

“to assert our Right before it be quite lost”: The Leisler Rebellion in the Delaware River Valley

David William Voorhees
New York University

On April 10, 1690, England's Lords of Trade and Plantations commanded Pennsylvania proprietor William Penn, who had returned to England in 1684, to “attend them on the 17th of the month” and address a series of charges received from *de facto* New York Governor Jacob Leisler. Leisler accused Penn's New World Quaker government of refusing to declare for England's new Protestant monarchs, William and Mary, while aiding and abetting the American interests of the exiled Roman Catholic King James II. As one of King James's closest friends, Penn had been arrested soon after William's December, 1688, entrance into London. Released on bail, he was in the intervening year rearrested and released twice more, and remained under heavy surveillance for his friendship with the former king.¹

At the same time that the Lords were reviewing Penn's actions, they were determining how to treat Jacob Leisler. Leisler had assumed the New York government after that province's militia rebelled against King James in May, 1689. The subsequent flight of James's New York Lieutenant Governor, Francis Nicholson, left the province in a political vacuum and, while awaiting instructions from the new king, a provincial convention composed of delegates from various counties had elevated Leisler to the role of interim governor. Leisler thereupon implemented a program that in late-twentieth-century America seems distinctly modern: a return to the traditional values of “true Christianity” (that is, orthodox Calvinism), abolition of monopolies and special privileges, no taxation without representation, and devolution of governmental authority to local communities.²

Leisler bitterly polarized Americans. Though historians usually treat him as a uniquely New York personality, contemporary commentators reveal that he had wide impact from New England to the Chesapeake. In 1692 Connecticut justice Gershom Bulkeley identified that colony's political split into Leislerian and anti-Leislerian camps; seventy years later Massachusetts Governor Thomas Hutchinson wrote that New England events after 1691 were “prejudiced” by the party legacy that Leisler left.³ Early national historians saw in Leisler the impetus behind the development of an American political ideology independent of Europe. As William Dunlap wrote in 1839, “We see in that party of which Leisler was the head, the germ of our present democratic representative government.”⁴

Historians, nonetheless, are mostly silent on Leisler's impact in the Delaware River Valley. Noted astronomer Dr. Annie Jump Cannon presented in 1892 a paper tracing the state of Delaware's Revolutionary ideology back to Jacob Leisler, but her thesis thereafter remained a curiosity known only to a few antiquarians.⁵ References to Leisler in Pennsylvania and West Jersey histories are also scarce. Documents, however, show that from 1689 to 1691 Leisler played a pivotal role in the tumultuous politics of this region as well as in New York, and that his actions influenced Delaware River Valley affairs well into the eighteenth century.

I

Imperial as well as colonial politics shaped Jacob Leisler's and William Penn's fates. Religious conviction motivated both men. While in 1690 the Quaker Penn struggled from London to retain control of his New World proprietorship in the face of a changed regime, Leisler sought from New York to obtain hegemony in America for "the true Reformed religion." Imbued with a millenarian fervor, Leisler wanted to root out, as he wrote, "those hidden Agents of the dark regions" who opposed the forces of pure doctrine.⁶ He consistently maintained that in doing so he was seeking not temporal but godly favor. Leisler's actions in the Delaware River Valley, including his 1690 attack on Penn, can be fully comprehended only when his religious convictions are taken into consideration. Nonetheless, he was an actor in the valley long before events in 1689 propelled him to assume a political role.

Since Petrus Stuyvesant's conquest of New Sweden in 1655, trade with the South or Delaware River was a significant part of New Amsterdam's and New York City's economy. Tobacco exported by Delaware settlers, together with an Indian trade in trinkets and furs, created lucrative markets for that city's merchants. The City of Amsterdam's elaborate 1656 plans to develop the region independently with a capital at New Amstel (present-day New Castle) in competition with New Amsterdam came to an abrupt end with the 1664 English conquest of New Netherland.⁷ Thereafter the Delaware River Valley became an economic satellite of New York City. By 1680 New Castle and the other Delaware communities had greatly declined. Dutch traveler Jaspas Danckaerts, who visited the Delaware River the previous year, noted that formerly New Castle "was much larger and more populous . . . but since the country has belonged to the English, ships may no longer come here, or they must first declare and unload their cargoes at New York, which has caused this little place to fall off very much, and even retarded the settlement of the plantation."⁸

Jacob Leisler was one of the more successful New York City merchants in the Delaware River Valley from the 1660s through the 1680s. He entered the Delaware trade soon after his 1660 arrival in New Amsterdam as a Dutch

West India Company career officer. As a member of a wealthy European patrician family, he had access to the credit needed to enter commerce on a large scale. His paternal grandfather, Dr. Jacob Leisler, had been chief councilor to the counts of Oettingen and civil prosecutor for Prince Christian of Anhalt; his maternal grandfather was Geneva University regent Dr. Heinrich Wissenbach.⁹ But it was the monied connections established by Leisler's father, Frankfurt-am-Main French Reformed minister the Reverend Jacob Victorian Leisler, who was well-known throughout Europe and in England for his fundraising efforts on behalf of Reformed refugees, that proved most beneficial to his mercantile career. Among the Reverend Dr. Leisler's contacts were a number of wealthy Dutch patrons prominent in the early development of the Delaware, including investors in the firm of Gabry and Company.¹⁰

It is likely that the Gabry family introduced Leisler to the Delaware. His initial commercial contacts along the river included Augustine Hermans of New Bohemia (in present-day Maryland) and Henri Couturier of New Amstel. Hermans, who was of Bohemian origins and possibly had European connections with the Leisler family, had arrived in New Netherland in 1643 as Gabry and Company's representative. By the 1660s Hermans was the wealthiest tobacco trader in the Delaware Valley.¹¹ Couturier, a Leiden draper and artist best known today for his oil portrait of Petrus Stuyvesant, served as a factor for Hermans. In 1662 the as yet unwed twenty-two-year-old Leisler acted as the baptismal sponsor for one of Couturier's children, an unusual honor for a bachelor and indicative of a close relationship between the two men.¹²

Through his association with Hermans and Couturier, Leisler rapidly expanded his operations as a supplier of the Delaware Valley with finished cloth and trade goods, slave and indentured human cargos, and liquors and wines, in exchange for the valley's tobacco and grain products.¹³ His involvement in the Delaware trade can be seen in a long-running dispute with Peter Grovendyke of the Whorekill (present-day Lewes, Delaware). Arising out of a 1676 partnership venture, Grovendyke became indebted to Leisler for 3,207 pounds of tobacco, for which the courts arranged a compromise of £ 25 sterling in December, 1679. Grovendyke nonetheless counter-sued, claiming that Leisler owed him "436 guilders, 20 florins" in goods. Leisler retaliated with a new suit for 1,045 guilders, twelve stuivers. Though the courts generally favored Leisler in these suits, his commercial luck on the Delaware soon changed.¹⁴

The Duke of York's separation of Pennsylvania out of New York with his 1681 grant of the Delaware River's west bank to William Penn dealt a financial blow to such New York City merchants as Leisler. New Yorkers may have exaggerated when six years later they complained to New York Governor Thomas Dongan that the loss of the Delaware River Valley cost the city a third of its revenues, but there is no doubt that the loss was substantial. Dongan

noted to the home government, "the doing whereof by Mr. Penn has been of great detriment to this place."¹⁵ To adapt to the changing times, Leisler in the 1680s shifted his trade through such Philadelphia Quaker merchants as Samuel Carpenter, but he nonetheless found his commercial success in the region rapidly being eroded.¹⁶

Curtailement of the Delaware trade and growing competition from Philadelphia's Quaker merchants was not the only financial setback that Leisler suffered in the 1680s. Operating out of Basel, Switzerland, his brothers Franz and Johann Adam had emerged in the previous decade as major suppliers of tobacco, linens, silk bands, and other commodities for the French luxury trade. In 1685, the Roman Catholic French king Louis XIV revoked the act of religious toleration known as the Edict of Nantes, and forbade all Protestants from trading in his realms. The king's actions specifically excluded the Leisler family from French markets.¹⁷

Louis XIV's revocation of the Edict of Nantes reveals the continuing influence of religious doctrine as a force in shaping early modern national policies. The Reformation witnessed not only the struggle between Protestant and Catholic but competition among a proliferation of Protestant sects for governmental control. In the early seventeenth century Calvinists split into two distinct camps: those favoring more expansive theology and those favoring doctrinal purity. In the second half of the century, a pietist movement for further doctrinal purification led by Utrecht University theologian Gybertus Voetius rent Reformed churches and states. Known as the *Nadere Reformatie*, or "Further Reformation," this movement swept the Delaware Valley in the 1680s. Jasper Danckaerts noted in 1679 that the valley's inhabitants had "a craving" for religious instruction.¹⁸ Great attempts were made by the South River consistory to call the leading Dutch Reformed pietist theologian and Voetius' disciple the Reverend Jacobus Koelman to the region's ministry in 1682, though without success.¹⁹

Leisler emerged as the popular champion of the *Nadere Reformatie* in New York. For three generations his family had been at the forefront of the Reformed movement in Europe, and Leisler followed them into Calvinist activism. He joined the New Amsterdam Dutch Reformed church in 1661, at age twenty-one, and was by 1670 a church deacon and a member of the consistory.²⁰ His outspoken criticism of the Stuart government's Catholicizing religious policies brought him notoriety. His 1676 theological dispute over the nature of original sin with Albany minister the Reverend Nicholas Van Rensselaer—Leisler defending the orthodox doctrine of predestination against Van Rensselaer's heterodox preachings—was New York's most divisive issue between the English takeover in 1664 and the uprising in 1689.²¹

Into this region's economic turmoil and religious ferment, in which Jacob Leisler was a major player, English, Dutch, and German Quakers began arriving

in 1681. Leisler's impact on subsequent Delaware River Valley events would equal the role he came to hold in New York.

II

The Delaware River's Dutch Calvinists, Swedish Lutherans, and English dissenters were initially pleased to be released from New York City's economic domination when in October, 1682, William Penn arrived to assume jurisdiction over the new colony of Pennsylvania. But they became increasingly resentful of growing Quaker domination. Jealousy over the rapid commercial rise of Philadelphia's Quaker merchants was soon joined by complaints of high taxation and underrepresentation both in judicial appointments and in the newly created Pennsylvania assembly. Discontent became centered in the longer settled "Three Lower Counties" of Kent, Sussex, and, in particular, New Castle, where Jacob Leisler remained a commercial force.²² European events combined with local dissatisfaction and religious zeal would soon compel Leisler to assume a political role on the Delaware.

In 1688 Penn, facing a personal financial crisis, growing unrest in the lower counties, and a revolt from dissident Pennsylvania Quakers who opposed his proprietary policies, appointed as his governor John Blackwell, a New England Puritan known for his fiscal genius. Blackwell arrived in Philadelphia in December, 1688, just as rumors of the Protestant Prince of Orange's invasion of England from Holland filtered into America.²³ Intending to smooth relations between Quakers and non-Quakers, Blackwell instead found himself embroiled in an acrimonious dispute with a clique headed by Quaker merchant Thomas Lloyd. He discovered that, though the council and assembly publicly met, provincial policies were in fact being privately determined under Lloyd's auspices. The resulting struggle between Blackwell and Lloyd for governmental control rent Pennsylvania. Then, on February 24, 1689, the news came that the Prince of Orange's invasion was a success and that Penn's patron, the Roman Catholic King James II, had fled England.²⁴

Several weeks later Jacob Leisler was among the first Americans outside of official circles to learn of the Prince of Orange's success and to receive copies of the prince's three declarations justifying the invasion on the grounds of "Preserving of the Protestant Religion, and for Restoring the Laws and Liberties of England." While James II's provincial governors attempted to suppress the news and subdue the rumors, Leisler made the news public.²⁵ When in April, 1689, Boston emulated England's "Glorious Revolution" and overthrew James II's hated Dominion of New England—which had joined New England, New York, and New Jersey into a single megacolony—royal authority throughout English America began to collapse. Blackwell, caught between Quakers loyal to James because of the king's policy of religious toleration and Calvinists and Lutherans supporting the Protestant prince, hesitated to act without Penn's

order. Popular opinion in England was as hostile to Quakers as to Roman Catholics; the arrest of Penn in London seemed an evil omen.²⁶

In mostly Calvinist New York, the collapse of royal authority unleashed anti-Catholic hysteria and chaos. Throughout the summer of 1689 community after community verged on civil war as hostile factions vied for power and long-standing animosities came to the fore. With the June 10 flight of King James's lieutenant governor, Francis Nicholson, a pro-Orangist committee called for representatives from the counties to meet in New York City "to act in the affairs [so] that the peace of the inhabitants may be preserved." In late June this convention named Jacob Leisler commander of the New York City fort, on August 16 it elevated him to commander in chief of the province "for the Interest of their Most Excelent Majesties King William & Queen Mary & due preservation of the inhabitants."²⁷ The predominantly Dutch Reformed and Puritan East Jersey counties of Bergen and Essex joined the convention and fully participated in the creation of Leisler's government, but sparsely settled and Quaker-controlled Monmouth County remained aloof.²⁸

Non-Quaker Protestants along the Delaware River also enthusiastically received the news of the prince's invasion, but they lacked the political concentration to act on it. With confirmation of Parliament's February proclamation of William and Mary as joint king and queen came word of an act restoring the colonies to their 1660 state. The Delaware River would fall within New York's jurisdiction.²⁹ When Pennsylvania's Quaker councilors refused to proclaim the new monarchs, malcontents looked to New York and Leisler. In light of the "alteration of affayres in England," and uncertain of "the Cond[it]ion of the Proprietor [Penn] himself and his powers, and the feare of what dangers might ensue," Blackwell issued a declaration on June 23. Whereas "some persons have endeavored to suggest . . . That the Governor and some of the members of the Councill have a designe or intent to subvert and overturn this frame of Government," he declared to "Keep and preserve" all the laws and commissions "made before the Proprietor's going for England . . . until We shall Receive Orders out of England."³⁰

Blackwell's efforts to maintain the government for his employer and King James's friend William Penn did little to quiet the growing fears of the Delaware's Calvinist and Lutheran inhabitants of a conspiracy to "cutt off the Protestants, or at least to reduce them to the See of Rome." New Castle, which was "much disquieted," became the center of pro-Orangist, anti-Quaker agitation under justices Jonathan Moll and Johan Forat.³¹

The Dutch-born Moll had about 1660 entered business in Bristol, England, where he married a Puritan woman, "a pious independent," and carried on a large trade until the Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-1667) caused him to fail. He immigrated to America in order to clear his debts and emerged a person of considerable distinction at New Castle. He was presiding chief

justice from 1677 to 1683 and became a member of Penn's council in 1683.³² Forat, a ship's carpenter, first appears in New Castle records in 1683. He soon became connected through business and marital alliances with wealthy New Castle landowner, militia captain, and provincial councilor Johannes De Haes [D'Haes]. Blackwell named Forat a justice in 1688, but Forat immediately became embroiled in a bitter dispute over jurisdiction with proprietary clerk John White.³³ These men shared their Reformed religion, personal relations with Leisler, and a growing distrust of Quakers.

Moll and Forat initiated a correspondence with Leisler to discredit Penn's government, charging Quaker "treason agst . . . King William." They also forwarded to Leisler anti-Jacobite letters they had received from London to show "the Careckter & opinion they have In England" of James II's governors.³⁴ Blackwell complained to his council that "divers of the inhabitants of New Castle had declared themselves unsatsfied That king Wm. had not been proclaimed."³⁵ Forat wrote to Leisler, "in August [Blackwell] termed me a Seditious person & one that Stirred up the people to Cause the King to be proclaimed & for that reason he took from me my office of a Justice of the Peace."³⁶

Through the encouragement of Moll and Forat, pro-Leisler sentiment grew in the lower Delaware Valley. There, as in New York, he was seen by Reformed Protestants as the defender of the "true Protestant interest" and of "the Rights and Liberties of Englishmen against Popish and Arbitrary Government." West Jersey Deputy Governor John Tatham at Burlington, perhaps unclear as to the legal status of that proprietary, joined the growing movement.³⁷ That Quakers could not take the oath of allegiance to King William without violating religious principles heightened suspicions of their loyalty. Leisler wrote to the Maryland Assembly, "I received Informatione [from the Delaware] that they [the Quakers] of philadelphia send their powder to the french, & that . . . it was agt their pinlls to fight therefore when the french comes they are intended to send some of the wisest people to tell them that they rather would give their land & goods than to fight."³⁸

Rumors rapidly spread that the Quakers were conspiring with Maryland's Roman Catholics, the French, and the Indians to massacre the Delaware River's Protestants. Blackwell reported that "there had been formerly severall Rumours of danger from the french & Indians, in conjunction with the Papists, for the Ruine of the Protestants in these parts." An alarm had been given "as if 9 thousand french & Indians were then neare approaching for that purpose, upon which the Justices & Sheriffs of the two Lower Countyes with the people thereof, had betaken themselves to arms for their defence."³⁹ Jonathan Moll encouraged Leisler to consolidate his power on behalf of William and Mary in order to counteract this "papistical Stategema & hellish designe."⁴⁰ In September John Tatham sold "1000 lb. powder" to Leisler for the country's defense, and

promised him that he would "buy all [munitions] what may be had at philadelphia."⁴¹

By the fall of 1689 the situation was critical. The lower counties, more exposed to invasion from the sea, clamored for defense and "earnestly set upon" for a proclamation for the Protestant king and queen. Armed bands organized and called for the counties to secede. Lacking word from Penn, in feud with the Quakers, and facing a secessionist movement, Blackwell desperately needed non-Quaker support to retain control. To allay tensions between the largely Reformed Protestant lower counties and the mostly Quaker upper counties, he called for the council to meet at New Castle on September 17. Only five councilors appeared and the meeting was canceled.⁴²

When on October 1, 1689, Blackwell received an order from King William to prepare the province for war with France, the question of loyalty to the new monarchs could no longer be evaded. Councilor Johannes De Haes refused to "Act either as a magistrate in New Castle or here [in Philadelphia], untill he knows who is king." Council Secretary William Markham stated, as "We believe King William and Queen Mary are the King and Queen of England, . . . where is the prejudice in obligeing of those who would have them declared to be so?" Blackwell nonetheless attempted to remain neutral. He was willing to prepare for war, and privately acknowledged that William and Mary were king and queen, but he still avoided making an official proclamation. Quakers opposed a proclamation without Penn's order and resisted military measures in a country whose only enemies, according to Quaker councilor John Simcock, were "Bears & wolves."⁴³

Leisler forced the issue. He sent to the lower Delaware River communities, as he wrote John Tatham on October 30, copies of Parliament's proclamation of William and Mary "with orders to desire any sheriffe or Justice of the peace in them parts to proclaim their sd Maties."⁴⁴ Convinced that the lower counties would secede and join New York if he did not act, Blackwell now pushed for proclamation. In doing so, he noted, "I think for peace sake with our Neighbours [of New York] and amongst ourselves, we should do it." The Quaker councilors acquiesced and on November 2, 1689, William and Mary were proclaimed in Philadelphia.⁴⁵

III

Despite a proclamation for the new monarchs, Quakers were not about to ally with their Reformed Protestant critics, and a backlash developed. When in December, 1689, a letter from William Penn finally arrived in Pennsylvania instructing that council elections be held, the Quaker-dominated council ousted John Blackwell as deputy governor and elected Thomas Lloyd president of the council. Quakers were now in firm control of the provincial government.⁴⁶ In the election's wake Jacob Leisler wrote to England, "our Neighbours of East

Jersey and Pensilvania being many Quakers in these parts, who . . . encourage if not out do the Roman Catholiques and most of our Calamities and divisions are truly indebted to them, covering their pernicious practices by their blind scruples, and impudent interpretations, depending still upon and asserting Mr Pen to be a person of undoubted sincerity: in the mean time they advance the Interest of K. James.” He pointedly added, “we hope in due time to subdue” them.⁴⁷

The rift in the Delaware River Valley between the Reformed Protestant and Lutheran lower counties and the Quaker government widened in 1690. At the outbreak of war with France, the lower counties had expressed legitimate concerns over their vulnerable state, but the Quakers thwarted all efforts toward improving the counties’ defenses. To diffuse dissent and ensure loyalty in the counties, Lloyd appointed nonresidents to offices. Local elections were weighted to remove outspoken critics of Quaker policies from the provincial assembly. The conflict “ultimately was reduced to one of religious beliefs, and, as such became utterly unsolvable.”⁴⁸

In 1690 Leisler was not in a position to assume military control over the Delaware on behalf of the “true Protestant interest.” Besides, the new king’s instructions to “Such as for the time being take care for preserving the peace & administring the Lawes in our said Province of New York,” which arrived in December, 1689, specifically relegated the recipient’s jurisdiction to the provincial boundaries as they existed at the time of James II’s 1685 accession to the throne.⁴⁹ Leisler concentrated instead on a political campaign to subvert those “evill instruments . . . fiercely devoted to [the] great prejudice of his present Majesties interest and our tranquility.” Combining Reformed political thought as developed by such sixteenth-century Huguenot theorists as Simon Goulart with the contemporary “democraticizing” doctrines of Rotterdam Voetian minister Johannes Borstius and the radical rhetoric of English Orangist propagandist Robert Ferguson, Leisler determined that the “Supreame Legislative Authority” resided in the consent of the people. “That our adversaries should not overpower us by their crafty devices,” he called “for free elections by the People for civil and Military Officers.”⁵⁰

Leisler had Reformed doctrinal concerns rather than democratic principles in mind, but his advocacy that the people should choose all officers and that the electorate consisted of “all Protestant freeman,” regardless of property, gave his program widespread populist appeal. His opponents criticized the selection of rulers through “A method never formerly allowed of under any of our Kings reigns, it being always granted to be the undoubted prerogative of the King to Commissionate his Justices of the peace and Military Officers.” One critic put it succinctly: “all authority turned upside Doune.”⁵¹ The Leislerian concept of the people’s right to self-determination provided a lasting legacy in the Delaware, but its immediate intent was to unite Protestants against a perceived

threat by the supporters of the Roman Catholic King James II "of being delivered up to the French Canada Forces belonging to the French King [Louis XIV]." ⁵²

The worst Reformed Protestant fears of a Jacobite conspiracy seemed confirmed by a February 8, 1690, French and Indian night raid on the New York frontier community of Schenectady. Sixty-two men, women, and children were brutally butchered. In the massacre's wake, Leisler issued warrants for the arrest of all Roman Catholics in New York and other suspected opponents of his policies. Many towns used the crackdown to rid themselves of undesirables. Long Island's Quakers, centered at Flushing and Gravesend, fled en masse to Monmouth County, East Jersey, and Philadelphia. Albany, which in June, 1689, had formed its own Orangist convention under the auspices of King James's appointees, and had subsequently served as a center of opposition to Leisler, capitulated to Leisler's control. ⁵³

The Delaware River's Reformed Protestants were ripe for anti-Quaker agitation. Leisler intensified the campaign to undermine Quaker influence along the river. He forwarded to London copies of depositions and other inflammatory papers discrediting Penn's government. He then had distributed pamphlets suggesting that Quakers were not Christians. ⁵⁴ Following the arguments used by Leisler in New York, New Castle County published in February a broadside urging the people there to elect their own magistrates and establish their own courts in order "to assert our Right before it be quite lost." ⁵⁵

Surrounded by a rising tide of anti-Quaker hostility, unsure of the proprietor's status in England, and facing an increasing flouting of its authority, Lloyd's government attempted to reassert legal control of the lower counties. To legitimate its actions, the council issued on March 31 the following declaration: "Wee Doe hereby Freely acknowledg Allegiance to the King & Queen and Declare & Promis Fidelity and Lawfull Obedience to Wm. Penn, Sonn and Heir of Sr Wm. Penn Deceased, and his heirs and Assigns, as Rightfull Proprietary and Governour of the Same, according to the King's Letter Pattents and Deeds of Grant and Feofment From James, Duke of York and Albany, &c." ⁵⁶

Blackwell in Philadelphia, blaming Leisler for Thomas Lloyd's December coup and for the turmoil in the lower counties, became enraged at Leisler's continuing interference in Pennsylvania affairs. In March he visited Leisler in New York City, calling him "a mad man as arbitrary & tyranical as any Bassa." He then undertook a counter-campaign to discredit Leisler among the New England governments. Boston physician Dr. Benjamin Bullivant reported that Blackwell "brought over" to Massachusetts "the Manifesto of the people of N. York against him [Leisler] printed at Pennsylvania." ⁵⁷

Blackwell's efforts fell on deaf ears. By March, 1690, Leisler was Protestant

America's first populist hero. Barbados Governor Edwin Stede and his council sent to Leisler their "most hearty thancks" and "Gratefull acknowledgments" for "your Zeale in Their Majties Service" and "the true Reformed Religion."⁵⁸ Similar sentiments expressed by England's other West Indian governments were joined by those from the Chesapeake.⁵⁹ New England mobs chanted, "Leisler, Leisler." Bostonian John Borl wrote, "most sober persons here have a good opinion of Captain Leisler's proceedings." Benjamin Bullivant complained that "Leislar's faction" was so strong in Puritan New England that any opposition to his policies "is disregarded."⁶⁰

At the peak of his popularity, Leisler, on April 2, 1690, invited all the governors of English America to join him in a conference to "conclude what may conduce most to the Kings intrest, welfare of the provinces & the prevention if not destructione of the enymies."⁶¹ This call resulted in English America's first intercolonial congress when delegates from Massachussetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New York met in New York City in the last week of April to plan a concerted military campaign against French Catholic Quebec. Maryland's delegates arrived late, in June; Barbados, Bermuda, and Jamaica favorably responded by letter.⁶² Leisler's request to West Jersey Deputy Governor John Tatham "to urge the piple that the[y] ma[y] be sensible off this aproching en Menasing Storme" was also warmly received.⁶³ On May 13 Leisler wrote, "I have sent [troops] that way [toward Quebec] with hopes we shall make it up by the help of East & west Jerseys pensilvania & Rhoad Island 1000 men, being but in hopes by their letters."⁶⁴

The Pennsylvania council, however, had taken note of Leisler's letter "Directed to Thomas Lloyd" and then ignored his request "to send some agent to New York to treat with them of York and other Collonies, about some cours to preserv themselves from their Enemies, the French." The council ordered instead "That the Commissions of the Peace for the Three Lower Counties be Renewed, and that They runn by the king's Authority." By directly linking, and rejecting, the lower counties' desire to elect their own magistrates with Leisler's request for aid, the council made an all-out effort to crush pro-Leisler sentiment in the valley.⁶⁵

The council's actions outraged the lower counties. Several weeks later Lloyd received a petition from "some of the Inhabitants willing and Ready to bear Armes for the service and Defense of This Governmt." Because of recent raids by the French, "which have struck no Small terrour in us and our Familyes," the petitioners asked the governor "to settle the Country in such a posture that we may be able by Force of Armes, to Defend it against any assault of our Enemies." Lloyd and his council deferred by sending a committee "to Range along the most likely parts For the Discovering of any Designe of the French, or their Indians, against the peace," and promptly forgot the matter.⁶⁶

When the Leislerians took control of Albany in March, 1690, Philadelphia

emerged as the new anti-Leislerian center as New York Quakers, Roman Catholics, and other dissidents sought sanctuary there. Refugees so swelled the population that Philadelphians grumbled they were "greatly burthened and oppressed by the increase of the poor."⁶⁷ William Bradford's Philadelphia press turned out such tracts as *A Modest and Impartial Narrative of . . . the Extravagant and Arbitrary Proceedings of Jacob Leysler*, and the *Manifesto of the People of New York Against Jacob Leisler*. These works, aimed at moderate Protestants, portrayed Leisler as a "Great usurper" and a "dark politician," whose policies were designed to enslave "considerate Inhabitants . . . and their posterity, so that he might command their purses." As "Nothing less than Lording and domineering in all Causes (Ecclesiastical, Civil and Military) will satisfy this Man," the authors argued that he "endeavors [to] create the same disorders and confusion in Church as he hath already done in government."⁶⁸

The anti-Leislerian hand strengthened in late May with the surprising arrival in the Chesapeake of King James II's deposed New York Lieutenant Governor, Francis Nicholson, as King William III's Lieutenant Governor of Virginia. Imperial politics were determining Leisler's and Penn's fates. Leisler's lobby in London had attracted the patronage of William's Secretary of State, Charles Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, and of Charles Mordaunt, Earl of Monmouth, both Presbyterian Whigs prominent in the early stages of William's invasion but whose influence was in precipitous decline in 1689-1690.⁶⁹ Popular English reaction to the "Dutch invasion" and Church of England hostility to the Presbyterian (or Reformed) party caused the pragmatic new king to favor loyal Anglican churchmen. Nicholson's patron was Charles Paulet, Duke of Bolton, a high church Anglican whose political career was in the ascendancy in 1690.⁷⁰

Nicholson had been joined in London by Joseph Dudley of Massachusetts, a Dominion councilor roughed up by Leislerian mobs on Long Island before being sent to England in the fall of 1689 on charges of Jacobitism. Nicholson's and Dudley's aggressive campaign portraying Leisler as "a Rebel" paid off. Shrewsbury's recommendation to the Lords of Trade that military aid be sent to New York was considered then rejected. In April, 1690, West Jersey proprietor Daniel Coxe replaced the pro-Leislerian Tatham with Dudley as his deputy governor, and on May 22 the Lords of Trade determined that New York "is at present under no legall Government being in the hands of one Leisler a Walloon who has sett at the head of the Rable."⁷¹ It was with this determination that New York's new royal Governor, Henry Sloughter, left for America on November 29, 1690.⁷²

Leisler suffered further setbacks at home. The need to finance the Canadian expedition forced him to increase taxes. His supporters' zeal in rooting out opposition backlashed as increasing numbers fell under suspicion. His electoral policies created social upheaval to the point where communities refused to hold any more elections. And his imposition of Voetian doctrinal conformity

upon churches rent congregations. In June a riot erupted in New York City, during which Leisler was physically attacked. In August the military expedition against Quebec collapsed.⁷³

Throughout the summer of 1690 Philadelphia's coffeehouses were gathering places for an increasing number of New Yorkers plotting to overthrow Leisler's administration. Francis Nicholson's emissary Colonel Cuthbert Potter reported in July that he met in Philadelphia with exiled New York customs collector Mathew Plowman, a Roman Catholic, as well as "discourst some time" with John Barberrie and Jacob DeKay, "the two last forced to fly from York" after participating in the June anti-Leislerian riot. Long Island Dutch Reformed Dominie Rudolphus Varick, who initially supported Leisler but ran into trouble with his more zealous Long Island supporters, fled to Pennsylvania in June.⁷⁴ Petitions, letters, and tracts aimed at solidifying the anti-Leislerian position and strengthening their lobby in London circulated among the exiles as they anxiously awaited the arrival of Governor Sloughter.⁷⁵

Facing an emboldened opposition centered in Philadelphia and growing unrest in New York, Leisler's personal involvement in the Delaware River Valley rapidly diminished. Nonetheless, the forces of popular self-determination that he had encouraged in the valley acquired a momentum of their own. In November, 1690, six Protestant council members from the lower counties, including Johannes De Haes, privately resolved to establish their own courts independent of Quaker provincial authority. Lloyd understandably refused to recognize this "clandestine meeting" and declared the councilors' actions "null, and of no force."⁷⁶ But the secessionist movement intensified. When the provincial assembly met the following April the lower counties' representatives walked out, ostensibly over a dispute regarding Penn's proposal that the government's executive branch be conducted by either a council, five commissioners, or a deputy governor. None of the alternatives pleased the lower counties. Lloyd's attempts to get the members to return were futile. Penn, desperately attempting from London to retain his proprietary intact, reluctantly commissioned his cousin William Markham, a low church Anglican who had joined with the seceding members, as deputy-governor for the three counties.⁷⁷

By 1691 Leisler was no longer in a position to shape Delaware River Valley events. The January arrival in New York City of English regulars under the command of Capt. Richard Ingoldsby placed Leisler literally under siege. Ingoldsby appeared without a commission, and Leisler refused to surrender the government "until he should exhibit his Majesty's orders regarding us." Leisler's refusal to capitulate caused him to barricade himself with his council in the city's fort while Ingoldsby held the town.⁷⁸

As word spread to Philadelphia of the presence of royal troops in New York, exiled New Yorkers poured out of that city and back to their homes. The

appearance of so many “disaffected persons” convinced Leisler of “some ill designe” against him and fueled a tense two-month standoff.⁷⁹ Though he surrendered the fort when Governor Sloughter arrived in March, Sloughter nonetheless imprisoned Leisler and his council and brought them to trial for treason. The trial’s presiding chief justice was none other than the embittered Joseph Dudley; the prosecutor was William Nicolls, jailed by Leisler as a Jacobite; and the jury consisted largely of those, such as John Barberrie and Tunis DeKay, brother of Jacob DeKay, who had been in exile in Philadelphia. Leisler was condemned to death and, along with chief aide and son-in-law Jacob Milborne, hung till “halfe dead,” then beheaded in New York City on May 16, 1691. His body was then mutilated by a hysterical mob.⁸⁰

IV

Despite Leisler’s execution, the populist movement he inspired continued to play a role in English America. In a contemporary critique of those Calvinists in Connecticut advocating popular sovereignty, Gershom Bulkeley wrote, “Let any truly pious, loyal and prudent man wisely feel the pulse of this sort of men, from the highest to the lowest and see if these *religiosi* do not readily espouse the cause of Leisler and Milborne. And why so? . . . because they are their confederates, and so it is a common cause.”⁸¹ While today the term “Leislerian” is largely associated with New York, Bulkeley’s charge, first published in Philadelphia in 1692, was as applicable to the Delaware River Valley as to New York and New England.

William Penn’s creation of a separate government for the three lower counties in 1691, the outbreak of the Keithian Controversy among Quakers in that year, and the removal of pro-Leislerians from offices only temporarily mollified the conflict between Reformed Protestants and Quakers in the Delaware. In 1693 the Lords of Trade determined that, “by reason of great Neglect and miscarriage in the government,” Penn’s proprietary “is fallen into Disorder & Confusion.” The crown annexed the region to New York, placing Pennsylvania and “the Country of New Castle” under royal New York Governor Benjamin Fletcher. A struggle between executive and assembly marked Fletcher’s Pennsylvania administration. Quaker refusal to provide for defenses continued to roil relations.⁸² With the regions politically united, Delaware secessionists joined New York Leislerians in seeking from London redress for their grievances. In doing so, the Delaware’s alignment with New York against Quaker Pennsylvania followed the pattern established in 1689.

Leisler’s execution sent shock waves throughout America, where he had remained popular among Calvinists, and created an outcry among European Orangists. As early as August 1691 Holland began an inquest into the execution. On October 15 the States General requested William III, who in addition to being King of England was Stadholder of the Dutch Republic, to

look into the matter.⁸³ English Whigs took up the cry and made an act clearing Leisler central to the king's resettlement of the American colonies. The importance Whigs placed upon the act is seen in Parliamentary leader Sir Henry Ashurst's comment to New England Divine Increase Mather, "I shall never do N: England so much good as getting this bill passed."⁸⁴ Massachusetts Governor Sir William Phips sharply focused the underlying constitutional issue when he quipped, "If what Govr. Leisler . . . have don be ill, how comes their Majesties to sit upon the Throne[?]"⁸⁵

Delaware secessionists actively participated in the trans-Atlantic Leislerian-Whig network. In 1691-1693 New Castle's Jonathan Moll served as a Leislerian courier, carrying letters deemed treasonable by the English Tory colonial governors between Boston, New York, and the Delaware. So closely identified with Leislerian interests were Delaware's secessionists that, in the wake of Leisler's trial, the lower counties felt it necessary to disclaim Thomas Lloyd's charge that they were "wishing to throw their territory into the hands of New York."⁸⁶

Ironically, William Penn's fortunes now became tied to those of the Leislerians. At the outbreak of the 1689 rebellion Leisler closely allied with the more radical English Whigs, such as Charles Mordaunt, Earl of Monmouth—an alliance that proved fatal in 1691. By 1694, however, Whigs were ascendant in King William's government, and the radical element was being tolerated. Their argument that Leisler had "preserved the liberties" of New Yorkers from the absolutist policies of the Roman Catholic James II, much as William did for England, complemented Penn's defense of his proprietary "that the Power of Incorporation is the Substance of w[ha]t is granted to Him from the Crown." Penn secured the aid of William's Secretary of State, Sir John Trenchard, and Lord Henry, Viscount Sidney, who also represented Leislerian interests.⁸⁷ The Whig success in determining colonial policy in 1694-1695 is seen by the king's restoration of Penn's proprietary in August, 1694, John Tatham's reappointment as West Jersey deputy governor several months later, and Parliament's reversal of Leisler's treason sentence in May, 1695.⁸⁸

The restoration of Pennsylvania placed William Markham, who had sided with Delaware's secessionists, as Penn's deputy governor, and in 1698 the pro-Leislerian Whig Richard Coote, Earl of Bellomont, arrived as Governor of New York. Bellomont and Markham forged a Whig alliance that benefited Leislerians and attempted to address the military grievances of the lower counties by creating a watch against invaders.⁸⁹ Leisler's populist ideology of self-determination, which in 1690 had solidified Protestant resistance to Quaker government, nonetheless continued to inform distrust of Philadelphia. Resistance became most apparent in the provincial elections of 1698 through 1700, during which the lower counties expressed dissent by refusing to elect

delegates. In 1701 Penn, alarmed by the continuing turmoil, appended to a revised Charter of Liberties a provision that, "If the Representatives of the Province and Territories shall not hereafter agree to Joyn together in Legislation," they could each have a distinct assembly. In 1704 the two assemblies began to meet separately.⁹⁰

In the late 1690s an influx of settlers, largely Scots-Irish and English Anglican, began to overwhelm the lower counties' Dutch, Swedish, and English Non-Conformist inhabitants. Moll and De Haes died in 1695, and Forat died in 1712. Calvinism seemed submerged by a rising tide of Quakers and Anglicans. As the new settlers assimilated, however, marital and mercantile arrangements reveal ideological continuity. The Calvinist doctrinal foundations of Leislerism revived in the lower counties after 1700 in a Presbyterian movement now led by Scots-Irish.⁹¹

The lower counties' continued distrust of the Quaker government appears in their anti-proprietary politics, manifested through what nineteenth-century historians have called the "People's party." Roeloff De Haes, son of Johannes De Haes, who had personal associations with Leisler, Richard Halliwell, a Low Church Anglican who had led the secessionist movement in 1690, and John Donaldson, a newly arrived Scots-Irish Presbyterian, emerged to lead popular Protestant interests into the eighteenth century.⁹² In 1692 Donaldson wed Elizabeth Rodenburg, Leisler's wife's cousin, and in 1712 their daughter Catharine wed Leisler's grandson Michael Vaughton. Nicholas Loockerman's arrival at Dover in the early eighteenth century also brought to the party alignments the familial feud that characterized New York's political leadership.

Delaware's Bayard family had direct ties with Leisler's principal antagonist, Nicholas Bayard. In a reflection of New York's Leislerian/anti-Leislerian division, the Delaware Bayards, descendants of Nicholas's brother Samuel, became defenders of Proprietary and, after the Revolution, Federalist interests. Nicholas Loockerman, son of Leisler's brother-in-law Jacob Loockerman, was, Annie Jump Cannon wrote, "a firm adherent to the Democratic or Leisler party." His son, Vincent Loockerman, a member of the lower counties assembly, became "a prominent Whig in the Revolution."⁹³

Ideological and familial continuity in the eighteenth-century dispute between Delaware's Peoples and Proprietary parties reveals Leisler's continuing influence in American politics. Historian Robert Ritchie writes of the Leislerian legacy: "The most vigorous level of government to emerge from this period was that of the locality. It was from this solid base that popular politics emerged and future leaders were trained."⁹⁴ The intercolonial network that Jacob Leisler created in 1689 provided a lasting foundation, perpetuated through eighteenth-century colonial politics, upon which the patriot organization of the Revolutionary era built.⁹⁵ As early national historians clearly saw, Leisler created the first steps toward a populist political ideology that would culminate in the

birth of a new nation eighty years later.

The early history of European America is conventionally viewed through the development of isolated individual colonies. Yet, as Leisler's impact on the Delaware region, New England, colonies as far south as the West Indies, and British politics illustrates, events in all the colonies were closely related to each other as well as to events in Europe. By looking at this total picture we can gain a fuller understanding of an episode that unleashed forces still influencing our world. Jacob Leisler's actions made Reformation doctrines and radical contemporary European political theory comprehensible for a broader American public. In doing so, he put in motion a set of popular assumptions about government, religion, and the people's role in them that would not only shape colonial New York and the Delaware Valley but continue to inform American politics to the present day.

Notes

1. Minutes of the Lords of Trade and Plantations, Apr. 10, 1690, CO 5/1081, pp. 1-4, Public Record Office, Kew Gardens, London [hereafter cited as PRO]; Robert Proud, *The History of Pennsylvania, in North America, from the Original Institution and Settlement . . . till after the Year 1742* (Philadelphia, 1797), 347-348. For Penn's correspondence during this period see Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, eds., *The Papers of William Penn*, volume 3 (Philadelphia, 1986), 217-283.
2. Minutes of the Lords of Trade and Plantations, PRO CO5/1081, p. 310. For the most recent works on Leisler's administration see David S. Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America* (New York, 1972; 1987); and Charles Howard McCormick, *Leisler's Rebellion* (New York, 1989).
3. Gershom Bulkeley, *Will and Doom, or the Miseries of Connecticut* (Philadelphia, 1692), in *Collections of the Connecticut Historical Society*, III (Hartford, Conn., 1895), 201-204, 212-215, 238; Thomas Hutchinson, *The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay* (London, 1765), L. S. Mayo, ed., 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), II: 64-65, 81-82, 160.
4. William Dunlap, *History of the New Netherlands, Province of New York, and State of New York*, 2 vols. (New York, 1839), I: 210.
5. Annie Jump Cannon, "The Loockerman's Manor House Near Dover" (1892), Delaware State Archives, Dover, Del., abstracted and published in *Delaware History*, III (September, 1948), 97-104.
6. David William Voorhees, "The 'fervent Zeale' of Jacob Leisler," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d. ser., LI (July, 1994), 447-472. Quote from Leisler to Maj. John Wildman, Oct. 20, 1690, Blathwayt Papers, VIII, folder 1, Special Collections, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Library, Williamsburg, Va.
7. C. A. Weslager, "The City of Amsterdam's Colony on the Delaware, 1656-1664; With Unpublished Dutch Notarial Abstracts," *Delaware History*, XX (Spring-Summer 1982), 1-26 (Fall-Winter 1982), 72-97; and idem., *The Swedes and Dutch at New Castle* (New York, 1987). See also Charles T. Gehring, ed., *New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch, Volumes XVIII-XIX, Delaware Papers (Dutch*

Period) (Baltimore, 1981).

8. Jaspas Dankers and Peter Sluyter, *Journal of a Voyage to New York*, Henry C. Murphy, trans. (Brooklyn, 1867; reprint Ann Arbor, Mich., 1967), 228.

9. David William Voorhees, "European Ancestry of Jacob Leisler," *The New York Genealogical and Biographical Record*, CXX (October, 1989), 4: 193-202.

10. P. Cuno, "Geschichte der Wallonisch-reformierten Gemeinde zu Frankenthal," in *Geschichtsblätter des Deutschen Huguenotten-Vereins*, III (1894), 3: 19. The Rev. Dr. Leisler's Amsterdam connections included the mercantile houses of D'Orville and of Jacob Repemaecker, a director of the Dutch West India Company, see Franz Reformerte Gemeinde XXXVIII: 148; LX: 4v-5, Stadtarchiv, Frankfurt am Main. For Gabry and Company see *Algemeen Nederlandsch Familieblad* (1888); and Dennis J. Maika, "Commerce and Community: Manhattan Merchants in the Seventeenth Century" (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1995), 43.

11. For Jacob Leisler's early connection with the Gabrys, see, for example, Pieter Pia vs. Tymotheus Gabry, Apr. 22, 1664, Berthold Fernow, ed., *Records of New Amsterdam from 1653 to 1674*, 7 vols. (New York, 1897), V: 47. For Hermans' connection to the Gabrys see Cornelis van Tienhoven, "Answer to the Representation of New Netherland" (Amsterdam, 1650), in J. Franklin Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664* (New York, 1909), 375; Dankers and Sluyter, *Journal of a Voyage*, 230; and Maika, "Commerce and Community," 43-47.

12. Berthold Fernow, *Minutes of the Orphanmasters Court of New Amsterdam, 1655-1663*, 2 vols. (New York, 1907), II: 56. For Couturier see Charles X. Harris, "Henri Couturier An Artist of New Netherland," *The New-York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin*, XI (July, 1927), 45-52; and Weslager, *The Swedes and Dutch at New Castle*, 223-230. Leisler was baptismal sponsor for Couturier's daughter Rebecca, Nov. 22, 1662, *New York Genealogical and Biographical Society Record*, VI (July, 1875), 151. For a discussion of Leisler's connections with both Couturier (Coutary) and Hermans see Dennis J. Maika,

"Jacob Leisler's Chesapeake Trade," *de Halve Maen*, LXVII (Spring, 1994), 9-14.

13. Mayor's Court Minutes, 1677-1682 (engrossed), 329, 341, New York County Clerk's Office, New York City; Fernow, *Records of New Amsterdam*, VII: 59; Leisler vs. John Blomfield, 1678, 1685, Provincial Court Judgements 150, Delaware State Archives, Dover; Ephriam Hermans to Capt. Brockholls, Dec. 16, 1681, in Charles T. Gehring, ed. *New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch, Volumes XX-XXI, Delaware Papers (English Period)* (Baltimore, Md., 1977), 354. Leisler's 1663 marriage to Elsie Tymens, stepdaughter of wealthy New Amsterdam trader Govert Loockermans, possibly enhanced his connections in the Delaware, see Edwin R. Purple, *Genealogical Notes Relating to Lieut.-Gov. Jacob Leisler and His Family Connections in New York* (New York, 1877), 19-20. Nonetheless, the Delaware played a small role in Leisler's overall trade, which included Europe, Africa, the West Indies, the Chesapeake, and New England, as well as New York and the Delaware.

14. Leisler vs. Grovendyke, 1679-1680, Mayors Court Minutes, Wills 19B: 294, New York State Archives, Albany, and Mayor's Court Minutes, 1677-1682 (engrossed), 178, 180v, 181v, 189, New York County Clerk's Office [these are separate books of minutes]; Grovendyke vs. Leisler, 1680, Wills 19B: 301, 305; and Leisler vs. Grovendyke, 1680, Mayors Court Minutes, 1677-1682 (engrossed), 208, 216, 260, 361v. Also see New York State Colonial Manuscripts Volumes XXVIII: 170b, XXIX: 40, 44, New York State Archives. Grovendyke was Kent County representative to the Pennsylvania Assembly in 1689. Gertrude MacKinney, ed., *Votes of the Assembly. Pennsylvania Archives*, 8th series (Harrisburg, Pa., 1931), I: 94.

15. Dongan's Report to the Privy Council on the State of the Province, Feb. 22, 1687, and Address of the Mayor and Common-Council of New York to the King, n.d., in Edmund B. O'Callaghan, Berthold Fernow, and John Romeyn Brodhead, eds., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, 15 vols. (Albany, N.Y., 1853-1885), III: 393, 424-425 [hereafter cited as *DRNY*]; Bernard

Mason, "Aspects of the New York Revolt of 1689," *New York History*, XXX (April, 1949), 173-174; Robert C. Ritchie, *The Duke's Province: A Study of New York Politics and Society, 1664-1691* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1977), 191.

16. Leisler's association with Samuel Carpenter may not have been entirely favorable: "I admire my wine in Mr Carpenters hand should have grown so bad, being so good when I sent it about," he wrote John Tatham, Oct. 30, 1689, in Edmund B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documentary History of the State of New York*, 4 vols. (1848-1852), II: 39 [hereafter cited as *DHNY*].

17. Traugott Geering, *Handel und Industrie der Stadt Basel* (Basel, 1886), 622-628; Alexander Dietz, *Frankfurter Handels-geschichte*, 4 vols. (Frankfurt am Main, 1925), IV: 84; Niklaus Röthlin, *Die Basler Handelspolitik und deren Träger in der zweiting Hälfte des 17. und im 18. Jahrhundert* (Basel / Frankfurt am Main, 1986), throughout.

18. Dankers and Sluyter, *Journals of a Voyage*, 223.

19. Edward Tanjore Corwin, et al., eds., *Ecclesiastical Records, State of New York*, 7 vols. (Albany, N.Y. 1901-1916), I: 724, II: 746-747, 783, 823-824, 874-876. Zeeland minister Jacobus Koelman is often incorrectly identified as a Labadist. For a correction of this view see James Tanis, "Reformed Pietism in Colonial America," in Ernest Stoeffler, ed., *Continental Pietism and Early American Christianity* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1976), 43-45.

20. Voorhees, "'fervent Zeale' of Jacob Leisler," 451-453, 461-467.

21. Lawrence H. Leder, "The Unorthodox Domine: Nicholas Van Rensselaer," *New York History*, XXXV (April, 1954), 166-176;

22. Robert W. Johannsen, "The Conflict Between the Three Lower Counties on the Delaware and the Province of Pennsylvania, 1682-1704," *Delaware History*, V (March, 1952), 102-104; Joseph J. Kelly, Jr., *Pennsylvania: The Colonial Years 1681-1776* (New York, 1980), 43-44.

23. Joseph Dorfman, "Captain John Blackwell—A Biographical Note," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, LXIV (July, 1945), 233-237;

Nicholas B. Wainwright, "Governor John Blackwell," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, LXXIV (October, 1950), 457-473.

24. Gary B. Nash, *Quakers and Politics: Pennsylvania, 1681-1726* (Princeton, N.J., 1968); Examination of Zachariah Whitepaine, Feb. 24, 1688/89, *Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania in Pennsylvania Archives*, Samuel Hazard, ed., (Harrisburg, Pa., 1852), I: 246-247, 249 [hereafter cited as *Minutes of the Council*]. See also *Minutes of the Council of New York*, Mar. 1, 1689, *New-York Historical Society Collections I* (1868), 241-242.

25. Leisler to the Governor of Barbados, Nov. 23, 1689, *DHNY*, II: 40; Deposition of Andries Greveraet and George Brewerton, Dec. 31, 1689, PRO CO5/1080, p. 223. The declarations are published in *State Tracts: Being a Farther Collection of Several Choice Treaties Relating to the Government from the Year 1660, to 1689* (London, 1692; reprint, Wilmington, Del., 1973), 420-428.

26. *Minutes of the Council*, I: 287, 299, 302, 304-305. For historical background see Lovejoy, *Glorious Revolution in America*, 220-270.

27. Charles R. Street, ed., *Huntington Town Records, Including Babylon, Long Island, New York*, 2 vols. (Huntington, N.Y., 1887-1888), II: 31-32; *DHNY*, II: 11, 23.

28. Edwin F. Hatfield, *History of Elizabeth, New Jersey; including The Early History of Union County* (New York, 1868), 232-239. Henry Lyon and John Curtis represented Essex County, William Lawrence represented Bergen, see Abstracts of the Committee of Safety, June 27-Aug. 15, 1689, PRO CO5/1081, pp. 105-137.

29. In 1689 Whigs in Parliament attempted to pass a measure restoring all charters surrendered under Charles II and James II. The first bill failed the House of Commons; the second passed the Commons but languished in the House of Lords. The provision restoring American charters was deleted in January, 1690: Leo Francis Stock, ed., *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments Respecting North America*, 5 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1924-1926), II: 1-17;

- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Twelfth Report, Appendix, Part VI, The Manuscripts of the House of Lords, 1689-1690* (London, 1889), 423-432. The measure presented difficulties for New York, which had no charter in 1660. Leisler initially attempted to have New York included within Connecticut's charter, see Leisler to Nathan Gold, June 2 [12?], 1689, *DHNY*, II: 14.
30. *Minutes of the Council*, I: 288, 296-297.
31. *Minutes of the Council*, I: 299.
32. Dankers and Sluyter, *Journals of a Voyage*, 229-230; Richard S. Rodney, "Early Relations of Delaware and Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, LIV (no month, 1930), 3: 214-216.
33. The Historical Research Committee of the Colonial Dames of Delaware, *A Calendar of Delaware Wills New Castle County, 1682-1800* (New York, 1911), 11.
34. Leisler to Simon Bradstreet, Aug. 13, 1689, and Oct. 30, 1689, *DHNY*, II: 22, 39.
35. *Minutes of the Council*, I: 299.
36. Forat to Leisler, Oct. 4, 1689, PRO CO5/1081, pp. 168, 188. Forat's Deposition was among the papers Leisler sent to Gilbert Burnet, Mar. 31, 1690, PRO CO5/1081, pp. 269-270.
37. Quote from *Loyalty Vindicated* (New York, 1698), in Charles M. Andrews, ed., *Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675-1690* (New York 1915), 401. Leisler had long been known in Burlington, see, for example, Gehring, *Delaware Papers (English Period)*, 310.
38. Leisler to the Maryland Assembly, Sept. 29, 1689, *DHNY*, II: 34.
39. *Minutes of the Council*, I: 299.
40. Leisler to Simon Bradstreet, Sept. 3, 1689, Prince Collection 61.I.21, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
41. Leisler to Robert Treat, Aug. 25, 1689, *DHNY*, II: 25.
42. The attending councilors were John Simcock, Peter Alrich, William Markham, John Bristow, and Johannes De Haes, see *Minutes of the Council*, I: 301.
43. The Earl of Shrewsbury to the Pennsylvania Council, Apr. 13, 1689, *Minutes of the Council*, I: 302; Wainwright, "Gov. John Blackwell," 469; *Minutes of the Council*, I: 302-303, 306; Charles P. Keith, *Chronicles of Pennsylvania 1688-1748*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, Pa., 1917), I: 185-204.
44. Leisler to Tatham, Oct. 30, 1689, *DHNY*, II: 40. Leisler received printed copies of Parliament's declaration for the king and queen from Connecticut on June 21, 1689, and appears to have received additional copies from England in August, see Stephen Van Cortlandt to Governor Andros, July 9, 1689, *NYCD*, III: 595, and Leisler to the Maryland Assembly, Sept. 29, 1689, *DHNY*, II: 32.
45. *Minutes of the Council*, I: 304-305.
46. Penn to the Council, Aug. 12, 1689, *Minutes of the Council*, I: 314-315, 316-317.
47. Leisler to Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, Jan. 7, 1690, *DRNY*, III: 654-657.
48. Johannsen, "Conflict Between the Three Lower Counties," 103-104; *Minutes of the Council*, I: 321, 344-348; MacKinney, *Votes of the Assembly*, I: 110-111.
49. Lords Carmarthen and Halifax to New York, July 29, 1689, and Lord Nottingham to New York, July 30, 1689, *DRNY*, III: 605-606.
50. By the Lieut Governor & Council, Dec. 20, 1689, *DHNY*, II: 50-51; Leisler to the Bishop of Salisbury, *DRNY*, III: 654-655. Leisler, related to Goulart through maternal grandmother Catherine Aubert, probably possessed Goulart's popular 3-volume *Memoirs of the State of France under Charles IX* (Geneva, 1576-1577), as a number of his declarations closely follow political tracts in this work, see Voorhees, "'fervent Zeale' of Jacob Leisler," 454, note 51. For the popularity of Borstius in New York, see Eric Nooter, "Between Heaven and Earth: Church and Society in Pre-Revolutionary Flatbush, Long Island" (Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1994), 132. Leisler was possibly introduced to Ferguson through his business connections with English Whigs in exile in Holland. For Ferguson, see *Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 1921-1922), VI: 1214-1217. Leislerian ideology falls within the current of radical English Whig and Dutch Voetian-Orangist thought, see Gary S. De Krey, "Revolution *redivivus* 1688-1689 and the radical tradition in seventeenth-century London politics," in Lois G. Schworer, ed., *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, Eng., 1992), 198-217; and Jonathan I. Israel, *The*

Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall, 1477-1806 (Oxford, Eng., 1995), 804-805.

51. *A Modest and Impartial Narrative* (Philadelphia, 1690), reprinted in Andrews, ed., *Narratives of the Insurrections*, 337; DHNY, II: 64-66.

52. Quote from "A Memoriall," DHNY, II: 57.

53. Papers Relating to the Invasion of New-York and the Burning of Schenectady By the French, 1690, DHNY, I: 285-312; Warrant to arrest all Catholics, Feb. 15, 1689/90, DHNY, II: 71. For the plight of Long Island's Quakers see Bowne Family Papers, Long Island Collection, Queensborough Public Library, Jamaica, N.Y.

54. Leisler's anti-Quaker tracts have not been found, but they were most likely pamphlets published in London. For a response see Society of Friends, *The Christianity of the People Commonly called Quakers, Asserted, Against the Unjust Charges of their Being No Christians upon several Questions relating to those Matters* (Philadelphia, 1690), Charles Evans, *American Bibliography* (Chicago, 1903-), Microform 1, 1639-1724, 83: 509.

55. Johannsen, "Conflict Between the Three Lower Counties," 103-104; Kelley, *Pennsylvania*, 68.

56. *Minutes of the Council*, I: 322.

57. "Journal of Dr. Benjamin Bullivant," *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 1st ser., XVI (Boston, 1878), 107, and *ibid.*, 2d ser., XIII (Boston, 1899), 27.

58. Stede to Leisler, Jan. 27, 1690, Massachusetts Archives vol. XXXV: 163-164, Secretary of State, Boston.

59. Maryland Assembly to Leisler, Apr. 3, 1690, DHNY, II: 211.

60. Jacob Melyen to Johannis Kerfbijl, July 30, 1691, Melyen Letter Book, 11, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass.; Borl to Robert Ferguson, Apr. 1, 1690, PRO CO5/1081, 271; "Journal of Benjamin Bullivant," 105, 106.

61. Circular to the Governors of Severall Provinces, Apr. 2, 1690, DHNY, II: 211.

62. Maryland sent William Blankstone and Amos Nicolls. See John Coode to Leisler, May 19, 1690, DHNY, II: 248-250.

63. Leisler to Tatham, May 7, 1690, DHNY,

II: 241-242.

64. DHNY, II: 242.

65. *Minutes of the Provincial Council*, Apr. 11, 1690, I: 332. The hostility of Pennsylvania's Quakers made mails between the Chesapeake and New York unreliable. See John Coode to Leisler, Apr. 4, 1690, DHNY, II: 225, and Leisler to Coode, Apr. 9, 1690, *ibid.*, 229.

66. *Minutes of the Provincial Council*, I: 334. The signators were William Markham, Lacy Cock, Swan Swanson, Jon Holmes, and Andrew Binkson.

67. As early as September, 1689, Leisler charged that Philadelphia was a refuge for Jacobites. DHNY, II: 32. In a letter to the Maryland Assembly, Mar. 4, 1690, he provided a list of seven suspected Jacobites who "have absconded themselves out of this government to pensilvania or Maryland," DHNY, II: 182.

68. *A Modest and Impartial Narrative*, 320-354, esp. 321-329, 331-332, 341.

69. NYHS *Collections*, I: 297-298; McCormick, *Leisler's Rebellion*, 315-320. Discussions of the political climate in England are in Lovejoy, *Glorious Revolution in America*, 225-234; and Jonathan I. Israel, "The Dutch role in the Glorious Revolution," in *idem*, ed., *The Anglo-Dutch moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact* (Cambridge, Eng., 1991), 142-143.

70. Stephen Saunders Webb, "The Strange Career of Francis Nicholson," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., XXIII (October, 1966), 523-528; "Mr. Potter's Journal," 6.

71. Eugene R. Sheridan, "Daniel Coxe and the Restoration of Proprietary Government in East Jersey, 1690—a Letter," *New Jersey History*, XCII (Summer, 1974), 103-109; Memorandum of the Lord President of the Board of Trade, May 23, 1690, PRO CO5/1081, p. 310.

72. Charles H. McCormick, "Governor Slougher's Delay and Leisler's Rebellion, 1689-1691," *New-York Historical Society Quarterly*, LXII (July, 1978), 3: 238-252.

73. Lovejoy, *Glorious Revolution in America*, 321-324.

74. "A Journall and Narrative of a Journey made by me Cuthbert Potter from Middx Virginia to Boston in New England," in Newton D. Mereness, ed., *Travels in the*

American Colonies (New York, 1916), 4-5. Plowman fled to Philadelphia in late February: see Leisler to Johannes Johnson, Mar. 10, 1689/90, *DHNY*, II: 188. For Varick see Rudolphus Varick to the Classis of Amsterdam, Apr. 9, 1691, *Ecclesiastical Records*, I: 1048-1053, esp. 1052-1053, and Berthold Fernow, "Domine Rudolphus Varick in Philadelphia, 1690," Notes and Queries, *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, XIII (July, 1889), 249-250.

75. The Petition of the Merchants, Traders, and Principall Inhabitants of New York, though dated New York, May 19, 1690, appears to have circulated among the refugees in Philadelphia, PRO CO 5/1081, pp.

76. Charles P. Keith, *Chronicles of Pennsylvania from the English Revolution to the Peace of Aix-La-Chapelle 1688-1748*, 3 vols. (1917, rptnt. Port Washington, N.Y., 1972), I: 203-207. The seceding council members were William Clark, Luke Watson, Griffith Jones, John Brinklow, John Cann, Johannes De Haas, see Proud, *History of Pennsylvania*, 352-353.

77. Johannsen, "Conflict Between the Three Lower Counties," 106. The seceding members were William Clark, John Cann, John Brinklow, John Hill, Richard Halliwell, Albertus Jacobs, and George Martin, see Proud, *History of Pennsylvania*, 354-358.

78. Leisler's Refusal to Surrender the Fort to Major Ingoldsby, Feb. 4, 1691, *DHNY*, II: 324-326.

79. Samuel Worden to Thomas Hinkley, Mar. 30, 1691, Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 4th ser., V (Boston, 1861), 282-284; NYHS Collections, I: 300-330.

80. Lawrence H. Leder, ed., "Records of the Trials of Jacob Leisler and His Associates," *New-York Historical Society Quarterly*, XXXVI (October 1952), 431-454. For Leisler's execution see Dunlap, *History of the New Netherlands*, I: 208-209, 209n; New-York Historical Society Collections, I (1868), 321, 407-407; and Voorhees, "'fervent Zeale' of Jacob Leisler," 447.

81. Bulkeley, *Will and Doom*, 238-239.

82. Keith, *Chronicles of Pennsylvania*, I: 206-207; Johannsen, "Conflict Between the Three Lower Counties," 105-106, 109-111; Proud, *History of Pennsylvania*, 363-380. See also

Fletcher correspondence to the Lords of Trade, *DRNY*, IV: 52-57.

83. For the reaction in New England see *Diary of Samuel Sewall 1674-1729*, M. Halsey Thomas, ed., 2 vols. (New York, 1973), I: 278. Testimonies of Magdalena Claas, Johannes Provoost, and others before the *Hof van Holland* (provincial court of Holland), Aug. 24-25, Aug. 30, Oct. 10, 1691, David Stafmaker Varlet Nots. 4752-4753, Notarial Archives, Gemeentearchief, Amsterdam. News of Leisler's execution first reached Amsterdam Aug. 6, 1691, *Amsterdamsche Courant*, No. 94, Aug. 7, 1691, 1. Some of the documents sent by the States to the King in October, 1691, are in PRO CO5/1082, pp. 83-105.

84. Ashurst to Mather, May 5, 1695, in Hutchinson, *History of Massachusetts*, II: 64.

85. Abraham Gouverneur to his Parents, Oct. 12, 1692, *DRNY*, IV: 4. Phips never refuted making the statement, see Phips / Fletcher correspondence *ibid.*, 3, 5-6, and Fletcher to Phips, Jan. 6, 1693, PRO CO5/1082, p. 121.

86. For Moll see Jacob Melyen to Isaac van Vleecq, Oct. 12, 1691, and Melyen to Johannes Kerfbijl, Jan. 25, 1691/2 and Oct. 28, 1692, Melyen Letter Book, 40, 46, 65. From the Council of the Lower Counties to Penn, Apr. 2, 1691, in Dunn and Dunn, eds., *Papers of William Penn*, 3: 295-302.

87. *Captain Leisler's Case* (London, 1695), British Museum Collections, London; Breviate of Petition to Queen Mary and the Privy Council in Dunn and Dunn, eds., *Penn Papers*, III: 395-396. For Penn's aligning with Shrewsbury and Monmouth see *ibid.*, 414-415, 418. For a historical background of the more radical Whig element see Robert Beddard, *A Kingdom without a King* (Oxford, 1988), 20-23.

88. Lovejoy, *Glorious Revolution in America*, 362-364. For the crown's restoration of Penn's proprietary see *DRNY*, IV: 108-112. For Tatham see John E. Pomfret, *The Province of West New Jersey, 1609-1702* (Princeton, N.J., 1956), 186-187. For the Parliamentary hearings on Leisler see Stock, *Proceedings in Parliament*, II: 112-131, and NYHS Collections, I: 348-357.

89. Earl of Bellomont to Council of Trade and

Plantations, Sept. 21, 1698, in Noel Sainsbury, et al., eds., *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1574-1736*, 42 vols. (London, 1860-1953), XVI: 446. #835.

Johannsen, "Conflict Between the Three Lower Counties," 112-128; Rodney, "Early Relations of Delaware and Pennsylvania," 229-240. Francis Nicholson's machinations as Maryland governor, 1692-1698, to bring the lower counties into Maryland's orbit created additional tensions, see Gary Nash, "Governor Francis Nicholson and the New Castle Expedition of 1696, *Delaware History*, XI (1964-1965), 229-239.

90. Frame of Government, Oct. 28, 1701, *Minutes of the Council*, II: 57-58.

91. Johannsen, "Conflict Between the Three Lower Counties," 128-130; William R. Cario, "Anglicization in a 'Frenchified, Scotchified, Dutchified Place': New Castle, Delaware, 1690-1750" (Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1994), 60-66, 79-82, 171-173.

92. Cario, "Anglicization," 80-81; Craig W. Horle and Marianne Wokeck, *Lawmaking and Legislators in Pennsylvania: A Biographical Dictionary*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia, 1991); *Calendar of Delaware Wills*, 11. For Halliwell see *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, III (1879), 210-211. For the marriage of Catharine Donaldson to Michael

Vaughton see Edwin R. Purple, *Genealogical Notes Relating to Lieut.-Gov. Jacob Leisler, and His Family Connections in New York* (New York, 1877), 11-12.

93. Cannon, "The Loockermans Manor House," *Delaware History*, 101-103; "News Notes," *Delaware History*, V (March 1953), 212. See biographies of James Ash(e)ton Bayard, James Ashton Bayard, John Bubenheim Bayard, and Richard Henry Bayard in Allen Johnson, ed., *Dictionary of American Biography*, vol. 1 (New York, 1927), 64-69.

94. Ritchie, *The Duke's Province*, 237.

95. Milton M. Klein, "Politics and Personalities in Colonial New York," *New York History*, XLVII (January 1966), 3-16.

DAVID WILLIAM VOORHEES is editor of the Papers of Jacob Leisler, a National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) project at New York University. This paper was presented at a symposium, "The Dutch and Swedish Presence in the Delaware Valley," held at the American Swedish Historical Museum, Philadelphia, April 1, 1995. He thanks Firth Haring Fabend, Mary Lou Lustig, and Dennis Maika for thoughtful criticisms.