

THE EMERGENCE OF PLURALISM IN THE UNITED STATES

THOMAS O'BRIEN HANLEY, S.J.

Marquette University

GREAT SOCIAL crises inevitably leave their mark on the religious life of a people. The American Revolution was no exception to this. That religious life was dominantly Protestant; and if we would fully appreciate the impact of the American Revolution on Catholicism, we must see it within the religious whole of a dominantly Protestant culture. This is particularly so since the salient religious feature of Revolutionary change was the emergence of pluralism.

QUEST FOR PRINCIPLES

When the American Revolution overthrew the old order in Maryland and made all religions equal before the law, it inevitably brought about a change in the relationships of the different denominations toward each other. Tolerance in principle and fact became more real among them. Particularly, if one explores these relationships from the standpoint of Methodists, one finds strong evidence of evolution in the direction of tolerance among the denominations with whom the Methodists had greater empathy.

One cannot escape the impression of a growing esteem for tolerance during the Revolutionary Period in Maryland and, at minimum, the desire to esteem it. At the very first meetings of conventions to form an autonomous state in 1776, delegates were keenly aware of religious differences. Such differences could destroy unity in defense of political freedom. County committees were strongly urged to see that religious differences were put aside in the interest of the common good. To do so required that men recognize and respect the fact and right of differences in religious belief and opinion.¹

The various denominations responded to this difficult requirement in the days of fighting and fulfilment of political independence. Before the War had concluded, the Lewes, Delaware, Presbytery, which held

¹ John A. Silver, *The Provisional Government of Maryland (1774-1777)* (*Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science*, Ser. 16, no. 1; Baltimore, 1895) p. 12.

jurisdiction over the Eastern Shore of Maryland, attributed to it a peculiar force for Christian union and harmony. It praised those occasions when "the pious of all parties will often talk together to promote . . . Religion, on which it is promised their names will be registered in the Chronicles of heaven. . . ."² The evangelical-minded Methodist, Thomas Haskins, did not hesitate to see wide application of this principle when he attended the preaching of the extreme liberal and Universalist, Elhanan Winchester, whom Haskins thought a good man. Yet Haskins did not see that tolerance implied indifference to other principles with which he had no agreement. "We ought to distinguish between a man & his principles," he noted, "tho' we cannot between a man & his practices."³ All of this did not keep Haskins from judging the merit of principle and practice with a certain strength of individuality which in no way prevented respect for the individual's rights in these matters.

With tolerance went the quality of benevolence. This implication was also accepted together with the principle, and we find it clearly formulated even in a high-ranking leader of the once Established Church. "I know that a few *grains* of mutual confidence & Benevolence among different denominations of Christians," William Smith, President of the first Maryland Conventions of the Protestant Episcopal Church, wrote shortly after the War, "will be better, than splitting & torturing. . . . Christian good will is not [to] be weighted [*sic*] of *Drams & Scruples*—It should be unconfined & universal—."⁴ From a somewhat different viewpoint but with the same spirit, Francis Asbury, Superintendent and Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, viewed other denominations. "This neighborhood," he noted of Worcester County, "is supplied with preaching by the Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists and Methodists. All is well, if the people are saved."⁵

William Duke, who had served as a minister under the dispensa-

² Minutes of the Lewes Presbytery, 1755-1788 (Presbyterian Historical Society Library, Philadelphia, Pa.) Oct. 15, 1782, p. 116.

³ Thomas Haskins, *Journal* (Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.) July 29, 1783.

⁴ Smith to West, 1784 [?], in Ethan Allen Collection (Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Md.).

⁵ Francis Asbury, *The Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury*, ed. Elmer T. Clark *et al.* (3 vols.; Nashville, 1958) 1, 655, Nov. 3, 1790.

tions of both Smith and Asbury, gave further analysis of the principle of interdenominational relationships. "I could not help reflecting," he said as an Episcopalian and ex-Methodist, "upon the—I don't know what to call it [—] that induces every religious denomination to distinguish itself even in the most trivial circumstances." Their conduct is as "distinguishable as that of ducks and geese. . . ." He finds these trivia an obstacle to good relationships between the denominations. "I hope they don't intend it for a shibboleth or anything very essential to the service of God." Since this is not the case, or at least should not be, such obstacles should be removed in the interest of harmony.⁶ "Had occasion to animadvert with some severity," Duke said in deprecation of an inane exercise harmful to tolerance, "on the insolence with which some people attack opinion's [*sic*] which they are not able to affect one way or another by real reason."⁷ Duke was directing attention to the need for constructive exposition of one's own position as a proper exercise of zeal. Conceivably the opinions of others would be examined without insolence. Undoubtedly Duke applied these views in practice. "I told him," he wrote of one who had expressed great dislike of Methodists, "that I differed so much with him as to like them very well and advised him not to trouble his head about the Methodists but to get the spirit of a Christian."⁸ He insisted on this fair-mindedness even in authors such as Hume, whom he might read.⁹

Like the Methodist Haskins, but with greater breadth, Duke considered a man as identified with his practices. Duke's analysis was psychological as well as logical. It was less difficult to deal with a man from the standpoint of his principles, with which one disagreed, than from that of his conduct, which externally affects others. As Haskins said, one can in the first case distinguish principles from the man, but not so his conduct. In dealing with this second situation, Duke would focus attention on God and self. One must "hate only what God hates and for that only reason." "We should find so much matter," Duke said by way of application, "of Censure and abhorrence on our own corruptions that we should be rather inclined to excuse the Misconduct of others. . . ." These are "Matters which do not immediately

⁶ William Duke, *Journal* (Peabody Library, Baltimore, Md.) July 29, 1789.

⁷ *Ibid.*, April 21, 1792. ⁸ *Ibid.*, Nov. 9, 1790. ⁹ *Ibid.*, Aug. 17, 1790.

affect the Moral State." He would thus restrain evangelicals and those of stronger Puritan inheritance from external suppression of private immorality by the hand of the state. "And supposing they are avowed Enemies to to [*sic*] the Gospel of Christ," said Duke, passing a step further, "we shall combat them only with spiritual Weapons knowing that this Cause cannot be injured but by a spiritual Opposition."¹⁰ In this line of reasoning he found agreement with his Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Maryland, Thomas Claggett, who believed exertions in the use of the spiritual weapons of the gospel would bring a victory over bias as well as vice.¹¹

In the light of these general observations, can we say that the principle of tolerance so annunciated generally applied in practice? There was no doubt in the mind of Bishop John Carroll that tolerance characterized the Revolutionary Period as a new experience for him. "I believe," he confessed to Plowden in England, "that in my last letter I gave you proof of the decay of religious prejudice here. . . ." He cited as evidence the election of Thomas Sim Lee, a recent convert to Catholicism, as the second Governor of Maryland.¹² He was aware of the problem of adjusting a healthy individuality in conviction with an indulgent and tolerant attitude, just as Duke and Haskins were.¹³ In all of this there was an unfavorable judgment passed on pre-Revolutionary conditions from which Maryland had emerged. A similar judgment was expressed by Bishop William White. He called attention to the fact that out of the Revolution "arises an argument for charity and forbearance among religious societies in America, with whom the same causes of contention and mutual censure have no place . . .," largely as a result of disestablishment.¹⁴

Again, however, Duke gives a more complex assent to the tenor of these favorable judgments on the practices of tolerance in general during the Revolutionary Period in Maryland. "Our different societies," he states in his qualifications, "though they do not anathematize one

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Feb. 1, 1787.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Jan. 12, 1787.

¹² Carroll to Plowden, June 1, 1792, in Carroll Papers (Mullen Library, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.). All Carroll correspondence cited hereafter is from this collection unless otherwise noted.

¹³ Carroll, sermon on possession of see, Dec., 1790.

¹⁴ William White, *The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered* (Philadelphia, 1782) p. 26.

another, acknowledge one another's excellencies with reluctance, and are sure to catch up every scandalous story that can gratify an envious disposition, for the entertainment of their respective parties."¹⁵ This indicates fundamental agreement with the generally favorable view of others; but it also shows the areas open to further growth. He would imply that the post-Revolutionary condition was better than the preceding one with its anathemas. Duke makes a major point of the quality of the new condition of tolerance, for he sees virtue of a kind in the pre-Revolutionary Period. "We find the people of this part of America about thirty years ago," he said, "not so guilty of bigotry and furious zeal as the people of New-England; but upon the whole they were not better." He would attribute credit to the virtue of "sociability" rather than to the kind of tolerance a man of deep conviction exercises. "Sociability" had superseded all religious principles, according to him. "Upon examination it is found to proceed either from culpable indifferency, or a prevalent spirit of disobedience and impiety."¹⁶ If we combine these views with what Duke has favorably observed of a revival of reform and piety after the Revolution, we will conclude that the absence of anathemas among Marylanders has derived from something firmer than sociability.

One cannot but feel, however, that Duke had his fingers crossed on the prospects for a harmonious relationship between the two virtues of zeal and tolerance. He labored under an assumption in this direction which requires that we take his estimates of the degree of tolerance together with other persons of a different viewpoint. He was reluctant to concede evidence of true tolerance. To begin with, a divided flock of Christ was itself a misfortune. "What makes it worse," he believed, "is, that we become the more dissonant as we become the more religious."¹⁷ And Duke had no alternative to becoming more religious, nor did he believe those of other sects had. In all of this Duke profoundly experienced a tragedy which was not and is not easily grasped.¹⁸ In his disturbed condition on this point, he did not clearly see the relevance of his other observations, which showed both the progress of "vital religion" and of a tolerance of higher quality.

¹⁵ William Duke, *Observations on the Present State of Religion in Maryland: By a Clergyman* (Baltimore, 1795) p. 31.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17. ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15. ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

METHODISTS AND THE DISESTABLISHED

The Methodists, the most active sectarians in Maryland, had the greatest basis for good relations with the Episcopalians, the most numerous; and this situation provides major evidence of the improved relationships during the Revolutionary Period. Asbury, for example, had always proceeded with the greatest regard for the Church of England and its discipline. He did so to the very end of the union of the two, which he likewise strove to maintain to the very eve of the Christmas Conference at Baltimore in 1784. That very week, when the division was an accomplished fact, he wrote to an Episcopalian: "The difference between us lay not so much in doctrines and forms of worships as in experience and practice."¹⁹ His practice gave substance to his disclaimer of the "violent sectarian," the dissenter who could not make this statement.²⁰ When some preachers in Virginia were not as faithful to this policy, Asbury redoubled his efforts at fidelity to ordinances received at the hands of Episcopalian ministers.²¹ He kept contact during this period with a number of Episcopalians who were intent on retaining Methodism within its Church. Among these were William West, Secretary of the Maryland Episcopal Conventions, and John Andrews, both of the vicinity of Baltimore.²² Other Episcopalians, such as Thomas Gates of Annapolis and Mason Weems of Anne Arundel County, also consulted with Asbury in this period before the Christmas Conference.²³ Needless to say, when the Conference radically separated Methodists from the Episcopalians, it was not easy for them to meet again without some embarrassment, as Asbury found on one occasion when he met with Duke.²⁴ But this did not sow rancor or destroy the large area of theological and liturgical harmony between Methodists and Episcopalians.

Although William Duke profoundly disagreed with the decision which Asbury made to leave his Church, he still maintained esteem

¹⁹ Quoted in Nathaniel C. Hughes, "The Methodist Christmas Conference: Dec. 24, 1784—Jan. 2, 1785," *Maryland Historical Magazine* 54 (1959) 285.

²⁰ Asbury, *Journal and Letters* 2, 323, Nov. 22, 1779.

²¹ *Ibid.* 1, 346-47, April 25, 1780.

²² William W. Sweet, ed., *The Methodists: A Collection of Source Materials* (Chicago, 1946) p. 25.

²³ Asbury, *Journal and Letters* 1, 441, June 2, 1783; 473, Nov. 30, 1784.

²⁴ Duke, *Journal*, Aug. 12, 1789.

for the separated "society," to which he had belonged before this event. Duke's Church had commended George Washington, "who has happily united a tender regard for other churches with an inviolable attachment to his own."²⁵ Duke himself gave special application of this virtue. His wife was a Methodist and seems not to have been disturbed by her husband's "inviolable attachment to his own" Church.²⁶ Methodists, for their part, did not exclude interdenominational marriages, least of all with Episcopalians. They did, however, oppose marriage with the ungodly and unbeliever.²⁷

Duke's journal frequently noted association and dialogue with Methodists and their preachers. While at the Ridgelys' residence, he was on one occasion in the company of their Methodist minister friend.²⁸ He always took note of Methodist preachers in the area where he was visiting.²⁹ On one occasion at Frederick, Duke was mistaken for a Methodist preacher. "It was necessary," he said of his confused host, "to tell him that I was not. However he said he believed that I was a servant of God (may I justify his good opinion). . . ." ³⁰ Withal, he was well received. He held conversations with Methodists and, in one case, a recent convert to them. There was none of that insolent attack on opinions of either party which Duke so much deprecated. "Spent the evening comfortably," he said by way of summary of this exchange of views.³¹

As milder dissenters against the once Established Church of England, Methodists in some ways took on a more favorable relationship with Episcopalians after the Revolution. Previously, within that Church, they tended in the minds of churchmen to be lumped together with more violent Presbyterians and Baptists, extremists to whom they would by their reform criticism of the Church give comfort. Jonathan Boucher, Maryland's notorious Tory minister of the Church of Eng-

²⁵ Protestant Episcopal Church, *Journals of the General Conventions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America: From the Year 1784 to the Year 1814, Inclusive; Also First Appendix Containing the Constitution and Canons; and Second Appendix Containing Three Pastoral Letters* (Philadelphia, 1817) pp. 131-32.

²⁶ Duke, Journal, Aug. 12, 1789.

²⁷ Haskins, Journal, Jan. 26, 1785; Richard Whatcoat, Journal (Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.) Dec. 7, 1792.

²⁸ Duke, Journal, Jan. 16, 1792.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, July 8, 1789.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, July 8, 1789.

³¹ *Ibid.*, June 21, 1792.

land, among others, testified how these sectarians disturbed the Church and its relationships with their churches.³² Asbury describes the tensions of some of these former situations. "I visited Joseph Cromwell," he noted in 1774, "a very stiff, old Churchman. But his parson, a Mr. Edmiston, disagreed with him in the doctrine of predestination, he was much displeased with him, and willing to receive us."³³ On another occasion, while he did not disagree with Samuel Chase's father, the Anglican minister, he did indulge in the reformer's judgment: "One more ignorant of the deep things of God, I have scarcely met with, of his cloth."³⁴ When this society moved out of the Church in 1784, Episcopalians were at least rid of an annoyance of this kind, and the Methodists were put in a more constructive position with its accompanying responsibility. Moreover, Methodists took much of the theology and liturgy of Episcopalianism with them, and in this and other ways they were far more favorably related to Episcopalians than were Presbyterians and Baptists.³⁵

The remaining issue of importance between them, to judge from the emphasis in journals and Duke's book, *State of Religion in Maryland*, centered on the question of "enthusiasm" in religion. "The noise and confusion of the Methodist meetings," Duke found in 1789, "has become a very common topic of conversation."³⁶ This was a concern among men with "a pretty good share of understanding qualified with a proportion of prudence." Such men, however, "regard the Methodists very sincerely [*sic*]. . . ."³⁷ This difficulty between the denominations was not faced with intransigence on either side. We need only cite the adaptation of Methodist enthusiasm to Episcopalian hymnology and preaching.

³² Jonathan Boucher, *A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution: In 13 Discourses Preached in North America between the Years 1763 and 1775: With a Historical Preface . . .* (London, 1797) p. 47; George B. Utey, *The Life and Times of Thomas J. Claggett, First Bishop of Maryland and the First Bishop Consecrated in America* (Chicago, 1913) pp. 18 and 20.

³³ Asbury, *Journal and Letters* 1, 110, March 14, 1774.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 99, Dec. 14, 1773.

³⁵ Hughes, *Maryland Historical Magazine* 54, 287.

³⁶ *Journal*, Aug. 27, 1789.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, July 8, 1789; see also Bend to Claggett, May, 1796; Utey, *Life of Claggett*, p. 95.

DISSENTERS AND REFORMED CHURCHMEN

Methodists had a great deal in common, not only with the Episcopalians but also with other dissenters, Presbyterians and Baptists, as well as the pietist sects, such as the Lutherans. In the first case, Methodists had striven to accomplish many of those things within the Church of England which the Presbyterians and Baptists sought to effect by leaving it. These dissenters and reformers all applied the remedy of enthusiastic and awakened preaching, together with an emphasis on evangelical piety. Although the Methodists did not go further and categorically revise ecclesiastical structure, they did after the Revolution move significantly in this direction when they modified English episcopal and sacerdotal power. This revolutionary step brought the now independent Methodist Church to a more acceptable place in the eyes of other dissenters. Methodists stood more on dissenter ground, now clearly outside the pale of Anglicanism. In addition to this better basis of feeling, it should be noted that the old case against the once Established Church had now passed and with it any resentment for Methodist identifications with that Church. There may have been subtler differences, such as Calvinistic predestination, but here too modification had been made by dissenters and they were moving in the direction of the Arminianism of Methodists.

We find clear evidence of improved relations between Methodists and Presbyterians. While Presbyterians were strongly anti-British and hostile toward such Tory Anglicans as Boucher, they found much less cause for complaint against Methodists, who were far less political.³⁸ Native Methodist preachers tended to be favorable to the American cause. With the passing of the War, adjustment could thus proceed more rapidly. Even during this less favorable period, Methodists continued contacts with Presbyterians. Asbury himself heard the preaching of Patrick Allison, distinguished Presbyterian pastor at Baltimore.³⁹ Asbury found Presbyterians receptive of his preaching and he was welcomed to their homes.⁴⁰ They found in him the spirit of the Great Awakening with its "warm preaching," something many Presbyterians complained was wanting in Allison.

³⁸ Boucher, *View of the Revolution*, p. 105.

³⁹ Asbury, *Journal and Letters* 1, 153, April 2, 1775. ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 97, Nov. 13, 1773.

Freeborn Garrettson, a native Maryland preacher of Methodism, illustrated in his pre-Independence career some of the difficulties which his sect had with Presbyterians and which passed after the War. In Somerset County in 1779 he first received hospitality at the hands of a Presbyterian minister and a layman. The following day, however, Garrettson reported, "one sayes my Proselites is two-fold mor a Child of hell than before. & the other showes to asperce my Caractor. . . ."⁴¹ He received similar treatment a few months later from another dissenting minister.⁴² These attempts at winning adherents to his society would not proceed under such unfavorable circumstances after the War. Garrettson would then be making his appeal largely among Episcopalians. He would no longer appear to Presbyterians as one undoing their work as he formerly did, by bringing their members back to the Church of England.

Another point of friction which persisted in Garrettson's experiences in these War years was his liberal view of predestination, so widely opposed to the Great Awakening theology of Presbyterians. He ran into controversy, not only on the Eastern Shore, but also around Baltimore.⁴³ This situation also was to improve with the more liberal theology which Allison and others began to popularize among Presbyterians, bringing them closer to the Methodist view of predestination.

The Peace of Paris brought a thaw in Presbyterian relations not only with Methodists but also with Episcopalians. The results of a new outlook seemed evident. "Inasmuch as universal Liberty in Religion," declared the Lewes Presbytery, "is now firmly established thro' all the united states . . . it is hoped that all Churches pursuing their own forms of Religion, will enjoy perpetual Harmony and Charity. . . ."⁴⁴ We find no more mention of those conflicts with Presbyterians which Garrettson noted in his journal during the War years and before. We even find the Presbyterian Mr. Balch in cordial association with the ex-Methodist, and now zealous Episcopalian, William Duke. "I spent the evening in agreeable [*sic*] conversation with revd. Mr. Balch,"

⁴¹ Freeborn Garrettson, Journal (Rose Library, Drew University, Madison, N.J.) Jan. 18, 1779.

⁴² *Ibid.*, July 8, 1779.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, May 29 and June 14, 1779.

⁴⁴ Minutes of the Lewes Presbytery, p. 116, Oct. 15, 1782.

Duke wrote. "How I wished for the vigour and cheerfulness which seemed to afford him a fund of constitutional happiness."⁴⁵ Accord may have been carried a little far in Bishop Thomas Claggett's eyes, when he was approached by a Presbyterian minister with a desire for a convention between the churches. Although it was regarded by the Episcopalian bishop as "an artful overture," it was not wanting as an expression of better feelings between dissenter and churchman.⁴⁶

The Baptists, another dissenting sect, considerably more aggressive than Presbyterians, also entered upon better relations with Methodists with the passing of the War. Duke had noted that they had stirred a tidal wave of proselytizing which broke on Maryland about 1770. They could not but be sensitive to their greatest rival in such activities, the Methodists; Presbyterians had receded from the vigor found during the Great Awakening. Asbury leaves no doubt that he went through trying experiences as a result of this situation with the Baptists. "About five and twenty Baptists," he wrote of Frederick, Maryland, in 1772, "are the greatest enemies the Methodists have in this place."⁴⁷ Those that attended his sermons went away angry. "There are some," he also found, "who oppose the work under us, and perplex and trouble our young beginners. . . ."⁴⁸

All of this was in the area evangelized by such Baptist exponents of the vigorous gospel as Jeremiah Moore. Asbury has left a brief narrative of the Methodists' fortunes and these tensions. "Friend Bonham," he wrote, "was awakened by the instrumentality of Friend Strawbridge, and he told me that he had been much opposed [by Baptists]. He said they had used him very ill; but he was determined to have no more connection with them. He appears to be a solid, sensible man."⁴⁹ The year of the Declaration of Independence, however, the heat of this friction seemed to decline. Civilities among preachers of rival evangelical sects were in evidence on one occasion, thanks to the traditional hospitality of a Maryland gentleman and the Dutch Reformed Church. Asbury had been asked to preach at this church and afterward met

⁴⁵ Duke, *Journal*, July 2, 1789.

⁴⁶ Claggett to Duke, June 19, 1786; Utley, *Life of Claggett*, p. 50.

⁴⁷ Asbury, *Journal and Letters* 1, 53, Nov. 19, 1772.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 52, Nov. 11 and 12, 1772.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 54, Nov. 21, 1772.

two Baptist preachers among the Ridgely family's guests, who were possibly welcomed, as was Asbury, by the Dutch Reformed Church.⁵⁰

A year after this incident Freeborn Garrettson began noting his own changing experiences with Baptists, which like Asbury's slowly brought better relations. He boldly evangelized Baptist communities for two weeks. "Distress I met," he said with understatement, "and many very disagreeable disputes. . . ." Garrettson relates that the nub of opposition was a conservative Calvinism which prevailed among this particular group. Yet he did not hesitate to plunge ahead with a discussion of election, predestination, and final perseverance of the saints, which the Baptists felt in duty bound to confute. "I saw it my duty to preach," Garrettson likewise said for his part, "and that strong, that Christ dyed for all. . . ." Amidst all this "distress" appeared some light in the sky, promising a better day. "Among some I met with cold reception," he observed, "but with others was recd. with openness."⁵¹

Garrettson, however, began in 1779 to have friendlier associations with Baptist ministers. He might, for example at Baltimore, share a house of worship with a Baptist and preach after a Baptist sermon and service.⁵² They might as itinerants meet each other on the road as they journeyed to such a situation. Things once became so favorable, Garrettson narrates, that he made his sermon a rebuttal of the Baptist's preceding remarks, in order to show the reasonableness of infant baptism. No unpleasant incident followed on this exchange.⁵³ Zealot though he was, Garrettson listened with open mind and heart to a Baptist preacher, and that more than once. "I thought much more of his discourse," he confessed on one occasion, "than I did the day before." A few days later he found two Baptists, for their part, accepting some of his views.⁵⁴ There was further evidence of increased good will. "I lodged with an old baptist," he recorded at this time, "I had great satisfaction, altho' we differed in regard to external spirit."⁵⁵ This situation was repeated later in subsequent years, and after the Revolution we find little or no mention of the conflicts and tensions

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 190, June 15, 1776. ⁵¹ Garrettson, Journal, July 6, 1777.

⁵² *Ibid.*, June 18, 1779. ⁵³ *Ibid.*, April 3, 1779. ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, June 22, 1779. ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

noted in the earlier period.⁵⁶ The experience of Haskins, another Methodist preacher, did not seem to differ from Garrettson.⁵⁷ In fact, in testing with Garrettson, use is being made of something of an extremist compared to these other Methodists and their manner of preaching and evangelizing. A fortiori, things were better with these others. In all of this, too, attention is called to the fact that a theology less dissonant from Methodist ideas was developing among Baptists after 1780, and that Methodists did not proselytize very much among Baptists after the War.⁵⁸

Nothing seemed better to indicate these generally improved denominational conditions than the cordial relations in the 1790's between Duke and the Baltimore Baptist pastor, Roach. Communication had passed from Baptists to the Methodists and now beyond to the disestablished Church of Duke. The first meeting which Duke's journal mentions at this time was in 1792. He had preached at a courthouse one evening. "Immediately after [,] Mr. Roach a Baptist from New England unexpectedly preached."⁵⁹ While it was customary to share such a temporary place of worship, the dinner engagement between the two preachers which followed was not; and neither friendly situation was likely twenty years previously. A year later the atmosphere had become so congenial that Duke, "after a stirring day," as he tells us, "went to hear him [Roach] preach in the evening." Earlier that same day the two had breakfasted together.⁶⁰ Further cordiality and charity was extended to Roach by Bend, another Episcopal minister of Baltimore. Three Sundays every month he made his chapel at Fell's Point available to Roach, and out of these beginnings developed the Second Baptist Church.⁶¹

As might be expected, heated controversy with a third dissenting sect, the Quakers, was not recorded in Methodist journals as they were

⁵⁶ Freeborn Garrettson, *The Experiences and Travels of the Rev. Freeborn Garrettson, Minister of the Methodist-Episcopal Church in North-America* (Philadelphia, 1791) p. 108, April 4, 1779.

⁵⁷ Haskins, Journal, Sept. 19, 1783.

⁵⁸ Robert B. Semple, *A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Virginia* [1810], ed. G. W. Beale (Richmond, 1894) p. 385.

⁵⁹ Duke, Journal, Oct. 7, 1792.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, Oct. 28, 1793.

⁶¹ J. F. Weishampel, *History of the Baptist Church of Maryland Connected with the Maryland Baptist Union Association* (Baltimore, 1885) p. 55.

of Presbyterians and Baptists. There were Quaker-Methodist differences, however, and out of them and other more human factors occasionally came subdued friction. Yet theological developments in Methodism following the Revolutionary War provided greater grounds of agreement with Quakers, who were notably inaccessible to Episcopalians.

Francis Asbury had what might be typical Methodist experience with Maryland Quakers. In the early 1770's he had been favorably impressed with William Sewell's (1654-1720) history of the Quakers, published in 1725. "My heart has been affected," he confessed.⁶² Undoubtedly Asbury found admiration for the exemplary lives narrated in such histories, rather than for the theology churchmen attributed to the Quakers. The two months following Asbury's reading of Sewell had journal entries which unfavorably described Quaker acquaintances. In one instance Asbury found one individual "too much a Quaker in principle." Another would not allow prayer in his family, which, it would seem to Asbury, was an application of Quaker views of these matters.⁶³ Silent prayer which would not allow "hollowing" meetings would never be adequate diet for a Methodist's soul, no matter how his heart might be affected by the good example of the Quaker. But Quakers also preached and, as Haskins found firsthand, "speak feelingly." He seemed to have a greater attraction for their religious spirit than Asbury expressed. "I have felt a love for the people called Quakers," he wrote in 1783, "ever since I knew anything about religion." He regretted, however, that they were a "sad people," as he observed them.⁶⁴ The austere Garrettson, however, was closer to the feelings of Asbury toward them. Like Asbury, he read their books, but, unlike Haskins, Quaker sadness did not disturb him. Rather, he felt, "it [Quakerism] appeared to be too easy a way for me."⁶⁵

As it turned out, however, after the Revolutionary War Asbury and his coreligionists stood closer to becoming "a Quaker in principle." When the Methodist Christmas Conference of 1784 settled the matter of ordination of ministers and bishops differently from previous practice within the Church of England and afterward in the American

⁶² Asbury, *Journal and Letters* 1, 65, Jan. 1, 1773.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 68, Feb. 2, 1773; 71, March 1, 1773; and 54, Nov. 21, 1772.

⁶⁴ Haskins, *Journal*, Sept. 19, 1783.

⁶⁵ Garrettson, *Journal*, Bk. 1, 17, 1775.

Protestant Episcopal Church, its ministers were put in a more favorable light as Quakers viewed them. Minutes of monthly meetings had deplored marriage of Quakers before Anglican priests.⁶⁶ There were no such "hireling priests" after the Revolutionary War among Methodists. These and other implications were reflected in an enlightening conversation which Asbury had with one Quaker. "It gave him pain," Asbury wrote of the Quaker's reaction to an ordination at the hands of English bishops, "that Joseph Pilmoor should go home for ordination. . . ." He felt, as Methodists later decided, that they should themselves have the power of ordinances.⁶⁷ Undoubtedly, such a favorable Methodist change in the direction of Quakers increased good will and even attracted Quakers to Methodism. When an elderly Quaker preacher became a Methodist in 1785, it was reasonable to suppose the new doctrinal settlement the previous year had provided a forceful motive for the decision.⁶⁸

Unlike the case of the Baptists and Episcopalians, good relations with Methodists logically did not move Quakers closer to Episcopalianism, nor is there any evidence that their relations with it notably improved. A correspondent of Duke revealed some of this distance between the two sects in 1796. "I should be willing almost to become a Quaker," he wrote ironically to show his intransigent retention of confirmation, "were not Baptism to be followed by this rite."⁶⁹ Duke does not reveal any strong appreciation for Quakers. In reading of them he was not moved as Asbury was. "He seems to have been a man of great firmness and probity," he blandly commented on a life of William Penn.⁷⁰ In his *State of Religion*, positive praise, often given to other denominations, was notably lacking in the case of his treatment of Quakers, even though he was tolerant.

PIETISTS AND THE NATIVE PROTESTANTS

Methodist relations with the pietist sects of Continental European origin were better than those with the Quakers. Actual collaboration

⁶⁶ Kent Monthly Meeting of Friends, Cecil County, Md., Minutes, March 10, 1779.

⁶⁷ Asbury, *Journal and Letters* 1, 109, March 11, 1774.

⁶⁸ Thomas Coke, *Extracts from Journals of the Rev. Dr. Coke's Five Visits to America* (London, 1793) p. 24, Jan. 7, 1785.

⁶⁹ Jackson to Duke, Aug. 21, 1796, Allen Collection,

⁷⁰ Duke, *Journal*, Nov. 23, 1790,

took place. Moreover, for theological and political reasons, the formerly Established Church out of which Methodism grew was generally held in greater favor than it was among dissenter sects.

Reports to the Lutheran Ministerium from the western part of Maryland before the Revolution suggest that things were not always so favorable. "This district," it was noted in 1772, "is said to be very populous and to abound in various sorts of sectarian agitators."⁷¹ From what we know of Baptist, Presbyterian, and Methodist evangelizing in the area, the disturbances would be more among themselves; but each of these made some effort to win influence among German pietists without directly disturbing them. Lutherans were nonetheless bothered by these rivalries, though they may not have been part of them. When they abated in the 1780's, as they did, Lutheran relationships with dissenters, and particularly with Methodists, could not but be better.

After the War, however, Lutherans seemed to gravitate more toward the Episcopalians than toward the Methodists. As early as 1781, the Ministerium record noted that "a union with the so-called High Church [was] proposed." The Episcopal bishop-to-be, William White, seems to have been responsible for these overtures. Because the development of American independence had faced Episcopalians in the direction of autonomy, such liberal innovations and initiative in conduct became possible. Although this design was not accomplished, it showed that the new constitution of the once Established Church enhanced the good relations it already had with Lutherans.⁷² Another token of this improvement was the application of an Episcopalian for ordination in the Lutheran Church.⁷³ As these conditions continued, we find William Duke in 1789 attending a Lutheran sermon, and afterwards discussing it in detail with the preacher.⁷⁴ There was evidently a substance of communication sufficient to offset Duke's confessed aversion for the German temperament of these pietists.

These communications evidently obtained between pietist sects

⁷¹ Lutheran Evangelical Ministerium, *Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States. Proceedings of the Annual Conventions from 1748 to 1821. Compiled and Translated from Records in the Archives and from the Written Protocols* (Philadelphia, 1898) p. 3. (Cited hereafter as *Documentary History of the Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania*.)

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 178, 1781.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 187-91, 1783.

⁷⁴ Duke, *Journal*, July 8, 1789.

themselves. The Lutheran minister, Schmucker, of Hagerstown, once preached at Otterbein's Reformed Church.⁷⁵ In 1783 Lutheran meetings with other Reformed congregations took place, and evidently continued through the decade.⁷⁶ Theological, ethnic, and cultural affinities encouraged these movements, as did the secular force of the new nationalism, which had to be dealt with as a common problem.

Methodist contact with Maryland pietism was not to come directly, or even through its associations by origin with Episcopalianism, which possessed greater empathy with Lutherans. Collaborations with the Dutch Reformed Church, which was in communication with Lutheranism, provided the only noteworthy relationship for Methodists and Lutherans. This is not to say that individual preachers were estranged, in contrast with the experience of Duke. Richard Whatcoat, the Methodist preacher, states that he too attended Lutheran sermons, discussed them with the minister, and even did this on a social occasion.⁷⁷ Nevertheless, official reserve toward Methodists was suggested in Ministerium records, and this has meaning in view of the fact that this reserve was not held for Episcopalians and Dutch Reformed. The Ministerium warned pastors to proceed cautiously, specifically with regard to Methodists.⁷⁸

Francis Asbury's impact on Philip Otterbein and his Dutch Reformed Church was dramatic and decisive. Indeed, he would seem to carry the revolutionary spirit of the times, on which his evangelical religion grew, into the congregations which were to evolve into the United Brethren. From Asbury's first days in America he had attended the preaching of Otterbein. Richard Whatcoat's journal in 1793 tells us that the practice by other Methodists still continued to link the two religious movements.⁷⁹ Asbury's earliest probings proceeded beyond this passive exercise. With Benedict Schope, an early associate of Otterbein, he discussed the theological matter of ordinances (or sacraments), their meaning and necessity. Asbury did not believe that they were essential to the Church, but this was far too liberal for Schope, at least at this early date of 1772.⁸⁰ After two years, however, the asso-

⁷⁵ *Documentary History of the Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania*, p. 289, 1797.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 187-91. ⁷⁷ Journal, July 10, 1789.

⁷⁸ *Documentary History of the Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania*, pp. 187-91.

⁷⁹ April 9 and 10. ⁸⁰ Asbury, *Journal and Letters* 1, 54, Nov. 21, 1772.

ciation had developed greater understanding. "He appeared to be a good man," Asbury commented, "and I opened to him the plan of Methodism."⁸¹ Later Philip Otterbein joined the discussions of Schope and Asbury and proceeded further with an adaptation of the plan of Methodism. It would not seem, however, that they adjusted basic theological differences on ordinances. "They agreed to imitate our methods as nearly as possible," Asbury said in summary.

There is no doubt that he left the mark of his influence "respecting the plan of Church discipline on which they intended to proceed."⁸² The following year Asbury took a social occasion to urge Schope and Otterbein further with this business.⁸³ At the appropriate moments Asbury played the intermediary within the Dutch movement. He prevailed upon Otterbein to accept the independent Reformed Congregation in Baltimore, thereby effecting Otterbein's leadership among those evangelicals who came from the First Reformed Church of Benedict Schope. Thus under Methodist influence were taken the first decisive steps toward the Evangelical Reformed Church.⁸⁴

CATHOLICS AND THE BRIDGE OF METHODISM

Catholics stood in a quite different relationship with all of the Protestant denominations which have been observed in interaction. They were not, it is true, the target of nativism, as may have been the case with pietists, since such would be a nineteenth-century Catholic phenomenon. Those who stood in the minds of Marylanders for Catholicism were of English stock, and many of their families were residents of America for several generations. Unlike Maryland Germans, however, their faith was long considered as alien in English thought, which upon analysis often seemed to say it was not Protestant. Politically, at least, for more than seventy-five years they had in Maryland, and for longer elsewhere in the Empire, been stigmatized as suspect of disloyalty for the nonnational nature of their faith. Socially, however, Catholics possessed an important advantage, which emerged when Maryland was liberated from a lingering domination by the official English religious and political views of Catholicism.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 103, Jan. 4, 1774.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 114, May 3, 1774.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 153, March 28, 1775.

⁸⁴ Daniel Berger, *History of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ (The American Church History Series 12; New York, 1894)* pp. 329-30.

With full citizenship the latent prestige of some prosperous and cultured Catholics created a new image that was naturally more palatable to Marylanders. The relationships of Catholics and Protestants clearly improved under the impact of the newly-won freedom.

Consideration of Asbury, Garrettson, and Haskins shows that there was no deep bitterness toward Catholics, even if there were great differences. The War and the combined Christian endeavor in a new state threw Catholics and Methodists, as well as other dissenters, together in a way that brought about better relationships.

Educated as he was in the Church of England, Asbury had many views that created difficulty in his relationships with Catholics. As late as 1774 he tells us that he devoted himself to the study of the Book of Revelations (or Apocalypse) of the New Testament and found therein clear prophecy of the "gradual rise and artful progress of Popery."⁸⁵ Thomas Coke, in his sermon to the Methodist Christmas Conferences, had pointed out how the Church of England had been artfully deceived by this deviation in Christianity.⁸⁶ These things were but evidence of a criticism of Catholic emphasis on papal and other hierarchical authority in the Church, which was stated even more emphatically by Presbyterians and Baptists.

In the hard days of the War, however, a Catholic governor in Maryland came to the rescue of Asbury and Garrettson in an incident which could not but leave both sides better disposed. This occurred at the time when Asbury was in Delaware. He heard that Garrettson had been imprisoned and was awaiting trial. In those times such waiting inevitably involved a long period of discomfort and suffering. Asbury, consequently, approached the Governor of Delaware to see if something could be done to bring relief to Garrettson. When the Governor contacted the Catholic Governor of Maryland, Thomas Sim Lee, he received a generous response. Lee ordered the local justices to bring Garrettson to Annapolis for a personal review of his case. After an examination of the matter, Garrettson was found innocent and set free; undoubtedly there were sincere regrets expressed by the Governor for the state government's failure or inability to remove such conditions of injustice.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ *Journal and Letters* 1, 113, April 23, 1774.

⁸⁶ *Substance of a Sermon on the Godhead* . . . (New York, 1815).

⁸⁷ Garrettson, *Experiences and Travels*, p. 170.

About ten years after this experience, Garrettson had occasion to note that he was again pleased with Catholics, and implied that relations had improved. This was due not only to improvement in Methodist attitudes but also in those of Catholics. These people, whom he found in 1789 to be "mild and Catholic" upon his visit to a particular town, had not always been mild as their present pastor seems to have made them. "[He] did not do as some had done," Garrettson tells us, "prejudice and harden the hearts of the people against other denominations, especially arminians, as we are called."⁸⁸ The past tense and general manner of reference indicated that Garrettson, a native and Maryland resident of many years, was speaking from his own experience. Undoubtedly the suffering of discrimination tends to make one generous toward another when better days come, but it also develops a defensive psychology which not all are able to control. It is reasonable to explain what Garrettson saw of improvement to have been a happy outcome of the Revolution, which made all religions equal before the law, thus removing the source of such tensions as he recalled.

Thomas Haskins throws further light on Protestant relationships with Catholics and by his mentality gives an example of better days in the Revolutionary Period. He had an inquiring mind toward Catholics, as he showed in his reading of Louis du Pin (1657-1719), the French Catholic who had written a history of the Church. "It is pretty well so far as it goes," he believed. "And it is worth reading." Yet he found this European "a rigid Roman Catholic. . . [who] favored his own Church at the expense of every other church."⁸⁹ Du Pin had a spirited propensity for designating other denominations as heretical.⁹⁰ In du Pin's case, however, it was not the preoccupation of a minority but that of a conformist in a Catholic state. Haskins did not hesitate to regret this spirit in writers among his own fellow Protestants. In doing so he revealed his own sensitive attention to these interdenominational relationships.⁹¹ In one incident Haskins discloses that he had attained some success with his good intentions and that the Catholic party whom he encountered had been similarly prepared. "In the morning [I] visited some prisoners under sentence of death & to be executed in a few days," he noted in his journal a short time before

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 235-36.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, Dec. 11, 1782.

⁸⁹ Haskins, Journal, Jan. 22, 1782.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, Dec. 12, 1784.

the conclusion of the War, "[and] they were all Romans [...] [The] Priest came in while we were exhorting them to prepare to meet their God. . . ." ⁹² The mild response by each clergyman to what would be an explosive situation under other historical circumstances spoke well of interdenominational relationships. The priest "seemed dissatisfied" and merely "desired we would retire as he wanted to be privately with them," ⁹³ evidently intending to hear their confessions.

On the Catholic side of these growing good relations with Methodists was the pre-eminent influence of Bishop John Carroll. A reading of his many letters to Catholic clergymen throughout Maryland invariably discloses some reference to considerations which would keep down any inclination to be the "rigid Catholic" of which Haskins spoke. The experience and personality of Carroll was poles apart from that of du Pin, as Americans in general believed their situation and ideals to be from those of the Old World. Moreover, Carroll enthusiastically collaborated with Methodists and dissenters on what they commonly believed to be an effort at safeguarding the spirit of the Maryland Constitution. Together they prevented the passage of a Clergy Bill which they felt lacked impartiality. Carroll believed the Bill was "calculated to create a predominant and irresistible influence in favor of the Protestant Episcopal Church; and therefore we shall all oppose it with might and main. . . ." ⁹⁴ In this analysis of Carroll we also find a peculiar bond between Catholics, Methodists, and others in this matter of opposition to the Episcopalians. "All other denominations," he recalled, "were formerly subject to pay a heavy tax to the Clergy of the Ch. of England." ⁹⁵ Not only the War, then, but the pre-Revolutionary experience and the New Nation created forces which united Protestants and Catholics in certain vital areas.

CATHOLICS AND THE DOMINANT EPISCOPAL FAITH

The favorable relations which developed between Catholics and Episcopalians during the Revolutionary Period should not, however, be overlooked in the face of the special case of the Clergy Bill. They had meaning for the Methodist-Catholic relations in addition. Theologically and ecclesiastically, Methodists and Episcopalians were kin.

⁹² *Ibid.*, Oct. 28, 1783.

⁹³ *Ibid.*

⁹⁴ Carroll to Plowden, February 27, 1785.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

This fact must be related to certain similarities and associations between Episcopalians and Catholics which were favorably viewed by Methodists. Such considerations, however, do not seem justified in the case of the Presbyterian, Baptist, and Quaker views of Catholics. At least these, and the Catholic situation with pietists of European origin, do not, in the light of the sources studied here, reveal any concrete evidence which would suggest exploring such aspects of interdenominational relationships.

William Duke provides a good example of an improved Episcopalian attitude toward Catholics. He expressed frank admiration for the Catholic Church, its leaders, and their management of its affairs.⁹⁶ Like Haskins, he challenged writings which expressed the Old World Protestant view of Catholicism and its history. At this early date Duke called in question the fable of Pope Joan.⁹⁷ Other reading took him into a discussion of Anglican ordination written by a Catholic. The author's favorable treatment of the matter pleased Duke and reminded him of an ancient basis of kinship with Catholics, however difficult its genealogy might be.⁹⁸ Thus it is not surprising that he went out of his way to attend a sermon by a Catholic priest.⁹⁹ On one occasion he noted in his journal that he called at Melwood on a priest-member of the distinguished Digges family. "He talked freely and was pretty communicative," Duke found, "but he insisted too much on points in which he must have known that I as a protestant could not agree with him."¹⁰⁰ Surely this tells of a natural situation that would allow of a little imprudent zeal without causing offense.

There were other instances and persons attesting to better days between the two denominations, one of which was now free from the hostile policy an Anglican government had once fixed on it. A Talbot County Vestry, for example, spoke in joint praise of Episcopal and Catholic clergy. "The Episcopal Clergy," it said in respect to their ecclesiastical affinity, "whether protestant or Papal, conduct themselves as men who fear God and keep his Commandments."¹⁰¹ When James Madison was returning from his consecration in England as the first Episcopal Bishop of Virginia, he found John Carroll as an amicable

⁹⁶ Journal, Feb. 3, 1792.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, April 25-June 10, 1791.

⁹⁸ Duke, Journal, Feb. 10, 1794.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, May 5, 1792.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, June 10, 1791.

¹⁰¹ St. Peter's Parish, Talbot County, Report to Claggett, 1797, Allen Collection.

shipboard companion, likewise returning from episcopal consecration.¹⁰² Certain of Carroll's administrative principles for that office agreed with those of Bishop Thomas Claggett of Maryland.¹⁰³ Carroll was willing to appeal to the example of the Episcopal Church in justifying his recommendation that American Catholic clergy themselves should choose their own bishop.¹⁰⁴

John Carroll possessed an exact intellectual grasp and perceptive awareness of the situation in Maryland. Both qualities were decisive in the successful Catholic adjustments with non-Catholics in the Revolutionary Period. In general principle he accepted some of the reasoning of Grotius touching this matter. The broader meaning of the Christian community must be restored, even though it lacked all that unity which prevailed at earlier times in Europe. Discussion of this, he believed, would promote tolerance not only in America but in England.¹⁰⁵ While saying this and experiencing a favorable response from Protestants, Carroll was not lulled into unawareness of the delicate position of Catholics. "More caution is required in the ministers of our Religion," he warned a cleric recently arrived from France, "than perhaps in any other Country."¹⁰⁶ Catholic positions could not merely be stated. They must take into account the Protestant mentality which would receive these statements and adapt them, if they would disarm a heritage of misunderstanding.¹⁰⁷ When Carroll in one of his letters crossed out the phrase "violent opposition" as descriptive of some Protestants and replaced it with "deep rooted prejudice," much was revealed of his grasp of the transition between 1770 and 1800.¹⁰⁸ Protestant good will was banishing violence, that came from bitterness; there yet remained prejudice, which would recede with growing understanding.

Carroll and Episcopalians seem to have dealt successfully with what was perhaps the most difficult situation to come between them. This was the defection of the Catholic priest, Francis Wharton, to Epis-

¹⁰² Carroll to Plowden, Sept. 25, 1790.

¹⁰³ Carroll to Plowden, Nov. 12, 1788.

¹⁰⁴ To Farmer, Dec., 1784.

¹⁰⁵ To Plowden, Oct. 21, 1791. See also Peter Guilday, *The Life and Times of John Carroll, Archbishop of Baltimore (1735-1815)* (New York, 1922) pp. 172-73, for discussion of papal authority in this connection.

¹⁰⁶ To LaPoterie, April 3, 1789.

¹⁰⁷ Carroll to Thorpe, Feb. 17, 1785.

¹⁰⁸ To Gardoqui, Nov. [March?], 1795/96.

copalianism. Duke had noted that such things more than anything else strained good feeling because of a peculiar proneness of Marylanders. Carroll noted in February of 1785 that Protestants exulted over the matter.¹⁰⁹ A controversy followed on both sides and proceeded to doctrinal matters. While Carroll decided to speak out, he took pains to avert any protraction of polemics. He justified his remarks as a pastoral office directed at his own flock and their understanding of their faith. He seems to have been faithful to this spirit when he resisted the opportunity to reopen controversy in June of 1785.¹¹⁰ Six years later he gave further meaning to his principle by keeping one of his clergymen from debate.¹¹¹ There was a display of moderation by Episcopalians, avoiding the easy opportunity to exploit Wharton, who—as often happens with one in such a position—was tempted to take up controversy. Wharton himself showed some signs of moderation.¹¹² In another case, Carroll noted that it was usually not the “leading people in this country” who gave countenance to what was unseemly in these delicate situations.¹¹³ All of these things were indications of a growing stability.

The developing pattern of interdenominational harmony is found in other areas. Some questions called for a firm statement of clear differences. Yet there was a tendency to proceed with these matters in a spirit of mutual respect which was extremely difficult and even unknown under the colonial eighteenth-century proprietorship. Inter-faith marriages were no exception to this.¹¹⁴ A dignified plea could be made at court for the Catholic interest in a guardianship of an orphan.¹¹⁵ John Carroll was extremely broad-minded in his discussion of Freemasonry with his brother Daniel.¹¹⁶ By far the most striking area of evidence of a new day was education.

It was during this period after the Revolution that St. John's College

¹⁰⁹ To Plowden, Feb. 27, 1785.

¹¹⁰ To Plowden, June 29, 1785.

¹¹¹ To Plowden, Feb. 22, 1791.

¹¹² To Plowden, Dec. 22, 1791/[1793?]. In 1798, after his wife's death, Wharton again renewed his attacks (see Carroll to Plowden, Dec. 13, 1798).

¹¹³ To Plowden, April 27, 1780.

¹¹⁴ Carroll to Charles Carroll, July 15, 1800; and to Beeston, Nov. 16, 1791.

¹¹⁵ Carroll to Charles Carroll, Nov. 11, 1783.

¹¹⁶ Carroll to McElhinc[e]y, Jan. 7, 1794.

took on new life, and Washington College at Chestertown, Methodist Cokesbury College, and Georgetown began their vital existence. The initiation of the first two with interdenominational and governmental support is unparalleled in American history since this time. A typical plan would be to have on the board of one of these colleges Bishop Thomas Claggett of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Dr. Patrick Allison of the Presbyterian Church, and Bishop John Carroll. Laymen would be represented in the same denominational manner, with the expectation that subscriptions would be drawn from all religious sources. The state voted contributions to this type of corporation.¹¹⁷ The curriculum in the earliest days strove to be religious without being sectarian, and the faculty was open to any clergyman of competence in a particular field. Implementation of this at Washington and St. John's found no objections on these grounds from Catholics, who very shortly were to start their own colleges. In time, however, Bishop Carroll was dissatisfied with the discipline of both institutions and was seeking a solution to the problem of forming a native clergy. These and other considerations led to the founding of Georgetown College. Methodists associated with the founding of Cokesbury College found more intrinsic disagreement with Washington and St. John's. Nevertheless, the enduring co-operation of all religions confirms the tendency that has been generally found in the religious and social climate of these times in Maryland.¹¹⁸

This, then, was the pluralism that emerged with the success of the American Revolution. It had its own distinct character, so that we cannot univocally predicate our contemporary concept of those days. The decades that followed Bishop Carroll's episcopacy were likewise not a univocal experience of pluralism. The Constitution was the same, but those who lived the law were becoming a new generation of nationalists, who found ever-enduring Charles Carroll of Carrollton (he lived until 1837) well enough a native but wondered about his

¹¹⁷ Bernard C. Steiner, *History of Education in Maryland* (Washington, 1894), provides a general description of schools during this period.

¹¹⁸ See Minutes of the Board of Directors of Georgetown College, 1797 to 1815, entry for April 24, 1799 (Georgetown University Archives, Washington, D.C.); Whatcoat, *Journal*, Aug. 16, 1792, and Dec. 7, 1793; Asbury, *Journal and Letters* 2, 30-31, Oct. 21, 1794.

coreligionists who were not gentlemen, let alone natives, and whose clergy and hierarchy spoke with no authentic native dialect, however well they might grasp the American Catholic mind which Bishop John Carroll left them. In retrospect, the emergence of the first pluralism was surely a first spring inviting wonder and curiosity in today's Church with its mass of immigrant descendants. The hope of another spring is very much alive, and its realization would not be unfaithful to the past experience of the Church.