

*Doct. Stephen Collins*  
*from his friend J. P. Moore*  
LETTERS

ON

THE EARLY HISTORY

OF THE

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA,

ADDRESSED TO

THE LATE REV. ROBERT M. LAIRD.

BY IRVING SPENCE, ESQ.

OF SNOWHILL, MARYLAND.

WITH A

SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

AND A SELECTION FROM

HIS RELIGIOUS WRITINGS.

---

PHILADELPHIA:

HENRY PERKINS, 134 CHESTNUT STREET.

PERKINS AND MARVIN, BOSTON.

1838.

Entered according to the act of Congress, in the year 1837,  
by HENRY PERKINS, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court  
of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

L. ASHMEAD AND CO., PRINTERS.

## P R E F A C E.

---

THIS little volume contains the principal articles of a religious character, found among the papers of their lamented author. The letters on the early churches in the Peninsula, were the last labours of his hand. They were undertaken at the request of the Presbytery of Lewes. They were left unfinished; most of them in his first draught, were, since his death, collected on scattered pieces of paper.

It is scarcely justice to his memory to publish them, as they are, undoubtedly, far from what they would have been, had he been spared to give them the finishing touch of his own pen. It is, however, the opinion of many competent judges, who have examined these papers, and their accompanying documents, that they embody a history of facts too important to be withheld from the Presbyterian church, from any delicacy of mere individual feeling; and, that although they may not be what they would have been, yet, that even in their present state, they are far from disreputable to their respect-

ed author. They are the result of investigations, in which he took a deep interest for some time immediately preceding his decease, and for which, few men would have been so competent. The individual addressed in these letters is the late Rev. Robert M. Laird.

The tract on being "Ashamed of Christ," it is said, was suggested by the following occurrence: The author at some early period of his christian course, was present at a prayer-meeting, and was called on by a pious elder to lead in prayer, which through diffidence he declined. That elder then gave out to be sung, the hymn of Dr. Watts, which begins with these lines:

"I'm not ashamed to own my Lord,  
Or to defend his cause."

This made so deep an impression on the mind of Mr. Spence, that he took the subject into very prayerful and personal consideration, the result of which was this excellent tract.

The piece entitled, "A Few Reminiscences," appears to have been suggested by the Convention of the signers of the Act and Testimony, at Pittsburgh, in May, 1835, and was probably written about that time. At that period, the author's own mind appears to have been so much employed on the subjects of

death and eternity, that he could not sympathise in the zeal of those conventionists for mere modes and forms.

The few poetical compositions at the end of the volume, were written on various occasions; at one time, for the purpose of giving pious verses to a favourite tune; at another to give vent to the author's own feelings on a particular subject; and at another, perhaps, for the gratification of a friend; but never with the most distant intention of his being known as a poet. One of them, with his own permission, was published anonymously in a religious periodical; another was transcribed by a friend, and published in a newspaper, without his knowledge; and the remainder were found amongst his manuscripts, perhaps unknown to any except his own family. As their publication is demanded by some, whose judgment is not unworthy of regard, they are added as a part of his religious writings.

# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
Life of the late Irving Spence, Esq., - - - -	13

## LETTER I.

Introductory remarks—the laws of provincial Virginia intolerant, &c. - - - - -	31
--	----

## LETTER II.

The laws of Maryland while under the proprietary, the Roman Catholic Lord Baltimore, tolerant, &c. - - -	38
--	----

## LETTER III.

The tolerance of Lord Baltimore's government proved from the history of the times—Government passed into the hands of William III., - - - - -	43
---	----

## LETTER IV.

Church of England established in Maryland—Various laws referred to—John Calvin and Servetus, - - - -	48
--	----

## LETTER V.

The intolerant laws now enacted in Maryland and those of Virginia compared with the laws of Geneva in the time of Calvin, - - - - -	53
---	----

## LETTER VI.

Government of Maryland, after the establishment of the church of England, in many things onerous to dissenters; yet less so than that of Virginia—Hence Presbyterians settled in Somerset and Worcester counties, Maryland, rather than in Accomack county, Virginia, - - - 58

## LETTER VII.

The Rev. Francis Makemie the first Presbyterian minister that visited this continent, - - - - - 64

## LETTER VIII.

Rev. Francis Makemie's travels, labours, persecutions, &c. - 69

## LETTER IX.

The Rev. Francis Makemie's zeal, disinterestedness, and liberality in the cause of the church, - - - - 75

## LETTER X.

Inquiry in regard to the time of the organization of the first Presbyterian churches in Somerset and Worcester counties, &c., - - - - - 79

## LETTER XI.

Presbyterian churches organized in the tract of country now Somerset and Worcester counties, before the commencement of the eighteenth century, &c., - - - - 84

## LETTER XII.

The same subject continued, - - - - - 91

## LETTER XIII.

Rehobeth the eldest of the churches, in what is now Somer-

	PAGE
set and Worcester counties—Rev. Mr. Makemie its first pastor, Rev. Mr. Henry its second, &c., - - -	95

## LETTER XIV.

Memoir of the Rev. David Purviance, - - -	100
---	-----

## LETTER XV.

Memoir of the Rev. Henry Blatchford, - - -	106
--	-----

## LETTER XVI.

Memoir of John P. Duffield, Esq., - - -	112
---	-----

## MISCELLANIES.

1. A few Reminiscences, - - -	125
2. Are you ashamed of Christ, &c., - - -	135

## POETRY.

1. O that it were with me as in months past, - - -	149
2. The prodigal son returning to his father, - - -	150
3. The King seen in his beauty, &c., - - -	152
4. Hymn, - - -	155
5. He showed them his hands and his feet.— <i>Luke</i> xxiv. 40.	157

## APPENDIX.

## A.

1. Will of William Anderson, Mr. Makemie's father-in-law,	163
2. Extracts from the early intolerant laws of Virginia,	166

## B.

1. Records of Accomack court relating to Rev. Francis Makemie, - - -	171
2. Rev. Francis Makemie's Will, - - -	172



C.

1. Will of Mrs. Anne Holden, Mr. Makemie's daughter, - 178
2. Extracts from the Will of the Rev. John Henry, - - 179
3. Extract from the Will of the Rev. John Hampton, - 179

D.

- Court records of Rev. George McNish, and Rev. John Hampton in regard to their license to preach the gospel, - - 181

E.

1. Letter from George Handy, Esq. on the church of Monokin, - - - - - 190
2. Letter from Rev. Abrm. De Witt, on the church at Lewes, &c. - - - - - 194

MEMOIR  
OF  
IRVING SPENCE, ESQ.



A  
SKETCH OF THE LIFE  
OF THE  
LATE IRVING SPENCE, ESQ.

---

ON perusing a book, the reader, as if not fully satisfied with the knowledge of what is written, almost instinctively inquires, "who writes?" To gratify this reasonable curiosity in the reader, as well as to profit him by the example of one, who, although dead, yet speaketh, is the object of this brief sketch.

IRVING SPENCE, Esq., was born November 19th, 1799, near Snowhill, on the Eastern shore of Maryland, of pious and highly respectable parents. His great-grandfather, Adam Spence, of whom he speaks in the tenth letter of the present volume, as having probably affixed his name to the solemn league and covenant, emigrated from Scotland, some time about the year 1680, and settled at, or near the place, where Snowhill now stands. He was a merchant, and became a ruling elder in the church at Snowhill, perhaps immediately on its organization by the Rev.

Francis Mackensie, some time between 1680 and 1690. He was married soon after his arrival in this country. He reared a family of five children, one son and four daughters. The son's name was Adam, who also became a merchant, and a member of the Presbyterian church. He was twice married. His second marriage was with a Miss Irving, whose maiden name was made the christian name of her grandson, the subject of this sketch. By this marriage he had eight children, Adam, John and George, Margaret, Elizabeth, Anna, Mary, and Sarah.—George, the father of Mr. Irving Spence, was twice married. His first wife was Andasia Robins, an aunt of the late Judge Robins of Worcester county, Maryland. His second wife was Nancy Purnell. The children by his first marriage were, Adam, deceased. Thomas, the present Dr. Thomas R. P. Spence of Snowhill. Elizabeth and Andasia, both deceased. The children by the second marriage were, Lemuel, the present Register of the county of Worcester; John, one of the present Senators in Congress from the State of Maryland; James, deceased; Ara, now Chief Justice of the Fourth Judicial District of Maryland; William and George, both deceased; and Irving, the subject of this brief notice, also deceased. The latter, was the youngest of the family, and was born just before his father's death, and after his will had been executed, which precluded him from any portion in his father's estate. During his childhood he was sickly. This confined him at home, and together with the remote situation

of his mother, who resided near the sea shore, east of Snowhill, deprived him of the advantages of a school, during his early childhood. Yet, unpropitious as were his circumstances, with a little occasional attention from his mother, he learned to read correctly, at the early age of five or six years. Being the youngest child, and doomed by his very delicate health, to the fire-side, so soon as he learned to read he made books the principal amusement of his childhood, until the love of reading became his ruling passion. With as little attention from his mother, he also acquired the art of penmanship, so as to write not only a legible, but an elegant hand. Subsequently he was put to school, under the tuition of Mr. Purnell F. Smith, now the Rev. Purnell F. Smith, of Georgetown Cross Roads, Kent county, Maryland; by whose instructions Mr. Spence considered himself much benefited, and for whom, throughout life, he cultivated the sentiments of gratitude and esteem. At about twelve years of age, he was sent to Buckingham Academy, under the guardianship of his brother John, where he remained for some time under the tuition of a Mr. Hopkins. Here he prosecuted with ardour and almost unprecedented success, the study of the Latin and Greek languages. He was then removed to the academy at Snowhill, where he terminated his academical studies at the age of seventeen years. Immediately afterwards, he commenced the study of the law, under the late Judge Robins, of his native county, and continued under the legal instructions of that eminent gentleman,

until duly qualified for the practice of the profession. In 1820 he was admitted to the bar, at Snowhill, and subsequently at Princess Anne, the seat of justice for Somerset county in the same State. In 1822, he was married to Miss Margaret, second daughter of the honourable gentleman under whose superintendence we have just said he prosecuted his legal studies. In the same year, and for some years subsequent, he was elected a delegate to the Legislature of the State. In 1826, he was appointed by the electoral college to the Senate, for six years. In this honourable body, he took his seat, and soon became, and continued to be, throughout the whole term, one of its most useful and influential members. For his talents, fairness, candour, and general excellence of character, he was so highly esteemed, that not unfrequently his opinions were consulted, and his counsels followed, by the party opposed to him in general politics. His political friends would gladly have continued him in public life, and the people would have elevated him to the highest office within their gift, but his attachment to books, his habits of sedentary life, and domestic retirement, and especially those high motives of religion, which none but the christian can duly appreciate, rendered him altogether averse to public life, and to the acceptance of any offices of honour farther than a regard to the wishes of his friends, and sense of duty to the people who loved and respected him, rendered it in his judgment indispensable.

He continued throughout life, to pursue the prac-

tice of the law, although it was a profession in which he never delighted. From the commencement of his professional career, he had a fair share of practice, although at that time, there were several men of eminence at the same bar. In the course of a few years afterwards, when two of these gentlemen had been elevated to the bench, and the place of one of them vacated by death, he became the senior practitioner in the county where he lived, and with all his aversion to the business, and the difficulty with which his services could be obtained, he was much sought after, especially in all important cases. He not only stood first in the county courts where he ordinarily practised, but was also eminent in the highest courts in the State, to which he was almost always called, when appeals were taken on important cases, in the counties where he practised.

As a practical and experimental agriculturist, he was successful, not only in the culture of his own lands, but also in diffusing the spirit of agricultural improvement in his immediate neighbourhood, and throughout his own, and some of the neighbouring counties.

Mr. Spence was of a middle stature; his hair black; his eyes dark and penetrating; and when warm in debate, his countenance highly animated. His natural capabilities were of a very high order. To a sound and discriminating judgment, he united strong conception and glowing imagination, chastened by a fine taste. And, what is rarely possessed by a mind endowed with a large portion of these qua-



lities, his was a memory of the most unrivalled tenacity. The writer of this sketch has been recently informed by two highly respectable gentlemen, formerly schoolmates with Mr. Spence, that when at school, he has been known to take a page in a Latin grammar, containing little else but a succession of names, wholly unconnected in sense, as in the rules and exceptions for the gender of nouns, and after having read it over once, and that the first time, to lay down the book, and repeat the whole without the least mistake; and that with infinite ease, in a very few minutes, he could prepare to recite his lessons, better than any other one in the class could, after the most laborious and assiduous study. The fact is, that during his whole life, he almost literally committed to memory every book that he read. And his reading too, was very extensive, in Law, Theology, History, Agriculture and Politics. His Belles-lettres reading was almost boundless. Endued with an exquisite taste, he caught, not only the spirit, but the very ideas and the precise language of the best English poets. His literary friends have been perfectly astonished at the accuracy with which, to the spirit, word, and letter, he could repeat the poetical works of Goldsmith, Cowper, Gray, Pope, Moore, Byron, Shakspeare, and others, whilst the religious amongst them, have been equally delighted, by the pious fervour, with which he was wont to quote the sacred poetry of Dr. Watts, whom he regarded as the best of English hymnologists. Possessing a memory that never let loose its grasp on knowledge, an industry in

reading that never wearied, and withal a judgment exquisitely discriminating, his learning in law, theology and history, especially ecclesiastical history, was such, as would have been highly respectable for a man who had devoted his whole life to any one of those branches. In his pleadings at the bar, his knowledge of law and facts was so perfect, as sometimes to confound the opposite counsel, and to astonish the court, whilst he himself appeared wholly unconscious of his own superiority. But as a lawyer, he knew nothing of those deceptive artifices, and subterfuges from the face of truth and honesty, which have sometimes dishonoured the name of the legal profession. On the contrary, he was as conscientious in the cause of veracity and equity, in the management of a case before a court, as he was in any other business transaction in life. In his very soul, he despised duplicity, meanness, or dishonourable dealing of any kind. In his practice, he declined undertaking causes which he knew to be bad, and when in any instance he was deceived by his client into the advocacy of a bad case, he just made a fair representation of law and facts relating to the subject, and then left it, without any colouring of falsehood, or varnish of sophistry, to the decision of the constituted arbiters. He would not impair his own moral integrity, nor violate the decisions of his conscience, to gain an unrighteous cause for any man.

His social qualities were such as to render him universally beloved. He could accommodate himself to society of the highest or the humblest order of

intellect, or cultivation, and never failed to render himself pleasant and interesting. In the true sense of the Scripture, he became all things to all men.

He was a man of benevolence and philanthropy; but in the distribution of his charities, he was prudent and unostentatious. In this he appeared not to have let his left hand know what his right hand did. For some time previous, up to the time of his death, he contributed one hundred and fifty dollars a year to be divided equally between two feeble congregations, within the bounds of his own presbytery, to aid them in supporting a minister of the gospel. This benefaction he committed to the agency of the late Rev. Robert M. Laird, then minister at Princess Anne, to be distributed to those congregations, with a strict injunction, not to reveal the donor. This fact in his history was not understood, until it accidentally transpired since his decease. No doubt many other of his benefactions will never be known, except by those immediately benefited by them, until the revelations of the great day.

From a child, he was of a serious, inquiring, and contemplative mind, early evinced a strong interest in religious things, and read all the books on the subject of religion, that could be found within his reach. He was undoubtedly the child of many prayers. About the age of seventeen years, some twelve months after his mother's death, he became a member in full standing in the Presbyterian church at Snowhill. From that time until 1829, about thirteen years, he continued a pious and exemplary pri-

vate member of that church. Then he was elected and ordained in it a ruling elder, the office of which he valued, and magnified throughout his whole subsequent life. He delighted to visit the sick, and to pour the balm of consolation into wounded spirits; and also, in case of the absence of the pastor, instead of permitting the Sabbaths to pass away in silence, imitating the examples of the elders of the primitive churches he scarcely ever failed, at the request of his brethren of the eldership, to lift his voice in the public congregation, and warn sinners to escape from the wrath to come, and to exhort saints to the discharge of their duty. These performances were always able, and most acceptable and edifying to the people. He is said to have possessed extraordinary gifts in prayer, which, together with the character for unblemished morals and unaffected piety, which he sustained, rendered the part he took in prayer-meetings delightful to the pious, and affecting to all present. And whilst in his private conversation and public exhortations, he was instructive to christians of cultivated minds, he could also charm the uneducated believer, with his most child-like simplicity, on the subject of practical and experimental piety. The current of his devotion became deeper and stronger, as he advanced in life. And with the growth of his religion, his interest in all that pertains to the church of God on earth, became more and more lively. Ardently did he cultivate an acquaintance with the various systems of theological philosophy, and ecclesiastical polity, until

his knowledge of theology as a system, and especially of ecclesiastical history and church government, was such as would have been reputable in a professor of any one of those departments. So great was his interest in the advancement of religion and the prosperity of the church, that for some years before his death, he was deliberating whether it was not his duty, as a servant of the great Master, to withdraw from all secular pursuits, and to devote himself exclusively to the work of the christian ministry. Two difficulties, however, always met him, after he began to turn his face towards the ministry. One was, his almost invincible dislike to bodily exertion, and the other was, his feeble health. He always found himself physically disqualified for the great work to which his spirit aspired. It is believed, however, that he lived almost to the last, in hope that Providence would ultimately open the door before him, by giving him better health, and grace to overcome his inactive habits. This hope was never realized.

As a ruling elder, he sometimes attended the judicatories of the church, and on every occasion, by his capability and zeal, he was an influential and useful member. His views on theology were extensive and deep, yet clear. He considered the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian church, as one of the best human exhibitions of Scripture truth ever made, but was too just in his views, and too catholic in his spirit and feelings, to unchurch all who might differ from him on the peculiarly moot points of phi-

losophy, by which that truth may be explained. He believed that an agreement in doctrine, so far as to adopt the statements in the very language of the Confession of Faith, is as much as can reasonably be expected in a body containing some two or three thousand ministers, and some five or six times that number of ruling elders, educated in different modes of thinking, in different systems of philosophy, and influenced by different local feelings and prejudices. Under this conviction, he frowned equally on those who would disturb the church by unmeaning or pernicious innovations, and those who would rend her sacred body by their contentions for stereotype technicalities and party shibboleths.

Mr. Spence's peculiar condition in his boyhood, as has been already noticed, subjected him to confinement at that very period of life when bodily action is most necessary for the invigoration of the human frame. This confinement naturally induced early sedentary habits, which, while they contributed vastly to his very great amount of reading, yet created that habitual disrelish for bodily exertion, which proved the greatest misfortune of his life, and prepared him to become the victim of a premature grave. But for this, he would doubtless have been one of the most distinguished men of the present age. For a long time he felt his health to be on the decline, until eventually his sight almost utterly failed him. He was advised by his physicians to submit to bodily exercise, and to relinquish his incessant reading of books. He did partially submit himself to this regi-

men, but his aversion to bodily exercise was so invincible, and his passion for reading so strong, as not to be wholly subdued by any resolutions which he could form. But by his very partial submission to the remedies prescribed, his health was in a good degree recovered, and his sight restored. He never had much zest for the practice of his profession, or for the duties of political life; but after this severe visitation, he endeavoured wholly to withdraw from the scenes connected with these pursuits, and to make the cultivation of personal piety, and usefulness in the cause of his Saviour, the exclusive objects of his life. After this, he wholly withdrew from all political contest; but his previous engagements in litigations not then decided, and the importunity of clients who knew the value of his services, rendered his total abandonment of the bar almost impossible. But after this, he became more increasedly devoted to the cause of religion, and more thoroughly dead to the world. More than ever before, he felt himself to be a stranger and a pilgrim on the earth, sighed for purer air and brighter skies, and longed to be with Christ. This disrelish for the world could have been nothing else, but that crucifixion to the things of time, which the christian feels, when by faith, he surveys the glory of the Redeemer's kingdom, and recognises the heavenly felicities not only as *his*, but also near at hand. It could not have been an austere misanthropy; for never was man more delighted in the society of his family, or more cheered by the presence of his friends than he. It could

not have been the repinings of a disappointed ambition, for in the courts where he practised, his legal standing was all that could gratify ambition, and his political estimation among the people, all that would have secured him the highest honours they could bestow. Nor could it have been the vexation of pecuniary embarrassment, for his earthly possessions were not only unincumbered, but abundant. His indifference to the honours and the possessions of the present state, must then undoubtedly have been, because he was crucified to the world, and the world to him. And the nearer he approached the termination of his earthly pilgrimage, the more this crucifixion became apparent. During the session of the court, in the November preceding his death, he remarked, that he "never expected to plead another cause in a court of civil law," and declaring himself to be weary of the world, he remarked to one of his family, "If my house were in order, I would rather depart and be with Christ." Early in the month following, the illness commenced which eventuated in his dissolution. He endured the painful trial with patience, composure and resignation. He was fully aware from the beginning of the attack, that he could never recover, and expressed his willingness to die. One of his special fears was, that he was too anxious to escape from his post of trial and suffering in this world, before his Father in heaven had called him hence. To the last, his faith remained strong, and his hopes bright. Knowing himself to be justified by faith, he had peace with God. In this sweet



peace, he patiently awaited the call of his God. On the morning of the 11th January, 1836, the messenger death delivered the call, which summoned him to spend the noon of that day in his Father's presence. He departed without a murmur or a groan, to be with Christ, and to sit down with him at his table.

Thus terminated the earthly existence of one, who possessed all the natural elements of mental greatness, but who never enjoyed that celebrity—that notoriety afar off, which his talents, not to say his moral worth, justly merited, and which men of powers far inferior to his, not unfrequently enjoy. That he was known—honourably and affectionately known, in the neighbourhood where he resided, in the counties in which he practised law, and in no mean degree, in the superior courts of his native State, and in her legislative halls, where his talents were an ornament—is certainly true; but still *in comparison with his endowments*, his character as an intellectual man was in a great degree unknown. So indeed it was, because he shunned notoriety and sought retirement. But why were these endowments made by him who does nothing in vain, to be spent in the shades of retirement, when they might have adorned and blessed a nation or a world? Why a mind like his should have been united to a tenement of clay so frail; why it should have been cast upon a spot of earth almost insulated from all the world; and why its energies should have been confined to so limited a sphere, while far humbler minds rise to eminence,

and load almost every breeze of heaven with the burden of their fame, is one of the inscrutable things in the providence of Him whose ways are not as ours ; yet this we do know, that heaven can find appropriate exercise for the noblest powers. No human endowments can certainly be too excellent for the service of Him, who makes angels that excel in strength, his ministers. And although He makes neither health, nor locality, nor worldly acquisition, the condition of his grace, yet for aught that we can tell, in his hands whose dark paths are in the deep waters, those circumstances in life, that we are wont to call unfortunate, may be the very parts in the plan of mercy, which he chooses to employ and honour, in weaning immortal spirits from the fading splendours of this world, to crown them with the imperishable glories of the next.

Mr. Spence wisely did what is done by few indeed of the great and the wise of this world. He preferred the things that are unseen, to the things that are seen. Whatever celebrity he might have obtained as a man of taste and genius, or as a scholar of varied and liberal learning ; whatever wealth he might have acquired, as a lawyer of extensive erudition and practical eminence ; and whatever fame he might have secured, as a statesman of large and enlightened views and unimpeachable integrity—all this, he was willing to sacrifice, and to count but loss, that he might win Christ and be found in him.

Though dead he yet speaks to the living. His

example admonishes the ambitious, that in his estimation the service of the meek and lowly Jesus is more desirable than the renown of courts and senates, and, that no powers of mind are too great, no stores of learning too rich, and no gems of genius too brilliant, to be cast down at the foot of the cross.

LETTERS  
ON  
THE EARLY HISTORY  
OF  
THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES  
ON  
THE PENINSULA,  
ADDRESSED TO THE  
LATE REV. ROBERT M. LAIRD.



## LETTER I.

Introductory remarks.—The writer's object stated.—None but the pious entertain right notions of the church.—God's moral perfections best seen in the church.—The condition of the Peninsula comprehending Somerset and Worcester counties in Maryland, and Accomack county, Virginia, at the time of its early settlement, peculiar in regard to liberty of conscience.—The government of Virginia founded by James I., and partook of his intolerant character.—This intolerance increased by acts of the provincial legislature.—Most intolerant towards Puritans and Quakers.—Puritan missionaries from Massachusetts driven away.—Mr. Jefferson's mistake in accusing American Presbyterians of persecution.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—

I have too long delayed the performance of my promise, to furnish you with such of the facts in my possession, in relation to the first Presbyterian churches organized on this peninsula, as I considered interesting. Other engagements and ill health have heretofore interfered with my purpose; but the very agreeable task is at length undertaken. I intend to write familiar letters to a friend;—be not surprised, then, when you find, that I neither “pinch the plaits of my phraseology, nor place my patches and feathers,” to suit the taste of any one but yourself. My object will be to put you in the possession of a mass of facts, in relation to this subject, and you must suffer me to do this in my own way. Should my manner be wild, or desultory, or the matter be irrelevant, or unimportant, in your judgment, or should I appear to slight some subjects, and to give

undue prominence to others ; or should I repeat the same thing over and over again ; you will, I doubt not, bear with me. The web will be yours after I shall have woven it : but let me select its materials, and arrange its colours.

To one who knows nothing of the *stupendous* agency, exerted by the church of God in this fallen world, my present employment may seem a very humble one ; but you and I view it differently. That none save those

“———whose souls are lighted,  
With wisdom from on high,”

can form any just notion of the church of Jesus Christ, I am as firmly persuaded as of any kindred truth ; and that preacher who, by the grace of God, communicates a right knowledge of the character of the church to a fellow being, is made the instrument of saving a soul alive. No man hath seen God at any time, or can see him and live ; but in his church he makes a most glorious revelation of himself, yet so veiled, that a

“——— mortal eye *can* bear the sight.”

All the works of his hands show his wisdom, his power, his goodness ;—but they make no disclosure of his holiness, his majesty, his inflexible justice, or his purposes of mercy to a fallen and rebellious race. In the church, as in a grand panorama, the believer can see the whole of that “new and living way” in which God can be just, and yet justify the ungodly. The bloom of Eden, blasted by the first transgres-

sion; Mount Sinai arrayed in terrors; Mount Calvary clothed in wonders—and all the glories of redemption, are exhibited in the church. Truly “the king’s daughter is all glorious within; her raiment is of wrought gold.” What is the richest and most extended empire that burthens the earth, when compared with the smallest branch of the Redeemer’s kingdom? The glories of the Godhead are partially radiated upon every believer,—the church collects all the rays which shine upon the whole

“—— sacramental host of God’s elect.”

I write about a kingdom, which God planted, after it had been purchased by the blood of his own Son: and I am not ashamed of my employment. But enough of this.

The condition of that part of the peninsula, now composing Somerset and Worcester counties in Maryland, and Accomack county, in Virginia, was in some respects peculiar, as the interests of religion were regarded, for many years after the country had been settled by Europeans.

Virginia was a royal colony whose form of government was singularly constructed. You are already acquainted with the disastrous failure of the attempt to settle that part of this continent, made by Sir Walter Raleigh, in virtue of letters patent, granted to him for that purpose by Queen Elizabeth. It was after that bold projector and distinguished man had been convicted of high treason by a perversion of law, and in despite of justice, and had suffered death upon the scaffold, that Virginia was perma-



nently peopled, and that form of government organized, which continued to exist, with some modifications, until the war of the Revolution. As to its creation and character, it is enough for our purpose to say, that James the First of England founded it by three several charters granted to a company:—the first bore date, April 10, 1606; the second, May 23, 1609; the third, March 12, 1611–12. But for the cowardice of that Prince, he would have been a despot; and he breathed into those instruments all that blind and unrelenting bigotry for which he was remarkable, from the time of his accession to the throne of England until his death. It is hard to determine, whether he discovered greater dislike to the professors of that faith in which his murdered mother died, or to the church in which he was reared, and of which he was a hypocritical member, until, by the death of Elizabeth, he succeeded to the crown of England. All apostates resemble each other in one thing: their dislike to the society from which they have fallen, rarely knows mitigation or end. This remark applies with equal propriety, to Lucifer, Julian, and England's James I. From the character and feelings of the man, we might expect just such a form of government as that of colonial Virginia. It bore his image; and the manner of its administration proves, that his love of absolute power; his lust for honour, wealth, territory; and his bitter and intolerant spirit, pervaded all its ramifications. It is true that those charters granted by King James, were afterwards annulled by judgment of the Court

of King's Bench;—but the government had received its tone, and its principles remained unchanged.

At the period to which this letter relates, the persecution of all classes of English nonconformists, was more vindictive than it had been at any time since the first year of the reign of Elizabeth; and all those statutes, passed for that purpose, during her reign, and that of her successor, James, and of his son Charles, not only extended to Virginia, but were enforced there with greater rigour than in the parent country itself. All that, however, was not enough to satisfy those in power; and by Provincial legislation further pains and penalties were prescribed for those, who would not conform to the established church.\* *Puritans* and *Quakers*, were more obnoxious to the government of Virginia, than nonconformists of any other name. You are familiar with the fact, that the Puritan missionaries from Massachusetts, who visited that province at the earnest request of a portion of the people, were not only “despitefully used, and evil entreated,” but actually driven away. It is equally true, that many Puritan families, who had settled there, were compelled by cruel persecution, to leave the colony. Understand me, I beg you, when the word *Puritan* is used here, that no term of reproach is intended;—so far from that, I believe those so named in derision, have included in their number, some of the holiest men, who have lived since the days of the Apostles.

\* See some of those Acts in Appendix A.

Speaking of names, reminds me of a strange mistake into which Mr. Jefferson has fallen in his "Notes on Virginia." I quote the passage, not only to call your attention to the error, but because it corroborates, in other respects, my own statements. The work was written in 1781-2. He says:—"The first settlers in this country [Virginia,] were emigrants from England, of the English church, just at a point of time when it was flushed with a complete victory over the religious of all other persuasions. Possessed, as they became, with the powers of making, administering, and executing the laws, they showed equal intolerance in this country [i. e. Virginia,] with their *Presbyterian* brethren, who had emigrated to the northern government. The poor Quakers were flying from persecution in England. They cast their eyes on these new countries, as asylums of civil and religious freedom: but they found them free only for the reigning sect." When did *Presbyterians* in America, ever persecute any man on account of his religious faith? I have neither heard, nor read of any such persecution. But it is apparent, that he refers to the Independents, or Congregationalists, of New England. You may tell me, that the man who would charge upon the inspired Psalmist the exclamation: "Lord! what have I done that the wicked should praise me," might very readily confound the names *Presbyterian* and *Independent*. That will not remove the difficulty; for his works prove, that he laboured more sedulously to investigate the peculiarities of religious creeds, and

to detect faults in the lives and characters of their professors, than to become familiarly acquainted with the Bible. It is also untrue, that no American province offered to the "poor Quakers" an asylum. There was one splendid exception, to which I shall call your attention hereafter.

## LETTER II.

The writer's esteem for Mr. Jefferson, although he considers him erroneous in matters of religion.—The government of Maryland under the original proprietary, the Catholic Lord Baltimore, was tolerant—So that south of the line which separated Maryland from Virginia, was Protestant persecution, and north of it, Catholic toleration.—Even Lord Baltimore himself, when on his travels in Virginia, was on one occasion required to take the oath of allegiance and supremacy.—The early settlers of Maryland, as those of New England, were driven from Europe by persecution.—Maryland the first government in Christendom, which made religious toleration a corner-stone.—Remained tolerant until it passed from a Roman Catholic, to the Protestant Prince of Orange.—The Bishop of Salisbury is thought to have been favourable to intolerant enactments.

REVEREND SIR,—

Because of the manner in which Mr. Jefferson is mentioned in my last letter, it may be necessary for me to say, that I have always regarded him as a very great man; but I believe he entertained many of those opinions which deluged “unbaptized France” in blood; and that he was a bitter enemy to the religion of the Bible. I have no unkind feeling to any one of God's creatures; but no name, however distinguished, will induce me to suppress what I consider pertinent truth.

Two governments could not be more unlike, as to religious toleration, than were those of Virginia and Maryland during their colonial existence. The charter of Maryland, was granted by Charles I., on the 20th day of June, 1632, to Cæcilius, Lord Baron of Baltimore. He had just succeeded to the

title and estate of his father, George, the first Lord Baltimore, to whom the charter had been promised, but who died before it passed the seals of office. But it was, no doubt, fashioned, so far as it affected the rights of conscience, by the wishes of that amiable and tolerant nobleman. The first lord proprietary and his successors, carried out the purposes of their benevolent ancestor, and whilst their chartered rights were undisturbed, the inhabitants of Maryland were as carefully protected in worshipping God according to the dictates of conscience, as they are at this time. A man might live in peace, whether Jew, Mohammedan, or Pagan; whether atheist, deist, or polytheist; provided he neither molested his neighbour, nor endangered the public morals. Religious opinions wrought no civil disqualification; and no one could be vexed with religious tests, or legally taxed to support any church of any name. Never was any government more indulgent to persons of all religious persuasions, than was that of Maryland, whilst the *Roman Catholic* Lords Barons of Baltimore controlled it; and they had powers, more ample in fact, as to the matter under consideration, than could have been exercised by the first James or his successor, in the kingdom of Great Britain. Much is said, and no doubt with truth, about the persecutions by Roman Catholics, because of what they consider heresies. I am no Roman Catholic,—I doubt whether there be older Presbyterian blood in America, than flows in my veins at this moment;—but let us do justice.

You will now understand something of that peculiarity of condition of this peninsula in regard to religious liberty, for many years after its first settlement, which is referred to in my former letter. Consider the great difference between the charters of Maryland and Virginia in relation to religious freedom; and the widely different tempers with which their governments were administered, and you will then see, that although the lines which separated their peninsular territory was "a right line," neither more visible nor tangible than a parallel of latitude; yet on the north of that line, an individual could rely on all the mildness and tolerance of the charter of Maryland, and the government which it created;—whilst on the south of it he was confronted, not only by all the terrors to nonconformists, conjured up by every British statute at that time in force in England, but also by pains and penalties created by kindred laws of Virginia fabrication, equally or more cruel. On the one side of that line, a man might worship God according to the dictates of his conscience—on the other, he must rely upon the indemnity of the government to protect him at the judgment-seat of Christ, or be made to endure severe pains and pay heavy penalties. When Cæcilius, the second Lord Baltimore, visited the colony of Virginia, he was required, and without lawful authority, it is believed, to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy; which, of course, he declined, and the matter was submitted to the king in council. This fact is mentioned for the purpose of showing to what ex-

tremes the loyalty and christian charity of colonial Virginia would travel, to detect and punish opinions, heretical in the estimation of the government, but which could affect the eternal interests of none but the heretic himself.

The stinted charities of young Virginia were without excuse. Her first settlers did not fly from Europe for conscience sake; on the contrary, they migrated for the speedy acquisition of great wealth. Persecution under the statutes of Elizabeth for non-conformity to the articles of faith, and manner of worship, which they established, drove the Puritan pilgrims in their ship *May-flower* from Southampton to Plymouth; and causes similar to those propelled from their native land, the first settlers of Maryland.

You know that I am a native of Maryland. Let me then candidly confess, that after looking over so much of this letter as is already written, I feel unwilling to conclude it without boasting a little. You must be patient. Do you inquire of what I boast? You shall hear, or to speak perhaps more properly, you shall read.

The government of Maryland was one of the first organized in Christendom, which made religious toleration a corner-stone. From its institution until the expulsion of the unfortunate James II. from the British throne, indeed until his Protestant successor laid violent hands upon it, the principle was not only recognised, but carried out in practice, that "error of opinion [in religion] may be tolerated while rea-



son is left free to combat it." It is true, that during the Protectorate, prelacy and the papacy as to the provinces were interfered with by the legislation of the parent country; but I have seen no evidence, and believe that none exists, that the enactment referred to, was enforced in Maryland. It is also true, that the laws of the province prescribed punishments for offences against public morals, and so ought the criminal code of every christian commonwealth; but until the sceptre of England passed from a Roman Catholic to the Protestant Prince of Orange, Maryland was as tolerant as to the creeds and religious observances of individuals, as is at this time any State in our Federal Union. The national debt of England, and her interference with the rights of conscience of her subjects residing in this then province, were commenced at the same time. It is said that the good Bishop of Salisbury, with a view to the security of the throne of King William, and of a Protestant succession, caused the imposition of the former burthen under which the nation still groans; and perhaps his anxiety for the permanent establishment of his own church throughout the British dominions, made him not unfriendly to the laying on of the other, from which we were at length freed by the revolutionary sword.

## LETTER III.

The futility of attempting to regulate the faith of men by legal enactments.—The purpose of Lord Baltimore that his government should be tolerant, proved by an appeal to the history of the province of Maryland.—The first settlement of Maryland made by about two hundred emigrants from England, mostly Catholics, many of them gentlemen of fortune, A. D. 1634.—The form of oath required by the lord proprietary of his governors.—Mr. M'Mahon's History of Maryland referred to, and one of his opinions quoted with approbation.—The preamble of an enactment of the provincial legislature of Maryland, 1649, admired.—Jealousies excited against the second lord proprietary under the reign of Charles II., and requests made for the establishment of the church of England in Maryland.—In 1692 the province submitted to the immediate government of William III.—The consequences of this submission unhappy to religion.

REVEREND SIR,—

Governors and other magistrates can compel those under their authority to conform their words and actions to the written law, or punish them, if disobedient to it: but how rarely has the exercise of so much power satisfied them! How frequently and fruitlessly have they attempted to visit the hearts of others for the purpose of modelling their religious faith according to a pattern of their own fashioning! How strange it is, and how clearly it proves that man is a fallen being! It is the same mischievous principle which hurled Satan, like lightning, from heaven, and which not only lives but reigns in almost every natural heart.

Do not misunderstand, however, my opinion in relation to religious tests. I am, upon that subject,

avowedly unfashionable, for there is a certain class of them which I admire. None was prescribed in Maryland whilst governed by Roman Catholics, nor has been since the adoption of the existing constitution of the State, which I do not entirely approve; and as it is "german to the matter," I will now give you a portion of their history.

The fixed purpose of the first lord proprietary, that his government should be "one which tolerated all christian churches, and established none," is apparent from the history of the province from the time of its settlement. That settlement was made by emigrants from England, about two hundred in number, principally Roman Catholics, many of whom are said to have been gentlemen of family and fortune, who landed on the 27th day of March, 1634, at an Indian town, which their Governor, Leonard Calvert, had purchased of the natives, and which was situated in what is now St. Mary's county. From that time until 1649, we find nothing resembling a religious test, in the government or laws of the province, except what may be contained in the official oath prescribed by the lord proprietary to his governors, each of whom was required to swear: "That he would not by himself, or another, directly or indirectly, trouble, molest, or discountenance, any person professing to believe in Jesus Christ, for, or in respect of religion; that he would make no difference of persons in conferring offices, favours or rewards, for or in respect of religion, but merely as they should be found faithful and well-deserving, and

endued with moral virtues and abilities ; that his aim should be public unity, and that if any person, or officer, should molest any person professing to believe in Jesus Christ, on account of his religion, he would protect the person molested and punish the offender." Is it not a beautiful compendium of the principles which should direct the march of all christian governments? Mr. M'Mahon, to whose History of Maryland I am indebted for much pleasure, and for many facts contained in this letter, calls it "a text book of official duty," and I subscribe to the truth of his remark. The governors of the province were appointed and removed at the pleasure of the lord proprietary. He must have been very jealous for religious liberty, or he would not have imposed such an obligation upon persons whose appointment to, and continuance in office, depended entirely upon his own will; and I confess, I cannot but feel astonished, that he should have prepared such a form of oath to be taken by the very first governor of the province, and that governor his own brother! In 1649, the provincial legislature enacted a law, which recognised and adopted precisely the same principles, and which continued in force, until the Protestant revolution hinted at in my last letter. I admire its preamble more than that to the act of assembly of Virginia upon a similar subject, which was drawn up by Mr. Jefferson, for that is long and swollen—the other consists of a single sentence;—indeed the preamble to the Maryland law would not disparage the legislation of any country, at any time. It

is in these words: "Whereas the enforcing of the conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequences in those commonwealths where it hath been practised; and for the more quiet and peaceable government of the province, and the better to preserve mutual love and unity amongst the inhabitants," &c. How brief it is, and yet how ample! So much for religious tests in Maryland whilst governed by Roman Catholics.

I have nearly done boasting of the religious freedom of provincial Maryland, for we now approach the termination of the happiest period of her history.

Scarcely had Charles Calvert, the second lord proprietary succeeded to the government upon the death of his father, before he was annoyed, and his proprietary rights endangered by the jealousy of the government of the loathsome Charles II. Representations were made to the king, that Lord Baltimore in his appointments to office, was partial to Catholics; and earnest prayers were addressed to the proper authorities, that the church of England might be established here. Proof of the fact that a majority of the officers in the province were Protestants, was followed by no result but a royal command that none other than Protestants should be thereafter appointed. That royal jealousy of the government of Maryland continued throughout the reigns of the second Charles, and James, and in 1692 the province submitted to the immediate dominion of the then new government of William III. No revolution more entirely unaccountable ever occurred in

any country, than that one, which prostrated the proprietary government, and transferred all its powers to the British crown. No sufficient cause has ever been assigned for it. The people of England had just driven James II. from the throne, because he was a Catholic—the same spirit must have passed from the parent country to the province, where it effected a similar revolution. The unpleasant consequences of that revolution to all churches but one, will be partially detailed in my next letter.

## LETTER IV.

The church of England established in Maryland by a law of the provincial legislature, A. D. 1692.—Supported by a tax to be paid in tobacco.—By an act in 1702, dissenters in Maryland allowed the benefit of a statute passed in the first year of William's reign.—Roman Catholics and Unitarians excepted from this benefit.—The doors of the meeting-houses of all dissenters must however be left "unlocked, unbarred and unbolted."—Their teachers still obnoxious to penalties, unless they subscribed certain articles mentioned in 13 Eliz. ch. 12.—The act of 1702, a legislative finesse to establish the church of England by stealth.—The test act passed by the legislature in 1716.—A law authorising a tax on tobacco to be assessed by the justices of the peace, on application of the vestrymen and church-wardens, was enacted 1729.—The case of John Calvin and Servetus suggested, and the consideration of it promised in the next letter.

MY DEAR SIR,—

With your permission, I will now glance at those laws which established a church in Maryland, and endeavour to show you something of their effects upon all classes of dissenters.

By an act of the provincial legislature (no doubt drawn up in England,) approved by the representation of their Majesties King William and Queen Mary, June 5th, 1692, the church of England was united with the government, and became the established church of Maryland. By that law, provision was made for the division of the province into parishes, the election of vestries, the building and repairing of churches, and supporting their ministers; and a tax of forty pounds of tobacco "per poll," was imposed on every "taxable," to meet the necessary

expenditure. By another act, passed in 1702, dissenters residing in Maryland were declared to be entitled to the benefit of the statutes passed in the first year of the reign of William and Mary, commonly called *the toleration act*. The toleration act declares, that neither of the statutes of Elizabeth, James, or Charles, already mentioned, *except the test acts*, shall extend to any dissenters, other than papists, and such as deny the Trinity; provided such dissenters will take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, or similar affirmations, being Quakers, and subscribe the declaration against popery. So far the statute was not very burthensome upon Protestant dissenters; but it further requires, that they repair to some congregation certified to and registered in the court of the bishop, the arch-deacon, or at the county sessions;\* and not only so, but that the doors of their "meeting-houses" shall be "unlocked, unbarred, and unbolted;" and disobedience to the last requisition exposed every one in the house, to all the pains for nonconformity, prescribed by every statute at that time in force in England. How much they feared conventicles! But all this was not only required of dissenting *teachers* but they were still obnoxious to all those penal laws, unless in addition they subscribed the articles of religion mentioned in 13 Eliz. ch. 12. Those articles related to the con-

\* Instead of that kind of registration, the act of 1702 required that the several places used for religious worship by dissenting congregations, should be certified to and registered in the county courts in the manner prescribed by the toleration act.



fession of the true christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments, with exceptions as to the government and power of the church, and as to infant baptism.

It is a fact worth some attention, that after William and Mary had seized the government of the province, and could control its legislators, their first act recognized the right of their majesties to the crown of England and its appurtenances, and the second law passed by them, established the church of England here, which was followed by all the unpleasant consequences to dissenters, alluded to in the preceding paragraph. Not content with that, the same authority in 1706 declared in round terms, that all the penal statutes mentioned in the toleration act were in force in Maryland. The act of 1702 must have been a piece of legislative finesse;—it attempted the establishment of the church of England by *stealth*, in all the terrors which environed it. The only advantage which dissenters could derive from the toleration act was, by complying with its terms, to shield themselves and their social worship from the vengeance of the cruel laws already referred to; but there had never been a prosecution in Maryland under either of those statutes; in fact, they had not extended to the province, until its legislature indirectly enacted them by declaring the toleration act in force here. That such was their purpose is clearly proven by the act of 1706; the government was then a little older and could venture farther. In 1716, the legislature passed a test act, which excluded every

one who would not comply with its terms, from every office, deputation, or trust, in the province. The oath prescribed by it, very properly called "the abhorrency," was highly spiced:—"I, A. B., do swear, that I do from my heart, abhor, detest, and abjure as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position," &c. By a law passed in 1729, it was further provided: "That it shall, and may be lawful for, and the several justices of the several county courts within this province are hereby required and directed, on application to them made by the vestrymen and church-wardens of any parish, yearly to assess the parishioners of such parish, any quantity of tobacco not exceeding ten per poll, on the taxable inhabitants thereof; for the enlargement or repairs of any church, heretofore or hereafter to be enlarged, or *for any other charge that shall hereafter be judged by the vestry and church-wardens to be necessary for the use of the same parish.*" The lines which I have underscored, certainly gave to "vestrymen and church-wardens" dangerous power. From the passage of that law until the Revolution, there was no important change in the laws relating to the established church or to those dissenting from it.

The matter about which I have been writing, has recalled to my mind, John Calvin and Michael Servetus. The admirers of the great reformer are frequently taunted, and by descendants of the first settlers of Virginia and Maryland too, with his alleged agency in procuring the death of the heretic. I shall endeavour to show you in my next letter, that pro-

vincial Virginia was not more tolerant than Geneva; and that in provincial Maryland, Servetus might have been legally and more cruelly punished for the offence for which he died. You will excuse the digression?

## LETTER V.

Some ultra notions on toleration corrected.—The writer's views on the subject stated.—Injustice done to Calvin's name for his supposed agency in procuring the death of Servetus.—As Servetus's punishment was then approved by the churches generally, Calvin could be justly blamed, only for not having that light which had not shone upon the world at his time.—The laws of colonial Virginia and Maryland were more cruel than those under which Servetus suffered.—Law of Virginia passed 1659-60, cited and commented on.—A law of Maryland passed 1723, and remaining in force until 1820 quoted, and its effects explained.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—

Before I undertake the redemption of the pledge given in the conclusion of my last letter, I will copy a very old law, which was once rigidly enforced. "And he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death, and all the congregation shall certainly stone him: as well the stranger, as he that is born in the land, when he blasphemeth the name of the Lord, shall be put to death." By whom was that law enacted? But I may be told, that upon the subject of civil rights, and the policy of human laws, the world has been much enlightened within the two last centuries:—it is true, and it is equally true, that many have gazed upon the light until it "has blinded their eyes." The effects of that blindness is most injurious to themselves and others; for it induces them to make certain extravagant demands. When they speak of civil and religious li-

berty, they mean, that every man has a right "to work all uncleanness with greediness," and either to apportion the respect to be paid to God and his law, or to trample upon the authority of both. In my opinion, there are very few crimes for the commission of which, human authority should take the offender's life, and *blasphemy* is not one of that very limited number; but I should be afraid to follow the fashion of our days, by maligning a law the counterpart of one made by God himself. My opinions upon many subjects are odd—you know that they are so. Let me assure you, I glory in the fact; for to use language which perhaps I ought not to copy, "my mind is my kingdom," and I must reign there or occupy no throne in this world.

You know, that for uttering horrible blasphemies, Michael Servetus was burnt; and that gross injustice on account of it has been done to the character of John Calvin, by those who have written and spoken centuries after his death. You are also aware that the whole christian world, the Protestant churches especially, approved the proceeding, and you are satisfied, as I feel persuaded, that if Calvin had made and enforced the law under which the blasphemer suffered, he ought to be blamed for nothing but not living in light which did not dawn upon the world until many years after he had slept in death. To frame a fair issue, I am now willing to admit, that, in the language of this world, Calvin might have prevented the death of Servetus, and, that it was because of his advice the heretic suffer-

ed; and shall notwithstanding this admission, endeavour to prove, that the legislation of colonial Virginia and Maryland was more cruel than the very law under which Servetus died. For this purpose I shall not travel through the whole codes of those provinces, but confine myself to a single enactment of each.

I shall not use for my present purpose any law of Virginia, designed to prevent or suppress or punish Puritanism, lest you should think me anxious to give to the persecutions of that sect too prominent a place in these letters, but will refer to a portion of a law selected from several of similar character, and aimed especially at Quakers.\* As early as 1659-60, the legislature of Virginia passed a law "for the suppressing the Quakers." With other provisions equally angry, it required that all Quakers in Virginia should be, and remain imprisoned, until they gave security to leave the colony and never to return; that for returning they should be punished as contemners of the laws and magistracy, and again be banished; that for returning again, they should "be proceeded against as *felons*;"—that means, should be put to death. As to the charitable feelings which made and enforced that and similar laws, we may form, I think, a pretty correct estimate from the following entry fairly copied from the public records of the colony. "On the 12th day of September, 1663, John Porter, † a member of the house of Burgesses,

\* See Appendix A. Act VI.

† See last paragraph of Appendix A.

was expelled, being loving to the Quakers, his opposition to baptism of infants, and his refus'g to take the oaths." Now institute a comparison and answer for yourself this question: Would it be more cruel to burn a bold blasphemer, whose death was demanded by the whole christian church, or to hang a peaceable orthodox Quaker, for visiting the same country three times? Let not Virginians speak contemptuously of Connecticut blue laws, nor reproach the memory of John Calvin with the burning of Servetus. But let us turn to Maryland and see whether she was more tolerant than her sister province.

The Protestant successors of King William "of glorious memory," were not less careful to preserve and sustain the rights of the established church, or less jealous of the aggressions of heresy, than he had been. Accordingly, by an act of the legislature of this province of his then majesty George I., passed in 1723, it was provided: That a person convicted "of wittingly, maliciously and advisedly, by writing or speaking, blaspheming or cursing God, or of denying our Saviour Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, or denying the Holy Trinity, or the Godhead of any of the Three Persons, or the Unity of the Godhead, or of uttering any profane words concerning the Godhead," should, for the first offence, be bored through the tongue, and fined £20; or if unable to pay the fine, be imprisoned six months; for the second offence, should be branded in the forehead with the letter B., and fined £40; or if too poor to pay it, be imprisoned twelve months; and

for the third offence should “*suffer death without benefit of clergy.*” That law was not repealed until 1820. Servetus suffered death in 1553; but had he lived in Maryland, and been convicted of his blasphemies, at any time between October 26th, 1723, and January 11th, 1820, nothing but natural death, or physical force, or executive clemency, or legislative interference, or Almighty power, could have saved him from severer pains than he endured, or from death itself. And the terrors of that act of assembly were not restricted to those alike guilty with Servetus. Every poor Jew or deluded Unitarian, who avowed his creed three several times, or any other person, who uttered any profane words concerning the Holy Trinity three several times, was obnoxious to the same punishments. Whether an offence charged was either of those defined by the act of Assembly, depended entirely upon the instructions of courts, or opinions of juries. That law was not enacted in Geneva or in Rome;—on the contrary, it emanated from a government, which, more than thirty years before that time, had established the Protestant church of England throughout its entire territory. I write not for the purpose of complaining of the act of 1723; but we ought not to be taunted with the burning of Servetus, or the intolerance of John Calvin, by the descendants of those, who were less tolerant than that great and good man, although they lived a century and a half after he had done with time.



## LETTER VI.

The statute of 13 Charles II. ch. 2. excluding all except communicants of the church of England from office, not enforced in Maryland.—The requisitions of the test act of 1716.—That act especially hard on Roman Catholics.—The writer's opinion of Queen Anne unfavourable.—The government of Maryland given in 1715 by the crown to Charles, the fourth Lord Baltimore, and third lord proprietary—a Protestant.—All the oaths extorted by acts of Parliament could be taken by Presbyterians—still they laboured under great grievances.—In Virginia the burdens laid on all nonconformists greater than in Maryland.—The consequence was, Presbyterians, as well as Episcopalians settled in Maryland; Episcopalians exclusively in Virginia.

DEAR SIR,—

You will perhaps understand what follows more distinctly, by reperusing, before you proceed farther, my fourth letter.

Most probably the act of 1702, and certainly, that of 1706, placed dissenters in Maryland of every name, in precisely the condition of their brethren in England; but I do not believe the *corporation act*, that detestable and wicked statute of 13 Ch. II. ch. 2, which excluded from all offices relating to the government, every person who had not received the sacrament of the Lord's supper according to the rites of the church of England, within the twelve-month which preceded his election or appointment, was at any time enforced in the province. The act of 1716 required, "that all persons then holding any office or trust within this province, or thereafter to be admitted into such office or trust, should take the

oaths of *allegiance*, *abhorrency*, and *abjuration*, and should subscribe the oath of abjuration, and make and subscribe a declaration of belief, that there is no transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord's supper: which declaration was called "*the test.*" I withhold explanations in this place; and they will be entirely unnecessary, if you will refer to the law itself, a copy of which accompanied my fourth letter.

The requirements of the act of 1716, affected Protestant dissenters and the members of the established church alike; but it continued the war, which had been waged against the civil rights of the Roman Catholics, from the revolution in 1689. They certainly shared a hard fate. The province had been settled by them, and they and their descendants, had there enjoyed the sweets of "perfect freedom" in matters of religion. From the time of the enactment first referred to in the preceding paragraph, until the war for independence, they were exposed to all the oppressions, pains and penalties prescribed by every British statute to prevent popery, passed at any time after the death of the bloody Mary. There are many of those laws, and they are indeed cruel and bloody. I am aware that prosecutions under them were suspended at one time. How long? During the pleasure of the queen. What queen? Anne, for whose memory (the opinion of good Doctor Watts to the contrary notwithstanding,) I have no respect. Did she not approve the expulsion of her father, not only from the British throne, but the kingdom itself, because he was a *Catholic*? Did she not

desert him, and act in concert with his enemies? Yes;—and it was her abandoning of him when in his deepest distress, which almost broke his heart, and extorted the pathetic exclamation, “God help me! my own children have forsaken me.” James II., was no doubt at heart a tyrant, and a tyrant of the worst order,—for he was a bigoted papist. He desired despotic power; and he would have wielded it in aid of a superstition which has shed rivers of human blood, in the name of the Prince of Peace! I believe he acted conscientiously; and although he had many and grievous faults, he was not only an indulgent but a fond father, and Anne was an unnatural daughter. No unnatural daughter can become an estimable princess. Her treachery to some of the tenderest affections of the human heart, soon received the reward which unquestionably induced it; for the very same act of the convention which gave James’s government to William and Mary, made Anne their successor in case her sister died without issue. Mr. Hume and other partial historians, may call Anne “a virtuous child;” but I insist, that when prosecutions against the Catholics in Maryland were suspended during *her* pleasure, they were left at the discretion of one “whose tender mercies were cruel.”

The government of the province, which had been wrested from Charles, Lord Baltimore in 1689, was, in 1715, given by the crown to his son Charles who had survived him, but it was not administered in his name, until the succeeding year. He was the fourth

Lord Baltimore, the third lord proprietary, and a Protestant. It is said he was educated in the Protestant faith by his father, because of the persecutions he had himself suffered on account of his own.

We have seen that Maryland, during the first seventy years of her existence, neither interfered with any man's religious creed, nor disabled him in any way on account of it; we have also seen some of the consequences of a union of one branch of the christian church with her government, to all who entertained another faith, or preferred a worship differing in its manner from that which the established church prescribed. All the oaths and declarations extorted by acts of parliament, and of the provincial legislature, could be taken by Presbyterians with a good conscience; but they had grievances of which they loudly, and (I think) justly complained. To be compelled to build churches in which they never worshipped, and to support a clergy to whose instructions they thought it unlawful to listen; to be required to make a public record of the names of the places at which they waited upon God in the ordinances of his house, that they might be constantly watched by the jealous minions of a jealous government,—and that those satellites of power might not be impeded in the performance of their ignoble work, to be further obliged, and under severe penalties, to keep the doors of their “meeting houses, unlocked, unbarred and unbolted,” were indeed “heavy burdens and grievous to be borne.” But we have also seen, that on the south side of that “right line,”

which divides the eastern shores of Maryland and Virginia, still more intolerable burdens were imposed upon all nonconformists, for not only were all the statutes in relation to them, passed in the reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles, enforced there without mercy, but Virginia added to those laws many others equally or more oppressive. A dissenter then, who emigrated from Great Britain, and especially one whose conscience had driven him beyond the reach of the established church, could not have hesitated at all, on which side of the line to pitch his tent. The effects were such as might have been anticipated: the eastern shore of Virginia, so far as I am advised, was settled almost exclusively by Episcopalians—the adjoining territory of Maryland was first peopled by Presbyterians, Episcopalians and a few Quakers. Presbyterians were scattered over it from its boundary line most probably to the Choptank river; and I doubt whether any other Presbyterians were affected by the provisions of the act of 1702.

Until the Baptists effected a settlement in Virginia, there was no organized christian church from the line of Maryland to Cape Charles, a distance of more than eighty miles, except the churches established by law. There was a house at Drummond Town, the county town of Accomack, in which a few Presbyterians formerly worshipped. I know little of its history, but feel satisfied that a congregation was never organized there. That house of God was removed, some years since, from the vil-

lage, and converted into a mill-house! Northampton county extends from the south side of Accomack to the Capes, and has a population of seven or eight thousand. I have never heard of but one Presbyterian who resided within its limits; and he, I believe, became a member of the Episcopal church a short time before his death, which occurred a few years ago. He was a son of that gentleman of Somerset, whose conversion from Episcopacy to Presbyterianism, is noticed by Dr. Miller, in his life of Rodgers.

## LETTER VII.

The planting of a christian church in a new world, an important work.—Francis Makemie unquestionably the first Presbyterian minister that visited this continent,—He was a native of Ireland—When he first came, not known; but he was permanently settled in Accomack county, Virginia, in A. D. 1690.—Account of his family, residence, &c.—Mr. Makemie's circumstances, character, labours, &c.—His persecutions in New York by Lord Cornbury.—The pamphlet which he published on the occasion.—His library extensive.—A portion of it bequeathed to the First Presbyterian church in Philadelphia, &c.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—

The planting of a christian church in “a new world,” is a great work. “The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob. Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God. Selah.” Civil governments can torture men's bodies, and after that, have no more that they can do; the influences of the church will be felt by myriads of immortal spirits, myriads of ages after this “great globe and all which it inherits,” shall have been burnt up.

The Presbyterian church in America contains probably two hundred and fifty thousand members, and her labours of love girdle the earth: let us inquire then about the planting of this vine, “whose boughs are sent out unto the sea, and her branches unto the rivers.” Great effects from little causes, or grand results from small beginnings, afford matter

for pleasing speculation, whether it be in tracing the terrors of an earthquake to a little fissure which was in the earth before the sun was rolled together; or in passing from the present condition of the Presbyterian church in America to a period of time, when but a single man proclaimed her scriptural truth and order at any place between the icy "recesses of Baffin's Bay and the frozen Serpent of the South."

Francis Makemie was unquestionably the minister of the Presbyterian church, who *first* visited this continent. He was a native of Ireland. I know not when he reached this country, or at what places he had laboured; but he had settled himself permanently in Accomack county, Virginia, anterior to the year 1690.\* His residence was situated on a creek called Matchatanck, which empties into the Chesapeake Bay a little south of the village of Onancock. Miss Naomi, the eldest daughter of Mr. William Anderson† of Accomack, became his wife. He died in 1708, no doubt in the summer of that year, leaving a widow, two daughters and a large estate. His daughters were named Elizabeth and Anne. Elizabeth survived her father but a short time, for she left this world in the same year,‡ young and unmarried, and her mother soon afterwards followed her. Anne intermarried with a gentleman named Holden, and died without issue near the end of the year 1787, or in January, 1788. There flows not a drop of Ma-

\* See Appendix B.

† See Appendix A.

‡ See the last paragraph of Appendix A.



kemie's "blood in the veins of any living creature." Mrs. Holden was a wealthy widow, and warmly attached to the Presbyterian church. The pastor of the church at Pitts's creek (about which you will hear more hereafter,) although not at all related to her, was one of her executors and legatees, and the church itself is still aided by one of her bequests.\*

We can take no view of Mr. Makemie, which does not present him in an interesting attitude. He was well educated, and records prove that he was benevolent, and a thorough-bred Presbyterian. He was not only a divine, but an importing merchant; and the frame of his will,† and the contents of his rich library, would induce us to think that he had also studied law. As a commercial man he must have been skilful, and was eminently successful. As a citizen he assisted in enforcing those wholesome laws so important to every community, but peculiarly so to one in its infancy. In his personal transactions he would neither do, nor suffer wrong;—he obeyed the law himself and wielded it against its transgressors. As a minister of the gospel, he must have possessed the spirit of those who visit the ends of the earth that they may preach the unsearchable riches of Christ.

Mr. Makemie did not emigrate to America, that he might live in ease, and fatten upon luxuries extorted from an unwilling people by an established church, or to exchange a rude and unlettered society

\* See Appendix B.

† See Appendix A. first paragraph.

for one more learned and refined ;—on the contrary, his faith and practice might and did expose him to persecution and pecuniary loss, and he abandoned the elegancies of life to reside with those who had just taken possession of a wilderness. Instead of “riotous living” he endured labour, travelled much, preached often, and at last died greatly beloved.

I am reminded of the cruel treatment which he received in New York, during the administration of Lord Cornbury. Where is the pamphlet in which he published the particulars? Was there not one copy of it in the library of the late Rev. Dr. J. P. Wilson? If the book can be found, it certainly should be re-published.

The library of Mr. Makemie, (which of course he must have imported) has been referred to. I do not remember the number of its volumes, but it contained hundreds. By his will, he gave one hundred and twenty of his *English* books to his wife and daughters; his *law-library* to a gentleman named Hamilton, and the remainder of his library to “Mr. Jedediah Andrews, minister at Philadelphia.” After the death of Mr. Andrews or his removal from Philadelphia, the bequest disposes of the books given to him as follows:—I give and bequeath said library to such minister or ministers as shall succeed him, [Rev. Mr. Andrews] in that place and office, and to such only as shall be of the Presbyterian or Independent persuasion, and none else.\* He further directs:

\* See Mr. Makemie’s will, Appendix A.

“That as soon as said books are remitted to Philadelphia, the numbers and names of said library may be put upon record, to be preserved there as a constant library for the use of foresaid minister or ministers successively for ever.” Is the first church in Philadelphia in possession of that library or of any part of it? The public records of that city of 1708 or 1709, will no doubt furnish its catalogue.

## LETTER VIII.

Mr. Makemie's travels in different parts of this continent, and, in the summer of 1704, to Europe.—About the time of his return, probably with him, two other Presbyterian ministers came to this country.—A more particular account of Mr. Makemie's persecution in New York, by Lord Cornbury, &c.

REV. SIR,—

In my last letter, I alluded to Mr. Makemie's travels. He appears not only to have been much attached to the Rev. Mr. Andrews of Philadelphia, but familiar with the condition of the people of his charge. He visited New York, New England, and the West Indies, how frequently I know not, but the persecution which he suffered from the bigotry of the universally detested Lord Cornbury, proved, that he used those journeys for the good of souls. He must also have preached in the island of Barbadoes,\* for he there complied with the terms of the toleration act, which he could have done for no other purpose, except to qualify himself to preach as a dissenting teacher.

In the summer of 1704, he went to Europe, where it seems he remained until the autumn of the succeeding year. I say he went to Europe,† because,

\* See Appendix B. 2d paragraph.

† See Appendix B. 3d paragraph.

that was his own expression, but that he visited the United kingdom there can be little doubt. The year before he had contemplated a voyage to England, which he did not perform. In Ireland he had near relations—two brothers and two sisters,\* if no more, and from the length of his stay we may conclude, that his old fashioned principles of “elective affinity,” or some other consideration, drew him to Scotland. That visit had, no doubt, relation in part to his commercial transactions, but from the character of the man, we must be persuaded, that the interests of the infant churches which he had left behind him, were not forgotten. This conjecture has strong support. Shortly after his return to Virginia, indeed so shortly, that they might have crossed the Atlantic in the same vessel that brought him, two Presbyterian clergymen† from Ireland, had arrived and were labouring among those dissenters who were noticed in my sixth letter.

Mr. Makemie was a bold man; and it would seem that he was willing to endure all things for the elect's sake, that they might also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus, with eternal glory. I have heretofore alluded to the persecution, which he suffered in New York. He reached that city in the month of January, 1707. From the season of the year, we conclude certainly, that he made the journey by land, and not coastwise; and from the missionary spirit

\* See Appendix B., the part of his will which relates to his kindred in Ireland.

† See Appendix D.

of the man, there is no doubt, he preached the truth all along the way. He was accompanied by the Rev. John Hampton, afterwards the settled pastor of the church at Snowhill. There were at that time, in New York, Dutch and French Calvinists, Episcopalians, and Irish Presbyterians. The Presbyterians had neither meeting-house nor minister. Messrs. Makemie and Hampton had, with the consent of the congregation, or their representatives, preached certainly once, perhaps many times, in the Dutch church; but on a particular Sabbath-day, Mr. Makemie preached in a private house with open doors,\* and Mr. Hampton preached at New Town. By the order of the governor, they were both arrested the same week at New Town, and carried before his lordship, who reprimanded them severely, but they withstood the ferocity of his temper and manner with undaunted firmness. The charge preferred against them was, that they had violated those British statutes which relate to dissenters and dissenting teachers. Mr. Makemie replied with great power to the arguments of the attorney general, and proved conclusively, that those obnoxious laws were not intended for that province, and therefore did not extend to it. His lordship replied, that they had nevertheless committed an offence against his instructions, and accordingly committed them to prison to await the return

\* I have seen it stated somewhere, that he also baptized a child. I have no evidence of the fact. It may have been mentioned in the pamphlet referred to in my last letter; but it was not noticed in the prosecution afterwards instituted against him.

of the chief justice from New Jersey. When they were arraigned before the court, the governor becoming convinced that the indictments found could not be sustained, changed entirely the character of the offence charged. They gave bail for their appearance at the next term of the supreme court, and were discharged after an imprisonment of almost seven weeks duration. The grand jury which next acted upon the case, found no bill against Mr. Hampton; but on the 6th day of June in the same year, Mr. Makemie was tried upon an indictment, the substance of which was in the following words: "That Francis Makemie pretending himself to be a Protestant dissenting minister, contemning and endeavouring to subvert the queen's ecclesiastical supremacy, unlawfully preached, without the governor's license first obtained, in derogation of the royal authority and prerogative; and that he used other ceremonies and rites than those contained in the common prayer-book; and lastly, that he being unqualified to preach, did preach at an illegal conventicle." The two last charges were said to be contrary to the forms of the statutes. The people took deep interest in the trial; for very precious rights were involved, and the most learned and eminent members of the provincial bar were engaged in it. The court favoured the prosecution, but the jury returned a verdict of "not guilty." Notwithstanding his acquittal, his bail was not discharged until he had paid the whole cost of the prosecution, amounting to the sum of *eighty-three pounds seven shillings and sixpence!*

More grievous oppression, or more unrighteous extortion, never disgraced the government of any tyrant.

The deep injuries inflicted on Mr. Makemie, had a powerful effect upon the people. They saw for the first time, their chief magistrate in his true character; they saw that invaluable rights, the rights of conscience, were in danger; and a legislative assembly, convened on the 8th November, 1708, spoke to the offender in language not to be misunderstood. In one of a series of resolutions, they denounced the extortion practised upon Mr. Makemie in the following words: "Resolved, that the compelling any man upon trial by a jury or otherwise, to pay any fees for his prosecution, or any thing whatsoever, unless the fees of the officers whom he employs for his necessary defence, is a great grievance and contrary to justice."

That a second indictment was not found against Mr. Hampton, is to me entirely unaccountable: from the evidence before the grand jurors, he and Mr. Makemie must have been *in pari delicto*.

That he was deeply injured, indeed greatly oppressed, by the prosecution and its consequences, Mr. Makemie was entirely aware; and I presume his object in publishing the pamphlet about which some questions were asked in a former letter, was to attract public attention to the facts in the case, and to advertise the inhabitants of the provinces, that tyranny might exist in a provincial governor; and that the rights of conscience even on the western side of



the Atlantic, might be trampled upon by one whose power was but "the accident of an accident." The effect of that publication upon public opinion we cannot ascertain, or whether it provoked the energetic but dignified expression of displeasure from the popular assembly of New York, already quoted, we must remain uncertain. It came too late, however, to sooth the wounded feelings of the sufferer, or to satisfy him that the citizens of his adopted country would be free: he had already gone "where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest."

## LETTER IX.

Remarks concerning Mr. Makemie continued.—His zeal for the church.—Received no compensation for his labours, but on the contrary supplied the wants of his infant congregations out of his own funds.—The situation of the Rehobeth church shown.—Built on Mr. Makemie's own land.—Provided for by his will.—His zeal for the church, as well as his desire for the religious education of his children proved by his will.

REV. SIR,—

I have not yet done with Francis Makemie, and am more unwilling to quit his name, because so few of the members of the Presbyterian church in the United States, know any thing about him; and because *my knowledge* of the man, his character, his conduct, his labours of love, will soon be consigned to a house, in which there is neither available knowledge nor wisdom.

Instead of living upon the church, or receiving a revenue from the contribution of its members, he supplied the temporal wants of the church from his own resources: indeed the whole church was dear to him. For the first church in Philadelphia, and for its pastor, he discovered a deep interest, as appears from my seventh letter, but at that time, just before his death, the church at Rehobeth must have been his darling. As I shall be obliged to speak frequently of Rehobeth in what follows, to save trouble

hereafter, let me say now, that the place is on the west side of the Pocomoke river, about twenty-five miles from Snowhill. On the 22d August, 1666, Somerset county was erected on paper, by order of the provincial governor, and embraced the whole eastern shore of Maryland lying between the Nanticoke river and the line which divides Maryland from Virginia. By an act of assembly, passed in 1742, Worcester county was carved out of it, and includes the southern portion of its territory as represented on our maps. For a similar reason, it is necessary to say something of the location of Somerset county, within the bounds of which Rehobeth is situated; for Worcester county did not exist by that name, until after the occurrence of most of the events noticed in these letters. You will understand by Somerset county, the territory now included in both, unless additional terms of description be annexed. Be pleased to take some pains to understand this paragraph, as I shall insist hereafter, that Somerset county thus defined, is the "*faderland*" of American Presbyterianism.

I have already referred to Mr. Makemie's disinterested labours, his benevolence, his strong Presbyterian predilections, and that instead of deriving temporal advantage from the church, he was in temporal things, as well as spiritual, the church's benefactor. The meeting-house at Rehobeth, in which worshipped the congregation that appears to have been the Benjamin of his latter days, was erected upon his own land, and provision is made by his will for the

conveyance of the lot of ground in perpetuity to be used in the same way.

To any one who is not hardened through the deceitfulness of sin, the preparation of a last will and testament, is as solemn a business transaction as can be undertaken. The ruling passion is generally strong in death, as I have frequently professionally witnessed. A will, in many instances, shows with certainty, the habit of the testator's mind, and the tone of his feelings. The only inducement to make a will, is a solicitude about some person or thing that will probably survive the testator; and a christian can never make a testamentary disposition of his estate, without reflecting, that the moment the instrument prepared for the purpose becomes operative, he will have passed into the eternal world, and that his condition will be unalterably fixed.

From Mr. Makemie's will, it appears that he was anxious about nothing but his wife and his children, and the church. I have said enough already to exhibit his attachment to the church to which he belonged, and in which he ministered; but the solemn manner in which he provides for the religious education of his daughters, deserves some notice. They are intrusted with perfect confidence to the guardianship of his wife, but in case of her death, during their minority, the Honourable Colonel Francis Jenkins and Mary his wife, of Somerset county, in Maryland, are constituted their guardians until maturity or marriage, and all persons are charged in the presence of "Almighty and Omniscient God" to give

and allow them a “*sober, virtuous, and religious* education, either here or elsewhere, as in Britain, New England or Philadelphia.”\* Colonel Jenkins was one of the oldest Presbyterians in Maryland, and the laws of the state prove, that there were few men, if any, of higher standing on the Eastern Shore. Public documents prove, that before 1696, he was entitled to the adjuncts which Mr. Makemie prefixed to his name. My purpose in writing this paragraph, is to show that Mr. Makemie’s dying wish was, that the Presbyterian church might prosper, and, that his children should have a sober, virtuous and religious education, under the direction of their Presbyterian mother, or of his Presbyterian friends.

\* See in Appendix B. the part of his will which relates to the education of his daughters.

## LETTER X.

The question when were Presbyterian churches first organized in Somerset county, Maryland, brought under consideration.

REV. SIR,—

I now approach a question of much interest in the history of the Presbyterian church in America.—At what time were Presbyterian churches organized in Somerset county?

For a long time after the settlement of Virginia, dissenters were not permitted to preach within her limits on any terms; and although Mr. Makemie had become domiciliated there anterior to the year 1690, yet he was not authorized to preach there until October 15, 1699. He must have been ordained in Europe; I believe by the Presbytery of Donegal, Ireland. Reflect upon his character and answer the question for yourself:—would such a minister, and such a man remain quietly at home and kept silence for ten, or twenty, or for aught we know, for thirty years, by laws more cruel than those which he had left behind him? Tradition, common sense, and authenticated facts, seal the conclusion, that it is impossible he could have *so* spent so many years of his life. But where did he execute the duties of the office, into which he was initiated by the laying on of

hands of the presbytery? The answer is at hand: By travelling a few miles over as level a country as the sun shines upon, he was beyond the reach of the laws and constituted authorities of Virginia—he was in Somerset county, in Maryland, where there were many Presbyterians, and where he could do his Master's work, without hinderance or molestation from any quarter. Do you ask me how I ascertain that there were Presbyterians in Somerset before the year 1699? Because of some of them I know the names, and the names of their children, grand children, and great grand children; and because public documents show where they lived, and when they died; and evidence which would be admissible in a court of law, fixes the name of the religious persuasion to which they were attached. An ancestor of my own, who had probably affixed his name to the solemn league and covenant, was a citizen of Somerset county many years before the period mentioned above, unless public and private records speak falsehood. My own conviction is, that Mr. Makemie resided in Somerset county, and organized churches there previously to his settlement in Accomack. A town to be called Snowhill, was established in Somerset, now Worcester county, by an act of the provincial legislature, passed in the year 1684, and I believe, that the Presbyterian church in that place, is nearly, or quite as old as the town. Snowhill was settled by English Episcopalians, and Scotch and Irish Presbyterians, and it is certain that persons resided there at the time, or soon after the time, in which the town

was laid out, who were afterwards members of the Presbyterian church. My ancestor, to whom I have already alluded, was a ruling elder in that church—he was the father of five children, all of them natives of Snowhill or its neighbourhood, the youngest of whom was born in April, 1698. I am persuaded that he lived in Maryland the last twenty years of the seventeenth century. Do you ask for the evidence of any connexion between that church and Mr. Makemie? I doubt whether the memory of any gospel minister was ever held in higher honour by an American congregation, than was that of Mr. Makemie by the people of Snowhill. His praises have not yet left the church, although he has rested from his labours almost a hundred and thirty years. Tradition has made a record of his labours and many excellencies of character; one generation has uttered his praises in the ears of its successor, and you may even yet, hear their echo. Parents made his surname, the christian name of their children, until in the neighbourhood of Snowhill, it has become a common one. The church has had no pastor from 1708 until this time, whose name it so profoundly venerates. Information derived from aged lips, which it was once my pleasure to listen to, and my duty to honour, produces peculiar feelings whenever I hear the name of Francis Makemie. Further proof of Mr. Makemie's connexion with the church in Snowhill, and indeed with the other churches in Somerset, is derived from the fact, that those churches were organized when there was no other Presbyterian mi-



nister on the continent, to effect their organization. There is record evidence of the fact, that there were five church edifices and as many organized Presbyterian congregations in Somerset county, on the 13th day of March, 1705,\* and neither popular tradition, nor public nor private documents, know any thing of any Presbyterian clergyman within the bounds of the existing Presbytery of Lewes at that time, except Francis Makemie. The building of a country church now, where population is comparatively dense, and money abundant, is a difficult work; how then can we account for the existence of five churches and congregations within the limits of Somerset county, on the day mentioned above, but by the supposition, that the word had been preached to the people for years previously? The country was newly settled, the population sparse and money scarce, indeed tobacco was the currency—the legal circulating medium.† Can any one believe, that the gathering together of five congregations, and the building of five houses of worship, was the work of a few months, or even of a single year? And that those emigrants so straitened, erected those churches with-

\* See Appendix D. Extract 5, and Makemie's will, Appendix A.

† This reminds me of an error into which some one has fallen, I think it is the editor of the Christian Advocate or some one of his correspondents. He speaks in commendatory terms of the Rev. Mr. Hampton, for agreeing to receive his salary in tobacco. The fact is, in Maryland all public dues were taxed in tobacco; and all public bonds made payable in that commodity until 1810.

out ever having had, or any prospect of having the ordinances of the gospel? Their faith must have been strong if they did so, but not so strong as his, who gives credit to the supposition. If Mr. Makemie did not organize those churches and preach to them, who did? He had been the only minister of that religious persuasion on the continent, and you saw in my eighth letter, that from some time in the summer of 1704 until the autumn of 1705, he had been in Europe.

I conclude this letter with remarking, that the churches in Somerset were planted and watered by ministers from the Presbyterian church of Ireland, although the church of Scotland has always been considered the mother of us all; and, that the Presbyterian church in America, owes a debt to the memory of Francis Makemie, which has never been discharged. Were I to endow a scholarship in one of our theological seminaries, it would certainly be called "The Francis Makemie scholarship."

## LETTER XI.

Reflections.—Presbyterian churches organized in Somerset county before the beginning of the eighteenth century.—The claims of Philadelphia to the first Presbyterian church organized in the United States, not well founded.

REV. SIR,—

After the interval of more than a month, a part of which has been occupied in the discharge of known duties, another part in drinking those salutary bitter-nesses, which medicate the cup of human life, and much of it, I fear, in sinning against God, I resume my pen. Whilst we continue in the church below, we must fight or die; and even in a spiritual sense, a man's worst foes are those which belong to his own house. We have a horrible notion of those countries whose caverns, and the fastnesses of whose mountains, and the clefts of whose rocks, are infested by blood-spilling robbers, but our own hearts resemble them, and in their relations to the perfect will of God, are even worse than those very countries. When we first saw the light, or felt the sun, we were cherishing in embryo the seeds of moral

“———— diseases, of massacre, and poison,  
Famine and war,”  
———— “plague and pestilence.”

Who made thee to differ from another? In the heart of an assassin the noxious seed not only germinates,

but buds, blossoms, and bears (in its kind) perfect fruit. The hot beds in our own bosoms are equally prolific, and are supplied with seeds of precisely the same class: why the difference between us and them?

“’Twas all of thy grace we were brought to obey,  
While others were suffer’d to go  
The road, which by nature we chose as our way,  
Which leads to the regions of wo.”

We must endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ, but the citadel of a christian is the house of God. His people in all ages have preferred the church above their chief joy, and I am fully persuaded that the more carefully we attend upon her ordinances, the more decisive will be our victories over sin, and the larger the communications to us of divine love. The church of the living God, the pillar and the ground of the truth! What a glory encircles every

—— “little spot enclosed by grace  
Out of the world’s wide wilderness.”

I am prone to wander in another sense, besides that intended by the hymn from which the expression is borrowed, but to misuse, perhaps to pervert, a fragment of a kindred line, am

—— “now made willing to return,”

to the subject of these letters.

From the considerations suggested by my last letter, I assume in this, that there were Presbyterian churches organized in Somerset county, before the

commencement of the eighteenth century. Can you doubt it? I can not. I further assume, that Francis Makemie organized those churches, and preached to them. Upon any other terms we must do injustice to his memory, for he was unquestionably a zealous minister of the gospel, and a man of missionary spirit. To believe that the cruel laws of colonial Virginia made him a "dumb dog" for ten or twenty or thirty years of his life, within a few miles of the comparatively tolerant Maryland, where there were persons who entertained his own faith, both as to doctrine and discipline, would be absurd. Who can suppose, that in Somerset county, then newly settled, abounding in neither population or wealth, five Presbyterian churches were erected in as many years? Or who can believe, that so situated without having ever enjoyed in America the ordinances of the gospel, and where there was no preacher of their own persuasion on the continent to administer them, the people would have erected so many houses for worship? No one, certainly. At the time when records prove the existence of those five congregations in Somerset, there was but one brick church in Maryland, and that was in the city of Annapolis. This proves, that there was difficulty in procuring the erection of church edifices in the province, and it is to be remembered, that most of the other parts of Maryland were settled before Somerset, and there is no body of land of the same size in the State, the soil of which was, and is, so poor. An intelligent friend, in a letter to me upon this subject, uses the

following language:—"Forasmuch as the license given by the governor to Messrs. Hampton and McNish,\* to preach in four distinct meeting-houses, bears date March, 1705, is not the conclusion strong and irresistible, that the gospel had been preached by ministers of our denomination for several years before that date? It is well known, that anterior to that time, this part of the country was but thinly settled, that the people were poor, and the times peculiarly oppressive on Presbyterians: as they were compelled to support the established church as well as their own, and money being scarce, it is not probable they could have had the means of building four churches, three of which are within fifteen miles of each other, in two, three, four or five years, immediately anterior to 1705, and early too in that year." I take precisely my friend's view of the matter, and so, I think, would any unprejudiced mind acquainted with the facts. Remember, that the church at Rehobeth, is not referred to in the foregoing extract.

I know that "Philadelphia claims the honour of having received into her bosom the first regularly constituted Presbyterian church in the United States." But is that claim well founded? I think it has no foundation whatever. The first regularly constituted Presbyterian church which Philadelphia "received into her bosom" in the year 1698, was an association of Congregationalists, Baptists and Presbyterians, and their minister was a preacher of the Bap-

\* See Appendix D., extract 5.

tist persuasion. Was that a regularly constituted Presbyterian church? I cannot consider any congregation organized as regularly Presbyterian, unless constituted according to the *principles* of that form of government adopted by an act of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, on the 10th day of February, 1645. I am not saying that Presbyterianism originated in Scotland; so far from that, I hold that it is older than the circumcision of Timothy, or the conversion of the Apostle Paul. But the Kirk of Scotland, so far as human arrangement is concerned, is certainly the mother of the Irish and American churches, and to be a Presbyterian church, her principles of government must be adopted. The officers of the church contemplated by that form of government, are pastors or teachers presbyterially ordained, and ruling elders, and its members consist of believers and their children. Was that the character of the congregation organized in the bosom of Philadelphia in 1698? Is that a regularly constituted Presbyterian church whose pastor denies that the covenant promises of God are to our children, and who refuses to sprinkle them with the baptismal water? Who can believe, that the association of Presbyterians and Congregationalists who constituted what has been called "the first Presbyterian church," elected ruling elders and deacons, or if they did so, that the gentleman who preached for them, would have ordained those officers? A "regularly constituted Presbyterian church" excluding infants from its pale, without ruling elders, or dea-

cons, and having for its pastor a minister from a different branch of the christian church, and who must have been anti-presbyterian both as to doctrine and church government! I am aware, that the Rev. Mr. Andrews took charge of the church in Philadelphia in 1701. He, I believe, was a Congregationalist. I think that the will of Mr. Makemie shows, that he died in doubt whether the congregation now denominated "the first church" in Philadelphia, would be Presbyterian or Independent in its government. His will says, in relation to it:—"I give and bequeath said library to such minister, or ministers as shall succeed him [Rev. Mr. Andrews,] and to such only as shall be of the Presbyterian or Independent persuasion, and none else."\* Compare with the above extract the following language used in relation to the church at Rehobeth:—"I order and empower my executrix afterwards nominated and appointed, to sell, dispose of, and alien \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

also my lot joining to the new meeting-house lot in Pocomoke town, called Rehobeth, empowering my executrix afterwards named, to make over and alienate, that lot on which the meeting-house is built, in as ample manner to all intents and purposes, as shall be required for the ends and uses of a Presbyterian congregation, as if I were personally present, and to their successors for ever, and to *none else but to such*

\* See Appendix A.



*of the same persuasion in matters of religion."* As to the church in Philadelphia, he was willing it should enjoy his liberality, whether it assumed decidedly the Presbyterian or the Independent form of government: about the church at Rehobeth, which he had planted, watered and endowed, he felt no such uncertainty, and therefore he permits no option as to the religious name of the persons who should be benefited by the devise.

I may be told of the strong resemblance which exists between the Presbyterian and Congregational churches. I may be in error, but popular blindness upon this subject astonishes me. I wish no sounder Calvinism than I find in the articles of religion of the Episcopal church; and as to government, principles equally important, broad and distinctive, separate Presbyterianism from Episcopacy and Independency. But I have fatigued myself, and am fearful that you may complain of the length of this letter, in which I designed to conclude the subject. Will you permit me to resume it in my next?

## LETTER XII.

The subject continued.

REV. SIR,—

What I regard as the great beauties in our form of government is, the parity of the ministry, and the constitution and powers of “the presbytery;” and what I consider our radical defect in the constitution of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, adopted in 1789, is the attempt by presbyteries to delegate to other ecclesiastical bodies, powers derived immediately from the Great Head of the church, which in their nature are intransmissible, and to which a maxim borrowed from the civil law, applies with all its force, *Potestas delegata non delegari potest*. Can any one doubt the absolute power of a church session over its own pulpit in despite of the presbytery? On this subject the constitution is plain and consistent, and the responsibility of protecting particular congregations, from the errors of transient and heretical teachers, is thrown upon their spiritual overseers. If I am not a layman\* (and according to the doctrines of Dr. Miller I am not one,)

\* He refers to the office of ruling elder, which he sustained in the church at Snowhill.

yet about these matters I claim the same degree of indulgence, and ask that this error in opinion, if it be one, may be excused. I almost regret that I have found any fault with the constitution of the church, but the train of thought was suggested by the difference between the first Presbyterian church in Philadelphia in its early days, and a regularly constituted Presbyterian church.

The fact that Mr. Andrews was a member of the first presbytery organized in the colonies, affords no proof that either he or his people were Presbyterian in their predilections. If there were not more than a half dozen Presbyterian and Independent ministers between the southern boundary of New York and Terra del Fuego, I think they would all willingly meet in an ecclesiastical court, whether called classis, council, convention, conference, association, consociation, or presbytery.

But I think the latter extract from the will of Mr. Makemie, in my last letter, raises a doubt whether the meeting-house referred to, was not a second church edifice erected upon, or near the same site. He says, "the *new* meeting-house." Now, so far as I am advised, it is, and has been unusual to qualify the term church, or meeting-house, by the word *new*, but by the party name of the christian society for whose use it is erected; but the practice is, and has been universal, so to describe the house when the same congregation had occupied an older one. I have the records of a church session at hand, by whose procurement three churches were succes-

sively built; the second and the third, each in its turn, became the new meeting-house, and is so called for a time by the record.

I would mention another fact in this connexion. As early as 1707, the congregation at Snowhill could alone, and unaided, support a pastor; and in 1709, a benefaction to the Presbytery of Philadelphia of £30, was ordered by that body, to be distributed amongst the most necessitous congregations. The churches in New Castle and Philadelphia, each received a share, but, I think, the records of the presbytery will prove that not one penny of the amount was given to the church at Snowhill.

Would you inquire why there is not record evidence of the ages of the churches in Somerset? The answer is readily given. The churches were built on private property: the early sessional records are lost, and no public registration was necessary, until extorted by the act of 1702, about the provisions of which you read in my fourth letter. That law, it is believed, was not enforced against the dissenters here for some years after its passage, although its terms were complied with by the first and only brethren who laboured with Mr. Makemie in the field.

I refuse to the first church in Philadelphia, the name of a "regularly constituted Presbyterian church," until it became Presbyterian in government and doctrine; but date its organization in 1698, and I think the evidence is not only clear and cogent, but convincing, that it is younger than the five churches in Maryland.

I feel as though in this letter and its two immediate predecessors, I may have been chasing "small game;" but if the honour of having received into her bosom the first regularly constituted Presbyterian church in the United States, be of sufficient value to be claimed by Philadelphia, it cannot be wholly unimportant to resist that claim, if it is not well founded. I have written these letters without any unkind feeling towards a living being, and were I conscious that they contain any thing to offend any one, deeply should I regret having written them. But call it pride, or prejudice of education, or superstition, it is nevertheless true, that I venerate an ancient church.

## LETTER XIII.

The church at Rehobeth the eldest of the family of churches in Somerset county, Maryland.—Reflection suggested by the present dilapidated state of that eldest of American Presbyterian churches.—Mr. Makemie the first pastor of that church.—His successor Rev. John Henry.—Mr. Henry's connexions and descendants.—His death in 1717.—His manuscript volume written for the use of his descendants.

REV. SIR,—

Of the family of Presbyterian churches in Somerset and Worcester counties, the church at Rehobeth has been generally considered the eldest sister. To her claim to seniority I submit; my hand shall never pluck a single one of her honours.

All ruins are melancholy spectacles, but to me the sight of a church in ruins is positively painful. To think of generations now sleeping in the dust, who in years that have passed, occupied places within those crumbling walls, and there held that communion with God which qualified them for the kindred, but infinitely superior enjoyments of his upper sanctuary; to ponder on the happy seasons which have been thus enjoyed by those who have feasted on the fatness of God's house, and then to reflect, that those seasons never can return, will touch any heart in which God has shed abroad his love.

I have always regretted the destruction of so

many church edifices in Scotland by the rage of the Reformation. The abomination was not in the walls, nor even in the statuary nor paintings, which ornamented them; if the friends of the truth had said to the money changers and mass mongers: "Take these things hence," and then drove them out with scourges made of small cords, those dens of thieves might have been converted into houses of prayer. A church may be in ruins notwithstanding the condition of the building in which it has been wont to assemble, may be not only comfortable but superb. Between a church in good health, and one abounding in lukewarm, hypocritical and self-deceiving members, there is as much difference as between a healthy, happy and industrious family, and one, some of whose members are gasping for life, and others already dead and undergoing putrefaction.

There are within the bounds of the Presbytery of Lewes, many church ruins, but we have reason to be thankful that the church at Rehobeth is not one of them. That house of God is in comfortable repair, and its register still contains the names of a few who will, I trust, walk with the Lamb in white, because they are worthy; but they may now take up the melting strain of the prophet, whose harp was tuned into mourning, "The ways of Zion do mourn because none come to the solemn feasts: all her gates are desolate. Behold, O Lord, for I am in distress: my bowels are troubled; my heart is turned within me, for I have grievously rebelled." If the things that remain and are ready to die, be not

shortly strengthened, the church at Rehobeth will be among the wreck of things that were.

“The first congregation which worshipped at Rehobeth, consisted of English dissenters. A few families migrated from England, their consciences not suffering them to comply with the establishment then existing, and settled near the mouth of Pocomoke river and the adjacent parts; some on the east, and some on the west side of the river, and formed themselves into a religious society for the public worship of God. A house for public worship was built on the west side of the river, at a place called Rehobeth.”\* That emigration and organization of the church must have taken place before the passage of the act of 1702, for after that time the laws of Maryland and England, as to Protestant dissenters, were alike, and imposed equal burdens upon their purses and their consciences.

The authority last quoted asserts that the Rev. Francis Makemie was the first pastor of the church at Rehobeth, but there could exist no doubt upon the subject, had it been silent. His successor in that pastoral charge was the Rev. John Henry. I know not at what time he arrived in Maryland, or settled in Somerset; but presume it was soon after the death of Mr. Makemie. He stood high, not only as a divine, but also as a citizen, and his descendants have been at all times as respectable as any members of our community; indeed one of them was for a time

\* Copied from the autograph of the Rev. Samuel McMaster, for many years pastor of the church.



the governor of the State. His wife was Mary, who had been the wife and widow of Colonel Francis Jenkins, both of whom I mentioned in a former letter. Mr. Makemie calls her in his will, the "beloved consort" of Colonel Jenkins, and leaves us in a pleasant kind of uncertainty: for whether we understand the intention of the writer or not, we cannot err from the truth.—She was the consort of Colonel Jenkins, and certainly "beloved," whether predicated of the testator or of her husband. Mr. Makemie entrusted to her, provisionally, the most precious charge, except his own soul, that God had committed to him; and her husband, who left no child, bequeathed to her an immense estate. She was a distinguished woman, or as I have heard her called, "a great woman." Her maiden name was King. She was the daughter of Sir Robert King, an Irish Baronet. She is uniformly called on the public records, "Madam;" but whether on account of the baronetcy of her father, the colonelcy of her first husband, or the clerical profession of her second and third husbands, I am uncertain. She left two sons, the only descendants of herself or of Mr. Henry; they both attained manhood; were married, and their descendants may be found in Dorchester, Somerset and Worcester counties, and in other parts of Maryland. After the death of Mr. Henry, she became the wife of the Rev. John Hampton,\* whom she survived. She died in 1744. Mr. Henry died in 1717.†

\* See Mr. Hampton's will in Appendix C.

† See Mr. Henry's will in Appendix C.

I remember to have seen, seventeen years ago, a manuscript strongly-bound octavo volume of from three to five hundred pages, entitled "Common Place." It was a mass of religious instructions prepared by Mr. Henry for his descendants. From my recollection of the book, it enforced the prominent doctrines of the Confession of Faith, in their length and breadth, urged upon those who should inherit his name or blood, the faithful performance of the duties which result from them—with his advice as to the best manner of performing those duties. I remember that he recommended 9 o'clock in the evening as the hour for family worship. The book was made up with great care, was more legible than many printed volumes, and must have cost much labour. I would not make the impression, that Mr. Henry elevated the Confession of Faith above the Bible; he considered that there was perfect concord between them. As for myself, I consider the Confession of Faith the best commentary and the best summary of Bible truth.

## LETTER XIV.

Memoir of the Rev. David Purviance.

REV. SIR,—

I commence this letter with the deliberate purpose of acting disorderly. I shall write about *the dead*. They were neither ministers nor elders, nor even members of the peninsular churches, whose history has heretofore occupied our attention; indeed they were not citizens of this State, but they were fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, and were called to their eternal rest while labouring in, and for the churches of Somerset and Worcester counties.\*

The first whom I shall mention, is the Rev. David Purviance. All that I know about him is contained in the memoranda of my boyhood; but I was at that time so much interested by what I learned from one who knew him, that I committed the facts to paper. Why is it, do you think, that I doubt whether any other human being is aware that such a man as David Purviance ever lived, makes me anxious to tell you all I know in relation to him? Is it that

\* The author does not of course here include Mr. Duffield, who was a member and an elder of a peninsular church.

clinging to life which builds minsters, and mausoleums over the departed, which records the virtues in deep cut marble, and which induces survivors to embalm their bodies with sweet spices? We are strangely constituted creatures: our bodies are fearfully and wonderfully made; but I consider the moral man a much more subtle, fearful and wonderful creation; and the mode of its existence, and the nature and the consequences of its union with that mass of corruptible matter which will soon be destroyed by worms, or fish, or fire, as hard to be understood as any thing revealed in the Bible. I am compelled to believe in relation to myself, what is as entirely incomprehensible, and as profoundly mysterious, as any revelation which God has made to man, either as to his own character or the dispensations of his providence. I love to think of death. Do not suppose I am boasting when I say so; for I am often fearful that in that awful hour, Satan will be permitted to sift me as wheat. But the funeral of the pious dead is more grateful to my feelings than the most merry meetings, or delightful measures. Why should not christians love to contemplate death. *Here* we are but strangers and pilgrims; but death will terminate our pilgrimage, and if we are the called according to God's purpose, we shall then go home and occupy those mansions in our Father's house, which have been prepared for us by our elder brother: *here* we are engaged in continual conflicts with sin, and exposed to every ill that flesh is *heir to*; *there* we shall be made like unto Jesus, because we

shall see him as he is: *here*, our spiritual comforts are stinted or dilated, and we too often depend for their supply upon broken cisterns, and even when that is not the fact,

“ We drink, and drink, and drink again,  
And drink, and still are dry;”

*there*, we shall bathe in waters purer than those of Siloah, although they went softly and flowed fast by the oracles of God, and will drink of the pure river of the water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb; *here* we see through a glass darkly; *there*, delightful thought! we sinners, saved by grace, will gaze upon the ineffable glories of the Godhead. “It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God,” but we know that faith can take from death its sting, and from the grave its victory.—

—————“There is no by-road  
To bliss. Then why, like ill conditioned children,  
Start we at transient hardships, in the way  
Which leads to purer air, and softer skies,  
And a ne’er setting sun? Fools that we are,  
We wish to be where sweets unwith’ring bloom;  
But straight our wish revoke, and will not go.”

You may tell me that all this moralising about death, has nothing to do with the subject of these letters. My first letter avows my purpose of selecting my own topics, and managing them according to the caprice of my own fancy. But death has had much to do with David Purviance—it broke his heart-

strings, and will soon perform the same office for us—but to return :—

Mr. Purviance was a native of Pennsylvania, and a licentiate of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. He was reared and educated by a maternal uncle, as I ascertain from the correspondence occasioned by his death, between the gentleman at whose house he died and a relation of Mr. Purviance of the same name, who resided in Philadelphia ; those letters are now in my possession. He had been sent by the Presbytery of Philadelphia to perform missionary services in the vacant churches on this peninsula ; and had discharged the duties of his mission faithfully, and most acceptably to the congregations in which he laboured. The church at Snowhill had no pastor at that time, and Mr. Purviance gave to it a liberal portion of the time and labour which he expended in this region. He was an interesting young man. I have said already, that what I know concerning him, was collected from one who was acquainted with him : my informer was the daughter of the gentleman at whose house he for some time lived, and at which he died ; that house has been the home of clergymen, for more than a century. I take leave to say of the lady herself, that she was intelligent, a Bible student, an enlightened Presbyterian, and was considered by those who knew her, not only a consistent, but a very pious member of the church from the days of her youth until her death, on the 30th of August, 1821, in the 79th year of her age.

Mr. Purviance came to these churches in buoyant youth, and apparently vigorous health. He spent a night, unexpectedly, at the house of a stranger, and discovered when he arose in the morning, that a window covered with a curtain, had been left open: he never again had health. The exposure produced disease which assailed his lungs, and after lingering a short time, he died. In the interval between his attack and his death, he and the friends with whom he resided, believed that he was not only convalescent, but wholly relieved; and at the very moment of his death, his horse, by his own order, was standing at the door to bear him to the home of his childhood. It is true, although not contained in so many words in the scriptures, that in the midst of life we are in death. A short time before his death, when Mr. Purviance and his friends considered his health restored, he had attended a funeral: to that was attributed afterwards his unexpected death. He was a talker in his sleep; but one of an extraordinary character. He plead in that way God's "exceeding great and precious promises." Early in the morning on which he died, a member of the family near his chamber-door, heard him utter, whilst asleep, the gracious words contained in the first three verses of the fourteenth chapter of the gospel of John: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions. If it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and re-

ceive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also." He arose afterwards, prepared for his journey, breakfasted with the family, ascended the stairs to his chamber for some purpose, and in a few minutes afterwards slept in death. This occurred in the spring or summer of 1757. His grave is in the yard of the church in Snowhill, and has been most carefully protected by the congregation, and I have been pleased, indeed amused, at the jealousy with which they watch it. They know nothing about it, but that a Presbyterian missionary sleeps there, but by those whose place in the church they now occupy, they have been taught to honour the spot. I should be pleased to show you the chamber where he met his fate, and to point out the spot where sleeps the dust of David Purviance.



## LETTER XV.

Memoir of the Rev. Henry Blatchford.

REV. SIR,—

I wish to communicate to you at this time, some particulars in relation to another of death's doings. I am aware that I incur risk, for I entertain many doubts whether my last letter contained any thing to interest you, and I had advantages there of which I cannot here avail myself. Death, to be sure, has canonized the excellencies of his character about whom I shall write; but the facts are of recent occurrence, and therefore known to many, as well as your correspondent. The twilight which rests on the things and the persons from whom we are separated by a long interval of rolling years, greatly enhances their value in the estimation of all who attempt their retrospection. Upon your indulgence, however, on this occasion, I have peculiar claims. The person about whom I shall write, broke the bread of life to the people recently in your pastoral charge, and between which and yourself exists the strongest reciprocal attachment; he died in an apartment which you have probably since occupied, and where you have no doubt consumed much oil in poring

over huge theological folios ; and some of the incidents occurred in the church whose walls have hundreds of times echoed with the threatenings and the invitations of the gospel which they have caught from your lips. You have read this inscription on the neat white marble slab planted within a few feet of the front of the last named church : "BY THE CONGREGATIONS OF SNOWHILL, PITTS CREEK, REHOBETH, AND MONOKIN." That slab covers the grave of one who, humanly speaking, was cut down in the very midst of his usefulness.

The Rev. Henry Blatchford was a native of England. I think he was born in Devonshire, or Cornwall, but his father, the late Rev. Samuel Blatchford, D. D. of Lansingburg, New York, removed with his family to this country, when Henry was very young, perhaps not more than two years old, and here they continued to reside until they ceased to live. I know nothing of the early life of Mr. Blatchford, except what was contained in a letter received from his father after his death. That letter, I am sorry to say, I have lost. He was, however, liberally educated, and a member of the first class of students which was organized at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey. In the early part of the summer of 1822, the churches at Snowhill, Pitt's creek, Rehobeth,\* and Monokin, were without a preacher. To interrupt the silence of their Sab-

\* It may be necessary to say, that the Rev. Mr. Balch, then the pastor of the three first named churches, had at that time leave of absence for an indefinite period, on account of ill health.

baths, Mr. Blatchford visited them. He had not long before that time, resigned the pastoral charge of a church in Salem. The first sermon which he preached in either of those churches, perhaps the first one he preached in this peninsula, was delivered in Snowhill, on a Sabbath morning in the month of June. His text was Job xxvii. 8th.—“For what is the hope of the hypocrite though he hath gained, when God taketh away his soul?” It was an able, pungent, searching sermon, and made a deep impression upon his auditory. His preaching was most acceptable to christians of all names; and whilst he laboured here, the people became increasingly interested in his public ministrations. His sermons were not merely *carefully*, but *punctiliously* elaborated, and he read them, I believe, precisely as they had been written. The churches of Snowhill, Pitts-creek and Rehobeth, had the larger share, but the church at Princess Anne (I ought to say the church at Monokin, for that is its name,) also enjoyed a portion of his labours. I never knew a minister who gained more rapidly upon the affections of those whom he taught publicly; but especially of those with whom he mingled in social intercourse. It fully justified the expression in an obituary notice, written by a friend, who had no doubt known him much longer than I: “*All who knew him loved him.*”

On Sunday, the ——— day of ——— 1822, he preached three times in the church at Snowhill. His public prayers, at all times remarkable for their fluency, fervour, and humble familiarity with God,

were so remarkable for those qualities on that day, and especially in the evening, as to thrill the feelings of those who in faith united with him. I remember distinctly the expression of a female in very humble life, a member of a church of a different name: "I never heard such prayers," said she, "they pierce through and through me." Her form of expression might perhaps have been more elegant, but any attempt of mine to communicate to you the same truth with equal force, would be worse than in vain. The text of his third sermon preached on the evening of that day, was John i. 41: "We have found the Messias; which is, being interpreted, the Christ." I know not that he had ever preached with deeper feeling or greater power, and he concluded the sermon by repeating that solemn hymn, one verse of which is:—

Lo! on a narrow neck of land,  
 'Twixt two unbounded seas I stand,  
 Yet how insensible!  
 A point of time, a moment's space,  
 Secures me in that heavenly place,  
 Or shuts me up in hell!

It was his last sermon, and but one other earthly Sabbath dawned upon him; for on Saturday the 7th of September, at Princess Anne, whither he had gone but a few days before, he fell asleep, and entered, I doubt not, upon a Sabbath, which will never end.

On the morning of Sunday, I attended his funeral, and could my pen shed the light of pure, unadulter-

ated truth upon the scenes to which that visit introduced me, this letter I am persuaded would have attractions for you, although the transactions of yesterday constitute its burden. You know that I have visited Princess Anne very many times, in fact have spent much time there ; but never did I see that village so quiet on any day as on that one—it was Sabbath stillness indeed. The people of the place of all classes, were not only grave but seemed awed, and their sensibilities were certainly tenderly alive. Princess Anne certainly never looked so lovely. The funeral services were performed in the church, and at the grave. In the absence of a Presbyterian minister, an Episcopal clergyman preached a sermon on the occasion: he was assisted in the other services by two brethren of the Methodist Episcopal church. The sermon was a good one, and the other exercises were not only appropriate, but interesting. I have been in many worshipping assemblies, but that certainly was one of the most solemn and tender congregations of which I ever made a part. The death of Mr. Blatchford was unexpected: the people appeared to recognize the hand of “the Judge of all the earth,” to realize the uncertainty of their own hold on life; to feel, in a measure at least, the import of the injunction, “Be still and know that I am God;” and the removal of such a man to his “long home,” whilst far away from father, and mother, and wife, and children, and all the friends of his early life, aroused all their sympathies, and bathed the faces of the speakers and many of their hearers in

tears. I remember at this moment, the appearance and the manner of one of the Methodist clergymen who stood at the head of the grave: his eyes were red and swollen, and his voice husky; and elevating his right hand, he commenced an address to the congregation, substantially as follows:—"It has been, and is, my prayer, to die as our brother has died; to be called home while busily engaged doing my Master's work." But I feel that all my attempts to do justice to the events which this letter notices, have failed, and I will now release you from the perusal of its dull details. I send you herewith a copy of a letter which I addressed to a friend in Philadelphia, in October 1831, which appeared in the Christian Advocate of the succeeding month. It contains a brief memoir of a ruling elder, who was one of my most highly valued friends. \* \* \* \*

## LETTER XVI.

Memoir of John P. Duffield, Esq.

REV. SIR,—

The reading of this brief memoir of a departed friend, may afford you but little pleasure; and that you receive it, is attributable to the promise that I made you at our last interview, that I would prepare and forward it to you. Forgive, my friend, its dullness, in consideration of its object, and the simplicity of my purpose. I would record several particulars in relation to a christian brother removed from his labours to his rest, which depend entirely upon my own memory; I would exhibit a triumph of divine grace; I would furnish you with a few incidents in the life of a ruling elder, the recollection of which is most agreeable to myself. How lamentably small is the number who know any thing of the spiritual character of the office of ruling elder or of its dignity in the church of God!

John Potts Duffield was the son of Dr. Benjamin Duffield, a distinguished physician of Philadelphia, and was born in that city November 2d, 1784.

His father was attached to the Episcopal church; and the son was baptized by him, who is at this time

senior bishop of Pennsylvania, and was reared as a member of the congregation at that time in his especial charge. Had the wishes of his father been gratified, he would have been educated for his own profession; but the death of Dr. Duffield, when his son was only fifteen years old, defeated those wishes. He was permitted to choose his own calling, and became a sailor. From that time until the year 1811, he continued in what was then his favourite employment; and had passed from the subordinate place, which at first he very properly occupied, to the command, and had made several voyages to India, to Europe, and to South America. He was a skilful navigator, and had acquired the confidence of all who were interested in his commercial enterprises. He was twice happily married. His first marriage took place in 1811, from which time until his death, he continued to reside in Worcester county, Maryland: he was married a second time in 1821. Seven children survived him—three by his first, and four by his second marriage. With the skill and reputation of a sailor, Mr. Duffield had, alas! acquired the vices too common to his profession. I know not that he was skeptical or intemperate; but it is nevertheless true, that he was a blasphemer—“that he walked in the counsel of the ungodly, and stood in the way of sinners, and sat in the seat of the scornful.” Such was his character at the time of his first marriage, and such it continued to be until the spring of 1812. However much you may be surprised at the declaration, it gives me pleasure to charge the cha-



racter of my friend with the sins of which he was guilty ; and to enumerate his spiritual diseases in all their loathsomeness ; for where sin abounded, grace did afterwards much more abound, and over his besetting sins he came off more than a conqueror, through him that loved him. There is nothing in the moral world comparable in beauty or grandeur with the church of Jesus Christ ; and in the life of an individual there is no period so interesting to christian feelings as that which translates him from the kingdom of Satan into the kingdom of God's dear Son. Should this part of this memoir be improperly minute, may I not hope that you will pardon me ?

I have already said that Mr. Duffield was married in 1811 : his wife was the pious daughter of a pious mother, and a member of the Presbyterian church at Snowhill, in full standing.\* In the spring of 1812, to gratify her wishes, and perhaps accomplish some vain purpose of his own, he accompanied her to Snowhill from their residence in the country a few miles distant, on the morning of Saturday ; there were services in the Presbyterian church on that day, preparatory to the administration of the Lord's supper on the next. They visited the house of a friend who was a member of the church ; and the subject of this memoir carried with him all his love of sin, and entire carelessness to the interests of his

\* I knew her long and loved her much. One of the last sentences which she addressed to mortal ears, was in substance : Oh ! he [Christ] is inexpressibly precious to my soul.

soul, or the wrath of God. He would not attend upon the religious services of that day. The gentleman whom he visited, on his return from church, found him preparing for some idle recreation, and to his friend's inquiry, "why he had not gone to church?" he replied in some of those "grievous words" which generally "stir up strife." Such a man was John P. Duffield, on the morning of the next day, when he took his seat in the sanctuary of God, and so careless, hard-hearted, and altogether in love with sin, he continued throughout the prefatory services and the sermon. But while the Rev. Stuart Williamson, at that time pastor of the church, was addressing a company of christians, seated at the table of the Lord, and celebrating his death, the barbed arrows of the Almighty reached his conscience; and he wished, (I quote substantially, if not precisely his words to me,) to be under the pavement of the church, or in any other place which would conceal him. From that time, he ceased to be at "ease in Zion;" he read, he prayed, he meditated; but ashamed of the cause of his distress, he communicated his state of mind to no one, not even to his pious wife. But that he had "tasted the powers of the world to come," was soon discovered; and the manner of the discovery affected his feelings powerfully the very last time I heard him allude to it, although eighteen years had elapsed since the occurrence. He had retired to his chamber to ask relief from him that "giveth liberally to all men and upbraideth not;" but contrary to his custom on those

occasions, neglected to lock his door; and whilst on his knees, engaged in importunate prayer, Mrs. Duffield entered the room, saw him, and comprehended the whole matter, threw herself upon his neck, and bathed it with tears of joy. He no longer attempted to conceal his convictions of sin, but continued to seek deliverance from condemnation on account of it, until he found that Saviour of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write. In the autumn of the same year, he was admitted to full standing in the church in which he first trembled under the terrors of God's violated law; and in the succeeding year he was elected ruling elder by the congregation, and solemnly set apart for that office according to the form of government of the Presbyterian church. It cannot be improper to remark in this place, that after having investigated the subject, he considered the government of that branch of the christian church to which he attached himself, as not only expedient, but most conformable to scriptural warrant: that he cordially received her doctrines, and greatly admired the simplicity of her worship.

Mr. Duffield had great energy of character—whatsoever his hands found to do, he did it with his might. He counted the cost of following Christ, before he assumed his cross; and he not only attempted the crucifixion of every lust, but as soon as he had obtained a good hope through grace, he endeavoured to walk in all God's statutes and ordinances blameless.

Convinced that family worship is a duty in every christian household, he instituted it very soon after he became a follower of Christ. In a confidential conversation upon the subject, he said that when he commenced family worship, he used a form of prayer. Because of his fluency, especially in prayer, the reason was inquired for; he replied, "I was afraid to trust my own feelings in so solemn a service, and even with a book before me I had considerable trouble, for tears almost blinded me." He did not suppose that this remark would be repeated or even remembered, but what christian can read it without desiring feelings like those which almost blinded him with tears? On all proper occasions, he did not hesitate to avow, that he was on the Lord's side, or to rebuke sin, or to exhort sinners to repentance. In his piety, however, there was nothing obtrusive or ostentatious. His whole deportment exhibited the power of faith, the effect of the religion of the heart upon the life; but except in religious exercises, taking sweet counsel with christian friends, or discharging duties which weighed upon his conscience, his religion did not discover itself in words. In all his domestic relations, he was most exemplary. As a master, a father, a husband, he was indulgent, affectionate, tender; but in all matters of duty, as the government of his family was regarded, he was uncompromising. I know not how often he has reminded me of the resolution of good old Joshua. "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." This sketch cannot show his moral influence upon

the community to which he belonged: and the services which he rendered to that little flock of which he was a member and an officer, will never be duly appreciated by those of them who survive him, until the coming of the great day, "for which all other days were made."

As a ruling elder, he magnified his office. When duty required and circumstances permitted it, he never failed to attend the judicatories of the church; and as a member of the session, or a representative of a portion of the church in the higher ecclesiastical courts, he promptly contributed his aid to the correction of whatever he considered amiss, whether in doctrine or discipline. He loved the Catholic church, but the congregation with which he was more immediately connected, was most dear to him. For the church in Snowhill, he laboured indefatigably and prayed frequently and fervently. From the death of the Rev. Mr. Williamson in 1814, until 1818, the church had no pastor, and was favoured with only occasional and unfrequent supplies. During that period, the church was regularly opened for public worship, and the services (prayer, praise, and the reading of a sermon,) were conducted by the session. Unless unavoidably prevented, Mr. Duffield always appeared in the desk on those occasions. Many profitable sermons, and many fervent prayers have I heard from his lips, although he was no preacher; and in the discharge of this duty to the church, he continued faithful until the end of his life. I have seen him in very feeble health, his breast

so much diseased, that he could not sing the praises of his Maker, in which he took great pleasure—go into the desk and perform all the services. He said those services were “inexpressibly sweet” to him. In prayer-meetings he greatly delighted. For many years his house was regularly opened to all who chose to attend a meeting for social prayer; he generally conducted the exercises, and in a most acceptable manner. This was the case at the time of his death. The last time the congregation which had selected him for an overseer, heard his voice, was at a prayer-meeting at the house of a member of the church, Thursday evening, the 14th of October, 1830. He had directed the meeting; had called upon such of his brethren as he chose to select for that purpose to lead in prayer; had read the sixth chapter of Matthew; and exhorted the christians present to avail themselves of their christian privileges; to spend more time in prayer and communion with God, because with him the prayers of christians were prevalent and could effect wonders, even the building up of believers in their most holy faith, and the conversion of sinners. After he had announced that the services would be concluded with the singing of the 84th hymn of Dr. Watts’ second book, his respiration became so much embarrassed, that he was unable to read the hymn; he handed the book to a friend, left the room, and never again appeared in a worshipping assembly.

The disease which caused Mr. Duffield’s death was gout. It had preyed upon him for many years, and

had assailed his whole body; its attacks were agonizing, and towards the end of his life became quite frequent. In the month of August, 1830, when his recovery from the attack which preceded his last sickness, had just commenced, he was visited by a christian brother. It was the Sabbath, and he seemed in the spirit on the Lord's day. The love of God, the salvation of souls, and the prosperity of the church constituted the burden of his thoughts, and the subject of his conversation. His attention was called to a piece of soothing poetry; he read it attentively, and when he had finished it, remarked with swimming eyes, "it has gratified me much." He proceeded to exhort his visiter to be more faithful to the church than *he* had been; he said he had endeavoured to serve the church, but at that time, when he was aware that he had nearly done with the church on earth, he felt that he had not done all his duty, and that he could then only repent of his barrenness.

The mind of Mr. Duffield was of a superior order, and he was unusually fond of books. The Bible he read diligently, and Scott's Commentary was a favourite work with him. To the inquiry of a friend, as to his seasons of devotion, his answer was, that he was an early riser, and spent an hour in the morning reading the scriptures, in self-examination and prayer, and employed an hour in the evening in the same manner. He was a happy man! The summer before his death, whilst making some arrangements as to his property, in anticipation of that event,

he was asked abruptly: "Are you afraid to die?" "Not at all," was his answer. He proceeded to say, he did not know how fearfully he might be assaulted when engaged in the last conflict, but no fears of it disturbed him—he was kept in peace. Such was the state of his mind for many years, indeed almost throughout his christian life. Gloomy or rapturous seasons were not frequent with him—superior spiritual enjoyment he would call "a sweet season," or characterize it by some similar term. I believe that in most cases, just in proportion as a christian is careful not only to forsake every known sin, but also to discharge every known duty, however mortifying to the flesh, just in that proportion will his life and death be peaceful and happy. Such was the case with the subject of this memoir. His death-bed resembled his life: both were peaceful. After his confinement few were permitted to see him, for talking increased his sufferings, and he was urged by his medical attendants to converse as little as possible. To one of them he said, "my sufferings have been very great, but I trust I have not murmured, and hope I shall not be permitted to murmur. Jesus is all my hope—in him with all my imperfections, I shall be received. I have not a doubt or fear as to my acceptance with God." His sufferings were not prolonged; on the morning of Sunday, October the 24th, 1830, he "breathed his life out," and left a world of sin and sorrow for "a better country, even a heavenly." On the afternoon of Monday, an appropriate sermon was preached to a mourning con-



gregation from Job xiv. 1, by the Rev. Alexander Campbell, and his body committed to the earth, within a few feet of that church which he loved so much, and in which he laboured so faithfully. Thus lived and died John P. Duffield. "Mark the perfect man; for the end of that man is peace."

A FEW REMINISCENCES.



## A FEW REMINISCENCES.

---

THE days of the years of our pilgrimage are "evil and few." None but the children of God ever enjoy a moment of peace, and although the pious rejoice sometimes with "joy unspeakable," yet this world is to them generally, but a vale of tears. To look forward to the end of the dismal journey, to that "point of time" which will seal their eternal destiny, is an awful business—even to some good people it is appalling.

I was thinking a little while since about the "Act and Testimony," about the Convention of disorganizers at Pittsburgh, about the war in the Presbyterian church, about Presbyterians who would unchurch me, and about other denominations who believe that beyond their own party-wall, there is little religion, and the thought crossed my mind, "what importance will those brethren attach to those peculiarities at the hour of death?" Suppose you that one of them will die rejoicing in the "Act and Testimony," or in the "Book of Common Prayer," or in the Wesleyan "Discipline"? I thought of the

happy death-beds of some of my friends of different religious persuasions, and I could not remember that they said a single word about a party name.

I knew a lady, the widowed mother of several children. She had been affluent, but poverty and blindness visited her about the same time. She had a mind unusually strong and discriminating, had read much, and was warmly attached to the Episcopal church, to its government, its rites, its liturgy, and to its doctrines according to their literal meaning. In early life she had devoted herself to God. I believe for years she was distressed with no doubts as to her interest in the Saviour's blood; indeed she was satisfied as to the moment in which she was justified by faith. She was not at all superstitious, but the couplet

The Spirit answers to the blood  
And tells me I am born of God,

was carried home to her with great power. Children and husband and fortune were taken from her—she submitted: disease preyed upon her body,—she was resigned, knowing that her light affliction would work out for her a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; day and night became alike to her—she was light in the Lord. After years of mental and corporeal suffering, (but rejoicing all the while in hope) she met the king of terrors without a single fear, as to the result of the conflict; and having committed her two surviving daughters to God in prayers, not only fervent, but more pertinent than

any that can be found in the "Book of Common Prayer," she fell asleep. She could repeat a large portion of the Psalter, and perhaps the whole of the morning and evening services of the Episcopal church. I love to think of her daughters. They were left very young, and almost friendless, but they will never be forsaken, nor beg their bread; the truth is, their mother invested their inheritance in the safest stock in the universe of God!

I knew another widowed mother of several children, whom she endeavoured to rear "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." She was from principle a Presbyterian, although baptized and educated in a different branch of the church of Christ. I have seen her reading the scriptures to her children weeping as she read—I have seen her examining her household on Sabbath evenings as to their acquaintance with Bible truth, and especially of that summary of its doctrines which is contained in the Assembly's Shorter Catechism. She was more anxious to depart and be with Christ, than any child of the kingdom I have ever known. I saw her on one occasion, when a son who had visited her was about to leave her, remove her cap, clip a lock of hair, which with some gold she handed to him, saying in substance, "My child! I am about to die—make of these something in memory of your mother." She was then in health apparently as good as usual, and although that son saw her again very soon, she was on her death-bed. She walked in the garden on an evening shortly after the former interview, was over-

heard by the family bidding farewell to the setting sun, returned to her chamber and her bed, which she did not leave until she exchanged it for a coffin. She expressed no wish during her confinement but to be absent from the body, that she might be present with the Lord.

I knew another son of her's. He was rarely endowed. When a little more than fourteen years old, he had qualified himself for studying one of the learned professions. He was wondered at by all his acquaintances, and doated upon by his friends. He had been reared upon the plan of Eunice the mother of Timothy, and his death, according to human speculation, was as premature as his mind was precocious. After a sickness of a few weeks, he said,

See truth, love, and mercy, in triumph descending,  
 And nature all glowing in Eden's first bloom,  
 On the cold cheek of death, smiles and roses are blending,  
 And beauty immortal awakes from the tomb ;

and died !

I loved a young lady who had been the companion of my boyhood—I loved her because she was amiable, but my love was that of a friend. Notwithstanding, humanly speaking, she was so good, yet, until about eighteen months before her death, she was entirely careless about her eternal interests. There was at the time of which I am thinking, much excitement in the Presbyterian church of the village in which she lived ; many were anxious about their souls, some of whom still adorn their profession by a walk and conversation which become the gospel of

Christ, and some have gone to glory. On a weekday evening, there was a meeting for prayer and inquiry at the house of an elder of the church, and a Presbyterian clergyman conducted it. An elder sister of the young lady about whom I write, who was eminently pious, and a member of the Methodist church, attended the meeting. The clergyman, who knew her character, asked her some question which I did not hear distinctly: she said "my sister," and burst into tears. I soon discovered that she considered her sister not only careless, but in a hopeless condition. Her adviser told her to pray for her, and not to despair. He asked her if she did not remember the woman who continued to pray to our Saviour, and whose prayer was granted, although he had called her a "dog"? Very few hours elapsed before I saw that careless, hardened sister at a similar meeting, and in very few hours more, she was on the side of the people of God. She was introduced to the kingdom of heaven by Presbyterian and Methodist instrumentality, but she was from that time a zealous, indeed an ardent Episcopalian. I was near her when she died—I watched her dead body. Her death was a glorious death! Her attendants had supposed for some time, that the agony, except the last gasp, was finished: suddenly, a smile so radiant lighted up her face, that they thought she would laugh aloud: "Beautiful! beautiful!" (said she with great emphasis) "*I see angels!* Father, forgive my sins for Jesus's sake"—and breathed her life out.

I have spoken of Presbyterians and Episcopalians



—I write now of a Methodist “after the strictest sect,” and the “leader” of a “class” of members of that church according to the terms of the Wesleyan Discipline. He was in very humble life, and a poor man. He had been married a short time, and was the father of one child. His health had been sound, he was young, and his prospect for long life was good; but “the Master” came and called for him, and he willingly obeyed the summons. A little while before the occurrence of the few incidents which I shall notice, one of his neighbours had been convinced of sin, and had for several days endured horrible sufferings on account of it; whilst the subject of this notice was praying “with him and for him” *under a crab-tree*, he experienced that “peace of God, which passeth all understanding.” A little while before his death, (his disease was short and violent, but did not affect his mind at all) whilst surrounded by relatives and friends, that neighbour entered his house, and found him in fine spirits. “Ah! brother D—” said he, “I have not forgotten the crab-tree.” Soon after another neighbour was added to the company. “Brother B—,” was his salutation, “I am glad to see you—I was about to send for you. I wish you to make my coffin, and to have me decently buried in the yard of the little meeting-house where we have had so many *good meetings*.” His friends and family wept much: “Do not distress yourselves on my account,” said he, “I am as happy as I now wish to be, but I shall soon be a great deal happier.” His weeping wife then seated herself beside his bed, and

held up in his view their infant ; the trial was a sore one, and he felt it ; but he triumphed, and sung with great animation,

“ *Hinder me not,*

For I will serve God, and praise him when I die,”

and soon afterwards passed over Jordan.



READER!

ARE YOU

ASHAMED OF CHRIST,

AND OF

HIS WORDS?



ARE YOU  
ASHAMED OF CHRIST?

“For whosoever shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father’s, and of the holy angels.”—*Luke ix. 26.*

---

THE Bible recognises two kinds of shame; one is the effect of “repentance towards God;”\* the other is produced by that pride which not only lives but reigns in the heart of every unconverted child of Adam. The former kind is illustrated, Dan. ix. 8. O Lord, to us belongeth confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we have sinned against thee: the latter kind, is denounced by our Lord Jesus Christ, Luke ix. 26: For whosoever shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father’s, and of the holy angels. *Pride, the parent of the shame denounced by our Lord, is the great enemy of God in*

\* Acts xx. 21.

*the human heart*; and whilst it reigns there, in vain may Christ “stand at the door and knock,”\* for the strong man will not permit his admission, lest he should spoil his goods. Reader! is this your case? Does not the consideration appal you, that that pride, which exalteth itself against every thing that “is called God,”† should exclude the Lord Jesus Christ from your heart; should prevent the renewing influences of his Spirit, and the application of his blood (which cleanseth from all sin‡) to your conscience? But this is not the whole amount of the evil. Unless the pride which reigns in your heart be crucified, you will continue ashamed of Christ and of his words until death overtakes you, and then you must be turned into hell with all the nations that forget God.§ But why will you continue the slave of pride, when “without money and without price,”|| you may become the “free man” of Christ?¶ Has not pride destroyed the lives of millions of our race? May we not with fear and trembling suggest the apprehension, that multitudes of souls are now involved in “the blackness of darkness for ever,”\*\* because they were ashamed of Christ and of his words? Pride has desolated the very garden of God, and crucified God’s only begotten Son, notwithstanding which, you prefer obedience to it “and the pains of hell for ever,” rather than the cross of Christ, and the blessings which accompany it, “righteousness and

\* Rev. iii. 20.

† 2 Thess. ii. 4.

‡ 1 John i. 7.

§ Ps. ix. 17.

|| Isa. lv. 1.

¶ 1 Cor. vii. 22.

\*\* Jude 17.

peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.”\* Does not your conscience admonish you as you read this, that pride makes you ashamed of Christ? Neither feign nor conjure nor concert excuses: confess your guilt, and repent of it, and thus pursue a course worthy of an immortal being. With pride reigning in your heart, heaven can never be your portion, and God has revealed to man no manner in which it can be crucified, save on the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, upon which every christian indeed is crucified to the world and the world is crucified to every christian.† But why are you ashamed of the cross? Would you writhe under the sneers and taunts of your ungodly acquaintances? Now all who would live godly in Christ Jesus, are warned that they may expect persecution,‡ and it is a merciful discipline by which God’s children are made humble: but let the scoffer continue to scoff, it can do you no real injury, and cannot long continue; for very soon his eye will become glazed, his brow will be horribly ravaged, and his tongue will be as quiet as silence itself, and as clammy as a grave-worm. Moreover, the reproaches of the enemies of God cannot annoy you long, for they will not reach your ear when it is so “dull and cold” that it cannot be grated by the screaming of a coffin screw within a few inches of its drum. Oh! where will you be then? If you continue ashamed of Christ, your place will certainly be the lake that “burneth with fire and brimstone,”§ and your com-

\* Romans xiv. 17.

† Gal. vi. 14.

‡ 2 Tim. iii. 12.

§ Rev. xxi. 8.



panions devils and damned spirits. Reflect upon the threatening contained in the verse already quoted from the gospel of Luke: of all such as are ashamed of Christ in this world, will he be ashamed when he comes in his own glory, and his Father's, and of the holy angels, "to judge all the dead, small and great,"\* and in vain will they call on mountains and rocks to fall on them and hide them from Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb, for the great day of His wrath will have then come.† If your soul were separated from your body at this instant, would you be found interested in the cross of Christ and in his blood and righteousness? Let your conscience answer, and it will accuse you or else excuse you.‡ Assume the cross of Christ then for your soul's sake, for Christ's sake, and let grace make you a child of God "by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost."§

But you are guilty of the blackest ingratitude in permitting yourself to be ashamed. Has not God loaded you with benefits? Has He not crowned all of your years with his goodness?|| For many years when there was but "a step between you and death," has he not prevented you from falling into hell? And yet you are ashamed of his only begotten Son, either to follow him or to be called by his name. But your pride may perhaps suggest, that it is incompa-

\* Rev. xx. 12.

† Rev. vi. 16.

‡ Romans ii. 15.

§ Titus iii. 5.

|| Ps. lxx. 11.

tible with the dignity of your nature that that man should reign over you, who was cradled in a manger, the reputed son of a carpenter, who was so poor that he had “not where to lay his head,”\* who was mocked, buffeted, spit upon, crowned with thorns, and crucified between two thieves.† Let me remind you that although he was “meek and lowly in heart,”‡ from the time of his birth until Joseph of Arimathea begged his body of Pilate and “wrapped it in a clean linen cloth and laid it in his own new tomb,”§ yet “a multitude of the heavenly host” rejoiced at his nativity;|| the glory of God shone round about those to whom that blessed intelligence was communicated, and a star pointed out his humble birth-place.¶ It is true he was poor, but he had been rich, for the treasures of the universe had been his. Reader, do you know why he became poor? “He who was rich for *your* sake became poor, that you, through his poverty, might be rich”\*\* For your sake his soul was “exceeding sorrowful;” for your sake he was agonized, “and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground;”†† and that you might live, “he bowed his head and gave up the ghost.”‡‡ He has opened “a new and living way”§§ in which God can be just and yet justify the chief of sinners, and in him all the promises are “yea and amen.”|||

\* Matt. viii. 20.

† Matt. xxvii. 38.

‡ Matt. xi. 29.

§ Matt. xxvii. 59, 60.

|| Luke ii.

¶ Matt. ii.

\*\* 2 Cor. viii. 9.

†† Luke xxii. 44.

‡‡ John xix. 30.

§§ Heb. x. 20.

||| 2 Cor. i. 20.

“Did pity ever stoop so low,  
 Dress'd in divinity and blood?  
 Was ever rebel courted so,  
 In groans of an expiring God!  
 And yet you are ashamed of him!”

But perhaps, reader, you may have declared by a public act, that you will follow Christ—you may have professed his name publicly in words or by participating in one or both of the sealing ordinances of his church: be not deceived, for still you may be ashamed of him. The injunction of our blessed Saviour is to take up his cross and follow him, (not monthly, nor semi-annually,) but “daily.”\* You may meet the people of God periodically, and unite with them in commemorating the Redeemer’s death by the eating of bread and drinking of wine, and, notwithstanding, show that you are ashamed of him each day that intervenes between the celebration of that “feast of fat things.”† As the name of Christ may be professed by a single act without a single word, in the same way may it be denied—you need not “curse and swear,”‡ to show that you are ashamed of it. If you be a christian, you cannot live in the habitual commission of any known sin, or omission of any known duty. Do you not “restrain prayer before God,”§ because you are ashamed to be seen engaged in that duty? Do you not permit the name of God to be profaned in your presence without exhortation or rebuke, because you are

\* Luke ix. 23.

‡ Matt. xxvi. 74.

† Isa. xxv. 6.

§ Job xv. 4.

ashamed to declare that you are “on the Lord’s side?” Are you a parent? Have you endeavoured to lead your children to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus? \* have you prayed with them and for them? Are you at the head of a family? Are your walk and conversation so ordered, that every member of it may take knowledge of you, that you have been with Jesus and learned of him? Does shame restrain you from the performance of no christian duty to your family or any one of its members? Does your whole deportment say at all times to your household, “as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord”? † Do your children, your servants, and your visiters hear you ask the blessing of God upon the provisions of your table; and do they hear you at your family altar praising God for his goodness, and beseeching his blessing upon your house? What are your relations with your neighbourhood? Would your opinions and example influence the opinions and practice of others? Are you not ashamed to let them see you following Christ through good report and bad report? Do you at all proper times, both by precept and example, recommend his religion, and do your words and actions say, “I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation”? ‡ We are supposing you a member of Christ’s visible church. Are your professions and practice consistent? Even under the dispensation of the law to the Jews, David was “glad” § to visit the house of God, and said, “if I

\* Eph. iv. 21. † Jos. xxiv. 15. ‡ 2 Tim. i. 12. § Ps. cxxii. 1.

forget thee, O Jerusalem, (the place where ‘prayer was wont to be made,’) let my right hand forget her cunning;”\* and even then “they that feared the Lord, spake often one to another.” But I will refer you to the last three verses of the third chapter of the prophecy of Malachi, from the first of which I make the last quotation. *Read them—they contain important matter!* But since life and immortality have been brought to light by the gospel, christians are enjoined not to forsake “the assembling of themselves together,” but to exhort one another *daily*; to “pray without ceasing;” “that prayers, supplications and giving of thanks be made for all men; to teach and admonish one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs;”† and Christ himself graciously promises that when even two or three are gathered together in his name, he will be there and bless them. Do you love the assemblies of God’s saints? or when you assemble with them, are you ashamed to bend your knees or close your eyes in prayer, lest an ungodly witness should say, “behold! he prayeth”? After the resurrection of our Saviour, his disciples met in one place, notwithstanding they closed the doors for fear of the Jews (not because they feared the *ridicule* of the Jews,) and he appeared in their midst “and showed them his hands and his feet.”‡ Do you forbear to meet with the people of God for his worship, because you fear this derision

\* Ps. cxxxvii. 5.    † Heb. x. 25, and iii. 13.    1 Thes. v. 17.  
1 Tim. ii. 1.    Col. iii. 16.    ‡ Luke xxiv. 40.

of wicked men? Then be it known to you, you are ashamed of Christ!

Perhaps you might be able to render some service to that branch of the church with which you are connected—to discharge some duty, to fill some office which might promote its interest. Do you withhold your services because you are ashamed to render them? David, who was a king, was willing, if duty required it, to be “a door-keeper”\* in the house of God, and if you will examine the scriptures, you will ascertain that that was an humble office in the Jewish church.

Perhaps you may consider God’s dealings with you remarkable, and that your conversion is a wonderful manifestation of divine grace. Would the communication of your spiritual conflicts and encouragements, and the ultimate triumph of grace, comfort or assist others who tell you they are suffering under the frowns of an angry God, (as you know you have suffered) and are you ashamed to tell them what had been your condition?—of your horrible anticipations, of the pangs of your repentance, of your darkness and uncertainty, and of the “joy and peace in believing,”† which you experienced when you had found that Saviour “of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write”? Now understand me upon this subject. No christian can *boast* of his religious experience, or intentionally encourage conversations upon religious subjects, which might lead

\* Ps. lxxxiv. 10.

† Rom. xv. 13.

others astray; but examine the lives of many christians who have lived since the days of the apostles, or consult the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and you will find that very many of the people of God in all ages of the church, have detailed many particulars which occurred in their passage “from death unto life.” Two instances from the scriptures are deemed sufficient. David invites others to come near and he will tell them what God hath done for his soul;\* and St. Paul recounts in public, the particulars of his conversion.†

Permit me to make a few suggestions in addition to what I have already said upon this subject. We read in the gospel, that Christ in the days of his flesh, healed the diseases of many sick persons; palsy and leprosy, and many other diseases were driven away by him who has “all power in heaven and in earth.” Amongst other miraculous cures, we read that he opened the eyes of one of age at the time of the miracle, who had been born blind; and restored to health and strength, a man who had been impotent thirty-and-eight years,‡ If afterwards those persons had been asked by others afflicted as they had been, “tell us how you were relieved, that we may resort to the same remedy:” and the man born blind, ashamed of his benefactor, had answered, “it is enough for you to know that I see plainly:” and the man who had been impotent had said, “excuse my delicacy; the manner of my cure is known only

\* Ps. lxvi. 16.

† Acts xxii.

‡ John v. and ix.

to my physician and myself"—what would be your opinion of those persons? Reader! if you in truth know the great "Physician," and he has healed you, he has delivered you from more awful blindness, and freed you from diseases more horrible than any which can beset the body. And can you (because you are ashamed,) refuse to direct one spiritually blind and diseased as you once were, to the only remedy,—to the same balm of Gilead which healed your soul, and to the only physician who can administer that blessed medicine?

Reader! have you not failed to perform some, or all the duties which I have mentioned, because you are ashamed of Christ? Does your own heart condemn you? God is greater than your heart, and if you die without repentance, *He* also will condemn you!

I bid you farewell, and apprise you—you must bear the cross of Christ with all the shame that attaches to it, or in the eternal world to which you are hastening, you will dwell with everlasting burnings.





SACRED POETRY.



## SACRED POETRY.

O THAT IT WERE WITH ME AS IN MONTHS PAST!

*Tune*—"HIGHLAND MARY."

Happy the time when Christ my Lord  
 Appear'd from guilt to save me,  
 When first I heard his gracious word :—  
 "Poor sinner, I forgive thee."  
 A new creation round me smiled,  
 What glories met together !—  
 I felt that God was reconciled ;  
 That I might call him *Father*.

New hopes, new joys, my soul possessed,  
 New light upon me shining,  
 In Jesus I found perfect rest,  
 And thought I'd ceased from sinning :  
 How vain did seem each earth-born care !  
 Each earth-born hope or pleasure !  
 How poor did all things else appear,  
 Compared with heav'nly treasure !

My soul o'erflowed with love divine—  
 My mouth was filled with praises ;  
 I loved to call my Jesus mine,  
 And tell of all his graces.  
 Redeeming love was all my theme,  
 Redeeming grace bestowing ;  
 Whene'er I heard my Saviour's name,  
 It set my bosom glowing

But all those heavenly joys are flown—  
 Because of sin I languish ;  
 I see my Saviour on me frown,  
 How keen my bosom's anguish !  
 Like weeping Peter, Lord, I come,  
 Dear Saviour, end my mourning !  
 Receive a guilty wanderer home—  
 O welcome me returning !

---

#### THE PRODIGAL RETURNING TO HIS FATHER.

I will arise, and go to my Father, and will say unto him : Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son : make me as one of thy hired servants.—*Luke xiv. 18, 19.*

Long the ways of sin I've trod,  
 Long have walked the downward road,  
 Long rebelled against my God,  
 And sovereign grace have spurn'd,  
 Mercy's calls I've all withstood,

Trampled on redeeming blood,  
 Fearless of that fiery flood,  
     Where all the tares are burned.

Hating God, his word, his cause,  
 People, government, and laws,  
 My dear Redeemer, and his cross,  
     My guilt how great its load !  
 Loving sin, I scorned to pray ;  
 Harder made my heart each day ;  
 Wandering farther from the way  
     To glory and to God.

Light now bursts upon my eyes :  
 Now I see with sad surprise,  
 How vile I am, and will arise,  
     And to my Father go ;  
 " Father, I'm a wretch undone !  
 For my sins can ne'er atone ;  
 But the merits of thy Son,  
     Can save from endless wo."

I for Christ my Saviour pant,  
 Jesus, thou art all I want ;  
 Be thou mine, and to me grant,  
     To sit at thy dear feet :  
 I thy yoke no longer fear,  
 I will all thy burden bear,  
 Wage with sin unceasing war,  
     Dear Saviour, I submit.

THINE EYES SHALL SEE THE KING IN HIS BEAUTY.

ISAIAH XXXIII. 17.

All glorious is my King,  
 Immanuel is his name!  
 His wondrous love I sing,  
 His wondrous grace proclaim;  
 'Tis wondrous grace indeed to me—  
 I, in his beauty, Jesus see!

Directed by his star,  
 A heavenly babe is found;  
 A manger is his bed,  
 With swaddling clothes he's bound:  
 Transcendant beauty here I see,  
 My God assumes this form for me!

From sacred Olivet,  
 What truth his lips impart!  
 Blessings unnumbered pledged,  
 To all the pure in heart:  
 Behold the grace! to me, my God,  
 Points out the straight, the heavenly road.

Astonished I behold  
 Thy power, Almighty Lord,  
 I see the leper cleansed,  
 The palsied man restored,  
 "And stand erect!" Thy word he hears,  
 And to his house his bed he bears:

The filmed eye, which ne'er  
 Received a beam of light,  
 Is opened by thy power,  
 To all the bliss of sight :  
 I see the lame man leaping home,  
 And hear the praises of the dumb !

E'en terror's king himself,  
 Confesses thee his Lord,  
 And yields his victim up,  
 Whene'er he hears thy word :—  
 " Arise ! come forth," the dead revives,  
 He quits his shroud—again he lives !

And yet thy love, my King,  
 Is equal to thy power,  
 My sympathies awake !  
 My trembling soul adore,  
 Jesus!—a man of griefs for thee,  
 The Godhead's fulness bodily.

How tender to his friends !—  
 In condescension sweet,  
 The Lord of glory stoops  
 To wash his people's feet !  
 Lord, I am all defiled with sin,  
 O wash me too and make me clean.

What sorrows him beset !  
 What agony profound !  
 He sweat " great drops of blood,"  
 Fast falling to the ground !



And all for me ; and watched and prayed,  
 And " had not where to lay his head !"

But lo ! a crown of thorns  
 Circles his sacred head !  
 With robe and sceptre mocked,  
 He's to the judgment led ;  
 Why is that shout ?—the words decide—  
 " Let Israel's King be crucified."

Then what terrific sights,  
 My staring eyes appal !  
 Stretched on a bloody cross,  
 I see the Lord of all,  
 Taunted, reviled, by friends denied,  
 Wounded his hands, his feet, his side !

Nature beholds the scene,  
 With wonder and affright ;  
 Earth trembles, groans, and quakes !  
 The sun withdraws his light !  
 The temple's vail is rent in twain !  
 Dead saints arise and walk again !

In agony he prays,  
 (What love and beauty too)  
 " Father, forgive the sin,  
 They know not what they do ;"  
 And " it is finished," now he cries !  
 And for me bows his head and dies !

But vain thy efforts, death !  
 Vain all thy mighty bars !  
 “ The dead revives again ;”  
 Silenced be all my fears !  
 I now a glorious victory tell—  
 King Jesus conquered death and hell !

He rides upon a cloud  
 In sight of gazing friends :  
 Open ye gates of light !  
 For he to heaven ascends ;  
 And there he reigns and intercedes,  
 For me and all his people pleads.

All beautiful to me,  
 As Prophet, Priest, and King ;  
 Let all thy beauty see,  
 That all thy grace may sing ;  
 To see thy beauty still there's room,  
 “ And whosoever will, may come.”

---

HYMN

When, O my God, my eyes survey,  
 The glorious new and living way,  
 That leads to bliss above :  
 What joy, what rapture fills my breast—  
 I am of heavenly joys possessed,  
 And feel that God is love.

Ere sun, or moon, or star had shone,  
 Ere thou hadst bid a morning dawn,  
     Or earth on nothing hung;  
 Ere thou hadst heard an angel's lays,  
 Or burning seraph tuned thy praise,  
     Or morning stars had sung:

Ere Gabriel before thee stood—  
 'Twas in the Godhead's solitude—  
     Eternity's profound,  
 Thou didst devise this "way" of grace,  
 And to redeem a rebel race,  
     A glorious ransom found.

I love to visit Bethlehem's plains,  
 To hear the sweet, the angelic strains,  
     That broke night's stillness there;—  
 I join the shout—the enraptured cry,  
 "All glory be to God on high,  
     Immanuel is here!"

I love my Saviour's life to read;  
 For all he did and all he said,  
     My thoughts delight afford;  
 What kings and prophets long'd to see,  
 Is graciously vouchsafed to me,  
     In th' annals of my Lord.

I love to climb Mount Calvary,  
 The friend of sinners there to see  
     Dying, though Lord of all;

Mine were the sins that nailed him there,  
 Mine were the thorns, and mine the spear,  
 The vinegar and gall.

Jesus was born, has suffered, died,  
 His Father's law has magnified ;  
 To save our souls from death ;  
 Saints, ye are purchased by his blood,  
 Then praise the " way " that leads to God,  
 While ye have life or breath.

Mount Sinai once alarmed my soul,  
 When first I heard its thunders roll,  
 How dreadful was the place !  
 Now faith in Jesus makes me dare—  
 Fearless I face its lightning's glare,  
 And touch its trembling base.

Angels who knew not sin, may raise  
 To grace preserving, highest praise,  
 And swell the shouts above ;  
 Let Gabriel keep his harp, for we  
 Will sing a sweeter song than he—  
 We'll sing redeeming love.

---

HE SHOWED THEM HIS HANDS AND HIS FEET.

LUKE XXIV. 40.

Arouse my soul and sing his praise  
 Whose goodness smiles on all my days,  
 And blesses all my store ;

Praise him for all that he has done—  
 For thee he gave his only Son—  
     O praise him and adore.

Dark was that hour when first I saw,  
 My God, thy violated law,  
     And heard its thunders roll—  
 Alarmed, condemned, of thee afraid,  
 Thy wrath suspended o'er my head,  
     Thy vengeance o'er my soul.

In vain, it seemed, I sought the path  
 Whose travellers all escape thy wrath,  
     And reach thy courts above.  
 In vain, it seemed, to mourn or pray,  
 Or read thy word from day to day,  
     Or to desire thy love.

When e'er my lips did mutter prayer,  
 My fears pronounced it empty air  
     Which ne'er would reach thine ear.  
 I feared to sleep, to think, to rest,  
 Or entertain within my breast  
     Aught else but gloom and fear.

I asked thy saints to show the road  
 By which they found a pardoning God,  
     And peace through him once slain :  
 Vainly they taught—it seemed that I,  
 Unlike all other men, must die  
     While seeking God in vain.

But Jesus hears each sinner's cries :  
 Because of sin he touched my eyes,  
     (My soul, his praise repeat!)  
 And showed me that for man he died—  
 For sinners had been crucified—  
     Showed me his hands and feet.

The darkness fled—by faith I saw  
 Jesus fulfil his Father's law,  
     And all its curses meet.  
 Be thou my righteousness, I cried,  
 And be my hope thy wounded side—  
     Thy wounded hands and feet.

Terror no more besieged my breast,  
 Nor marred my peace, nor spoiled my rest—  
     I saw the work complete—  
 The Son of God for *me* had died,  
 For *me* was wounded in his side,  
     And in his hands and feet.

For *me*, he vanquished hell and death—  
 Be thou my all, my health, my breath,  
     While this poor heart shall beat,  
 Who soothed my sorrows, dried my tears,  
 And gave me sight to see the scars  
     Upon his hands and feet.



APPENDIX.





## APPENDIX.

## A.

(1.) I, James J. Ailworth, Dy., for Thomas R. Joynes, Clerk of Accomack County Court, in the State of Virginia, do hereby Certify, that the following extracts are truly copied from the Will of William Anderson, recorded in Accomack County Court, October 10th, 1698, viz.—“ Item, I will and bequeath unto Mr. Francis Makemie and Naomie, his wife, my eldest daughter, all my Lands at Matchatauck, being One Thousand Acres, viz : 600 by patent in my name, and 400 by purchase of Joseph Newton. To the said Makemie and his wife and the heirs of their or either of their bodies, lawfully begotten, for ever. But for want of such, who shall live to full age to possess and enjoy the said Land, then the said one thousand acres of land shall revert unto my three granddaughters, Elizabeth, Naomie, and Comfort Taylor, and the daughters of Elias and Comfort Taylor, and to their hereditary heirs for ever. I also give unto said Makemie, all the money lent him in full of all or any accounts that may be between us upon consignments or any other ways ; and my will is,

that he may have his Sloope with what may appertain to her at my death; Likewise whatever my daughter can claim as her's In my house, &c., without let or delay, and all on both sides to be ballanced, he paying six pounds starl. to my sister Barons, and five ditto to sister Hope, and five ditto to sister Nock, and bestowing in education to the vallue 50 pounds on my three Grand Daughters."

"Item. I give unto said Francis, and Naomie, his wife, all my Plantation at Pocomoke, containing nine hundred and fifty acres, for and during their or either of their Naturall lives, in remainder to the child or heire of my aforesaid Daughter Naomie, if such she have, and its Hereditable issue for ever. But for want of such, then to revert and descend to my Grand Daughters, by my daughter Comfort Taylor, and to her heirs for ever. My meaning is, That if my daughter Naomie should become mother of more than one child, then the most worthy of blood to have Pocomoke, and the next to have Matchatauck, but in case she die childless, after her and husbands naturall lives on itt, my other Grand Daughters to have itt as co-heirs amongst them, giving them liberty to sell each of their part of the Value to each other, the price of the whole being Valued by any three or four honest Neighbours, who may be made choice of for that purpose, to prevent Either Inconveniencies in Liveing so near each other, or other differences that may happen by unequalling in the Value, but not any one to have any power or authority to sell, Give, Lease, lett, or by any ways or means,

to dispose of any part thereof out of the family that hath proceeded, or may proceed from my Loynes, but to my said Grand Daughters, and to their lawful and Hereditable heires as aforesaid for Ever: Nevertheless, it is my meaning, and provided said Makemie's and the survivor of them, if my daughter Naomie have no issue, shall keep the Dwelling House in repaire, and what other useful houses worth preserving thereon, likeways Orchards: neither Remove or dispose the horse mill, still and copper, but them to remain and pass with the freehold to my heires aforesaid."

"Item. My Lotts, being three at Onancock Town, I give unto Mr. Francis Makemie and his heirs and assigns for ever."

"I Give and bequeath to my Daughter Naomie Makemie, four negro Slaves, viz: Dollar, Hannah the elder, Darkish, young Sarah."

"Item. I make, constitute, ordain, and appoint my son in Law, Mr. Francis Makemie, to be my joynt and Several Executors of this my last Will and Testament, desiring them to be Kind and assisting to my Wife."

I also Certify, that it appears from the Records of the said Court, that administration was granted to Madm Naomie Makemie, on the Estate of Elizabeth Makemie, decd, on the October 6th, 1708, in these words, viz:—"This day Madm Naomie Makemie petitioned this court for Administration on the Estate of Elizabeth Makemie her daughter, late

deceased, she dying intestate, which was by the court granted, she giving Bond and Security as the Law directs, she presented Capt John Brandhurst and Hill Drummond for Securityties, who were by the court accepted of, and ordered that the Clerk take bond accordingly."

The name of Naomie Makemie does not appear on the Records of Accomack county court, as I can find, since the Administration of the Estate of Elizabeth Makemie was granted to her, which was on the 6th day of October, 1708.

Test.

J. J. AILWORTH, Dy.

FOR THO. R. JOYNES, C. A. C.

---

(2.) The following are abstracts from our statutes, which I presume you desire in your letter to me.

ACT VI.

An Act for the suppression of the Quakers, passed 1659-60.

Whereas there is an vnreasonable and turbulent sort of people commonly called Quakers, who, contrary to the law do dayly gather together vnto them vnlaw'll assemblies, and congregations of people, teaching and publishing lies, Miracles, false Visions, prophecies and doctrines, which have influence vpon the communities of men, both ecclesiasticall and civil, endeavouring and attempting thereby to destroy religion, lawes, communities, and all bonds of

civil societie, leaving it Arbitrarie to everie Vaine and Vitious person, whether men shall be safe, lawes established, offenders punished and Governours rule, hereby disturbing the publike peace, and just interest, to prevent and restraine which mischiefe, It is enacted, That no Master or Commander of any Shipp or other Vessell, do bring into this Collonie any person or persons called Quakers, vnder the penalty of One hundred pounds Sterling, to be leavied vpon him and his estate by order from the Governour and council, or the Commissioners in the severall counties where such shippes shall arrive: That all such Quakers as have beene questioned, or shall hereafter arrive, shall be apprehended wheresoever they shall be found, and they be imprisoned without baile or mainprize, till they do abjure this country, or putt in security with all speed to depart the Collonie and not to returne again. And if any should dare to presume to returne hither after such departure, to be proceeded against, as contemners of the lawes, and magistracy, and punished accordingly, and caused again to depart the country; And if they should the third time be so audacious and impudent as to returne hither, to be proceeded against as *felons*. That noe person shall entertain any of the Quakers that have heretofore beene questioned by the Governour and Council, or which shall hereafter be questioned, nor permit in or near his house, any Assemblies of Quakers in the like penalty of one hundred pounds sterling; That Commissioners and officers are hereby required, and authorized, as they will answer the

contrary at their perill, to take notice of this Act, to see it fully effected, and executed, and that no person do presume, on their peril, to dispose or publish their bookes, pamphlets, or libells bearing the title of their tenents and opinions.

## ACT IX.

*Sundays not to be profaned—passed 1661-2.*

That the Lord's day be Kept holy, and that noe journeys be made on that day except in case of emergent necessity, And that noe other thing be used or done, that may tend to the prophanation of that day, But that all and everyperson inhabiting in this country, haveing noe lawful excuse to be absent, shall upon every Sunday, and the fower holy days hereafter mentioned, diligently resort to their Parish Church or Chappell, accustomed, then and there to abide orderly and soberly, during the time of common prayers, preaching or other Service of God, upon penalty of being fined fifty pounds of tobacco by the County Court, upon presentment made by the Church Wardens, who are to collect the same, with the parish levies: Provided alwayes, that this Act include not Quakers, or other recusants, who out of non conformitie to the Church, totally absent themselves, but they shall be lyable to such fines, and punishments, as by the Statute of 23d of Elizabeth, are imposed on them, being for every month's absence, twenty pounds Sterling, and if they forbear a Twelve Month, then to give good Security for their good beha-

viour, besides their payment for their monthly absences, according to the tenor of the said statute; and that all Quakers for assembling in unlawful assemblies and conventicles, be fined and pay each of them there taken, two hundred pounds of tobacco for each time they shall be for such unlawful meeting taken, or presented by the church wardens to the county court, and in case of the insolvency of any person amonge them, the more able then taken to pay for them, one halfe to the informer and the other halfe to the publike.

There was an Act passed in the year 1663, Imposing a fine of Two Hundred pounds of Tobacco on Quakers assembling to the number of five for the purpose of religious worship, for the first offence. For the Second offence, forfeite five hundred pounds of Tobacco, to be levyed by distresse and sale of the goods of the party soe convicted, by warrant from any one of the Justices before whome they shall be soe convicted, rendering the overplus, (if any be) and for want of such distresse or for want of ability of any person among them to pay the said fine or fines, then it shall be lawfull to levy and recover the same from the rest of the Quakers or *other seperatists*, or any one of them then present, that are of greater ability to pay the said fine or fines: And if any person after he or she in forme aforesaid, hath been twice convicted of any of the said offences, shall offend the third time, and be thereof lawfully convicted, that then every person so offending and con-



vict aforesaid, shall for his or her third offenee, be banished this colony of Virginia to the places the Governor and Council shall appoint. A fine was also imposed upon Masters of Vessells of Five Thousand pounds of Tobacco, for bringing Quakers into the Colony.

A Fine of five Thousand pounds of Tobacco, was imposed upon the inhabitants of the Colony for entertaining Quakers, or permitting them to preach in or neare their houses, the fine aforesaid to be imposed for each time the inhabitants is guilty of entertayneing them.—Provided alwayes, and be it further enacted that if any of the said persons, Quakers, or *other seperatists*, shall after such conviction as aforesaid, give security that he, she or they shall for the time to come, forbear to meete in any such unlawful assemblies as aforesaid, that then and from thenceforth, such person or persons shal be discharged from all the penalties aforesaid, any thing in this act to the contrary notwithstanding.

On the 12th day of September, 1663, John Porter, a member of the house of Burgesses, was expelled, being loving to the Quakers, his opposition to baptism of infants, and his refus'g to take the Oaths.

Copied from Statutes at Large.

J. J. AILWORTH.

## B.

*State of Virginia, Accomack County, sc.*

(1.) I do hereby certify, that the name of Francis Makemie first appears on the records of said Court on the 17th day of February, 1690, in an Action brought by him against William Finney, for Molasses sold by the said Makemie to the said Finney.

It also appears from the records of the said Court, that 450 Acres of Land were granted to the said Makemie by a Certificate from the said Court, on the 21st day of February, 1692. The name of Francis Makemie does not appear on the Records from the year 1692 until the 4th day of October, 1698. The following is a true copy of an entry made on the Records of the said Court on the 15th day of October, 1699, viz :

“Whereas Mr. Francis Makemie made application by petition to this Court, that being ready to fullfill what the Law enjoynes to dissenters, that he might be qualified according to Law, and prayed that his own dwelling-house at Pocomoke, also his own house at Onancok, next to Captain Jonathan Livesley’s, might be the places recorded for Meeting, and having taken the oaths enjoyned by act of Parliament instead of the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and subscribed the Test as likewise that he

did in compliance with what the said Law enjoynes, produce Certificate from Barbadoes of his qualifications there, did declare in open Court of the said county and owned the articles of religion mentioned in the statute made in the 13th year of Queen Elizabeth, except the 34th, 35th and 36th, and those words for the 20th article, viz:—The Church hath power to decide rights and ceremonies and authority in controversies of faith, which the Court have ordered to be registered and recorded, and that the Clerk of the Court give certificate thereof to the said Makemie, according as the Law enjoynes.”

The name of the said Francis Makemie appears very often on the records of the said Court, from the year 1699 to the 1st day of August, 1703, which does not contain interesting matter enough to be recited here.

On the 1st day of August 1703, the said Francis Makemie executed a power of attorney to his wife, Naomie Makemie, and John Parker, reciting that he was about to depart for England, and therefore constituted them his attorneys to do and transact all manner of business for him.

May the 30th, 1704, the said Francis Makemie executed a power of attorney to his wife, Naomie Makemie, Andrew Hamilton, and James Kemps, reciting that he was about to depart for Europe.

(2.) The name of the said Francis Makemie does not appear on the Records of the said Court (except

through his authorized Attorney, Naomie Makemie,) from the 30th day of May 1704 until December 4th, 1705, after which date, the name of the said Francis Makemie appears frequently on the records until his death, but which is not of sufficient interest to be recited.

The following are true extracts from the will of the said Francis Makemie, which will was recorded in the Clerk's office of Accomack county court, on the 16th day of August, 1708, viz :

“I give, will and bequeath unto my loving wife, Naomie Makemie, and my two daughters, Elizabeth and Anne Makemie, one hundred and twenty books to be chosen by my Executrix afterwards nomenated, and appointed, out of the English Books of my Library. My meaning and will is, that my wife and each of my daughters enjoy forty english Books, and the longest liver or livers, to enjoy said Books in reversion, in case of the decease of my wife, or any of my said daughters, and their heirs for ever, and the rest of my Library of Books of all sorts, I give and bequeath unto Mr. Jedidah Andrew, minister at Philadelphia, excepting my Law Books, and after his decease or removal from Philadelphia, I give and bequeath said Liberary to such minister or ministers as shall succeed him in that place and office, and to such only as shall be of the Presbyterian or Independent persuasion, and none else. My will is, that as soon as said Books are remitted to Philadelphia, the number and names of said Liberary may be put upon record, to be preserved there, as a constant

Liberary for the use of foresaid minister or ministers, successively, for Ever.”

“ I give, will and bequeath unto Mr. Andrew Hamilton and his heirs for ever, all my Law Books to be found among my Liberary of Books, and thoes he already hath in possession.”

“ I order and empower my Executrix afterwards nominated and appointed, to sell, dispose of and Alien my house and lott at the new towne in Princess Anne county, on the Eastern Branch of Elizabeth River, as also my lott and house or frame of house in the new towne on Wormlye’s creek, called Urbana, as also my lot Joyning to the *new* meeting House Lott in Pocomoke towne, called Rehoboth, empowering my Executrix afterwards named, to make over and Alienate that Lott on which the meeting-house is built, in as ample manner to all intents and purposes, as shall be required for the ends and uses of a Presbyterian Congregation, as if I were personally present, and to their successors for ever, and none else, but to such of the same perswation in matters of Religeon.”

“ I give and bequeath unto Mr. Jedidah Andrew, minister at Philadelphia, and his heirs for ever, my black camlet Cloak, and my new cane, bought and fixed at Boston.”

“ I will, give and bequeath unto my beloved wife and two daughters, Elizabeth and Anne Makemie, the remainder of my Estate, reall and personall, not already disposed off, either by the will of Mr. William Anderson or this will, equally to be divided

among them, and the reversion of all Reall Estate to return to the longest liver or livers of them; and if my daughters aforesaid, die without issue of their natural Bodyes, their parts of all Estate, reall and personall, given by this will, I give and bequeath to my youngest sister, Anne Makemie, of the Kingdom of Ireland, and the two eldest sons of my brother John and Robert Makemie, both of the name of Francis Makemie, and their heirs for ever."

"I doe constitute, appoint, and ordaine, my deare and well beloved wife, Naomi Makemie, my Executrix of this my last will and testament, comitting to her, and her only, the guardianship and the tutorship of my aforesaid children, whilst in minority, during her natural life, and in case of the death of my deare wife, Naomi Makemie, before this my will is proved and executed, or the arrival of my said daughters, Elizabeth and Anne Makemie, at age, I doe constitute, appoint and ordaine the Honorable Colonel Francis Jenkins, of Somerset County, in Maryland, and Mary Jenkins, his Lady, and beloved Consort, Executors of this my last will and Testament, and gardians to my said children during their minority, and till marriage, charging all persons concerned in the presents of Almighty and Omnitient God, to give and allow my said children a sober, virtuos, and Religeous Education, either here or elsewhere, as in Britian, New England, or Philadelphia, and that no other person or persons, Courts or Judiciary whatsoever, besides my Executrix or Executors, nominated and appointed, and whom they shall

appoint in case of the Mortallyty of Executors already appointed, shall have any power to Intermeddle with my said Estate, reall and personall, or the tuctory or guardianship of my said Children, without incurring the penalty of the Statute of wards and liveryes and thereby liable to an accon of trespass."

"My will and pleasure is, that in case of my wife marring, she have power and authority, if she apprehend it requesit or nessessary, either before or after marring, to relinquish her Executorship and comit the same with relation to her children, their Estate and gardianship, unto the trust, care and management of Colonel Francis Jenkins and his Lady.

"In Witness whereof, I have hereunto affixed my hand and seale this 27th day of April, in the Yeare of our Sovarian, Lady Anne, Queen of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the faith, Annog. Dom. 1708.

"FRANCIS MAKEMIE." (Ls.)

"Signed, sealed and acknowledged in presence of us as Witnesses, John Parker, of Mattapani; Eliz. Davis, Elizabeth Vepre, A. Hamilton, Tully Robinson, John Lewis."

The within last will and Testament of Mr. Francis Makemie, deceased, was proved in open Court of Accomack county, by the oaths of Andrew Hamilton, Tully Robinson and John Lewis, three of the above witnesses, and allowed by the Cort for suffi-

cient prof, and ordered to be recorded, August 4th, 1708.

Recorded August 16, 1708, by

ROBERT SNEAD, Clerk of the county.

The above extracts I believe contains every thing on record in the said court of any interest in regard to Mr. Francis Makemie, from the year 1690 to the year 1708.

Teste.

Js. J. AILWORTH, Dpty.

For

THOS. R. JOYNES,

*Clerk of Accomack Court.*



## C.

(1.) The will of Mrs. Anne Holden, now of record in the clerk's office of Accomack county court, is in the following words, viz.

[Here follows the will in form and at length, which proves that she possessed a great estate. From it we extract the following, the only part deemed interesting to our readers.]

"I give to the Rev. Jacob Ker, the sum of twenty pounds."

"I give to the Rev. Samuel McMaster, the sum of forty-six pounds, a mahogany desk, a bed and furniture, and a negro woman called Keziah and her children." \* \* \* \*

"I give fifty pounds to the good poor of my neighbourhood, to be given and disposed of at the discretion of William Selby."

"I give one hundred pounds to the Pitts' creek congregation, to be disposed of by the session for the support of a minister."

"My last will and testament to which I have affixed my hand and seal this 15th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1787.

"ANN HOLDEN," (Ls.)

“Signed, sealed and acknowledged in the presence of,” &c.

Teste. LITTLETON SAVAGE, Clerk.

A true copy.

Teste. Js. J. AILWORTH, Dpty.

For THOS. R. JOYNES, Clerk.

(2.) An extract from the last will and testament of the Rev. John Henry.

“In the name of God, Amen. The first day of October, Anno Domini 1715, I, John Henry, of Pocomoke, in the county of Somerset, and province of Maryland, being sensible of my approaching dissolution, though now of tolerable health and sound judgment, blessed be God, do make, constitute and appoint this my last will and testament, disannulling and revoking all others before made, that is to say:— I commend my soul to God,” &c.

True copy. Teste.

JAMES POLK, *Reg. Wills.*

(3.) An extract from the last will and testament of John Hampton, deceased, dated October 28th, 1719, and exhibited, proved and recorded in the office of the register of wills, (in Somerset county, Maryland,) on the 2d day of February, 1721–22.

“In the name of God, Amen. I, John Hampton, of Somerset county, and province of Maryland, minister of the gospel, being weak and crazy in body, but of a sound judgment, and perfect memory, bless-

ed be God, and considering the shortness and uncertainty of this life, have made, ordained, constituted and appointed this my last will and testament, in manner and form following, that is to say, I commit my soul to God the giver thereof, and my body to the earth, in hopes of glorious resurrection through Jesus Christ, to be decently interred at the discretion of my executrix hereafter mentioned"— &c. &c.

## D.

## EXTRACT 1.

“At a court held by her Majesty’s wor’ll. Justices of Peace for Somerset county, at Dividing Creek, the 14th day of November, in the fourth year of the Reign of our Soveragn, Lady Anne, by the Grace of God, of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, Queen, Defendr of the faith, &c. Anno Dom. 1705.”

“Commissioners present were—Capt. John West, Maj. John Cornish, Mr. Tho. Newbold, Capt. John Frankland, Capt. Chas. Ballard, and Mr. Jos. Venables.”

Amongst other proceedings of the Court were the following, viz:

## EXTRACT 2.

“The Rev. Mr. Robert Keith and Mr. Alexander Adams, with one Mr. George McNish, before the wor’ll Justices in Court sitting, did their *Petions* exhibit as followeth:

“*Somerset County, sct.*

“To the wor’ll the Commissioners of Somerset County, the Address of the Vestry of the Parish of Coventry, Humbly showeth—That whereas, we have

good ground to believe, that Mr. Francis Mackemy and others his assistance, are intended to ad-dresse your worships on account of a Tolleration granted to the Dissenters, for Preaching and building meeting houses, and doing what else is incumbent on them As such, and wee duely considering the import of the matter ; humbly desire, that the whole, as to Premises, be remitted to his Excellency the Governor of this Province, and the honourable Council of State thereof, By them to be considered, ordered and determind as they shall think fitt ; And that nothing bedone in The premises untill warrant and order be obtained from them, as to the whole premises, or any part thereof. And the same presented to your worships in open Court, or to the Vestry of the said Parish, and the remnant Vestrys therein concerned. This, our humble desire, we offer without any presumption of disobedience to The Laws, whereof we find ourselves not competent Judges. May it therefore please your worps seriously to consider the matter above represented, and to grant our desire according to Justice, and your Petioners shall ever, &c.

“ Signed, per order,

“ JOHN HEATH, Pro Vestry.”

“ To the Justices of the worshipfull Court of the County of Somerset now sitting, the Petition of George McNish humbly sheweth,—That your petitioner craveth that the usual oaths according to law

tendered to, And to be taken by dissenting Ministers, and Preachers, may be tendered to yr Petitioner. And your Petitioner shall in bounden duty pray, &c.

“GEORGE McNISH.”

“The Petions aforesaid being read in Open Court, wor’ll Justices having heard and deliberately Considered the Premises on both sides, it having reference to his Exncy for result in Ecclesiastic matters, &c., he being here Representative in Chief of Church and State, Allow the said Vestry’s Petion to have its final result and determination By his said Exncy and honble Council of State as prayed for. Notwithstanding the said McNish in decent manner, Did require (he being a Dissenter from the Church of England,) that he might be dignified as by law in this County to preach, offering to take the Oaths and subscribe the Declaration. Nevertheless the wor’ll Court hath Resolved as aforesaid.”

EXTRACT 3.

“At a Court held by her Mjty’s wor’ll Justices of Peace for Somerset County, at Dividing Creek, the eighth day of January, in the fourth year of the Reigne of our Sovereign Lady Anne, by the Grace of God, of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c., Anno Domini 1705-6,—

“Commissioners present were—Capt. John West, Major John Cornish, Mr. Thos. Newbald, Captain

John Franklyne, Capt. Charles Ballard, Mr. Joseph Venables.”

Amongst other proceedings of the court were the following, viz.

EXTRACT 4.

“Then did Mr. George McNish and Mr. John Hampton their Petition exhibit before the worshipfull justices in court as followeth :

“To the worshipfull court of Somerset county, in the Province of Maryland, the petition of George McNish and John Hampton, most humbly sheweth,

“That whereas there is an Act of Parliamēt made in the first year of the reign of King William and Queen Mary, Instituted an Act for Exempting their Majesties Protestant subjects dissenting from the Church of England, from the penalties of sundry Laws. And whereas by the Express words of the said Law, we are required to tender to the Justices of the Peace at the General or Quarter Sessions of the County Town, parts or division where we live, to Take the Oath of Allegiance, take or subscribe the Declarations, and Declare our Approbation of, and subscribe the Articles of Religion made the thirtieth year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Excepting such as are Excepted in said Act ; and whereas we In a ready Compliance with said Law have already attended and tendered ourselves to take the said Oath and perform every thing required in said Law ; we do humbly tender ourselves again to your worships, as the proper Court held by the Justices of the Peace for this

County Empowered and required to administer such Oaths, and for receiving such subscriptions, as are Enjoyed in said Act of Parliament.

“ We, therefore, your Humble Petitioners pray, that by a further Consideration of sd Law, we may be admitted to do our duty in complying with said Law, which we are ready to doe, seeing all Dissenters in all her majesties Dominions have in this manner Qualified themselves; and your Petitioners as in duty bound, shall allways pray.”

“ The aforesaid petition being read, and by the wor’ll Court Considered: That whereas a petition from Coventry Parish, and another from said Macnish, was in No’ber Court last to this court preferred, and the same referred to his Exncy and honble council for result, it is this day likewise by the wor’ll Justices again ordered, that said Hampton and Macnish petition be continued till the aforsd result be returned.”

#### EXTRACT 5.

“ Att a Court held By her Majty’s wor’ll Justices of the Peace for Somerset County, att Dividing Creek, the 12th day of June, Anno Dom. 1706,

“ Commissioners present were—Capt. John West, Major John Cornish, Mr. Thos. Newbold, Captain John Franklyne, Captain Charles Ballard, Mr. Joseph Venables.”

Amongst other proceedings were the following, viz:—



“ This day appeared Mr. John Hampton and Mr. George Macnish, Exhibited an order from his Excellency the Governor and honourable council for their Qualification to preach in this county, in obedience thereunto this Court did administer the Oaths appointed per Act of Parliament, to the said Hampton and McNish, who did comply therewith, and did likewise Subscribe the Declaration, whereupon this Court did allow that the aforesaid Hampton and Macnish should preach att the meeting-house near Mr. Edgar’s, the meeting-house att the head of Monocan, the meeting-house att Snowhill, and the meeting-house on Mr. Joseph Venables’s Land, as per the Desenting preachers required.”

“ By his Exncy the Governor, March the 13th, 1705—Ordered then that the worpfull Justices of Somerset County, take the Oaths of the Desenting ministers according to the Act of Parliament of the first of King Wm and Queen Mary, Exempting her Majty’s Protestant subjects from Certain penaltys, &c.

Signed per order,

W. BLADEN, Cl. Councill.

Indorst to Somerset Court.”

The foregoing extracts, taken from Liber A. B. No. 1,—one of the Record books in the office of the clerk of Somerset county court, were intended, and are believed, to be exact to a word and letter, except that in several instances, where ancient abbreviations

occur in the record, I have written the words at large. The extracts are intended to be exact in other particulars—for example—in punctuation and the use of capital letters. Some of the inaccuracies in spelling, improprieties of punctuation, and other imperfections, were most probably errors of the clerk. Perhaps it would have been better, scrupulously to have observed the abbreviations throughout this copy; or still better to have disregarded them altogether.

In the record, and of course in the extracts which I have made from it, the order of the governor that the justices of Somerset county should take the oaths of the dissenting ministers, is dated not only before the joint petition of the Rev. Messrs. Hampton and McNish, but also before the previous sole petition of Mr. McNish. The sittings of the court are chronicled in the book in regular consecutive order, so that there is no mistake, I think, as to the dates, at which the petitions were preferred. The inconsistency in dates, I therefore believe to be owing to an error of either the clerk of the council of state, or the clerk of the county, in affixing the date to the order. Instead of having been dated in 1705, it ought, I doubt not, to have been dated in 1706, or 1705-6. If so dated, time and sense perfectly agree.

The joint petition of the Rev. Messrs. Hampton and McNish, represents that *they* had *already* tendered themselves to take the oath; and that *they* tender *themselves again* for that purpose. I do not perceive that there is any minute in Liber A. B. No.

21, of Mr. Hampton's having previously attended and tendered himself to take the oath; and as the order of the court on the joint petition refers to antecedent petitions of only the vestry of Coventry parish and of Mr. McNish, and not to any of Mr. Hampton, and those petitions are on the second page, it is unlikely, I think, that there is such a minute in the book. It may be then either that the expressions in the joint petition, that have been alluded to, are somewhat loose: or that Mr. Hampton attended on the first occasion with Mr. McNish, and tendered himself orally only, and so informally, that it was not thought proper to make any minute of it; and that their cases being precisely the same in principle and circumstantially too, it was understood that one petition should try the matter. The latter surmise receives a colour of probability from the statement in the petition of the vestry of Coventry parish, that they had good ground to believe that Mr. Francis Makemie and *others* intended to address the court in relation to the act in favour of the dissenters. This probability is strengthened by the consideration that the petitioners would hardly allege to the court that there had been transactions of business before it, which nevertheless had never occurred. Perhaps this consideration strengthens probability into certainty that either on the occasion that has been adverted to, or on some other occasion subsequent to that and previous to the joint petition, the Rev. John Hampton tendered himself to the court

to take the prescribed oath, and make and subscribe the required declarations.

Or it may be after all, that there is a minute in some preceding book of Mr. Hampton's having tendered himself to take the oath, and that his petition was continued on other grounds than that assigned for continuing the petition of Mr. McNish, and the joint petition of Messrs. Hampton and McNish. I have not been able, however, as yet to find such a minute. The joint petition was preferred, no doubt, on account of delay in hearing from the governor and council, and for the purpose of urging the matter on.

RIDER HENRY WINDER.

*July 22, 1835.*

N. B. It might be better, if the foregoing remarks were revised and written over; but at present time for the business cannot well be spared. The comments on some expressions in the joint petition having occurred to me, I have put them down. Perhaps, however, it may be thought that they are unnecessary and superfluous. R. H. W.

Mr. Winder, who is also assisting me in making an alphabet to the records belonging to the clerk's office, has made a full copy of the proceedings in relation to the license of the Rev. Messrs. McNish and Hampton. I have thought proper to enclose them to you, although they were intended for myself.

G. HANDY

Mr. SPENCE.

## E.

*Princess Anne, Somerset County, 1835.*

MY DEAR SIR,—

(1) In my researches, I find among the records of this county, a deed dated in 1723; to the Rev. William Stewart, the pastor, and others, the elders, “and their successors for ever, for the use, support, maintenance, and continuance of a meeting-house for the worship and service of Almighty God, according to the Presbyterian persuasion, and for no other use whatsoever,” for “a part of a tract of land called in the original patent, ‘Nutter’s Purchase,’ lying on the north side of the head of Menokin river, containing one quarter of an acre.” This is the identical spot whereupon the Presbyterian church now stands at Princess Anne—and the remains of the said Rev. William Stewart now lie mouldering in the dust, in the *spot* of ground mentioned in said deed, and upon which our church now stands. This fact has been handed to the present generation by a lady named Hitch, a descendant and grand-daughter of the Rev. Mr. Stewart, who died a few years ago, at an advanced age. Mr. Stewart departed this life about the year 1742, and a short time previously to

his death, had the misfortune to lose his house and other property by fire, among which was the session book of our church; for which reason I am unable to give you any information in regard to the ministers of our church, from our present session book, anterior to the year 1747. It appears from the Monokin session book, that in the year 1747, the Rev. John Hambleton was the pastor of the Monokin and Rehoboth congregations, and that he had preached to the congregation at Snowhill. This session book imparts very little more information about Mr. Hambleton further than that he went to Philadelphia to meet Synod in 1750. The next pastor mentioned in our session book, is the Rev. Hugh Henry, who it appears assisted in the administration of the Lord's supper at Monokin in 1752, and in 1758 entered on the pastoral charge at Monokin and Rehoboth. The call was made in 1758, and Mr. Nehemiah King and Col. Robert Henry were appointed to present it to the Lewistown Presbytery to sit at Cold Spring, in Delaware. This gentleman was not of the family which then resided in Somerset. The name of the clergyman who had previously resided in this county, was John Henry, as I have heretofore informed you. In 1759, the Rev. John Harris assisted in the administration of the sacrament, and the Rev. Hugh Henry sat in session in 1762. No further notice is taken of the Rev. Hugh Henry by our session book, until 1763, when a receipt by his administratrix is mentioned. In 1764, the Monokin congregation agreed to call the Rev. Jacob Ker of the New Bruns-

wick Presbytery, who had previously settled in this congregation, and in November of that year, was regularly installed. The Rev. Mr. Miller preached the sermon from Heb. xiii. 17, and the Rev. Mr. Harris gave the charge. It likewise appears from our session book, that the Rev. Jacob Ker departed this life on the 29th July, 1795.

In the year 1764, our session finding that the *meeting-house* was much decayed, and too small to hold the people who then attended, determined to build a new one of brick, which determination the session carried into effect, and accordingly erected the church which now stands at the head of Monokin, at Princess Anne, covering therewith the *spot* of ground where the old church stood. Many years however previously to the construction of the present church, the congregation had purchased about one acre more of land, which now belongs to it. In the year 1796, the Rev. John Collins was directed to supply every third Sabbath at Rocowalkin, Monokin and Rehoboth.

In June, in the year 1799, the Rev. John Brown Slemmons was installed pastor of the congregations of Wicomico, and Monokin, and officiated as such until the year 1821. In the year 1824, the Rev. Robert McMordie Laird became the stated supply for these congregations until the year 1825. In 1826, the Rev. Joshua Moore became the pastor of the congregations of Wicomico and Monokin, and officiated for about two years, when he resigned the charge, and in the year 1829, the Rev. Robert McMordie

Laird again became our stated supply, in which capacity he continued to act until July, 1835.

From the above, it will appear that the Rehobeth and Monokin congregations were at one period of time united, and at another the Wicomico and Monokin congregations—but the session book above referred to, does not explain these unions and disunions.

It is but reasonable to suppose, that from the grant of the piece of land to the Rev. William Stewart, and the elders therein mentioned, making in all nine persons, that the church must have been erected long before the date of the deed, else there would not have been a pastor with such a full eldership. We cannot at this period of time, account for the erection of the meeting-house upon the ground before it was purchased and conveyed. The language used in the deed conveys the idea that it had been built before the date of the grant. Among other terms in the deed, the word "continuance" is used, evidently implying that it *had been* used as a church. Again the word "continuance" is unusual in conveyances of land, but is used in this deed. And again in 1764, it is expressly stated in the session book, among other reasons for building a new church, that the *meeting-house* was *much decayed*; which would not have been the case had the meeting-house been built in 1723, the year the deed bears date, for in that case, the house would have been only about 41 years old—and it is unreasonable to suppose that if it was built in 1723, it would have been *much decayed* in



1764. But in fact this is the same church that was spoken of in the order of council of 1705, at the head of Monokin, a copy of which order you have in your possession.

With much regard, I remain

Yours, &c.

GEO. HANDY.

MR. IRVING SPENCE, Snowhill.

(2.)

*Lewes, Del. February 17th, 1837.*

DEAR BROTHER,—

The following is all that I can collect from the records of the United congregations of Lewes, Cool Spring and Indian River, worthy of an insertion in the work of Irving Spence, Esq.

The early records of the congregations of Lewes and Cool Spring, and probably also of Indian River, are lost. The book now in existence which contains the records of these churches, was bought May 8th, 1758. They commence with the call and installation of the Rev. Matthew Wilson. The latter event took place May 5th, 1756.

The following historical sketch is found in the session book in the hand writing of the Rev. Francis Hindman. I shall copy it verbatim, and leave you to select, alter, &c.

The first Presbyterian clergyman who made any

considerable residence in the county of Sussex, according to the best information now to be had, was a certain Mr. Black. It is certain he was in Lewestown in the year 1708.

The next was Mr. Thomson.\* The present Presbyterian church at Lewestown was built for him, [i. e. the old brick church in which Mr. Hindman preached. A. D. W.] because on the eastern end of the house, before it was overlaid, were to be seen these letters, J. T., and these figures, 1728, which is as much as to say: this house was built for the Rev. John Thomson in the year of our Lord 1728. There was a small wooden house at Lewestown before the present building, but whether it was built for Mr. Black or for Mr. Thomson, is uncertain.

The Rev. Josiah† Martin, from Ireland, was the next. Under his ministry the congregation of Cool Spring was formed: and Lewestown and Cool Spring in union, were his pastoral charge until the day of his death. But although Mr. Martin was the founder of the church at Cool Spring, and was their pastor in union with the Presbyterian church at Lewestown for many years, yet the times when his ministry commenced, and when it ended with his death, are uncertain. This is certain, however, that

\* By an extract taken from the session book of Rehobeth, Somerset county, Md., by the Rev. Jos. Copse, it appears that the Rev. John Thomson was ordained at Lewestown, 1717.

A. DE WITT.

† James, as I am assured by one of the heirs, J. Burton, October, 1803.

they were between the years 1728 and 1756, and that his remains are interred before the pulpit in the [old] Presbyterian church in Lewestown.

The Rev. Hector Allison was the next. But how long he was their pastor is uncertain; 'tis certain, however, that he had left them before the year 1756.

The Rev. Matthew Wilson was the next. He had been licensed in April, 1754, by the Presbytery of Newcastle, and ordained *sine titulo* by the same presbytery in 1755, and by order of the same presbytery, he was installed at Lewestown by the Rev. Alexander McDowell, in less than a month after said congregations had called him to be their pastor. The call was April 13th, the ordination May 5th, 1756.

The distance of the churches of Lewestown and Cool Spring is about seven miles; the one standing in the town, or rather village, whose name it bears; the other at the aforesaid distance, in a south-western direction. It appears that disputes ran high then in Sussex, as well as in other places, between the *new* and the *old* sides; and that Mr. Wilson's settlement at Lewestown and Cool Spring, although agreeable to the *latter*, was opposed by the *former*.

There is another Presbyterian church at about the distance of thirteen miles from Lewestown, in a southern direction. This appears to have been formerly known by the name of Frame's; but is now most commonly named from Indian River, at the head of which it stands. The congregation of Indian River appears to have been chiefly formed un-

der the ministry of the Rev. Mr. Harris, but about a year after the union of the synods, namely, in 1759, Mr. Harris obtained a regular dismissal in the Presbytery of Lewestown, from his pastoral charge of the congregation of Indian River: hoping, no doubt, that it would some time unite with the congregations of Lewestown and Cool Spring. It would seem that the chief part of the congregations of Lewestown and Cool Spring, were of the *old side*, and those of Indian River chiefly of the *new side*. It is certain that many attempts were made to unite the congregation of Indian River with the other two, under the pastoral care of Mr. Wilson; but that they all proved abortive. However, in the year 1767, they were so far reconciled to one another, that the congregation of Indian River supplicated the presbytery for a third part of Mr. Wilson's labours as a stated supply, which was granted. But notwithstanding those congregations were thus separate in their spiritual concerns, yet in the time of Dr. Wilson's ministry, they became united in their temporalities. The legislature of the State of Delaware in the year 1787, made a law to enable all the religious societies in the State, consisting of fifteen families and upwards, to become incorporate by observing the regulations therein prescribed. These congregations availed themselves of this law in the year 1788, and so they were all three incorporated into one by the name of "The United Presbyterian Congregations of Lewes, Cool Spring and Indian River"—that is to say, their temporal concerns were united; and

indeed these seem to be all belonging to the church, with which human laws have a right to interfere.

Dr. Wilson died March 31st, 1790, and his remains are interred in the Presbyterian burying-ground in Lewestown.

The Rev. Francis Hindman received a call from "the incorporated and fully united congregations of Lewestown, Cool Spring and Indian River," and was ordained and installed at Cool Spring, October 27th, 1791.

It is stated by Mr. Hindman, that the above sketch of church history was approved by the Presbytery of Lewestown, at Broad-creek, April 21st, 1795, and yet below is the following record:—"I, the subscriber, being the only surviving minister present at the time when this sketch of church history was said to be read and approved, do declare and assert that there was no such paper read in presbytery.

"SAML. McMASTER."

Query.—May it not have been read during some short absence of Mr. McMaster? Or by a committee on the session book, as is usual? Mr. Hindman says *approved*, not *read*.

The following are the pastors who succeeded Mr. Hindman:

Rev. John Burton, A. M., began to labour as stated supply, December 10th, 1795, received a call April 11th, 1797.

Rev. James P. Wilson, D. D.

Rev. Jos. Copse, V. D. M.

Rev. Benjamin Ogden, M. A.

Rev. John Mitchelmore, V. D. M.

Rev. Abraham De Witt, call dated June 13th,  
1834. Labours commenced May 25th, 1834. In-  
stalled November 14th, 1834.

THE END.