In 1991 Michiel Wielema published *Filosofen aan de Maas*, a chronicle of five hundred years of philosophical thought in Rotterdam. He recognized the importance of Rotterdam as a center of early Enlightenment, but did not fully expand upon the influence of the city's intellectual life abroad. A 1689 uprising in New York, popularly known as Leisler's Rebellion, reveals, however, that in the 1680s Rotterdam thinkers played a role in the development of political ideology in the former Dutch West India Company colony. This paper examines the influence of a coterie of Rotterdam theorists that included Jacobus Borstius, Pierre Jurieu and Frans Kuyper upon New York's Leislerian movement.

A December 1689 dispute over the validity of a customs act highlights the ideological differences between the factions rending New York in the wake of England's 1688 Glorious Revolution. On December 19 a 'plakkaat' appeared in New York City condemning rebel leader Jacob Leisler's resurrection several days earlier of a 1683 New York assembly act for raising government revenues. Citing the Magna Carta and statutes of English kings Edward I, Richard III and Charles I, the authors declared 'that no man thenceforth be Compeld to Make or yield any gift Loan benevolence tax or such Like Charge without Common Consent by act of parliament'. The following day Leisler responded with a declaration against the 'false construction on the wholesome Lawes of England not regarding An Act of the freemen represented in Assembly', and concluded that the English constitution guaranteed the 'Supreme Legislative Authority under his Maties & ca shall for ever be & reside in a Governor, Councill & the People met in Generall Assembly'.

At issue was not whether an English sovereign should reign over the
province; both sides agreed that one should. Rather, at issue was the meaning of English sovereignty. Did it mean, as Leisler's opponents argued, a centralized state with the legislative authority in the hands of a national parliament at the discretion of the crown? Or did it mean, as Leisler believed, a federation of kingdoms, provinces, and towns with semi-autonomous assemblies united by the crown? It was an ancient dispute, born in the debates over the constitution of the Roman empire, intensified by the doctrinal turmoil of the Reformation, and brought to the New World by the European colonists. But in the late 1680s the discussion over the direction the English state should take was being most intently debated not on the banks of the Thames but in Rotterdam's salons on the Maas.

That Rotterdam should influence political thought in New York is not surprising considering the long-standing relations between the two cities. In 1611, after first receipt of news of Henry Hudson's explorations, Rotterdam delegates requested for their constituents a copy from the States General of a petition presented by 'divers Merchants and Inhabitants' regarding 'certain newly discovered Navigation', and, in 1614, the city was appointed along with Dordrecht [Dordt], Delft, Amsterdam, Hoorn, and Enkhuizen to explore the formation of a general company 'to carry on Trade on some Coasts of Africa and America'. With the creation of the West India Company [WIC] in 1621, Rotterdam agreed with the cities of Dordt and Delft to equally divide the directors and business allotted to the Maas Chamber. This agreement resulted in the erection of three subchambers, each with 'its separate government, with little direct communication with the others', as well as 'its own Bookkeepers, Cashiers, storekeepers, houses, yards, stores and whatever else appertains thereunto'.

The Maas Chamber's combined initial capital investment of £1,039,202 in the WIC was weak compared with Amsterdam's investment of £2,846,582, but Rotterdam's maintenance of its own subchamber proved beneficial. Beginning in the 1640s, West Indian sugar began to arrive in the city, and in the 1650s the emergence of the Chesapeake-New Amsterdam connection in the tobacco trade marked
the beginning of a consistent growth period for Rotterdam that extended into the 1680s. While the WIC’s Amsterdam, Enkhuizen, Dordt, and Delft chambers operated at a loss, Rotterdam was ‘not behind’. By the 1660s New Amsterdam merchants were enjoying increasing liaisons with Rotterdam merchants, from whom they acquired cloth, hardware, and long-term credit.

The 1664 transfer of New Netherland to England strengthened Rotterdam’s commercial position. English mercantilism, which prohibited trade between England’s colonies and other countries, now necessitated a detour via English ports. Rotterdam’s proximity to England’s channel ports resulted in the city becoming a major import center for the Chesapeake tobacco carried by New York shippers destined for the European market. Seeking cargo for the return voyage, New York shippers acquired in Rotterdam linen, canvas, and earthen wares. Rotterdam’s increasing role in the New York trade is seen with the Dutch reconquest in 1673. On March 21, 1674, the Maas Admiralty Board at Rotterdam sent the States General a letter from the ‘schout, burgomasters, and schepens of the city of New Orange, on the Island of Manathans’, containing ‘a Summary account of the state and condition of things in those parts and requesting immediate succor’. Despite tensions between the New West India Company’s Maas Chamber and the Maas Admiralty Board over passports and duties on ships and goods coming from New Netherland after the return of the province to the English in 1674, New York-Rotterdam trade continued to blossom.

A number of New York merchants of Huguenot and Scottish origin were particularly active in the Rotterdam trade in the 1670s and 1680s. Jacques Cousseau, a Huguenot from Marnes with established ties in French commerce, is an example. In partnership with Cornelis Steenwyck he exported to the French and Dutch West Indies and sent regular cargoes to Rotterdam. Another example is Benjamin Faneuil, whose cousin Jean Faneuil operated an extensive shipping business out of Rotterdam. The Faneuil family, with relations in La Rochelle, London, the West Indies, and New England, formed an important trade network with members of a shared Reformed faith. André
Thauvet, who married Suzanne Faneuil, became instrumental with Jacob Leisler in founding a Huguenot refugee colony at New Rochelle, New York, in the late 1680s. Robert Livingston is perhaps the best known of Scots New Yorkers connected to Rotterdam. His father, a Scots Presbyterian minister, had fled to Rotterdam, where Robert spent his childhood. He later emigrated to Albany, there to emerge as one of New York’s wealthiest merchants and landholders, while maintaining close contact with his brothers-in-law, Andrew Russell and James Miller, merchants in Rotterdam.

The conjunction of Huguenot, Scots, and Dutch merchants is important for understanding Rotterdam’s intellectual influence in New York. Seventeenth-century New York politics mirrored the split in the Dutch body politic between supporters of the fiscal office of ‘raadpensionaris’, loosely identified as the ‘Staatspartij’, and supporters of the Prince of Orange. In these protracted disputes, politics closely aligned with theology. In the middle of the century, the followers of Utrecht University professor Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676), a strict Calvinist, had stressed moral precisionism and the need for a personal conversion to Christ. Inspired by Voetius, a movement for spiritual regeneration, inner piety, and a more godly lifestyle known as the ‘Nadere Reformatie’, or Further Reformation, spread among rigid Protestants in Europe and to America. The followers of Leiden University professor Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669), on the other hand, espoused a more liberal covenant theology that seemed to endorse the new intellectual forces in science and philosophy. In this religious dispute, Orangists allied with Voetians while the ‘Staatspartij’, led in Rotterdam by Adriaen Paets, allied with Cocceians. By the last third of the century the Voetian-Cocceian controversy colored every aspect of Rotterdam’s political life, and had direct bearing on events in New York.

Party factionalism in the Republic came to a violent head when a devastating French invasion in 1672 resulted in a backlash against the ‘Staatspartij’s policies of appeasing Louis XIV, Cocceian liberalism, and the increasingly French cultural affectations of the regents. Mobs forced numerous towns to replace their magistrates with Orangists and
murdered the chief architects of ‘Staatspartij’ policy, Johan and Cornelis de Witt, while the provinces of Holland and Zeeland restored the stadholdership, which had been revoked in 1650, to William III, prince of Orange. In 1674 Voetians gained control of the Rotterdam city council, making that city and its press a center for Orangist agitation and propaganda.

The conflict between Rotterdam’s tolerant regent class and its orthodox Voetian classis and democratic-leaning Orangist city government created a climate for religious and political debate. Moreover, large Scots Presbyterians and Huguenot mercantile communities made the city a magnet for English, Huguenot, and other dissenters in exile from Roman Catholic regimes. The resulting intellectual ferment generated an explosion in republican political theory. Gathering in salons, such as English merchant Benjamin Furly’s ‘Lantern’, were such English Whigs as John Locke, Anthony Ashley Cooper, earl of Shaftesbury, Gilbert Burnet, and Algernon Sydney, all of whom resided for a time in Rotterdam, Amsterdam professor and journalist Jean Leclerc and Amsterdam Remonstrant theologian Philippus van Limborch, Huguenot theologians Pierre Bayle and Pierre Jurieu, and Dutch Collegiants Frans Kuypers and Barent Joosten Stol. In 1677 the Quaker William Penn visited Rotterdam and held meetings in Furly’s second home on the Wijnstraat. He returned to Rotterdam in 1686 to obtain more settlers for his plantation in America.

Also circulating within this community were a number of New Yorkers who would play a prominent role in the 1689 uprising. Foremost was Jacob Milborne, who became Jacob Leisler’s chief aide and, in 1691, his son-in-law. Milborne was a member of a radical English dissenting family. His father, William Milborne, had been one of the ‘Fanatiks of East Sheen’, and his brother, William Jr., was the notorious ‘Fifth Monarchist’ Bermuda councilor. Jacob Milborne spent the years 1686-1689 overseeing business interests from Rotterdam. There he may have served as an agitator for the Prince of Orange, for in 1688 Benjamin Furly made a number of depositions, ‘at the request of Jacob Milborne’, complaining against King James II’s trade policies. In February 1689 Milborne’s father-in-law, Samuel
Edsall, and brother-in-law, James Evetts, joined Milborne in Rotterdam. Edsall returned to New York to lead rebellion there three months later. Milborne would return to New York City to become a leading figure in the rebellion the following August.27

Other New Yorkers in 1680s Rotterdam later prominent in the New York uprising include Benjamin Blagge, Jacob Mauritz, and Joost Stol. Mauritz, a ships captain and half-brother of New Amsterdam mayor Cornelis Steenwyck, acted as Rotterdam factor for the Quaker William Penn.28 Joost Stol, a wine merchant, is believed to be the son of Barent Joosten Stol, co-author with Frans Kuypers of the controversial Den Philosopherenden Boer (1676). He first appears in New York City in 1688. The following year he served as the rebel emissary to new English King William III's court at Whitehall.29 According to Plymouth port books, Jacob Leisler was also in direct trade with Rotterdam in the late 1680s.30

New York merchants brought back to America from Rotterdam not only trade goods but the ideas and books circulating in the city. New Yorkers' reading matter in the 1680s particularly reflected the broad appeal of the Rotterdam 'Nadere Reformatie'. While shop and estate inventories reveal eclectic individual literary tastes, devotional works were the most popular.31 Frequently cited authors in estate inventories are Voetian dominee Franciscus Ridderus (1620-1683), pastor of the church in Rotterdam from 1656 to 1683, and his successor Willem à Brakel (1653-1711). Brakel published in 1670 his father's, Theodorus (1608-1669), 'literary classic of the pietist movement', De trappen des geestelycken leven [The steps of spiritual life]. De Trappen remained a standard in American Dutch Reformed households a century later.32 The most widely read authors in New York in the 1680s were, however, Rotterdam dominee Jacobus Borstius (1612-1680) and the controversial dominee Jacobus Koelman (1632-1695).

Borstius, a prolific Voetian author and dominee in Rotterdam from 1654 until his death in 1680, was widely popular in New York. Forty-six volumes of his Kort begrijp der christelijcke leere [Succinct Ideas, 1665], an adaptation of the Heidelberg Catechism aimed at parents, were snatched up at auction in Kingston in 1665 and made mandato-
ry reading by the Long Island consistory in 1679. Other works by Borstius, including *Geestelike genees-konst* (1651, 1662), *Bedenkingen over het H. Avondmaal* (1665), and *Historie der kerken van Schotlandt* (1668), a history of the Scots Presbyterian church, appear in numerous New York estate inventories. Moreover, his son, Rotterdam printer and bookseller Joannes Borstius, played an important role in disseminating Orangist-Voetian propaganda to New York.

Voetius’ ‘beloved pupil’ Jacobus Koelman is well known to students of religion in colonial America. This controversial fundamentalist, who served as dominee at Sluis from 1662 to 1674, played a prominent role in the Rotterdam ‘Nadere Reformatie’. In 1682 the Delaware River Reformed congregation unsuccessfully attempted to obtain his services as their minister. Koelman subsequently influenced a generation of New World dominees with his brand of pietism. Koelman, like Borstius, was attracted to English Puritans and Scots Presbyterians, and translated a number of their writings for the Dutch public. Most New York inventories include Koelman’s Dutch translation of William Gutherie’s *Christian Interest* (1669).

The connection between Rotterdam’s resident alien Presbyterian community and Dutch Voetians is important. Although none of Voetius’s works was translated into English – and, indeed, had little influence in England – his Latin texts were widely used by English Calvinists in America. Among the guidebooks for students at Harvard, the training ground for New York’s English ministry, for example, were Voetius’s *Exercitia et Bibliotheca Studiosi Theologiae* (1644) and *Exercitia Pietatis* (1664). The Rotterdam authors thus introduced Voetius’ brand of pietism to English New Yorkers, and English translations of their works appear in New York inventories. Perhaps because of the influence and appeal of the Rotterdam dominees, a presbyterian movement grew among New York’s English congregations. As early as 1674 the English congregation at Jamaica, Long Island, declared, ‘we are not to maintain any other way of church government than that is according to the synod of Dordt’. Throughout the following decades other English congregations on Long Island and in Westchester County followed Jamaica and rejected both the
Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* and congregationalism for a Reformed Church structure and Voetian pietism.\(^{39}\)

Tensions between pietists and traditionalists laid a foundation for political conflict in New York as they did in Rotterdam and other Dutch cities. The 1676 controversy over dominee Nicholas van Rensselaer, the most serious dispute to rend New York between the English takeover in 1664 and the rebellion in 1689, is illustrative. James, duke of York, had appointed Van Rensselaer, ordained an Anglican, to the Albany Reformed pulpit. The Roman Catholic duke's act outraged the Reformed Dutch, who held to the rule from the Synod of Dordt that a minister must be ordained in the Reformed church and called by the congregation.\(^{40}\) The controversy between Voetians and those who acquiesced in the duke's appointment came to a head in July 1676 when wealthy New York City Reformed Church deacon Jacob Leisler circulated a four-point gloss criticizing a sermon by Van Rensselaer on original sin. In a critique that followed supralapsarian verses infralapsarian arguments within the Calvinist world, Leisler charged the dominee with heresy for suggesting that only after Adam's fall did God decree the election or nonelection of individuals to salvation.\(^{41}\)

Leisler was joined in his complaint against Van Rensselaer by Jacob Milborne, who had arrived in New York two months earlier as factor for a group of London merchants trying to break Gov. Andros's control of the New York market.\(^{42}\) Historians have focused on the Van Rensselaer dispute both because of its severity and because of the conjunction of Leisler and Milborne, who later played leading roles in the 1689 uprising. Yet similar disputes rent congregations and communities throughout the 1680s. In 1683, for example, the Staten Island Reformed congregation refused to support Morgan Jones, the minister appointed by Roman Catholic Lt. Gov. Anthony Brockholst.\(^{43}\) Dutch Reformed dominee Henricus Selijns complained in 1685, 'troubles are arising in other of the neighboring churches. Certain men came over last year with certificates from Sluys in Flanders, and from Middleburg and Groode, in Zeeland, [who] speak against the church, public prayer and the liturgy of the church'. He then prophesied, 'we look forward to very great troubles therefrom'.\(^{44}\)
Trouble did indeed come. The men with certificates, such as Guiliam Bertholf and Johannes van Eekelen, who oversaw congregations lacking an ordained minister, later ‘violently urged on’ rebellion.\(^\text{45}\) Revolt, however, first broke out on Long Island’s East End, when at the beginning of May 1689 the towns of Suffolk County, following Boston’s example in the wake of England’s Glorious Revolution, overthrew King James II’s government in order to secure ‘our English nations liberties and propertyes from Popery and Slavery’.\(^\text{46}\) Rebellion rapidly spread to Queens and Westchester counties, where ‘all magistrates and military officers were put out by the people and others chosen by them’.\(^\text{47}\) In pattern, these uprisings bear similarities to the 1672 Orangist uprisings in the Netherlands, when mobs there forced numerous towns to replace their magistrates with Voetian-Orangists.\(^\text{48}\)

As Orangist mobs in the Republic had believed, the rebels were according to their perspective acting within proper constitutional and legal frameworks. In the late 1680s Rotterdam’s press churned out an enormous quantity of political tracts aimed at the Dutch and English publics that stressed the threat of Roman Catholic ‘tyranny’ to the ‘Liberties and Estates of Free Protestant Peoples’.\(^\text{49}\) And the city’s virulent anti-Papist Voetian literature circulated in New York despite attempts by English Catholic King James II’s governors to suppress it.\(^\text{50}\) The influence of Rotterdam propagandists is clearly evident in Leislerian justifications for revolt. Leisler, for example, claimed the New York government had been seized ‘by the encouragement of the prince of Orange (now our gracious King) his 3 declarations’.\(^\text{51}\) Leisler’s reference is to William’s ‘Declarations’ of October 10 and 24, and November 28, 1688. The ‘First Declaration’, printed in Rotterdam in immense quantities in Dutch and English, 60,000 copies in English alone, and probably the ‘Second’, reached New York in mid March 1689.\(^\text{52}\) The ‘Third Declaration’ was in New York by May 31, when Nicholas Bayard accused Leisler of plagiarizing it.\(^\text{53}\)

In the ‘First Declaration’, confirmed by the ‘Second’, William’s propagandists justified his invasion of England on the grounds ‘for Preserving of the Protestant Religion, and for Restoring the Law and
Liberties of England'. King James II, the declaration asserts, did 'offer up the Laws, Rights and Liberties of a whole Nation' in order to establish the Papist religion and 'thereby to enslave a Nation'. The 'Third Declaration' claimed that a build-up of armed Papists in London and Westminster was occurring in order 'to make some desperate Attempt upon the said Cities ... by Fire or a sudden Massacre'. It called on magistrates to disarm Catholics and dispossess them of office. Catholics were given a clear warning: if they were found 'with Arms' or holding any civil or military office 'contrary to the known Laws of the Land', they and all who aided them would be treated as criminals and punished accordingly.

In New York, as in England, the 'Third Declaration' had an electrifying impact. Ever since the French invasion of the Republic in 1672, anti-Catholic hysteria had been building in the province, where many a settler's migration had been inspired by a fear of Roman Catholic violence. Family letters from Europe buttressed Orangist propaganda. 'People here are afraid of war with the French and when this happens woe to our country', Hilbert Coertsz. wrote his cousin on Long Island from the Netherlands in 1684. King James II's appointment of Roman Catholics to the province's highest offices intensified apprehensions. 'Such a Cloud of Popery hangs over our heads', Robert Livingston wrote to his brother-in-law, Andrew Russell, in Rotterdam, 'since none but Papists come to the helm'. French Catholic King Louis XIV's revocation of the edict of Nantes in 1685 and his subsequent persecutions confirmed fears. 'Hearing what greater success the Dragonnades in France had had', a New York letter recalls, 'we could only know what was in store for us'.

Despite the encouragement to rebel supplied by the Prince of Orange's three declarations, New Yorkers were reluctant to act on them in 1689. This is because for those with a Dutch perspective the 'defense of liberty was essentially based on a constitutional framework of fundamental laws and a balanced system of institutions'. The memory of these constitutional traditions restrained rebellion in New York and shaped its subsequent course. Political change had to follow legal principles. Indeed, Leisler, as a member of Lt. Gov. Francis
Nicholson’s expanded council, signed a declaration to defend the government at the uprising’s outbreak against ‘meutanous and rebellious persons neare unto us’. The militia captains, as the people’s representatives, acted only after official confirmation of William’s coronation had been received and only after the constituted magistrates continued to refuse to affirm it. Following the principle that they could not rule without the ‘People’s Resolutions’, the militia captains in June 1689 called for the representative convention ‘to act in the affairs’.

When ‘ruling elites were discredited’, historians note of political crisis in the Netherlands, the ‘loss of legitimacy caused ... a demand for changes of personnel in high offices, and a call for the restoration of the rights of local burgher communities’. As a case in point, Dutch constitutional theory drew on sixteenth-century Huguenot thought to justify the Republic’s revolt against Spain in 1572. In the 1680s, English, French, and Dutch thinkers working in Rotterdam, such as John Locke and Pierre Jurieu, reproduced the arguments of Theodore Beza, Francis Hotman, and Simon Goulart to prove that the ‘Sovereign power is in the hands of the people and of assemblies composed of its deputies’. In *Den Philosopherenden Boer*, Frans Kuyper and Barent Joosten Stol provided a democratic basis by suggesting that even the ordinary person was capable of understanding religious questions through natural reason. Following such arguments, Jacob Milborne, who was undoubtedly familiar with *Den Philosopherenden Boer*, stated, ‘it was in [New Yorkers’] power to Free Themselfs from that Yoke of arbitrary Power and Government ... of that Illegal king James, who was a Papist ... and that now the Power was in the People to choose new Civil and Military Officers as they Pleased ... and therefore they must have a free Election’. Such thinking, according to then current English constitutional theory and its adherence to divine right, as one New York critic wrote, meant ‘All Authority [was] turned upside downe’.

The provincial convention’s election of senior militia captain Jacob Leisler as commander-in-chief falls within the Dutch constitutional tradition. As Donna Merwick has observed, it was the pattern of the
people to look for a stadholder to balance the power of the magistrates. Wealth, social prominence, and military expertise made Leisler a logical choice, as did his association since 1659 with the interests of Cornelis Melyn, who in the 1640s had called for a representative government in New Netherland, and with his lay leadership in ensuring adherence to doctrinal purity within the New York churches. But it is Leisler’s personal link to Huguenot theorists that makes his elevation, and his political program, most comprehensible. His father, Frankfurt-am-Main French Reformed minister Jacob Victorian Leisler (1606-1653), a Geneva Academy graduate, was a disciple of Theodore Beza, John Calvin’s successor as Geneva president, and was a protégé of Jean Diodati, Geneva’s orthodox representative to the Synod of Dordt. Even more important is the family connection to Simon Goulart (1543-1628), Beza’s successor at Geneva and a popular figure among Rotterdam Voetians. Leisler was related to Goulart through his maternal grandmother, and it was Goulart’s son-in-law, Timothee Poterat, who Leisler’s father succeeded as minister of the Frankfurt French congregation.

Goulart’s popular *Memoires de l’Estat de France sous Charles IX* (1576) contained a number of revolutionary Calvinist political tracts including Beza’s *The Right of Magistrates* (1574), *The Politician* (1574) and *Political Discourses* (1574), and Hotman’s *Francogallia* (1576). Published in French, German, and Dutch editions, and frequently reprinted, this work was highly influential in popularizing the Calvinist compact theory of government and justification for resistance in Rotterdam, and appears in the library of John Locke as well as those of New Yorkers. Leisler undoubtedly also possessed a copy of this work by his relative, for his declarations of June 1689 and thereafter follow in their construction the arguments the Memoirs present.

Drawing on Calvinist thought as filtered through Rotterdam’s Orangist propagandists, Leisler encouraged in New York a ‘Further Reformation’ – a term that he and his followers did indeed use – for the ‘reestablishment and preservation of the true protestant Religion, liberty and property’. In doing so he and his party followed
European Orangist arguments by intertwining true doctrine with the preservation of estates. Rotterdam theorists held that ‘nations give the supreme authority to their rulers only for the preservation of the property, lives, liberty, and religion’. By losing ‘their Laws and Religion’, a Leislerian tract states, a people also lost ‘their Properties and their Souls’. Leisler thus sought a reformation to regenerate the Christian church from false creeds by securing civil control for ‘the preservation of our Religion’.

Just as Leisler and his followers believed that they were regenerating the Christian church to its original evangelical fervor, their ‘Reformation’ sought to restore the traditional balances of government. In the Dutch Republic, fundamental law, natural rights, representative institutions, and popular sovereignty were important aspects of the Dutch constitution, enshrined in the Union of Utrecht (1579) and Act of Abjuration (1581). The Leislerians thus sought to restore the traditional corporate rights of the people and to abolish monopolies so that ‘one place should have no more privileges than the other’.

The New York debate in 1689 over the legality of the 1683 customs act occurred within a larger English constitutional crisis. At its root was the issue of in whose hands – the sovereign’s or the people’s – final authority rested. Rotterdam theorists placed ultimate authority in the people, balanced by laws and institutions. It was within this framework that the Leislerians defined their regime. They attempted to create a rational program for the political reality of an English New York on the legal principles they understood, as Leisler noted, out of ‘the [Dutch] Lawes of this our Province & the Lawes & Customes of our Kingdome of England’. Seeking a constitutional basis for their actions, the Leislerians determined that the 1683 New York Charter of Liberties validated the customs act, an act ‘created by the [people] represented in assembly’.

Rotterdam’s intellectual ferment in the 1680s was the result of two countervailing trends: the pietist movement of the ‘Nadere Reformatie’ and the rationalist movement of the early Enlightenment. New
York's Leislerians, with their direct trade connections to Rotterdam, drew upon both movements for justification of their revolt against English Catholic King James II's government. In the end, the pietism of Rotterdam's Reformed clergy was more suited to the conditions of the New World's frontier society. The legacy of the Rotterdam 'Nadere Reformatie' would remain a major force in New York intellectual life for more than another century.
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