

NJS Presents**Invited Talks****In this Issue:*****The Reality of Empire: New Englanders on the Ground in Seventeenth Century East Jersey*****By Maxine N. Lurie****DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14713/njs.v3i2.82>**

The overall question of this article is what it meant for those living in seventeenth century New Jersey to be part of the English Empire. Did it matter at the local level? How did imperial changes (between Dutch and English, various proprietors) impact the settlers? What happens to our understanding of this time and place if we look at it from the perspective of the people on the ground, using surviving local town meeting records as the source? To find answers the paper asks two related questions: who were the settlers and where did they come from? And also what attracted them – was it land or religious freedom, or perhaps a combination of both?¹

The settlers who came to East New Jersey in the seventeenth century experienced many transitions as the land they settled on went from control by the Dutch to England by conquest in 1664, back to the Dutch by re-conquest in 1673, and then to England by treaty in 1674. To complicate matters, while under English control the region was first part of the Duke of York's proprietorship, when Richard Nicolls, his governor, made two large and forever troublesome land grants across the Hudson. A few months later he learned of the grant from the Duke to John

¹ This was originally presented as a paper at the session on Empires and Communities, for the conference "From Conquest to Identity: New Jersey and the Middle Colonies in the Seventeenth Century," organized by the McNeil Center and the New Jersey Historical Commission, in Trenton, New Jersey, on March 28, 2014. I want to thank the following – Ronald Becker, David Kuzma, and the rest of staff at Rutgers University Libraries, Special Collections and University Archives; Steve Tettamanti at the New Jersey Historical Society; Gary Saretzky, Randall Gabrielan, and Laura Poll in Monmouth County; Michael J. Gall for sharing a draft of his archaeological article on early settlers and land use in Woodbridge; and Jonathan Lurie and Richard Veit for suggestions.

Lord Berkeley and Sir George Carteret. They sent Philip Carteret as their governor of what they called New Jersey; he was ousted in a local rebellion in 1671, but returned in 1674 after the Dutch had left. By this point Berkeley had sold his half of New Jersey to a group of Quakers, and it became for a time the separate colony of West New Jersey. East New Jersey continued under George Carteret's ownership and then that of his widow even as his right to control the government was challenged by Sir Edmund Andros, the then governor of New York. In 1682 a second group consisting mostly of Quakers bought East New Jersey from the widow Elizabeth Carteret, the Twelve (later, Twenty-four) proprietors claiming the right to both the government and land.² However, they faced pressure by 1685 from an English government that was trying to consolidate its colonies and strengthen control over the empire, with the result that both East and West New Jersey were annexed to the Dominion of New England in 1688. The Glorious Revolution in England soon brought the Dominion to an end, and the East (and West) Jersey proprietors regained control but had an increasingly difficult time effectively dealing with the colony as the 1690s progressed – threatened by the English government from above, and challenged by unruly colonists from below. In 1702 they, along with the proprietors of West Jersey, surrendered their claims to the government (but retained title to the land). In 1703 the two New Jerseys were reunited and Edward Hyde, Lord Cornbury, was appointed as the first royal governor.³ Today these frequent changes are difficult to follow, but the question in this paper is whether or not these shifts impacted those on the ground – did it matter, and, if so, how?

² This brief account does not include the changes in those appointed governor of East Jersey after 1683, often including alterations in the instructions sent to them by those proprietors who remained in England, Ireland, and Scotland.

³ For general works on New Jersey, see: Richard P. McCormick, *New Jersey from Colony to State* Rev. Ed. (Newark: NJHS, 1981) especially 1-57; Wesley Frank Craven, *New Jersey and the English Colonization of North America* (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1964); John Pomfret, *Colonial New Jersey: A History* (New York: Scribner, 1973); John Pomfret, *The Province of East New Jersey 1609-1702: The Rebellious Province* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962); John Pomfret, *New Jersey Proprietors and Their Lands, 1634-1776* (Princeton:

To find an answer to this question the records of four of East New Jersey's earliest towns were examined. New Jersey is much smaller, and there were far fewer towns than in New England in the same period.⁴ In addition not all of the town records have survived. Some disappeared or were destroyed early in the eighteenth century, others in the maelstrom of the American Revolution in what was contested ground. The records of Elizabethtown, the largest of the early settlements, went missing in 1718;⁵ Shrewsbury's at an unspecified time.⁶ As a result, for this paper the early town records of Woodbridge⁷, Newark⁸, Piscataway⁹, and Middletown¹⁰ were used. What has survived for these towns is not complete – Piscataway records for example

D. Van Nostrand, 1964); Maxine N. Lurie and Richard Veit eds., *New Jersey: A History of the Garden State* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2012) Chapter Two.

⁴ John Frederick Martin, *Profits in the Wilderness: Entrepreneurship in the Founding of New England* (Chapel Hill, University North Carolina Press, 1991) sampled records from sixty-three towns.

⁵ John Harpster, *John Ogden, The Pilgrim (1609-1682): A Man of More than Ordinary Mark* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2006) 187. The records were reported as stolen and/or burnt, with the Elizabethtown Associates and East Jersey Proprietors trading blame for their disappearance. On Elizabethtown history see: Edwin F. Hatfield, *History of Elizabeth, New Jersey* (New York: Carlton and Lanahan, 1868); Theodore Thayer, *As We Were: The Story of Old Elizabethtown* (Elizabeth: New Jersey Historical Society, 1964).

⁶ Richard L. Kraybill, *The Story of Shrewsbury 1664-1964* (Red Bank, New Jersey, 1964).

⁷ There are two versions of the Woodbridge Township Freeholders Book – the original from seventeenth century, and a 1775 copy made by Nathaniel Fitzrandolph, both at Special Collections and University Archives, Rutgers University Libraries. The original records show that the clerks entered information at different times, mixing minutes, deeds, births, deaths, and marriages, wherever there was space. Citations are from the 1775 version, ac 2378 Liber A 1668-1717 BL II. In addition, there are handwritten and transcribed Woodbridge records at the New Jersey Historical Society, MG 68, but they were not used for this paper.

⁸ Newark's early town records were transcribed in 1775 by Joseph Hedden, Jr. and this copy is now at the New Jersey Historical Society; at that time the land records were entered in a separate book. Newark New Jersey Town Records 1666-1836: (1) Newark Town Book c. 1666-1737 [1760s?]; (2) Newark Town Book from 1691, Land Transactions 1666-1737. In addition, there are two volumes of land records copied by Daniel T. Clark, possibly in the nineteenth century - Town Meeting Record 1666-1700 v.1 and v.2 1704-1740. The meeting records were published as the *Records of the Town of Newark, New Jersey* (New Jersey Historical Society, 1864; reprinted 1990), without the deeds. Unless noted otherwise the citations are to the printed copy. The minutes are the basis for David Lawrence Pierson, *Narratives of Newark (in New Jersey) From the Days of Its Founding 1666-1916* (Newark: Pierson Publishing Co., 1917).

⁹ Piscataway Town Book transcription by John E. Brush with the assistance of Donald A. Sinclair and Edgar D. Shippee (1963-1964) ac. 2099, Special Collections and University Archives, Rutgers University Libraries. It does not include deeds, records of births, deaths, or marriages. The original document, 1682-1933, ac.1545, also at Rutgers, lists ear marks.

¹⁰ Used for Middletown was the copy of the printed town records transcribed by John E. Stillwell and held at Rutgers University Library, Special Collections and University Archives. This also appears in John E. Stillwell, comp., *Historical and Genealogical Miscellany: Data Relating to the Settlers and Settlement of New York and New Jersey* v.2 (1906) 149-198. The original Middletown First Town Book is at the Monmouth County Historical Association, Coll. 317 Middletown Township (N.J.) Records. See also: Ernest W. Mandeville, *The History of Middletown: The Oldest Settlement in New Jersey* (Middletown Township Courier: Middle Township, NJ 1927); *250th Anniversary of the First Baptist Church Middletown, New Jersey 1688-1938* (Middletown, N.J.: First Baptist Church, 1938).

start in 1683 even though the town was established in 1666. Missing as a result are the records of any early town meetings about dividing up the land among the settlers, but what exists does provide some insight into how the colonists reacted to events taking place around them. Interestingly, both Newark and Woodbridge copied over their original records in 1775/1776, in the process re-ordering the contents.¹¹ In Woodbridge, the land records were placed at the beginning of the new book; the Newark scribe put them in a separate volume (and they were not included when the meeting minutes were printed in the mid nineteenth century). The original seventeenth century Newark records apparently no longer exist, perhaps misplaced but possibly burned when the British marched through town during the Revolution (the fate of some early church records there). Only the brief printed records were used for Middletown, but the originals do exist.

The extant records are incomplete in other ways as well, sometimes noted as so by frustrated town clerks of the time. At one point Newark officials asked residents to come into the town meeting to report where they had laid out their lands as the records were not clear; Piscataway officials in 1693 noted that land sales were not being reported and threatened to fine those not recording these.¹² Woodbridge births, marriages, and deaths were interspersed in the original copy of the minutes (listed alphabetically by the family's last name at the end of 1776 version), but several times a clerk complained that residents were not reporting these events. In the case of both Woodbridge and Newark at least a few pages appear to be missing. Finally, not

¹¹ The eighteenth century clerk who copied the Woodbridge records stated this was done because the originals were in disorder and in bad shape; they still exist and it is evident he was correct. His handwriting is much easier to read, but besides re-ordering the records he apparently introduced some errors. Another possible reason for copying in 1775/1776, and taking particular care with the deeds, may be that these were again important. This is the point at which the East Jersey Board of Proprietors won an arbitrated case dealing with land titles, particularly those in the Newark area based on Indian titles alone.

¹² Piscataway Town Book, 15.

all residents in New Jersey deeded their lands, it was one way of avoiding paying quit rents (see discussion of this below).

Despite only having records for a few towns, the existing records reveal a number of characteristics that help put the larger Atlantic world in perspective – leading to the conclusion that in terms of everyday life *it did not matter*. In the earliest years, town residents met (or tried to meet) monthly as the colonists settled on the land and determined who got what parcels and where. They also tried to defend boundaries from the claims of neighboring towns. One of the earliest Woodbridge meetings discussed what to do about the Piscataway men who had pulled up all their stakes indicating parcels. But the meeting minutes also reflect a constant concern with laying out and then repairing roads, building and maintaining fences (to prevent domestic animals from getting into the crops), offering bounties for killing wolves, and recording “ear marks” for hogs and cattle that indicated individual ownership of the animals. The town was busy allotting lands with a proper portion of town lots, meadow lands, and uplands (sometimes also salt meadows and bogs), frequently noting when residents exchanged parcels to consolidate their holdings, providing additions for poor pieces and reimbursing for land taken for roads. They laid out commons and allotted the number of cattle a household could place there. The freeholders elected town officials, set rates for local taxes (including, by the 1690s, poor rates), and apportioned the time required of residents for public projects.¹³ Depending on the town this could also include obtaining a minister, building a church and parsonage, or hiring a school teacher. Except for the election of representatives to the colonial assembly, life beyond the bounds of the town only occasionally intruded and appears in the records. These intrusions will be noted below, but it is worth emphasizing the sense the records give that life went on

¹³ By the eighteenth century the town minutes often contain little more than the results of these local elections.

irrespective of who claimed New Jersey (Dutch, English, or a proprietary group). What was important was occupying the land, and then buying, trading, and selling it.

And yet even a cursory look at the deeds and wills that were recorded in the town records indicate the opposite might be true, because the deeds are almost always very careful to note just exactly where the land was situated, under what overlord, and in doing so make clear that the settlers in East Jersey were always aware of the changing imperial world around them. This was important for the legitimacy of their land titles.¹⁴ They also paid attention when they were forced to – for example, when Dutch admirals and generals required allegiance to Holland, or when Edmund Andros, backed by soldiers, insisted they recognize him, the Duke’s representative (and not Philip Carteret), as the legitimate governor over East Jersey.

Settler Identity

The seventeenth century East Jersey towns were primarily settled by New Englanders – coming either directly from New England or by way of Long Island. The exceptions, not discussed here, were Bergen (which had been started by the Dutch in 1660), and Perth Amboy (created by the Twenty-Four proprietors after 1683 and dominated by Scotchmen). Elizabethtown¹⁵ was started by and contained mostly New England Puritans, though they were joined by Anglican Philip Carteret and those who came with him (including several possible Catholics). Woodbridge and Piscataway were founded in 1666 when other New Englanders purchased part of the Elizabethtown grant, but at least originally there were differences. The Woodbridge settlers were Puritans who came from Newbury and surrounding towns in Massachusetts, while those in Piscataway were Quakers and Baptists from New Hampshire. Shrewsbury and Middletown, part of the Monmouth patent, were also settled by New

¹⁴ Even though doing so did not, for complex reasons, protect them in terms of the proprietors.

¹⁵ The original Elizabethtown and Monmouth (also called Navesink) grants came from Richard Nicolls.

Englanders, the first mainly Quakers from Long Island and the second primarily Baptists from Rhode Island. Newark was settled by Puritans from four towns in Connecticut: Branford, Milford, Guilford, and New Haven. Thus these settlers were mostly New Englanders, but they were not all alike.

All of these New Jersey towns maintained contact and connections with the places of settler origin, as shown by deeds and wills, well into the eighteenth century. Land passed to children but also to or from other relatives (fathers, sons, daughters- or their husbands, uncles, nephews), some of whom had returned to their original New England towns, and others who invested in the East Jersey towns but had never left the old.¹⁶ In 1672 several men living in Rhode Island gifted lands in Middletown to their sons located in East Jersey.¹⁷ Robert Treat, one of the leaders in settling Newark, returned to Connecticut in 1672, where he later served as governor, while Daniel Pierce, Sr. (one of the primary investors behind Woodbridge), stayed only four years and died back in Newbury, leaving lands to sons in both places.¹⁸ Although these men did not permanently stay in East Jersey their children and other relatives did. Treat's son (or sons) and Daniel Pierce's son Joshua, as well as a step daughter and her husband Thomas Thorp, took up lands to which the investors were entitled. In addition, the New England settlers of these towns then spread south in New Jersey founding Cranbury, Princeton, Cape May, and other places as well. Historians have noted the movement of New Englanders from the initial Massachusetts settlements south into Connecticut and then across the sound to Long Island, also north into Maine and west into New Hampshire, as families grew and with them the need for

¹⁶ Martin, *Profits in Wilderness*, comments on New England investors who bought land for their children elsewhere, 29.

¹⁷ Middletown Records, 19-20.

¹⁸ Daniel Pierce Sr. Will, Woodbridge Records, 45-46.

additional land. The move to New Jersey is noted less often by scholars outside of the state.¹⁹ It is though, as Walter Meuly (a Piscataway historian) noted, these East Jersey towns that “mark the utmost extension of the New England town system along the Atlantic Shore.”²⁰

Although East New Jersey was settled by New Englanders, it was not New England.²¹ Some of these settlers were moving to escape rigorous Puritan regimes, others (in Newark) to be even more strict. The proprietorships land system overlaid the towns system of allocations, but also the religious diversity of these settlers, and the proprietors’ provisions for religious toleration, made for differences.

Importance of Land

These New England settlers were attracted to New Jersey by its land and they first settled in the fertile rivers valleys that drained into the Atlantic.²² The religious toleration provided by the Dutch and then the proprietors was undoubtedly significant; as was the expectation/hope they would control local government. But the attention paid to land, its acquisition, division, location, purchase; and sale, especially in the early years, indicates the important role it played in settlement. This was the main preoccupation as shown in the early town records.

The process by which most of these towns were started is similar to that described by John Frederick Martin in *Profits in the Wilderness: Entrepreneurship in the Founding of New England*. Entrepreneurs put up money for Indian purchases and land surveys, settlers of the

¹⁹ New Jersey does not appear in the indexes of the classic books on New England towns by Philip J. Greven, Jr., Kenneth A. Lockridge, Charles S. Grant, John Demos, Sumner Chilton Powell, David Grayson Allen, or Edward M. Cook Jr.

²⁰ Walter C. Meuly, *History of Piscataway Township, 1666-1976* (Piscataway Bicentennial Commission, 1976) 30. For a discussion of cultural patterns of land settlement in New Jersey see Peter O. Wacker, *Land and People: A Cultural Geography of Preindustrial New Jersey: Origins and Settlement Patterns* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1975), especially Chapter 4 for early period and 303-329 for East Jersey.

²¹ Douglas G. Jacobsen, “American Puritanism Observed: New England and New Jersey,” *New Jersey History* 110 (Spring/Summer 1992):1-17.

²² “Early Settlement 1665-1765” map in Maxine N. Lurie and Peter O. Wacker eds., *Mapping New Jersey: An Evolving Landscape* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2009) 50.

towns then collected “rates” or taxes for the expenses of the town, but also to repay the initial costs, essentially buying into the project. Founders and those who later bought in became “freeholders” and were entitled to land dividends, to participate in town government, and to vote. Becoming a freeholder required a formal request to the town and then a vote to accept in the town meeting. The towns listed the original holders, and later divisions in land were given *in their name* (even if they had died or sold their holdings). Those who came and settled were entitled to differing amounts of land – they were evaluated based on their estimated worth (personal property, household members, animals) as well as what they had invested. The towns were in effect early land companies, with Woodbridge actually calling itself a corporation (and basing this designation on a charter received from Philip Carteret in 1669). The process differed though from New England in an important way. There the permission to settle and the original land grants came from the General Court i.e. legislature. In New Jersey it supposedly came from the proprietors (the Duke/Nicolls, Berkeley and Carteret, and then the Twenty-four who after 1685 were represented by the East Jersey Board of Proprietors). Land titles became confused and contested in New England, but appear particularly convoluted in New Jersey. Peter O. Wacker, in his 1975 book *Land and People: A Cultural Geography of Preindustrial New Jersey Origins and Settlement Patterns*, observed that “The seventeenth-century record of the allocation of lands in East Jersey reveals general illegalities and irregularities which were appalling. Not only settlers, but proprietors, and entrepreneurs as well, were responsible for the situation.”²³

To go back to the New England comparison, towns started when a group of investors/settlers (not all were both) obtained permission to settle. The town then usually controlled the allotment of lands with those admitted as freeholders becoming in effect stock

²³ Wacker, 326. He adds “To be fair, however, uncertainty had attended the land system and the Proprietors had inherited many problems from the Carteret regime.”

holders and eligible for land dividends, some granted into the eighteenth century.²⁴ Newark appears to have expected settlement within two years and if not land was to revert to the town. Its covenant also said that land could not be sold to those the “Town Allow not of.”²⁵ This town continued to purchase land from the Indians in 1678, 1700, and 1745 (perhaps more often). Woodbridge was more complicated, probably because it was next to Elizabethtown where Governor Philip Carteret lived, and because he and his surveyor general held land in the town.²⁶ There the town made some grants based on the Concessions and Agreements of 1665, including provisions in a few cases for the granting of head rights to new arrivals (a practice to which some objected, and it did not last long). For at least a time, then, the towns’ way of allocating land and the different proprietary systems overlapped. All of these towns, even Newark, granted small parcels of land as town lots to attract craftsmen such as a tanner, smithy, shoemaker, brick maker, and especially someone who might be able to build a grist mill. Usually they became residents, not freeholders entitled to later dividends. In Woodbridge, a number of these small grants were at first limited to seven years or the lifetime of the head of house hold, but this restriction was later lifted and descendants could inherit. In the end, as in many New England towns, there were freeholders (entitled to dividends) and there were residents (sometimes the category overlapped, but not always).

The essential point here though is that Woodbridge, Piscataway, Middletown, and Newark (as well as Elizabethtown) were settled by New Englanders who wanted the rich farm land for themselves as well as their relatives (usually sons, sometimes also daughters and their spouses). Town meeting records repeatedly show fathers and sons (Sr. or Jr. noted after their

²⁴ Woodbridge in 1682 listed all the freeholders and number of acres they held, but this clearly did not include all inhabitants as far more names are mentioned in the records. Woodbridge Records, 207-208.

²⁵ Reference is to non-Puritans, but as noted below this restriction did not last. Newark Records, 6.

²⁶ Capt. Philip Carteret’s name appears on a list of sixty-five freeholders of the town, Woodbridge Records, 157.

names) as town officials and land holders. An example of connections is indicated by an agreement signed by fifty-one men in Newark in 1688. Ward, Johnson, Baldwin, Riggs, Dod, Burwell, and Canfield appear twice; Tompkins, Pierson, Crane, and Harrison three times; and Browne four times; with Sr. and Jr. noted a number of times. Thus it is possible that thirty of the fifty-one men had relatives in town, and it is probable that there were even more family connections.²⁷ That men invested and/or settled in East Jersey towns to provide land for their sons is made particularly clear by Daniel Pierce, Sr.'s Will. He specified that the lands he left in both Newbury and Woodbridge were to be entailed to male descendants (and if there were none then the land was to be sold and the proceeds divided among the female descendants).²⁸ His son-in-law Thomas Thorp had seven sons, several of those who survived him remained in Woodbridge; he also entailed his lands in his will.²⁹ John Pike, another of the founders of Woodbridge, granted land to his son-in-law that was located between lands owned by his two sons.

In New England towns over time the entrepreneurs, particularly if absentees, came into conflict with town residents over the distribution of unoccupied lands.³⁰ In New Jersey conflict was in a sense built in from the start because of the proprietors. The land was also important for them because they wanted to make a profit from it, in the seventeenth century through quit rents (which first came due in 1670). They consistently insisted that Indian titles alone were not sufficient, that all towns and their settlers also needed to obtain title from them, have lands surveyed and registered, and pay rents (this was true whether the governors on the ground were the agents of Berkeley and Carteret or the Twenty-four/ then East Jersey Board of Proprietors).

²⁷ My calculation, list Newark Records, 102.

²⁸ Pierce Will, Woodbridge Records, 45-46.

²⁹ Maxine N. Lurie, "Who Was Elizabeth Dodderidge Thorp Powell and Why is the Fact She Took Her Former Father-in-law to Court in 1693 Important?" *Rutgers University Library Journal* v.67 (2015) 75-96.

³⁰ Martin, *Profits in Wilderness*, 255-293, on later years of the towns.

The proprietors also consistently denied the validity of the Nicolls grants, made by Duke's governor Richard Nicolls in New York before he knew of the transfer to Berkeley and Carteret, to what became Elizabethtown, and the Monmouth patent towns of Middletown and Shrewsbury.³¹

In New Jersey the proprietors insisted that settlers of the town clear Indian titles by paying out of their own pockets, and then also obtain proprietary titles for their land. Settlers appear to always take the first, but not necessarily the second, step of this process. The settlers in Middletown, while claiming their grant came from the Duke of York (the Monmouth patent from Nicolls) went so far as to state they had "purchased from the chiefe Proprietors of the Countrey: Viz: the Indians."³² This was an on-going issue in the colonial period as some settlers, for example those who located on lands purchased from Indians by Newark in later years, claimed this was sufficient. They actually lost on this issue when the East Jersey proprietors won an arbitration case just before the American Revolution.

Some settlers took out proprietary titles to protect themselves while others just ignored the requirements. Between 1672 and 1681 some forty-seven Piscataway heads of households registered their lands with the proprietors.³³ One early deed after another in early Woodbridge notes that it has been laid out with a warrant from the proprietary governor and by his surveyor general (Robert Vanquillion who lived in the town). That said, again here the settlers were inconsistent.³⁴ About 1670 Philip Carteret was threatening to take the lands of both Piscataway and Woodbridge residents who had not taken out proper proprietary patents.³⁵ Newark appears

³¹ Woodbridge and Piscataway purchased their lands from the Elizabethtown settlers, but they also obtained charters from Philip Carteret in 1669.

³² Middletown Records, 7

³³ Piscataway Town Book, introduction.

³⁴ For an example of this see Wacker, 345-347.

³⁵ Woodbridge Records, 179-180.

alternately to have done both, take proprietary titles and ignore the requirement, despite saying repeatedly that they wanted a “legal settlement with the proprietors.”³⁶ The proprietors, again consistently, tried to force the settlers to take out titles from them by trying to deny those who did not have titles the right to vote or serve in the assembly. They also threatened to grant the lands to others. They or individual proprietors (as in Woodbridge about 1700) tried to patent the common lands of the towns. These disputes increased in the late 1690s, exploded in violence in the 1740s, and provoked protests just before the American Revolution.³⁷

While the usual view is that New Jersey settlers objected to quit rents (and at times they obviously did) the early town records surprisingly show that in several cases they clearly tried to pay them but had trouble doing so. When the quit rents first came due in 1670, Newark town officials asked all the settlers to bring in their share of the cost, in wheat, and then two delegates took the produce to Elizabethtown to pay Governor Philip Carteret:

It was by the Joint vote agreed that Henry Lyon and Ths. Johnson should Take and receive every Mans Just Share and Proportion of Wheat for his Land; the Summer Wheat at 4s. pr. Bush’l and Winter Wheat at 5s. according to the order and Time prefixed to them to Bring it to Johnson’s House before the day be over, or else if they fail they are to Double the quantity; which Corn the said Lyons & Johnson is to Morrow to Carry to Elizabeth Town, and to make a Tender Thereof to the Governor upon the account of the Lords Proprietors rent for the Land, we make use of according to the Articles 25th March, 1670.

Carteret rejected the wheat on the ground that the rents were to be paid in hard coin, in the “money of England.” The crops were carted back to Newark and returned. The following year the same process was repeated, along with the same results.³⁸ It is highly unlikely that the

³⁶ Newark Records, 102.

³⁷ On land disputes in the eighteenth century see for example: Brendan McConville, *These Daring Disturbers of the Public Peace: The Struggle for Property and Power in Early New Jersey* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999); Thomas L. Purvis, “The Origins and Patterns of Agrarian Unrest in New Jersey, 1735-1754,” *William & Mary Quarterly* 39 (1982): 600-627.

³⁸ Newark Records 29, 30, 34-35; Pierson, 90-91.

Newark settlers had hard coin with which to make the payment; at the same time it is true that Carteret was following his instructions and the Concessions and Agreements. Either he had a change of heart or of instructions, because when he returned after the Dutch interlude he accepted the grain. When it came to quit rents, if the method of payment created a problem so did the shifts in proprietary owners. In 1682 Woodbridge wanted assurance that any rents they did pay were going to the legitimate owners of East Jersey so that they would not be called upon to pay the same rents twice; this is also about the time that deeds there specified that the individual purchaser was responsible for all quit rents and town rates (taxes).

Another complication was the question of who was responsible for paying the quit rents on town lands. Under the Concessions and Agreements school and church property was exempt, but the commons used to graze animals and cut wood was not. Again there are some examples of the towns trying to collect and pay these fees, but they were not consistent. Here there are also differences between Newark, which was more tightly controlled, and Woodbridge, where the settlers appear quicker to have scattered and be deemed responsible for individual payments.³⁹

There was conflict not only over quit rents but also over the land itself. The important point here is that if the towns operated as land companies, so did the proprietors. Richard P. McCormick noted that “Berkeley and Carteret were essentially real estate promoters,”⁴⁰ while after 1682 the proprietors worked in a way very similar to the towns. The East Jersey proprietorship consisted of twenty-four shares, and shareholders (or fractional holders) were entitled to dividends in land. The proprietorship itself became a corporation, as several of the

³⁹ Donald J. Mrozek, “The Distribution of Land in Seventeenth-Century Woodbridge, New Jersey,” *Journal of the Rutgers University Libraries* 35 (1971): 1-14; Michael J. Gall, “‘An Earthly Tabernacle’: English Land Use in Seventeenth-Century Woodbridge, New Jersey,” *Northeast Historical Archaeology* 43 (2014) 23-53.

⁴⁰ McCormick, 24. The desire of the Twenty-four proprietors to make a profit is obvious from the minutes of the early meetings they held in London; see the East Jersey Proprietors Minutes from the Barclay Record Book, *Journal of the Rutgers University Libraries*, v. LXIII 2007/08.

towns had already done.⁴¹ The conflict that resulted from these overlapping land companies therefore should not come as a surprise to the reader.⁴²

Religion

The New England settlers who came to New Jersey wanted land, but they also wanted a place where they were free to practice religion as they wished, and they came intending to found their own churches. That said, if they wished to reside in exclusive communities with like-minded others (and clearly this was true in Newark) they had by the end of the seventeenth century come to accept the strangers in their midst, as well as the “separation of church and state.” With the exception of Rhode Island, this did not happen in New England until well after the American Revolution.

Some of the differences came from the terms of settlement offered by the proprietors of New Jersey, beginning with the Concessions and Agreements of 1665 provided by Berkeley and Carteret. It stated:

“That noe person...shalbe any waies molested punished disquieted or called in Question for any difference in opinion or practice in matters of Religious concernments, who doe not actually disturbe the civil peace of the said Province, but that all such and every such person and persons may from time to time and at all times freely and fully have and enjoy his and their Judgments and Consciences in matters of Religion throughout all the said Province; They behaveing themselves peaceably and quietly and not using this liberty to Licentiousnes, nor to the civill injury or outward disturbance of others, any Law Statute or clause conteyned or to be conteined usage or custome of this Realme of England to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding.”⁴³

⁴¹ Maxine N. Lurie, “Unique Proprietary” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 111(1987):76-97; Maxine N. Lurie, “New Jersey: The Long Lived Proprietary,” in *Constructing Early Modern Empires: Proprietary Ventures in the Atlantic World, 1500-1750*, L.H. Roper and B. Van Ruymbeke eds., (Leiden: Brill, 2007) 327-355.

⁴² Martin, *Profits in Wilderness*, 248, notes in terms of New England “that land speculators operated, and settlers fought with them, throughout the colonial period, including the seventeenth century. Moreover, town struggles in both centuries were more than simply a contest between wealthy nonresidents and indigent pioneers. Pioneers were not always poor men combating big speculators; sometimes they were speculators themselves.”

⁴³ Julian P. Boyd ed., *Fundamental Laws and Constitutions of New Jersey 1664-1964* (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1964) 54.

A promise of toleration had also been made by the Duke of York; it was particularly important for the settlers of Middletown and Shrewsbury, most of whom were dissenters from Puritan Congregationalism, and some of whom had been persecuted in New England.⁴⁴

There are several indications of the importance of religion for these settlers. The founders of Newark had negotiated with the Dutch before 1664 to settle, but they backed off because the assurance of religious and political freedom was not sufficient.⁴⁵ When they did move a minister, Rev. Abraham Pierson, accompanied them, and he was later succeeded by his son. The importance of religion is also made clear by the wording of the covenant the settlers agreed to, and by the initial insistence that only church members could vote: “none shall be admitted freemen” except “such Planters as are members of some of other of the Congregational Churches.” New settlers were required to “bring a certificate from the Chief of the Place from whence he comes unless the Town be upon their Knowledge satisfied in and about the Good Carriage and Behavior of them otherwise.” Residents were expected to contribute to the maintenance of the minister; exclude from the town were those who “would subvert us from the true religion and worship of God, and cannot or will not keep their opinions to themselves or be reclaimed after due Time and means of Convictions and reclaiming hath been used.”⁴⁶ Dissenters, the covenant noted, would be asked to leave the town, though they would be reimbursed for their property. These restrictions ended about 1677.⁴⁷ The town had admitted craftsmen with skills they needed, even though they were not Congregationalists, apparently willing to forgo religious conformity.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ McCormick, 21; Daniel J. Weeks, *Not for Filthy Lucre's Sake: Richard Salter and the Antiproprietary Movement in East New Jersey, 1665-1707* (Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 2001) 16-17.

⁴⁵ Pomfret, East Jersey 47-49.

⁴⁶ Newark Records 1-5; Wacker 263-264.

⁴⁷ Pierson, 62-63.

⁴⁸ John T. Cunningham, *Newark* (Newark: New Jersey Historical Society, rev. ed. 1988), 8.

Although Woodbridge is supposedly named for the minister of Newbury, he did not join the settlers and they had trouble obtaining and retaining ministers well into the eighteenth century. But they kept on trying (Douglas Jacobsen sees this persistence as “evidence of the strong religious piety of the residents”) and the town even attempted early on to hire away ministers from Newark and Elizabethtown. They sent requests for help to Congregationalists in New England, and even contacts in England. The town minutes show repeated efforts as well to build a proper church, and establish a parsonage. Even when the town had success those who came rarely stayed very long, and efforts started all over again. Once when they did find someone they apparently really liked, a Samuel Shepard, and he was willing to consider settling permanently, his wife adamantly objected (perhaps the town was too rural and isolated, or too far from her family).⁴⁹

Toleration on the local, town, level did not always initially mean separation of church and state, even though as a colony New Jersey never had an established church. Both Newark and Woodbridge at first collected money for the minister and provided for the costs of building the church from all in town, collected with the town rates. But unlike New England this did not last long - by about 1700 none of these towns were collecting money for the churches even where (Newark and Woodbridge) they had parsonage lands. In Newark in 1687 a disagreement over the minister led to an agreement signed by fifty-one men to contribute to his salary; yet not everyone apparently did as when he left in 1692 he was owed two years back pay. In the long run religious diversification led to some interesting issues. Thus Newark in 1760 tried to clarify ownership of the church lands that went back to its initial settlement. The town initially voted to divide the lands (or perhaps their value) among the original Congregational (now Presbyterian) church, a satellite church, and the Anglican church in town. After a heated debate the town voted again,

⁴⁹ Woodbridge Town Records; Jacobsen, 7-10.

and this time it appears that they left it with the original church.⁵⁰

In Woodbridge accommodation came after a Quaker protest and resulted in a decision as a town to not collect for the minister. The 1669 town charter granted religious toleration for all settlers, *and* said the town could “chuse their owne Minister or Ministers” and all in town “shall contribute according to their estates for his maintenance.” It provided that others “of different judgment” could maintain ministers, but at their own (additional) cost. At an early point the records state the town would not collect for the minister, but then it clearly did. In 1695 the town resolved all heads of households needed to pay, but at the January 1696 meeting William Webster objected. Captain John Bishop then volunteered to pay Webster’s dues for as long as he should live. But in February 1700 after several “dissenting neighbors the Quakers” objected to the collection, the town moved to subscription by church members only.⁵¹ In Newark, the most Puritan of the towns, by about 1700 the town meeting agreed to deduct costs of the minister and church from the town rates for those of those who were not Congregationalists. In contrast in towns where Baptists and Quakers dominated (Piscataway, Middletown, perhaps Shrewsbury) the records do not show efforts to collect rates for ministers and churches. When Piscataway voted to build a town meeting house in 1686, no mention was made of a religion and instead the records note that this was to be for “Towne meetings, Courts and other publick businesse.”⁵²

The Piscataway town minutes reference here to local government and courts highlights the other concern of these settlers – their desire for control of political institutions. This was seen in the previously mentioned negotiations between the Newark leaders and the Dutch that fell

⁵⁰ The church property was later “amicably” divided. Walter S. Nichols, “Early Newark as a Puritan Theocracy in Colonial New Jersey,” *Proceedings New Jersey Historical Society* 5 (Oct 1920): 201-224.

⁵¹ Charter quoted in Joseph W. Dally, *Woodbridge and Vicinity* (1873; reprint 1967), and in Ruth Wolk, *History of Woodbridge* (Woodbridge, N.J.: Woodbridge Publishing Company, 1957) 3-4. Piscataway’s charter is similar, Meuly, 28-29. On the Quaker protest, see: Woodbridge Records 247, 251, 260.

⁵² Piscataway Town Book, 6.

through, and appears over and over in the contested relationship between colonists and proprietors, colonists and governors in this period. The Monmouth towns refused to participate in the first New Jersey assembly of 1668, settlers battled Philip Carteret before and after the Dutch return, and they later objected to the Fundamental Constitutions proposed by the Twenty-four Proprietors in 1683. This is an important part of the story, but one better reflected in the assembly and council records of the colony than in the town records discussed here.⁵³

When Imperial Connections Became Important

Even though the town records show an overwhelming concern with land and local matters, the larger world repeatedly intruded as shifts in sovereignty, changes in the proprietorships, and war had an impact on those who had settled in East Jersey. This can be seen in the land records, and in the towns' responses to specific events. The land records were a surprise as they show how the settlers were very careful to state where in the world they were when they wrote deeds, and how this shifted depending on who they saw as in control. Most deeds began with formalistic statements of greeting such as this August 3, 1671 one: "To all Christian people to whome this present Shall come Greeting Know Ye that I Samuel Moore of Woodbridge in the province of New Jersey..." (ignoring the Indians even though the settlers did repeatedly purchase land from them), thus noting the transfer of land held under whatever country or proprietary group was recognized at the time.⁵⁴ When this changed so did the wording of the deeds. This clearly reflects the importance of land for these settlers. That said, the changes also impacted whether and to whom quit rents were due, and whether and how local government functioned.

From Dutch to English to Dutch to English Again

⁵³ Maxine N. Lurie, "The Case of the Founding of Monmouth County," *New Jersey History* 126 (2011): 84-95; Weeks, 42-71.

⁵⁴ Woodbridge Records, 14.

An early Dutch map of the 1630s clearly shows colonists on the western bank of the Hudson River, but conflict with the Indians twice forced these early settlers to retreat.⁵⁵ When English forces arrived there was a fortified settlement at Bergen, and other settlers scattered in the area. The Duke of York's governor assured those Dutch who wanted to remain that their land titles would be honored. New Englanders were eyeing this region even before the British forces arrived, and by 1673 they had obviously settled the towns discussed here. During the Re-conquest they sought assurance from the Dutch that their titles would be recognized. Thus the Newark meeting on June 20, 1674 petitioned the government at New Orange for confirmation of town lands, and at the same time requested the creation of a "priviledged County" if possible that included all the towns, if not "what may be necessary for us in our Town."⁵⁶ In addition, land deeds written during the short period of Re-conquest reflect what had happened. For example, Middletown deeds now stated that the lands described were held in the "province of New Netherlands;"⁵⁷ a Woodbridge deed written 1672, but entered into records in 1674, made the same distinction.⁵⁸

When these towns arranged to submit to the Dutch authorities (Elizabethtown, Newark, Woodbridge and Piscataway) or were called upon and required to do so (Middletown, Shrewsbury, and Bergen), they complied. In Piscataway all forty-three men took the required oath of allegiance and the town became "Dorp Piscataway." Middletown selected local officials as required and fifty-two out of sixty men there took the oath; in Shrewsbury thirty-eight of sixty-eight (or fifty-six of sixty-eight if eighteen Quakers who "promised allegiance" are included). In Newark it was seventy-five of eighty-six. John Ogden of Elizabethtown became a

⁵⁵ Joannes Vingboons, Map of Manhattan, *Mapping New Jersey*, 49.

⁵⁶ Newark Records, 50.

⁵⁷ Middletown Records, 24.

⁵⁸ Woodbridge Records.

leading Dutch official, and fifty of seventy-one men there took the oath. Here some who refused were friends and supporters of Philip Carteret.⁵⁹ Those who took an oath to be “true and faithful” to the “States General” and “Prince of Orange” were promised they would not be forced to take up arms against their “owne nation.” Most importantly the towns were “granted the same Privileges and Freedoms” as Dutch towns, while the “Petitioners and their heirs shall unmolested enjoy and possess their lawfully purchased and paid for lands” as well as have freedom of conscience.⁶⁰ These appear to be generous terms.

While clearly some objected to the Dutch take over (or more likely absented themselves), most, as the numbers show, submitted to protect their lands, but perhaps also indicated an undeveloped sense of nationalism. In Virginia trade between English and Dutch persisted for many years after passage of the 1651 Navigation Acts “because both Dutch and English adventurers could swap out their imperial loyalties and personal identities relatively easily.”⁶¹

For at least one town Dutch rule was actually seen as an opportunity, although in the end it did not work out. Newark thus took this as the chance to obtain the “neck” lands they had wanted from Governor Lovelace of New York in 1669. Instead the “neck” or “New Barbadoes” was purchased at that time from the Indians by Captain William Sanford who deeded part of his purchase to Nathaniel Kingsland, both were settlers from Barbadoes who took up these lands under grants from Berkeley and Carteret. Apparently the Dutch confiscated their lands, and Newark again tried to obtain them. The town asked the Dutch if “We might have the Neck,” and subsequently bought it. But when English control returned so apparently did Sanford and

⁵⁹ “Minutes of the Council of the Administrations of Commanders Evertsen and Benekes, and of Anthony Colve, Governor of New Netherland 1673-1674” in E. B. O’Callaghan ed. *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York* v.2 (Albany: 1858; 1969 reprint) 571, 608. See also: Meuly, 37; Middletown Records, 28; Weeks, 42; Wacker, 130; Harpster, 169.

⁶⁰ Council New Netherland, 589, 576.

⁶¹ Cathy Matson, “The Early Modern Chesapeake Redux- Again,” *Reviews in American History* 41 (1913) 186, while reviewing the book *Early Modern Virginia*.

Kingsland. Newark then tried to get its money back from Dutch authorities; on May 1, 1678 the town wrote to Anthony Colve (who had been the governor of New Netherland) and the Court of Admiralty in Holland “for Reparation for our Expence about the Neck.”⁶² No mention was found in the records of the results.

Changes in the proprietorship, from the Duke of York to Berkeley and Carteret, to the Twenty-four proprietors also produced a reaction from the settlers, at times one of apparent disbelief and confusion. For example Middletown residents responded to initial claims of Berkeley and Carteret by stating “as to the Lords proprietors Interest It being a new unheard of thing to us and so obscure to us that at present wee are ignorant what it is.”⁶³ At this time, the Nicolls grantees in Elizabethtown, Middletown, and Shrewsbury indicated that they wanted to remain part of the New York (which they thought would protect their land and political rights, something New Englanders on Long Island would come to realize was not true). The Middletown minutes indicate settlers there initially refused to believe the Duke of York could give away land and “sovereignty,” although they did then say they would submit to the new proprietors if their interests were protected. But they were unwilling to betray their patent “for filthy Lucre’s sake.” Despite the use of this phrase they *were* concerned about the titles to their land, as well as their right to control local government.⁶⁴ Newark, even though settled on the invitation of Philip Carteret, also had doubts about being part of New Jersey. In July 1669 the town selected two delegates to: “Goe over to York, to advise with Col Lovelace Concerning our

⁶² Pierson, 102; Newark Records, 7, 55. At the meeting of November 21, 1676 Newark apparently agreed to pay William Meeker for his losses due to “changes in government,” possibly connected to the Dutch interlude; Newark Records, 65. Like other references though this is not clear.

⁶³ Town Book of Old Middletown, 6.

⁶⁴ *Ibid*, 7.

Standing, Whether we are designed to be Part of the Duke's Colony or Not; and about the Neck, and Liberty of purchasing Lands up the River...."⁶⁵

Despite these expressed reservations settlers in the towns took oaths of allegiance to the proprietors between 1665 and 1668: sixty-five men in Elizabethtown, thirteen in Woodbridge, twenty-eight in the Monmouth towns, and thirty-one in Bergen.⁶⁶ When, after the Dutch Reconquest, Philip Carteret returned as governor in 1674 Newark asked for a formal patent for its lands from him, and in 1678 continued to seek a "charter" that would include all the town bounds including lands not yet purchased from the Indians.⁶⁷ Its ambitions unmet Newark, and the other towns, remained part of New Jersey, but proprietary rights were repeatedly challenged in the period that followed.

In addition to rights to the land, quit rents were at times an issue. After the Twenty-four proprietors took over, Woodbridge first asked the "new proprietors" to confirm the town's charter given by Philip Carteret in 1669, but then a year later wanted the "governor and present proprietors" to prove they had the right to demand quit rents and that it was "safe" to pay them, because they were fearful if the request was not legal they might end up paying twice. Apparently satisfied by the reply from the governor, they later resolved to pay.⁶⁸ The Newark records show repeated efforts to deal with these new proprietors and their governors between 1683-1688 and then again in 1693.

Obviously war between England and Holland had a direct impact on settlers in this region in 1664 and 1673. But King Philip's War in New England and the time period that followed it (in particular 1679-1680) generated concern about safety and then fear of a more local Indian

⁶⁵ Newark Records, 21.

⁶⁶ Pomfret, *Colonial New Jersey*, 25-28.

⁶⁷ Newark Records, 56, 59, 71.

⁶⁸ Woodbridge Records 214, 216.

uprising. Newark asked to meet with the governor, and created a town watch of armed men.⁶⁹ Surely some of this resulted from the family ties that many settlers had with those further north. Then during King William's War, particularly 1689-1690, there was fear of an alliance between the French and Indians. At that time Woodbridge provided men for joint patrols with Elizabethtown, and also set meeting places for residents to congregate for defense.⁷⁰ These defensive actions stand out in the records because unlike other colonies in this time period they appear so rarely.

Finally, settlers in East Jersey were clearly affected by the efforts to centralize the British Empire at two points in this period. First came the effort to undermine claims to the government under George Carteret in 1680 (continuing challenges to the Quaker control of West Jersey), and the second was the inclusion of both Jerseys in the Dominion of New England in 1688. As part of the first effort Governor Edmund Andros in New York sent armed soldiers to arrest John Fenwick in 1677 for illegally acting as governor of West Jersey, and then others in 1680 to drag Philip Carteret in the middle of the night "out of his bed, his night-clothes stripped from his body;" he was taken by boat to New York City where he was tried for the same offence in East Jersey.⁷¹ The New York jury refused to convict and did not back down when Andros threatened them. Andros also called the East Jersey assembly into session, appearing in person to force agreement. But the local towns tried to resist his authority, no longer wanting to be part of the New York grant. Perhaps they also feared his threat to land holdings (as occurred in New England), and clearly were aware of efforts to rule without a legislature where he (and his Stuart

⁶⁹ Newark Records, 75.

⁷⁰ Woodbridge Records, meetings of March 3, 1689 and April 5, 1690.

⁷¹ Pierson, 125ff. The author terms this arrest of Philip Carteret a "blot spot upon Governor Andros' life." See also Mary Lou Lustig, *The Imperial Executive in America: Sir Edmund Andros, 1637-1714* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2002) 62-65, 109-114.

masters) gained control.⁷² For example Newark denied Andros and the New York government's claims over New Jersey. At a town meeting of March 29, 1679/1680 they gave:

“their positive Answer to the Governor of York's Writ, (viz): That they have taken the Oath of Allegiance to the King and Fidelity to the present Government [Carteret], and until they have sufficient Order from his Majesty we will stand by the same.”⁷³

Woodbridge also declined to cooperate when on July 24, 1680 Andros ordered them to select three men to hold a court. The town said this violated their charter from Philip Carteret, but at the September 17, 1680 meeting it backed down and did so.⁷⁴ It is interesting that some of the towns chose to side with Philip Carteret at this point, when earlier they had tried (especially the Nicolls patentees) to remain part of New York. They recognized Andros as a threat to their lands and to self-government. In submitting they did force him to back down on the continuation of some local government.⁷⁵ At this point Andros was recalled to England, and the decision by Sir William Jones, the king's attorney general, made there, which appeared to make proprietary government in New Jersey legitimate, meant this issue became for a short time mute.⁷⁶

The late addition and therefore brief inclusion of both Jerseys to the Dominion of New England has been seen as having had little impact except (with one brief exception) for suspension of the assembly; this certainly appears true from the perspective of the minutes of the town meetings.⁷⁷ There is no indication in the Piscataway minutes that this even happened, business apparently continued as before. That said there are several Newark deeds from 1688

⁷² Martin, *Profits in Wilderness*, 260-268.

⁷³ Newark Records, 78.

⁷⁴ Woodbridge Records, 195-196.

⁷⁵ Pierson, 131.

⁷⁶ In the meantime, the towns went back to bitterly fighting with Philip Carteret, especially over control of the courts. Edward Slater of Piscataway was arrested because he “uttered very pernicious and squerrillous words, rendering the Government of the province, the Governor and Counsell Odyousse in the eyes and hearts of the people.” Meuly, 67.

⁷⁷ Carlos E. Godfrey, “When Boston Was New Jersey's Capital,” *Proceedings New Jersey Historical Society* 51 (1933): 1-23. In August 1688 Andros traveled from Boston to New York City, Elizabethtown, and Burlington to formally accept the surrender of New York, East Jersey, and West Jersey. Local records were then supposed to be transferred to Boston, but Godfrey concludes there is no evidence they were.

and 1689 that clearly acknowledge this new government. They note land being transferred, for example, from “Joseph Riggs” of Newark, which is in the government of “New England.”⁷⁸ Here again is evidence of local residents paying attention to the wider world when it suited them: for example, when they felt that they had a vested interest in protecting their land titles.

Conclusions

In a sense the wider imperial world did not matter for seventeenth century residents of East Jersey – they focused on their everyday lives, and on land – obtaining it, trading it, protecting it. The settlers were primarily New Englanders, who had numerous sons (and daughters). They wanted the land itself – fertile farm lands were occupied first, but they also wanted religious freedom and political rights. However, in a second sense the wider Atlantic world did matter as recognizing who was in charge was clearly important in terms of protecting land titles, and because imperial conflicts intruded on people’s lives. The ultimate final conclusion is that life in seventeenth century East Jersey was akin to riding a roller coaster.

Maxine N. Lurie is Early American historian, who has taught and written about New Jersey history for twenty-eight years. Although retired from Seton Hall University she continues to teach (one course a year), is actively involved in several research projects, and in the history community in New Jersey. The author of scholarly articles, she also edited The New Jersey Anthology (first edition 1994, 2nd edition 2010); was co-editor-in-chief with Marc Mappen of The Encyclopedia of New Jersey (2004); worked with Peter O. Wacker and Michael Siegel on Mapping New Jersey (2009); and most recently with Richard F. Veit on both New Jersey: A History of the Garden State (2012) and Envisioning New Jersey: An Illustrated History (2016).

⁷⁸ Newark Town Book 1691, New Jersey Historical Society, for examples see 13, 15. Another interesting Newark deed is one from 1699 Newark that stated the land being transferred is “in Reigne of William the Third King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland.” Ibid, 54-55.