

A Suspected Loyalist in the Rural Hudson Valley: The Revolutionary War Experience of Roeloff Josiah Eltinge

Kenneth Shefsiek

In the years leading up to the War of Independence, battle lines were being drawn not only between the British government and its American colonies, but also among the colonial citizenry itself. For the radical revolutionaries who believed in the existence of a British governmental conspiracy to deprive the colonists of their liberty, as well as for those whose strong conservative stance enabled them to accept British authority in whatever form it was foisted upon them, matters of allegiance were fairly clear. But these two positions were the extremes, and the opinions of many resided in “the twilight zone between wholehearted support of the American cause and overt identification with the British.”¹ Most of the populace, whether or not they eventually became Patriot or Tory, were thoroughly uncomfortable with the innovative methods Parliament had enacted to raise revenue directly from the colonies. As William Nelson states, in regard to taxation the Tories “were as indignant as other Americans as to what seemed an unjust and arbitrary exercise of British authority.”² What separated the Revolutionaries from the Tories was not the belief that the British government was overstepping its bounds. Where they differed was in their opinion of the role of the British Crown and Parliament in relation to the elected governments of the colonies and the means open to them for resolving the controversy. There were, of course, Loyalists who actively fought on the side of the British. However, there were also many who considered themselves Loyalists because they felt negotiation and readjustment within the current imperial system was the proper approach to resolution. Then there were those who opposed the radical Revolutionaries because “they were alarmed at the prospect of strife between Britain and the colonies;” however, it took years for the “the issue of allegiance [to] crystallize.”³

The issue of allegiance was particularly complicated in New York, where the heterogeneity of the population in terms of ethnicity, religion, and wealth resulted in a similar heterogeneity in political beliefs. Whereas the greater homogeneity

© Congress 16 July 1776

Resolved Unanimously that all persons who
- being within the state of New York and deriving their
- title from the laws of the same are allegiance to
the said Laws and are members of the state; and that
all persons passing thro' visiting or making a tempo-
rary stay in the said state, being entitled to the protection
of the Laws during the time of such passage, residence
or temporary stay are during the said time allegiance
therein

That all persons members of or owing allegiance to
this state as before described who shall levy war
against the said state within the same or be ad-
versely to the King of Great Britain or others the Enemies
of the said state within the same, giving to him or
them aid and comfort are guilty of treason
against the state and being thereof convicted
shall suffer the Penalties of Death

Attest: M. M. M. M. M.

The Oath of Allegiance required of all New York citizens.
At right, a transcription of two oaths: to the new state (top) and to the king
(Courtesy of NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation,
Senate House Historic Site)

In Congress 16 July 1776

Resolved Unanimously that all persons abiding within the state of New York and deriving protection from the laws of the same owe allegiance (to) the said Laws and are members of the state, and that all persons passing thro visiting or making a temporary stay in the said state, being Intitled to the protection of the Laws during the time of such passage visitations or temporary stay owe during the same time allegiance thereto - That all persons members of or owing allegiance to this state as before described who shall levy War against the said state within the same or be adhesions to the King of Great Britain or others the Enemies of the said state within the same, giving to him or them aid and comfort are guilty of Treason against the state and being thereof convicted shall suffer the penalties of Death

Rob:t Benson, Sec.

In Testimony Of our Unshaken Loyalty and Incorruptible Fidelity To the Best of Kings Of our Inviolable Affection and Attachment To Our Parent State and The British Constitution Of our abhorrence of and Aversion To a Republican Government Of our Detestation of All Treasonable Associations Unlawfull Combinations Seditous Meetings Tumultuous Assemblies and Execrable Mobs And of All measures that have a Tendency To Alienate the Affections of The People from their Rightful Sovereign or Lessen their Regard for Our Most Excellent Constitution And To Make Known To All Men That We are Ready Chearfully Ready when properly Calld upon at The Hazard of our Lives and of Every thing Dear and Valualbe to us To Defend The King To Support The Magistrates in the Execution of The Laws And to Maintain The Just Rights of Constitutional Liberty of Freeborn Englishmen This Standard By The Name of The Kings Standard Was Erected By a Number of His Majestys Loyal & Faithful Subjects In the Precincts of Shawangunk & Hanover in the County of Ulster On the 10th day of February in the 15th Year Of The Reign Of Our Most Excellent Sovereign George the Third Whom God Long Preserve

of society and political belief in New England and Virginia resulted in a greater clarity of political divisions, the heterogeneity of New York resulted in a greater distribution throughout the possible range, from left to right.⁴ Additionally, New York's extensive experience in dealing with political and social division resulted in a culture of negotiation and moderation.⁵ The way of moderation was also followed in New York as a means of preventing a renewed outbreak of violence, like that experienced during the Stamp Act Riots of 1765.⁶

Once the war began, the situation became increasingly difficult for those who were unable to support the Patriot cause fully, and even for those "who have affected to observe . . . a dangerous and equivocal neutrality."⁷ To a Revolutionary, there was no middle ground: moderates were considered potential Tories. It was these moderates who faced some of the greatest personal challenges of conscience during the war. Since the Revolutionaries, who held the reins of government and the law, would accept nothing less than full, unequivocal support, the moderates were forced to compromise their principles by choosing either the far left or the far right, or simply lying and stating that they supported the Patriots.⁸ Those of questionable allegiance were particularly vulnerable in New York because the state was wedged between the British forces occupying New York City and the threat of invasion from the north. Both the British and the Americans believed that silent Tories would be encouraged to declare their true allegiance and threaten the state from within if the British forces were able to advance into the interior.

It was therefore incumbent upon the authorities in New York to find a method to deal with the Loyalist threat, whether real or phantom.⁹ The government imprisoned suspected Tories, often in extremely substandard facilities and without due process of law. Particularly feared Tories were exiled, others were put to hard labor (although many authorities denounced such punishment). The property of some Loyalists was confiscated; Patriot vigilantes occasionally tarred and feathered their opponents. Alexander Flick contends that the treatment was "firm but comparatively moderate,"¹⁰ and other historians also declare it "moderate and fair, all things taken into consideration."¹¹ Robert Calhoon is generally forgiving of the governmental organization charged with suppressing Loyalist activity; he notes that it was "more concerned with identifying persons of doubtful loyalty than with punishment or harassment." Tories, Calhoon adds, were given the opportunity either to take an oath of allegiance or "move to New York City." (By "move," he means exile.)¹² Although exile is neither punishment nor harassment, it was rather harsh, especially when forced upon those who did not pose any real threat, even if they did have Tory leanings. Calhoon also states that in New England, county committees provided suspected Loyalists with the opportunity to

end their “estrangement from the community through a recanting of any loyalistic statements,” and thus “served to define the moral and inclusive character of a community in crisis.”¹³ The same was true in New York. Being given the chance to recant before a committee that had the power to punish hardly suggests the “inclusiveness” of a community in regard to political opinions. Philip Ranlett is not so forgiving, stating that the treatment of suspected Loyalists “was not kind.”¹⁴

Many of the recent investigations into New York Toryism focus on sophisticated political ideology. The high-minded constitutional principles that were the basis for discussion and dispute were primarily the domain of the politicians and gentry. However, they were not the only Tories of the day: they were found in all ranks of society. It is more difficult to investigate the issue of allegiance for people of the middle and lower ranks of society because suspected Loyalists who were neither belligerent nor socially prominent were handled by local committees, and few of their records survive.¹⁵ Jonathan Clark has attempted to define allegiance for residents of all walks of life in Poughkeepsie, but he categorizes so many as “occasional loyalist” or “occasional patriot” that it is apparent that the issue of allegiance is often unclear.¹⁶ It is also difficult to investigate fully how such suspects were treated by the Revolutionary authorities. In the archives of the Huguenot Historical Society in New Paltz, a town of modest size during the eighteenth century, there survives a collection of documents relating to the wartime experience of one resident, Roeloff Josiah Eltinge (1737-1795), which substantially documents his treatment at the hands of the Revolutionaries. His story provides insight into both the mind of a man who was neither an avowed Patriot nor a staunch Loyalist and the methods and motives of Patriot authorities during the early years of the conflict.

Roeloff Josiah Eltinge was a third-generation resident of New Paltz, which had been founded by French Huguenot refugees in 1678 on a patent of nearly 40,000 acres. The first Eltinge who moved to New Paltz was Roeloff Josiah’s grandfather, a man of Dutch descent also named Roeloff (1689-1746/7), who married Sara DuBois (1682-c.1746), the daughter of New Paltz Patentee Abraham DuBois (1657-1731). According to tradition, the first Roeloff’s son, Josiah, began to operate a general store in New Paltz around 1740 and was considered the wealthiest man of the town.¹⁷ Roeloff Josiah took over the business from his father and was involved in many entrepreneurial endeavors.¹⁸ He was one of New Paltz’s most prominent citizens, but his influence did not extend outside the town. Although it is difficult to say where Roeloff Josiah fit in the overall social structure of his time and region, New Paltz was a small, isolated, relatively unimportant town in the eighteenth century, thus his social position would have been restricted. His



*The Roeloff Josiah Eltinge House in New Paltz
(Photograph by Christopher Pryslopski)*

small house, with three above-ground rooms, still survives, and it attests to his modest social standing.

Eltinge's Revolutionary War experience begins with his signing of the Articles of Association in May 1775. The articles had been prepared by the Committee of New York City on April 29, 1775, ten days after the battles at Lexington and Concord, and they had been transmitted to the counties of New York for signing in every town. The purpose of the association was to create a "firm union of its inhabitants in a vigorous prosecution of the measures necessary for safety (because) of the necessity of preventing the anarchy and confusion which attend a dissolution of the powers of government." It was a response both to Britain's taxation of the colonies and its subsequent aggression in Massachusetts. The association was an early statement of the independence movement, so many future Revolutionaries signed it. So, too, did many future Loyalists. This sometimes occurred because of pressure by the local committees and other townspeople, but moderates would have generally felt comfortable signing because it also stated that "we most ardently desire . . . a reconciliation between Great Britain and America on Constitutional Principles."

Whether or not Eltinge willingly signed the articles is unknown, but his signature ensured his continued safety for the following eighteen months. This was

to change on October 26, 1776, when he was brought before the Ulster County Committee meeting at the home of his kinsman, Abraham DuBois.¹⁹ This extra-legal governmental committee had been in existence since January 6, 1775, when five town committees had met in Hurley, near the county seat of Kingston. County, town, and district committees, some of which had been formed as early as 1774, were becoming increasingly central to the war effort and served to fill the function of regional and local government with the collapse of the colonial government. After the Declaration of Independence, they became the local governments in a free state until the new government was set up under the state constitution of 1777. Whether or not these committees were truly representative of the people is questionable. As Hugh Flick states, "In speaking for the people (in 1774-1775), active minorities were usurping the functions of local governments and, for the most part, without hindrance by the more passive conservative(s)."²⁰ And as Samuel Seabury noted at the time, "It is notorious that in some districts only three or four met and chose themselves to be a committee. . ."²¹ By the time Eltinge came before the Ulster committee in 1776, it probably was more representative of the public voice than in earlier years because sentiment against the British had been growing, especially since the struggles began in Massachusetts. Nevertheless, there was still a question in the eyes of many, particularly those with conservative tendencies, whether the committees had the right to assume governmental functions. Thus Eltinge might have approached his examination with severe misgivings.

The county committees were essentially the regional representatives of the New York Provincial Congress, and it was their responsibility to assist the Congress in its Revolutionary efforts. One of these activities was to confront the internal threat posed by those who were loyal to the British crown—the "disaffected." This became an increasing concern with the close proximity of British forces after the occupation of New York City in the fall of 1776, as well as the ongoing possibility of attack from the north. This effort to apprehend Tories had begun in May 1776, and it was stepped up with the creation of the Committee for Defeating and Detecting Conspiracies (to which the county committees were subordinate) on September 21, 1776. It was in its capacity as locator of Tories that Eltinge was brought before the Ulster County Committee.

Eltinge was forced to appear because he refused to take Continental currency in his store. According to his statement to the committee, he never entirely trusted the value of the currency, and although he initially received it, his trust in it subsequently eroded further. After the withdrawal of Continental forces from Long Island and a "general rumor amongst the people of [his] neighbor-

hood that in a little time Congress money would be good for nothing as the King was likely to overcome,” others came to his store to purchase goods with the currency, but he believed they did so simply because they also considered it would soon be worthless. Although he refused the currency, he told his customers that he would allow purchases on credit. According to the New York Provincial Congress, such actions were unacceptable according to their resolves passed on June 5, 1776, which indicated that those who prevented the circulation of paper money “were to be imprisoned, put under bond for good behavior, or removed from their localities on parole.”²² This local statement reflected the policy of the Continental Congress promulgated on January 11, 1776: those who did not accept currency should be treated as enemies. Although activities such as Eltinge’s were nonbelligerent in nature, such an extreme position was taken because the acceptance of Continental money was absolutely necessary to fund the war effort, and the Revolutionaries feared that “Tories” such as Eltinge might influence others, directly and by example. The committee chose to take the most extreme action they could under the Provincial Congress’ resolves, and Eltinge was sentenced to the prison in Fishkill, Dutchess County.²³

While Eltinge’s refusal to take Continental currency was in itself unacceptable to the authorities, the fact that he was brought before the committee and soundly punished might also have been reflective of personal animosities in both New Paltz and nearby Kingston. Tradition has it that there was an ongoing feud between the Eltinges and another prominent local family, the Hasbroucks, whose progenitors—the brothers Jean and Abraham—had been founding members of New Paltz (along with Abraham DuBois). According to Ralph LeFevre, the disagreement between the families resulted from a dispute over a land grant received by Eltinge’s uncle, Noah, which some landowners in New Paltz protested because they claimed that part of the land was contained in the New Paltz patent.²⁴ Jacob Hasbrouck, Jr. (grandson of Jean Hasbrouck), and Abraham Hasbrouck (grandson of patentee Abraham Hasbrouck) instigated proceedings over this dispute in 1748. Unfortunately for Eltinge, the woman from whom he first refused to take the Continental currency was Esther Hasbrouck Wirtz, the daughter of Jacob Jr. Both Jacob Jr. and Abraham were active Patriots. Jacob Jr. (of New Paltz) was a member of the Ulster County Committee and a major in the militia, while Abraham (of Kingston) was a colonel, and a rather petulant one at that.²⁵ Thus, Eltinge’s run-in with the authorities might have had an extremely personal side to it, as small-town politics often do.

From that point until after the signing of the peace treaty in 1784, Eltinge’s freedom was circumscribed by the authorities. After a stay of more than a month

at the jail in Fishkill, he was sent to New Hampshire for confinement.²⁶ He and others were exiled from New York, according to John Jay, a member of the Committee for Detecting and Defeating Conspiracies, because it was “indispensably necessary to remove a number of dangerous and disaffected persons, some of whom have been taken in arms against America, to one of the neighboring states.”²⁷ The committee’s prime concern was the men’s proximity to the British stronghold of New York City. The Council of New Hampshire was willing to take them. Leaving Fishkill on December 4, 1776, Eltinge arrived in Atkinson, New Hampshire, on December 13. He was confined at the home of a Lieutenant Belknap for several days before being moved to the home of Lieutenant Colonel Joseph Welch until February 3, 1777, when he was placed in prison at Exeter.²⁷ Even though Eltinge and the other prisoners had been confined against their will, they remained responsible for their own “expenses and diet,”²⁹ a policy made necessary because of the limited financial resources of the provincial government.

While officials in New Hampshire were willing to take the prisoners, the New Hampshire Council had some misgivings about their guilt. “Their clamours of being sent here without an examination at home and consciousness of their innocence which they assert, has had considerable influence among the people . . . And as a great number of them make such protestations of their not being sensible of their having ever given occasion for any person to suppose them unfriendly to the American cause, we wish an impartial inquiry might be made into their characters,” wrote council President Meshach Weare.³⁰

Eltinge remained in jail in Exeter until March 25, when he was released back to New York in response to a March 13, 1777, request by the Committee for Detecting and Defeating Conspiracies to return all prisoners except those who were “closely confined in Goal (sic),”³¹ to administer an oath of allegiance. If the prisoners refused, they were to be forced to remove themselves behind enemy lines. Eltinge arrived in Poughkeepsie to see the commissioners on May 13, but there is no evidence that he was asked to take an oath at that point. Nevertheless, he was given an order on May 21 to report to the fleet prison in Kingston in six days. Opened on May 2, 1777, the prison originally consisted of two former privateer vessels anchored off Kingston, but as the need arose, other boats had been added. Initially intended to house prisoners whom the commissioners feared might lead rumored uprisings in Dutchess County, Westchester County, and Livingston Manor, the prison later swelled with detainees from Albany and Orange counties, as well as with those, like Eltinge, who had been recalled from New England. Eltinge remained on board until June 18, when he was paroled to the home in Hurley of Jacobus Hardenburgh, his brother-in-law, who had petitioned for his

release. This was the first time in almost eight months that Eltinge was able to enjoy a modicum of freedom and be with family. It was to be short-lived.

In his diary, Eltinge does not record any dealings with the authorities for the subsequent four months, but on October 6, 1777, after being accused of breaking his parole, he was taken back to Kingston to appear before the Commission for Detecting and Defeating Conspiracies. He proved that he was innocent of the charge, and he was again paroled back to Hardenburgh's, although his parole was to last only a few more days. Forts Clinton and Montgomery, about forty miles south of Kingston, had been taken on October 6 by British forces under General Sir Henry Clinton; General John Burgoyne's forces were eighty miles north, at Saratoga. Meeting on October 8 in Kingston, the Council of Safety was not yet aware that Burgoyne's forces had been defeated on October 7, and in its eyes, the northern and southern armies were too close for comfort. Fearing that inactive Loyalists would be emboldened to act if British forces pushed into the region, the council felt it was necessary to remove all prisoners in and around Kingston to Hartford, Connecticut. Within hours, the militia was at the home of Jacobus Hardenburgh, where it again took Eltinge into custody. It also detained Eltinge's luncheon companion, Cadwallader Colden Jr., who was on parole to the Van Deusen House in Hurley. From that moment on, the wartime fates of these two men would be bound together.³²

Colden was the son of Cadwallader Colden Sr. (1688-1776), of Coldenham, near Newburgh. The elder Colden had been a member of the Governor's Council from 1721 through 1776 and lieutenant governor from 1761 until his death. During several periods—most importantly throughout the Stamp Act crisis of 1765-1766—he filled the position of acting governor. He was the owner of a great deal of land, although not to the extent of families such as the DeLanceys or Livingstons. He was a thorough supporter of royal authority and prerogative, and as a high-ranking royal official he made considerable use of the power of his office in furthering the interests of both himself and his family. The Colden name was synonymous with the colonial royal government, and the family was soon to be considered the enemy of the Revolution, which they were.

David Colden, Cadwallader Jr.'s younger brother, was a resident of Long Island who "actively supported royal government, and as a leader of the Loyalists who outnumbered whigs in Flushing, [he] prevented the creation of local protest committees in 1775 and '76."³³ Also, as the leader of 1,293 freeholders and inhabitants of Queens County who had "steadfastly maintained their royal principles,"³⁴ he petitioned the governor for the reinstatement of royal government when the British took New York City. After the war, David Colden was denied



*Remains of paneling and the front door
from Cadwallader Colden Jr.'s
Orange County home, on display at the
Montgomery Town Hall
(Photographs by Erin Gilhooly)*

admission to the State of New York (as an active Loyalist, he had been forced to flee when the British evacuated New York City), and his property was confiscated after his death in 1784.

The Loyalist activities of Cadwallader Colden Jr. were not as forward as those of his brother, possibly because the smaller number of Tories in Ulster County made it extremely difficult and dangerous to be so blatant. Nonetheless, his sympathies were identical. On April 14, 1775, he, Walter DuBois, and Peter DuBois³⁵ published a protest in response to the election of delegates from Ulster County to the Provincial Congress. They stated that the election was bogus because it had been executed by a group that in no way represented the eligible voters, and that the only legal governmental body was the Assembly. (Both were common Loyalist complaints.) They also declared that they would remain loyal “to our Parent State and British Constitution.”³⁶ Although Colden signed the Articles of Association in April because of pressure from the local committee, he continued to espouse his Loyalist rhetoric. He was arrested by the committee in June 1776 so they could disarm him. (Because he was considered an active Loyalist, he was assumed to have a large cache of guns at his home. Only a broken gun and his son-in-law’s fowling piece were found.) On July 4, he was asked to sign an oath stating that he would abide by the Association. He refused to sign when a codicil was added stating that, if necessary, he would bear arms against the British army. As a result, he was sentenced to jail as a Loyalist. On August 22, 1776, his case was given to the state Committee for Detecting and Defeating Conspiracies. His troubles with the authorities would last throughout the war, as would Roeloff Eltinge’s. Although Colden consistently claimed that he would obey the rules of the state and remain neutral throughout the struggle, he later stated that he could never swear an oath to the state in God’s name, since his oath to the king was completely binding and could not be superseded. During the Revolutionary War, however, neutrals in New York were believed to be “cowardly tor(ies)”³⁷ and could not be countenanced. While Eltinge’s condemnation as a Loyalist was not based on any overt support of the power of the king and Parliament, keeping company with an avowed Loyalist—especially one from such a hated family—was extremely compromising.

After the militia burst in on the luncheon at the Hardenburghs, it took Colden and Eltinge to Kingston along with other parolees it picked up along the way. Meeting in the Ulster County Courthouse in Kingston, the Committee for Detecting and Defeating Conspiracies issued a list of those who were to be sent out of state; for some unrecorded reason, Colden and Eltinge were left off. They were ordered by the “officer of the guard to come out of the ranks and (were) left

on the street.”³⁸ Not knowing what to do, both returned to Hurley, obeying their parole.³⁹

Eltinge was taken by guard back to Kingston on October 12 and confined to “close goal by the Council of Safety till further orders.”⁴⁰ He remained there for only a short time, as he and the other prisoners were removed on October 16, and “As soon as we got out of town it was in flames.”⁴¹ The British forces under Major General John Vaughan arrived in Kingston on October 15, having been sent by Sir Henry Clinton in the Highlands to meet up with Burgoyne at Saratoga. Burgoyne had already asked for surrender terms on the 13th, but Clinton had been unaware of this when he dispatched Vaughan. On the 16th, the residents of Kingston had fled, and Vaughan’s forces burned the town nearly to the ground.

Colden was still under parole in nearby Hurley at the time of the burning, and he was subsequently sent to appear before the State Council of Safety meeting in Marblatown. He stated before the council a few days later that he was bound by oath to the king, but would remain neutral and subject to the laws of the state. The council responded that he must remain a prisoner if he was a subject of the king, and it paroled him to the Hardenburghs’. Eltinge had been held as a “close prisoner” at the house of Johannes Tack, in Marblatown, since the burning of Kingston.⁴² On November 5, an order was issued by the Council of Safety that both men were to be sent away to a remote district of Dutchess County called the Nine Partners. There were so few Tories in that region, it was felt, that the two would have little opportunity to influence others.

Although they petitioned the council for a reprieve or postponement, Colden and Eltinge did not receive a response and arrived in Nine Partners, near the Connecticut border, on December 9. On January 27, 1778, they went to Poughkeepsie to confront the state legislature. Since their arrival in Nine Partners, Colden had been campaigning to be allowed to return home. He had approached the council, spoken with and written letters to Governor George Clinton (his former lawyer), and contacted many others, including his “old friend Coll [Levi] Pawling,” an important Patriot. His entreaties were apparently of no avail.⁴³ With the reorganization of the state government under the new constitution of 1777, there was a question of jurisdiction regarding the cases of the men. Colden attempted to use the influence that he thought he possessed with Clinton and others to have the state legislature decide their case, but that body decided that their fates should be under the purview of the reorganized Commission for Detecting and Defeating Conspiracies, which had not yet met. Colden and Eltinge contacted the two available members of the old committee, who agreed to allow them a two-week parole to their own homes until the new commission

met. Eltinge left for New Paltz on January 30.

During the period of Eltinge's incarceration, which had begun back in October when he was initially to be sent to Connecticut, it is obvious that various governing bodies were unsure about how to deal with him, as well as with Colden. While the two did not pose any direct threat to the war effort, their being designated Loyalists required that their influence on others be contained. Furthermore, the jurisdiction that was to deal with their situation—whether local, county, or state—was unclear, and there was no defined protocol to be followed on any level. Thus the two were in a state of legal limbo that would last a few months longer.

As directed, Eltinge returned to Poughkeepsie on February 13, but he was not accompanied by Colden, who had received a one-month extension because he anticipated he would not be able to cross the ice-bound Hudson. This was probably a ploy to remain home longer, as Eltinge had been able to make the crossing. Eltinge was also given an additional month at home, quite possibly because the commission considered the two cases to be a single issue. Colden arrived in Poughkeepsie on March 15, Eltinge on the 18th. According to Eltinge, he was "detained"⁴⁴ until March 23, but Eugene Fingerhut states that "For four days Colden parked himself outside the Assembly door, awaiting his fate,"⁴⁵ so the status of their level of freedom is unclear. Colden was told that he could return home until further orders, while Eltinge "was . . . permitted to remain at my place of abode. . . till I could be exchanged for some well-affected citizen or prisoner with the enemy."⁴⁶ While Colden's status was still uncertain, Eltinge's situation was apparently coming to a head.

On June 30, the legislature passed "An Act More Effectively to Prevent the Mischieffs ariseing from the Influence and Example of Persons of Equivocal and Suspected Character in this State." No longer would the state accept neutral persons in its midst; with British forces so close, it felt the risk was too great. While people like Eltinge and Colden never aided British forces or bore arms against the Revolutionaries, the state thought it would be better to be rid of them. However, they were given one last chance to regain their freedom and stay: Loyalists were given a final opportunity to take an oath of allegiance to the laws of New York. If they refused, they would be banished. This oath would also require the person to declare that the state had a right to be free and independent. Colden was the first person to be dealt with under the new law, and on July 4 he declined to take the oath. Although he could abide by the state laws, his oath to the king could not be superseded. On July 6, Eltinge also refused to take it.

Following Eltinge's refusal, he was paroled back to New Paltz, but on July 26 he received a notice from the Commission for Detecting and Defeating

Conspiracies. "Pursuant to the act of the Legislature," he was to appear at Fishkill on August 3 "in order to effect his removal within the Enemy's lines, that he be permitted to take with him his family (males capable of bearing arms excepted) one week's provisions and as much of his effects as together with his family and provisions as would be transported in two wagons."⁴⁷ Colden also was to appear on August 3 for the same purpose. Eltinge met up with him at Coldenham, and when they arrived in Fishkill they remained there for two days because no one knew how their transport would be effected. It was decided that they would travel to New York City on a sloop that had been obtained by another banished Loyalist, William Smith Jr., under the guard of Colonel Aaron Burr.⁴⁸ Even though Eltinge had been permitted to take his family, they remained in New Paltz, and he arrived in New York City on August 11. On September 8, 1778, he indicated that he "took (his) boarding at Anthony van Noorstrandt in Wolves Hollow on Long Island in Queens County," where it appears from his diary that he primarily remained throughout the war, although he made trips into the city every few months.

Also living in New York was Eltinge's younger brother Solomon (1742-1809). He, too, had been in trouble with the authorities. On November 8, 1776, he had been sent by the conspiracy commissioner to Exeter, New Hampshire, for being "notoriously disaffected to the American cause, which [he has] evinced by refusing to receive in payment the Continental currency, and endeavouring to depreciate the same"—the same charge originally levied against his brother.⁴⁹ Solomon followed Roeloff in his refusal to take the oath of allegiance on August 1, 1778, and he, too, was banished. Records indicate that the brothers were in close contact during their exile.⁵⁰

Although some account information concerning Roeloff Eltinge's financial situation during his exile survives, no descriptive information about his day-to-day life exists. His financial situation must have been precarious, since it would have been impossible for him to perform his livelihood as a merchant. To earn money, it appears that he turned to crafts such as "patching shoes" and "making a slay." Additionally, from January 1780 through March 1783 he left a considerable amount of "stoves," pails, piggins, "koolers," sugar boxes and "canteens" to be sold at various locations. This provided him with a steady, albeit small, income.⁵¹ Food, other essential goods, and housing were difficult to come by because of a significant surge in Loyalist refugees and the large garrison of British troops. Making matters worse, inflation rates were dramatic. However, Eltinge appears to have survived reasonably well. The last entry in his wartime diary and account book indicates that in 1784 (presumably at the conclusion of his exile) he had amassed £26.2.8.

Provisional articles of peace between Britain and the United States were signed at Paris on November 30, 1782, thus beginning the process for Loyalists either to emigrate or reconcile with and remain in the new nation. Article five provided for “the restitution of . . . the estates, rights, and properties of persons resident in districts in the possession of his Majesty’s arms and who have not borne arms against the said United States,” but this provision was only to be “earnestly recommended . . . to the legislatures of the respective states.” The provisional articles were included in the final treaty, which was signed by representatives of both countries in Paris on September 3, 1783. Because the agreement concerning the appropriate treatment of Loyalists was not binding on any state, Roeloff Eltinge’s position in relation to New York remained unaltered at the conclusion of the war. In other words, he remained banished. Thus, when the British army began the process of evacuating New York City in the spring of 1783, it was necessary for him to leave the state. A letter from Eltinge to his son (probably his eldest, Ezekiel) dated September 29, 1783, indicates that he and Solomon had moved to Achqueckkononck, New Jersey (now Passaic). In this letter, he informed his son that “if any of my friends want to see me [they] may come here, because I see no probability as yet to come to see them with Safety.”⁵² He and Solomon were still there on January 11, 1784, as indicated in a letter Roeloff wrote to his wife. He stated that “I [will] not be able to come home as soon as I had expected on account of the definitive triety [sic] not being published . . . and not knowing yet . . . whether [the state government] will or can do anything for us.”⁵³

The peace treaty was ratified by Congress on January 14, 1784, but New York refused to consider its recommendations regarding the treatment of Loyalists. On February 12, 1784, Roeloff and Solomon Eltinge petitioned the state legislature to be “released from the disagreeable situation to which they have been so long exposed and humbly pray the Honorable Legislature to make such order in their behalf as may remove the effect of the law under which they suffer and enable your Petitioners to return with safety to their families.”⁵⁴ Several other banished Loyalists, including Cadwallader Colden Jr., also submitted petitions. The Assembly voted to reject them all, and the Senate voted to postpone consideration. According to Alexander Flick, “In early 1784 the wartime policy of the state legislature was still clear and certain.” It had no intention of revoking the banishment of Loyalists.⁵⁵

On May 12, however, Roeloff and Solomon Eltinge and 25 others (including Cadwallader Colden Jr.) were permitted to return to their homes. This permission was passed in conjunction with an anti-Loyalist act that upheld the banishment of those who actively took part in the war on the side of the British. Only 36

Loyalists had their banishments revoked in 1784. It was not until 1792 that all of those who had been exiled were allowed to return.

The exact date of Roeloff Eltinge's return to New Paltz is unknown, but it is likely that he returned forthwith. Few records survive that indicate the process of his reintegration into society. Because he never took an active part on the side of the British, his property was never confiscated, nor he did face persecution extreme enough for him to emigrate from his native land. According to Alexander Flick, "Those whose worst crime was open loyalty, who had been arrested, imprisoned, exiled, or paroled, but never charged with treason, were found in every community, and, although subjected to more or less abuse, were for the most part allowed to remain after the war was over, and to keep their property. While never fully forgiven, in time they came to be looked upon as true Americans, and were given full political rights."⁵⁶ Roeloff Eltinge's experience in New Paltz supports Flick's assertion. Within a few years he was respected enough to serve in several elected government positions, first as overseer of the poor in 1790 and then "as one of the New Paltz Twelve Men for the share of Louis DuBois from 1791 until his death in 1795."⁵⁷ He also returned to his mercantile activities in partnership with his son Ezekiel.

It is clear that the Revolutionary authorities believed that Eltinge was a Tory, but were they accurate in their perception? His refusal to take the oath of allegiance clearly indicates that he did not embrace the Patriot cause, but in and of itself that might not indicate that he harbored pro-British sentiments. Before the issue of Eltinge's allegiance is considered in depth, his involvement in an earlier dispute concerning the relation between the colonies and Europe must be considered.

Eltinge was a lifelong member of the Dutch Reformed Church, having joined the Kingston congregation in 1762, at the age of 25. In 1737, the same year as Eltinge's birth, a controversy began to develop in the Dutch Reformed congregations in the colonies. The governing organization of the church, which was responsible for doctrine, ordination, dispute resolution, and all general ecclesiastical business, was the Classis of Amsterdam. Because of its distance from the colonies, a movement began in the 1730s to establish an organization in America to conduct church business, but this organization—the Coetus—would remain subordinate to the Classis. When the Coetus was formed in 1737, several congregations refused to send representatives because they believed that some congregations had obfuscated their true intention of ultimate independence from the Netherlands. Indeed, in 1754 the Coetus expressed its belief that it should serve as an independent, American Classis. The result was a schism in the colonial

churches, with those that desired maintaining ties with Amsterdam forming a separate, smaller body of congregations called the Conferentie, meaning “conference.” The schism was not mended until 1772, when the Articles of Union (which resulted in virtual independence of Dutch Reformed congregations in America) was signed by the American congregations with the approval of the Classis.

The New Paltz congregation sided with the Coetus, but there were residents who wished to remain subordinate to the Classis, and this resulted in the formation of a new, Conferentie congregation on August 29, 1766. Ten of the original 15 members of this new church had never been official members of the New Paltz church, but rather were congregants in the Dutch church in Kingston. (However, it appears likely that these Kingston members attended services in New Paltz on a regular basis.) The other five were members of the New Paltz congregation, although four of them had previously been members in Kingston. Although there was a great deal of strife in the Kingston congregation, it officially remained in the Conferentie party. Interestingly enough, one of the protagonists in the dispute within the Kingston congregation was Colonel Abraham Hasbrouck (of the reputed Eltinge-Hasbrouck feud), who was attempting to force the church in the direction of the Coetus. This would have placed the Eltinges in opposition to the Hasbroucks once again.⁵⁸ The founding members from the Kingston church had been granted a dismissal by the Kingston consistory in order to form the new church, as “they [were] living too far away from the church of Kingston to dutifully and stately attend divine worship there . . . in the pure doctrine of the truth, and to lead them to the communion of a Reformed (and to the Reverend Classis of Amsterdam subordinated) congregation.”⁵⁹

A leading member of the new congregation was Roeloff Josiah Eltinge’s father, Josiah Eltinge, who provided a large portion of the funds for construction of a house of worship. Roeloff Josiah (who was a member of the Kingston congregation) and his three brothers joined the church the year after its creation. Roeloff Eltinge was active in his new congregation, serving as both elder and deacon at various times. The last elections for elder and deacon of the second church in New Paltz for which evidence survives is dated December 16, 1776, four years after the Articles of Union had been signed, but the churches did not unite until May 25, 1783.⁶⁰

The fundamental question in this dispute was whether or not the colonial church should remain subordinate and dependent on the mother country or should it, as a result of growth and maturation and the need to manage its own affairs, become independent. That these issues were being faced in the Dutch church at the same time that the political independence movement was gaining

momentum was not coincidental. American society in many ways was considering its position in relation to Europe, with many in America leaning toward separation. That Roeloff Josiah Eltinge sided with the Conferentie party suggests a conservative mindset; when faced with the issue of political independence, the implication is that he would have possessed more of a Loyalist mentality.

While it is true that members of the Conferentie faction were cultural conservatives, those who were opposed to the Coetus party were not necessarily *political* conservatives as well. The controversy concerning religious independence did develop at the same time as the political independence movement, and both movements were guided by similar principles regarding American and European relationships. But it also occurred at a time when Dutch culture and language was being diminished by the dominating English influence, and those who expressed a desire to remain subordinate to Amsterdam might have been led by an equal desire to retain their cultural identity. Additionally, there were many in the Coetus who tended toward evangelical style of worship, thus encouraging those “uncomfortable with the vagaries of revivalism” to join the Conferentie opposition.⁶¹ Thus, all members of the Dutch conservative faction, including Eltinge, were not necessarily anti-Revolutionaries by definition since they were also being influenced by other cultural and spiritual concerns.

What, then, is the evidence that sheds light on Eltinge’s allegiance? His involvement in the conservative faction of the Dutch church suggests that even before the American political independence movement began he was a proponent of continued cultural connections with Europe. However, the incident that marked him as a Loyalist in the eyes of the Patriots—and by the definition of the Continental Congress—was his refusal to take Continental currency. At his trial, he never stated any support for the British government other than indicating that he did not feel that the Patriots would prevail. His decision not to take the currency was based on economic pragmatism and his belief that he was being taken advantage of. If he was truly a Loyalist, at that point it is likely that he would have made statements to that effect; both his involvement in the less-powerful Conferentie faction and his future refusal to take the oath suggest that he was a man of principle who was willing to declare publicly his ideology, whether it was popular or not. It must also be remembered that in the fall of 1776, even though independence had been declared, Loyalist and Patriot ideologies had not yet polarized the people into two camps. It is likely that, given his conservative mindset, Eltinge leaned toward the Loyalist side without fully committing to it—at least in 1776.

When he refused to take the oath in 1778, however, the situation had changed. By that time, a person had to be either a Loyalist or a Patriot because it had become a matter of one party against another, rather than an issue of a somewhat fluid ideology. Refusing to take the oath in itself was not a clear statement of pro-British sympathies; it could also have been an *anti-Revolutionary* declaration. During the previous two years, Eltinge had been shuttled around from place to place, confined in prisons, and in general treated poorly by authorities whose right to punish was questionable, particularly in the early years before the state had been officially formed. If we keep in mind that he did not declare pro-British opinions (if he in fact possessed them) when he would likely have done so, it is quite possible that his treatment at the hands of the Patriots hardened his heart against them and made it too galling for him to take the oath. *Thus, it is likely that he was a conservative forced into the Loyalist camp by the harsh treatment to which he was subjected for a perceived offense that was simply a matter of financial self-preservation.*

The other piece of evidence that might suggest a Loyalist stance was Eltinge's relationship with Cadwallader Colden Jr. Although the two were at least acquainted with each other before the war, their close interaction did not begin until both had difficulties with the Patriot committees. While it appears that the committees treated the two almost as a unit, suggesting that they believed the men shared a common ideology, there is no evidence to suggest that Eltinge held the same staunch Loyalist outlook that Colden did. Their relationship, then, was substantially a matter of circumstance. Finally, Eltinge's lack of involvement in the Patriot movement might have been a response to the active part played by such influential Ulster County leaders as Major Jacob Hasbrouck Jr. and Colonel Abraham Hasbrouck. If indeed there was a feud between the two families, it is possible that Eltinge was loath to support the Patriots in Ulster County due to personal conflicts.

Eltinge's political ideology will, unfortunately, never be known. During the Revolution itself, it is quite likely that his position was equally unclear in the eyes of his community, and his treatment was a direct result of this ambiguity. To the authorities, his actions would have marked him as a suspicious person, but because he did not pose any clear threat, they were at a loss to determine an appropriate method of containing him. Had he taken up arms against the Patriots, or otherwise blatantly assisted the British, the appropriate punishment would have been clear. But Eltinge's suspiciousness placed him in limbo, and his resulting treatment might have influenced his inability to sign an oath that would have resolved his predicament and allowed him to return home.

It is also clear that Eltinge's ambiguousness was considered a substantial threat; otherwise, he would not have been removed from the area whenever the possibility of British invasion increased. This highlights a different dimension of the activities of committees in relation to the Loyalists from that suggested by Jonathan Clark, who states that their primary goal was "to enforce a patriotic consensus" within the community by requiring that suspicious individuals "choose between acting like Patriots and silent acquiescence."⁶² Unfortunately, pretending to be a Revolutionary and/or keeping one's mouth shut would not have been sufficient to satisfy the Patriots. Even if oaths were taken by those whose actions suggested a Loyalist mentality, "Many participants remarked upon the difficulty of knowing who had sworn the oath with conviction, and who was simply being pragmatic in order to save his property or his skin."⁶³ Because those of ambiguous allegiance—many of whom did take an oath of allegiance—were still feared as potentially active Tories, the committees were additionally required to deal with the silent threat that they posed.

It is difficult to compare Eltinge's experience with that of others whose political allegiance was unclear, as there is little modern research on the subject other than that which concerns key figures, or the experience of Tories in general. But certainly Eltinge would not have been alone. In Poughkeepsie, Clark contends that 130 out of the 239 residents whose allegiance can be sufficiently determined were not fully supportive of the Patriot cause, although the level of their support (or lack thereof) varied.⁶⁴ He also states that "Perhaps the most unjustly treated victims of patriotic justice were men who belonged . . . in one of the 'occasional' categories."⁶⁵ This is likely because they were seen as unknown quantities and therefore unpredictable. As to the experience of Loyalists, or suspected Loyalists, after the war, Alexander Flick contends that nonbelligerents were generally accepted back into their communities, although not always fully forgiven.⁶⁶ Clark's investigation suggests a similar postwar treatment in Poughkeepsie, possibly because "Ties to family, to farms, and to the community . . . proved to a surprising extent stronger than political causes," although they were excluded from political affairs.⁶⁷ Eltinge was apparently successfully reintegrated, possibly more so than many in similar circumstances in Poughkeepsie, but this might have been because the affairs of New Paltz were heavily influenced by the original founding families through the organization known as "The Twelve Men," and Eltinge was the dominant member of the line of patentee Abraham DuBois. As long as his family accepted him, he would retain a position in the community.

Even though Eltinge's experience was far from unique, his story is rare for its completeness given his social standing. It demonstrates the sticky issue of alle-

giance, both in its time and in retrospect, as well as the motivations of a suspicious community in an anxious time. While those in the higher ranks of society were involved in an ideological struggle to understand how, and if, the colonies should remain attached to Great Britain, there were many in the middle ranks whose allegiance—although not always without philosophical foundations—was also determined by small-town politics, familial animosities, suspicion, and pride.

Notes

1. Robert M. Calhoun, *The Loyalists in Revolutionary America, 1760-1781* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973), 300.
2. William H. Nelson, *The American Tory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), 5.
3. Calhoun, xii.
4. Nelson, 41.
5. Nelson, 43-45; Philip Ranlett, *The New York Loyalists* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1986), 10-25.
6. Ranlett, 26-51.
7. Robert Benson, "To Aaron Burr," 2 Aug. 1778, Matthew L. Davis, ed. *Memoirs of Aaron Burr* (New York: Da Capo, 1971), 131.
8. Michael Kammen, "The American Revolution as a *Crise de Conscience*: The Case of New York," in Richard M. Jellison, ed., *Society, Freedom, and Conscience: The Coming of the Revolution in Virginia, Massachusetts, and New York* (New York: Norton, 1976), 125-89.
9. Both British and American authorities of the period felt that New York was rife with Loyalist sympathizers. Most modern histories follow the lead of Alexander Flick who contended that half of all New Yorkers were against the Patriot cause [*Loyalism in New York During the American Revolution* (1901; New York: Arno Press, 1969), 180-182]. Most historians who followed Flick accepted his analysis until Ranlett questioned this accepted view in his 1986 reevaluation of the issue [*The New York Loyalists*]. He suggests that "New York was probably similar to the other Revolutionary states in its degree of loyalism" (186-7). The issue of Tory strength in New York is sticky at best and irresolvable at worst, since it would have been almost impossible to determine allegiance of many at the time, let alone hundreds of years hence.
10. Alexander Flick, *Loyalism in New York During the American Revolution*, 71.
11. University of the State of New York, Division of Archives and History, *The American Revolution in New York: its Political, Social and Economic Significance* (Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1926), 225.
12. Calhoun, 410.
13. Calhoun, 304-5.
14. Ranlett, 162.
15. The only extensive group of documents related to a local committee are those of the Albany Committee.
16. Jonathan Clark, "The Problem of Allegiance in Revolutionary Poughkeepsie," in David D. Hall, John M. Murrin, and Thad W. Tate, eds., *Saints & Revolutionaries: Essays on Early American History* (New York: Norton, 1984), 285-317.
17. Ralph LeFevre, *History of New Paltz and its Old Families* (Albany: Fort Orange Press, 1903), 487.
18. The archives of the Huguenot Historical Society and Senate House (Kingston, New York) contain a great deal of information about Roeloff Josiah Eltinge's financial activities, but these have

yet to be fully studied.

19. Roeloff Eltinge's paternal grandmother was Sara DuBois, daughter of Abraham DuBois (1657-1731), one of the holders of the patent of New Paltz. Also, his mother was Magdalena DuBois, his father's first cousin. As there were several men with the name of Abraham DuBois alive in 1776, the familial relationship between Eltinge and this Abraham DuBois is unclear.
20. Hugh Flick, "The Rise of the Revolutionary Committee System," in *History of the State of New York* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1933) III, 232.
21. Quoted in H. Flick, 230. However, Seabury's analysis cannot be entirely trusted because his staunch Loyalism might have clouded his perceptions. Additionally, in his desire to discredit the Revolutionaries, he might have overstated his case.
22. A. Flick, 67.
23. According to his parole of June 17, 1777, he had been "confined since last Fall." Additionally, his diary attests to his leaving Fishkill on December 3, 1776. *Roeloff and Ezekiel Eltinge Family Papers*, Huguenot Historical Society, New Paltz, N.Y.
24. LeFevre, 485. While this supposed feud is a matter of folklore, it is said in New Paltz today that animosity extended well into the twentieth century.
25. Abraham Hasbrouck resigned his position as commander of the Ulster Fourth Regiment because he had been passed over for generalship in favor of George Clinton. The return of his commission was described as "childish" by the provincial government [quoted in Marius Schoonmaker, *The History of Kingston, New York* (New York: Burr Printing House, 1888), 175].
26. Prisoners were also sent to Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania.
27. New York State, Commission for Detecting and Defeating Conspiracies, 1777-78. *Minutes of the Committee and of the first Commission for Detecting and Defeating Conspiracies in the State of New York*, Minutes of Committee, October 13, 1776, The New-York Historical Society, *Collections* (New York, 1918), 414.
28. Lt. Col. Welch was an officer of New Hampshire who had been assigned to New York by Washington and was made responsible for removing the prisoners to New Hampshire. It is not clear from the Minutes exactly to whom Welch had been assigned, but he had a great deal of interaction with the Committee of Conspiracies in 1776-7.
29. Receipt of February 15, 1777 from Roeloff Eltinge to Joseph Stacy of the Exeter Gaol. *Eltinge Papers*.
30. Meshach Weare, President of the Council of New Hampshire, "To William Duer, Chairman of the Committee for Conspiracies," December 27, 1776, *Minutes of the Committee...Defeating Conspiracies*, 417-418.
31. Commissioners for Conspiracies, "To the Honourable Committee of Safety of New Hampshire." March 13, 1777, *Minutes of the Committee... Defeating Conspiracies*, 433-5.
32. Eugene Fingerhut suggests in *Survivor: Cadwallader Colden II in Revolutionary America* (Washington, University Press of America, 1983), 27, that the two might have become acquainted while involved in court cases in Kingston in the previous years, when Colden served as a judge. Their first recorded meeting of a personal nature occurred on June 18, 1777, when Eltinge was paroled and left several items, including eating and cooking utensils, in the care of Colden, who remained incarcerated on the prison ships. *Eltinge Papers*.
33. Fingerhut, 40.
34. Quoted in A. Flick, 97.
35. Peter DuBois was Roeloff Josiah Eltinge's third cousin. Walter DuBois is not identified in the published DuBois family genealogy.
36. Cited in Fingerhut, 44.
37. Fingerhut, 92.

38. *Eltinge Papers*.
39. It is not clear if Eltinge returned to Van Deusen's house in Hurley with Colden or if he returned to Hardenburgh's, also in Hurley. His diary simply states "went to Hurley again."
40. *Eltinge Papers*.
41. *Eltinge Papers*.
42. *Eltinge Papers*.
43. Quoted in Fingerhut, 88.
44. *Eltinge Papers*.
45. Fingerhut, 92.
46. *Eltinge Papers*.
47. In his diary, he recorded that he was to report on July 30. *Eltinge Papers*.
48. William Smith Jr. (1728-1793) was a prominent lawyer and historian who had been appointed to his father's seat in the Governor's Council in 1767 and subsequently served as Chief Justice of the Province of New York (appointed in 1780 by the royal governor during the British occupation of New York). He left for Canada after the British evacuation of New York City and was appointed Chief Justice of Quebec in 1786. While Smith was also banished from the State of New York for refusing to take the oath of allegiance, and while he was adamantly against independence, he was also staunchly opposed to Parliamentary taxation and was for the "cause of truth and liberty," as he stated in the first issue of his 1752 weekly, *The Independent Reflector* [as quoted in William Sabine, introduction, *Historical Memoirs of William Smith from 12 July 1776 to 25 July 1778* (Hollis, N.Y.: Colburn & Tegg, 1958), 2-3]. He was a close colleague of many other patriot radicals, including John Morin Scott, the Livingstons (to whom his wife belonged), and Alexander McDougall.
49. *Minutes of the Committee....Defeating Conspiracies*, 11.
50. Eltinge's diary indicates that he loaned Solomon six half guineas in April 1781, and two letters written from New Jersey in September 1783 and January 1784 state that they were together there pending the decision regarding their being allowed to return to New York. Roeloff had additional contact with his family during his exile; his wife, Maria, visited him in the company of Mrs. Colden, who was given permission to visit her husband in April 1781 for a total of 11 days. Eltinge's eldest son, Ezekiel, who was eighteen years of age, began the journey with his mother but was sent home when the American General William Heath detained their sloop at West Point. Additionally, when the general found "a quantity of provisions . . . over and above what appeared necessary to support the families on their way to the enemy," he seized the goods and put them in the public stores [New York State. *Public Papers of George Clinton* (New York and Albany: State of New York, 1899-1914) VI, 756].
51. A piggin, or pipkin, is a small wooden vessel with a handle. A "stove" probably refers to a foot-stove or footwarmer. A "kooler" might refer to a wooden vessel for cooling wine, and a canteen is a type of wooden keg. While Eltinge's account book does not definitively state that he made these objects himself, it is quite likely that he did; if he was serving as a middleman, he would probably have dealt in a greater variety of objects.
52. *Eltinge Papers*.
53. *Eltinge Papers*.
54. *Eltinge Papers*.
55. Fingerhut, 125.
56. A. Flick, 165.
57. Eric Roth, "Finding Aid, Elting Family Papers," Huguenot Historical Society Archives. The Twelve Men was a quasi-governmental organization in New Paltz that was charged with the administration of the land patent received in 1678 by the twelve founders of the town. Organized

in 1728, the Twelve Men were primarily involved in dividing land in the early years, but by the 1790s they were generally only responsible for resolving disputes concerning land titles. They were elected by the freeholders of the town, with each man serving as the representative of the share of one of the original twelve patentees. Only a person descending from an original patentee could represent the share of his ancestor, in this case, Louis DuBois, Roeloff Eltinge's great-great-grandfather.

58. Abraham Hasbrouck, a supporter of the Coetus, forced the domine (the minister) of the Kingston church to take an oath of allegiance to the king, which he felt would nullify any connection between the American churches and the Classis since the oath taker would be forced to declare "that no foreign prince, person, prelate, State or potentate had, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, dominion or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm" (quoted in Schoonmaker, 216). It was later determined that Abraham Hasbrouck had no right to administer an oath.
59. D. Veersteeg, *Records of the Reformed Dutch Church of New Paltz, N.Y.* (New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1896), 9. If they felt that they were too far from Kingston to worship, that would have been the case even prior to the internal disputes, thus suggesting that they had been previously attending the New Paltz church without becoming official members.
60. The last two elections are recorded on a single sheet of paper, rather than in a book or other such longer document, suggesting haphazard record keeping. It is possible there were additional elections for which no records survive.
61. Randall Balmer, *A Perfect Babel of Confusion: Dutch Religion and English Culture in the Middle Colonies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 147.
62. Clark, 306.
63. Kammen, *Crise*, 156.
64. Clark, 296. Clark created four categories of allegiance: Patriot, Loyalist, Occasional Patriot, and Occasional Loyalist. He states that "While another investigator might, in a very few instances, decide to assign to an individual an allegiance slightly different from the one I assigned, the general conclusions regarding allegiance would, I am confident, still stand" (310). Clark probably would have categorized Eltinge as a Loyalist, considering that he refused an oath. But as we have seen, Eltinge's allegiance is questionable. Using Clark's categories, I would define him as an "Occasional Loyalist."
65. Clark, 306.
66. A. Flick, 165.
67. Clark, 309.