

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONFLICT AND CHAOS

1690 TO 1693

FOR NEARLY three and one-half years, from the day Blackwell resigned until April, 1693, when Benjamin Fletcher arrived as royal governor, the people of Pennsylvania and Delaware ruled themselves. Penn could exert little control over the colonists, for he had been a friend and supporter of the recently deposed James II, and he was either in jail or in hiding from the crown during much of this time. The form of government changed several times, Delaware separated herself from Pennsylvania, and affairs were so chaotic that there are almost no public records for the period. While it is apparent that the colony was at a low ebb politically, Governor Fletcher's descriptions of Pennsylvania in 1693 indicate that there had been no gross disrespect for law and order. In addition, the Quaker community was embroiled in a religious controversy called the Keithian Schism.

Unaware of what the future held and swayed by tender letters from the Quakers which accompanied the one from Blackwell admitting failure, Penn sent word in the summer of 1689 that the government was to be placed again in the hands of the freemen of the colony. He wrote to the leading Quaker politicians: "I have thought fitt, upon my further Stop in these parts, to throw all into yr hands, that you may all see the confidence I have in you, & the desire I have to give you all possible contentment. I do earnestly press your constant attendance on the government & the dilligent persuit of peace and virtue, & god almighty Strengthen your hands in so good a work." He

asked them to make provision for his veto in all laws passed by the General Assembly. He urged them to "avoide factions and parties, whisperings & reportings, & all animosities."¹

Penn was filled with a desire to see the spirit of the "holy experiment" restored in the colony. He wished to regain the close relationship between himself and the colonists which had existed when he had been in Pennsylvania with them. He admitted that the appointment of Blackwell had been a mistake, and he urged the colonial leaders to understand why he was named, "Since no friend would undertake ye Gov's place, I took one yt was not a stranger, yt he might be impartiall & more revered, he is in England & Ireland of great repute, for ability and integrity & virtue. I thought I did well, it was for good, the Lord knows it, & no end of me my own."² Surely Penn could not expect his colonists to accept the last phrase unquestioningly.

Unable to come to the colony because he was under suspicion in England, Penn attempted to inspire the political leaders with high idealism. He admitted his own errors, pointed to the ones which had been made by the colonists in the past, and called on God for guidance for himself and for them. "The Lord Keep us all in ye gentle minde, . . . it is a precious frame, a noble frame, a conquering frame."³

Two observers believed that all the kindly and loving letters in the world would not heal the breach between Penn and the colonial leaders. One of these, Blackwell, frequently warned the Proprietor that the people of Pennsylvania were self-centered and completely out of sympathy with him. He once wrote, "I pray God deliver you: for they threaten you." The other skeptic was Edward Blackfan, a friend of Penn who had settled in the colony. He wrote to Phineas Pemberton, "I am sorry to say that the Governor is not well pleased with Tho. Loyd & others; yet hee will not have him trod under neither. . . . one thing take for grant if the Governor Never Come to you (I mean of his Communion) hee will never more bee well Assented with you (great men are not all ways wise) hee is so

poysoned with Markham and others writings: nothing but a verbal discourse Can mend the matter [...] I doupt thats too Late too doe it too."⁴

Blackfan very likely was right, especially about Penn's attitude towards Lloyd. The Proprietor had every reason to be critical of the colonial leader. He deliberately refused to accept Penn's choice of Blackwell as governor, and his actions were frequently arbitrary and sometimes childish. Penn's coolness to Lloyd is evident in his criticism of the decision to name Lloyd deputy governor in 1691, and his condemnation of Lloyd for allowing Royal Governor Fletcher to take over the colony in 1693, though Lloyd had no alternative.

There was also considerable reason for distrust between Penn and the colonists. Financial and political misunderstandings on both sides have been discussed. In addition, the colonists had two more reasons for becoming irritated with Penn. He constantly nagged them about inconsequential matters such as people living in caves along the banks of the Delaware River, as well as about more important things like his quitrents. He interlarded his querulous passages with spiritual admonitions and laments that the colonists were not living in the Truth. To a modern reader these portions sound pontifical and patronizing at times, and they may have sounded the same way to some of the colonial politicians. His absence placed him in the position of inquisitor, and that could not help but damage the spirit of close fellowship which was greatly desired.

In addition, the colonists still resented Penn's absence. When he was in the colony during the first two years he ran the government smoothly, he settled disputes over land, and he brought a spiritual quality to life which was appreciated by the people. The longer he was gone, the more the citizens deplored his absence and resented it. The fact that Penn promised each winter to come to them the following spring and then failed to keep his promise, did not help matters. Penn protested that he was doing a great deal of good in England, but the Pennsylvanians believed that he should abandon old responsibilities in England and come to live among them. This does not mean

that William Penn was not a great man in many respects. However as an absentee proprietor and governor he left much to be desired. The breach between Penn and his people widened in the ten years following the resignation of Blackwell, for he did not return to Pennsylvania until December, 1699.

The first fifteen months of this period of self-rule were tranquil except for an episode in November, 1690. The Council under Thomas Lloyd served as the deputy governor of the colony, in addition to its usual duties. It met infrequently and Penn complained that it told him nothing, but there was little to tell. The General Assembly met and a number of laws were enacted.

The Council held several sessions in the first week of January, to familiarize itself with the responsibilities it was assuming. Most of one day was taken up with listening to letters from Penn to the Council to Blackwell, and to Markham. The former Governor brought in all his correspondence from Penn, thinking that the instructions would prove helpful to the Council. One of the letters included an urgent request to settle estates for the widows Jeffs and Whitpain, in order to protect the reputation of the colony in the eyes of English businessmen. In the same letter Penn admonished Blackwell to end his dispute with Lloyd. "I intirely Know ye person both in his Weakness and Accomplishment, and would thee End ye Dispute between you two, upon my Single Request & Command, and that fformer inconveniences be Rather mended then punished." To Markham, the Proprietor had written a protest against those who would try to exclude all persons who held offices or performed services for William Penn from thy Council and Assembly. He resented the implication that his interest was opposed to the welfare of the country as a whole.⁵ After these first meetings were held, this council did not meet again.

The newly elected Provincial Council met Monday, March 31, 1690, in legislative session with seventeen members present by the second day.⁶ Thomas Lloyd was renamed president, a declaration of allegiance to the King and Queen and a statement promising fidelity and obedience to William Penn were

drawn up and signed. Most of the time was taken up with reviewing past legislation and preparing new bills. A total of seventeen new bills were approved and promulgated for the inspection of the freemen and Assembly. Notice went out that the General Assembly would meet in New Castle, in response to a request from the councillors from the lower counties.

Secretary Markham presented a memorial on behalf of the Proprietor, asking that financial help be given William Penn. He asked that the £600 owed the Governor be spent to build him a house or to equip three manors for his children. Markham further expressed himself in favor of duties to collect money for the Governor's use. This petition was completely ignored and the Council went on to other matters. Markham was not in very good repute for he had supported Blackwell during his administration.

A letter from Jacob Leisler, head of the revolutionary government in New York, was read April 11. It requested the appointment of a delegate to join a discussion of ways to protect the colonies from the French in King William's War, which was beginning, but no action was taken on this matter. Several other minor issues were disposed of without much difficulty.

When the Council met April 24 in a non-legislative session, it spent considerable time discussing a petition from five freemen headed by Markham and Lacy Cock, requesting that the province and territories be organized to defend the people against possible attack by the French and the Indians. A lengthy answer was prepared by four members of the Council.⁷ It made no mention of planning government defense of the colony, but did extend as a special privilege, to those who were interested, the right to provide for defense at their own expense and under rigorous requirements. For example, the Council required any militia which was established to yield full obedience to civil authority, and ordered "that all Cursing, Swearing, drunkenness, debauchery, & pillaging (the Crying evils of Camps, Such Societies) be severely forbidden, & discountenanced, by you, as the bane & shame of a Christian Profession." When this answer

was received the petitioners dropped the matter. However, when the Council was informed that Lacy Cock planned a journey up the Schuylkill River to find out how much ammunition the French families in that area had and to talk to the Indians, the body decided to send along Markham and Robert Turner. It also agreed to collect suitable gifts to give the Indians at a proposed council in the near future.⁸ These incidents provide another example of the Quaker attitude toward the use of force.

When the Assembly convened in New Castle on Saturday, May 10, 1690, it chose Joseph Growdon as speaker.⁹ The session, which ended the following Friday, was not only quiet and orderly but successful, for thirteen laws were enacted. The first one provided for the continuation of some laws for two years, and of the remainder for a single year. Another established a simple method for collecting debts under forty shillings. One law prohibited "hoggs, sows, shoats, piggs, or goats" from wandering in the streets of New Castle and Philadelphia.¹⁰ The Assembly passed a resolution declaring that it was illegal for any person to prevent a member of the Assembly from attending the sessions unless he were accused of treason, murder, or some heinous or enormous crime. This action vindicated John White, who had been arrested during the previous session.

Only six members were present at a meeting of the Council held November 21, 1690, and William Clark presided instead of Thomas Lloyd.¹¹ All the business related to Delaware directly or indirectly. For example, it was decided that there should be two fairs held annually in New Castle and that no officer in any of the lower counties could be appointed without the consent of two of the three councillors from that county. However the main order of business was an expression of dissatisfaction with the provincial court, and a new panel of judges was appointed. The judges were commissioned on two separate documents. The same names were on each paper, but John Simcock of Pennsylvania appeared at the head of one list, while Clark from Sussex County was named first on the other. Two

men were sent to Lloyd to obtain the endorsement of the Great Seal, but the keeper refused to seal the documents, and the commissions were passed under the Lesser Seal.

If Lloyd was in town, why was he not at the meeting? The answer came several days later when the Council met with Lloyd in the chair, and a protest was drawn up against a "rump" session of the Council on November 21. The actions of that session were declared null and void. The appointment of provincial judges came under special reproof, for some of those named "under their present Circumstances are unquallified for that Station."¹² Two men who had been present at the earlier meeting, Griffith Jones and Clark, the presiding officer, sat through this disavowal of their acts. This was the first round of a struggle between Delaware and Pennsylvania which finally ended with the separation of the lower counties from the upper counties after Penn returned to England in 1701.

The second round of this contest began with the convening of the newly elected Council in March, 1691, and ended with Delaware temporarily separated from Pennsylvania. When communications from William Penn were opened, one contained two commissions for deputy governor. Penn reported that he had heard that the freemen wanted either a single person as deputy governor again, or five commissioners of state. He announced his willingness to accept either change, though he expressed preference for the second type of executive.¹³ When the matter was discussed in the Council on March 30 and 31, it was discovered that all the Quakers from Pennsylvania, plus John Curtis and William Stockdale from Delaware, supported a single executive. The remaining men from Delaware preferred commissioners of state. When the minority discovered that it was going to be defeated it stopped attending the meetings and refused to return.¹⁴ On April 1 these men drew up a remonstrance against the majority decision. They resented the idea of a single man making all appointments. They had already discovered that the members of the Council from the province imposed officers upon their counties against their will. They disliked the idea of raising money to support a governor. Fur-

ther, they refused to allow the matter to be put to a vote, for they claimed that the Quaker members never allowed a vote unless they could win. The Delaware men said that they would withdraw and govern themselves rather than submit to a deputy governor.¹⁵

When the Council convened on the following day, Secretary Markham, who supported the people of Delaware, withdrew and took the minutes of the Council with him. Undeterred by this action, the Council then filled in the commission for a single deputy governor. Penn had asked for three nominations for the single position, and the Council named Thomas Lloyd, John Goodson, and Arthur Cook, but left no doubt about their preference for Lloyd. The bell of the town of Philadelphia was rung, and a proclamation was read "before a considerable appearance of friends & others to their Generall Satisfaction."¹⁶ Thomas Lloyd was deputy governor of Pennsylvania, but apparently not of Delaware.

John Delavall and John Bristow were sent by the Council on April 3 to request the members from the Lower Counties to rejoin the body in order that bills could be promulgated and judges commissioned. When they refused, Lloyd named the judges himself, for it was nearly time for the courts to meet.¹⁷

Thomas Lloyd wrote a letter to the absent councillors on April 4, calling on them to reconsider. His first paragraph did nothing to heal the wound. "I am sorry for this breach, which you have made . . . you have withdrawn your attendance, without any just cause; lay aside obstinacy, wilful neglect and self interest, I cannot conceive what can support you, at last, but the absurd lenity of the Government. . . . Consider well the confusion, to which this your rashness may expose you, and many innocent inhabitants of the lower counties; and return unto your duty, and representative service here." At that point Lloyd softened, and wrote that the Council would "lovingly" receive them back. Further, he promised that the people of the lower counties would never be forced to pay any of his salary, unless they willingly offered to share that expense. He also assured the absent councillors that he would not disturb

their local government. He added, "if you desire to be *apart*, let it be done with the same solemnity, whereby you were united to us." ¹⁸ The members of the Council from the counties in Delaware answered this appeal with a reiteration of their dissatisfaction with the new type of government and with their inferior position in the old one. ¹⁹

With the division of the colony irretrievable for the time being, the Council decided to report to William Penn on the events of the past two weeks. In the letter written in November Penn had expressed fear of new troubles in the colony and had urged the Council to deal with "factious profane men of turbulent furtive spirite . . . O my friends put an end to these jarrs and heats, and let humility and wisdom over rule all passions and Interests." The Council had failed to heed those words of admonition. However, the letter had closed with the complaint that no one ever told him what was happening in the colony, and the Council now proceeded to answer that complaint. In this the members were not entirely motivated by a love for Penn, for they wished to describe what had happened before the other side had the opportunity to do so.

The Council explained that it had chosen to accept the commission for a single Deputy Governor, and had chosen Thomas Lloyd. The members assured Penn that this decision was not meant to show disrespect for the Proprietor, who had expressed a preference for the commissioners of state, but the step was taken because they believed that a single executive would be more successful in supressing "vice & disorders in publick houses." ²⁰ The commissioners nominated must have included Markham, Robert Turner, and John Cann, for the Quaker councillors took great pains to point out the evils of these three men. "Captain Markham (wee on the spot doe see) is a chief upholder of those Clubbs wch are so much countenanced by his presence, even at unseasonable houres; & John Cann keeps a publick house in New Castle." They added that Cann had been accused of selling liquor without a license, and had been in trouble with the Lords of Trade. They said that Turner would have voted with the men from the lower counties and put such

men in office, if the commissioners were in control. The fact that seven of the nine councillors from Delaware had withdrawn from their body was reported in an off-hand manner, either to deprecate the importance of the move, or because they believed it was a temporary situation. The Council then replied to attacks made by Penn on the Assembly in his November letter. The members expressed displeasure at the way Penn accepted rumors and lying words against the government, and spoke of "those Methods wch thou of late has been misled into."

When the General Assembly convened on Monday, May 11, 1691, no laws had been promulgated and there was not a legal quorum in either house. Since it could do nothing else, it decided to send a letter to Penn. The men protested that they were peace-loving people who "abominated and obhorred" what was happening in the colony. They made a point of denouncing the attempt to raise a militia in Delaware, and said that if such projects were started in Pennsylvania they would cause the Quakers to "Leave our half made plantations our unfinished houses and Return poor and with Griefe to our Native Country."

The letter insinuated that Penn was attempting to limit their rights as Englishmen. It said, "Certainly the King our Sovereigne Intends not that a Subject shall Exercise Greater power over his people in a foraign plantation than he Doth himself at home in Parliaments." This was nonsense, for the people of Pennsylvania had more freedom than colonists anywhere. Penn sometimes wrote sternly and threatened to use power against them, but he always gave them what they wanted. This letter closed by entreating Penn "to receive noe Misrepresentations of thy best & truest friends & the peoples Representatives," nor expose them to the scorn of "Such as never Contributed to the Improvement of the Province Either by their Industry or Manrs." ²¹ This letter is another example of the way the colonists played on the sympathies of Penn while complaining that he did not treat them with enough consideration.

Robert Turner, who was having trouble with the council

about his position as deputy register general, was an old friend of William Penn's, and wrote a letter which expressed some of the views of the party out of power.²² Of Thomas Lloyd he wrote, "This new Governor by all meanes is labouring to Ingraisheit him selfe unto ye people, by offeringe great ffavours naturalising, & grantting Corporations & markitts in land yt it might Redound ye honour to to [sic] him & slightinge to yee." He added that there were many who loved and admired Penn, but would not oppose those in power for fear of reprisals. Thus he insinuated that the followers of Lloyd did not love Penn. But he was honest enough to admit that few in the Lower Counties were interested in helping the Proprietor, for they were motivated by self-interest. Turner urged Penn to remove David Lloyd as attorney general, a position he had held since 1686, and name Patrick Robinson instead. Of Lloyd he said, he may "be turned as a nose of wax, but not towards yee."²³ Turner was not only a leader in the political group which opposed the Quaker leaders, but was active in the support of George Keith, who was interested in challenging the beliefs and leadership of the "weighty" Friends in the Yearly Meeting.

In answer to these various communications, Penn wrote calling on the Council to forget past differences and to join the people of Pennsylvania and the Territories together again. He asked them to "fforgive, and pass by your respective heats & objections & studdy peace & love."²⁴ Penn needed assistance in settling this serious cleavage in the colony. He called on George Whitehead to write to the Quakers, and this worthy stalwart of the Society wrote to Thomas Lloyd and Arthur Cook a few days later. He urged a just settlement, and said that news of the dispute "cause Truth to Suffer and bring You under a Contempt and will look ill here, and as if ye Lord in Displeasure did withhold Counsell from you." He warned that the separation endangered Penn's precarious hold on the three lower counties.²⁵

The General Assembly met again September 10, determined to do something about the laws of the colony. A long bill was drawn up which reviewed the history of annexing the lower

counties to Pennsylvania, and stated that the freemen "now sitting, in this present General Assembly, are the Provincial Council and Assembly of this province of *Pennsylvania*." By virtue of this fact, the legislators declared that the laws enacted at New Castle in 1690 were to continue in force until new ones were published.²⁶

Some time during the winter of 1691-92, a truce was established between the two parties. Penn agreed to allow Lloyd to continue as Deputy Governor of Pennsylvania, and Markham was to assume the same office in the Lower Counties.²⁷ With separate executives who would have control over appointment of officials and other local matters, the two areas were satisfied, and agreed to elect councillors and assemblymen to serve in a common Council and General Assembly.

The joint Council met in legislative session April 4, 1692, to propose new legislation. The members agreed to one bill to re-enact old legislation, and passed three new bills. One of these was designed to regulate the provincial courts, another to regulate trade with the Indians, and the third to provide for the collection of taxes to support the government.²⁸ On April 6 a letter was written to Penn, describing the way in which the compromise was being worked out. This was signed by Lloyd, Markham, and all of the councillors.²⁹

The Assembly convened on Tuesday, May 10, in Philadelphia. As a gesture to the representatives from Delaware, William Clark, long a councillor from Sussex County, was elected Speaker.³⁰ During the discussion of proposed legislation, petitions were received from freemen in Philadelphia and Chester against the proposed tax. This tax was one penny per pound of property, or less than one-half of one per cent, with a minimum of two shillings. The representatives were asked to keep "their Country free from Bondage and Slavery, and avoiding such Ill Methods, as may render Themselves and Posterity liable thereto." The session continued until May 18, but presumably no laws were enacted.

Turner saw some sign of progress in this session, and wrote Penn: "hapy was it for us in ye Province ye Lower Counties

were Joynd in Som measure unto us, but better were it if wee were under one Government by 5 persons or by Presedent & Councill wch Last is taken for ye best & most Agreeinge way & I doe Advise yee to it."³¹ No other reports at the time supported Turner in this estimate of public opinion. His long letter contained much gossip about persons he did not like. Turner complimented Penn for naming Robinson attorney general in the place of David Lloyd, and he added, "Thy bissonace in courts hath now some face wth it and hee proves true [...] before thou was a man troden down and art still too much."

Early in February, 1693, Penn, in great need for funds, wrote a pathetic letter to Friends in the colony asking that one hundred men be found who could each lend him one hundred pounds. He desired them to forego interest for four years, but to receive the usual interest thereafter. Penn promised to sail for America within three months after the £10,000 arrived for him, and assured the Pennsylvanians that thousands of persons would follow him to their shores and be of immeasurable benefit to the colony.³² Governor Fletcher, who was soon after given control of the government, wrote that Friends did not respond. "Some meetings have been about it and It is reported that how much soever they appear his friends they stagger when he comes near their purses [...] those that are able want better security and those that are not (to excuse themselves) saying they would if they could."³³ Nothing affirmative was ever done about this request. There was little incentive to aid in bringing Penn to the colony as long as the government was in the hands of the crown. Money which could be transferred to England was exceedingly scarce, as is indicated in the two chapters on the economy of Pennsylvania. There were wealthy men in the colony, but they lacked ready money. Isaac Norris responded at the turn of the century that there were times when the colony was virtually bare of all gold and silver. In addition, the merchants of Philadelphia found it difficult to accumulate credit in London.

The scarcity of money and the fact that few taxes were collected by the government, were used twice during this period as excuses for rejecting demands for funds to aid in the defense of the English colonies against the French and Indians. On August 10, 1691, the Council received a request for money from Major Ingoldsby, of New York. Lloyd replied that there was no public treasury, "our Infancy hitherto not being trusted therewith."³⁴ In March, 1693, Lloyd replied to a similar request with the same answer. He added, "I might comically represent unto thee my personall difficulties & . . . request thy candid consideration & kindness toward me, w[ho]m a governmnt hath burthened but not relieved."³⁵

It was only a matter of weeks before Governor Fletcher arrived to relieve Lloyd and to attempt to raise money in the colony for the defense of New York, for William Penn had lost the right to govern his colony and Pennsylvania reverted to the Crown.

A SCHISM IN THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

Pennsylvania not only suffered from political agitation in the years between the retirement of Blackwell and the arrival of Fletcher, it was also rocked by the Keithian Schism. This religious quarrel was another indication that the colony was deficient in the spiritual qualities necessary to make the "holy experiment" successful.

Religious controversy was not entirely new in the Society of Friends. When a religious group is founded on the principle of direct revelation of the will of God to each member, it is to be expected that men will occasionally have differences of opinion about the divine will. In the early years of the movement James Naylor and a few other persons temporarily wandered away from the main stream of the Society. Later, John Perrot was at the head of a small faction which differed with George Fox and the other leaders of the group. The Wilkinson-Story separation in the 1670s was a more serious threat to the

existence of the Society, for it involved more persons and continued for a number of years. In the eyes of the world, however, these controversies within a small sect were of no importance.

But when the Keithian Schism broke open in Pennsylvania, the entire Quaker colony, including the lower counties, was immediately involved.³⁶ The "holy experiment," supposedly peopled with peace-loving Quakers, was exposed to the scorn of the world as a colony full of quarrelsome religious fanatics. The cleavage took on added significance because it soon became apparent that there were political implications in the struggle. The Christian Quakers, as the followers of George Keith called themselves, joined the faction in opposition to the Quaker politicians who dominated the colony. Thus, this breach in the Quaker Community produced serious consequences in Pennsylvania.

George Keith was a well-educated Scottish Quaker who first came to America as a surveyor in the Jerseys. He moved to Philadelphia in 1689, where he became master of the school which Friends were establishing. Instead of devoting all of his time to the development of the new school, he spent considerable time visiting meetings, preaching, and writing books and tracts.³⁷

Friends were subjected to severe criticism in the American colonies and especially in New England, because they had no specific creed which could be examined by outsiders. They were accused of many heretical beliefs, of the denial of the divinity of Christ for example, and found these charges difficult to answer. In 1690 Keith drew up a paper which called for a creed and some rules and regulations for the Society, and presented it to the Yearly Meeting. The suggestion was flatly rejected with the statement that such a creed was most un-Quakerly. The following year Keith produced a similar paper, but again met with no success. The Scotsman resented this refusal to adopt his proposals, and perhaps even suspected that some Friends did not subscribe to the fundamental tenets of Christianity which he had included in his document.

At the same time, Keith began to question the propriety of

Quakers holding office in the government. He decided that a true Friend who professed belief in non-resistance should not serve as a magistrate. This was the period of the separation of Delaware from Pennsylvania, and Keith deplored the fact that men who were the spiritual leaders of the Quakers were in the midst of the wrangling in the government.

Friends were sorely tried at this time, when a person named Babbitt and a crew of men stole a ship from the wharf at Philadelphia and then ravaged the shore. The Quakers were faced with a dilemma: if they used force to capture and punish this man they would violate their pacifist principles; if they left him alone, he would damage their property indefinitely. It was finally decided to commission an armed force to proceed against the pirates. However before the armed party could attack the sloop, a man named Peter Boss boarded the vessel, "without either Gun, Sword or Spear," and the men fled the ship. The armed company chased the offending men into the woods and wounded some, although no one was killed. Keith roundly condemned the officials for raising armed men, and a group gathered to support him in his steadfast attachment to Quaker principles.

At the time of Yearly Meeting in Philadelphia in September, 1691, George Keith was placed on the defensive, when William Stockdale accused him of preaching two Christs. Stockdale was a revered old Quaker minister and a member of the Council from New Castle County, which meant that his charge could not be lightly dismissed. Keith had frequently distinguished between the human Christ who lived on earth, and the divine Christ, a member of the Trinity, but he denied that he had preached two Christs. He demanded that the Yearly Meeting decide whether it was he or Stockdale who was guilty or heresy. Six sessions were held by the ministers of the Yearly Meeting to listen to statements from Keith and his witnesses, but no decision was reached about the orthodoxy of the beliefs of either man.

In January, 1692, at a session of Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Thomas Fitzwater accused Keith of "Denying the Suffi-

ciency of the Light within," which the latter vehemently denied. This quarrel continued through the winter. In the spring of 1692, Friends who had been meeting all winter in the Bank meetinghouse near the river, agreed that as usual with the arrival of better weather they would hold First Day meetings for worship at the Center meetinghouse, on what is now City Hall Square. Keith and his followers refused to go with the others to the meetinghouse in the country, and continued to meet near the river. The doors of the Bank meetinghouse were locked against them. The so-called Christian Quakers seldom met with the main body after this time.

Thomas Wilson and James Dickenson arrived in the colony near the end of April, 1692. They were public Friends from England who were visiting among the Quakers in the New World, and they tried to bring about a peaceful reconciliation. But they failed completely, and perhaps even widened the breach.

Throughout the summer months the speakers for the two factions visited Friends meetings and called for support of one side or the other. When the Yearly Meeting met in Burlington in September, 1692, Keith held his own session in the courthouse. There was some communication between the two groups, and Keith was disowned by the old organization. Approximately seventy persons, or one-fourth of those in attendance at the meetings, joined Keith in the new organization.

In the meantime, the Christian Quakers had drawn up twelve questions which they planned to present to the main body of Friends. The first eight of them dealt with doctrinal matters, but the last four implied criticism of the Quakers who participated in the government. Some questioned the share Friends had taken in the Babbitt affair, and the last question asked, "Whether there is any Example and Precedent for it in the Scripture, or in all Christendom, that Ministers should Enforce the Worldly Government as they do here?"

William Bradford, the lone printer in the colony and a supporter of Keith, printed this document without the consent of the government, and John McComb, a tailor and victualer, dis-

tributed the copies. The Quaker magistrates responded to this attack on their authority by arresting Bradford and McComb on the charge of printing unlicensed books without the name of the place or the printer provided thereon. Bradford saw his press and type confiscated by the magistrates, and McComb lost his license to operate a shop. Keith protested the decision in the trials of his two supporters, and deplored the cruel treatment meted out to Bradford and McComb. What had started as a difference of opinion about a printed declaration of faith had grown into conflicting charges of theological soundness and heretical beliefs, and had eventually developed into a full-scale political quarrel. By the time the twelve questions were prepared, it was suspected by the political leaders that theological terminology was being used to camouflage an attack on the government of the colony.

George Keith, however, wanted to continue the fiction that this was only a religious quarrel, and carefully stated, "We did not, nor do not intend anything against the present Government, or Magistracy, but own them in Commission to be Magistrates, and account it our Duty to obey them, either actively or passively." Taking refuge in his protestation that nothing he said was intended to attack the government, Keith reviled Thomas Lloyd, the Deputy Governor, "calling him Impudent Man, telling him he was not fit to be a Governor, and that his Name would stink." Furthermore, he called members of the Council "Impudent Rascals," and made slighting remarks about the magistrates.

The Quaker political leaders, enraged by this disrespect for authority, issued a proclamation against the schismatic leader on August 25, 1692. This document denied some of the charges made by Keith and demanded that he cease to issue pamphlets and make speeches "that have a tendency to Sedition, and Disturbance of the Peace, as also to the Subversion of the Present Government." The magistrates were careful to point out that this proclamation was aimed at the suppression of Keith's civil transgressions, and had nothing to do with religious differences between themselves and the Scotsman.⁸⁸

The Keithians failed to subside into complete silence, and on October 5, 1692, indictments were handed down by the Grand Jury against several of the leaders. Peter Boss was indicted for making scandalous, reproachful, and malicious expressions against Samuel Jennings. Keith and Thomas Budd were indicted as the authors of a book which contained accusations against Jennings, who was a justice of the peace. Keith was also indicted for "Defaming Samll Richardson he being a magistrate of this County, in Bidding him go home to his Whores And calling him heinous old man said he took up maids Petticoats [.] Exposing his reputation before some hundreds of People Contrary to that Law in that Case made & Provided." 39

The charges and countercharges were apparently allowed to get out of hand, and the trials were a credit to no one. The three men were found guilty. Boss was fined six pounds, and the other two were fined five pounds each. These fines were never paid. Requests by Keith and Budd for an appeal to the provincial court or to the Council were denied.

After all this Keith occasionally attended the regular Friends meeting for worship at the Bank meetinghouse, but was made unwelcome in the gallery assigned to the Friends in the Ministry. Whereupon his followers built another gallery at the opposite end of the meetinghouse. With speakers addressing the assemblage from both galleries simultaneously, the situation became intolerable. When some men destroyed the new gallery with axes, Keithians demolished the old one as well.

The following year, when Penn lost his province to the Crown and Fletcher arrived as royal governor, two members of the new Council appointed by Fletcher, Robert Turner, a Keithian, and Patrick Robinson, obtained a reversal of the old charges against Bradford, Keith, Budd, and the rest. Keith determined however, to go to England to defend himself, and he left Philadelphia late in 1693. He was unsuccessful there, and later became an Anglican. He returned to America as a representative of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. His Christian Quakers did not last very many years without him. Many confessed their errors and returned to the main

body of Friends, while others joined the Baptists or the Anglicans who were beginning to organize at the time.

Daniel Leeds, who edited an almanac, was a follower of Keith and continued a running attack on the Friends of Philadelphia. Bradford, who fled to New York after his troubles in the Quaker city, was his printer. A new edition of the almanac appeared in 1700 while Penn was in the colony and the Governor wrote to Lord Bellomont, Governor of New York, to remonstrate against it. "I hear ye printer has printed an Almanack for one Danll Leeds a Quondam Quaker with Reflections upon both o[u]r Governmt & p[er]swasion & am sure Ld Bellumont will not Indure Such Ill Manners & Unneighbourlyness to Pass upon pswasions & Governmt undr his [government]." 40 The attacks of the Christian Quakers on their old comrades reached the depths in 1701, when Leeds published a tract entitled, *News of a Strumpet Co-habiting in the Wilderness or, A brief Abstract of the Spiritual & Carnal Whoredoms & Adulteries of the Quakers in America.* 41 In this scurrilous document Leeds accused most of the religious and political leaders of crimes and misdemeanors, with great emphasis on sex offenses. As has been suggested, by this date the Christian Quaker movement was nearly dead. The end of the religious separation did not erase the scars which had been left upon the "holy experiment" by this religious conflict.