, the Law of 1718." *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology* 6 (September 1915): 323-44.
- Gillingham, Harold. "The Estate of Jonathan Dickinson, 1663-1722." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 59 (October 1935): 420-29.
- Jennings, Francis. "Brother Miquon: Good Lord!" In *The World of William Penn*, edited by Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, 195-214. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.
- . "The Indian Trade of the Susquehanna Valley." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 110 (1966): 406-24.
- . "'Pennsylvania Indians' and the Iroquois." In *Beyond the Covenant Chain: The Iroquois and Their Neighbors in Indian North America, 1600-1800*, edited by Daniel Richter and James Merrell, 75-91. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003.
- Kane, Hope Francis. "Notes on Early Pennsylvania Promotion Literature." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 63 (April 1939): 144-168.

- Key, Newton. "Clarendon Code." In *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603-1689*, edited by Ronald H. Fritze and William Baxter Robison, 98-99. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1996.
- Klepp, Susan E. "Seasoning and Society: Racial Differences in Mortality in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia." *William and Mary Quarterly* 51, no. 3, Third Series (July 1994): 473-506.
- Lenman, Bruce. "Colonial Wars and Imperial Instability, 1688-1793." In *The Oxford History of the British Empire. Vol. 2, the Eighteenth Century*, edited by P.J. Marshall, 151-68. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Lermack, Paul. "Peace Bonds and Criminal Justice in Colonial PA." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 100 (1976): 173-190.
- Marietta, Jack. "'The Things That Make for Peace': The Context of Pacifism in Quaker Pennsylvania." In *The Pacifist Impulse in Historical Perspective*, edited by Harvey L. Dyck, 159-81. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- . "William Rakestraw: Pacifist Pamphleteer and Party Servant." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (January 1974): 53-57.
- McCusker, John. "Colonial Statistics," in *Historical Statistics of the United States. Vol. 5. Millennial edition*, ed. Susan B. Carter, V, 627-772. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Merritt, Jane T. "The Long Peace in Pennsylvania." *History Compass* 2 (2004), 1-4.
- Miller, John. "'A Suffering People': English Quakers and Their Neighbours c. 1650-c. 1700." *Past and Present*, no. 188 (2005): 71-103.
- Nash, Gary. "The Early Merchants of Philadelphia." In *The World of William Penn*, edited by Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, 337-62. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.
- . "The Quest for the Susquehanna Valley: New York, Pennsylvania, and the Seventeenth-Century Fur Trade." *New York History* 48 (January 1967): 3-27.
- . "Slaves and Slaveowners in Colonial Philadelphia." *William and Mary Quarterly* 30, no. 2, Third Series (April 1973): 223-56.
- Neal, Andrew W. "Cutting Off the King's Head: Foucault's Society Must Be Defended and the Problem of Sovereignty." *Alternatives*. 29, no. 4 (2004): 373-98.
- Parmenter, John. "After the Mourning Wars: The Iroquois as Allies in Colonial North American Campaigns, 1676-1760." *William and Mary Quarterly* 64 (January 2007): 39-76.
- Peterson, Mark A. "The Selling of Joseph: Bostonians, Antislavery, and the Protestant International, 1689-1733." *The Massachusetts Historical Review* 4 (2002): 1-22.
- Quintero, Gilbert. "Making the Indian: Colonial Knowledge, Alcohol, and Native Americans." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 25 (2001): 57-71.

- Reay, Barry. "The Quakers, 1659, and the Restoration of the Monarchy." *History* 63 (1978): 193-215.
- Richter, Daniel K. "Whose Indian History?" *The William and Mary Quarterly* 50, no. 2 (1993): 379-93.
- Richter, Daniel K. and William A. Pencak. "Introduction." In Pencak and Richter, eds., *Friends and Enemies*, ix-xxi.
- Roach, Hannah Benner. "The Pennsylvania Militia in 1777." *The Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine* 23 (1964): 161-230.
- Robbins, Caroline. "Laws and Governments proposed for West New Jersey and Pennsylvania, 1676-1683." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (October 1981): 373-92.
- Rosenberg, Philippe. "Thomas Tryon and the Seventeenth-Century Dimensions of Antislavery." *William and Mary Quarterly* 61, no. 4 (2004): 609-42.
- Rowe, G. S., and Jack D. Marietta. "Domestic Violence in a 'Peaceable Kingdom': Pennsylvania, 1682-1801." In *Over the Threshold: Intimate Violence in Early America*, edited by Christine Daniels and Michael V. Kennedy, 22-44. New York: New York University Press, 1999.
- Shy, John. "Armed Force in Colonial North America." In *Against All Enemies: Interpretations of American Military History from Colonial Times to the Present*, edited by Kenneth J. Hagan and William R. Roberts, 3-20. Westport, Conn., 1986.
- Smolenski, John. "The Death of Sawantaeny and the Problem of Justice on the Frontier." In Pencak and Richter, eds., *Friends and Enemies*, 104-128.
- Solt, Leo F. "The Fifth Monarchy Men: Politics and the Millennium." *Church History* 30 (September 1961): 314-24.
- Spady, James O'Neil. "Colonialism and the Discursive Antecedents of *Penn's Treaty with the Indians*." In Pencak and Richter, eds., *Friends and Enemies*, 18-40.
- Stanwood, Owen. "The Protestant Moment: Antipopery, the Revolution of 1688-1689, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire." *Journal of British Studies* 46 (July 2007): 481-508.
- Steele, Ian K. "The Anointed, the Appointed, and the Elected Governance of the British Empire, 1689-1784." In *The Oxford History of the British Empire. Vol. 2, the Eighteenth Century*, edited by P.J. Marshall, 105-27. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- . "The Board of Trade, The Quakers, and Resumption of Colonial Charters, 1699-1702." *William and Mary Quarterly* 23 (October 1966): 596-619.
- Sugrue, Thomas. "The Peopling and Depeopling of Early Pennsylvania: Indians and Colonists, 1680-1720." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 116 (January 1992): 3-31.
- Vann, Richard T. "Quakerism: Made in America?" In *The World of William Penn*, edited by Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, 157-70. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

- Von Frank, Albert J. "John Saffin: Slavery and Racism in Colonial Massachusetts." *Early American Literature* 29 (1994): 254-72.
- Wax, Darold. "Quaker Merchants and the Slave Trade in Colonial Pennsylvania." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 86 (April 1962): 143-59.
- Webb, Stephen Saunders. "'The Peaceable Kingdom:' Quaker Pennsylvania in the Stuart Empire." In *The World of William Penn*, edited by Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, 173-94. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.
- Weber, Max. "Politics as Vocation." In *Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, edited by Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills, 77-128. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Wellenreuther, Hermann. "The Political Dilemma of the Quakers in Pennsylvania, 1681-1748." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 94, no. 2 (1970): 135-72.
- Williams, Lorraine E. "Indians and Europeans in the Delaware Valley, 1620-1655." In *New Sweden in America*, edited by Carol E. Hoffecker, 112-20. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1995.
- Zimmerman, John. "Benjamin Franklin and the Quaker Party, 1755-1756." *William and Mary Quarterly* 17 (July 1960): 292-313.
- Zuckerman, Michael. "The Fabrication of Identity in Early America." In *Almost Chosen People: Oblique Biographies in the American Grain*, edited by Michael Zuckerman, 21-54. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Michael J. Goode

Department of History (M/C 198)
 University of Illinois at Chicago
 601 South Morgan Street
 Chicago, IL 60607-7109

Education

PhD Candidate, University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), 2006-present

Concentration: Early America and Atlantic World

Dissertation: "Gospel Order among Friends: Colonial Violence and the Peace Testimony in Quaker Pennsylvania, 1681-1720"

Expected Completion: July 2012

Thesis Committee: James Sack (Chair), Corey Capers, James Searing, John Smolenski, (UC Davis) Robert Bucholz (Loyola University Chicago), John Donoghue (Loyola University Chicago)

Goshen College, 1996

B.A. in Business Administration, Minor in History

Fellowships and Awards

- Graduate Scholar in Residence, Newberry Library, Chicago, 2011-2012
- Dean's Scholar Award, UIC, 2011-2012
- Friends of the MCEAS Dissertation Fellow, McNeil Center for Early American Studies, University of Pennsylvania, 2010-2011
- The Library Company and Historical Society of Pennsylvania Residential Fellowship, August 2009
- Walter L. Arnstein Prize, Best Graduate Student Paper, Midwest Conference on British Studies Conference, University of Pittsburgh, 2009
- Deena Allen Memorial Fellowship, John B. and Theta H. Wolf Fellowship, Department of History, UIC, 2009
- Bentley Brinkerhoff Gilbert Endowed Fellowship, Department of History, UIC, 2008 and 2009
- Moore Fellowship, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, 2008

Publications and Working Papers

- "‘Merchants of Babylon:’ Millennialism and Protestant Antislavery in America, 1640-1740," *Building the Atlantic Empires: Unfree Labor, the Imperial State, and the Rise of the Global Economy, ca. 1500-1945*, eds. John Donoghue and Evelyn Jennings (Leiden: Brill Publishers, Global Social History Series, Forthcoming, 2013)
- "Husbands from Wives, Children from Parents: Gospel Order and Antislavery in Colonial Pennsylvania" (in preparation for publication)

Selected Conference Presentations

- “Dangerous Spirits: Alcohol, Native Revivalism, and Quaker Reform,” The War Called Pontiac’s Conference, McNeil Center for Early American Studies, University of Pennsylvania, scheduled for April 2013
- “American Slavery, British Freedom: The Glorious Revolution, the Rhetoric of Liberty, and the Slave Trade,” Midwest Conference on British Studies, University of Toronto, scheduled for October 2012
- “‘Filthy Lucre’: Indians, Alcohol, and Violence in Early Quaker Pennsylvania, 1682-1722,” McNeil Center for Early American Studies, University of Pennsylvania, March 2012
- “‘We Shall Not Be Dipt in Blood’: The Quaker Peace Testimony in Pennsylvania and Colonial Violence on the Margins of Empire, 1680–1720,” American Studies Association Conference, Baltimore, October 2011
- “‘Our new British Canaan’: Quaker Gospel Order and Colonial Violence in Pennsylvania, 1680-1720,” Society of Early Americanists, Seventh Biennial Conference, Philadelphia, March 2011
- “Antislavery and the Apocalypse: Anglo-American Protestant Millennialism and the Rise of Unfree Labor in the Atlantic,” Unfree Labor, the State, and the Rise of Global Capitalism Conference, Loyola University Chicago, June 2010
- “An Exhortation among Friends: The Problem of Slavery in Early Quaker Pennsylvania,” Newberry Library Seminar in Early American History and Culture, Newberry Library, Chicago, February 2010
- “Merchants of Babylon: Anglo-American Protestant Millennialism and the Transatlantic Slave Trade,” Midwest Conference on British Studies, University of Pittsburgh, October 2009
- “George Keith and the Peaceable Kingdom, 1690-1696,” British Group in Early American History, University of Manchester, United Kingdom, September 2008

Professional and Teaching Experience

Assistant to the University Archivist, Richard J. Daley Library, UIC, 2008-2010

Curated online and public exhibits on Chicago history, processed collections, and accessioned archives

Teaching Assistant, Department of History, UIC, 2004-2008

Taught two weekly undergraduate sections (averaging 25 students each) in Western Civilization from 1648 (including colonial North America) and in American History from 1877

Teaching Competencies: Early America, Atlantic World, World History, Early Modern Britain, Slavery, Colonialism and Empire, Settler-Indian Encounters, Religion and Political Culture, Peace Studies, and Violence

Invited Lectures (Selected)

Newberry Library, Chicago, August 2012

“Intimate Violence in Early America,” Wednesday History Colloquium

Millersville University, Millersville, Pennsylvania, April 2011

“Peace and Violence on the Colonial Borderlands of Seventeenth-Century Pennsylvania,” presented before a combined class of graduate and undergraduate students

Elfreth's Alley Museum, Philadelphia, March 2011

“The Struggle for Power and Authority in Seventeenth-Century Philadelphia”

University of Illinois at Chicago, Spring 2010

“Puritans and Quakers in Seventeenth-Century England and America,” presented before a 200-level undergraduate course on the history of punishment in colonial America and the early republic

Service

- Graduate Student Mentor, McNeil Center 3rd Annual Undergraduate Research Workshop, University of Pennsylvania, Spring 2011
- Commentator, “Europe and the New World” panel, Loyola University Chicago Graduate Student Conference, April 2010
- Commentator, “Morality, Persuasion, and Power” panel, UIC Graduate Student Conference, April 2010
- Organizing Committee, UIC Interdisciplinary Graduate Student Conference on Peace and War, 2009-2010
- Co-Curator, UIC Daley Library Exhibit on Athletics, 2009

Professional Affiliations

American Historical Association

American Studies Association

Society of Early Americanists

North American Conference on British Studies