There are two oft-repeated statements made about eighteenth-century British North America. The first is that colonists, especially those in rural areas, were often isolated, rarely venturing beyond the confines of their own hamlet. The second is that the colonies each had stronger links to Great Britain than with one another. David Hawke argued, “The country dweller lived rooted to the soil, and his horizon seldom swept beyond the view that rimmed his farm.” Robert Middlekauff concluded that “many perhaps never gazed beyond town, parish, or county lines.” Indeed, “the colonies at mid-century apparently could not attain even rudimentary unity, or at least showed no desire to attain it. Sunk in localism each clutched at its own institutions or looked across the Atlantic to Britain.” John Ferling affirmed that “each [colony] was independent of the others, generally liked it that way, and hoped to remain unfettered by ties to anyone, save the mother country.” “Historically,” the colonies “had looked across the Atlantic to the parent state, not across the borders to the neighboring American provinces.”

1. INTERCONNECTED COMMUNITIES: THE MIDDLE COLONIES ON THE EVE OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The present essay aims not to rebut the idea that colonists and communities were isolated and provincial. They often were. The purpose is rather to reexamine the Middle Colonies—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware—in light of the reservation Middlekauff offered concerning his above quoted generalization: “The divided character of the colonies can be overstated, for there were forces pulling them together.” Ferling made the same point: “Despite this long-standing indifference, or hostility, to cooperative endeavors, signs abounded that a new spirit existed in 1754.” Indeed, developments taking place in the eighteenth century, especially the commercial and consumer revolutions, were by the 1750s linking the people of the Middle Colonies much more closely to one another, to colonists living elsewhere in British North America, and to the Atlantic world beyond.

Philadelphia’s farsighted Benjamin Franklin very early encouraged this transformation, when in 1754 he published one of America’s first newspaper cartoons, the celebrated dissected snake with the caption, “Join, or Die.” That same year he also sponsored his abortive Albany Plan of Union, which would have united the colonies under a crown-appointed president general and a grand council elected by the provincial assemblies.

The primary focus here, however, is upon what was taking place within the area that the surveyor Lewis Evans highlighted in his A Map of Pensilvania, New-Jersey, New-York, and the Three Delaware Counties (1749). What noticeably set these four colonies apart was their heterogeneity. Religiously they included Anglicans, Presbyterians, assorted Calvinists, various Lutherans, Quakers, Moravians, Methodists, Anabaptists, Baptists, Jews, and Catholics. Ethnically the region was as varied: African, African American, Native American, Dutch, German, French, English, Palatine, Welsh, Scottish, Scots-Irish, Irish, Swedish, and Swiss. The Middle Colonies consequently “had a much larger proportion of non-English Europeans and their descendants” than did either New England or the South. The numbers are not precise, but it is possible to get an idea about how many immigrants were pouring into the Middle Colonies. Between 1700 and 1770 111,000 German-speaking settlers came to America; of these about three-quarters arrived in Philadelphia and settled in the Delaware Valley. From 1717 to 1760, between 100,000 and 150,000 Scots-Irish emigrated to America, many of whom settled in Pennsylvania. In addition, between 1760 and 1775 approximately 79,740 immigrants arrived in the region; of which 24,770 were Scots-Irish, 22,560, Scots, and 6,330, English.
The heterogeneity of these four colonies also helped to make the peoples living there exceptionally contentious and that, in turn, often begot violence as individuals and groups sought to protect and promote their own interests and beliefs. Bernard Bailyn considered the Middle Colonies to be "the scene of continuous contention." They were "a strange disorderly world . . . Lacking anything like a uniform land system; lacking social cohesion; and chaotic in public affairs." Patricia Bonomi entitled a book about Colonial New Yorkers _A Factions People_. In a recent study, Jack D. Marietta and G. S. Rowe have documented how immigration into Pennsylvania during the eighteenth century created a society that was "troubled by crime and disorder." The assault of the Paxton Boys in 1763 on Native Americans and the provincial government underscores how volatile and dangerous affairs could become.

This essay will demonstrate that communities throughout the Middle Colonies were becoming by the mid-eighteenth century, despite the pluralism and violence, interconnected on inter- and intra-colonial levels. This conclusion derives from an examination of almanacs and newspapers; mail service, roads, and travel; religious bonds; commerce; family ties; and scholarly links. It will show that the region's people were growing more conscious of, knowledgeable about, and interactive with one another. This development, in turn, facilitated their participation in the American Revolution. The claim is not that inhabitants crafted a shared identity as "Middle Colonyites." It is instead that they fashioned overlapping webs of communications and
relationships that partisans on both sides—Whigs and Loyalists—could exploit in the Revolution.\textsuperscript{15}

The Middle Colonies thus provide a fascinating vantage point from which to map the forces pulling the thirteen colonies together in the mid-eighteenth century. If the Middle Colonies can serve as a test case, it becomes much easier to understand how the American colonists were able, despite very great odds, to join together first in the Stamp Act Congress, then in the Continental Congress, and ultimately in a war for independence.\textsuperscript{16}

Almanacs and Newspapers

One way to measure the movement toward interconnectedness is to examine almanacs, "the most widely read of all printed material in the colonial period," for these publications provided readers with information they wanted for conducting their daily activities.\textsuperscript{17} There were at least thirteen almanacs published for 1740 in the thirteen colonies. Eleven of these were printed in the Middle Colonies: two in New York and nine in Pennsylvania. By 1775 thirty-two almanacs appeared in the Middle Colonies: two in Delaware, one in New Jersey, fourteen in New York, and fifteen in Pennsylvania.\textsuperscript{18} Almanacs also grew in size, and this trend was most pronounced in New York. The two extant almanacs for 1750 averaged 23 pages in length; the four for 1765, 41.5 pages; and the six for 1775, 62.3 pages.\textsuperscript{19}

A partial listing of the material typically found during the early 1770s in Gaine’s New-York Pocket Almanack reveals how intertwined the Middle Colonies had become and how wide-ranging and outreaching New Yorkers were in their businesses, interests, and activities: tide-tables for New York City, Boston, and Philadelphia; the dates and places of Quaker general meetings in Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey; calendars for the various courts in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania; tables of the value of coins from England, New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Quebec; charts showing the value in New York and Pennsylvania currency for sums up to one hundred pounds sterling; currency conversion tables for New Jersey and New York; schedules of fairs to be held in the Province of New York; the names of the municipal officials for Albany and New York; rosters of the judges, justices, and sheriffs in the province of New York; rolls of provincial officials for New York and New Jersey; listings of the inspectors of flour and of the masters and wardens for the port of New York; names of
the faculty for the College of New Jersey and King’s College; passenger rates for stages between Montreal, Quebec, New York City, and Philadelphia; the distances between all the key towns from New York City southward to Charlestown and northward to Quebec and Boston; and the same from Philadelphia westward to Fort Pitt, northward to Harris’s Ferry, and from Philadelphia to Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

Almanac publishers were often in the newspaper business. In 1763 there were twenty-one newspapers in the colonies, with an average circulation of about six hundred. By 1775 the number had climbed to forty-two, of which thirteen were published in the Middle Colonies; eight in Pennsylvania, and five in New York. Some papers appeared more than once a week. Circulation normally ranged from seven hundred to thirty-six hundred copies, with an average of about fifteen hundred.20 These readership numbers, however, do not adequately convey the extent of their influence, for newspapers were distributed to coffee houses and taverns, where they were sometimes read aloud to patrons. Printers in the different cities also exchanged copies of their newspapers, so they could print stories about happenings elsewhere in the colonies.21

The newspapers themselves tell an important story. There were five in New York City for the period from September 1, 1766 until December 31, 1766. During this four month time span, after the Stamp Act crisis had ended and affairs had returned to a more normal course, Baltimore is mentioned three times; Charlestown, eleven; Providence, thirty; Newport, thirty; Boston, sixty-eight; Albany, seventy-three; and Philadelphia, 116. During this same period, in the Pennsylvania Gazette, Charleston is named three times; Albany, eighteen; Providence, nineteen; Newport, twenty-four; Baltimore, thirty-three; and Boston, thirty-seven. However, New York appears 119 times, and New York City, sixty-seven. Although it is not always clear when a writer used “New York” to refer either to New York City or to the province of New York, the data underscore the strength of the ties between the two leading port cities in the Middle Colonies.22

Franklin’s entrepreneurship as a printer illuminates another facet of the emerging interconnectedness and outreach, for he created a “network” of about two dozen printers that extended from New England to the Caribbean.23 He typically set up family members or promising apprentices and journeymen, whom he had trained, in the printing business in cities lacking adequate newspaper coverage. He provided the capital, ink, and paper in return for one-third of the profits.24 Contracts generally lasted for six years but could
be extended. These partnerships also gave him new locations to vend his Poor Richard's Almanack, which sold more than one hundred forty-one thousand copies between 1752 and 1765. When possible, he used his authority as deputy postmaster general to get his partners appointed as local postmasters. He thereby provided them with extra income and a competitive advantage, since they were the first in their communities to receive newspapers from other locales. Because letters to and from the deputy postmaster general could be franked, Franklin also assured himself a steady flow of publishable information from his partners. Among those affiliated with him in the Middle Colonies were Benjamin Bache, Hugh Gaine, William Goddard, David Hall, John Holt, James Parker, and William Weyman.25

Mail Service, Roads, and Travel

In his role as deputy postmaster general, which he assumed in 1753, Benjamin Franklin also worked to enhance the bonds among the colonies by improving the speed and frequency of the mail service, especially between Philadelphia and New York City. In 1715 a post rider left from the former for the latter every Friday morning and arrived by Saturday evening. By 1754 post riders left each city every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday and arrived in the other thirty-three hours later.26 In 1762, because of the improved postal service, the New York Mercury boasted that it was available throughout New Jersey.27 That same year John Holt assumed publication of the New York Gazette and to build circulation announced that “to supply Materials for this Work, a Correspondence is open’d with Men of Genius and Learning … from Virginia to Boston.”28 In 1770 David Hall boasted that his Pennsylvania Gazette also circulated in Delaware and Maryland.29 John Watts, a New York City merchant, could consequently write in 1763: “When a little dirty Dispute arises here between Governor and People, of hardly any Consequence, they ["Massachusetts, N Hampshire, N Jersey, and Pennsylvania"] can send firie Instructions and Reproofs without a Moments delay.”30

By 1764 post riders were traveling through the night, and the time it took to send a letter between New York and Philadelphia had been cut in half. Hence, if Franklin sent a letter to New York, he maintained that he could receive a reply the next day.31 A sampling of Philadelphia post-office documents for the period from 1764 to 1767 indicates that 49.3 percent of the letters mailed from that city went to New York City. Although it is
impossible to distinguish between mail that was meant for New York and that which was destined for Europe, no other destination received nearly as much mail: 8.2 percent to Boston, 4.4 percent to Baltimore, 2.3 percent to Newport, and 0.5 percent to Charleston. New Jersey received 6 percent of the mail, and the interior of Pennsylvania 6.3 percent. By 1767 news items from Philadelphia newspapers were being reprinted in New York four days later. As a result, residents of one place quickly learned how denizens elsewhere were reacting to British imperial policies. By the 1760s the postal service had become “a sign and, in its own way, a cause of the growing unity among the English colonies.” Conversely, the improvements made in the colonial post office and the British government’s launch of regular packet boat service between the colonies and the mother country in 1755 augmented the ministry’s capacity to gather information and to further its policy of imperial centralization. In 1774 William Goddard consequently promoted the creation of a Patriot controlled Constitutional Post.

The flow of information into the interior was obviously not as rapid. In 1775 a message sent from Philadelphia could reach Reading, fifty-five miles away, in almost two days; and York, approximately one hundred eight miles away, in three days. A trip down the Hudson from Albany to New York City could be completed in as little as a day, but the return voyage upriver usually lasted three to four days.

In sum, to fully comprehend what was occurring anywhere in the Middle Colonies in the years before the Revolution, a historian needs to know what was happening throughout the region, for British Americans were knowledgeable about such matters. In 1761 the New Jersey Assembly resolutely (and competitively) declined to raise as many troops as the British commander-in-chief, General Jeffery Amherst, had requested, because New York’s Assembly had refused to do so. That same year, Richard Peters, a proprietary official in Philadelphia, wrote New York’s Governor Robert Monckton, a family friend and recent visitor to the city, with the latest news on Native-American affairs in Pennsylvania and New York. In November 1763, just before the Paxton Boys massacred six Conestoga Indians, New Jersey’s Governor William Franklin informed General Thomas Gage, the new British commander-in-chief, that a majority of his colony’s Assemblymen “have their minds so poisoned by the absurd Notions which prevail among many People in Pennsylvania with regard to Indians, that it will be a Work of Time before they can be brought to a right Way of Thinking again.” The quarrel in Rivington’s New-York Gazetteer in 1774 between the Patriot
Charles Thomson of Philadelphia and Benjamin Booth of New York City, an East India Company tea agent, over whether the latter was “an enemy to truth and his country,” demonstrates that residents in both places were conscious they were performing on what was becoming a single stage.\textsuperscript{42}

Traveling on colonial roads had also improved in response to the commercial and consumer revolutions.\textsuperscript{43} In 1750 it took five days to journey between New York and Philadelphia; in 1756, about three and one-half days; and in 1765, three days. Following the invention of the “Flying Machine” coach, travel time was cut to two days in winter and one and a half in summer. In 1772 the Flying Machine left Paulus Hook, New Jersey, just across the Hudson from New York City, every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, except in winter, when it departed on Tuesdays and Thursdays.\textsuperscript{44} Because of improved transportation, travel increased, and distant places became familiar.\textsuperscript{45} Niagara Falls entered the European-American imagination as “one of the wonders of the world.”\textsuperscript{46} Twice a year horses belonging to New Englanders, Philadelphians, and New Yorkers competed on Hempstead Plains, Long Island.\textsuperscript{47} James De Lancey (1732–1800) of New York raced his horses in competition at the Philadelphia Jockey Club on at least three occasions (September 1769; October 1770, and May 1773); he also attended a cock fight near Philadelphia in March 1770. When the Jockey Club was founded in 1766, it had 71 members, who lived between New York and Virginia.\textsuperscript{48} In 1769 it took Thomas Rodney three days to travel from Dover, Delaware to Philadelphia, “a glamorous cosmopolis which would afford [him] ... an endless round of tea, grog, and coffee drinking with friends, of visiting the ships on the river, and of playing billiards in Spring Garden.”\textsuperscript{49}

New Jersey was already being viewed as “a barrel taped at both ends” (a saying usually attributed to Benjamin Franklin) and a “mere pathway” between the two cities.\textsuperscript{50} Fortunately, along the “very good” New Jersey roads, “the inns are good, and everything as genteel as on the publick road in England.”\textsuperscript{51} Travel was convenient enough and affairs so intermeshed that in 1762 two members of the New Jersey Governor’s Council resided in New York.\textsuperscript{52} David Douglass operated both Philadelphia’s Southwark Theatre and New York’s John Street Theatre.\textsuperscript{53} In what had become commonplace, James Napier, the Director General of His Majesty’s military hospitals, just before he returned home in 1764, arranged a trip for a party of friends that leisurely visited Philadelphia, New Brunswick, New Jersey, and Mount Kemble, New Jersey, before returning to New York City.\textsuperscript{54}
By the end of the Seven Years’ War (1754–1763) the wealthy were mingling at spas and watering places throughout the Middle Colonies, including Yellow Springs in Chester County, Pennsylvania; Abington Mineral Works in Bucks County, Pennsylvania; and Black Point in Shrewsbury, New Jersey. Captain John Montressor of the British Engineer Corps, who was stationed in New York, visited Yellow Springs from April 18 to May 14, 1765. Perhaps the most popular spa was the one at Bristol, Pennsylvania, about twenty miles northeast of Philadelphia and on the road that passed through Trenton, New Jersey, before heading toward New York City. This trend “proved a potent factor in promoting colonial unity and nourishing nascent Americanism.”

More than relaxation was involved in these trips. In 1760–1761, Rev. John Gano was ministering to both the Philadelphia and New York City Baptist congregations. Improved travel explains, too, how Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York lawyers could practice in one another’s communities. James Alexander was admitted to the New York bar in 1720 and the New Jersey bar in 1723. New York’s William Smith belonged to the New York and Philadelphia bars. Alexander Hamilton of Philadelphia represented John Peter Zenger of New York in his famous trial in 1734. In the 1760s, in the infamous Forsey v. Cunningham case, after almost the entire New York bar had refused to represent the defendant, Cunningham had a representative scour New Jersey and Pennsylvania for an attorney willing to take the case. Because Middle-Colony lawyers understood that Cunningham was challenging the right to trial by jury, none would do so.

Ease of travel and improved communications benefited partisans as the Revolution approached. During the Stamp Act crisis, after the citizens of New York City had forced their stamp distributor, James McEvers, to resign, the city’s Sons of Liberty warned their Philadelphia counterparts that they must make John Hughes, Pennsylvania’s stamp distributor, resign “as the other Distributors have done,” or New York “would disown them and hold no longer Correspondence with them.” The New York City Liberty Boys even had representatives on the scene in Philadelphia, relaying intelligence; and at one point threatened Philadelphians that if they allowed the stamps to land, a group of reputable New Yorkers and New Jerseyites would go and destroy the stamps themselves. In late December the New York Sons of Liberty began to organize communities in nearby colonies into a military association to resist any efforts the British army might make to enforce the Stamp Act. In February 1766 New York’s Liberty Boys began building
a correspondence network with their compatriots in neighboring colonies, including New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. In March John Lamb, a leading New York City Liberty Boy, was in Philadelphia, when news arrived there that the Stamp Act would be repealed. He immediately forwarded the information home, where it arrived twenty hours later.

The Pennsylvania Journal reprinted the “Freeman” articles, which had first appeared in New York City in June 1765 and had called for independence if Americans were denied their natural rights. Philadelphia also learned very quickly about the riot that took place in New York on the night of November 1, 1765. Later that month Benjamin Rush reported that the city’s residents were being greatly influenced by what New Yorkers were doing in the crisis. Two days after New York’s Liberty Boys burned a parcel of stamps on February 13, 1766, William Bradford wrote them from Philadelphia to say that they had acted wisely. That same month the Philadelphia Sons of Liberty sent an express to their counterparts in New York City about a plot by some merchants to use stamped papers.

In 1774 Joseph Galloway, leader of the Quaker party in Pennsylvania and eventual Loyalist, invited Samuel Verplanck, a New York City merchant and a founder of the local Chamber of Commerce, to visit him at his estate at Trevose in Bucks County. Following the defeat of his Plan of Union, which he offered to the First Continental Congress on September 28, Galloway headed to New York City, where he met with Verplanck and other conservatives to promote his idea. After returning home Galloway maintained a correspondence about the imperial crisis with Verplanck that ran from December 1774 until August 1775. Galloway did likewise with New Jersey’s Governor William Franklin, another political ally. Although Galloway failed to stop the Revolution, he understood the importance of the Middle Colonies and did his best to marshal moderate forces throughout the region to meet the challenge. Of the eight letters Galloway wrote between September 1774 and April 1775, and that are printed in Letters of Delegates to Congress, 1774–1789, seven were addressed to people who lived in the Middle Colonies; the eighth was to a relative by marriage, who resided in England. In February 1775 he even sent a copy of his proposed plan to Rivington’s New-York Gazetteer for publication.

Military events overwhelmed Galloway’s initiative and also underscored the interconnectedness of the Middle Colonies. News of the battles of Lexington and Concord, which occurred on April 19, 1775, reached New York City at
4:00 p.m. on Sunday, April 23. From there, it arrived at New Brunswick at 2:00 a.m. the next day (thirty-five miles in distance); Princeton, at 6:00 a.m. (seventeen miles in distance), and Trenton at 9:00 a.m. (thirteen miles in distance), from where it was forwarded to Philadelphia.73

Religious Bonds

Some Middle Colonists traveled primarily for reasons of faith. As religious groups grew in size and the number of their ministers increased, churches early on built organizational structures to nourish faith, maintain unity, recruit and discipline ministers, and expand membership. At regular intervals these organizations brought together worshippers and ministerial leaders from distant settlements. Quakers established the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in 1684 and the New York Yearly Meeting in 1695. By 1775 the latter comprised five monthly meetings in New York; and the former, thirty-eight monthly meetings, including twenty-one in Pennsylvania, ten in New Jersey, and two each in Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.74 In 1707 the Baptists launched the Philadelphia Baptist Association, which initially included congregations from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware but which expanded geographically over time. In 1747 the Dutch Reformed Church set up a Coetus (or synod) of ministers and laypersons from New York and New Jersey. That same year, Pennsylvania’s German Reformed ministers organized as a subordinate body of the Dutch Reformed Church and formed a Coetus (of ministers) that met in Philadelphia and that periodically sent ministers to visit and report on the status of each congregation. Lutherans instituted their Ministerium of Ministers in 1748; by 1776 about 130 congregations, mostly in Pennsylvania, belonged to the body.75

Presbyterians founded the Synod of Philadelphia in 1716. New Light Presbyterians created the Synod of New York in 1745. The two bodies united in 1758 as the Presbyterian Synod of New York and Philadelphia, which included the presbyteries of New York (western Connecticut, New York, and northwestern Pennsylvania); New Brunswick (New Jersey and northeastern Pennsylvania); Philadelphia (Pennsylvania); Suffolk (western Long Island); Hanover (Virginia and North Carolina); Donegal (Delaware and Maryland); and New Castle (Delaware and Maryland).76 By the early 1770s Methodists in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York were in frequent contact and financially assisting one another in erecting new chapels.77 Although sectarianism
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was often a divisive force, the existence of these organizations inevitably broke down localism by affording church members the awareness that they freely belonged to a group that existed independent of and outside their own neighborhoods.78 Trips to meetings strengthened ties among people of the same faith, expanded participants’ horizons, and offered them a better sense of what other areas of the Middle Colonies were like.

A look at three churches elucidates this development. Quakers gathered not only at local preparative meetings for worship but also at monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings for worship and business. Thus, a Jamaica, Long Island, Quaker, who had earned the esteem of his coreligionists in his local meeting, might be appointed to attend the Flushing Monthly Meeting, which covered a larger geographic area and was responsible for moral behavior and disciplining Friends living under its purview. The monthly meeting might, in turn, appoint the same individual to the Westbury Quarterly Meeting, which served a still larger geographic area and to which appeals might be made from monthly meeting decisions. From there the same Quaker might be chosen to attend the New York Yearly Meeting, which had advisory authority over quarterly and monthly meetings. Each yearly meeting was autonomous, but the six colonial yearly meetings looked to the Philadelphia and the London yearly meetings for leadership and guidance.

At each stage in the process individual Quakers conversed and exchanged information religious and otherwise with Friends from other communities elsewhere in the Middle Colonies and beyond. English Quakers, including John and Samuel Fothergill, visited their American coreligionists to share their faith and fellowship, and American Quakers reciprocated.79 Abraham Farrington of Pennsylvania visited England in 1757–1758; Peter Andrews in 1756; James Daniel of New Jersey in 1761; William Horne of Pennsylvania in 1763; and William Hunt in 1771. Samuel Emlen of Philadelphia made several trips to Britain in his role as a Quaker minister.80 American Friends also visited other yearly meetings in America. Between 1743 and 1770, John Woolman, a New Jersey Quaker abolitionist and reformer, traveled extensively throughout the Middle Colonies. He died on a visit to York, England in 1772.81 In 1774 John Churchman, another reformer, visited meetings throughout the province of New York. At Newtown, Long Island, he met the English Quaker minister, Robert Walker, who was on a trip of almost two years to minister to American Friends. In sum, being an active member of a Quaker community impelled individuals to forsake localism and develop connections with people outside their own neighborhoods.82
Quakers also traveled and networked for reasons besides religion. Two wealthy Philadelphia Quakers, Hannah Callender and Elizabeth Drinker, visited New York City in this period for social reasons.83 Walter and Samuel Franklin, two New York City Friends, used the firm of their coreligionists James Able and Henry Drinker as their Philadelphia correspondent.84 Thomas Clifford, a Pennsylvania Quaker, and William Franklin, a New York Quaker, were business correspondents and part owners in the Pine Grove Iron Works in Maryland.85 When Friends moved west for economic opportunity, they invariably created and expanded religious, family, and economic links between newer and older Quaker communities.86

In short, Middle-Colony Quakers had established multiple webs of relationships that not only fostered spiritual unity but that reached beyond religion and facilitated a discourse about political and economic issues. Hence, in September 1774, while the First Continental Congress was meeting, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting issued an epistle “to our Friends and Brethren in these and the neighboring Provinces,” warning that “we are under deep obligations to manifest our loyalty and fidelity [to the crown], and that we should discourage every attempt which may be made by any to excite disaffection or disrespect to” George III.87 At the request of an anonymous New Yorker, Rivington’s New-York Gazetteer reprinted the key portion of the epistle, because its “sentiments… deserved to be considered by every man.”88 In May 1775, following the battles of Lexington and Concord, the Meeting for Suffering of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting again warned Friends throughout “the adjacent provinces” to conduct themselves “agreeable to the peaceable principles and testimony we profess” and not to participate in the rebellion.89

Friends were not alone in furthering regional integration. In 1758 Middle-Colony Presbyterians overcame divisions that had emerged in the Great Awakening and established the Presbyterian Synod of New York and Philadelphia.90 Meeting yearly, the body allowed the church’s ministers and leading laymen to exchange ideas and to place political and religious issues that concerned Presbyterianism in broader perspective. In May 1764 Charles Pettit, a New Jersey merchant, wrote to his brother-in-law, Joseph Reed, a Presbyterian, that “the Presbyterians having… become a Party in Opposition to the Quakers, they have been falling on means to form an Union amongst themselves, for which purpose they are instituting Monthly and Yearly Meetings.” Later that year their opponents satirized what was happening in a pamphlet entitled The Substance, of a council held at Lancaster August the 28th 1764. By a committee of Presbyterian ministers and elders deputed
from all parts of Pennsylvania, in order to settle the ensuing election of members for the Assembly. Published, at the request of their respective congregations. After the election an Anglican minister living in Oxford, Pennsylvania, reported to the SPG secretary that "the Presbyterian ministers... held Synods about the election, turned their pulpit into Ecclesiastical drums for politics and told their people to vote according as they directed them at the peril of their damnation."92

The Presbyterian effort to reach out and to become a political force continued unabated right up to the Revolution. In May 1766, following the Stamp Act crisis and at a time of significant religious tension in the region, the synod contacted the Congregational churches in Connecticut; and representatives from the two churches began meeting together that November. They continued to do so yearly until the outbreak of the Revolution in 1775, by which time the group had evolved into a "colonies-wide organization of Congregational and Presbyterian churches." In the summer of 1766, Ezra Stiles, a Connecticut-born Congregational minister, proposed a union and an annual convention of all dissenters, including Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Quakers, to safeguard religious liberty from Anglican attack. The idea was abandoned for fear the British ministry would view the gathering as another Stamp Act Congress.93 Nonetheless, in 1768 "Nov-Anglus," an Anglican, feared that Presbyterians aimed "in the Middle Colonies... to introduce an Establishment of Presbyterianism."94 In 1769, during a period of bitter religious acrimony between Anglicans and Presbyterians in New York City, Presbyterians suggested the formation of a Society of Dissenters to resist "the farther encroachments and stratagems of the Episcopalians." This effort, too, proved abortive; other dissenting churches feared Presbyterianism as much as they feared Anglicanism.95

The Presbyterian College of New Jersey (Princeton), which had been established in 1746, drew church members together from all over the Middle Colonies, enabling them to exert their might throughout the region. In its first twenty years the college educated 338 individuals. Ninety-seven (or 28.7 percent) became Presbyterian clergymen, who were "highly articulate and unusually vocal" in promoting their church. In the same period the school also produced forty-nine lawyers, forty-four medical doctors, and seventeen schoolmasters. It trained a notable number of future politicians, including twenty-eight provincial congressmen, forty-four state legislators, two governors, twenty-one Continental Congressmen, and five members of the Constitutional Convention.96 According to Ned Landsman, the college
supplied “a significant portion of the political leadership” from New York to South Carolinas. Middle-Colony Presbyterians clearly appreciated the school. When Rev. Samuel Davies died suddenly in 1761 after serving as the school’s president for nineteen months, Philadelphians and New Yorkers together raised over four hundred pounds for his wife and two daughters. Philadelphians also contributed enough money for his three sons to attend college.98

The college’s scholars had a considerable impact upon the Middle Colonies. Of the 301 students of known origin attending the school between 1748 and 1768, 61.5 percent came from the Middle Colonies. Of the 322 students, who attended the college during these years and whose future residence is known, over 53 percent settled in the region.99 In the Revolution the college became “the Cradle of Liberty.” In 1775, 279 of the students, who had matriculated between 1746 and 1768, were still alive. Ninety-four performed some sort of Patriot military service; only eight became Royalists. Between 1769 and 1775, 178 scholars (including James Madison) studied under the tutelage of the college’s President John Witherspoon, a Presbyterian minister and signer of the Declaration of Independence. His students held 105 significant state or national offices; two became Royalists.100

Middle-Colony Anglicans did their best to imitate and counter these Presbyterian organizational initiatives.101 In the early 1750s New York Episcopalians successfully used their political savvy to make the future King’s College (Columbia) Anglican to counterbalance the influence of Presbyterianism at the College of New Jersey and Congregationalism at Harvard and Yale.102 The success of the Presbyterians in organizing the Synod of New York and Philadelphia led New Jersey Anglicans to hold their own convention in 1758. Anglicans from other colonies eventually participated in these yearly meetings. In 1766, for example, nineteen clergymen from New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut met at Elizabethtown, New Jersey. However, this group could never fulfill the functions of a bishop in a church that was episcopal in design.103 In the 1760s Middle-Colony High-Church Anglican clergy consequently participated in a vigorous campaign to have an Anglican bishop appointed for America to complete their organizational structure and to hold Presbyterianism at bay. However, British officials and the Middle-Colony laity were not enthusiastic, and the proposal was never implemented. In the absence of a bishop, the SPG spearheaded Anglican growth by establishing almost one hundred fifty congregations in the colonies between 1740 and 1770. In the end it was SPG
High-Church Anglican ministers, who had been leaders in the campaign to improve the church's organizational strength, who also trumpeted the Loyalist cause in the Middle Colonies: Thomas Bradbury Chandler, Charles Inglis, Myles Cooper, and Samuel Seabury, Jr.104

The Anglican Church, however, was unable to operate as effectively at networking as its Presbyterian counterpart, and King's College never became for Anglicans what the College of New Jersey had become for their rivals: Anglicans had fewer members on King's College's board of trustees than Presbyterians had in their college; Anglicans did not flock from all over the colonies to attend the school; over 75 percent of the students came from a thirty-mile radius around New York City; only seven Anglican clerics sent their sons there for an education; ministerial candidates were always in short supply; and the Anglican population in the Middle Colonies was too small to support the endeavor.105 Anglican communicants never had the evangelical, proselytizing fervor of their Presbyterian counterparts. Anglicanism stressed tradition over innovation, reason over passion, and liturgy over evangelicals' emphasis upon rebirth. Moreover, rank-and-file Anglicans were never keen for the appointment of an American bishop. The SPG High-Church clergy were frankly self-appointed activists without a sizeable following. As a result, because the church lacked a broad-based organizational structure, Middle-Colony Anglican clergymen, who were natural allies of the crown, were less effective in promoting Royalism during the Revolution than Presbyterians were in advancing the Patriot cause.

The role religion played in linking the Middle Colonies together and in influencing developments in the Revolution can be seen, too, in the life of Joseph Reed, a talented, bright, amiable son of Andrew Reed, a minor officeholder and lesser merchant in New Jersey.106 Father and son were Presbyterians, who very much valued education. In 1750 the family moved from Trenton to Philadelphia, so the son could attend Rev. Francis Alison's (Old-Light Presbyterian) Philadelphia Academy in 1751. After Andrew's wife died, the family returned to New Jersey, and Joseph attended the College of New Jersey. He graduated in 1757 and for the next three years studied in Princeton at the law offices of Richard Stockton, a Presbyterian graduate of the College of New Jersey, future favorite of Governor William Franklin, and signer of the Declaration of Independence.107 In 1763 Reed traveled to London, where he enrolled in the Middle Temple. Early in his stay he met Dennys DeBerdt, a prominent Dissenting merchant, among whose American customers was the firm of Andrew Reed and Charles Pettit.
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Joseph Reed unsuccessfully proposed to DeBerdt's daughter Esther in 1763, but they eventually married in England in 1770. After Reed returned home, he moved to Philadelphia, where he established a successful law practice and became a prominent Whig leader, Washington's Adjutant General, and President of Pennsylvania's Supreme Executive Council.

Reed's Presbyterian connections were vital in introducing him to prominent Whigs within and without the Middle Colonies. In the summer of 1769 he traveled to Massachusetts with John Dickinson after DeBerdt, who was that colony's colonial agent, had appointed Reed as his assistant. There the two men cultivated what became long-term relationships with several leading Whigs: Samuel Adams, John Adams, James Otis, and Josiah Quincy. The last stayed at Reed's home during a 1773 trip to Philadelphia, and Reed hosted the Massachusetts delegation to the First Continental Congress (1774). These relationships doubtless helped the radicals outflank Joseph Galloway and defeat his Plan of Union.108

By the early 1770s, as a result of trips to New York City, Reed had also established a relationship with the Whig militants, Alexander McDougal and Isaac Sears.109 Exactly how they were introduced is unclear. One of Reed's college classmates was Nicholas Bayard, a future son-in-law of Philip Van Brugh Livingston and one of the persons who bailed McDougall out of jail in 1770, after he had been imprisoned for authoring To the Betrayed Inhabitants of New York.110 In 1771 McDougall, a Livingstonite in politics, wrote to Reed, thanking him for his support during his ordeal.111 Another of Reed's college classmates was James Smith, whose father was a founding trustee of the College of New Jersey. James's brother William was a member of the pro-Presbyterian "Whig Triumvirate," who often privately advised Sears and McDougall during the 1760s and early 1770s.112

Reed maintained his links to New Jersey politics after moving to Pennsylvania. In 1767 he used his DeBerdt connection to win appointment as Deputy Secretary of the Province of New Jersey.113 Upon resigning the post in 1769, he used his influence to have Charles Pettit, his brother-in-law and his father's business partner, appointed to the post. Richard Stockton, a favorite of William Franklin, perhaps brought his student to the governor's attention and paved the way for Pettit to become the governor's aide in 1771.114

In Philadelphia Reed became a leader in the Second Presbyterian Church and moved to the forefront of the Whig movement. In 1774 he was a member of the Committee of Nineteen, the Committee of Forty-three, and the
Committee of Sixty-three. He also served in the First and Second Provincial Convention (July 1774; January 1775) and in the Pennsylvania Assembly (January 1776). It is consequently no surprise that upon being appointed commander of Continental forces in June 1775 Washington vigorously urged Reed to join his staff. Reed was not only a competent politician; he was also well connected to Whig politicians throughout the Middle Colonies and in Massachusetts.

**Commerce**

Trade, too, played a key role in binding the Middle Colonies together, for the region participated in the commercial transformation that was having an enormous impact on the British empire in the last half of the eighteenth century. A few statistics are revealing. Between 1749 and 1774 Pennsylvania's imports from Britain increased from £238,600 to £625,700; New York's, from £265,800 to £437,900. During the same period Pennsylvania's exports to Britain rose from £14,900 to £69,600; New York's, from £23,400 to £80,000. As this trade expanded, so too did the links between Philadelphia and New York and their respective hinterlands. Philadelphia's included Delaware, southeastern Pennsylvania, West Jersey, and parts of eastern Maryland. New York's comprised East Jersey, the Hudson River Valley, Long Island, and Connecticut west of the Connecticut River.

It is impossible to understand the Revolution in the Middle Colonies without considering the impact trade had upon the protest movement. In 1774, while looking out his window in Philadelphia and watching “three topsail vessels” sailing by and hearing “the voice of industry perpetually” ringing out “along the shore,” Rev. Jacob Duché (the Anglican chaplain to the Continental Congress and a future Loyalist) argued: “I cannot behold this lively active scene without lamenting, that the streams of commerce should ever be checked in their course, or directed to wander in other channels, than those which they now possess. Was your Lordship to be but a few months on the spot, you would feel the force of this reflection;” and “your justly-acquired influence” in Parliament “would soon be exerted to silence” measures the “Administration” was taking to damage American liberty and commerce. Moreover, the consumer culture that emerged in the colonies in this period because of the growth in trade “provided them with the cultural resources needed to develop a bold new form of political protest”—the
consumer boycott. "Before this moment no massive political movement had organized itself around the denial of imported goods."119

This commercial expansion also fostered a "high degree of integration" among the Middle Colonies and within the North American economy.120 On the transatlantic front, Waddell Cunningham of New York City and Thomas Greg of Belfast had a co-partnership in the linen trade between 1755 and 1775. The firm soon developed a network of Middle-Colony correspondents, including Duncan and Phyn of Schenectady and McMichael and Scott of Philadelphia.121 John Smith conducted his mercantile business in both Philadelphia and Burlington, New Jersey. In 1764 Thomas Riche, a wealthy Philadelphia merchant, partnered with John Remsen, a New York City merchant, to supply the French colony of Guyana in South America with provisions.122 The family of Jacob Franks (1688–1769), a New York City Jewish merchant, is another example. His son, Naphtali, relocated to London; his son, David, to Philadelphia. Jacob’s son Moses eventually moved to London, where he became a partner in Colebrook, Nesbitt, and Franks. Jacob’s daughter Phila eloped with the Anglican Oliver De Lancey.123

These relationships could be lucrative. The New York City firm of the brothers-in-law, Oliver De Lancey and John Watts, had business and familial ties to the London firm of Colebrook, Nesbitt, and Franks, which in 1760 was awarded the contract for supplying British and provincial forces during the Seven Years’ War. Because of this relationship De Lancey and Watts also became the firm’s agent in New York. Moses’s brother David assumed that role in Philadelphia. When Colebrook, Nesbitt, and Franks lost the contract in 1762, Moses Franks joined the firm of the new contractor, Fludyer and Drummond. De Lancey, Watts, and David Franks continued as that firm’s agents.124 Jacob Franks of New York, in turn, was a contractor for victualling the British Navy at the island of Jamaica.125

The coastal trade was also an important part of this integration. According to James F. Shepherd and Samuel H. Williamson, the Middle Colonies had an average annual deficit of £392,000 in its overseas trade, but a £42,000 surplus in the coastal trade. The same authors concluded that the political consequences of the coastal trade for the Middle Colonies were probably more important than the economic ones, because of the role it played “in providing contact and communication between the colonies, and thus fostering political unity.”126 The growth in the coastal trade like that in the overseas trade strengthened the bonds between New York City and Philadelphia and their hinterlands. There were many reasons why Middle-Colony merchants
and businessmen from different places cooperated. Sometimes it was to compare prices or to obtain a product that was cheaper elsewhere; to buy, sell, or share ownership in a ship; to arbitrate a dispute; to defend another merchant’s reputation; or to provide a reference. The Irish linen merchants of New York City and Philadelphia competed fiercely against one another but nonetheless cooperated in the smuggling trade and in benefiting from price differentials in the flaxseed trade. Greg and Cunningham’s chief correspondent in Philadelphia was the Irish firm of John McMichael and John Scott. James and Drinker and Charles J. Shippen of Philadelphia brought maritime insurance in New York City, when the rates there were better. Greg and Cunningham, in turn, bought insurance in Philadelphia, when the terms there were more favorable. Thomas Wharton of Philadelphia and John Waddle of New York City worked together in the smuggling business. Matthew Clarkson, a New York City merchant, collaborated with Benjamin Franklin in 1765 in a project to acquire land in Nova Scotia. In 1770 the Coldens of New York, the Whartons of Pennsylvania, New Jersey’s Governor William Franklin, and Michael Gratz of Philadelphia collaborated to buy land from George Croghan, an Indian agent and Pennsylvania land speculator.

John Watts’ father Robert (d. 1750) had cultivated business and social connections with William Allen of Philadelphia. The two jointly owned the ship Watts Galley. John shrewdly continued the relationship, calling Allen “my friend” and visiting him periodically. Indeed, most firms in these two cities had an agent in the other. Thomas Wharton of Philadelphia maintained a correspondence with Gerard G. Beekman of New York, who also conducted business with several other Philadelphia merchants, including Thomas Clifford. Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan of Philadelphia used Henry White as their New York correspondent.

As trade expanded and merchants enlarged their networks of contacts, the content of their letters broadened to include politics, legislation, and gossip. In December 1762, John Watts wrote to Sir Charles Hardy in Britain, explaining what had happened in New York and New Jersey that led the ministry to dismiss the latter’s brother Josiah as New Jersey’s royal governor. Josiah had issued commissions to three Supreme Court justices on good behavior and not at the royal pleasure. The Board of Trade, in turn, understood that if it had not punished Governor Hardy, its failure would have had a negative “influence … in the neighbouring Provinces of Pennsylvania and New York.” In March 1764 Watts wrote Governor Robert Monckton,
who had returned to Britain, updating him about his lieutenant governor's performance; discussing the petition the city's merchants were sending to London protesting the changes Britain was making in how it regulated trade with the West Indies; providing his thoughts on Pennsylvania's "feeble disjointed Government" and its inept management of the Paxton Boys; critiquing Benjamin Franklin's denigration of the province of New York in his pamphlet on the recent frontier disturbances; and outlining Sir William Johnson's handling of the Delaware, Shawnee, and Iroquois. Watts ended with a few comments about British politicians, including Isaac Barré, who had spend time in New York during the Seven Years' War. On October 8, about a week after the Pennsylvania elections, Watts informed Johnson of the defeat of Benjamin Franklin and Joseph Galloway for the Assembly. 139

Few Middle-Colony residents had the same grasp of affairs as the well-connected Watts. However, as the Revolution neared, more and more residents were moving beyond localism and understanding better the larger world in which they lived. It was this interconnectedness that explains in part how there could be such "permeable boundaries" around British-occupied New York during the Revolution and how some partisans in the area could be such Generous Enemies toward one another. 140 The strong links that had developed among the Middle Colonies also explain, how after Pennsylvania had adopted its first and radical constitution, New York's Robert R. Livingston, Jr., could say about the way the Quaker state's conservatives had handled the process: "I long ago advised them that they shd yield to the torrent if they hoped to direct its course—you know that nothing but well timed delays, indefatigable industry, and a minute attention to every favorable circumstance could have prevented our being in their situation."141

Family Ties

Family ties also dissolved localism and the geographic distances separating Middle-Colony communities, especially when one considers elite families. John E. Pomfret made the point nicely, declaring that "the social ties of New Jersey with her neighbors were so close as to be almost unique among the colonies."142 So too did Stephanie Grauman Wolf, when she argued that upper-class families were bound more intimately to each other than they were to the communities where they lived. 143 In 1759, for example, John Bayard of Philadelphia went on a tour during which he stayed at the
homes of Colonel William Bayard in New York City and Balthazar Bayard in Boston. Members of the Middle-Colony elite intermarried. They socialized together and visited one another. They built country homes, frequented spas, and even moved into neighboring colonies. Although power and money were the two factors behind most marriage alliances, these people were also fashioning a Middle-Colony elite.

Historians know much about the inter-colonial connections of such families as the Livingstons and Morrises. However, the same point can be made by examining the somewhat less well known James Alexander family and by noting how it used marriage to link itself strategically to other prominent Middle-Colony families and to secure its place in society. James Alexander, an East Jersey Proprietor and member of the Governor's Council in New York (1721-1737, 1750-1756) and New Jersey (1722-1735), had been born in Scotland in 1691 and died in New York City in 1756. In January 1720/21 he married Ann, the daughter of John Sprat (of Scotland) and Marie de Peyster. Marie came from one of New York's most aristocratic families and had previously been married to Samuel Provoost, who belonged to yet another prominent New York family. She eased James's entry into the New York elite. Five Alexander children reached adulthood. Mary married Peter Van Brugh Livingston, whose father Philip was the second lord of Livingston Manor. William, who claimed to be the Earl of Stirling and who served both on New York's Governor's Council (1762-1768) and on New Jersey's Governor's Council (1758-1775), married Sarah Livingston, who was also one of Philip's progeny. Susannah married John Reid of Scotland. Elizabeth wed John Stevens, whose father was the New Jersey Surveyor General and whose mother was of noble descent. Catherine was married first to Elisha Parker and later to Walter Rutherfurd, who also belonged to an eminent New Jersey family and who soon after his marriage, according to William Allen, gained a "Wind-fall" (of £15,000) at the death of his new wife's mother.

Outlining the genealogies of each of James Alexander's five children would be arduous. The point can be made by mentioning some of the prominent Middle-Colony families, into which the children of the four daughters married: Bayard, Clarkson, Cox, Livingston, Morris, and Van Horn. The children of Lord Stirling and his wife Sarah Livingston deserve a bit more attention. Their daughter Mary married Robert Watts, the son of John Watts, Oliver De Lancey's brother-in-law and business partner. Their second and last child, Catherine, married William Duer, an English immigrant, who at the time
of his marriage in 1779 was a wealthy Hudson Valley landholder and former delegate to the Continental Congress.147

As already pointed out, the Watts-De Lancey alliance was an influential one. The De Lancey family’s Anglo-American connections are well known, but its Middle-Colony links are also remarkable.148 In the early 1720s, while James De Lancey (1703–1760), the future lieutenant governor and chief justice of the New York Supreme Court, was studying in England, so too was William Allen (1704–1780), his counterpart on the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. Although the De Lancey and Allen families were on opposite sides in the Peter Zenger case (1734), they would be forever linked. John Watts’s father Robert and William Allen became business associates. John Watts and Allen became great friends. James’s son James (1732–1800) belonged to the Philadelphia Jockey Club and married Allen’s daughter Margaret in 1771. James Allen dutifully noted in his diary that De Lancey’s horse Sultana won fifty pounds in a race at Philadelphia on May 17, 1773. In April 1775 William Allen’s eldest son John married Mary, the daughter of David Johnson of New York City, who was a good friend of Oliver De Lancey.149

The genealogical details about how these families were related are daunting to follow but worth noting, for they demonstrate how intertwined they really were. Moreover, these family relationships could take interesting turns during the Revolution. During the First Continental Congress, which met in Philadelphia from September 5 to October 26, 1774, James Duane, a New York representative, introduced his brother-in-law, Deputy Collector of the Customs at Philadelphia, John Patterson, to delegates from New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. In May 1775, at the start of the Second Continental Congress, Duane felt himself “quite at home” living at Patterson’s residence. However, by March 1776, Duane was still in Philadelphia, but his brother-in-law had retired to Livingston Manor, where for at least part of the time he was under house arrest.150 While living there, Patterson had been passing information to the British, including General John Burgoyne.151 Assisted by the Livingston family, to which he was also related, Patterson received permission from the state in November 1777 to go to British-occupied New York City. By 1779 Patterson was back in England. In this case, blood trumped ideology.152

It was not just elite families that threw such a wide geographic net. The role family ties played among ordinary people in dissolving localism is also apparent, especially if horizontal mobility and the relentless pursuit of land
are considered. From 1750 to 1770, in part because of migration, New York’s population increased by 112.4 percent (or by 86,224 people); Pennsylvania’s, by 100.6 percent (120,391 people); New Jersey’s, by 64.5 percent (46,038 people); and Delaware’s, by 23.7 percent (6,792 people).153 Put simply, these were not people who “never gazed beyond town, parish, or county lines.”154 Of the 256 individuals who sat in the New Jersey Assembly between 1703 and 1776, 34 percent had New York forebears and another 4 percent could trace their roots back to Pennsylvania.155 In the New York military units fighting in 1760 during the Seven Years’ War, only 32.4 percent of the soldiers were native born; 22.7 percent had been born in another British North American colony, and another 43.6 percent had come from across the Atlantic.156 The militia muster rolls from throughout Colonial America paint a similar picture: “In general, a high level of mobility stands out—certainly for these militiamen and, to the extent that they are representative, for the colonial population as a whole.”157 Although such levels of mobility doubtless had a disruptive impact on particular families, this movement of people nonetheless had, according to John E. Pomfret, “a significant influence in bringing the men of different colonies together.”158

A look at New York wills makes it clear that many a resident had a vision that “swept beyond the view that rimmed his farm.” Sprinkled generously throughout the records for the mid-eighteenth century are references to family members, who lived elsewhere in the region, but who had not been forgotten. Equally important are individuals who bequeathed land they owned in distant places to family or friends. The vagueness and incompleteness of the records makes any statistical analysis questionable, but the evidence is nonetheless telling. Thomas Noble, a New York City merchant, in his will remembered his dear friends: Augustus Spangenberg of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, Charles Brodien of Philadelphia, and Timothy Horsefield of Long Island. James Dailon of Monmouth County, New Jersey, bequeathed one thousand acres in Albany County, New York, to his children. Joseph Rodman of Westchester County, New York, but lately of Flushing, Long Island, left his daughter Mary a plantation in Bucks County Pennsylvania. William Beadell of Dutchess County left money to his brother, John, who lived in Queens County, Long Island. Joshua Cornel of North Castle, Westchester County, made his brothers, William of the Manor of Philipsburgh and John of Greenwich, Connecticut, his executers. Hendrick Cuper of Bergen County, New Jersey, remembered his daughters, Geertie of New York City and Mairtie Van Dalsen of Orange County. Adrian Hegeman mentioned his son Abraham, who lived in
Amwell, West New Jersey. John Ogilvie of New York City directed his executors to sell his land in Orange County. Isaac Prall of Staten Island left his land in Woodbridge, New Jersey, to his sons, Peter and Isaac. Rem Hegeman of Kings County left an inheritance to a daughter, who lived in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Frederick Wolves, a New York City glazier bequeathed money to his daughter, who lived in Philadelphia.159

New Jersey wills for the period tell a similar story. Harmen Yuriansen, an Essex County yeoman, bequeathed to his heirs his farm on the Passaic River and his land in Orange County, New York. John Bedell, another Essex County yeoman, did the same with his undivided land on Long Island and in New Jersey. William Wood, a Somerset County innkeeper, left his estate to his nephew William Wood, a New York City carman. Magdalen Valleu of Bergen County bequeathed part of her estate to her two daughters, who were living in New York. Timothy Ragan, a yeoman from Greenwich, New Jersey, made a small provision for his cousin Timothy Yong of Pennsylvania. Elizabeth Sparks of Wiccacoe, Pennsylvania, made her kinsman Josiah Albertson of Gloucester County, New Jersey, one of her executors. Jan Albert Roosa, a Sussex County yeoman made his two brothers, Dirk and Isaac, who lived in Ulster County, New York, his executors. James Eakid, a Philadelphia merchant, bequeathed land he owned in Morris County, East New Jersey. Henry Benjamin Franks of Burlington County, West New Jersey left his estate to Jacob Franks of New York and David Franks of Philadelphia. Ganatta Harrison of Perth Amboy, East New Jersey mentioned money owed to her by William Cox of Philadelphia and David Ogden of New York City. Charles Sexton of Hopewell Township, West New Jersey listed property he owned in Huntington, Long Island.160 Many other examples can be cited, but the conclusion is inescapable: many Middle-Colony residents had relations and were conducting business well beyond the confines of their own communities and colonies.

Newspaper advertisements for runaway slaves in New York and New Jersey also provide significant evidence about geographic mobility among ordinary people and the strength of family ties. In June 1764, Patrick Hanlon of Middlesex County, New Jersey, reported that his slave Lucy had run away, probably to Bucks County, Pennsylvania, where her daughter lived, or to Brunswick, New Jersey, where her mother and brother lived. The next month Joseph Anthony of Courtland Manor, New York, advertised that his slave Jack had run off, doubtless to Jamaica, Long Island, or to Westchester County, New York, where his two previous masters lived. The next January
John Thomas of Westchester County offered a three-pound reward for his runaway slave Joe, who had been born in New Jersey and who had previously lived near Stamford, Connecticut. On July 31 Mingo, who had been born on Long Island and had lately been owned by John Jones of Haverstraw, New York, ran away from his master in Westchester. In November Caesar fled Suffolk County, Long Island, most likely for West Jersey, where he once lived. In mid-1768 Norway, who had once labored for the Philadelphia innkeeper, William Ralsten, ran away from William Provost of New York City. In August 1768 Hendrick Coyler of Horseneck, East Jersey, offered a reward for his fugitive slave Ishmael, a blacksmith and amateur magician, who had previously lived in Middletown, New Jersey, and at the Spotswood Iron Works in Virginia. In 1772, when “a Negro Man named Jack” ran away, his New Jersey slave master advertised that he might have fled “to Anthony Ten Eyck’s at Albany, where he has a wife” or to Rocky-Hill in central New Jersey, where his mother lives. On March 13, 1773, the Negro Bret, who could read and write, fled from his owner in Connecticut Farms, near Elizabethtown; Bret had lived for the past three years in Wyoming, Pennsylvania.161

Advertisements for runaway slaves that appeared in the Pennsylvania Gazette tell a similar story. In August 1762 the “Mulattoe Man Slave, Joe, who had been born in Guadalupe and had lived in New York City and Charlestown, fled from his Philadelphia master and was evidently seeking to return to New York. The very same month John also fled a master in Philadelphia for New York. In May 1764 the African-American slave Abraham, who had once belonged to a master in Philadelphia, had run away from his present owner in Upper Freehold, West New Jersey, and been captured in Reading, Pennsylvania. In 1767 Harry, a miller and mulatto slave fled from Sussex County, Delaware to return to his former master Nicolas Veight, who operated a mill in Rockey-Hill, East New Jersey. In July 1769 Moses Grimes, a holster, fled his owner in Wright’s Ferry, York County, Pennsylvania, and was captured in Perth Amboy, East, New Jersey. In 1772 Anthony Welsh, who had been born in Monmouth County, East New Jersey and who was owned by Jamin Clarke of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, was captured in Gloucester, New Jersey.162

Scholarly Links

Another way to explore the growing interconnectedness of the Middle Colonies and their growing links to the Atlantic basin is to consider the emergence of
the American Philosophical Society. John Bartram, a Pennsylvania botanist of international repute, first proposed such an organization in 1739. He was discouraged from the venture by Peter Collinson (a British scientist, who had financially supported Bartram’s research and who had also befriended other American intellectuals, including Benjamin Franklin and Cadwallader Colden), because the colonies were underdeveloped. However, in 1743 Bartram and Franklin reconsidered the idea, and the latter presented it to the public in *A proposal for promoting useful knowledge among the British plantations in America*. Two New Yorkers, James Alexander and Cadwallader Colden, strongly supported the plan and recommended several people from their province for membership. Despite these promising beginnings, the organization failed to take root and by September 1745 had been “entirely dropt.”

The need for such an organization remained, however. In 1750 Franklin’s son William, Charles Thomson (a school teacher, scholar, and future Patriot leader), and several other Philadelphians organized a weekly discussion group fashioned after Benjamin Franklin’s famous Junto. After several reorganizations the group emerged in 1766 as the American Society for Promoting and Propagating Useful Knowledge, Held in Philadelphia. A group of political rivals then sought to revive the American Philosophical Society of the 1740s. The two competitors finally merged in January 1769 as the American Philosophical Society, Held at Philadelphia, for Promoting Useful Knowledge. Of its first 251 members, seventeen resided in Europe and ninety lived in other British colonies. The explanation given at the time for why such an organization was possible also explains why the Middle Colonies were becoming so interconnected: “The Means of conveying Knowledge are now become easy. Printing Houses are erected in all the principal Towns on the Continent, and regular Posts established to carry Letters and Papers from one to another. There is an easy and ready Communication with our Islands by Vessels which are employed in carrying our Trade. Besides, Hints thrown out in our public circulating Papers are not lost, as in this country, almost every man is fond of reading, and seems to have a Thirst for Knowledge.”

Conclusion

Given the extant evidence, historians will doubtless never know all the links that bound the Middle Colonies together. However, the evidence available—almanacs and newspapers; mail service, roads, and travel; religious
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bonds; commerce; family ties; and scholarly links—demonstrates that the
region had already become interconnected before the Revolution. Its inhabit-
ants were also clearly reaching out to people who lived elsewhere in British
North America and the Atlantic basin. Residents had clearly not forged a
regional identity and did not think of themselves as “Middle Colonyites”
in contradistinction to Delawareans, New Jerseyites, New Yorkers, or
Pennsylvanians. Nonetheless, these overlapping webs of communications
and relationships helped to counterbalance the often violent factionalism
that existed in the region and eventually to facilitate residents’ participation in the
American Revolution. Contacts made and networks developed before 1763
could be and were exploited to advance one’s cause in the tumultuous years
that followed. One need only think about individuals like Joseph Reed and
Joseph Galloway or groups like the Presbyterians and Quakers to grasp this
fact. Moreover, if the Middle Colonies in the mid-eighteenth century can serve
as a test case for what was happening throughout British North America, then
it becomes much clearer how the thirteen colonies were able to unite in the
1760s and 1770s to counter and eventually defeat British imperialism.
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