TOO METHODISTICAL: 
THE REJECTION OF UZAL OGDEN

SUZANNE GEISSLER

The delegates of the Episcopal diocese of New Jersey elected Uzal Ogden their bishop on August 16, 1798. He would have been New Jersey's first bishop but the honor done him by his fellow delegates turned out to be a dubious one. His election was overturned by General Convention amidst a still-murky controversy over the relationship between the Episcopal and Methodist Episcopal Churches. This dramatic reversal of Ogden's episcopal fortunes, though many of the circumstances surrounding it remain mysterious, was also indicative of the internal tensions afflicting both churches.

Ogden was born in Newark, New Jersey, in 1744 to a family prominent in the affairs of that town and in the founding of its Anglican parish, Trinity Church. Ogden's father, Uzal, Sr., served as a warden at Trinity. Uzal, Jr., appears to have had little or no formal schooling. As far as we know he never attended college. However, he was taken under the wing of one of the most prominent colonial clergymen, Thomas Bradbury Chandler, rector of St. John's, Elizabethtown. Under Chandler's tutelage Ogden prepared for the priesthood and journeyed to England where he was ordained by the Bishop of London, Richard Terrick, on September 21, 1773. Returning to New Jersey he married Mary Gouverneur and, under Chandler's patronage, served as a Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) missionary in northern New Jersey. Most, though not all, of his efforts were directed toward Sussex County and he became the first rector of Christ Church, Newton. He also preached extensively in Morris and Bergen counties and even traveled into Pennsylvania.

When the Revolutionary War came, Ogden remained in New Jersey (one of only five Anglican priests who did so). He demonstrated considerable political skill in remaining in the good graces of both sides, not an easy feat, to be sure. He was just enough of a Tory to convince the SPG of his loyalty to the Crown, and just enough of a Whig to convince the rebels that he was really on their side. His deftness in negotiating this political minefield gave him a reputation for caginess which proved difficult to shake. During the war he ministered in New York City and Newark as well as Sussex County. After the war, on August 18, 1788, he accepted the post of rector of Trinity, Newark. His rectorship was a successful one. His parish prospered, he published
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numerous pamphlets and sermons, and he received a Doctor of Divinity degree from the College of New Jersey (Princeton) in 1798.1

New Jersey, in ecclesiastical matters as in so much else, was dependent on New York and Philadelphia. But by 1798 the diocese of New Jersey (which then covered the entire state) decided that it was time to have a bishop of its own. A special convention was held at Christ Church, New Brunswick, August 15–16, 1798, for the purpose of electing a bishop. There was no formal nominating process but it is clear from convention records that only two candidates were seriously considered, Ogden and Henry Waddell, rector of St. Michael’s, Trenton. This is indicated by the fact that neither of them voted. There were seven voting clergy delegates and 30 lay delegates present representing 22 parishes. To win, a candidate had to receive a majority in both the clergy and lay orders. The clergy voted as individuals but the lay order voted by parish. (The total of nine priests probably represented all the clergy resident in the diocese at that time. As can readily be seen from the numbers, many parishes had no resident priest, and most priests took services at more than one parish.) Ogden was elected on the first ballot. The vote was unanimous in the clergy order. In the lay order Ogden received 17 votes, Waddell three, and John Croes, rector of Trinity, Swedesborough, one. (One parish did not vote because its delegation was divided.) Ogden was the clear victor and the delegates issued the appropriate certification for approval by General Convention.

We whose names are underwritten, fully sensible how important it is that the Sacred Office of a Bishop should not be unworthily conferred, and firmly persuaded, that it is our duty to bear testimony, on this solemn occasion, without partiality or affection, do, in the presence of ALMIGHTY GOD, testify, that the REVEREND UZAL OGDEN, is not, so far as we are informed, justly liable to evil report, either for error in Religion, or for viciousness of life; and that we do not know or believe, there is any impediment or notable crime for which he ought not to be consecrated to that Holy office. We do moreover jointly and severally declare, that having personally known him for three years last past, we do, in our consciences, believe him to be of such sufficiency in good learning, such soundness in the faith, and of such virtuous and pure manners and godly conversation, that he is apt and meet to exercise the office of a Bishop, to the honor of GOD, and the edifying of his Church, and to be a wholesome example of the Flock of CHRIST.

Every delegate, excepting Odgen himself, signed it.2

Much to everyone’s astonishment the General Convention, meeting in Philadelphia in June 1799 (a year late because of the yellow fever epidemic in that city the previous year), would not confirm Ogden’s election. After
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postponing discussion of the matter for three days the General Convention passed the following resolution:

**WHEREAS** doubts have arisen in the minds of some members of the Convention, whether all the Priests who voted in the election of the Rev. Uzal Ogden, D.D. to the office of a Bishop, in the State of New-Jersey, were so qualified as to constitute them a majority of the resident and officiating Priests in the said State, according to the meaning of the Canon in this case made and provided: And whether, as in a matter of so great importance to the interests of religion, and the honor of our Church, it is not only necessary, that they who concur in recommending to an office so very sacred, should have a firm conviction of the fitness of the person they recommend, but that they should also be perfectly satisfied with respect to the regularity of every step which had been taken in the business.

**Resolved therefore,** That in the opinion of the House of Deputies, all proceedings respecting the Consecration of the Rev. Uzal Ogden, D.D. ought to be suspended until a future Convention in the State of New-Jersey shall declare their sense of the subject.3

The reason given was something of a smokescreen, as we shall see, since there is no evidence that any priest’s credentials were not in order in the diocese of New Jersey, or that any member of General Convention actually thought that was the case. A careful reading of the resolution suggests that there was more to this situation than first met the eye. The phrase “should have a firm conviction of the fitness of the person they recommend,” and the concluding sentence, “until a future Convention in the State of New-Jersey shall declare their sense of the subject,” suggest that the diocese of New Jersey was being asked not to investigate the bona fides of its priests, but rather those of its bishop-elect. In effect, General Convention told New Jersey to think it over and try again.

In consequence of this startling development a special convention of the diocese of New Jersey met on October 16–17, 1799, at St. Peter’s, Perth Amboy.4 For reasons not altogether clear, but probably owing to the suddenness of calling this convention, only four priests attended. The number of lay delegates was not given but fourteen parishes were represented. The delegates stuck by Ogden, though not by the overwhelming majority demonstrated in the first election. Three separate resolutions were voted upon. The first stated, “That all the Priests who voted in the election of the Rev. Uzal Ogden, D.D. to the office of a Bishop in the State of New-Jersey, were so qualified as to constitute them a majority of the resident and officiating Priests in the said State, according to the meaning of the Canon in such cases made and provided.” The vote was 2–1 in the clergy order and 9–3 in the lay order with one congregation divided and one abstaining. The second resolution stated, “That each of the Priests that voted in said election, and all the Priests who signed the certificate in favor of the Rev. Uzal Ogden, D.D. agreeably to the Canon of the General Convention of this Church, were at that time resident and officiating Priests of the Church in this State.” The vote was 2–1 in the clergy order and 10–3 in the lay order with one congregation divided. The final res-
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olution stated, “That the said election was regular in every respect.” Again the results were 2–1 in the clergy order and 10–3 in the lay order with one congregation divided.

Only four priests attended this convention. One of them was Ogden and he did not vote. The two who voted in favor of the resolutions, in effect voting for Ogden, were Andrew Fowler, rector of St. Peter’s, Spotswood, and Menzies Rayner, rector of St. John’s, Elizabethtown. The one who voted against the resolutions was Henry Waddell, the losing candidate.

An address was then prepared over the signature of Rayner, vice president of the convention (presiding in the absence of the president, John Croes, who was ill), “to the several standing committees of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the different States” reporting the results of the special convention and requesting confirmation of Ogden’s election so that “the Consecration of the Bishop-Elect should take place as soon as possible.” After a recitation of the circumstances of the original election and its rejection by General Convention, the New Jerseyans pleaded:

As we are thus fully persuaded of the regularity of the election of the Rev. Doctor Ogden to the Episcopal office; and as without a Bishop, the organization of our Church is extremely imperfect, as we do not enjoy the privilege of perfect government and discipline, the power of ordination, the great benefits of confirmation and Episcopal visitation, nor the right of representation in the House of Bishops, a sense of duty and a regard for the interests and prosperity of our Church, compel us to apply to you, Gentlemen, for the exercise, in favor of our Church, of the power vested in you by the following Canon passed by our last General Convention.

The matter now rested in the hands of the standing committees of the other dioceses. The canon referred to above provided that in years when General Convention did not meet a majority of the standing committees could consent to the consecration of a new bishop. The wording of this address was itself a resolution and Waddell again voted nay but it passed anyway.

No approval ever came from the other dioceses or from General Convention which took up the matter again in 1801. Ogden was never consecrated and the matter was quietly dropped. New Jersey did not elect another bishop until 1815. But what really happened? What was wrong with Ogden that his election was negated? This matter remains something of a mystery but there are several plausible reasons, as well as some that can be discounted, that give us the best answer we are likely to get.

One difficulty that plagued Ogden was a throat infirmity that made him periodically lose his voice. The inability to be heard in church is an obvious
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liability to a potential bishop, but weighed against this was the fact that his colleagues were aware of this affliction and did not consider it serious at the time of his election.

Another supposed defect was Ogden’s lack of the intellectual attainments worthy of a bishop, although only three people ever made this charge publicly. They were Waddell and two laymen, Robert Morris, a delegate from Christ Church, New Brunswick (this was the congregation whose vote was divided), and Joshua Wallace, a delegate from St. Mary’s, Burlington. Immediately after the special convention which upheld Ogden’s election these three sent a dissenting letter to the standing committees stating that while they had no quarrel with the opinion of Ogden as a man of high moral character, “it is a matter of doubt how far the ‘sufficiency in good learning’ of the Rev. candidate may enable him to perform the duties of his station, and to reflect that credit upon the Church which arises from conspicuous and acknowledged abilities.”13 The letter stated that “several of both orders” agreed with this assessment.14 But there is no evidence that any other clergyman except Waddell thought so. Neither Morris nor Wallace had attended the convention that elected Ogden, though both attended the second convention and voted against him.15 The thrust of this charge is suspect in any case since others considered Ogden well read and well educated. A Presbyterian minister who knew Ogden well stated that he

was a man of learning. He had an extensive library and was addicted to habits of study, observation, and reflection, the fruits of which were obvious in all his public demonstrations. . . . Dr. Ogden was well read in History, especially Ecclesiastical. . . . His patristic lore would have adorned any station, even at the top of the pyramid of the hierarchy of England.16

A more plausible explanation of Ogden’s troubles is the fact that he seems to have made some powerful enemies in the course of his long career over one issue in particular, his sympathy for the Methodists and his perceived softness on Anglican distinctiveness. William White, the Presiding Bishop, stated in his memoirs that Ogden’s flirtation with Methodism was the “real reason” his election was never ratified. In a startling admission White claimed that there had never been any question about voting credentials. “The truth is, that the gentleman elected was considered by his brethren generally, as being more attached to the doctrines and practices obtaining in some other churches, than to those of his own.”17 This charge warrants a further look.

It is an indisputable fact that Ogden was a close friend and supporter of Methodism. He was corresponding with Francis Asbury as early as April 1783. Asbury referred to Ogden as "a man of piety, who, I trust, will be of great service to the Methodist societies, and the cause of God in general." Soon thereafter Asbury was visiting Ogden, first in Newton and later in Newark. According to Asbury, Ogden even attended a Methodist Quarterly Meeting. It is worth pointing out that he was not the only Episcopal priest to do so. Others named by Asbury included Devereux Jarrett of Virginia, Charles Pettigrew of North Carolina, and Samuel Magaw of Philadelphia.\(^1\) There is also no question that Ogden came in for criticism for what some Episcopalians viewed as over-eager ecumenism. In 1784 the SPG asked Abraham Beach (of Christ Church, New Brunswick, later Trinity Church, New York City) to investigate charges that Ogden had become "Methodistical" and was using extemporaneous prayers in services. Beach reported that Ogden had "laid aside the Liturgy" for congregations unfamiliar with it and that he, Beach, had warned him that he would report him to the Society. This seems to have been an ineffective threat inasmuch as the American church was in the process of achieving its institutional independence and, in any event, Ogden had already quit the SPG.\(^2\) There is a certain irony in this development inasmuch as Ogden's mentor Thomas Bradbury Chandler had once praised him as not "enthusiastic."\(^3\)

Was Ogden a Methodist sympathizer—or even a Methodist himself? And, if so, what did that actually mean in the context of early American denominationalism? In attempting to investigate these questions several points should be kept in mind. For one, the lines of demarcation between Methodism and Anglicanism were still vague. In these infant years of both American Methodism and American Episcopalianism it was not at all clear whether Methodism was a subgroup within Anglicanism, a sister church in intercommunion, or a completely separate church. Even though American Methodism was never as identified with the Episcopal Church as English Methodism was with the Church of England, many American Methodists still considered themselves Anglicans/Episcopalian as well, the aforementioned Devereux Jarrett being a good example. Likewise, a significant minority of American Methodist clergy had already been ordained in the Church of England (e.g., Thomas Coke) or soon sought ordination in the American


Episcopal Church (e.g., Joseph Pilmore, Thomas Vasey, and William Duke), and did not think themselves any less Methodist for doing so. These labels, therefore, do not shed much light. (To confuse matters more, the term "Methodist" was also used to describe New Light Calvinist adherents of the Great Awakening as well as the followers of John Wesley.) For another, as has already been mentioned, Ogden had some distinguished Episcopal company in attending Methodist meetings.

Another factor that must be taken into consideration is the burgeoning division within the American Episcopal Church between those who believed that cooperation and some sort of identification with other Protestant denominations was a theological imperative as well as a practical necessity and those who emphasized Anglican distinctiveness, in particular "apostolic succession" and strict adherence to the Book of Common Prayer. This split has recently been described in such books as Allan C. Guelzo's For the Union of Evangelical Christendom: The Irony of the Reformed Episcopalians (1994) and Diana H. Butler's Standing Against the Whirlwind: Evangelical Episcopalians in Nineteenth Century America (1995). Both these works demonstrate that this difference in philosophy of churchmanship has been present in the Episcopal Church since its origin. Uzal Ogden may well have been one of its first casualties long before the open internecine warfare of the nineteenth century.

What of Ogden's actual beliefs? There would appear to be no doubt that he fell into the ecumenical evangelical Protestant camp and was a friend to Methodists and Methodism. Throughout his ministry he wrote encouraging letters to Methodist ministers. Seventeen of these letters written in 1782–83 were later published in issues of the Methodist Magazine in 1822 and 1823. Some were written to clergy, some to laypeople including women. Ogden was also instrumental in the conversion of Elias Crane of Newark who later became a leader of the Methodist congregation in Elizabeth, New Jersey. As Ogden said in a letter to Methodist preacher George Mair, "I do not regret the countenance I have shown the Methodists; nor shall I cease to be friendly towards them, as I am persuaded they are instrumental in advancing the
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divine glory, and the salvation of mankind.” Ogden never paid much attention to denominational distinctions and maintained that

a sincere and laborious servant of Christ, therefore, merits our esteem, though we cannot perfectly agree with him in opinion. This is a sufficient basis for my love to faithful ministers of every denomination. . . . And I am also most desirous that the servants of Christ, in preaching the gospel, would ever keep the great objects of their ministry in view, and be most zealous to win souls to Jesus, than to gain proselytes to their particular code of faith, or distinguished tenets.

If this bothered his Episcopal brethren in New Jersey there is slim evidence of it, i.e. the small number of delegates who voted against him. But if Bishop White is to be believed, others in the church doubted his loyalty to the tenets of Anglicanism, or at least their interpretation of those tenets.

And what of Bishop White’s role? The Bishop in his memoirs is clearly no booster of Ogden’s, though he coyly distanced himself from the election controversy. Robert Prichard in a 1982 article claims that White did not want Ogden in the House of Bishops because he was a “vocal Calvinist” and White was trying to downplay the issue of predestination which he thought was divisive. White was concerned about how this conflict of predestinarian versus Arminian had divided the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Methodists, and he did not want to see the same thing happen to the Episcopalians. According to Prichard, White prevailed upon his brother-in-law Robert Morris (the New Jersey delegate who voted against Ogden in the second election and questioned his intellectual attainments) to protest the election as a “stalling tactic.” This theory has several weaknesses, however. There is no evidence that Ogden was either strongly Calvinist or predestinarian. Indeed, his close association with the clearly Arminian Wesleyan Methodists would seem to indicate otherwise. Prichard admits that White’s details on the election are vague and that his own impression of White’s motives is speculative. White himself admitted to no overt role in the overturning of Ogden’s election. Prichard may have assumed that because Ogden later joined the Presbyterian Church he must have been a Calvinist but, as we shall see, that decision probably had more to do with the eccentricities of age and infirmity than any doctrinal reason.

A more plausible explanation of any anti-Ogden action taken by White may lie in an internal conflict taking place in the Methodist Church. That conflict, put bluntly, was whether the Methodists would affiliate with the Episcopal Church or be completely separate. White himself was on friendly

---

26 Ogden to George Mair, July 10, 1783 in *Methodist Magazine*, 6 (1823), 59–60.
27 Ogden to Joseph Lyon, December 13, 1782 in *Methodist Magazine*, 5 (1822), 384.
terms with Methodist leaders so that reason alone cannot have been the cause of Ogden's rejection. What appears to have happened is that White and Ogden ended up on opposite sides of the Methodist disagreement. White was a friend of Thomas Coke, the first bishop of the American Methodist Episcopal Church. In fact, it was White to whom Coke (an ordained priest in the Church of England) wrote in secret in 1791 suggesting a plan for Methodist–Episcopal reunion which would involve the reordaining of Methodist clergy who were not already in Anglican orders. Knowing that John Wesley did not want a separation of English Methodism from the Church of England, Coke invoked his name frequently in this letter, not knowing that Wesley had already died. "But what can be done for a re-union, which I much wish for, and to accomplish which Mr. Wesley, I have no doubt, would use his influence to the utmost?" White's response was encouraging. "I do not think [difficulties] insuperable, provided there be a conciliatory disposition on both sides. So far as I am concerned, I think that such a disposition exists." He reported Coke's letter in secret to the other Episcopal bishops, but largely because of Methodist coolness to the project it died an early and quiet death. As Coke had predicted, the other Methodist bishop, Francis Asbury, "whose influence is very capital, will not easily comply: I know he will be exceedingly averse to it." Indeed, Asbury's view, separation from the Episcopalians, won the day. White is silent on how this relates directly to the Ogden case, but if he perceived Ogden as too close to the separatist Asbury then that might suggest why he was not comfortable with Ogden's Methodist leanings. Asbury, for his part, felt that Episcopal clergy (with the exceptions of Jarrett, Pettigrew, Magaw and Ogden) had on past occasions treated him badly and that was one reason he had moved to a separatist position. Many questions remain unanswered about the peculiar case of Uzal Ogden. White alone could not have engineered his defeat. Who at General Convention supported or opposed his election? Undoubtedly, one member of the anti-Ogden forces was Abraham Beach whose warning to Ogden had come to naught. Beach, President of the House of Deputies at the 1801 General Convention, was "unquestionably influential" and Episcopal historian Walter Herbert Stowe suggested that Beach's role in this affair may have been considerable. And why was a patently false reason given to justify the over-
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turning of his election? The deliberate obfuscation suggests that even though Episcopal fault lines were already well established, it was felt necessary, at least by some, to cover them up.

The confusion continued into the next several generations of episcopal hierarchy. George Washington Doane, second bishop of New Jersey, in his correspondence with William Sprague, author of *Annals of the American Pulpit*, indicated that he did not even know why Ogden had been turned down. Sprague could only conclude that "this controversy seems to have been of a complicated nature, and to have formed the subject of very contradictory statements."³⁹

The bishop-elect never did become a bishop but controversy continued to surround him. In 1803 the Trinity Church vestry reluctantly requested his resignation on the grounds that he was too infirm to continue. His vocal powers had deteriorated to the point where he could not be heard in church and many members were "absenting themselves from divine service" or attending services of "some other denomination."⁴⁰ It is obvious from reading the minutes that the necessity of this action pained the vestry and they offered Ogden a generous retirement settlement, but he took it as a personal insult and refused to resign. In retaliation he claimed, contrary to all Episcopal practice, that he had an absolute veto over the actions of the vestry.⁴¹ The desperate Trinity vestry brought the matter before the diocese of New Jersey convention in June 1804. The convention "without entering into a discussion of the merits or causes thereof" of the dispute asked Ogden to resign and accept his pension. He refused.⁴² A special session of the convention met on December 13, 1804. Ogden read a statement in which he declared that he was withdrawing from the Protestant Episcopal Church but intended to continue as rector of Trinity Church as a priest of the Church of England!⁴³ The standing committee then suspended him subsequent to "the aid and consent of a bishop."⁴⁴ Bishop Benjamin Moore of New York who had already been requested by the Trinity vestry to monitor the situation (New Jersey still having no bishop) consented to the suspension and it was ratified by the diocese of New Jersey at the June 5–6, 1805, convention.⁴⁵

Then Ogden, the Methodist sympathizer, surprised everyone by joining the Presbyterian Church. Why he chose this particular denominational affiliation at this point in his life is also a mystery, but it is likely that personal friendships and the willingness of the Presbyterians to accept him played a
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large role. He was received as a minister in the Presbytery of New York on October 16, 1805.\textsuperscript{46} He had no regular Presbyterian charge, but served as an itinerant preacher while continuing to live in Newark. He died on November 4, 1822.\textsuperscript{47} According to friends, he never abandoned the Episcopal Church in his heart. He was reported to have replied to one questioner, "No, Sir, I have not sacrificed my former principles; I still hold to the thirty-nine Articles, which are the products of minds not varying in their views from most of those I now associate with."\textsuperscript{48}

Ogden's long career was marred by controversy and disappointment. He suffered two monumental rejections. We can never know whether he would have made a good bishop. But he was not a failure by any means. His most effective years were in the 1780s and 90s. He published twelve works, the most popular and influential being his two-volume \textit{Antidote to Deism} (1795), a response to Thomas Paine's \textit{Age of Reason} (1794).\textsuperscript{49} In the early years of his ministry he was an indefatigable missionary. During the American Revolution Ogden alone kept the Anglican Church alive in northern New Jersey. Nelson Burr, historian of the Anglican Church in New Jersey, states, "When the war ended, the mission of this 'Methodistical' parson was probably the most vital area of the Church in New Jersey."\textsuperscript{50} Ogden may not have become a bishop but, according to a contemporary, he "lived to a good old age, and died, honoured by Christians, and greatly respected by the whole community."\textsuperscript{51}

The story of Ogden's career remains fascinating and elusive. There are many things we do not know about this early Evangelical whose chance at a bishopric was snatched away from him, not once but twice. His ministry as well as his election warrant further study opening as they do a window onto the early relationship between the Methodist and Episcopal Churches as well as the internal quarrels affecting both. Although the Methodists chose not to remain in "apostolic succession" the two communions were nonetheless closely related and in significant ways needed each other to carve out their own identities.
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