

1-1-1985

Francis Makemie: Social Development of the Colonial Chesapeake

Char Miller
Pomona College

Recommended Citation

Miller, Char. "Francis Makemie: Social Development of the Colonial Chesapeake," *Journal of Presbyterian History*, Winter 1985, 333-40.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Pomona Faculty Scholarship at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pomona Faculty Publications and Research by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.

Francis Makemie: Social Development of the Colonial Chesapeake

by Char Miller

FRANCIS MAKEMIE was neither a humble man nor a quiet one. Indeed, he seemed to seek out and to revel in disputes with those who did not share—or who challenged—his sense of conviction and righteousness. George Keith, a Quaker who assailed the theological underpinnings of a catechism that Makemie had written for children, may have been the first to have felt the sting of Makemie's words, but he certainly was not the last. That dubious distinction probably belongs to the Governor of New Jersey and New York, Lord Cornbury, who in 1707 barred Makemie from preaching from a public pulpit in New York City. Ever ready to accept a dare, Makemie promptly preached in a private home (with the doors wide open), was arrested for his transgression, and subsequently became embroiled in a legal battle with Cornbury. Makemie described his ordeal in his sharply-etched *Narrative of a New and Unusual American Imprisonment* (1707), a pamphlet that did much to damage Cornbury's political position all the while burnishing Makemie's reputation as a staunch defender of religious liberty. Though justly earned, that reputation was also due to Makemie's willingness, as one detractor put it, to make "a great deal of noise wherever he comes."¹

Makemie's disputatiousness earned him high praise from 19th and early 20th Century historians of the Presbyterian Church. The eulogiums flowed as fast and as freely as water: At various times he was declared the father of the American Presbyterian Church, extolled as the prototypical, even "pioneer home missionary among American Presbyterians," and, more grandly, was advanced as "one of the builders of the American Republic." Modern scholarship has begun to revise these earlier estimations of Makemie's contributions, a reevaluation that began in 1971 with the publication of Boyd Schlenker's judicious account of the colonial minister's life, one that contained as well a careful assessment of the significance of some of his writings. The Makemie that emerges from this and other reassessments may not quite be the miracle worker of tradition, but the nature of his activities, the depth of his commitment and faith, and the context of his battles with Keith, Cornbury and others are beginning to be more realistically portrayed.²

This reevaluation is not full-fledged, however. One of Makemie's works that has not received extensive analysis is his *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive* (1705). This is in part due to the essay's style—it is in a

Char Miller is Assistant Professor of History at Trinity University, San Antonio, TX.

truth a *friendly* persuasive, one largely devoid of rhetorical anger and fire, and thus does not easily fit within the traditional vision of Makemie as Presbyterian gadfly. The secular cast of the pamphlet—Schlenger labels it a “commercial writing”—has also deflected analysis; its relationship to the minister’s theological epistles and to the religious wars he waged seems tenuous. As a result, his concern for the growth of towns in Maryland and Virginia—and the meaning this had for him—has gone largely unexplored. Unexplored too have been the intellectual context in which he wrote the pamphlet and the influences that shaped his thought. An extended analysis of these issues will perforce deepen our sense of the complexity of Makemie’s ideas and enhance our understanding of his effort to strengthen the plantation south’s sense of community, an effort that enmeshed him in one of the central political debates of his time.

On the surface, all was well in the colonies of the Chesapeake. This “excellent and desirable Country” was blessed with a moderate climate “agreeable to European bodies,” Makemie boasted. The land was well drained by innumerable rivers large and small that flowed into a spacious “Bay in most respects not to be outdone by the Universe.” Rich and fertile soil, and extensive natural resources, further revealed “the Omnipotent Hand of our wise Creator,” Makemie enthused, one who had fashioned a vertible Garden of Eden.³

But this garden, like its biblical counterpart, had its problems. The most significant of which, Makemie averred, was its woeful lack of towns and communal life, a lack of which defied the course of history:

When I have considered the Antiquity of Towns and Cities, known to as many as are conversant with Sacred and Profane History, and the Universal Copy cast us by the whole Christian and Pagan World, I have been justly amazed to see the unaccountable Humor and Singularity of Virginia and Maryland who . . . must still endure, by their scattered and remote settlements, without Towns and Cohabitations. . . .

The settlement patterns of these colonies

also violated nature’s degree. Even “brute beasts” knew enough to “resort together in droves,” Makemie declared, and “the very Fowls of the Air do flock together.” The historic character of human life and the instinctive response of the animal kingdom conspired, he concluded, “to upbraid our Folly, and [the] ruining Singularity in our manner of living.”⁴

That Makemie drew upon biblical imagery, and employed a chastizing tone to convince his audience of the validity of his arguments, comes as no surprise; these were the tools of his ministerial profession. That he firmly believed that community defined the human endeavor is no surprise either; after all, he is credited with establishing the first American presbytery, and devoted his life in the British colonies to creating institutional and communal forms through which his fellow dissenters might more effectively worship their God. What is striking, however, is that Makemie shrewdly recognized that by themselves his sermon-like exhortations would not convince the Virginia and Maryland gentry; his arguments had to be more sophisticated and complex to sway those who were already doing so much to exploit the Chesapeake’s rich natural resources—without the benefit of towns. To influence those whose economic stability, political power and social status derived from and was interwoven into the fabric of the plantation way of life, Makemie was compelled to demonstrate that the material rewards and social benefits of urban civilization were exponentially greater than those that flowed from a rural existence. His was thus a dynamic model of the city, one that revealed his grasp of the powerful impact that urban development would have on the colonies of Virginia and Maryland.

“The great prevailing Topick in the World, that sways Men in all their Designs,” Makemie wrote, was commerce (or as the 18th Century put it, “Interest”). And so the Presbyterian minister began his litany “with the Advantages which will

highly promote our Interest, and the Interest of all Traders" to the colonies. Towns, he believed, would act as catalysts to rapid economic growth. The establishment of towns, he predicted, not only would increase the value of land, but their construction would also make valuable "our Woods and Timber": These building materials would in turn provide work for "Coopers, Carpenters, Joyners [and] Turners," highly-valued artisans that were necessarily scarce in a plantation economy. In addition, the growth of towns would spur the development of larger markets for the surplus produce and provisions grown on the plantations, sparking too a rejuvenation of the fishing industry and of fishermen; the increased urban demand for food stuffs would both encourage "many poor men to follow that Calling, and sundry sorts [of fish] which are now slighted, would be fit for a Town-Market." Towns, then, should be of interest to the gentry whose markets would increase and whose speculative appetite would be whetted by the prospects of ever-increasing land values. Moreover, towns would invigorate the economy by forcing it to diversify; this latter point also greatly concerned the Chesapeake gentry, whose economic fortunes were inextricably bound to the rise and fall of tobacco prices. "Cohabitation would not only employ thousands of people that plant little or no Tobacco," he asserted, but also "many who have poor Land, and not convenient Housing, to make Tobacco crops . . . who at present help to ruin the Tobacco Trade, rather than promote it: Such would soon be taken off, and employed otherwise."⁵

Towns had an additional economic consequence that would prove invaluable to the future of the two colonies. Established communities, by transforming the frontier into settled country, made the land much easier to defend and "more formidable against all Enemies which we lie naked unto." And this spread of civilization would boost the colonies in another respect: Western lands, "which now are waste and



Francis Makemie
Presbyterian Historical Society Statue

useless," would, if defended, attract a "Confluence of people" who would stream westward to purchase acreage, increasing the colonies' entire economic outlook, from the Tidewater to the Blue Ridge. For Makemie, towns would be powerful generators of economic prosperity.⁶

The sources of Makemie's arguments concerning the economic value of cohabitation were at once personal and political. He owned, of course, a moderate estate, and through skillful management and a timely inheritance from his father-in-law, increased his landholdings, the one sure sign of a Virginian's status. No doubt he hoped—as all Virginians did—to further expand the size and value of his properties, and he and his contemporaries recognized that the emergence of urban centers would redound to their good. His appeal (and its timing) was highly political as well. Published in London in 1705, while Makemie was in Great Britain, *A Plain and*

Friendly Perswasive was dedicated to Major Edward Nott, the recently-appointed Governor of Virginia. Makemie hoped that the pamphlet's publication and pandering dedication would convince Nott to support his cause:

It is to be hoped Our present Majesty [Queen Anne] will be the Founder of Ports, Towns, and Cohabitation, by recommending the same to your Excellency's Care and Conduct, in promoting that which will be the Glory, and only Improvement of that country; and if accomplished, will be a perpetual Monument to the Praise of Your Excellency, in conquering all such Difficulties as have been too mighty for former Governors.⁷

That earlier governors of Virginia had failed to secure the construction of towns ought to have given Nott pause about the feasibility of Makemie's ideas. Moreover, that Virginia had a historic concern for the establishment of communities suggests a final point about the economic orientation of Makemie's arguments: It was derivative on a number of levels. From the early 17th century colonists had petitioned Royal authorities, and schemed locally, to establish inland towns and port cities, efforts that increased in pace as the century wore on. And the arguments they brandished mirrored those that Makemie later employed: Virginia's economic problems—its ever fluctuating tobacco prices—were to a large extent due to a lack of towns. Makemie's arguments were derivative in another sense, too. As with copious other petitioners, Makemie firmly believed that government, royal or local, had the ability to restructure the natural world to conform to humanity's needs, and the power to alter significantly social relations. Makemie's concerns about town-building, and the manner in which he expressed them, placed him within the mainstream of a Virginian political and intellectual heritage.⁸

This heritage had another dimension that emerged in Makemie's *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*: The need for greater social cohesion in the agrarian colonies of the Chesapeake. Makemie joined with earlier commentators on life in the Ches-

apeake region who felt that economic expansion could only do so much to bind the community together; it could begin the process of linking the frontier with the Tidewater, and could provide better and more remunerative occupations for the poor, in effect giving them a greater stake in the colonies' future. But more was needed, Makemie argued, to resolve the pressing social and moral problems that confronted Virginia and Maryland. His resolution was again to invoke the city as panacea, believing it to be a most effective agent of civilization.⁹

Makemie, for instance, viewed rural life with some distrust; it was too private, too unregulated by public scrutiny. Tobacco planters, who occasionally filled their hogsheds with stones and sold them to unsuspecting strangers, could only do so by "trading in a corner, at private plantations," Makemie announced. But towns, with "publick markets," would "effectually prevent, and soon regulate a great many Frauds, Irregularities, Abuses and Impositions on Trade and Traders." Not only would falsifiers be publicly shamed for their actions, but a healthier form of competition would emerge: "If all Tobacco, and other commodities, were brought to publick, there would be a general Emulation to out vie one another, especially in Quality." Cities, in short, would elevate the moral tone of commercial transactions—and of commercial agents.¹⁰

Makemie's interest in moral probity and his distrust of rural areas were revealed as well in his assessment of the colonies' languishing religious and educational institutions. Both flourished best, he reasoned, in "Cohabitations . . . for in remote and scattered settlements we can never enjoy so fully, frequently and certainly, those Privileges and Opportunities as are to be had in all Christian Towns and Cities." As things stood, however, many colonists were "grosly ignorant of many necessary parts of the Christian Religion," indeed many were unchurched all together, which understandably dismayed a man who spent

much of his life trying to establish Presbyterian congregations on the Eastern Shore. That the colonists were also fast losing literacy because of the lack of teachers and adequate schools, was yet another defect of the Chesapeake colonies; this too, "we have no hopes of regulating or preventing" in the present scheme of settlement, he concluded. Without urban centers, Virginia and Maryland would be doomed to moral and social decay.¹¹

In the end, Makemie linked his intense concern for social cohesion with one for greater social conformity, something only towns could enforce. Thus those who were "averse to towns," he decided, must either be "Knaves who still carry on fraudulent Designs and Cheating Tricks, in a corner or secret Trade, afraid and ashamed of being exposed," or "Sluggards, who rather than be at labour . . . idle at home." Worst of all, but most easily handled, were the drunkards, that is "Sots, who may best cured of their disease by a pair of stocks in Town." The urban environment, Makemie prophesied, would produce honest, hard working and sober citizens.¹²

Beneath the humor of this recitation of rural sins lay a somewhat sharper reality. The city allowed for greater social control, a characteristic that appealed to the Presbyterian minister who emigrated to the New World in hopes of there establishing a New Jerusalem. But it would not be one in which democracy would be encouraged or disorder condoned. Makemie's beliefs in this regard were more fully unveiled in his sermon *A Good Conversation* (1707) in which he argued that "A Well-Ordered Life and Conversation consists in being answerable to various Stations, Capacities, and Relations . . . whether as Superiours, Inferiours or Equals." This hierarchical structure, Makemie declared, was an illustration of "the superlative excellency of the Christian Religion, and a demonstration of the fullness of the Scriptures . . . [for] . . . there are Duties of all Ranks and Stations prescribed and taught there." These prescriptions and reciprocal duties

were best worked out in what he called the "Societies of men;" only in congregation could discipline—"The Power of the Keyes to the Kingdom of Heaven"—be effective. And surely it is not a coincidence that he used an urban image to describe the true Christian's ultimate goal: "We have not this world, but Heaven for our city: Therefore if we expect Heaven in the end, we must begin and in some measure live a life of heaven on earth." Cohabitation was one such measure of a disciplined and Godly life.¹³

A desire to lighten the lines of authority did not just grow out of Makemie's sense of ministerial duty; it also may have reflected his concerns as an Eastern Shore planter. Although he was not in the colonies during Nathaniel Bacon's Rebellion in 1676, he was probably as deeply influenced by it as were his contemporaries who equalled, if not exceeded, his place and standing in the community. As John Rainbolt has demonstrated, one reason Makemie's peers supported the development of compact settlements was that these would defend the colony from internal insurrections such as Bacon's. Like Makemie, they expected communities would supply the kind of political and legal authority required to maintain social stability. *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive* reflects those concerns—town stocks were a reminder of the power to humiliate and control that town magistrates could wield if necessary. This particular emphasis of the pamphlet thus makes ironic Lord Cornbury's testy assessment of Makemie's activism. "This malicious man," the Governor wrote, "is well known in Virginia and Maryland to be a disturber of the peace and of all the places he comes into." Makemie may have disturbed Cornbury's peace in New York City, but *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive* showed that he would not hesitate to use less friendly persuasion, that the dissenter, once in power, would be a strict disciplinarian.¹⁴

The impact of *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive* is impossible to gauge. Certainly it

was read in London and in the colonies, but it would be an exaggeration to suppose that it had an influence on the bringing forward of legislation in 1705 to establish port cities in Virginia; instead Makemie probably hoped that his pamphlet would influence the shape of the debate surrounding the bill. If its influence is unclear, the appeal nonetheless casts light on why the bill of 1705 ultimately failed to secure crown approval, illuminating too Makemie's immersion into the increasingly treacherous waters that surrounded the topic of the colonies' political sovereignty.

In his prefatory comments to *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, Makemie entertained high hopes that Queen Anne and her newly appointed Governor, Edward Nott, favored and would successfully push for the creation of new ports and towns. More than that, Makemie implicitly assumed that the colonies and the crown *shared* the same motivation for town-building; more precisely, he argued that such construction would work to the mutual advantage of the metropolitan government and its overseas possessions. As Makemie advised Nott, "Your Excellency has a fair Opportunity put into your hands [for] . . . advancing the Honour and Interest of our present Sovereign, and laying a lasting Foundation for promoting and facilitating the trade of England to that Colony."¹⁵

This vision of compatible interests between crown and colony may have held true in the early 17th century, when the colonists and the royal authorities not only agreed that towns would help diversify the colonial economy, but that such diversification would increase transatlantic trade, thereby advancing the interests of the Empire. By the late 17th and early 18th century, however, that neatly woven web of mutual interests had begun to unravel. Both sides wanted to construct towns in the mid-Atlantic colonies, but their reasons now sharply diverged. The British government, for example, suspected that diversification of the Virginian economy was a threat to the royal treasury: If Virgin-

ians, as Makemie proposed, moved into other occupations and produced different foodstuffs, the crown would face a significant loss of tobacco tax revenue. So the only form of township that the British were willing to encourage in the Chesapeake colonies was port cities; these ports' *only* function would be to act as funnels for colonial imports and exports so that Crown officials could more effectively tax and control commerce. The British, in short, had narrowed their perception of the purposes of towns, making clear that the crown's interest—its sovereignty—was paramount.¹⁶

Increasingly, the American colonists disagreed with this interpretation of their role in the British Empire and Francis Makemie—at times almost despite himself—shared that disagreement. By the late 17th century many colonists viewed the Empire not as an homogeneous entity, in which each part contributed to the commonweal, but as a conflictive arena. To survive, to grow, each colony had to fight for all it could gain. Makemie alluded to this colonial conception of the Empire when he enumerated the economic disadvantages from which the non-urban Chesapeake colonies suffered: "For want of Towns and Cohabitation, our Neighboring Colonies, only by their Towns outstrip us far, . . . [and] drain from us the marrow of our Estates." The costs were high, he continued, "for Carolina, Barbadoes, Pensilvania, New York and New England, carry from us, the little scattered coin we have among us" and further drain the colony of its "old Iron, Brass, Copper, Pewter, Hides and Tallow, which we often want, and might use ourselves." The Chesapeake colonies seemed only able to produce primary goods, Makemie argued: The other colonies "carry away our Wheat; and return it again to us in Bread and Flower, and make us pay for transporting, grinding, boulding and baking." The only way the two debtor colonies could reverse this situation was by throwing "off the Fetters of our self-destroying Folly," by establishing towns; only by those means would Vir-

ginia and Maryland maintain themselves in the combative Empire.¹⁷

But to view the British Empire in this light raised questions about the nature of the colonists' political allegiance to the crown, questions that most colonists—Makemie included—would have preferred to ignore if they could. When the issue of colonial allegiance first arose in *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*—"if Towns are promoted in Virginia and Maryland, they will grow too rich and great, and soon cast off their dependence on England"—Makemie rose to colonies' defense. "This objection savours too much of Design, to keep Virginia and Maryland poor and low," he asserted, "and should alarm Well-wishers of those Governments." Makemie then pushed his defense further, noting that the two colonies should have the right to grow as rich and as great as the others, to become as "capable of purchasing more superfluities for maintaining their extravagancy, as we see evident in all other growing Plantations," American and Caribbean. The Chesapeake colonies' reasonable desires for economic growth should not be singled out for punishment, unless all British colonies were so punished.¹⁸

This first of Makemie's efforts to discount the idea of future independence for the colonies was not convincing—he never really addressed the issue nor did he dispel the notion that the Empire was fractious rather than harmonious. Quite the contrary, he accurately captured the bumptious character and jealous nature of intercolonial relations, insight he no doubt gleaned on his evangelical tours of the North American colonies and to Barbados. Even Makemie knew that he had dodged, rather than answered, the issue of independence, for he returned to the question of the empire's future several paragraphs later. At first he tried to laugh off the assertion that growth of communities would inexorably lead the colonies to "cast off their Allegiance to England, and set up a Government of their own." Such thoughts were nonsensical, he declared: "This is a

great flight of Wit and Policy for some, but so silly . . . that it scarce deserves an Answer." This abrupt dismissal notwithstanding, Makemie felt compelled to respond at length, a compulsion that suggests he knew how significant (and dangerous) this issue had become. The very nature of the colonial citizenry, he wrote, should allay the fears of those who predicted independence. "A Medly and Mixture of Nations, Opinions and Humors," the colonies "can never be of one mind even in small matters." As a result, the British need simply practice a policy of divide and conquer to retain control:

Maintain and propagate the distinct Governors and Governments . . . and Emulation, Division, Feats and Animosities . . . backed by Pride and Envy, will keep them asunder from uniting under a single head, to the prejudice of England.¹⁹

Although Makemie's confident analysis presaged arguments the Loyalists would employ later in the 18th century in defense of the Empire, the Presbyterian minister cannot be classified as an early Loyalist: He qualified his perspective in one vital way that indicated he disagreed with portions of the British imperial model. There was, first of all, the question of the colonies' economic growth, and how the British responded to it; rather than cavil at their success, why not "rejoice to see all the Branches of the same stock prosper and flourish," he demanded. More important, these shifts in economic relations perforce reshuffled political ones. Makemie wrote that he was persuaded that "it is the Interest, and should be the Interest of England, to preserve and maintain a just Ballance of Power in America as well as in Europe." His call for a *just* balance of power, one comparable to British-European relations, is striking. The implication is that the American colonies were sovereign, were entitled to share power with London. Makemie did not work out this complicated issue of the divisibility of sovereignty, but he raised the one point that the British would never accept, one that ultimately led to revolution with Great Britain in 1776. Makemie would

not live to see this come to pass, but the ideas embedded in his *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive* indicate that he was struggling to come to terms with independence.²⁰

Francis Makemie's *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive* was, then, no simple treatise. It contained an effective analysis of the powerful and sustained influence that communities would have on an agrarian, plantation economy; certainly the construction of "Towns and Cohabitations" would have significantly altered the economic structures that prevailed in Virginia and Maryland. Much less certain, however, was Makemie's presumption that compact settlement would foster moral reformation. If one can judge by the Puritans' experience in Boston, or by the Quakers' in Philadelphia, the pious in the Chesapeake would have found it virtually impossible to assert moral authority and political control for an extended period of time. Yet

Makemie's sanguine expectations were not misplaced, but rather were a necessary part of his larger ambition to reconstruct the social, political and religious bases of colonial life.²¹

That reconstruction would not come easily, he found. Despite his profestations to the contrary, Makemie recognized that the growth of towns in Virginia and Maryland posed a serious threat to the maintenance of British imperial rule. Twentieth century historians share Makemie's sense that efforts to create new communal forms based on urban settlement and a diversified economy could not occur without dismantling the established order of things. In wrestling with these often painful and controversial issues, Makemie proved to be a perceptive observer of the forces that shaped the colonial world and a sensitive barometer of the escalation of transatlantic political tensions.²²

NOTES

¹ Francis Makemie, *An Answer to George Keith's Libel*, [Boston: Benjamin Harris, 1694]; James H. Smylie, "Francis Makemie: Tradition and Challenge," *Journal of Presbyterian History* (hereafter *JPH*), 61:2 (Summer 1982) 147.

² I. Marshall Page, *The Life Story of Francis Makemie*, [Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1938], p. 196; Samuel McLanahan, "America's Pioneer Home Missionary, Francis Makemie," in *Home Mission Heroes: A Series of Sketches*, [New York: Presbyterian Home Missions, 1904], p. 1-23; Boyd S. Schlenker, *The Life and Writings of Francis Makemie*, [Philadelphia: Presbyterian Historical Society, 1971], p. 11-28; Smylie 197-209.

³ Francis Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive to the Inhabitants of Virginia and Maryland, for Promoting Towns and Cohabitations* [London: John Humphreys, 1705], in Schlenker, *The Life and Writings of Francis Makemie*, p. [139]-52.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 143, 142. John C. Rainbolt, "The Absence of Towns in Seventeenth-Century Virginia," *Journal of Southern History*, 35: 3 (August 1969) 347.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 144, 146.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

⁷ Schlenker, p. 16, 18f., 139.

⁸ Rainbolt, p. 347f., passim. That self-interest played a role in his analysis is evident in the petition he and others sent to the Virginia Burgesses, 2 November 1705, in Schlenker, p. 262f.

⁹ Schlenker, p. 144.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 146f.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 152.

¹³ Rainbolt, p. 345, 351; Lord Cornbury to the Lords Commissioners of Trade, in Schlenker, p. 265.

¹⁴ Rainbolt, p. 348, 353; Robert Beverly, *The History and Present State of Virginia*, edited by Louis B. Wright, [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947], originally published in 1705, was another contemporary appeal for the construction of towns.

¹⁵ Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive* in Schlenker, p. 139ff.

¹⁶ Rainbolt, p. 353ff.; Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, in Schlenker, p. 150.

¹⁷ Makemie, *ibid.* in Schlenker, p. 148.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 151.

²⁰ *Ibid.* Gordon S. Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic*, [New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1972].

²¹ E. Digby Baltzell, *Puritan Boston and Quaker Philadelphia*, [New York: The Free Press, 1980]; Darret Rutman, *Winthrop's Boston: A Portrait of a Puritan Town*, [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965]; Sam Bass Warner, Jr., *The Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods of its Growth*, [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968].

²² Howard Chudacoff, *The Evolution of American Urban Society*, [Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1981], p. 14-29.