

Jonathan D. Sarna



THE IMPACT OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION ON AMERICAN JEWS

There is no dearth of literature on the subject of Jews and the American Revolution. Jewish historians have chronicled the actions of Jewish patriots, described and analyzed the contribution of Jewish financiers and merchants, and even devoted space to the controversial subject of Jewish Tories. But the impact of the American Revolution on American Jews has so far been neglected.¹ Consequently, we know far more about how Jews affected the Revolution than about how the Revolution affected them.²

The American Jewish population in the late eighteenth century numbered about 2500, scarcely one tenth of one percent of the national population. Jews' influence loomed far larger. Concentrated as they were in developing areas, Jews naturally became intimate with leading politicians and businessmen. Jewish merchants and non-Jewish merchants traded freely. Discriminatory legislation, though it existed in the colonies, rarely limited Jews' right to work and worship in peace. Indeed, Jews enjoyed far better conditions in the American colonies than in most other corners of the diaspora.³

Treatment of Jews did not, therefore, become the major factor determining Jewish loyalties in the struggle against Britain. Individuals based their decisions largely on business, national, and personal considerations. Many Jews vacillated, and pledged allegiance to both sides in the dispute for as long as they could. But when finally forced to choose, only a small minority sided wholeheartedly with the Crown. Most Jews came down on the side of the Whigs, and cast their lot for independence. They contributed what they could to the national struggle, shed blood on the field of battle, and, after the victory, joined their countrymen in jubilant celebration.⁴

The Revolution had an enormous impact on Jewish life in America. Most immediately, wartime conditions caused massive human disloca-

I am grateful to Drs. Robert Handy, Jacob R. Marcus, Michael A. Meyer, and Abraham J. Peck for their comments on an earlier draft of this essay. A French version of this essay appeared in *Dix-Huitième Siècle*.

tions. Several families—among them the Gomezes, Frankses, Hayses and Harts—divided into two hostile camps: Whig and Tory. A few British sympathizers, notably Isaac Touro, chazzan of the synagogue in Newport, left the country altogether. Isaac Hart, a Jewish loyalist shipper who fled only as far as Long Island, was killed by patriotic Whigs. Some loyalists came in the other direction, from Europe to America. These were the Jewish Hessians, German soldiers employed by England's King George III (himself a German) to fight the rebellious colonists. Alexander Zuntz, the most famous Jewish Hessian, is credited with preserving Congregation Shearith Israel of New York's synagogue sanctuary during the period when that city was under British military control. Other Jewish Hessians settled further south: in Charleston, South Carolina and Richmond, Virginia. They seem to have met with mixed receptions from the Jews who preceded them there.⁵

Supporters of the Revolution were no less mobile than their Tory opponents. A large contingent from Shearith Israel fled to Stratford, Connecticut, when the British moved on New York. Later, Philadelphia became the chief haven for patriotic refugees. Shearith Israel's minister, Gershom Seixas moved there from Stratford in 1780. For Jews, as for non-Jews, war meant "fly[ing] with such things as were of the first necessity" when the British approached. Possessions that were left behind were usually lost forever.⁶

These wartime migrations had lasting effects. People who never had met Jews discovered them for the first time, and learned how similar they were to everyone else. Jews from different parts of the country encountered one another, and cemented lasting unions. A succession of Jewish marriages took place, as Jewish children made new friends. Finally, the distribution of Jews in the colonies changed. Newport, Rhode Island, formerly one of the four largest Jewish communities in America had its port destroyed in the war. Its Jews scattered. The Savannah Jewish community also suffered greatly from the war's decimating effects. On the other hand, two cities that were spared destruction, Philadelphia and Charleston, emerged from the war with larger and better organized Jewish communities than they had ever known before.⁷

In addition to geographical mobility, the Revolution fostered economic mobility among American Jews. Trade disruptions and wartime hazards took their toll, especially on traditional, old stock Jewish merchants like the Gomezes and Frankses. Their fortunes declined enormously. On the other hand, adventurous entrepreneurs—young, fearless and innovative upstarts—emerged from the war wealthy men. Haym Salomon bounded up the economic ladder by making the best both of his formidable linguistic talents, and of his newly learned advertising and marketing techniques. He and his heirs seem not to have adapted as well to the inflationary postwar economy, for when he died his family became

impoverished. Uriah Hendricks, and Hessian immigrants like Alexander Zuntz, Jacob and Philip Marc, and Joseph Darmstadt rose to the top more slowly. But by the early nineteenth century all were established and prospering. Generally speaking, the postwar decades were years of progress in the United States. Opportunities were available, and Jews, like their non-Jewish neighbors, made the most of them.⁸

In order to take advantage of postwar economic opportunities, Jews sometimes compromised their ritual observances. They violated the Sabbath; they ate forbidden foods; and they ignored laws regarding family purity. War conditions had encouraged such laxities: the few Jews who struggled to observe the commandments while under arms are remembered precisely because they were so unique. Postwar America also encouraged such laxities. While religious denominations scrambled to adapt to independence, many parishioners abandoned their churches for other activities. "Pious men complained that the war had been a great demoralizer. Instead of awakening the community to a lively sense of the goodness of God, the license of war made men weary of religious restraint," John B. McMaster observed. He likely exaggerated. Historians no longer believe that the postwar religious depression was quite so severe. Still, McMaster's comment demonstrates that Jews did not simply leave Shearith Israel empty on Saturday morning for business reasons. They also were caught up in the lackadaisical religious spirit of the age.⁹

No matter how lax Jews may have become in their observances, they did not abandon them altogether. To the contrary, they remained proud Jews; more than ever, they expected recognition as such from their non-Jewish neighbors. Jews viewed the War for Independence (and later the War of 1812) as an initiation rite, an ordeal through battle. Having passed the test—having shed blood for God and country—they considered themselves due full equality. They felt that America owed them a debt, and they demanded payment. Jonas Phillips made this clear in his 1787 appeal for rights directed to the Federal Constitutional Convention meeting in Philadelphia:

. . . the Jews have been true and faithful whigs, and during the late contest with England they have been foremost in aiding and assisting the states with their lives and fortunes, they have supported the cause, have bravely fought and bled for liberty which they can not Enjoy.¹⁰

Gershom Seixas, Haym Salomon, Mordecai Noah, and a host of other Jews employed precisely the same arguments in their battles for equal rights. In Maryland, where the debate over Jewish rights was particularly prolonged, even non-Jews appealed to the "Jews bled for liberty" plea. Thomas Kennedy reminded his fellow citizens that

during the late war [1812], when Maryland was invaded, they were found in the ranks by the side of their Christian brethren fighting for

those who have hitherto denied them the rights and privileges enjoyed by the veriest wretches.¹¹

Jews and sympathetic non-Jews thus appealed to their countrymen's patriotic piety. They demanded that the Jewish contribution to America's "sacred drama" be both recognized and rewarded.¹²

It took time before these demands met with full compliance. Many Americans apparently felt that Jews' pre-Revolutionary gains sufficed. They wanted the old colonial status quo in religion to remain in effect. Under the British, Jews had eventually won the rights—sometimes in law, sometimes in fact—to be naturalized, to participate in business and commerce, and to worship. They suffered from disabling Sunday closing laws, church taxes, and special oaths, and they were denied political liberties. But devout Protestants considered this only appropriate. In their eyes, God's chosen people still labored under a Divine curse.¹³

Protestant Dissenters—Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians and smaller sects—were not content with the old status quo. Their interest in Jews was minimal; the reason that they opposed the colonial system of religion was because it permitted church establishments. Since most established churches relegated Dissenters to an inferior status, or refused to recognize them at all, Dissenting Protestants insisted that church and state should be completely separate, and church contributions purely voluntary. They defended these positions by appealing to the arguments of British dissenters and Enlightenment philosophers.¹⁴

Dissenters couched their rhetoric in the language of freedom. They endeavored to convince traditional forces that liberty of conscience and diversity of belief would not open the door to licentiousness and immorality. The question, as they saw it, was merely one of liberty—the very question that had been decided in the Revolution. "Every argument for civil liberty," Virginia Dissenters insisted, "gains additional strength when applied to liberty in the concerns of religion."¹⁵

"Liberty in the concerns of religion," to these men, undoubtedly meant liberty in the concerns of the Protestant religion. With the exception of Roger Williams, whom succeeding colonial generations viewed as a dangerous extremist, prominent Dissenters generally failed to fight for the rights of Catholics, non-Christians, or non-believers. They feared that admitting them to equality would threaten the safety and moral fiber of society. Logically, however, Dissenting arguments on behalf of liberty of conscience, and church-state separation should have applied equally to non-Protestants. There was simply a disjunction between the radical ideas that Dissenters espoused, and the social realities which they were prepared to accept. The Baptist leader, Isaac Backus, for example, argued nobly that "every person has an unalienable right to act in all religious affairs according to the full persuasion of his own mind, where others are not injured thereby." Yet, he lauded Massachusetts lawmakers for decree-

ing that “no man can take a seat in our legislature till he solemnly declares, ‘I believe the Christian religion and have a firm persuasion of its truth’.”¹⁶

The development of complete church-state separation in America—the post-Revolutionary development that was of greatest significance to Jews—can thus not be credited to Protestant Dissenters. Though they spread the idea of religious liberty, and so helped all minority religions, their battle on behalf of this principle ended with the victory of Protestant pluralism over church establishment. Jewish rights rather came about through the work of a second group of Revolutionary-era thinkers: those inspired by the ideas of Enlightenment rationalism. Classic Enlightenment texts—among them the works of Locke, Rousseau, Grotius, Montesquieu, Harrington, and Voltaire—found many readers in America. Leading patriots like Franklin, Jefferson, Adams and Paine openly avowed deistic or Unitarian principles. For these men, a utilitarian belief in the value of “all sound religion” was enough. They felt sure that reason alone would guarantee society’s moral order; “my own mind,” Thomas Paine said, “is my own church.”¹⁷ To Paine and those like him, Protestantism, no matter how desirable it might be, was not a prerequisite of good citizenship.

The Enlightenment view of religious liberty eventually gained the upper hand in America, though Protestant pluralists continued to struggle—with various degrees of success—for many years. In 1777, New York became the first state to extend liberty of conscience to all native born, regardless of religion. An anti-Catholic test oath was required only of those born abroad. Virginia’s justly famous “Act for Religious Freedom (1785),” written by Thomas Jefferson, was both more comprehensive and more influential. It carefully distinguished civil rights from religious opinions, and decreed that “all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge or affect their civil capacities.” Once the national Constitution, in Article Six and Amendment One, wrote Virginia’s version of religious liberty into federal law, the claims of Revolutionary-era American Jews to equal rights were finally conceded. At least at the national level, an epochal change in Jews’ legal status had come about.¹⁸

Constitutional guarantees were not binding on the states; they could legislate as they pleased. As a result, some legislatures—notably those in New England, New Jersey, Maryland and North Carolina—enacted into law only the principles of Protestant pluralism. Jews who refused to avow their faith in the Protestant religion were denied equality in state government. The implications of this were absurd: theoretically, a Jew could be President of the United States, but ineligible to hold even the lowliest political office in Maryland. Realizing this, a majority of states granted Jews full rights by 1830 (though New Hampshire held out until 1877).

Full rights, however, had only limited effects on social equality. Many Americans still viewed Jews with the greatest of suspicion.¹⁹

Jews realized that they could only win equality in popular eyes by demonstrating that being Jewish in no way conflicted with being American. They had to prove that non-Christians could still be loyal and devoted citizens. As we have seen, they had taken major steps in this direction simply by fighting in America's great war. This justified their being granted legal equality in the first place. The fact that America's great orators associated the mission of the United States with that of the ancient Hebrews (King George was Pharaoh; America was the Holy Land; Americans were God's chosen people) may also have redounded to Jews' benefit.²⁰ But no single action and no single speech could break down centuries of popular prejudice. Jews had *continually* to prove their patriotism. The battle against anti-Jewish stereotypes was a never ending one.

Even before the Revolution, Jews had taken scrupulous care to display their loyalty through energetic participation in government ordained religious ceremonies, both fast days and days of thanksgiving. New York's Congregation Shearith Israel, for example, held lengthy special services in 1760 on "the Day Appointed by Proclamation for a General Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the reducing of Canada in His Majesty's Dominions." In subsequent years, it, along with other congregations, celebrated or mourned at times of battle, times of victory, times of pestilence, and times of achievement. After the Revolution, the identical pattern prevailed. In 1784, 1789 and then almost annually, Jews gathered in their synagogues whenever governments ordained special days of prayer. They only demurred when insensitive politicians issued proclamations directed only at American Christians.²¹

The two most famous early American Jewish displays of patriotism occurred outside of the synagogue. They were the 1788 celebrations connected with the Grand Federal Procession in honor of the newly ratified Constitution, and the 1790 congregational letters to President George Washington. The former, held in Philadelphia, symbolized in remarkable fashion the tension between the Jewish desire to belong and the Jewish need to be separate. Jews participated fully in the celebrations, and their "rabbi"—probably Jacob R. Cohen—walked "arm in arm" with "the clergy of the different christian denominations." Yet, at the conclusion of the ceremony, Jews ate apart—at a special kosher table set aside for them at the end of the parade route. This was appropriate: in the eyes of the Constitution all religions were equal, yet each enjoyed the right to remain distinctive and unique.²²

Jews made the same point in their letters to the President. These letters, by their very nature, were sectarian expressions of support; they dealt largely with matters of Jewish concern. Yet, Jews did not wish to be

considered a people apart. The Newport Congregation therefore assured Washington that its members intended to “join with our fellow-citizens” in welcoming him to the city. But they still wrote their own separate letter. The President understood. He hoped that Jews would “continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants,” even as each Jew individually sat “in safety under his own vine and fig tree.”²³

Besides these displays of loyalty, Jews sought to “merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants” by organizing their synagogues on democratic principles. They may have done so unconsciously, following the example of those around them. They certainly knew, however, that Catholics and others resisted the temper of the times and in many cases continued to organize their churches on an autocratic model. By choosing to imitate patriotic Protestants, rather than the more traditionally oriented religious groups, Jews sided with the native born majority; in so doing, of course, they subtly courted its favor.²⁴

Formerly, American Jews had imitated the example of the Anglican Church, the church that was officially established in many of the colonies. Synagogues modelled themselves on the Bevis Marks Synagogue in England, and looked to the Mother Country for guidance and assistance.²⁵ After the Revolution, congregations prudently changed their constitutions (actually, they wrote “constitutions” for the first time; before 1776 they called the laws they were governed by “Hascamoth”). They became more independent, and discarded as unfashionable leadership forms that looked undemocratic. At Shearith Israel, in 1790, the franchise was widened (though not as far as it would be in other synagogues), a new constitution was promulgated, and a “bill of rights” was drawn up. The new set of laws began with a ringing affirmation of popular sovereignty reminiscent of the American Constitution: “We the members of K. K. Shearith Israel.” Another paragraph explicitly linked Shearith Israel with the “state happily constituted upon the principles of equal liberty, civil and religious.” Still a third paragraph, the introduction to the new “bill of rights” (which may have been written at a different time) justified synagogue laws in terms that Americans would immediately have understood:

Whereas in free states all power originates and is derived from the people, who always retain every right necessary for their well being individually, and, for the better ascertaining those rights with more precision and explicitly, from [form?] a declaration or bill of those rights. In a like manner the individuals of every society in such state are entitled to and retain their several rights, which ought to be preserved inviolate.

Therefore we, the profession [professors] of the Divine Laws, members of this holy congregation of Shearith Israel, in the city of New York,

conceive it our duty to make this declaration of our rights and privileges.²⁶

Congregation Beth Shalome of Richmond followed this same rhetorical practice. It began its 1789 constitution with the words “We the subscribers of the Israelite religion resident in this place desirous of promoting divine worship,” and continued in awkward, seemingly immigrant English to justify synagogue laws in American terms:

It is necessary that in all societies that certain rules and regulations be made for the government for the same as tend well to the proper decorum in a place dedicated to the worship of the Almighty God, peace and friendship among the same.

It then offered membership and voting privileges to “every free man residing in this city for the term of three months of the age of 21 years . . . who congregates with us.”²⁷

By inviting, rather than obligating all Jews to become members, Beth Shalome signalled its acceptance of the “voluntary principle” in religion. Like Protestant churches it began to depend on persuasion rather than coercion. This change did not come about without resistance. In 1805, Shearith Israel actually attempted to collect a tax of ten dollars from all New York Jews “that do not commune with us.” But the trend was clear. The next few decades would see the slow transition from a coercive “synagogue-community” to a more voluntaristic “community of synagogues.” As early as 1795, Philadelphia became the first city in America with two different synagogues. By 1850, the number of synagogues in New York alone numbered fifteen.²⁸

The voluntary principle and synagogue democracy naturally resulted in synagogues that paid greater heed to members’ needs and desires. Congregational officers knew that dissatisfied Jews could abandon a synagogue or weaken it through competition. In response to congregant demands, some synagogues thus began to perform conversions, something they had previously hesitated to do for historical and halachic reasons. Other synagogues showed new leniency toward Jews who intermarried or violated the Sabbath. Leaders took their cue from congregants: they worried less about Jewish law, and more about “being ashamed for the Goyim . . . hav[ing] a stigma cast upon us and be[ing] derided.”²⁹

The twin desires of post-Revolutionary American Jews—to conform and to gain acceptance—made decorum and Americanization central synagogue concerns. In the ensuing decades, mainstream Protestant customs, defined by Jews as respectable, exercised an ever greater influence on American Jewish congregational life. Not all changes, of course, reflect conscious imitation. When Christian dates replaced Jewish dates in some congregational minutes, for example, the shift probably reveals nothing more than the appointment of a new secretary—a more Americanized one. When Jewish leaders consulted “with different members of

Religious Incorporated Societies in this city," and followed their standards, they also in all likelihood acted innocently, without giving a thought to how far social intercourse had evolved from the days when Jews only observed non-Jews in order to learn what *not* to do. Some, however, were fully conscious that Jews' accepted point of reference had become respectable Protestantism, and they turned this knowledge to their own advantage. When Gershom Seixas haggled with congregational officers about a raise, for example, he offered to submit his dispute to "three or five citizens of any religious society" for arbitration. He knew that an appeal to Christian practice was the easiest way to obtain redress from his fellow Jews.³⁰

In the heady atmosphere of post-Revolutionary America, it was easy for Jews to believe that they were witnessing the birth of a new age, one in which they would be accepted as perfect equals if only they proved themselves worthy and eager to conform. Jews had shed blood on the field of battle. The Constitution had promised them more than they had ever before been promised by any diaspora nation. President Washington himself had assured them of "liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship."³¹ All that America seemed to demand in return was loyalty, devotion, and obedience to law.

Jews kept their side of the bargain. They displayed their patriotism conspicuously, and diligently copied prevailing Protestant standards of behavior. In return, they won many new rights and opportunities. Yet, they failed to receive hoped-for equality. Instead, popular anti-Jewish suspicions lived on, and reaction set in. Missionaries arose to convert Jews, and succeeded in rekindling old hatreds. Many Americans, especially those affected by religious revivals ("the Second Great Awakening") and anti-Enlightenment romantic currents, insisted anew that America was a "Christian country."

Social, cultural and political changes had taken place, of course, and Jews benefited from them. The Revolution did have a permanent impact—one that distinguished post-Revolutionary American Jewish life from its pre-Revolutionary counterpart. But, viewed retrospectively, the Revolution was no more than a single important step in a much longer evolutionary process. Many more steps would be needed in order to transform American Judaism from a barely tolerated colonial religion into one of the twentieth century's three great American faiths.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

NOTES

1. The impact of the American Revolution on European Jews is also a neglected subject, but it is not the concern of this paper. For an example of how such an

inquiry might be carried out, see Horst Dippel, *Germany and the American Revolution 1770-1800* (Chapel Hill, 1977) and Max Kohler, "Phases in the History of Religious Liberty in America with Special Reference to the Jews," *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society (PAJHS)*, 11 (1903), pp. 53-9.

2. On the general subject of war and religion, see Salo Baron, "Impact of Wars on Religion," *Stepped by Adversity* (Philadelphia 1971), pp. 417-53; and the magnificent bibliography in Keith L. Neilson, *The Impact of War on American Life: The Twentieth Century Experience* (New York, 1973). A valuable sociological study that has informed this essay is Stanislaw Andrzejewski, *Military Organization and Society* (New York, 1954).

3. Jacob R. Marcus, *The Colonial American Jew* (3 vols., Detroit, 1970); Doris G. Daniels, "Colonial Jewry: Religion, Domestic and Social Relations," *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* (= *AJHQ*), 66 (1977), 375-400. Leo Hershkowitz, "Some Aspects of the New York Jewish Merchant and Community 1654-1820," *AJHQ*, 66 (1976), pp. 10-34.

4. For the history of Jews and the American Revolution, I have relied throughout this essay on Richard Morris, "The Jews, Minorities and Dissent in the American Revolution," *Migration and Settlement: Proceedings of the Anglo-American Jewish Historical Conference* (London, 1971), pp. 146-164; Marcus, *Colonial American Jew*, pp. 1249-1326; *idem*, *The Jew and the American Revolution: A Bicentennial Documentary* (Cincinnati, 1975); Samuel Rezneck, *Unrecognized Patriots: The Jews in the American Revolution* (Westport, 1975); and Robert T. Handy, "The American Revolution and Religious Freedom," The Sol Feinstone Lecture for 1979 delivered at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America (New York, 1979).

5. Jacob R. Marcus, *American Jewry Documents: Eighteenth Century* (Cincinnati, 1959), p. 52; and Myron Berman, *Richmond's Jewry, 1769-1976* (Charlottesville, 1979), pp. 3, 78.

6. Berman, *Richmond's Jewry*, p. 15; Edwin Wolf 2nd and Maxwell Whiteman, *The History of the Jews of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1975), pp. 76-145; Jacob R. Marcus, *The Handsome Young Priest in the Black Gown: The Personal World of Gershom Seixas* (Cincinnati, 1970), pp. 2, 66.

7. Wolf and Whiteman, *Philadelphia*, pp. 100, 114-203; David de Sola Pool, *Portraits Etched in Stone* (New York, 1952), pp. 288, 415; Marcus, *Colonial American Jew*, pp. 320, 368; Morris A. Gutstein, *The Story of the Jews of Newport* (New York, 1936), pp. 191-227; Charles Reznikoff and Uriah Z. Engelman, *The Jews of Charleston* (Philadelphia, 1950), pp. 676-7.

8. Marcus, *Colonial American Jew*, pp. 1295, 1318-9; Miriam Freund, *Jewish Merchants in Colonial America* (New York, 1939), esp. 81; Hershkowitz, "New York Jewish Merchant," pp. 28-29; Rezneck, *Unrecognized Patriots*, pp. 81-97; Nathan M. Kaganoff, "The Business Career of Haym Salomon As Reflected in His Newspaper Advertisements," *AJHQ*, 66 (1976), pp. 35-49; and Maxwell Whiteman, *Copper for America: The Hendricks Family and a National Industry 1755-1939* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1971), pp. 30-45.

9. John B. McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States* (New York, 1928), II, p. 586; Everts B. Green, *The Revolutionary Generation, 1763-1790* (New York, 1946), pp. 367-71; Franklin M. Littell, *From State Church to Pluralism* (New York, 1971), p. 34; Hyman B. Grinstein, "The American Synagogue Laxity of Religious Observance 1750-1850," (Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Columbia University, 1935); *idem*, *The Rise of the Jewish Community of New York 1654-1860* (Philadelphia, 1945), p. 336; Bertram W. Korn, "Judaism in the Ante-Bellum Period,"

AJHQ, 53 (June 1964), pp. 341-51; Leon A. Jick, *The Americanization of the Synagogue* (Hanover, N.J., 1976), pp. 7-9; Douglas H. Sweet, "Church Vitality and the American Revolution," *Church History* 45 (1976), pp. 341-57.

10. Morris U. Schappes (ed.) *A Documentary History of the Jews in the United States, 1654-1875* (New York, 1971), p. 69.

11. E. Milton Altfield, *The Jews' Struggle for Religious and Civil Liberty in Maryland* (Baltimore, 1924), p. 97; cf. Edward Eitches, "Maryland's Jew Bill," *AJHQ*, 60 (March 1971), pp. 258-79.

12. For other examples, see Wolf and Whiteman, *Jews of Philadelphia*, p. 112; Reznick, *Unrecognized Patriots*, pp. 159, 160, 169; and J.R. Marcus, *Memoirs of American Jews 1775-1865* (Philadelphia, 1955), I, p. 136.

13. Abraham V. Goodman, *American Overture: Jewish Rights in Colonial Times* (Philadelphia, 1947); Oscar and Mary Handlin, "The Acquisition of Political and Social Rights by the Jews in the United States," *American Jewish Year Book*, 56 (1955), pp. 43-54; Marcus, *Colonial American Jew*, pp. 397-515.

14. Anson P. Stokes, *Church and State in the United States* (3 vols., New York, 1950); Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, 1967), esp. 246-272; John W. Pratt, *Religion, Politics, and Diversity: The Church-State Theme in New York History* (Ithaca, 1967); Robert T. Handy, *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities* (New York, 1971); William McLoughlin, *New England Dissent 1603-1833* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1971); Cushing Strout, *The New Heavens and New Earth: Political Religion in America* (New York, 1974).

15. Quoted in Bailyn, *Ideological Origins*, p. 261.

16. William G. McLoughlin (ed.), *Isaac Backus on Church, State and Calvinism* (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 487, 436; cf. *idem*, *New England Dissent*, pp. 389, 594, 612, and *passim*.

17. Joseph L. Blau, *Cornerstones of Religious Freedom in America* (New York, 1964), p. 71.

18. Handlin, "Acquisition of Political and Social Rights," pp. 54-65; Stanley F. Chyet, "The Political Rights of the Jews in the United States: 1776-1840," *American Jewish Archives*, 10 (1958), pp. 14-75; cf. James H. Kettner, *The Development of American Citizenship* (Chapel Hill, 1978).

19. See, in addition to works cited above nn. 11, 18, Leon Heuhner, "The Struggle for Religious Liberty in North Carolina with Special Reference to the Jews," *PAJHS*, 16 (1907), pp. 37-71; Stokes, *Church and State*, pp. 860-883.

20. Conrad Cherry (ed.), *God's New Israel: Religious Interpretations of American Destiny* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1971); Milton Konvitz, *Judaism and the American Idea* (New York, 1978).

21. Marcus, *Colonial American Jew*, pp. 971-4; David de Sola Pool, *An Old Faith in the New World* (New York, 1955), pp. 126-38; Grinstein, *Jewish Community of New York*, pp. 269-70.

22. Reznick, *Unrecognized Patriots*, p. 163; Marcus, *Jews and the American Revolution*, pp. 246-50. Catherine Albanese, *Sons of the Fathers* (Philadelphia, 1976), p. 214, offers a different symbolic interpretation of this ceremony.

23. Joseph L. Blau and Salo W. Baron (ed.), *The Jews of the United States 1790-1840: A Documentary History* (New York, 1963), pp. 8-11; Marcus, *American Jewry Documents*, pp. 167-70.

24. J. R. Marcus, *Early American Jewry* (Philadelphia, 1953), II, pp. 486-93; cf. Edward F. Humphrey, *Nationalism and Religion in America 1774-1783* (Boston, 1924).

25. Marcus, *Colonial American Jew*, pp. 855-1031; esp. 906, 1017.
26. Marcus, *American Jewry Documents*, pp. 154-5; Pool, *Old Faith*, pp. 260-264.
27. Marcus, *American Jewry Documents*, pp. 145-6; Berman, *Richmond Jewry*, pp. 36-63.
28. Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven, 1972), p. 382; Sidney E. Mead, *The Lively Experiment* (New York, 1963); Winthrop S. Hudson, *The Great Tradition of the American Churches* (New York, 1953); Pool, *Old Faith*, p. 26; Wolf and Whiteman, *Jews of Philadelphia*, p. 225; Grinstein, *Jewish Community of New York*, pp. 472-3.
29. Wolf and Whiteman, *Philadelphia*, pp. 127, 224, 233-238; Malcolm Stern, "The Function of Genealogy in American Jewish History, *Essays in American Jewish History* (Concinnatti, 1958), pp. 89-93; Joshua Trachtenberg, *Consider the Years* (Easton, 1944), p. 253; quote is from Manuel Josephson to Moses Seixas (February 4, 1790) in *PAJHS*, 27 (1920), p. 189.
30. Marcus, *American Jewry Documents*, 162; Grinstein, *New York*, p. 211; and *PAJHS*, 21 (1913), p. 155; 27 (1920), p. 131.
31. Blau and Baron, *Documentary History*, p. 9.