

A ‘Ruining Singularity’: Francis Makemie on Civil and Religious Isolationism

Andrew M. McGinnis
Research Fellow
Junius Institute for Digital
Reformation Research

The Presbyterian minister Francis Makemie (1658–1708) opposed what he called a “ruining Singularity” in colonial American civil and religious life. In an open letter to the inhabitants of Maryland and Virginia and in his response to the Quaker theologian George Keith (1638–1716), Makemie opposed isolationism in colonial living as well as in the Christian church. In so doing, Makemie was advancing a vision of human flourishing as inherently connectional, ordered, and interdependent. Makemie’s writings are significant for the way they highlight an early period in the development of concepts of human flourishing in America.

Introduction

Francis Makemie (1658–1708), often considered the father of American Presbyterianism, is known primarily for his efforts in establishing the Presbytery of Philadelphia in 1706—the first presbytery in the American colonies.¹ He was licensed to preach in 1681 or 1682 by the Presbytery of Laggan in his native Ireland and was ordained in 1682 as a missionary to the mid-Atlantic colonies, where he arrived the following year.² From the beginning of his ministry, it seems that Makemie was concerned to bring organizational unity to the scattered Presbyterian churches in colonial America. Organizational unity was, in fact, “essential to the complete functioning of the Presbyterian system”; thus the separation of members and churches by vast distances, the poor or nonexistent roads, rough terrain, and limited access to horses, as well as the threat of attack by Native Americans and bandits, meant that achieving visible, organizational

Presbyterian unity was no easy task.³ Makemie, therefore, does not fit into the stereotypical mold of the settled minister who prepared sermons in his study. As historian D. G. Hart puts it, “to conclude that Makemie was an itinerant evangelist and organizing administrator of American Presbyterianism is not far from the mark.”⁴ Makemie’s contribution was, therefore, not so much in theological writings or scholarship but in connecting the disconnected Presbyterian churches. This was no small accomplishment. In fact, it was quite remarkable given the challenges that Makemie and the other ministers in that first presbytery faced. Aside from the common hardships of life in the American colonies, Makemie even suffered government opposition and imprisonment for preaching in New York, and he had to defend himself in court to preserve his freedom to preach there.⁵ What is more, Makemie and his colleagues were not guided by any overseeing church in Europe. Yet, the presbytery they founded would be the organizational roots of one of America’s largest and most influential denominations.

To be sure, Makemie saw connectional churches and organizational unity as necessary for the proper functioning of Presbyterianism, but in Makemie’s few extant writings we see, as Hart notes, deeper “insights about the dependence of healthy churches on strong communities.”⁶ Hart’s work has highlighted Makemie’s observations about the symbiotic relationship between healthy churches and organized towns,⁷ but Makemie’s observations go deeper still. Makemie was convinced that isolationism in both the civil and religious realms has a deleterious effect on human life. As we examine two of Makemie’s works, one aimed at the civil realm (*A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, 1705) and the other a response to a theological challenge (*An Answer to George Keith’s Libel*, 1694),⁸ we discover that Makemie’s analysis of what he calls a “ruining Singularity” applies to both the isolated colonial settlers living independent lives and to the religious sects and teachers who separated themselves from traditional Christian connections and doctrines.⁹ Thus, the form of civil and religious isolationism that characterized a large part of the colonial American context was, from Makemie’s perspective, a double threat to the human flourishing that he believed to be inherently connectional, ordered, and interdependent. Furthermore, Makemie’s vision represents an understanding of morality, economics, and religion that was prevalent before the stark divergence of two competing concepts of human flourishing in America.¹⁰

Civil Isolationism: The “Ruining Singularity” of Colonial Life

Although he received occasional gifts from the churches in which he ministered, Makemie was not supported by a regular salary.¹¹ Rather, he supported himself and his family through his own business dealings as he moved throughout Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Delaware, New Jersey, and New York. He also lived in Barbados for a few years in the late 1690s, perhaps to attend to business interests there.¹² Makemie, therefore, was quite well acquainted with the necessity of civil order, organization, and commerce for human existence. His own life directly depended on these things or, as the case may be, was negatively impacted by their absence.

Beyond these mere personal matters, in his extensive travels around the settlements of colonial America he undoubtedly took note of the varying levels of development among the people he visited. His observations of the level of development in other settlements left him with some measure of concern over the comparative lack of development in his primary places of life and ministry, the colonies of Maryland and Virginia. As he says in his open letter to the inhabitants of these colonies, “your Infant and Neighbour Colonies out-vie and out-strip you, in many degrees, and in divers respects.”¹³ But Makemie, being a native of Ireland, could also see how the situation of the young colonies contrasted with the towns in the Old World. However, it is not simply these colonies’ “scattered and remote Settlements, without Towns and Cohabitation” that he laments but the very sensibility that seems to prevent their development. Compared to towns in the Old World, he writes, “I have been justly amazed to see the unaccountable Humour and Singularity of Virginia and Maryland.”¹⁴ That is, the citizens of Virginia and Maryland seemed to him to relish their isolation.

Makemie’s analysis of their sensibilities was accurate. The Chesapeake colonies were populated with many former indentured servants who had achieved prosperity and independence because of the tobacco boom of the 1640s and 1650s. In Virginia, the economic downturn of the 1670s led some of these same planters to violently rebel against the ruling class. Thus, as Alan Taylor writes, “in a world where dependence was the norm, independence was an especially cherished and vulnerable status.”¹⁵ Makemie also correctly observed the relative lack of organized towns in these colonies. The scarcity of even a “hamlet or village crossroads” in the Chesapeake colonies stands in contrast to the developed towns in the New England colonies in Makemie’s era. The unique community structure that developed in Virginia and Maryland was a result of many factors,

including geography, tobacco farming techniques, immigrant demographics, and colonists' pursuits of wealth and religious tolerance.¹⁶

Over against this prized independence and scattered existence, Makemie argued that the colonists ought, instead, to "put on a publick Spirit, combine with harmonious and united Counsels, avoiding Partiality, waving Self-Interest, or causing it truckle [submitting it] to the Common Good."¹⁷ In Makemie's estimation, this order of the common good, which thrives in organized communities, is inherent to human flourishing. Contrary to some concepts of humanity's original condition as ruggedly individualistic or a war of all against all, Makemie sees it as part of the natural order for human beings to organize into ordered societies and to dwell together for the common good. Even the "brute Beasts" and the "heathen world" naturally gathers in groups, which serves to rebuke the Virginians and Marylanders for their own "ruining Singularity" in their "manner of living" and their "scattered Habitations."¹⁸

Makemie then proceeds to outline the advantages of organized communities and the disadvantages of the kind of civil isolation that he sees in these colonies. Among the advantages of organized communities are increased value of the land and resources through coordinated cultivation, production, trade, and increased protection from attacks by Native Americans and foreign invaders. In passing, Makemie also notes that interdependent towns and communities offer protection from spiritual attack, namely, the influence of "Jesuitical Tools," or Roman Catholic teaching.¹⁹ This warning was not mere scaremongering. Maryland in particular was an early haven for Catholics in America and had been a focus of Jesuit missions since the 1630s.²⁰ And, as Makemie surely knew from his experience of the religious conflicts in Ireland, if a community is not intentionally training its children in its own faith, someone else will train them in another. Drawing together as interdependent communities would also guard against fraud, price gouging, and unjust business practices because there would be a closer network of individuals to identify the perpetrators and their illicit activities and to expose them.²¹ Of course, as Hart has noted, Makemie also emphasized the importance of towns for the advancement of religion because close proximity makes gathering for worship relatively easy, particularly for children and servants and others who cannot travel long distances.²²

The disadvantages of isolationism include not only the lack of all the above advantages but also at least three stifling realities that are exacerbated by the "self-destroying Folly" of isolated existence.²³ First, Makemie notes the overabundance of tobacco in these colonies and how the lack of trade to increase demand has virtually killed the tobacco market. As he says, "all Markets cannot consume the quantity." Additionally, there is simply the lack of opportunity for expanded

trade because separation at such a great distance means that traders cannot meet or transact as often or as easily.²⁴ Second, Maryland and Virginia are “beholden” to their neighbors for things that they could themselves produce. Makemie notes that these two colonies have the resources to produce everything they need and more but that their citizens’ isolation from one another leaves them dependent on purchasing so much of what they need from other neighboring colonies and forces them to pay for “transporting, grinding, bolting and baking.”²⁵ Lastly, Makemie notes that a scattered people can “never expect to be well furnished and supplied with Artists and good Tradesmen” because employment is sparse and too much time is taken up in travel from one job to the next. Additionally, because of their stifled economy, Marylanders and Virginians pay very poorly and can only pay their tradesmen in tobacco, which neither attracts outside workers nor encourages local workers “to follow their Callings.”²⁶

Hart has quipped that Makemie, in his *Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, “could sound like an officer from the local Chamber of Commerce.”²⁷ In fact, we could add that Makemie hardly sounds like a pastor at all in the letter. Apart from the passing mention of his worry about Roman Catholic influence and his brief and rather general comments about the benefits of towns on religion, there is no indication that the author is a minister. There is no biblical or theological reasoning in the letter whatsoever, but we should be careful not to separate Makemie the pastor from Makemie the citizen. There are clear religious underpinnings to Makemie’s concerns, as historian Char Miller has shown through a comparison of this letter to other comments by Makemie on the divinely instituted social order.²⁸ What we ought to guard against, however, is what Miller seems to do elsewhere, namely, to characterize Makemie’s religious purposes merely as an attempt to establish the church’s moral authority and social control in the colonies.²⁹ Of course, how one characterizes Makemie’s attempt to establish social order depends on whether one believes such a social ordering is a good thing. Makemie clearly believed it was good, and his concept of the social order was a far cry from the modern concept of social control.³⁰ Indeed, Makemie’s civic and political missive reflects an enduring tradition of Christian reflection on the goodness of ordered human existence. Makemie insists that civic life and commerce is both natural and good and that isolation and an attitude of radical independence stifle human life. As such, Makemie’s letter is not primarily concerned with instituting moral authority or social control but rather with fostering a particular vision of human flourishing.

Religious Isolationism: Unaccountable Churches and Teachers

The criticism of singularity, or isolation, that is central to Makemie's *Plain and Friendly Perswasive* had also been on display in a distinctly theological and religious context several years earlier. In his *Answer to George Keith's Libel* (1694), Makemie defended a catechism that he wrote, which is now lost, from an attack by the famous Quaker theologian George Keith (1638–1716). Keith, who had academic training in the Old World equal to Makemie's, was himself a controversial figure even among his Quaker coreligionists. In what seems an ironic twist in light of his staunch opposition to Makemie's traditional theology, Keith's long controversy among the Quaker fellowship in America resulted in his joining the Church of England in 1700, after which he became a missionary for Anglicanism in the American colonies.³¹

In the early 1690s, however, Keith was still taking up the pen against traditionalists such as Makemie. According to Makemie's account in his epistle to the reader, Keith gave his unsigned, handwritten paper to a certain George Layfield of Maryland who later gave it to Makemie. Before he received the paper from Layfield, Makemie had a face-to-face meeting with Keith in Makemie's home in Virginia. At this meeting Keith charged Makemie with being a false teacher and challenged him to a public debate, which never occurred. When he received Keith's paper, Makemie took it upon himself to publish Keith's fifteen-page "Libel" along with his own eighty-three page "Answer."³²

As a polemical treatise against the Quakers, Makemie's *Answer* is rather unoriginal, and because the subject of Makemie's treatise and Keith's paper is a catechism that is no longer extant, it is impossible to engage the substance of the dispute except through their quotations of the lost catechism. We are not interested here in adjudicating the theological debate, however, or evaluating Makemie's arguments. Rather, for our purposes Makemie's treatise is noteworthy for the way it reflects his opposition to what we might call religious isolationism. In his response to Keith, Makemie counters a form of theological individualism in ways that echo his concerns over the ruining singularity in the colonies of Maryland and Virginia. His arguments reveal his deep commitment to the ordered and connectional nature of the church, which mirrors his commitments to the ordered and connectional nature of civic life.

A notable line of criticism in Makemie's *Answer* is that Keith and his coreligionists do not make themselves accountable to anyone beyond themselves. This apparent lack of accountability takes shape in both a broad, church-wide isolationism and in the practices of individual teachers among the Quakers.

First, Makemie attacks the Quakers for practicing a church-wide isolationism. In his meeting with Keith, Makemie rejected Keith's offer of a public debate in part because the Quakers had not "Published to the World" any agreed-upon doctrinal positions.³³ This lack of a public, corporate confession of faith, in Makemie's opinion, was not only a hindrance to constructive debate but also an abdication of accountability to the broader Christian church. Further, alluding to Paul's exhortation in 2 Timothy 1:13, Makemie asks why the Quakers have "never yet adventured to Publish a form of sound words according to the Apostles['] language, containing a confession of their faith, and principles, unanimously agreed upon among themselves, as all other churches in the world have done."³⁴ Similarly, he asks why they have not published "interpretations of Scripture seeing they condemn & so far disapprove all other Commentaries, as far from the mind of God, and full of gross Errors, and mistakes."³⁵ Of course, Makemie knows that the Quakers, and Keith in particular, published books and stated their individual theological positions,³⁶ but Makemie's point is that the Quakers had not publicly and corporately, as a church, *confessed* their faith and doctrinal positions. In other words, Makemie argues that in order for a church to be a true church it must publicly state positions that are subject to evaluation and review by other Christian churches. There is a corporate, unified, and publicly accountable essence to being a true church, even granting that there may be various churches with different beliefs and doctrinal statements. For Makemie, because the Quakers reject this corporate and public accountability, "they cannot be looked upon as a Church."³⁷

Second, Makemie accuses Keith and the Quaker teachers of practicing religious isolationism individually. These teachers place themselves beyond criticism by claiming revelation and insight from the Holy Spirit that is not subject to evaluation either by other ministers or, more importantly, by the Bible itself. Makemie charges Keith with "possessing" his hearers with the notion "that what he delivers is immediately from the Spirit of God," which allows Keith to "deliver what he will, as infallible, and never to be questioned."³⁸ Makemie spends most of his energy presenting biblical counterarguments and exposing Keith's errors, yet it is also clear that Makemie sees his own connection and accountability to the broader church tradition as an entirely natural impulse both for a Christian theologian and for all Christians generally. His catechism is, he says, merely "a Collection from others," and at various points he claims that his catechism is in complete accord with the doctrines of the Reformed churches everywhere and particularly with the doctrines of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms.³⁹ Furthermore, in his response to Keith's attack on the dogma of the three persons in the Godhead, Makemie replies that Keith is standing in a

long line of ancient heretics “whose subtleties have been long since cunningly silenced and exploded.” Makemie points to Reformed stalwarts James Ussher and John Calvin, as well as one ancient authority, Tertullian, as examples of theologians who have done such silencing and exploding.⁴⁰ Woven into the fabric of Makemie’s response, therefore, is an assumption that a Christian teacher must be situated within a tradition of Christian doctrine.

The collision of fundamental convictions about the nature of Christianity that we see in Makemie and Keith’s dispute is just one more instance of the common conflict between the ministers of traditional churches and the populist religious teachers who claimed new light or insight. As we read their debate today, both with an awareness of the subsequent history of this perennial battle in America between different concepts of Christianity and with an awareness of how presuppositions impact religious disputes, we might see Makemie’s appeals to traditional authorities as an effort in futility in a debate with a Quaker. Yet, such an evaluation, while perhaps true, might prevent us from noticing what Makemie clearly saw as essential to the church’s existence: accountability and connection to the broader church. As J. M. Barkley has noted, for Makemie, “personal experience, or ‘inner light’, must be balanced by Church Order and Discipline. A Christian is a Christian in community, in the Church.”⁴¹ What is more, as his response to Keith indicates, Makemie understood the church not only as a community of contemporary, local believers but also as a community of teachers and teachings that spanned the ages.

Conclusion

Makemie’s pioneering role in establishing the Presbyterian church in the New World is certainly his greatest contribution to American religious life. By contrast, his few extant writings may not stand out as important contributions. As Hart has aptly pointed out, Makemie was simply a persistent pastor carrying out his calling in the colonial context.⁴² Thus, in one sense, his simple letter to the colonists in Virginia and Maryland and his little theological dispute with a Quaker teacher were not major contributions to civic life or theology. In another sense, however, they are indeed significant when seen against the backdrop of the developing conflict between rival views of American civic and religious life.

A strong case has been made that there have been two competing concepts of human flourishing at work in America since the colonial era. One recent rubric, proposed by Donald Frey, identifies two divergent approaches to ethics and economics in American history: one that is “ordered ... around the autonomy

of the individual” and one that centers on “right relations between individuals.” These rival views, which Frey calls, respectively, “autonomy morality” and “relational morality,”⁴³ encompass broader themes and ideas than merely human action in the economic realm, and this framework is helpful for understanding the work of someone like Makemie. As we have seen, Makemie’s advice to the settlers of Virginia and Maryland and his response to George Keith indicate that he viewed human flourishing—in both its civil and religious aspects—as necessarily connectional, ordered, and interdependent. Societies and churches that nurture singularity and isolation will find themselves fragmented, impoverished, and confused. Yet, what Makemie called a ruining singularity was seen as freedom and liberty by those Chesapeake colonists who chose to live their lives in relative isolation from their neighbors. Similarly, what Makemie saw as an un-Christian practice of unaccountability was seen as the freedom of the Holy Spirit by Keith and the Quakers.

And so it seems that Makemie would fit rather nicely into the second of Frey’s two paradigms: moral and economic goods arise from the right relationships between individuals. What is striking, however, is that Frey presents the Quakers, not the Puritans with whom Makemie was closely aligned, as paradigmatic of relational morality. It was the Quakers who championed communal living and viewed human flourishing in terms of right kinship relationships. But Makemie certainly would not fit into Frey’s first group, namely, the proponents of individual autonomy. Despite the apparent discord, however, Frey’s framework does in fact help us make sense of Makemie and his place in the history of American views on human flourishing. Makemie’s argument for connectional and interdependent religious and civil life—which on closer inspection has great affinity with certain Quaker emphases—comes from that early era of American thought before the rise of Enlightenment self-reliance and radical individual autonomy. That is, as Frey argues, there was an ethic of “relational individualism” in the early colonial period that was largely shared by both Quakers and Puritans.⁴⁴

When viewed in this light, then, Makemie and the Chesapeake colonists in effect were disagreeing over the kind of community that was most effective for human flourishing, not whether a form of community or “collective action” was necessary.⁴⁵ Similarly, Makemie and Keith were in effect disagreeing over the forms and authorities for the Christian church and theology, not their necessity, given that even the Quakers had their own sources of authority and methods of individual accountability. Thus, Makemie’s *Plain and Friendly Perswasive* and his *Answer to George Keith’s Libel*, while not having an enduring impact in politics or theology, are significant for the way they highlight an early period in the development of American concepts of human flourishing—a period in which

the disputants shared much more common ground than they perhaps realized, and in which the individual human person was seen as thriving not in radical isolation but within a relational civic and religious life.

Notes

1. On Makemie's life and work, see William B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. 3 (New York: Robert Carter, 1858), 1–4; E. H. Gillett, *History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee, 1864), 1–18; I. Marshall Page, *The Life Story of Rev. Francis Makemie* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1938); Boyd S. Schlenker, ed., *The Life and Writings of Francis Makemie* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Historical Society, 1971); J. M. Barkley, *Francis Makemie of Ramelton: Father of American Presbyterianism* (Belfast: Presbyterian Historical Society of Ireland, 1981); James H. Smylie, "Francis Makemie: Tradition and Challenge," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 61, no. 2 (1983): 197–209; Boyd S. Schlenker, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 36 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), s.v. "Makemie, Francis (c.1658–1708)"; D. G. Hart, "Francis Makemie and the Meaning of American Presbyterianism," *The Confessional Presbyterian Journal* 2 (2006): 71–78; D. Clair Davis, "Francis Makemie—Presbyterian Pioneer," in *Colonial Presbyterianism: Old Faith in a New Land*, ed. S. Donald Fortson III (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2007), 27–46.
2. Clifford M. Drury, "The Irish Background of Francis Makemie," *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* 35, no. 2 (1957): 118; Lefferts A. Loetscher, *A Brief History of the Presbyterians*, 3rd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 60–61; Barkley, *Francis Makemie*, 9–10; Schlenker, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. "Makemie, Francis," 259; Hart, "Francis Makemie," 71–72.
3. Loetscher, *Brief History*, 60–61 (quote on p. 60).
4. Hart, "Francis Makemie," 72.
5. Makemie's account of this incident is idem, *A Narrative of the Imprisonment of two Non-Conformist Ministers; and Prosecution or Trial of one of them, for Preaching a Sermon in the City of New York* (Boston: n.p., 1708). See also Gillett, *History*, 12–17; D. G. Hart and John R. Muether, *Seeking a Better Country: 300 Years of American Presbyterianism* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 2007), 27–29.
6. Hart, "Francis Makemie," 73.
7. See also Hart and Muether, *Seeking a Better Country*, 26–27.

8. Francis Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive to the Inhabitants of Virginia and Maryland: For Promoting Towns and Cohabitation* (London: John Humfreys, 1705); Francis Makemie, *An Answer to George Keith's Libel: Against a Catechism* (Boston: Benjamin Harris, 1694).
9. Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, 7.
10. On the rival concepts of human flourishing in America, see E. Digby Baltzell, *Puritan Boston and Quaker Philadelphia: Two Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Class Authority and Leadership* (New York: Free Press, 1979); Donald E. Frey, *America's Economic Moralists: A History of Rival Ethics and Economics* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009).
11. Makemie, *An Answer*, 63; Barkley, *Francis Makemie*, 12.
12. Barkley, *Francis Makemie*, 11–12; Loetscher, *Brief History*, 61; Hart, "Francis Makemie," 72. For a glimpse into Makemie's business dealings, see his two letters related to a land suit, published in "Old Letters of Francis Makemie," *William and Mary Quarterly* 21 (1913): 278–83.
13. Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, 6.
14. Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, 7.
15. Alan Taylor, *American Colonies* (New York: Viking, 2001), 139.
16. Lorena S. Walsh, "Community Networks in the Early Chesapeake," in *Colonial Chesapeake Society*, ed. Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean B. Russo (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 200–241 (quote on p. 200); Michael Graham, "Meetinghouse and Chapel: Religion and Community in Seventeenth-Century Maryland," in *Colonial Chesapeake Society*, ed. Carr, Morgan, and Russo, 242–74.
17. Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, 6.
18. Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, 6–7.
19. Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, 9.
20. Graham, "Meetinghouse and Chapel," 246–53.
21. Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, 10, 12.
22. Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, 11; cf. notes 6 and 7 above.
23. Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, 12.

24. Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, 12, 13.
25. Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, 13, 12.
26. Makemie, *A Plain and Friendly Perswasive*, 13.
27. Hart, "Francis Makemie," 72.
28. Char Miller, "Francis Makemie: Social Development of the Colonial Chesapeake," *American Presbyterians* 63, no. 4 (1985): 337; Francis Makemie, *A Good Conversation: A Sermon Preached at the City of New York* (Boston: B. Green, 1707), 16–17.
29. Miller, "Francis Makemie," 337, 340.
30. The limits of the concept of social control for historical analysis are highlighted in another context by Scott M. Manetsch, "Holy Terror or Pastoral Care? Church Discipline in Calvin's Geneva, 1542–1596," in *Calvin—Saint or Sinner?*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 283–306 (esp. 285–86).
31. On Keith's life and work, see J. William Frost, introduction to *The Keithian Controversy in Early Pennsylvania* (Norwood, PA: Norwood Editions, 1980), i–xxii; Hugh Barbour and J. William Frost, *The Quakers* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988), 343–44; J. William Frost, "Keith, George," *American National Biography Online* (Oxford University Press, 2000), <http://www.anb.org/articles/01/01-00475.html>; J. S. Chamberlain, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 31 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), s.v. "Keith, George (1638?–1716)."
32. Makemie, "Epistle to the Reader," in Makemie, *An Answer*, n.p. My reading of the order of events differs from the standard view, which holds that Keith wrote his paper *after* he and Makemie met face-to-face. The standard view is articulated in, e.g., "Francis Makemie (c. 1658–1708), Father of Organized American Presbyterianism," *The Journal of Presbyterian History* 84, no. 1 (2006): 81; Barkley, *Francis Makemie*, 14; and Sprague, *Annals*, 1. Against the standard view, Makemie's account seems to indicate that Keith's paper was already written—but that Makemie either knew nothing of it or that he had received it but did not know that Keith was the author of it—at the time of their meeting. Makemie recounts that when Keith left his house he "gave not the least intimation of this Paper left behind him," but only made a cryptic comment about how he would not write any more than he had already written (Makemie, "Epistle to the Reader"). It would therefore appear that Keith's paper was written before their meeting.
33. Makemie, "Epistle to the Reader."
34. Makemie, *An Answer*, 1; cf. 3.
35. Makemie, *An Answer*, 1.
36. Makemie, *An Answer*, 21–22.

37. Makemie, "Epistle to the Reader."
38. Makemie, *An Answer*, 28.
39. Makemie, *An Answer*, 23, 25, 28, 43, 55 (quote on p. 23).
40. Makemie, *An Answer*, 34, 40–41 (quote on p. 34).
41. Barkley, *Francis Makemie*, 15.
42. Hart, "Francis Makemie," 78.
43. Frey, *America's Economic Moralists*, 1, 2.
44. Frey, *America's Economic Moralists*, 13–24 (on relational individualism, see esp. pp. 23–24).
45. On "collective action" in the Chesapeake colonies, see Walsh, "Community Networks," esp. pp. 200–202.