THE SOUTHERN DISSENTING CLERGY AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee

Cline Edwin Hall

December 1975

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Cline Edwin Hall entitled "The Southern Dissenting Clergy and the American Revolution." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in History.

Milton M. Klein, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

DEDICATED TO

MY WIFE, BEVERLY,

AND

MY PARENTS, REV. AND MRS. L. C. HALL

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the importance of the southern dissenting clergy in the American Revolution. Rapidly growing in numbers in the quarter century before the Revolution, these men began to take places of leadership in which they could actively influence their communities.

Even though their sermons were important sources of whig ideology, the clergy had a natural tendency to steer away from political involvement. This reluctance, along with their location outside the political and religious establishment in the South, forced them into a position of moderation rather than militant leadership regarding the issues leading to the Revolution. Yet in their own way they contributed to the creation and development of patriot spirit. Their activities in the Carolina backcountry, for example, weakened the loyalists, and their support of and modest participation in the extralegal agencies of government everywhere in the South demonstrated their whig thought.

Religious issues that aroused the dissenting clergy of the North did not have the same effect in the South. Though of minor concern, the episcopate controversy and the passage of the Quebec Act did not cause enough excitement among the southern dissenters to be classified as causes of the Revolution. The major issue that the dissenting clergy came to support was the struggle for disestablishment of the Anglican church. Undergirded by the efforts of such libertarians as Jefferson, Madison, and Mason, the Baptist and Presbyterian ministers provided the enthusiasm to bring disestablishment to a successful conclusion.

By far the best indication of the course of action taken by the dissenting clergy was the example they set during the Revolution. Changing from men of moderation to active participants, they served as soldiers, chaplains, and recruiters of troops. Up to two-thirds of them can be definitely classified as whigs, with another one-third as pacifists. Only a very few were loyalists. Their main contribution, however, was the propagation of a political philosophy of resistance to British oppression and their enthusiasm for freedom of conscience in the realm of religion.

PREFACE

Ever since the publication of Bernard Bailyn's work on the ideology of the American Revolution, there has been renewed interest in the political thought of the varied groups of people who contributed to the shaping of the American Revolution. The clergy is one such group. While there has been considerable writing on the clergy of specific denominations and in certain geographical areas, not many historians have dealt with broader topics affecting the clergy across denominational lines. The following study seeks to assay the role of the southern dissenting clergy as a group during the era of the Revolution. My research has shown that they were whigs in politics but not in a position to exert a major influence on the outcome of the Revolution. It is also clear that some suggestions made by historians about the influence of religious issues on the Revolution can not be applied to the South. Hopefully, the following pages will clarify some misconceptions.

Whatever success may have been achieved by this study, much of the credit goes to others. Dr. Milton M. Klein aided in selecting the topic and guided me along the way. Other members of my dissertation committee have given valuable suggestions for improvement of this study. Because of the nature of the topic, much material had to be obtained through interlibrary loan, and the staff of the University of Tennessee Library did an admirable job in securing that material. I would also like to thank the librarians at Princeton University, the Presbyterian Historical Society, the Virginia State Archives, the Southern Historical

Collection, Duke University, the South Caroliniana Library, and other places at which I did research. Special acknowledgement must be given to my parents who provided much encouragement and financial assistance to complete this work. The contributor deserving my warmest words of appreciation is my wife, Beverly.

A comment is necessary on my use of manuscripts. In quoted materials, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation remain the same as in the original.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Leadership of the American Revolution was provided by many different groups: merchants, lawyers, newspapermen, writers, and clergymen. Since they have been the subject of detailed analyses, we know a good deal about most of these groups. The role of the clergy in the Revolutionary Era, for example, has long been recognized. Contemporaries such as Peter Oliver of Massachusetts believed that "Mr *Otis's* black Regiment, the *dissenting* clergy" played a leading role in the coming of the Revolution.[1] John Adams believed similarly. Within recent years, historians have also placed increasing emphasis on the significance of religion and the role of the ministry in the American Revolution. A useful work on the New England clergy has been written by Alice M. Baldwin.[2] Examining the sermons of the New England Congregational clergy, she has demonstrated the similarity between "Puritan theology and fundamental political thought" and also the ease with which the clergy popularized these "essential doctrines of political philosophy." She later attempted to extend her analysis to the New Light Presbyterian clergy of Virginia and North Carolina and concluded that they preached the same philosophy of government as the New England clergy, except for a lesser reliance on John Locke.[3]

---

[1]Peter Oliver, *Origin & Progress of the American Rebellion*, ed. by Douglas Adair and John A. Schutz (San Marino, California, 1961), 41.

[2]Alice M. Baldwin, *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution* (Durham, 1928).

[3]Alice M. Baldwin, "Sowers of Sedition: The Political Theories of Some of the New Light Presbyterian Clergy of Virginia and North Carolina," *William & Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, V (1948), 52-76.

Because she considered only a few clergy of a single denomination and left untouched the political views of the remainder, this study was of limited nature.

By far the most significant recent work on the relationship of the clergy to the Revolution has been Alan Heimert's *Religion and the American Mind from the Great Awakening to the Revolution* (1966). His differentiation of the American Protestants into two parties, the Liberals or the rationalists, on the one side, and the Calvinists or evangelicals, on the other, was not unique. What was unique was Heimert's challenge to the traditional view that it was the rationalist religion expressed by the liberal clergy which constituted the spiritual underpinning of the Revolution. Instead, Heimert saw Calvinism, or the evangelical impulse, as the force which inspired men to fight the Revolution and which became the "instrument of a fervent American nationalism."[4] It was Liberalism, he contended, that was a profoundly elitist and conservative theology. The Liberals employed the philosophy of John Locke as a justification of the *status quo* and as a means of limiting the revolutionary enthusiasm of the people; the Calvinists, by contrast, infused Locke with a moral significance which stimulated the hearts and wills of the American people. The Great Awakening, then profoundly influenced the American mind, and it was evangelical religion which was the father of the American democratic tradition, not the Age of Reason.

---

[4]Alan Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind From the Great Awakening to the Revolution* (Cambridge, 1966), 14.

Heimert reached this conclusion not only by analyzing the sermons of the clergy but by "reading, not between the lines but, as it were, through and beyond them" in order to determine "not merely what was said but what was *meant*." Here he ran into difficulty, because it is not always possible to determine what was "meant," especially when a statement was taken out of context, as Heimert did, or to determine just what was in a person's mind at the time he was speaking. By using this method, according to one critic, Heimert managed to turn the tory Thomas Hutchinson of Massachusetts into a man of the people.[5] Heimert might have done just as well to let the words of the clergy stand on their own merits; his principal hypothesis would not have been altered appreciably had he done so. His thesis, however, does not hold up when tested against the southern clergy.

Despite the renewed interest in the role of the clergy and their beliefs, there has been little work done on the southern dissenting clergy apart from the treatment of the Presbyterian clergy in Virginia and North Carolina in the mid-nineteenth century works of William Henry Foote. John Thornton, in his nineteenth-century collection of political sermons of the revolutionary period, did not include a single sermon by a southerner.[6] Books on the episcopate controversy, similarly, say very little of the dissenting clergy in the South.

---

[5]See Comments by Edmund S. Morgan in his review of the book in *William & Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, XXIV (1967), 454-59.

[6]John W. Thornton, *The Pulpit of the American Revolution* (Boston, 1860).

Those who have written on religion in the South, such as Brydon, Meade, Dalcho, and Osgood, have consistently emphasized the role of the established church, and they all neglect the role of the dissenters.[7] This is understandable because of the strength of the established church in the South and the leadership provided by the Anglican clergy. In addition, the legal status of the dissenting clergy in the South was ambiguous. Not able to preach unless they were licensed, neither could they preach at a particular meeting house unless it was licensed, as well. All of these factors have led previous writers to overemphasize the importance of the southern Anglican clergy in the Revolution.

By the time of the American Revolution, however, the dissenting clergy were in a position to exert more influence than before. For one thing, there were more of them: by 1776 their numbers surpassed the Anglicans in some regions, especially in North Carolina. They also expressed a surprising unanimity of religious belief since most southern dissenters were Calvinist in theology, the Arminian Methodists being the principal exception. As a result, there was a sharing of pulpits across denominational lines in some areas. Thirdly, there was a shortage of ministers among the Anglicans. In many cases even though the parish was organized as a political unit, there was no glebe land nor a minister present. The Anglican ministers in Virginia also had

---

[7] G. MacLaren Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church* (2 vols., Richmond, 1947-1952); Bishop Meade, *Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1900); Frederick Dalcho, *An Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in South Carolina* (Charleston, 1829); Herbert L. Osgood, *The American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century* (4 vols., New York, 1924-25).

lost much respect because of their worldliness and the famous case involving their salaries, known as the Parson's Cause. As the Anglicans lost influence, the dissenting clergy in the backcountry, ministering to the many thousands of new arrivals, slowly assumed positions of leadership. Several educated Presbyterian clergymen in the backcountry, such as Samuel Davies, David Caldwell, and Henry Patillo, rose to prominence even outside the South. Baptists entered the more settled regions and drew converts from the Anglicans. Baptist leaders included such men as Oliver Hart, Richard Furman, John Leland, and Samuel Harris. And who could deny the leadership role of John Peter Muhlenberg among the Germans in the Valley of Virginia, or John J. Zubly in Savannah?

If contemporaries of the Revolution, such as Peter Oliver, looked upon the dissenting clergy of Massachusetts as the instigators of public opinion against Britain, was their role similar in the South? Writing in the early twentieth century, Claude Van Tyne concluded that the loyalists included the Anglican clergy and the wealthy plantation owners of the South.[8] Even though this interpretation has been challenged by recent historians, very little has been done to enlarge our knowledge of the role of the southern dissenting clergy, leading to an incomplete picture of the Revolution in the South. What role did the dissenting clergy play in formulating public opinion? Were the Calvinists here the radical leaders of the Revolution? Was their political ideology different from that of ministers in other areas? How

---

[8]Claude H. Van Tyne, *The Loyalists in the American Revolution* (New York, 1902), 4-5.

did they respond to the new British colonial policy? Were they tory or did they support independence? What part did they actually play in the revolutionary war? It is the purpose of this study to answer these questions.

By way of definition, dissenter clergymen, for the purpose of this study, are considered to be all ministers outside the established church, excluding Quakers and Roman Catholics. The latter were obviously outside the Protestant tradition, and the former had no formally organized group that can be classified as clergy. Thus, what held all the dissenters together mainly was their opposition to the established church. It was this hostility to Anglicanism which constituted the common basis of their religious and political confrontations with the colonial and British governments.

The major dissenting groups include, then, the Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, and such German sects as the Moravians, Lutherans, Reformed, and Mennonites. The southern colonies included in the present study are those extending from Maryland to Georgia. One of the problems has been the scarcity of sources, since many of the manuscripts of the period have either been lost or destroyed by fire and the ravages of war. Sources used were the printed and manuscript sermons, diaries, journals, and letters of the dissenting clergy, as well as the official colonial and state records, along with minutes of individual churches and church bodies that have survived. In some cases comments made by lay leaders have thrown additional light on the subject. From these sources it is possible to draw a composite picture of the political

thought and activities of the southern dissenting clergy. By doing so it is hoped that a contribution will be made to a better understanding of the revolutionary generation.

CHAPTER I

THE SOUTHERN DISSENTING CLERGY: A PROFILE

Increasing rapidly in numbers in the two decades before the Revolution, the dissenting clergy of the South were a disparate lot. Some were ill-educated and were truly itinerants, preaching wherever they could secure an audience and generally among the lower classes. Others were college-educated and occupied places of leadership and influence among the middle class and, in rare cases, the urban upper classes. While it is difficult to determine the extent of their influence in their communities, nevertheless, all of them undoubtedly were looked upon as leaders, at least by the people they served spiritually. A composite portrait of the group reveals the broad outlines of their collective personality.

There were a little less than 400 dissenting clergymen serving in the South from about 1750 until the Declaration of Independence.[1] Not all of them were living in 1776, but a composite picture of them at that time is revealing. Of the 249 whose birthplace is known, 57 percent (141) were born in the colonies, and over half of these in the

---

[1]The information in this composite picture of the dissenting clergy was compiled from many different sources, but particularly Frederick L. Weis, *The Colonial Clergy of Maryland, Delaware and Georgia* (Lancaster, Massachusetts, 1950), and *The Colonial Clergy of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina* (Boston, 1955). As a rule, Weis was substantially correct in most of his factual information, but corrections were made from other sources. Weis tended to neglect the Methodist ministers, probably because they were really still Anglican missionaries before the organization of the Methodist church.

South, Virginia having the largest number, fifty-eight. The second largest number, twenty-seven, were natives of Pennsylvania. The birthplaces of the rest were scattered over eight other colonies. The remaining 43 percent (108) were born in nine foreign countries, with regions of the British Empire predominating (sixty-two). Germany was the next largest, with thirty.

The Anglican clergy are usually assumed to have been the best educated of the colonial clergy, and this is probably true, but the dissenting clergy were not entirely without formal schooling. The Presbyterian, Lutheran, and German Reformed churches required their ministers to be college-educated or to have the approval of a synodical committee. Even though New Side Presbyterians did not stress a college education as much as the Old Sides, most New Side clergymen received formal schooling at one of the several log colleges. Baptists and Methodists were less likely to be college-educated, but most were self-taught or were instructed by a more experienced minister. Out of the dissenting clergymen in the South, at least 13 percent (fifty-one) held the Bachelor's degree. Most of these (thirty-seven) were Presbyterian ministers who were graduates of the College of New Jersey, evidencing the concern of the Presbyterians for an educated ministry. At least 8 percent (thirty-three) of the dissenting clergymen received the Master's degree, all of them in the colonial period and from institutions such as the College of New Jersey, College of Rhode Island, Harvard, and Yale. Generally, this M.A. was an honorary degree given three years after the Bachelor's degree for some service performed. In

most cases, however, all that was necessary was to return to the college and participate in some scholarly disputation. Four of the ministers were apparently important enough to receive more than one Master's degree. Five percent (eighteen) held the Doctor of Divinity degree, most of them receiving the honor after the Revolution. One received the Doctor of Literature and one the Doctor of Sacred Theology degree. These figures are conservative, as there were many more who probably attended college at one time or another, some of them in Europe before coming to the colonies, especially those of the German sects who were educated at Halle or Heidelberg.

Only about 330 of these dissenting clergymen were still living in 1776. It is difficult to obtain statistical information on many of them; consequently the birth date of many is unknown. Generally, they were young men who had been in the ministry only a short time. Of the 330, the birth date of 53 percent (174) is known--their median age being thirty-nine, with the average age slightly higher, forty-two, at the time of the Declaration of Independence. The distribution, however, was broad, the youngest being nineteen and the oldest, eighty-two. With the average age at forty-two, it would appear that the length of service as a minister was brief. Among those living in 1776 the length of service is known for 81 percent (268).[2] Of these, a majority (57 percent) has been in the ministry for ten years or less by the time

[2]To determine the length of service the date of the ordination was used, or if that was not available the date of his being licensed by a church body or the date of his first pastorate.

of the Revolution, with the greatest number (112) serving five or fewer years. The median length of service for the group was seven years.

A composite picture of the average dissenting clergyman at the beginning of the Revolution, then, discloses an individual who was most likely a native-born American about forty years old, probably a Presbyterian or Baptist, having been in the active ministry between five and ten years. He generally held a settled pastorate but probably preached to more than one congregation; and some were entirely itinerant, moving from one church to another. Most had some formal education, with about one out of every seven being a college graduate, either from the College of New Jersey or from a European university.

It is difficult to determine the social and economic standing of the dissenting ministers, but there is evidence that they were on the fringe of political and social leadership. The Anglican clergy have generally been considered to be in the upper middle class and part of the political establishment. They were closely associated with local vestries which were largely made up of the wealthier members of the community. In addition, their salaries were set by the legislatures which also required the Anglican clergy to keep vital statistics of births, marriages, and deaths. Because of intermarriage into the planter class by the Anglican clergy, their social position was enhanced. One estimate is that at least one-third of the Anglican clergy had definite ties of kinship with influential families in Virginia.[3] This was not

---

[3]Joan R. Gundersen, "The Anglican Ministry in Virginia 1723-1776: A Study of Social Class" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1972), chap. 4.

generally true among a sizable number of dissenting ministers. A comparison of their social standing with other ministers is almost an impossible task, but it seems that the ties of the dissenting ministers with the upper class were not as great as those among the Anglicans in the South or the New England Congregationalists.

In some areas of the South dissenters had risen to socially acceptable positions. In Virginia the planter Robert Carter became a Baptist and Charles Gordon a Presbyterian. These representatives of the upper class dissenters were an exception, however, rather than a common occurrence. In the urban regions there seems to have been a friendly relationship among the dissenting clergymen and between them and the upper class. This was evidenced by pulpit-sharing and a minimum of religious bickering. Oliver Hart, a Baptist minister in Charleston, was closely associated with the Presbyterians John J. Zubly and William Tennent and also with the Church of England minister there.[4]

---

[4]Oliver Hart was born in Warminster, Pennsylvania, July 5, 1723. He was ordained a Baptist minister in October 1749 and became pastor in Charleston in February 1749/50. As Baptist work progressed, Hart was one of the founders of the Charleston Association in 1751. Largely self-taught, he received an honorary degree from the College of Rhode Island in 1769. After fleeing the British in 1780, he settled in Hopewell, New Jersey, where he died in 1795. See William B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit* (9 vols., New York, 1857-69), VI, 47-50; Loulie Latimer Owens, "Oliver Hart, 1723-1795. A Brief Biography," *Baptist History and Heritage*, I (1966), 19-46.

William Tennent, III, was born into the famous Tennent family in Freehold, New Jersey, in 1740. He received a degree from the College of New Jersey in 1758 and was ordained by the New Brunswick Presbytery in 1762. The following year Harvard College conferred an honorary Master's degree on him. After serving as pastor in Connecticut, he came to the Independent Church in Charleston in 1772 where he remained until his death in 1777. See Sprague, *Annals*, III, 242-45.

John Joachim Zubly was born in St. Gall, Switzerland, August 27,

Hart commented in 1754 that religious bigotry must be rooted out and that it was such "a pity that our little outward differences Should cause Such a Shyness between us."[5] William Tennent of the Independent Church of Charleston was accepted by the upper class of that city and had among his members Josiah Smith, Jr., one of its wealthy merchants. Anglicans often attended Tennent's services, and Smith noted that

> many of our Episcopal neighbors have attended on his preaching and I don't know that any of them have spoke to his dispraise. May we not therefore hope that he may Prove as a Pointed Dart to some of them as well as to some of his own flock.[6]

When Henry M. Muhlenberg, the Lutheran minister from Pennsylvania, visited the South in 1774-1775, he mentioned his fellowship with Tennent and Pierre Levrier, the Huguenot minister. In addition, Muhlenberg preached in Tennent's Independent Church to a "Congregation composed of influential citizens." When Muhlenberg went to Savannah, Zubly was well enough acquainted with important citizens of that city to introduce the

---

1724. He studied at Tubingen and Halle and was ordained into the German Reformed church before arriving in America in 1744. After serving various Lutheran, German Reformed, and Congregational churches in Georgia and South Carolina, he became pastor of the Independent Church in Savannah in 1760. He was a member of the Georgia Provincial Congress in 1775 and the Second Continental Congress. Because he would not agree to independence, he was declared a tory. See Sprague, *Annals*, III, 219-22; Allen Johnson, et al., eds., *Dictionary of American Biography* (24 vols., New York, 1928-1941), XX, 660, hereafter cited as *DAB*.

[5]Diary of Oliver Hart, October 27, 1754, South Carolina Baptist Historical Collection, Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina.

[6]Josiah Smith Jr., to Rev. John Rodgers, April 10, 1772, Josiah Smith Letterbook, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

visitor to Judge Anthony Stokes, James Habersham, who was President of the Council, and various members of the Assembly.[7]

On the whole, however, the dissenters of the New Light persuasion were looked upon with disfavor by the Anglican clergy and political establishment. When Samuel Davies came to Virginia, the Anglicans tried to discredit him and the New Lights as a group by circulating a reprint of an Old Light New Hampshire minister's 1742 publication, John Caldwell's *An Impartial Trial of the Spirit.* The printer, William Parks, remarked in the preface that the purpose of the reprint was to open the eyes "of some deluded People among us, who are imposed upon by Itinerants," and to demonstrate that the Presbyterian ministers were "in Reality a Set of Incendiaries; Enemies not only to the established church, but also common Disturbers of the Peace and Order of all religious societies where ever they came."[8] To him they were imposters and schismatics. An Anglican minister in the Carolina backcountry, Charles Woodmason, similarly described the "Itinerants" as a

> Sett of Rhapsodists-Enthusiasts-Bigots-Pedantic, illiterate, impudent Hypocrits-Straining at Gnats, and swallowing Camels, and making Religion a Cloak for Covetousness Detraction, Guile, Impostures and their particular Fabric of Things.[9]

---

[7]Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein, eds., *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg* (3 vols., Philadelphia, 1942), II, 570, 574, 576, 675ff.

[8]Preface to John Caldwell's *An Impartial Trial of the Spirit* (Williamsburg, 1747), xiii-xiv. Davies defended himself by calling these charges "satires" in *The Impartial Trial Impartially Tried and Convicted of Partiality* (Williamsburg, 1748).

[9]Richard J. Hooker, ed., *The Carolina Backcountry on the Eve of the Revolution; the Journal and Other Writings of Charles Woodmason, Anglican Itinerant* (Chapel Hill, 1953), 42.

These remarks reveal not only a difference in religious beliefs but also a considerable social gulf between the itinerant preachers and the more permanently located Anglican ministers.

As the Separate Baptists began to expand in the late 1750s and the next decade, they too were regarded as a disturbing element. In many cases, their ministers preached without licenses and, as a result, were arrested for "breach of the peace and good behavior," especially in Virginia and in the rural areas of other colonies. Charles Woodmason described New Light Baptist and Methodist ministers as "exceeding low and ignorant persons - yet the lower Class chose to resort to them rather than to hear a Well connected Discourse."[10] He thought the Baptists "Vain and Ignorant" men and, as he talked with them, found that their reading was "of no greater Extent than the Pilgrim's Progress and Works of John Bunyan."[11] John Zubly, similarly, found the Baptists uneducated. Writing to Ezra Stiles about the Baptist College in New England, Zubly made this comment about the Baptist ministers of Georgia:

> There is an Intimacy between most of their Ministers in these parts & myself, but I doubt whether they would learn any greek if it was not for βαπτω & βαπτγω.[12]

---

[10]Hooker, *Carolina Backcountry*, 20. William Dawson, the Anglican Commissary of Virginia, charged that Davies was "holding forth on working days to great numbers of poor people who generally are his own followers." Dawson was alarmed that this neglect of their labors by the working classes might contribute to the weakening of the colony's economy. See Dawson to Bishop of London, July 27, 1750, in William S. Perry, comp., *Historical Collections relating to the American Colonial Church* (4 vols., Hartford, 1870), I, 366.

[11]*Ibid.*, 22.

[12]John Zubly to Ezra Stiles, October 10, 1768, in Franklin B. Dexter, ed., *Extracts from the Itineraries and other Miscellanies of*

Obviously, some dissenting ministers were looked upon with disdain by many of the Anglican leaders.

The Southern dissenting ministers in the decades before the Revolution had little political power and what influence they possessed in this respect was indirect. In places where the dissenters were in the majority, the laity served as vestrymen even though, legally, vestrymen in all the southern colonies were supposed to adhere to the doctrines of the established church. Presbyterians, for example, served on the vestry in Augusta County, Virginia, from its inception in 1746 until 1769, when the Assembly passed an act dissolving the vestry and ordered a new election on the grounds that a majority were dissenters. Most of these vestrymen, as well as James Patton, sheriff of the county, were members of the Presbyterian church, where John Craig was pastor.[13] The same was true in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, where there were many Presbyterians. Alexander Craighead had served as pastor of the Presbyterians there for ten years when an attempt was made to send an Anglican minister, a Mr. Morton, into the county. Morton decided not to go when he learned that the people of the county

> evaded the Vestry Act by electing the most rigid dissenters for Vestrymen who would not qualify; that the county abounded

---

Ezra Stiles (New Haven, 1916), 598. Both of the Greek words are verb forms of "to dip" or "to plunge." A liberal translation would be "to dip and to baptize."

[13]Lillian K. Craig, *Reverend John Craig, 1709-1774, His Descendants and Allied Families* (New Orleans, 1963), 14; Richard L. Morton, *Colonial Virginia* (2 vols., Chapel Hill, 1960), II, 754; Ernest T Thompson, *Presbyterians in the South, 1607-1861* (2 vols., Richmond, 1963), I, 84.

> with Dissenters of various denominations and particularly with Covenanters Seceders Anabaptists and New Lights.[14]

In both of these cases there was some indirect political influence by the ministers but its extent is difficult to demonstrate. It is clear, however, that no dissenting clergyman held a major political office until the eve of the Revolution.[15]

The number of dissenting clergy grew quite rapidly in the decades preceding the Revolution, soon outnumbering the Anglican ministry. In 1750, there were approximately 170 Anglican churches in the South and only about 100 dissenting churches.[16] Since all churches did not have a pastor, the total of dissenting ministers was probably even smaller.

---

[14]James Reed to Secretary of Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, July 20, 1766, in William L. Saunders, ed., *The Colonial Records of North Carolina* (10 vols., Raleigh, 1886-1890), VII, 241.

[15]An exception to this would be three men who held political offices before they became ministers. Samuel Harris became a Baptist minister in 1758. Previous to this he was an Anglican planter and had served as church warden, sheriff, justice of the peace, and colonel in the militia in Lunenburg and Halifax counties, Virginia. John Williams was sheriff of Lunenburg County, Virginia, in 1769 before his ordination in 1772. James Bell of Sussex County, Virginia, was captain of a militia company, justice of the peace, and sheriff before becoming a minister.

[16]These figures were compiled from charts in Edwin S. Gaustad, *Historical Atlas of Religion in America* (New York, 1962), Figures 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 20.

Southern Churches, 1750

	Anglican	Dissenters						Total Dissenters
		Bapt.	Cong.	Luth.	Pres.	G.R.	Hug.	
Md.	50	4	0	3	18	4	0	29
Va.	93	4	0	5	17	5	0	31
N.C.	9	12	0	1	0	2	0	15
S.C.	16	5	4	5	9	3	2	28
Ga.	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Total	171	25	4	16	45	14	2	106

Nevertheless, these figures indicate the predominance of the Anglican church over the dissenters at mid-century. Even in this period, however, there were already more dissenting than Anglican churches in places like North and South Carolina.[17] Before the colonial period had ended, the dissenters were in a majority in most areas of the South, with the possible exception of Maryland and Virginia. In Maryland, it has been estimated that there were about forty-two Anglican clergy in 1760 and about twenty dissenters.[18] In Virginia, with ninety-five parishes, the largest number in any southern colony, there were thirty Presbyterian churches by the Revolution, and between 1770 and 1780, sixty-seven additional Baptist churches were established.[19]

North Carolina had the largest number of dissenting clergy. Many attempts were made to strengthen the Church of England in that colony but without success. In the early 1760s, under Governor Arthur Dobbs, twenty-nine parishes were organized, but the colony possessed only half a dozen clergymen of the established church to serve them. As a result, Dobbs had to be buried by a magistrate because no Anglican minister was available to officiate at the services.[20] Even during the administration of Governor William Tryon (1765-1771) there were only five

---

[17]See note 16 above.

[18]Nelson W. Rightmyer, *Maryland's Established Church* (Baltimore, 1956), 97.

[19]Gaustad, *Historical Atlas*, 9, 12, 21.

[20]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VI, xxix.

Anglican ministers, and in spite of Tryon's continuing efforts to strengthen the Anglican church the proportion of dissenting ministers grew rapidly.

The situation in South Carolina was somewhat better for the Church of England. Charles Woodmason, in his "account of the Churches" prepared in 1765, listed twenty Anglican clergymen in the colony.[21] Five years previous to this, Ezra Stiles had tallied the number of ministers as follows: Presbyterian, eleven; Congregational, three; Anglican, thirteen; and Baptist, three.[22] The figures do not include Lutheran and German Reformed clergymen. Thus, dissenting ministers were in a decided majority. Woodmason listed only one Anglican clergyman in Georgia,[23] but John Zubly reported the numbers in 1773 as two Anglican, two Congregational, one Presbyterian, and two Lutheran.[24]

The dissenting clergy, however, were not evenly spread throughout the South; they were more prominent on the frontier than in the settled regions as a survey of the location of each denomination makes clear. (See Figure 1.) The largest group was the Presbyterians. Organized Presbyterianism had its beginning in the South in Maryland in 1648, but it was not until 1683 that Francis Makemie, the real founder of American Presbyterianism, arrived from Scotland. He secured a

---

[21]Hooker, *Carolina Backcountry*, 67-68. In Woodmason's journal of 1768 this number is reduced to 10 or 12. See *ibid.*, 41.

[22]Quoted in George Howe, *History of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina* (2 vols., Columbia, 1870-1873), I, 363.

[23]Hooker, *Carolina Backcountry*, 68, 75.

[24]John J. Zubly to Ezra Stiles, 1773, Massachusetts Historical Society *Proceedings*, VIII (1864-1865), 215.

Figure 1. The South during the Revolution.

Source: Adapted from map 74, James T. Adams, *Atlas of American History* (New York, 1943).

license to preach in Virginia in 1689, under the Toleration Act, and most of his work was done on the eastern shore. After his death in 1708, however, Presbyterianism declined temporarily. By 1717, southern Presbyterianism was so inconsiderable that when the Synod of Philadelphia was organized, one of its four Presbyteries, New Castle, was considered sufficient to serve Maryland and Delaware.[25]

The major source of Presbyterian strength in the South thereafter came from two directions: one, the Scots Highlanders, and the other, the Scotch-Irish. One group of Highlanders arrived about 1732 and settled on the Cape Fear River in North Carolina. Cross Creek became the major center of their settlement, and by 1776 there were about 12,000 Highlanders in the area which today comprises Cumberland, Harnett, and Hoke counties. As no permanent minister lived among these people, James Campbell came from Pennsylvania in 1758 in response to a plea by Hugh McAden, an early Presbyterian missionary sent out by the Synod of New York. Since many of the Highlanders spoke only Gaelic, Campbell preached in both Gaelic and English.[26] Farther south in Georgia there was also a group of Highlanders led by the Rev. John McLeod, who settled at Darien, established by General James Oglethorpe as an outpost of the colony against the Spanish and Indians. This group did

---

[25]Four of the Presbytery's seventeen ministers served in Maryland. See Thompson, *Presbyterians*, I, 17-30.

[26]*Ibid.*, I, 36-37; Duane Meyer, *The Highland Scots of North Carolina* (Chapel Hill, 1961), 113-16.

not last long, as McLeod moved his congregation to Edisto Island, South Carolina, in 1741.

It was the Scotch-Irish, however, who contributed most to Presbyterianism. One entrance route was through Charleston, when in 1732 the Council of South Carolina granted to Ulster colonists the Williamsburg Township. But the great mass of Scotch-Irish came in waves from Pennsylvania down the Valley of Virginia and settled along the frontier in Virginia and in Anson, Orange, Rowan, and Mecklenburg counties in North Carolina. By 1750 they were pouring over into the South Carolina Piedmont, and by the Revolution they were moving into upland Georgia.

In Virginia, the southern portion of the Valley was filled by 1750 with Scotch-Irish Presbyterians, and most of their ministers were of the Old Side Donegal Presbytery. Among the most prominent were John Craig, Samuel Black, and Alexander Miller. The next decade saw the indigenous growth of Presbyterianism across the mountains to the east in Hanover County. These people were ministered to by the New Side Samuel Davies, who took the lead in securing religious toleration for dissenters. Within a few years Presbyterianism had spread to Cumberland, Prince Edward, Charlotte, and Louisa counties under the leadership of John Todd, Robert Henry, and John Wright.

Because of differences over the Great Awakening, the Presbyterian church in America suffered a division in 1741. Those who favored the revival were called New Sides, and four years later they formed themselves into the Synod of New York, made up of the Presbyteries of New

York, New Brunswick, and New Castle. Insisting on the essentiality of a religious conversion experience for their ministers, the New Sides agreed that a minister could preach anywhere he felt moved to do so without approval of the Presbytery. The Old Sides, on the other hand, rejected the emotionalism of the revival, emphasized the authority of the Presbytery over the movement of ministers, and insisted that the minister should be a college graduate or approved by a synodical committee. They formed themselves into a Synod of Philadelphia.[27] This division in Presbyterianism lasted until 1758 when reunion was accomplished and the resulting merged synod was named the Synod of New York and Philadelphia.

In the South most of the Presbyterian clergy were New Sides and belonged to the Hanover Presbytery, formed by the Synod of New York in 1755. Its members included Samuel Davies, John Todd, Alexander Craighead, Robert Henry, John Wright, and John Brown.[28] This Presbytery served all the South until 1770 when the ministers south of Virginia--Hugh McAden, Henry Pattilo, James Creswell, Joseph Alexander, Hezekiah James Balch, and Hezekiah Balch--were formed into the Orange Presbytery.[29] So Presbyterianism grew in the backcountry and the western Piedmont until by the Revolution the Presbyterians had become one of the largest

---

[27]Leonard J. Trinterud, *The Forming of an American Tradition* (Philadelphia, 1949; reprint ed., Freeport, New York, 1970), chap. 6.

[28]William M. Engles, ed., *Records of the Presbyterian Church* (Philadelphia, 1904; reprint ed., New York, 1969), 264-65.

[29]*Ibid.*, 409.

dissenting groups. No other denomination challenged them until the decade before the Revolution, when the Baptists and Methodists began to emerge, representing the next wave of the great revival.

Another group closely associated with Presbyterianism was the Independents who stemmed mainly from New England Congregationalism. As early as the 1720s, in the Carolinas, there was a Charleston Presbytery, an independent group not associated with the Synod of Philadelphia. Founded by Puritans from both Old and New England and by Huguenots, the Charleston church went under the name of the White Meeting House, the Independent Church, or the Circular Church. The pastor was Josiah Smith and, after 1772, William Tennent, III, who led the struggle for religious freedom in South Carolina and served on a mission to the backcountry to win the tories over to the colonial cause. Another group with a Congregational background came from Dorchester, Massachusetts, in 1696 and founded a settlement by the same name on the Ashley River.[30] They were led to Midway, Georgia, in the 1750s under their pastor, John Osgood, a graduate of Harvard College. Osgood died before the Revolution, but the Midway Congregationalists were active patriots, and one of their ministers, Moses Allen, was captured by the British. Also in Georgia was the Independent Meeting House in Savannah, founded in 1755 by Highland Scots, Scotch-Irish, and French and Swiss Calvinists who adhered to the Westminster Confession.[31] The pastor

---

[30]Thompson, *Presbyterians*, I, 21.

[31]*Ibid.*, 37.

here was John J. Zubly, an ardent supporter of the American cause until the Declaration of Independence. He was an outspoken leader in Georgia, and many of his political sermons were published.

The second largest group of dissenters was the Baptists. There were basically two groups of Baptists in the South, with a third developing out of the Great Awakening. Since most Baptists were of English descent, they divided along the same lines as their English counterparts--Arminian and Calvinist. The former were known as General Baptists, and their theological belief was that Christ died for all, in contrast to the Calvinist doctrine of particular election. In organizational polity, the General Baptists believed that an association of churches should exert some authority over the local church in matters of theological belief and practice. The Calvinist groups were not as strict on these matters, but they firmly held to predestination and election, emphasizing that atonement was for the select few only. They were also known as Particular Baptists but in America sometimes went under the name Regular Baptists.[32]

Many of the early Baptists in Virginia and North Carolina were General Baptists. In the former colony they settled in Isle of Wight County, organizing the first church there in 1714. In North Carolina the first preacher was Paul Palmer, who arrived from Maryland in 1720. The number of General Baptist churches grew over the years, but by 1750 many of them had changed to Calvinism.

---

[32]Robert G. Torbet, *A History of the Baptists* (Philadelphia, 1950), 84-91.

The first Baptist association in America was the Philadelphia Association, which was Calvinistic in doctrine, having adopted in 1742 a Confession of Faith based on the London Confession of Particular Baptists of 1689. This association was to influence the South by virtue of the number of ministers sent into Virginia and the Carolinas to organize the General Baptist churches into Particular churches.[33] The minutes of the Philadelphia Association list four churches in Maryland and Virginia in 1762: the Ketocton Church in Loudon County, Virginia; the Opekon Church in Frederick County, Virginia; the Smith's Creek Church in Frederick County, Virginia; and the Baltimore Church in Maryland. In order to form a Regular Baptist Association in Virginia, the first three of the above-mentioned churches were released from the Philadelphia Association in 1765 to organize the Ketocton Association.[34]

There was a close association between the Regular (or Calvinist) Baptists in Maryland and northern Virginia. The pastor of the first Baptist church in Maryland, organized in 1742 near Baltimore at Chestnut Ridge, was Henry Loveall, who was also pastor at the Ketocton Church in Virginia for a time. John Davis at the Winter's Run Church in Baltimore, a member of the Philadelphia Association, was the only other major

---

[33]Robert A. Baker, ed., *A Baptist Source Book* (Nashville, 1966), 9, 13.

[34]A. D. Gillette, ed., *Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association from 1707 to 1807* (Philadelphia, 1851), 72-73, 86-88, 95; See also William Fristoe, *A Concise History of the Ketocton Baptist Association* (Staunton, Virginia, 1808), 7.

Baptist minister in Maryland; thus, the Baptists were weak in that colony, supporting by the Revolution only four churches.[35]

In the decade of the 1750s the General Baptists began to shift to Calvinist views, especially in North Carolina, mainly because of the influence of missionaries sent out by the Philadelphia Association. One such missionary was John Gano, who came south in 1754, Calvinizing the Baptist churches he visited. Based upon his report to the Association, two other ministers were sent, and in a few years the Calvinists were dominant. These reformed churches in North Carolina gathered in 1765 into a Regular Baptist Association known as the Kehukee (Quehuky) Association.[36]

In South Carolina there is a strong tradition that Baptists migrated from New England and England about 1682-1683 and settled near Charleston. At least by 1696 William Screven had come to the Charleston area from Maine and organized a Baptist church. A second group moved from the Welsh Tract on the Delaware River and settled on the banks of the Pedee River, organizing the Welsh Neck Church in 1738.[37] Baptists grew until the Charleston Association was organized

---

[35]Morgan Edwards, Materials towards a History of the Baptists in Maryland, S.C. Baptist Hist. Coll., Greenville; Joseph T. Watts, *The Rise and Progress of Maryland Baptists* (Baltimore, 1953), 2-16.

[36]Joseph Biggs, Lemuel Burkitt, and Jesse Read, *A Concise History of the Kehukee Baptist Association* (Tarborough, North Carolina, 1834), 27-31.

[37]Leah Townshend, *South Carolina Baptists, 1670-1805* (Florence, 1935), 5, 61.

in 1751 as a Regular Baptist Association with Oliver Hart, pastor in that city, as the principal leader of South Carolina Baptists before the Revolution. He was instrumental in setting up the association.

The third group of Baptists in the South was the Separate Baptists, a product of the Great Awakening. This revival had caused a controversy among the Congregationalists of New England, as some rejected infant baptism and insisted on limiting church membership to those who experienced the emotional conviction of sin, while others were willing to retain the more casual type of church membership which had resulted from such compromises as the Half-Way Covenant of 1662. The emotional New Lights began to separate from the Congregationalists much as the Old Side-New Side schism had developed among the Presbyterians. These Separate Baptists, even though mildly Calvinistic, did not adhere to the Philadelphia Confession, as did the Regular churches, but insisted on the Bible alone as a platform for their beliefs. They were critical of the Regular Baptists for not being strict enough in requiring new church members to give clear evidence of a religious experience. The Separate Baptists rejected the Half-Way Covenant, opposed infant baptism, and accepted as full members only those who were regenerate. Their preaching being zealous and noisy, to some extent they represented the lower social element of the community.[38]

---

[38]For a good discussion of the Baptists in the Great Awakening, see Wesley M. Gewehr, *The Great Awakening in Virginia* (Durham, 1930; reprint ed., Gloucester, Massachusetts, 1965), 106-9; Torbet, *History of the Baptists*, 239-42.

This New Light Baptist strain came into the South under Shubael Stearns, a Separate Congregationalist and later a Baptist minister in Tolland, Connecticut. Feeling a call to go southward, he stopped for a while among the Regular Baptists in northern Virginia in 1755 and then moved on to Sandy Creek in Guilford County, North Carolina. There, with the help of his brother-in-law, Daniel Marshall, he organized the Sandy Creek Church and in 1758 the Sandy Creek Separate Baptist Association. This church became the mother church of all Separate Baptists in the South. Within twenty years they had spread into southern Virginia under Dutton Lane and Samuel Harris, across the Carolinas under Philip Mulkey and Daniel Marshall, and finally into Georgia under Marshall.[39] Their evangelistic fervor resulted in a rapid expansion, not always approved of, as shown by this comment in 1766 by John Barnett, a missionary of the Anglican Society for the Propagation of the Gospel: "New light baptists are very numerous in the southern parts of this parish--The most illiterate among them are their Teachers even Negroes speak in their Meetings."[40]

By the Revolution, then, Baptists were located around the Baltimore area, in northern Virginia, in upper Piedmont Virginia and the Carolinas, at Charleston, and in backcountry Georgia. Their approximately one hundred churches were organized into seven associations, including four Regular associations: the Philadelphia (1707), Charleston

---

[39]M. A. Huggins, *A History of North Carolina Baptists* (Raleigh, 1967), 50-52.

[40]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VII, 164.

(1751), Ketocton (1766), and Kehukee (1765); and three Separate associations: Sandy Creek (1758), Rapidanne (1770), and the Congaree (1770).

The Methodists were the third major group of dissenting ministers. At the time of the Revolution they were only itinerant preachers, most of them sent over by John Wesley. These included Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmore, who came in 1769; Robert Williams and John King, in 1770; Francis Asbury and Richard Wright, in 1771; Thomas Rankin and George Shadford, in 1773; and James Dempster and Martin Rodda, in 1774.[41] The stronghold of Methodism in the South was in the Baltimore region and the Norfolk area in Virginia. Robert Strawbridge set up a house of worship near Pipe Creek in Frederick County, Maryland, in 1766. Further south Robert Williams came to Norfolk in 1772 and preached there from the courthouse steps, moving the next year into the Petersburg area. In addition, Francis Asbury often preached in Maryland and Virginia. In the deep South, Joseph Pilmore made a missionary trip in 1772 and 1773, going as far as Savannah. Before the Revolution he was the only Methodist itinerant to preach in that area with the exception of the earlier George Whitefield.[42]

Most of these English-born preachers had returned to their native country by the time of the Revolution. By then, however, there was a

---

[41] Nathan Bangs, *A History of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (4 vols., New York, 1838-1841), I, 59-73.

[42] Frederick E. Maser, ed., *Journal of Joseph Pilmore* (Philadelphia, 1969), *passim*.

growing number of native Americans who assumed leadership among the Methodists. Although the first Methodist Conference in the colonies was not held until 1773, by the beginning of the Revolution there were at least four or five circuits in the southern colonies.

In addition, a number of Germans settled in the South, most of them either Lutheran or Reformed. The first Lutherans came to Virginia in 1717 as indentured servants, settled on the lands of Lieutenant Governor Alexander Spotswood, and became the first permanent Lutheran settlement in the South. One of their problems was the lack of ordained ministers, a defect remedied by the arrival in 1739 of George Samuel Klug, ordained in Germany. He built a church and school in Madison County but preached often across the Blue Ridge in both Lutheran and German Reformed churches--a common practice. Other German settlers soon came down the Valley from Pennsylvania to Winchester, Sheperdstown, Stephens City, and Lovettsville,[43] but the scarcity of ministers simply prevented the settlement of pastors of this persuasion on a regular basis. It was not until 1772 that John Peter Muhlenberg settled permanently at Woodstock.[44] He became a distinguished pastor, and a leading patriot preacher of the Revolution. Muhlenberg ministered to both Lutheran and Reformed congregations since the latter had no settled pastors. On occasion, Reformed ministers, such as John C. Steiner,

---

[43]William E. Eisenberg, *The Lutheran Church in Virginia, 1717-1962* (Roanoke, Virginia, 1967), 1-22, 39-40.

[44]John W. Wayland, *The German Element of the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia* (Charlottesville, 1907; reprint ed., Bridgewater, Virginia, 1964), 111-14.

William Otterbein, William Hendel, Frederick L. Henop, and Jacob Weymer, preached on their journeys through the Valley. The Reformed church did not grow: it lacked the evangelistic fervor of the other denominations and it emphasized a theologically trained ministry but could not supply clergymen in sufficient numbers for southern congregations. Only the Classis of Amsterdam had the authority to ordain Reformed ministers.[45]

In North Carolina the situation was much the same. Germans moved down the Valley of Virginia into the colony, settling in Orange, Davidson, Davie, Rowan, and Cabarrus counties. No resident pastor arrived until 1773, however, when Adolph Nussman came from Germany as pastor near Salisbury along with John Gottfried Arends, a school teacher, who was ordained two years later.[46] There was also a German Lutheran settlement near the Georgetown area in South Carolina and another at Ebenezer, Georgia. Both of these were very reluctant to support the American cause during the Revolution.

Other groups of German extraction in the southern colonies were the Mennonites, especially in Page County, Virginia, and the Dunkers or German Baptists. Most of these were pacifists and thus were accused of lack of patriotism during the Revolution. The charge was unfounded;

---

[45]J. Silor Garrison, *The History of the Reformed Church in Virginia, 1714-1940* (Winston Salem, 1948), 42-43, 46-47.

[46]Jacob L. Morgan and others, *History of the Lutheran Church in North Carolina* (n.p., 1953), 14-21; G. D. Bernheim and George H. Cox, *The History of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod and Ministerium of North Carolina* (Philadelphia, 1902), 9-14.

they assisted the American cause in various peaceful ways.[47] The largest group of German pietists was the Moravians, who came to North Carolina in 1753 and settled on a tract of land that had been purchased from Lord Granville. Situated in Rowan County, the first settlers built the community of Wachovia under the spiritual leadership of Bernard Adam Grube. A peaceful people, the Moravians played an important role in keeping peace with the Indians on the North Carolina frontier. Being formed into Dobbs Parish in 1755 by the North Carolina Assembly, they also enjoyed many privileges that other dissenters did not enjoy.[48]

It is evident that the dissenting clergy were strongest on the frontier and generally were associated with the class of people that would not direct them into places of political leadership. Their political influence, if any, was indirect. Because of the differences in their educational background, theological views, and denominational affiliations, it is difficult to make any general statements concerning the dissenting clergy as a whole. But basically they were mature, highly mobile members of society, preaching to largely lower class congregations, and more concerned with their ministerial duties than with large issues of politics.

---

[47]Wayland, *German Element*, 128-29.

[48]The act creating Dobbs Parish is printed in Adelaide L. Fries, ed., *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina* (11 vols., Raleigh, 1922-69), I, 152-53; Levin T. Reichel, *The Moravians in North Carolina* (Philadelphia, 1857; reprint ed., Baltimore, 1968), 40.

CHAPTER II

THE DISSENTING CLERGY AND THE EMPIRE BEFORE 1763

Between 1750 and 1763 the dissenting groups had begun to fill up the frontier, and their presence began to affect their relationship with the colonial governments and the established church. Because of their increasing growth, they presented a challenge to the Anglicans. Therefore, an effort was made by the colonial Anglican establishment to keep their numbers small and to restrict their freedom to worship. Two major incidents, however, brought increasing acceptance of the dissenters: one was the arrival in Virginia of the Presbyterian minister, Samuel Davies, who led the struggle for legal toleration; the second was the support the dissenters gave the British in the French and Indian War. By 1763, then, dissenting clergy had gained limited toleration and were firmly on the side of the British government along with other Americans. This condition was to change during the next decade and a half.

As has been shown earlier, the Scotch-Irish and Germans were the main groups settling in the Valley of Virginia. Presbyterianism would have disappeared, however, without the missionaries sent out to follow the settlers. These Scotch-Irish frontiersmen made annual appeals to the Synod of Philadelphia for ministers to come and settle among them, but the Synod was hesitant to respond out of fear for the safety of its ministers on the Virginia frontier. The Old Dominion, among all the southern colonies, had the strictest enforcement of laws against dissenters. It was fortunate for the Scotch-Irish dissenters

in the 1730s, however, that Governor William Gooch of Virginia was sympathetic to their desire for ministers. Since the colonial government wanted settlers on the frontier as a buffer against Indian attacks, Gooch's interest was material as much as spiritual, for it was known that these sturdy Scotch-Irish would provide just such a bulwark. Gooch was willing to ignore his official obligation to promote the growth of the established church in order to accommodate dissenters on the frontier, and the dissenting minister was thus to provide major leadership in the settlement of that region.

Designating two representatives as official emissaries, the Synod of Philadelphia in 1738 addressed a letter to Gooch requesting his permission to send ministers among the Scotch-Irish in the Valley. The letter informed the governor that the Presbyterians were of the same persuasion as the Church of Scotland and beseeched him to allow them "the liberty of their consciences, and of worshipping God." He was reminded that in Europe they had an "inviolable attachment to the Protestant succession, in the illustrious house of Hanover, and have upon all occasions manifested an unspotted fidelity to our gracious sovereign King George. . . ."[1] In his reply, Gooch approved the settlement of the western part of the colony and gave the assurance that there would be no interference with the ministers who came, provided they subscribed to the "act of toleration in England, by taking the oaths enjoined thereby, and registering the places of their meeting,

---

[1]Engles, *Records of the Presbyterian Church*, 139, 142.

and behave themselves peacably towards the government."[2] The same policy towards dissenters was followed in 1752 under Governor Dinwiddie, the House of Burgesses exempting new settlers from the "payment of all public, county, and parish levies for a term of ten years."[3]

From this time on, increased efforts were made to supply the frontier settlement with ministers, the first permanent Presbyterian minister in the Valley being John Craig, who came to Augusta County in 1740. He recorded in his diary that he was "encouraged to settle there by the honorable Sir William Gooch, then Governor of Virginia, a good man and a father to the frontier. . . ."[4] Shortly after this, other Presbyterian ministers--Samuel Black, Alexander Miller, Alexander Craighead, and John Thompson--settled in the Valley.

Western expansion was temporarily halted by the French and Indian War. By treaty agreement, Indian land had been absorbed by the white man under the Treaty of Lancaster in 1744, Virginia having obtained from the Iroquois all their land within the colony. Recognizing the deception, the Indians took out their indignation on the settlers, especially upon the Germans of Winchester, Virginia, the first settlement west of the Blue Ridge. Attacks were made on the Scotch-Irish settlements in the upper (southern) part of the Valley as well as on

---

[2] *Ibid.*, 147.

[3] William W. Hening, ed., *Statutes at Large* (13 vols., Richmond, 1823), VI, 258.

[4] "Autobiography of John Craig," printed in Craig, *John Craig*, 52.

the Germans in the lower (northern) part. As the Indians allied themselves with the French in attacks on British settlements, conditions worsened, especially after Braddock's defeat at Fort Necessity in 1755, which left the frontier settlements with little or no British protection.

Because of the danger to life and property, the clergy reacted to this news not out of political interest but out of necessity. Alexander Craighead, who had moved into Augusta County and was now pastor of the Windy Cove Presbyterian Church, left the colony and moved into the Mecklenburg area of North Carolina. Shubal Stearns, the Separate Baptist minister, who had come to Opequon Creek in Bekeley County the year before, now moved on to Sandy Creek in North Carolina. Others also changed their locales, though the situation was not as bad in the Carolinas as it was closer to the Ohio River Valley, the real point of contention between the French and British.

Some ministers chose to stay and fight after the news of Braddock's defeat. In Augusta County, Virginia, the Presbyterian minister, John Craig,[5] led his people to resist the Indians despite the fact that three weeks after the defeat of Braddock, Colonel Patton, leader of the August militia and a member of Craig's congregation, had been killed by the Indians. Craig noted in his autobiography that the

---

[5]John Craig, born in Ireland in 1709, was educated at the University of Edinburgh. After coming to America, he was licensed and ordained by the Old Side Donegal Presbytery. He became the first settled Presbyterian minister in the Valley of Virginia when he came in 1740 to the Tinkling Spring and Augusta (Old Stone) Churches in Augusta County. He served these churches until his death in 1774.

country was laid open to the enemy and there was much confusion and discouragement among the people. Some were for leaving the area, and when his advice was asked concerning removal to safer country, he opposed the

> scheme as a scandal to our nation, falling below our brave ancestors, making ourselves a reproach among Virginians, a dishonor to our friends at home, an evidence of cowardice, want of faith, and a noble Christian dependence on God, as able to save and deliver from the heathen; it would be a lasting blot to our posterity.[6]

Going further than merely giving advice, Craig was instrumental in the building of forts in the county, each designed to accommodate twenty to thirty families. One such fort, built around his church (Old Stone Church), became known as Fort Defiance. He said that he did this cheerfully, "though it cost me one-third of my estate. The people very readily followed, and my congregation in less than two months was well fortified."[7] Craig also went with the Augusta militia on its expedition against the Indians as did John Brown, another Presbyterian minister, both of them preaching to about 340 militiamen in February 1756. Colonel William Preston, commander of a company of Rangers from Augusta County, wrote in his Journal that "Rev. Mr. Craig preached a military sermon, text in Deuteronomy."[8] It is not known what was said, but he must have endorsed an Old Testament justification of "holy war."

---

[6]"Craig Autobiography," in Craig, *John Craig*, 57

[7]*Ibid.*

[8]Quoted in Howard M. Wilson, *The Tinkling Spring, Headwater of Freedom* (Fisherville, 1954), 146-47

Wanton attacks by both sides resulted in loss of life and property all along the frontier; and the clergy suffered along with others. At least one Mennonite minister, John Rhodes, and his family were killed by the Indians in the Valley in the 1760s. Being a pacifist, he had continually preached against the use of force and pleaded for kindness in the treatment of the Indians.[9] Even though there was little loss of life among the clergy, the confusion of war caused disruption of congregations and loss of possessions. The Philadelphia Baptist Association noted in its October 1756 minutes that Samuel Heaton, pastor on the Virginia frontier, had been "driven from his possessions by the Indians," and it called on the Baptist churches to "make some charitable contribution" towards Heaton's relief.[10] At Smith's Creek Baptist Church in Virginia, Indian disturbances in 1759 ended all opportunity for worship and forced the whole settlement "to go into Forts or over the mountains, to escape their Rage. . . ."[11] Further south, the problem on the North Carolina frontier was the Cherokee Indians. John Gano, a Baptist minister who had left his church in New Jersey and settled on the Yadkin River from 1757 to 1760, returned to New Jersey because of the severity of the Cherokee War in the Carolinas.[12]

---

[9]See Freeman H. Hart, *The Valley of Virginia in the American Revolution, 1763-1789* (Chapel Hill, 1942), 75

[10]Gillette, *Minutes of Philadelphia Association*, 74

[11]Smith Creek Church Book, Minutes for 1759, Virginia Baptist Historical Collection, University of Richmond, Virginia.

[12]John Gano, *Biographical Memoirs of Rev. John Gano*, ed by Stephen Gano (New York, 1806), 83-87; Saunders, *Colonial Records*, V, 1188.

Although most dissenting clergy supported the British against the Indians, the Moravians of North Carolina were a notable exception. Inasmuch as they had treated the Indians fairly, the Indians made no attack on their settlement. By 1756, however, rumors of such an attack made it necessary to build a palisade around their houses. When Governor Arthur Dobbs petitioned the Moravians for volunteers to join the militia, Jacob Loesch, one of the Moravian ministers, led a delegation to the local justice to explain that the Brethren "were exempt by special Act of Parliament. . . but under the provisions of the aforesaid Act they were ready and willing to contribute in money whatever was right. . . ."[13] The next year Loesch, now Captain of an Independent Company consisting of the inhabitants of Dobbs Parish, set up a watch against attack. Even though the Moravians did not fight, they furnished provisions for friendly Indians, for which they were reimbursed by the colonial government.[14]

Further South there were problems with the Cherokees on the South Carolina and Georgia frontier. Although the Cherokees were generally supportive of the British government, some young warriors had murdered whites on the frontier. The Indians sent delegates to Charleston to settle the matter, but Governor Lyttleton of South Carolina, determined to punish them, seized the delegates, called out the troops

---

[13]Fries, *Records of the Moravians*, I, 170.

[14]*Ibid.*, 182-83, 189, 195-96; Jacob Lash, Moravian minister, received £25 from the Committee of Public Claims, December, 1759, Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VI, 210.

in the fall of 1759, and after marching to the Congaree River, forced the Cherokees to sign a treaty. Upon returning to Charleston in 1760, Lyttleton was welcomed as a hero by many, including the Presbyterian ministers Patrick Kier, John Alison, James Campbell, William Richardson, Charles Gordon, John Martin, John Baxter, John McLeod, John Rae, Charles Lorimer, Archibald Simpson, and Philip Morison. They signed a "humble address" to Lyttleton, congratulating him on his safe return from the Cherokee expedition, and giving thanks "to the Almighty for [his] Preservation and Success in a campaign attended with so many Difficulties and Dangers."[15]

While attacks were being made on the frontier, across the mountains to the east, Samuel Davies, another Presbyterian minister, was so actively involved in arousing public support for the war effort that he has been called a recruiting agent for the government. Another Presbyterian minister who spoke out for the war was Samuel Finley who preached in Maryland and Pennsylvania.[16]

---

[15]Quoted in Howe, *Presbyterian Church in South Carolina*, I, 304-5.

[16]Samuel Davies, born in Delaware in 1723, was trained at Samuel Blair's school at Fagg's Manor and received a Master's degree from the College of New Jersey in 1753. He served as a pastor in Hanover County, Virginia, from 1747 until 1759 when he became President of the College of New Jersey. Because of the large number of his published sermons, it is clear that he was one of the leading clergymen of the South in the eighteenth century. See *DAB*, V, 102; George W. Pilcher, *Samuel Davies: Apostle of Dissent in Colonial Virginia* (Knoxville, 1971); Sprague, *Annals*, III, 140-46.

Samuel Finley, born in Ireland in 1715, received an honorary Doctor of Divinity degree from the College of New Jersey in 1749. After being ordained in 1742, he was pastor in New Jersey and later on the Pennsylvania and Maryland frontier before following Davies as President

From their sermons dealing with the French and Indian war, certain attitudes common to the dissenters may be observed. The sermons stress three principal themes, the first being the connection between religion and patriotism. In one sermon, *Religion and Patriotism,* preached before a company of volunteers in Hanover, August 17, 1755, Davies equated love of country and patriotism with the Lord's work. His text was taken from II Samuel 10:12, in which Israel was fighting against Syria and the children of Ammon: "Be of good courage, and let us play the men for our people, and for the cities of our God: and the Lord do that which seemeth him good." In fact, there is a good deal of national consciousness in his words when he said:

> While I have you before me, I have high thoughts of a Virginian; and I entertain the pleasing Hope that my country will yet emerge out of her Distress, and flourish with her usual Blessings. . . . Our holy Religion teaches us to bear *personal* Injuries without *private* Revenge; But *national* Insults, and Indignities ought to excite the *public* Resentment.[17]

This same theme was expressed three years later by Davies in a sermon preached at a general muster in Hanover. Again equating the taking up arms with the work of the Lord, he actually concluded that the art of war was a part of religion.[18] To emphasize his point he asked the question, ". . . is it not our Duty in the Sight of God, is it not a Work to which the Lord loudly calls us, to take up Arms for the Defense

---

of the College of New Jersey, 1761-1766. See Sprague, *Annals,* III, 96-101; *DAB,* VI, 391.

[17]Samuel Davies, *Religion and Patriotism the Constituents of a Good Soldier* (Philadelphia, 1755), 6.

[18]Davies, *The Curse of Cowardice* (Boston, 1759), 3.

of our Country?"[19] In both sermons, he stressed the Christian duty of fighting the savages and Frenchmen who were threatening liberty.

A second major theme was that the crisis demanded active participation in the war effort by southerners. Since, it was claimed, Massachusetts had done her duty and raised troops, it was now time for Virginia to do the same. In April 1755, Davies, alarmed at the feebleness of military spirit and the low rate of enlistment, predicted that in the summer "the decisive Stroke will be given: may all-ruling Heaven decide it in Favour of Religion, Liberty and Property."[20] That stroke came in July, with the defeat of Braddock, and the next month Davies preached his *Religion and Patriotism*, encouraging men to enlist "as an advocate for your King, your Fellow-Subjects, your country, your Relatives, your earthly All." Trying to impress upon his audience the urgency of the situation, he said, "We *fight for* our People. . . . *Our Liberty, our Estates, our Lives! our King, our Fellow-Subjects*. . . ." Duty demanded action; it would be "a sneaking, sordid Soul indeed that can desert it at such a Time as this. . . ."[21] In another sermon, Davies advised the soldiers to

> furnish yourselves with arms, and put yourselves into a posture of defense. . . . What is that religion good for that leaves men cowards on the appearance of danger. . . That is a mean, sordid,

---

[19] *Ibid.*, 11.

[20] Samuel Davies to Dr. Stennett, April 25, 1755 (copy), Samuel Davies Collection, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.

[21] Davies, *Religion and Patriotism*, 13, 22.

> cowardly soul, that would abandon his country, and shift for his own little self, when there is any probability of defending it.[22]

Courage was essential, as it was three years later, when Davies railed against the

> sneaking Coward, who, when God, in the Course of his Providence, calls him to Arms refuses to obey. . . [and the] sly, hypocritical Cowards, who undertake the Work of the Lord, that is, take up arms; but they do the Work of the Lord *deceitfully*, that is, they do not faithfully use their arms for the Purposes they were taken up.[23]

In the meantime, Samuel Finley was also calling on his people to be faithful to the "Lord's work." In a 1757 sermon, he warned that there was no middle ground in this war; and just as there was a connection between the parts of the human body, so was it in the body politic:

> If our Liberties are invaded, and we do not oppose the Invader, do we not give them away? . . . they who belong to a community, and yet will not assist in defending it when attacked, are to be esteemed as virtual Enemies. . . . For every Member, according to his Place, should make the Defense of his Brother's Life, against unjust violence, his business.[24]

At the same time, he, like Davies, thought that the war was just and good; "consequently they who do not *help to support this cause, do not help the Lord.*" These two clergymen did not hesitate to say that the

---

[22]Davies, "On the Defeat of General Braddock," in *Sermons on Important Subjects* (3 vols., New York, 1841), III, 226-27.

[23]Davies, *Curse of Cowardice*, 6. His text here was Jeremiah 48: 10, "Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully, and cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood."

[24]Samuel Finley, *The Curse of Meroz; or, The Danger of Neutrality* (Philadelphia, 1757), 14, 16.

duty of all men was to enlist in the militia and hurry to the frontier to defend their fellow countrymen. The cause was not just the king's, but God's!

But who were the dissenters fighting? Was it simply the Indians and the French? Identification of the enemy is a third major theme of these Presbyterian clergymen. One of Davies's favorite expressions was to identify the enemy as "heathen savages and French papists." As far as he was concerned, both were anti-Christian forces of evil, since people on the frontier had been "murdered with all the horrid Arts of *Indian* and Popish Torture." He described in vivid terms their wounds, children being carried off, women raped, all done by the "mongrel Race of *Indian Savages* and *French Papists*."[25] In order to win support for the war, he tried to identify the enemy with every sinister force he could think of, such as "greedy Vultures, Indians, Priests, Friers [*sic*], and hungry *Galic* [*sic*] Slaves." The British were to guard their religion against "Ignorance, Superstition, Idolatry, Tyranny over Conscience, Massacre, Fire and Sword" and all the "Mischief beyond Expression, with which Popery is pregnant."[26]

In the minds of the Presbyterian clergy there was a definite connection between the French, popery, and tyranny. French government represented political tyranny, just as popery meant tyranny in the religious sphere. As an example, Finley said of the French:

---

[25]Davies, *Curse of Cowardice*, 8-9.

[26]Davies, *Religion and Patriotism*, 19-20.

> *Tyranny* is the *Genius* of their Government, and *bloody Cruelty* of their *Religion;* by both which, their Tempers are so formed, as to be more fit for the Rule of Beasts than of Men. . . . If they prevail, they will suppress *Truth* and *Righteousness.*[27]

The mutual tyranny of France and of popery was a threat to liberty, both civil and religious; it must be contested in order to secure the blessing of liberty, "*British Liberty,* from the chains of *French* Slavery. . . ."

Catholicism was regarded as un-Christian and evil. Thus a French victory would not only constitute a threat to British liberties but also a victory for Catholicism. Therefore, to these dissenters, the defense of a Protestant monarch and a Protestant way of life was all within the will of God. If the French were successful, Finley declaimed, there would no longer be an evangelical ministry, but instead "a Swarm of hypocritical Monks, Friars, Priests and Jesuits; whose Deceit, Pride, Lust, Cruelty, and Avarice, will. . . make it seem, as though the Mouth of the bottomless Pit was indeed opened. . . ."[28]

What had brought on these sufferings to a Christian people? To Davies, the cause was the sins of the colonists themselves and their reluctance to repent. If God governed the world, then the calamities of war were ordered by his Providence. From this starting point of a Calvinist sovereign God, he reasoned that since God does not punish a

---

[27]Finley, *Curse of Meroz,* 24-25.

[28]Davies, *Religion and Patriotism,* 19.

[29]Finley, *Curse of Meroz,* 25.

righteous or a penitent people, they must have sinned against Him. When he passed through the country, Davies observed, he saw drinking, swearing, avarice, vanity, sensuality, cards in use, horse-races, cock-fighting, prayerless families, slaves in a Christian country, religion neglected, and little sign of repentance. The country had erred for 150 years; thus the "only cure" for the wounded country was repentance.[30] As a New Light evangelist he made it clear that not until the country had truly done penance and turned to God, would it be spared from the devastation of war. In another sermon, designed as "a hurried attempt to save a sinking land," Davies again saw the remedy as a return to God in order to escape the "*French* Papists, and savage *Indian* Heathen."[31] The modified form of Calvinistic predestinarianism showed through, however, when Davies encouraged his hearers to submit to the events of the war since they depended entirely on the Providence of God.[32] God was in every event, he noted in a fast-day sermon, even in punishing America by the "rod of France" as He had done with other countries in the past.[33]

Yet Davies held out hope that the empire would survive, not by man's efforts, but because God would spare those who followed Him. God would permit the "Body Politic to suffer. . . in order to give it

---

[30]Davies, *Religion and Patriotism,* 27ff.

[31]Samuel Davies, *Virginia's Danger and Remedy* (Williamsburg, 1756), 38.

[32]Davies, *Religion and Patrictism,* 22-26.

[33]"The Crisis" in Davies, *Sermons,* III, 70-71.

Sensibility, and rouse us to exert our Strength. . . ."[34] But it would be the dissenters who would play the leading role in bringing about repentance, for Davies did not express much confidence in the clergy of the established church: "Whoever knows the moral and intellectual Character of the Generality of the Clergy here, can hardly expect a Reformation from that Quarter. . . ."[35]

This dramatic response by these two dissenting clergymen to the French and Indian War is a good example of devotion to Protestantism and the British Empire. There is no discernible difference between the response of Old Side and New Side Presbyterians to this crisis. The words and actions of the Old Side John Craig are similar to those of the New Sides, Samuel Davies and Samuel Finley. Expressing their loyalty to the empire and their indignation at the acts of the French and their Indian allies, the ministers of the Hanover Presbytery in 1756 sent a letter of congratulations to the Earl of Loudoun upon his arrival in New York. They pledged to

> zealously exert our utmost influence in our respective provinces, to make our people justly sensible of the important interests now at stake, to inspire them with a public spirit and the love of their country, and to animate them by our instruction and example, bravely to hazard their lives and fortunes in its defense.[36]

---

[34]Davies, *Curse of Cowardice,* 13-14.

[35]Samuel Davies to Dr. Stennett, April 25, 1755 (copy), Samuel Davies Collection, Princeton.

[36]Minutes of Hanover Presbytery, April 28, 1756, Union Theological Seminary Library, Richmond, Virginia.

Two years later the Presbytery assured Governor Francis Fauquier of Virginia that they would use their influence to "circulate a spirit of patriotism and martial bravery, in this season of general danger."[37] Both Presbyterian and Baptist clerical groups adopted resolutions supporting days of fasting and prayer.[38]

While these ministers do not reflect the sentiments of the whole number of dissenting clergy, their support of the colonial governments undoubtedly did a great deal to influence officials to look more kindly upon all dissenters. Patriotism had its advantages; and colonial officials were now quick to recognize that the increasing number of dissenters on the frontier provided a buffer against the Indians. In this way the French and Indian War aided in the cause of religious toleration.[39] How could a government refuse to allow dissenting ministers to preach, when clergymen like Davies made patriotism a part of a Christian's religion and the defense of his country an essential aspect of his religious duty?

Another major concern of the dissenting ministers in 1763 was the status of the established church and its effect on the dissenters. In all of the southern colonies, the Church of England was the tax-supported church. In Virginia, it was intended that the Church of

---

[37] *Ibid.*, July 14, 1758.

[38] Engles, *Records of the Presbyterian Church,* 229; Gillette, *Minutes of Philadelphia Association,* 74, 76-77, 79.

[39] Leonard J. Kramer, "The Political Ethics of the American Presbyterian Clergy in the 18th Century" (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1942), 106-8; Gewehr, *Great Awakening,* 99.

England be established from the beginning, and by the 1660s the structure of the church establishment was fixed by laws, requiring ministers to be ordained by a bishop in England and requiring attendance of everyone at an Anglican church under penalty of a fine.[40] In Maryland, there was a degree of toleration, but in 1702 the Assembly passed an act setting up parishes and taxing every person for support of the Anglican ministers.[41] In North Carolina (1715), South Carolina (1706), and Georgia (1758) acts were passed by the assemblies to establish parishes and to levy taxes for support of the minister.

Although the laws were similar in all these colonies, enforcement differed from colony to colony. In Maryland, for instance, the Toleration Act of 1649 permitted all who believed in the Trinity to worship freely; and even the act of establishment in 1705 allowed dissenting ministers to preach as long as they were properly licensed and registered by the county courts. In Virginia, the English Toleration Act of 1689 was applied ten years later when the Assembly exempted dissenters from the penalty of attendance at compulsory worship if they could show that they had attended some lawful dissenter meeting house. There was more leniency in North Carolina, where provisions were made for dissenters in the original charter and extended by the establishment act of 1715. The latter was accompanied by another act which allowed all dissenters to exercise "their Religion without molestation, Provided

---

[40]Hening, *Statutes at Large*, II, 44-55.

[41]William H. Browne, ed., *Archives of Maryland*, (72 vols., Baltimore, 1883-1972), XXIV, 91-98, 265-73.

that the same be Publick. . . ."[42] Dissenting clergymen preached freely on the frontier in South Carolina and Georgia. The latter colony never applied the Toleration Act of 1689, and dissenters could preach here without even being licensed.

By the mid-eighteenth century, then, the main dissenter problem was not so much whether their clergy would be allowed to preach as it was the interpretation and enforcement of the laws governing toleration. The framework of all colonial legislation was the English Toleration Act of 1689, which extended toleration to the dissenting clergy as long as they took the proper oath of allegiance to the king, subscribed to the articles of religion of the Church of England (which expressed a belief in the Bible and fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith but excluded any of the particular features of the discipline and worship of the Anglican church), and preached in meeting houses registered with local justices of the peace. All of the southern colonies with the exception of Georgia attempted to enforce the Toleration Act; however, in Virginia there was a dispute over its interpretation.

When Samuel Davies came to Virginia in 1747 he immediately appeared before the General Council in Williamsburg and was licensed to preach at four meeting houses. Upon returning the next year to settle permanently in Hanover, he was granted permission to preach in three other places, but his friend, John Rodgers, was denied a license Out of the seven places, three were in Hanover, one each in Henrico,

---

[42]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, II, 884-85.

Caroline, Louisa, and Goochland counties.[43] The question was whether or not the Toleration Act of 1689 applied to Virginia. The General Council was of the opinion that it did not, while Davies insisted that it did. Davies was most explicit in his arguments: "We claim no liberties but what the Act of Toleration allows Protestant dissenters." He queried how dissenters could be required to qualify according to the act if it were not in force.[44] Davies won his point that the Toleration Act did apply when the Council granted him the additional meeting places.

But Davies's victory did not lead to agreement over the interpretation of the act. As he became more popular and the number of dissenters grew, he requested the licensing of an eighth meeting house. In 1750 the County Court of New Kent granted approval, but the General Court immediately reversed the decision. This led to the question of whether the Toleration Act allowed a dissenter to preach in any number of places or whether each nonconforming minister must be limited to only one licensed meeting house. Both sides appealed to England for support of their interpretation and looked for justification in English

---

[43]Samuel Davies, *The State of Religion Among the Protestant Dissenters in Virginia* (Boston, 1751), 19-21.

[44]Samuel Davies, *Appendix Proving the Right of the Synod of New York to the Religious Liberties and Immunities allowed to the Protestant Dissenters* (Williamsburg, 1748), 1-4. For a more detailed view of the toleration issue in Virginia, see Robert S. Alley, "The Reverend Mr. Samuel Davies: A Study in Religion and Politics, 1747-1759" (Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1962), chaps. 3-4; and Pilcher, *Samuel Davies*, chaps. 7-9.

practice. In 1750 Commissary William Dawson wrote to the Bishop of London informing him of the situation, and the bishop offered the opinion that the Toleration Act confined a preacher to a particular place,[45] an opinion shared by Peyton Randolph, Attorney General of Virginia. Randolph's view was that "there ought not to be more than one house licensed for one preacher" and that the "justices in the counties have no power to license such houses. It is lodged entirely in the governor."[46]

Davies enlisted the support of his friend, Philip Doddridge, a noted London preacher, and later appealed to the English Protestant Dissenting Deputies for advice. Davies's argument was that since the dissenters were scattered over a distance of eighty or ninety miles in six or seven counties, it was necessary to have several meeting houses. To require attendance at a single place would be impossible and would either encourage a return to heathenism or unfairly support the more accessible Anglican churches. Such an interpretation would defeat the very purpose of the Toleration Act, which was designed to allow freedom of conscience. Davies denied he was an itinerant, as had been charged, but claimed that he was a licensed minister serving a congregation which met in different places, just as some Anglican clergymen preached in several chapels of ease.[47] He had also written

---

[45]Bishop of London to William Dawson, December 25, 1750, Dawson Manuscripts, Library of Congress.

[46]Peyton Randolph to T. Lee, undated, Virginia Religious Papers, Library of Congress

[47]Samuel Davies to Bishop of London, January 10, 1752, in William

to Dr. Benjamin Avery of the London Dissenting Deputies to learn if dissenters in England were allowed "to license as many houses for religious worship as they please and in as many different places."[48] The Deputies decided to secure the opinion of the Attorney General, for if this practice was true in England, it could be applied to the colonies also. Avery's report to Davies included the opinion of Attorney General Dudley Ryder, who decided that the dissenters might ask for as many meeting houses as they thought necessary.[49] This seemed to be in line with English practice, but the decision was contrary to the views of both the Bishop of London and Commissary Dawson, as well as officials in Virginia.

Matters stood thus when Davies went with Gilbert Tennent to England in 1753-1755 on a fund-raising trip for the College of New Jersey. While there, Davies appeared before the Dissenting Deputies, and he was first advised to secure a petition from the inhabitants of Virginia, to be presented to the king, complaining of the hardships they suffered in securing licensed meeting houses. This idea was later dropped and Davies was instructed that the dissenting ministers should make application to the county courts for licensed meeting houses. If

---

H. Foote, *Sketches of Virginia* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1850), I, 180-206. This letter was never delivered to the bishop. The same view is expressed in Davies, *State of Religion,* 42-44.

[48]Minutes of the Protestant Dissenting Deputies, September 27, 1752. A copy of this letter is in Foote, *Sketches of Virginia,* I, 207-11, and is dated May 21, 1752.

[49]Benjamin Avery to Samuel Davies, in Foote, *Sketches of Virginia,* I, 211-14.

denied, they should apply to the Council, then to the governor and, if refused, preach in unlicensed houses. If prosecuted, they should then appeal to the King in Council.[50]

When Davies returned home from England in 1755, the French were inciting the Indians on the frontier, and with the outbreak of the French and Indian War he became increasingly involved in support of the British war effort. As a result of this support, it became easier for government officials to demonstrate great leniency towards dissenters. Already five other New Side preachers were in Virginia: John Todd in Louisa County, John Brown and Alexander Craighead in Augusta County, Robert Henry in Charlotte County, and John Wright in Cumberland County. In addition, the Anglican clergy soon lost much of their support in the struggle over their salaries, known as the Parson's Cause. By 1763 the struggle for toleration had been won, and there was little molestation of dissenting clergy thereafter as long as they were law-abiding. This decade, however, saw the rise of the Separate Baptists, many of whom refused to be licensed and who were arrested for disturbing the peace. (This phase of the struggle for complete religious freedom will be covered in a later chapter.)

Another problem faced by the dissenting clergy was whether or not they could legally perform a marriage ceremony, and when they did, whether it was a valid marriage. In many places a marriage ceremony

---

[50]Minutes of Protestant Dissenting Deputies, February 27, 1754 and January 29, 1755. See also Foote, *Sketches of Virginia,* I, 297.

performed by a dissenting minister was considered illegal and children born of such a union, illegitimate. In all of the southern colonies, governors were instructed to insure that marriages were performed according to the canons of the Church of England and all the assemblies except Georgia passed laws at one time or another to this effect.

The Maryland Establishment Act specified that the ceremony was to be performed by an Anglican clergyman, and in places where they were not available, by a magistrate or a justice. Since the situation was similar in Virginia, a valid marriage had to be performed by an Anglican clergyman or the banns published by the parish clerk or reader. In North Carolina, the Marriage Act of 1741 prescribed that marriage ceremonies must be performed by clergy of the Church of England or by any lawful justice of the peace. In that colony, however, there were some Baptist ministers who were also justices, and in the western counties, where the Presbyterians were most numerous, Presbyterian justices and Presbyterian clergy performed marriages on a regular basis. By the Establishment Act of 1706 in South Carolina, Anglican ministers were given exclusive rights to perform ceremonies, but because of the paucity of Anglican ministers on the frontier and the large number of dissenters, ceremonies came to be regularly performed by dissenting clergymen.

By 1763 none of the five southern colonies officially recognized dissenter marriages as valid. Yet dissenting clergy regularly performed the ceremony because of the scarcity of Anglican ministers.[51] The rapid

---

[51]As early as 1749 Davies admitted to having performed marriage ceremonies and given the fee to the local rector.

growth of the population on the frontier made it impossible to establish enough Anglican parishes to meet the social needs of the region Of necessity, therefore, dissenting ministers came to perform this service.

In conclusion, it appears that the dissenting clergy at the end of the French and Indian War in 1763 had contributed much toward settling the frontier and supporting the British government in its struggle with the French. Support of the war effort brought toleration, and their new-found freedom to preach, in turn, encouraged dissenters in their support of the government Much had yet to be done to achieve complete religious liberty, but by 1763 the dissenting clergy could preach as long as they abided by the Toleration Act of 1689 as interpreted by the respective colonial officials.

Support of the war effort was not unique with the clergy; most Americans supported the crown. But for the dissenting ministers, the war opened a door to political influence on the growing population Up to then, the dissenting clergy had been handicapped because of their social and economic standing; the war changed this, and their political influence would grow as the Revolution approached. One could not predict in 1763 that dissenting clergymen, anymore than other Americans, would a decade later, be sharp opponents of British policies. But an examination of the clergy's political ideology discloses a set of beliefs that explains their change in attitude without much difficulty.

CHAPTER III

THE POLITICS OF REVOLUTION

In recent years there has been renewed interest in the political ideology of the revolutionary generation, and one of the groups analyzed in the process has been the clergy. One writer has suggested that if ministers had been the only spokesmen of the American cause, and the words of Jefferson, the Adamses, or Otis never appeared in print, the political thought of the Revolution would have followed almost exactly the same line as it did.[1] The sermon was the means of communication for many people who did not read a political pamphlet or a newspaper. For this reason, the oral and printed sermon competed with the political pamphlet and newspaper article and, it has been estimated, comprised one-third of the total output of political literature during the Revolutionary Era. Commenting on these "rebellious scoundrels," a British traveler in Virginia in 1774 excoriated the Presbyterian ministers there as preaching "nothing but political discourses instead of Religious Lectures."[2]

Yet, in the South, in contrast to the northern and middle colonies, there is a scarcity of printed political sermons.[3] In New

---

[1] Clinton Rossiter, *Seedtime of the Republic* (New York, 1953), 328.

[2] Lincoln Macveagh, ed , *The Journal of Nicholas Cresswell, 1774-1777* (New York, 1924), 46 (Entry for November 6, 1774).

[3] The political sermon is the basis for Baldwin's *New England Clergy* and Heimert's *Religion and the American Mind*. In the latter, however, among the important clergymen listed in the biographical glossary only five out of 91 were dissenting southerners.

England the annual election sermon took on special significance by the 1770s as a means of disseminating political thought. The close association of the Congregational ministers with the government of New England made this arrangement possible and necessary for the Puritan way of life. In the middle colonies a liberal policy concerning religion allowed all ministers freedom to speak on various topics. In the South, however, there were no election sermons, and only an occasional muster sermon; and the dissenting ministers were victims of a church establishment that would not allow them to take an active part in politics. Here the Anglican priests were closely tied to the political establishment; consequently, dissenting clergymen often ministered to those not at the center of political power. The absence of a printing press in the interior and the ravages of war may also have contributed to this scarcity of printed sermons.

What follows in this chapter, then, is only a composite statement of the political ideology of those dissenting clergymen who were able to allow their views to become known. It cannot be considered a comprehensive statement of even a majority of the dissenting clergy, for there were many who left no recorded evidence of what they were thinking and saying regarding the politics of the day. But in certain places and at various times there were a few who were in positions of leadership, and their political thoughts have been preserved. It is these few who are considered here, and with the hope that their ideology will provide at least a clue to the stand taken by the remainder on such questions as the origin and purpose of government and on

constitutional issues such as the question of sovereignty, representation, consent for taxation, the danger of arbitrary power, and finally, justification for war against the mother country.

It must be remembered that these dissenting clergymen were not living in a vacuum, for what they said politically was influenced by their study of the Scriptures as well as by the creedal statements of their respective denominations. A majority of the clergy, such as the Presbyterians and the Calvinistic Baptists, were in those denominations that adhered to the Westminster Confession of Faith. This creed emphasized the original sin of Adam and the total depravity of man; therefore, those who did express an opinion on the origin of government did so in terms of man's inability to get along with his fellow man, which necessitated a compact. William Graham, a Presbyterian minister in the Valley of Virginia, commented that

> had we never apostatized from our primitive innocence, nor transgressed the laws of our Creator, there would have been no use for Government. . . . Government, then, like dress, is a badge of lost innocence, and as our shame makes the one, so our wickedness makes the other, necessary.[4]

Similarly, Thomas Reese, a Presbyterian minister in South Carolina,

---

[4][William Graham], *Essay on Government* (Philadelphia, 1786), 4-5. Graham was born in Pennsylvania in 1745. Two years after receiving a degree from the College of New Jersey in 1773, he came to the Timber Ridge Church, Rockbridge County, Virginia. He was selected by the Hanover Presbytery to be the rector of a new academy (now Washington and Lee University) where he remained until 1796. At this position he influenced many a young minister, both spiritually and politically. After purchasing land in Kentucky, he became involved in a suit over ownership and died in 1799 on a trip to Richmond. See Sprague, *Annals*, III, 365-70; *Evangelical and Literary Magazine*, IV (1821), 263.

viewed the civil compact as originating from man's misuse of self-love, which turns to violence. The evils of injustice, violence, rapine, mutual slaughter, and bloodshed made a compact necessary. To Reese, religion was of utmost importance, for it would calm the passions and offer spiritual rewards, whereas civil government could only provide punishment.[5] And finally, John Leland, a Baptist minister in Virginia during the Revolution (who later moved to Massachusetts), asserted that civil government was not appointed by God from the beginning: it was not necessary until sin had intoxicated man. To him, government was a mutual compact of a certain body of people, defined strictly in the terms of John Locke.[6]

Inherent in these statements was the assumption that since men could not trust themselves, they entered into society for their better

---

[5]Thomas Reese, *An Essay on the Influence of Religion, in Civil Society* (Charleston, 1788), 5-6, 16-17. Reese, born in Pennsylvania in 1742, also received a degree from the College of New Jersey in 1768 and an honorary D.D. degree later. He was ordained by the Orange Presbytery in 1773, and after a brief stay in North Carolina, went to the Sumter area of South Carolina from 1773-1792. He spent the remainder of his life near Anderson until his death in 1796. See Sprague, *Annals,* III, 331-32.

[6]John Leland, *The Yankee Spy* (Boston, [1794]), 3; John Leland, *The Rights of Conscience Inalienable* (New London, 1791), 3-6. Leland spent most of his early ministry in Virginia but moved to Massachusetts in 1792. He was born at Grafton, Massachusetts, May 14, 1754. As a missionary to Virginia in 1775 he first embraced Presbyterianism, but was later ordained a Baptist minister. He was active in the struggle for religious freedom, especially after moving back to Massachusetts where he became a prolific writer until his death in 1841. See Sprague, *Annals,* VI, 174-86; James B. Taylor, *Virginia Baptist Ministers* (3d ed., 2 vols., New York, 1859), II, 30-41; Lyman H. Butterfield, "John Leland, Jeffersonian Itinerant," *Proceedings of American Antiquarian Society,* LXII, Pt. 2(1952), 155-242.

security. Both Graham and Leland insisted that man first existed in a society possessing mutual concern for its members, but because of certain wants and needs, an assembly was formed in which every man would have a seat. Later, districts were formed by agreement and delegates sent from each for representation.[7] Even though John Locke was not mentioned specifically, the influence of Locke's philosophy is evident. It would be incorrect, however, to give Locke all the credit, because a major influence in explaining the origin of government was the clergy's understanding of the covenant theology of the Old Testament.

But what was the purpose of government? The answer to this question is not altogether precise, for one finds in the clergy's writings a curious mixture of Locke and Jean Jacques Burlamaqui, a French natural law jurist. In addition to Locke's use of the words life, liberty, and property, some dissenting clergymen added Burlamaqui's emphasis on the happiness of society. For example, in a 1776 petition to the General Assembly of Virginia from the Hanover Presbytery, representing the Presbyterian clergy of that colony, there was this statement:

> We should humbly represent, that the only proper objects of civil government, are the happiness and protection of men in the present state of existence; the security of life, liberty, and property of the citizens; and to restrain the vicious and encourage the virtuous by wholesome laws, equally extending to every individual.[8]

---

[7][Graham], *Essay on Government*, 5-6; Leland, *Rights of Conscience*, 4-5.

[8]Petition in Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 323-24.

Silas Mercer, a Georgia Baptist minister, explained that civil government was a creature of the people and its purpose was to preserve liberty and happiness.[9] Thomas Reese, the South Carolina Presbyterian, simply said that the end of civil society was the security of liberty and property and added that religion would restrain men and was necessary for the well being of a civil society.[10] Samuel Eusebius McCorkle of North Carolina agreed when he declared that

> happiness is the center to which all the duties of man and people tend. It is the center to which states as well as individuals are universally and powerfully attracted. To diffuse the greatest possible degree of happiness in a given territory, is the aim of good government and religion.[11]

When Richard Furman, a Baptist minister in South Carolina, spoke of a happy society, he was actually speaking of a Christian society. Christianity, to him, corresponded to the civil constitution in that both advanced the happiness of men. The purpose of each was "to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. The means of attaining

---

[9]Silas Mercer, *Tyranny Exposed, and True Liberty Discovered* (Halifax, North Carolina, 1783), 62.

[10]Reese, *An Essay,* 5.

[11]"Speech of McCorkle at the laying of the cornerstone of University of North Carolina," 1793, Southern Historical Collection, Chapel Hill. McCorkle was a prominent North Carolina Presbyterian minister and educator. He was born in Pennsylvania in 1746. Upon completing his education at the College of New Jersey in 1772, he was ordained and settled at Thyatira in Rowan County, North Carolina. He became a trustee of North Carolina University and was a Professor of Moral Philosophy from 1795 to 1811 when he died. See Sprague, *Annals,* III, 346-49; James F. Hurley and Julia G. Eagan, *The Prophet of Zion-Parnassus, Samuel Eusbius McCorkle* (Richmond, 1934).

it, [was] the regular and constant exercise of the Christian virtues."[12] Government alone could not produce a happy society; it required religion as well. Whereas most politicians of the day, such as George Mason and Thomas Jefferson, stressed happiness in purely secular terms, as an "unalienable right," the clergy added to this the importance of Christianity for societal happiness. In this way, the ministers differed from the political leaders.

What form of government would be best? John J. Zubly of Savannah answered that the

> form of government is undoubtedly best which has the greatest tendency to make all those that live under it secure and happy. . . . It is evident that the safety of the whole must be the grand law which must influence and direct every other: Men did not pass from a state of nature into a state of society, to render their situation more miserable, and their rights more precarious.[13]

But to Zubly that form of government was not a republic, for as a member of the Continental Congress, he observed that "a republican government is little better than [a] government of devils."[14] While rejecting

---

[12]Richard Furman, *Unity and Peace* (Charleston, 1794), 3-4. Furman (1755-1825), born in New York, was ordained a Baptist minister at High Hills of the Santee in 1774, where he remained as pastor until 1787 when he became a pastor in Charleston. He was one of the outstanding Baptist ministers of South Carolina and much interested in education. The College of Rhode Island conferred on him a Master's degree in 1792. See Sprague, *Annals*, VI, 161-65; Harvey T. Cook, *A Biography of Richard Furman* (Greenville, 1913).

[13]John J. Zubly, *The Law of Liberty* (Philadelphia, 1775), 4-5.

[14]Worthington C. Ford, ed., *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789* (34 vols., Washington, 1904-1937), III, 491. John Adams commented, "the colonies will have republics for their government, let us lawyers and your divine [Zubly] say what we will." John Adams to

absolutism, he accepted a limited monarchy as long as the rights of the people were preserved. Zubly, however, seems to be the only dissenting clergyman in the southern colonies to take such a bold stand against republicanism. Richard Furman of South Carolina, like most Americans, supported a mixed monarchy as long as there was no abuse of power, pointing out that both the king and the people's representatives were "officers of trust, and accountable for what they do, the people giving [them] their authority. The King can do nothing without the representatives, nor the representatives without the King."[15] Neither of these two clergymen, like most political leaders of the colonies, had worked out a complete theory of government before the Revolution, except to emphasize that government was best when it preserved the natural rights of those governed.

The same dissenting clergymen who had lived through the Revolution, however, were less equivocal in the views they expressed in the years immediately following the war. From those statements that have been preserved it is evident how far they had become inclined to republicanism. Silas Mercer of Georgia, taking his illustration from the Old Testament that kings were a curse to the nation of Israel, declared that the monarchical form of government was associated with the evil of the anti-Christ which he identified as the pope in Rome. A republic, he asserted,

---

Archibald Bulloch, July 1, 1776, in Edmund C. Burnett, ed., *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress* (8 vols., Washington, 1921-1936), I, 521.

[15]Richard Furman, An Address to the Inhabitants of South Carolina, November 1775, Baptist Hist. Coll., Greenville, hereafter cited as Furman, An Address.

was "the most likely to secure a general peace, and make war to cease in all lands."[16] In an undated poem he praised a government in which the people had a voice through their chosen representatives:

The Happiness of a Free Government

Behold with joy the peaceful state
Of People, where Jehova reigns
Whose wisdom, power and goodness great,
Their glorious freedom still maintain.

Happy the land whose rulers are
Choose [chosen] by the people's voice alone;
For such will take a special care
To save a country of their own.

Those men who govern by the power
With which the people them invest;
Can ne're [*sic*] their dearest friends devour
And hence such government is best.

Hail happy place where freedom stands,
And liberty erects its throne;
Where fraud, and cruel slavery's bands,
And tyranny are never known.

Where peace, and love, and freedom rule,
And persecution cannot come;
And where a ministerial tool
Hath neither power, nor place, nor home,

Where none each other's peace annoys,
Where conscience never is oppressed,
Where each free liberty enjoys,
This is the land which God hath blessed.

In this free state we would rejoice,
And dwell for-ever-more in peace;
And praise our God with cheerful voice,
Who makes our thrall and bondage cease.[17]

---

[16]Mercer, *Tyranny Exposed*, 4-6, 47.

[17]*Ibid.*, 70.

William Graham's pamphlet in 1786 discussed the virtues of a republican government and summarized its principles in the following maxims:

> All citizens are equal, and originally possessed of legislative, executive, judiciary and military powers.
> Citizens are not subjects, but confederates, united for their common safety and happiness.
> All officers of government are agents and servants, employed to manage the common concerns of the confederacy, and accountable, at all times, to the people, who have employed them.
> That government is excellent, which inviolably preserves the equality of the citizens both in a civil and a religious respect.[18]

Even though the Virginia Baptist John Leland thought that Israel's theocracy before the time of Saul was the best form of government, he did not think that mankind had enough virtue to bear it. However, he praised the republican government resulting from the new federal constitution, reserving the greatest praise for the balance of elective and appointive officers and the exclusion of any religious test for office.[19] While writing on the reasons for the Baptist espousal of republicanism, William Fristoe, another Baptist minister in Virginia, pointed out that a government was "most likely to be freest from blemishes when composed by the representatives of the people. Besides, the wisdom of a nation, is contained in the great body of the people." Therefore, monarchical government and an established religion were twins; accordingly, he concluded that despots and kings were a curse

---

[18][Graham], *Essay on Government*, 20.

[19]Leland, *The Yankee Spy*, 4-8.

to nations.[20] The dissenting clergy before the Revolution obviously had little quarrel with a mixed form of monarchical government as long as it remained true to the constitution; nevertheless after the Revolution this same group came to advocate a republic as the best form of government. The Revolution undoubtedly had a good deal to do with this change of position, for the experiences of the decade preceding the Revolution no doubt convinced them that there was too much tendency to abuse power in a monarchical form of government. In any case, the nation had committed itself to republicanism, and the clergy accepted the decision.

Of utmost importance to the constitutional question in the British Empire was the determination of the location of sovereignty. Did sovereignty repose in the king, Parliament, the local assemblies, or a local magistrate? Did Parliament in London have absolute dominion, or was sovereignty divided between Parliament and the colonial assemblies? Most Americans came to accept the idea of divided sovereignty. Many clergymen, however, did not interpret dominion to mean "human control of human life" but rather, in theological terms, God's dominion over all the earth. According to the Westminster Confession, civil magistrates stood between God and man, exercising dominion

---

[20]Fristoe, *History of Ketocton Association,* 156-61. Fristoe and his minister brother, Daniel, were born in Virginia. William pastored Baptist churches in Fauquier and Stafford counties and was active in the Ketocton Baptist Association until his death in 1828. See Sprague, *Annals,* VI, 125; Taylor, *Virginia Baptist Ministers,* 1, 69-78.

in His name. Any human claim to absolute and arbitrary dominion was a usurpation of divine perogative. Therefore, all political dominion must be so constituted as to form a curb against human pretensions.[21] In this light, Parliament's claim to absolute dominion over the colonies was as objectionable as the claim of any other body to universal authority in the political field.

At the heart of this problem was the passage of the Declaratory Act of 1766 which proclaimed that Parliament had absolute power to bind the colonies in all cases whatsoever. Like other Americans, some dissenting clergy, as shown by the following statements, resisted the absolute sovereignty of Parliament. Zubly, writing to Lord Dartmouth, declared that the whole subject of the dispute between Great Britain and America was whether Parliament had a right to bind the colonists. He looked upon the act "as the language of despotism in its utmost perfection" and as "unjust, illegal, and detestable."[22] Furman, the South Carolina Baptist, agreed that the Declaratory Act was at the center of the conflict, all tax bills resulting from it.[23] A Presbyterian minister on the Maryland frontier, Robert Cooper, called the act a "sufficient foundation for a system of tyranny, both civil

---

[21]See James H. Smylie, "Presbyterian Clergy and Problems of 'Dominion' in the Revolutionary Generation," *Journal of Presbyterian History*, XLVIII (1970), 161-75.

[22]John Zubly to Earl of Dartmouth, September 3, 1775, in Peter Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series (6 vols., Washington, 1837-1846), III, 635-36.

[23]Furman, An Address.

and ecclesiastic."[24] Others, when looking back at the Revolution, emphasized much the same thing regarding sovereignty. Oliver Hart, a Baptist minister from Charleston who moved north as a result of the war, said in a 1791 Thanksgiving day sermon that the right to bind the colonies had created a situation that "was truly alarming. A state of the most abject slavery, like some evil Demon, stared us in the face." Remembering the alternatives available to them, he added:

> Tamely to put on the shackles fabricated for us, we apprehended, would argue a meanness of soul, unworthy the offspring of Freemen--a baseness, derogatory to the dignity of human nature. We still retained an affection for Great Britain, although strangely metamorphosed from a tender *Mother*, to a tyrannical *Step-Dame*. We therefore petitioned--we remonstrated--but obtained no relief.[25]

In similar vein William Fristoe, Baptist minister in Virginia, looked back in 1808 and said that if sovereignty had been given to Parliament no one could predict where it would end. Tax on tax would have been added and the empire expanded. He concluded that "monarchial usurpation cannot be glutted, it never cloys; the desire of pomp and enlargement of empire has never met with an entire gratification."[26] Thus, at least some dissenting clergymen were in agreement with many

---

[24]Robert Cooper, *Courage in a Good Cause* (Lancaster, 1775), 21. Born in Ireland around 1732, Cooper was graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1763 and ordained two years later. Most of his ministerial work was done on the Pennsylvania and Maryland frontier at West Nottingham.

[25]Oliver Hart, *America's Remembrancer, with respect to her Blessedness and Duty* (Philadelphia, 1791), 9,

[26]Fristoe, *History of Ketocton Association*, 155.

patriot political leaders on the sovereignty of Parliament. Their theological precepts did not allow them to approve of the complete dominion of any civil authorities.

One of the issues relating to sovereignty was the prerogative of the crown. As far as the records show there was only one dissenting clergyman, Zubly of Savannah, who took an active part in this debate. It was over the question of a royal governor's negating the choice of the speaker of the Georgia Commons House of Assembly, and it is important to look at this issue closely. In April 1771, the Commons House elected Noble Wimberly Jones speaker, but Governor James Wright rejected this choice. No reason was given but Jones was probably rejected because of his activities as leader of the Georgia Sons of Liberty. The Commons elected another man but adopted a resolution stating that the rejection of the speaker by the governor was a high breach of the privileges of the House and subverted the rights and liberties of the people; whereupon Governor Wright dissolved the House and in July departed for England, leaving James Habersham as acting governor. When the new Commons convened in April 1772, Jones was again elected speaker and rejected by Habersham. After his third election, Jones declined the position so that another speaker acceptable to the governor could be elected; but when the Commons refused to expunge the record of Jones's third election, Habersham dissolved it also.[27]

---

[27]The background for this incident is found in Kenneth Coleman, *The American Revolution in Georgia, 1763-1789* (Athens, 1958), 34-37; Jack P. Greene, *The Quest for Power* (Chapel Hill, 1963), 433-36; Reba Carolyn Strickland, *Religion and the State in Georgia in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1939), 143.

There were several articles in the *Georgia Gazette* on the actions of the governor, and Zubly is believed to have written his *Calm and Respectful Thoughts* in answer to Anthony Stokes's defense of the governor's action. To deny or curtail the privileges of the House, to Zubly, was an attempt to abolish it and, of course, to destroy the constitution. One of the privileges of the House was the free election of a speaker, but

> to talk of a free choice, which yet may be controlled and annulled by another, seems inconsistent with the very nature of choice. If a person is acceptable only to the one who makes the choice what does their choice avail if set aside by another.[28]

He concluded that the selection of the speaker must be as "free and final" as the people's choice of their representatives.

Zubly argued that there were three things which were matters of right and not dependent upon the favor of the crown: the sitting of Commons, the privileges of the House, and the freedom of debate. He drew upon the works of Blackstone and Coke to show that the king's power was limited. Under the British system the very purpose of an assembly was to prevent undue influence by the crown, but if the speaker held his place by favor of the crown, Zubly argued, then that design was defeated:

> If the King has a right to reject a Speaker chosen, he must hold that right either in virtue of some act of Parliament, or it must be a part of his Royal Prerogative; the former was never asserted, the latter is the subject in question.[29]

---

[28]John J. Zubly, *Calm and Respectful Thoughts on the Negative of the Crown on a Speaker* [Savannah, 1772], 6.

[29]*Ibid.*, 8.

Denying that prerogative, Zubly proposed that even if the king had the constitutional right to impose a speaker, that right was given up by his permitting the Georgia Assembly to choose one. If the king were to approve no one except a speaker representing his interest, this would give him a powerful influence and there could really be no freedom of debate in the House. The prerogative of the king to reject the speaker, consequently, was against the constitution and privileges of the House and infringed upon the rights of the people of which Zubly was an absolute defender.

All these dissenting clergymen, then, rejected the absolute sovereignty of Parliament and any prerogatives of the king that encroached upon America's constitutional rights. In these respects, they agreed with other whigs who defended American popular rights from absolute government.

Although they opposed the unlimited power of the king, most dissenting clergymen, like other Americans, were loyal to the British throne. There were theological grounds for their position, as evidenced by many sermons on the theme of obedience to civil magistrates as ordained of God. This was true not only of those who adhered to the Westminster Confession[30] but also of the General or Arminian Baptist in Maryland who in 1742 pledged themselves to King George in this way:

---

[30]Chapter XXIII, "Of the Civil Magistrate," of the Westminster Confession said that God ordained civil magistrates, and it was the duty of the people "to pray for magistrates, to honor their persons, to pay them tribute and other dues, to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority, for conscience sake." See Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (3 vols., New York, 1877), III, 652-54.

> We do also engage with our lives and fortunes to defend the crown and dignity of our gracious sovereign King George, to him and to his issue forever, and to obey all his laws, humbly submitting ourselves to all in authority under him.[31]

David Thomas, a Baptist clergyman in Virginia, drew up a statement of beliefs in 1774 in which he "heartily" acknowledged

> King George the third of Great Britain. . . as our rightful king; and do on all occasions, agree to pay him all due homage, and allegiance. We also esteem ourselves in duty bound to give all becoming deference to the legislature of this colony; and to respect, regard and obey all in lawful authority.[32]

Apart from their creeds, individual dissenting clergymen made public statements of support to the crown. Among them was Samuel Davies, who spent most of his ministry in Virginia but, as president of the College of New Jersey, preached a memorial sermon in 1760 on the death of George II, urging his hearers to support the new king. He eulogized the dead king:

> George is no more! George, the mighty, the just, the gentle, and the wise; George, the father of Britain and her colonies, the guardian of laws and liberty, the protector of the oppressed, the arbiter of Europe, the terror of tyrants and France; George, the friend of man, the benefactor of millions, is no more![33]

---

[31]Edwards, Material towards a history of the Baptists in Maryland, 1772, S.C. Baptist Hist. Coll., Greenville.

[32]David Thomas, *The Virginian Baptist* (Baltimore, 1774), 33. Thomas began as a missionary in Virginia in 1751. Born in Pennsylvania in 1732, he was educated under Rev. Isaac Eaton in New Jersey and later the College of Rhode Island conferred on him an honorary Master's degree in 1769. He served as a Regular Baptist pastor in the northwest counties of Virginia from 1762 to 1796 when he moved to Kentucky where he died several years later. See Taylor, *Virginia Baptist Ministers,* I, 43-48.

[33]Samuel Davies, "On the Death of His Late Majesty, King George II," in Davies, *Sermons,* III, 24.

Earlier Davies had expressed his devotion when he avowed, "I am as well satisfied at his present Majesty King George, as my Supreme Civil Ruler, as, perhaps, any loyal Subject. . . ."[34] Of course, most Americans thought similarly at this early date; but Davies's loyalty was consistent, to his death in 1761. Upon the repeal of the Stamp Act, Zubly wrote:

> Bless, O God, the king, long let the Crown flourish on his head. Give him the desires of his soul, may he ever be a king after thine own heart; give him wise counsellors and faithful subjects; let his reign be long, peaceful, and glorious.[35]

Zubly, of course, was loyal to the king right up to his death in Savannah in 1781. Richard Furman, too, expressed devotion to the crown in his 1775 letter to the inhabitants of South Carolina enunciating the view that while Americans opposed those things to which his Majesty had consented, yet they did not reject him as king and desired him to reign over them.[36]

The clergy's allegiance was not to monarchs in general but to the Protestant Hanoverian line of English sovereigns. Writing to their congregations during the Regulator troubles, four Presbyterian clergymen in North Carolina urged obedience to the laws on the ground that their ancestors had "always evidenced a zealous attachment to the

---

[34]Samuel Davies to Rev. Patrick Henry, April 21, 1747, Dawson Manuscripts, Library of Congress.

[35]John J. Zubly, *The Stamp-Act Repealed* (Charleston, 1766), 18.

[36]Furman, An Address.

Protestant Succession in the present royal Family. . . and this on the principles strictly enjoined by the Westminster Confession of Faith."[37] In addition, Charles Cummings, Presbyterian minister on the Virginia frontier, helped draw up the Fincastle Resolves of 1775 pledging love and duty to King George and a willingness to risk lives in the service of his Majesty "for the support of the Protestant religion and the rights and liberties of his subjects."[38]

Although these statements were not unique, they do point up clerical support of the government. Like other Americans, these clergymen were loyal English subjects who only resorted to independence and war when they believed that an unconstitutional act had been committed. In this respect, they were like the New England clergy who expressed loyalty to the crown while at the same time preaching a political philosophy that served to intensify resistance among the people.[39]

Another major constitutional question facing the empire was that of colonial representation in Parliament and the right of taxation.

---

[37]"Letter from the Presbyterian Pastors," August 23, 1768, in Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VII, 815.

[38]"Fincastle Resolutions," January 20, 1775, in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, I, 1165-66. Cummings was a patriot leader on the frontier. Born in Ireland, he was ordained a Presbyterian minister in 1767. After serving as a pastor in Augusta County, Virginia, he moved to the Holston region near Abingdon in 1772 where he was an important member of the committee of safety and Indian fighter during the Revolution. See Sprague, *Annals*, III, 285-88; Mrs. James H. Mongle, *Sketches: Rev. Charles Cummings, Fort Kimakronen, Black's Fort* (Abingdon, Virginia, n.d.); Thompson, *Presbyterians*, 88-93; Lewis P. Summers, *History of Southwest Virginia, 1746-1786, Washington County, 1777-1870* (Richmond, 1903; reprint ed., Baltimore, 1966), 717.

[39]See Baldwin, *New England Clergy*, chap 7.

There is no recorded statement by any dissenting clergyman in support of virtual representation. Richard Furman instead rejected virtual representation:

> The representatives can agree in no law, but they find themselves in it. The House of Commons of Great Britain are their representatives and everything passed as law there is first agreed to by them. The House of Assembly of the provinces of America are their representatives. . . . Neither can the representatives of one part of the Kingdom represent another part of it.[40]

Representation, of course, was closely tied to the tax power of Parliament. Most Americans held that consent, through elected representatives, was necessary before the taxing power could be operative, and those dissenting clergy who addressed themselves to the subject agreed. Thus, David Rice, Presbyterian minister in Virginia, proclaimed in an undated sermon that

> this assumed right of taxation is contrary to every idea of civil liberty, and to the spirit of the English constitution of government, according to which no man can be bound by any law but those of his own making; he cannot be obliged to pay any tax but by his own consent. It is a blow at the root of the English constitution, it saps the foundation of English government.[41]

---

[40]Furman, An Address.

[41]Quoted in Robert H. Bishop, *An Outline of the History of the Church in the State of Kentucky. . . containing the Memoirs of Rev. David Rice* (Lexington, 1824), 94. Rice grew up in Hanover County, Virginia, under the influence of Samuel Davies. He studied under John Todd and James Waddell, Presbyterian ministers, before receiving a degree from the College of New Jersey in 1761. After ordination he pastored the church that Davies held and then moved to Bedford County in 1770. He moved to Kentucky in 1783 and was one of the founders of Transylvania Seminary. Several excerpts of his sermons with political content remain. He was a delegate to the Kentucky constitutional convention, 1792. He died in Green County, Kentucky, in 1817. In addition to Bishop, *ibid.*, see *DAB*, XV, 537; Sprague, *Annals*, III, 246-49.

The Presbyterian clergy in Pennsylvania, writing to their fellow-ministers in North Carolina in 1775, stated that the grand debate revolved around "whether the English Parliament in which we have no representation, has a power to tax us, or to have and dispose of our money without our consent." Their own view was that

> to take any man's money, without his consent, is unjust and contrary to reason and the law of God, and the Gospel of Christ; it is contrary to Magna Charta, or the Great Charter and Constitution of England; and to complain, and even to resist such a lawless power, is just, and reasonable, and no rebellion.[42]

One of the resolutions agreed to by Peter Muhlenberg, Lutheran pastor in Virginia, while chairman of a 1774 committee of citizens in Dunmore County, declared

> that it is the inherent right of *British* subjects to be governed and taxed by representatives chosen by themselves only; and that every Act of the *British* Parliament respecting the internal policy of *North America*, is a dangerous and unconstitutional invasion of our rights and privileges.[43]

This statement not only questioned the power of Parliament to tax but also denied its power over any act relating to the internal affairs of the colonies.

---

[42]"An Address to the Ministers and Presbyterian congregations in North Carolina," July 10, 1775, in Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 223-24.

[43]Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, I, 417. Muhlenberg, son of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, was born in Pennsylvania in 1746. After training at the University of Halle he was licensed as a Lutheran minister and served Lutheran churches in New Jersey before going to the Valley of Virginia. He then went to London for Anglican ordination and preached at both Anglican and Lutheran churches As a patriot he was a member of the Virginia Convention in 1775 and had a distinguished military career during the war After the war he held several political offices. See *DAB*, XIII, 311.

The most outspoken dissenting clergyman on this subject was John Zubly, who had previously called the Stamp Act "an unhappy ill-advised act" in a sermon of thanksgiving upon its repeal. Repeal was "more deserving of a public day of thanksgiving" than any other event, and Zubly encouraged his congregation to give thanks that their "invaluable privileges are preserved, that our land is not become a land of slaves, nor our fields a scene of blood."[44] After the passage of the Townshend Duties, Zubly wrote a series of articles on parliamentary taxation for the *Georgia Gazette* from June 28 to July 5, 1769, later printed in pamphlet form and entitled *An Humble Enquiry*. The pamphlet was written to examine two arguments: whether the Parliament of Great Britain was the supreme legislature in all the British Empire, and whether all British dominions ought to pay obedience to all the laws and if by disobeying whether they had declared themselves an independent people.[45] Believing in a government of laws, Zubly held to the limitations placed on Parliament by the English Constitution. He readily accepted the fact that Parliament was the supreme legislative body in the British nation, thus all parts of the empire, including the American colonies, were bound by and subject to all laws of Parliament.

This led Zubly, however, to consider whether the power of Parliament affected all the subjects of the empire in the same manner.

---

[44]Zubly, *Stamp-Act Repealed*, 16.

[45]John J. Zubly, *An Humble Enquiry into the Nature of the Dependency of the American Colonies* (Charleston, 1769), 3.

He did not believe it did. Certainly England was bound by Parliament, and so was Scotland and Ireland even though they had been separate kingdoms at one time. Ireland was bound by an act in 1719 and the American colonies by the Declaratory Act of 1766. In comparing the two acts, Zubly found a different degree of dependency; the difference was that Ireland was declared dependent on the crown alone, whereas it was explicitly mentioned that America was dependent on and subject to both the crown and Parliament in all cases whatsoever. From the beginning the colonial charters had declared America subject to the crown alone, but now the dependence on both crown and Parliament was an alteration in the British system and should be resisted. Thus, Zubly had shown that subordination to and dependency on Parliament was not the same in all parts of the empire.[46]

In applying this principle to taxation, Zubly pointed out that all taxes levied by Parliament did not apply to all parts of the empire equally. An example would be the land tax. If subjects of the empire are not liable to any or every tax laid by Parliament, it must be either that they are not liable by the Constitution (not represented), or because they are excused by favor of Parliament.[47]

While Zubly approved of taxes for the purpose of regulation of trade, taxes for revenue had to be levied in accordance with constitutional means. To him, taxes were a free gift of the subjects to the crown, and the crown could only collect what was agreed to, either

---

[46] *Ibid.*, 5-10.

[47] *Ibid.*, 12-13.

by the subjects themselves, or by their representatives; otherwise an unconstitutional act was committed. Zubly appealed to the constitutional principle of giving consent to taxation and rejected virtual representation:

> If the representatives have no right but what they derive from their electors and election, and if the electors have no right to elect any representatives but for themselves, and if the right of sitting in the House of Commons arises only from the election of those designed to be representatives, it is undeniable, that the power of taxation in the House of Commons cannot extend any further than to those who have delegated them for that purpose; and if none of the electors of England could give a power to those whom they elected to represent or tax any other part of his Majesty's dominions except themselves, it must follow, that when the Commons are met, they represent no other place or part of his Majesty's dominions and cannot give away the property but of those who have given them a power so to do by choosing them their representative.[48]

If Parliament has a right to tax the colonies, Zubly continued, it must be based on the same right they possess to tax Great Britain, that is, that the representatives had been chosen by the people. Because the representatives in Parliament were not chosen by Americans, Zubly declared, that body had no constitutional right to tax the colonies.[49]

Zubly concluded his pamphlet by addressing himself to the assumption made by many that America wanted to be independent. That was not the case, he said, for America had not been taxed since she was settled, but nobody had previously suggested that America was independent. He assured Britain that the loyalty of America was never suspect; the colonists' main concern was the improper taxing power.

---

[48] *Ibid.*, 17.

[49] *Ibid.*, 19-20.

> The opinion of the Americans, is that to be taxed where they are not represented could deprive them of the rights of Englishmen, nay in time, with the loss of the constitution, might and must deprive them of liberty and property altogether.[50]

Just a few years later, William Tennent, pastor of the Independent Church in Charleston, also emphasized the significance of the taxing power to American freedom. In a letter to the ladies of South Carolina in 1774, Tennent, writing as "The Husband of the Planter's Wife," stressed the significance of tea in the dispute with Great Britain:

> It is tea that has kept all America trembling for years. It is tea that has brought vengeance upon Boston. . . . It is for tea that the very vitals of America are staffed. . . . It is in support of the Tea Act that the chartered privileges of a great province are sacrificed. . . . All America is threatened with a deluge of blood from this accursed tea.[51]

Appealing to the patriotism of the women of the colony, Tennent added:

> I cannot think you so divested of all love to your country as to be willing to partake of any trivial pleasure at the expense of the liberties, if not of the blood of your husbands and children. Will not my fair readers be persuaded to lend their hand to save America from the dagger of tyranny? . . . My dear ladies, have you any spirit? Have you the soul[s] of Englishwomen? I'm sure you have. . . . The Ministry think that your love to your tea-tackling, those play-things of the evening, will make you surrender the liberties and lives of your country. And will you not disappoint them? Here is the

---

[50] *Ibid.*, 25.

[51] *South Carolina Gazette and Country Journal*, August 2, 1774, hereafter cited as *SCG&CJ*. See also Newton B Jones, ed., "Writings of the Reverend William Tennent, 1740-1777," *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, LXI (1960), 135-39. Apparently the "Planter's Wife" had written a plea, which has not been located, that the ladies not use tea. The *SCG&CJ*, August 16, 1774, contains a letter from "Andromache" to "The Planter's Wife" praising her for the part she had taken in the tea controversy.

> great bone of contention, and you have it in your power to remove it. . . . If you will make no tea, that baneful plant will no more load the Atlantic, nor spread our shore with disease and tyranny.[52]

Tennent enumerated the beneficial effects resulting from the non-use of tea: it would entirely negate the Tea Act; it would show that American patriotism extended to the fair sex; it would punish the East India Company; it would discourage any more attempts to import tea; it would save money; and--a moral reason--the ship captains and merchants would not be tempted to smuggle.

Both Zubly and Tennent were unequivocal in their statements concerning the taxing power of Parliament, completely rejecting parliamentary sovereignty. As residents of urban sections of the South and leaders in their respective towns, they certainly had some influence on the populace, but just how much is difficult to determine. Their views, in any case, were not dramatically different from those of their fellow ministers in the North and the political pamphleteers in all the colonies.

Another major concern of those dissenting clergy who left recorded evidence was the danger to Americans of arbitrary exercises of power that threatened traditional constitutional principles. Richard Furman, the South Carolina Baptist, believed that America had to oppose Parliament in order to maintain the Constitution.[53] When Samuel Davies praised George II, he characterized him as an ideal king

---

[52] *SCG&CJ*, August 2, 1774.

[53] Furman, An Address.

who "claimed no power[s] but such as were granted to him by the constitution," defining the Constitution as the voluntary compact between sovereign and subject.[54] Stressing the importance of constitutionalism, Zubly's political philosophy was based on the belief that every society must have laws, but when those laws took on the nature of arbitrary and oppressive acts to destroy liberty, then law as well as liberty were subverted. When he wrote to Lord Dartmouth pleading for reconciliation, he emphasized that the only way to restore peace and harmony was to restore the "known blessings of the *British* Constitution."[55] And in the Fincastle Resolutions, Charles Cummings agreed that even on the frontier

> the hand of unlimited and unconstitutional power hath pursued us, to strip us of that liberty and property with which God, nature and the rights of humanity have vested us. We are ready and willing to contribute all in our power for the support to his Majesty's government, if applied to constitutionally. . . .[56]

In a similar vein, David Rice, Presbyterian minister in Virginia, stated that what Americans opposed was "nothing less than a fundamental subversion of the Civil Constitution of the Colonies and the substitution of arbitrary despotic power in the room of a free government."[57] Other

---

[54]Samuel Davies, "On the Death of. . . George II," in Davies, *Sermons*, III, 30.

[55]Zubly, *Law of Liberty*, 4-5; Zubly to Lord Dartmouth, September 3, 1775, in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, III, 638.

[56]"Fincastle Resolutions," in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, I, 1165.

[57]Undated sermon of David Rice, quoted in *Presbyterian Advocate*, I (1830), 2.

clergymen who expressed themselves on this subject emphasized that both Parliament and the king had gone too far in exercising power.

Violation of the Constitution was also considered as disobedience to the ordinances of God because government was ordained of God. As Alexander Craighead, Presbyterian minister in Pennsylvania before coming south, said, "there is no Power or Authority in itself, but what is of God. . . [it] is an ordinance, of God's own Institution. . . ."[58] Therefore, what the British government could do was limited not only by the Constitution but also by God. Four Presbyterian ministers pointed this out in 1775 when they wrote that the powers of Parliament were "limited by the Laws of God and of reason; they are limited by the fundamental laws of the Constitution, and by the Great Charter of England."[59]

Believing as they did in a government based on laws, these same dissenting clergymen were certain that what was taking place in the empire was an enslavement of the people arising from the violation of the Constitution. Muhlenberg, in the Dunmore County resolutions,

---

[58]Alexander Craighead, *A Discourse Concerning the Covenants* (Philadelphia, 1742), 17. Craighead, born in Ireland in 1707, was ordained a Presbyterian minister in Pennsylvania in 1735. Because of his Covenanter political views, he was dismissed from the Synod of Philadelphia at the time of the New Light split. He went to Augusta County, Virginia, but fled to North Carolina during the French and Indian War. The remainder of his life, until his death in 1766, he was pastor in Mecklenburg County. See Sprague, *Annals*, III, 75; Baldwin, "Sowers of Sedition," 64-71

[59]"An Address to the Ministers and Presbyterian congregations in North Carolina," July 10, 1775, in Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 224.

called the Boston Port Bill "repugnant to the fundamental laws of natural justice" and "a despotic exertion of unconstitutional power, calculated to enslave a free and loyal people."[60] To emphasize the theme of enslavement, Zubly, discussing the Declaratory Act, observed that it was designed to make Americans "hewers of wood and drawers of water: . . . the Emperor of Morocco would not expect more of his slaves than to bind them in all cases whatsoever."[61] A Presbyterian minister in North Carolina, David Caldwell, insisted that paying taxes without consent was an acknowledgement of subjection and therefore degrading. A tax greater than was necessary for the operation of government was unjust.[62] Likewise, Archibald Simpson, Presbyterian minister in South Carolina until his return to Scotland in 1774, wrote in his diary that troops had set off for America

> to subdue that country and forge chains for that brave people, which will undoubtedly revert upon ourselves, and destroy our liberty as well as theirs, if the tyrannical measures of government take place.[63]

---

[60]Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, I, 417.

[61]Zubly to Dartmouth, September 3, 1775, in *ibid.*, III, 635.

[62]David Caldwell. "The Character and Doom of the Sluggard," in Eli W. Caruthers, *A Sketch of the Life and Character of the Rev. David Caldwell* (Greensboro, North Carolina, 1842), 273. Caldwell was an important educator and physician as well as Presbyterian minister in North Carolina. Born in Pennsylvania, he received a degree from the College of New Jersey in 1761 and then was a tutor there. After ordination he became pastor at Buffalo and Alamance churches where he remained until his death in 1824. In addition to Caruthers above, see *DAB*, III, 406; Sprague, *Annals*, III, 263-67.

[63]Diary of Archibald Simpson, April 27, 1776, in Howe, *Presbyterian Church in South Carolina*, I, 390.

What were these rights now threatened by an undue exercise of power? They were not usually enumerated; in most cases they were referred to in general terms, with an assumption that they included the natural rights of man and those derived from the British Constitution. For example, David Rice of Bedford County, Virginia, said in an undated sermon that

> all the rights of free born British subjects have been made over to us, ratified and confirmed by royal charter, and can never be taken from us but by a flagra[n]t breach of faith. And what we are now contending for is an undoubted, and indisputable right of a British subject.[64]

Most often mentioned were the rights to trial by jury and to freedom of conscience.[65] William Tennent was the only one to mention the threat of a standing army. In writing on the insolence of General Gage in Massachusetts, Tennent called a standing army

> the most dangerous enemy to the liberties of a nation that can be thought of. . . It is much better with a well regulated militia to run the risque of a foreign *invasion* that [than] with a standing army to run the risque of *slavery*.[66]

The American distrust of the military was long-standing but, as will be shown in a later chapter, Tennent himself was a firm believer in "a well-regulated militia" as disclosed by his active part in the establishment of the militia for the defense of South Carolina in 1775.

---

[64]Quoted in Bishop, *History of Church in Kentucky*, 93-94.

[65]See Furman, An Address; Caldwell, "Character and Doom of the Sluggard," 280. The right of a free conscience will be discussed in the next chapter.

[66]Tennent writing as "A Carolinian No. IV," in *SCG&CJ*, August 23, 1774.

What was liberty to the dissenting clergy? In most cases, it was defined in spiritual rather than secular terms. Article XX of the Westminster Confession, "Of Christian Liberty, and Liberty of Conscience," stated that the liberty which Christ purchased consisted of freedom from the guilt of sin, the condemning wrath of God, and the curse of the moral law.[67] Liberty was viewed by the clergy, then, as freedom from sin. For instance, Hezekiah James Balch, Presbyterian minister in North Carolina, had this to say about freedom in 1774:

> There can be no freedom without order! Oh, for the order which is in Christ, that we might have that freedom which is in him also![68]

He went on to describe the improvement in the human condition that adherence to Christ's laws would surely bring. Quite often a sermon on spiritual liberty would include references to political liberty and this was the case when Hugh Alison, Presbyterian minister in South Carolina, preached a sermon on spiritual liberty in 1769 soon after the nonimportation agreement resulting from the Townshend duties. While most of the sermon dealt with spiritual liberty found in Christ, the introduction to the sermon dealt with political liberty, which Alison described as "an inestimable treasure; the delight and passion of mankind." His definition of liberty was comprehensive:

> By liberty in general, I understand the Right every man has to pursue the natural, reasonable and religious dictates

---

[67] Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, III, 643.

[68] Letter of Hezekiah James Balch, 1774, quoted in *Journal of Presbyterian Historical Society*, III (1905), 80.

> of his own mind; to enjoy the fruits of his own labour, art and industry; to work for his own profit and pleasure, not for others, who live in idleness, and would not riot in luxury, rapine and oppression.[69]

This liberty was in danger in America, but one of the solutions was the salvation of the soul in Christ, the subject of the remainder of the sermon.

Zubly, similarly, in his 1775 sermon before the Georgia Provincial Congress, preached on the gospel as the source of liberty and freedom from sin but concluded that the gospel was "an institution equally tending to make men just, free and happy here, and perfectly holy and happy hereafter." There were no precedents in the New Testament, Zubly contended, to support arbitrary power or unlimited obedience.[70] The liberty of the individual was linked with spiritual liberty, the one supporting the other. Blind obedience was inconsistent with the gospel; the individual should be free to make his own choice. But there was little room for licentiousness since individual liberty did not mean the absence of moral or legal responsibility. To Zubly, liberty and law were perfectly consistent:

> There is a very essential difference between liberty and licentiousness, and it is highly criminal under pretence of the one to indulge the other.[71]

---

[69]Hugh Alison, *Spiritual Liberty* (Charleston, 1769), 4. Alison came to South Carolina from Pennsylvania after receiving a degree from the College of New Jersey in 1762. After serving as pastor in Williamsburg, he went to James Island where he remained until the approach of the British in 1780. See Sprague, *Annals*, III, 244-45.

[70]Zubly, *Law of Liberty*, 17-18.

[71]Zubly, *Stamp-Act Repealed*, 21.

After the Revolution, William Graham, the Virginia Presbyterian, warned against the same thing, when he said that if a person used his liberty to justify exemption from obedience to law, he could hardly pretend to be living in a regular society; he might better join himself to the Cherokees at once. Graham gave liberty a personal definition:

> Liberty is a being governed by my own will, or a government by my own choice. When I am subjected to the will of another, or restrained by the will of another, I am not free.[72]

In political terms this meant the only free men were those who could vote for the officers of government; all others were political slaves, differing from the African only in being allowed to live where they pleased.

Since the clergy believed that all power came from God and the British government had usurped this power, it was easy for them to take a step towards resistance. They generally counselled obedience to constituted authority, but when governors went beyond the Constitution, it was a different matter. Richard Furman advised that

> what the King does, contrary to the constitution, is not the power, that is of God, spoken of in Scripture and therefore ought not to be obeyed.[73]

Unconstitutional power must be fought even at the risk of life itself. In looking back at the Revolution, Silas Mercer, a Baptist minister in Georgia, recalled that as long as

---

[72][Graham], *Essay on Government*, 7.

[73]Furman, An Address.

> tyrannical nations will make war against an innocent free people, to destroy their liberty, property and lives, it must be the duty of these free people to resist them as long as they have power to resist.[74]

Other dissenting clergy were more forthright on the right of resistance. Hugh Alison, in a funeral sermon at the death of William Tennent, in 1777, expressed the thought thus:

> What! sit down tamely, when the cruel hand of tyranny is lifted up, and every sacred right is at stake! when violence and oppression with ten thousand furies in the rear were rushing upon our land, like an impetuous torrent, to sweep our liberties away? Was this a time for a lover of his country to be cold and inactive, or to hide his talents in a napkin? no; such a conduct had been treason against All America; treason against our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred freedom.[75]

The words of David Rice, the Virginia Presbyterian, are similar:

> Were it only some small encroachments, some lesser instances of maladministration that did not affect the very being of the constitution, resistance by force of arms would not be lawful; but where the very being of the constitution is struck at, resistance is justified by the laws of God and the dictates of common sense, and is agreeable to the fundamental principles of the civil constitution of Great Britain.[76]

And Rice, again, in another undated sermon:

> Should our king attempt to extend the royal prerogative beyond its proper limits, and thereby deprive us of our liberties, we should not even in that case be bound by the oaths we have taken to submit. The compact between the king and the people would then be broken; he would cease

---

[74]Mercer, *Tyranny Exposed*, 61.

[75]Hugh Alison, *The Faithful Servant of Christ honoured and rewarded* (Charleston, 1777), 26.

[76]Sermon of David Rice, quoted in *Presbyterian Advocate*, I (1830), 2.

> to be our king; resistance would not only be lawful, but an indispensable duty; it would be resisting a tyrant, not a king.[77]

Charles Cummings, the Virginia Presbyterian, in the Fincastle Resolutions of 1775, put it this way:

> If no pacifick measures shall be proposed or adopted by Great Britain, and our enemies will attempt to dragoon us out of those inestimable privileges, which we are entitled to as subjects, we declare that we are deliberately and resolutely determined never to surrender them to any power upon earth but at the expense of our lives.[78]

And finally James Ireland, Virginia Baptist minister, wrote a poem just after the Declaration of Independence, the second stanza of which began:

> Hail! now ye sons of liberty,
> Behold thy constitution!
> Depostic power and tyranny
> Have seen their dissolution
> No clattering arms,
> No war's alarms,
> Nor threats of royal vengeance;
> Thy hostile foes
> Have left off those;
> Now own thy Independence.[79]

David Caldwell, the North Carolina Presbyterian, in an undated sermon, compared the slothful in America to the inhabitants of the city of

---

[77]Quoted in Bishop, *History of Church in Kentucky*, 92.

[78]"Fincastle Resolutions," January 20, 1775, in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, I, 1166.

[79]Taylor, *Virginia Baptist Ministers*, I, 125. The complete poem is given in Appendix A. Ireland was born in Scotland in 1748. After coming to America he was ordained in 1769 and was pastor in Frederick and Shenandoah counties, Virginia until his death in 1806. He was imprisoned in Culpeper for preaching without a license. See also his autobiography, *The Life of the Rev. James Ireland* (Winchester, 1819).

Meroz in the Old Testament. When a call went out for soldiers to meet the cruel prince Jabin, the people of Meroz chose to live under oppression rather than to fight for their rights. Their fate was recorded in Judges 5:23, "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty." Caldwell saw a similarity between the American sluggard and the people of Meroz "both in the measure and manner of sinning."[80] In addressing himself to the American situation, Caldwell stated:

> We have therefore come to that trying period in our history in which it is manifest that the Americans must either stoop under a load of the vilest slavery, or resist their imperious and haughty oppressors. . . . I should have no difficulty in persuading you to shake off your sloth, and stand up manfully in a firm, united, and persevering defence of your liberties.[81]

Similarly, Robert Cooper of Maryland declared while preaching to troops in 1775:

> Armies have been sent to enforce obedience. . . . The alternative, in short, now is either to wear the chain or the sword. . . . Be diligent in learning the business of war, as at ordinary times to learn the common business of life.[82]

There seems to be no doubt what these dissenting clergymen were talking about; they were plainly calling for forcible resistance to oppression,

---

[80]Caldwell, "Character and Doom of the Sluggard," 281.

[81]*Ibid.*, 283-84.

[82]Cooper, *Courage in a Good Cause*, 23.

and they were resorting to the Westminster Confession's justification of war upon "just and necessary occasions."[83]

Some dissenting clergy, however, such as the Moravians, Mennonites, Brethern, and Seven Day Baptists, were pacifists in doctrine, and objected to bearing arms; but they were in the minority. There was no reluctance to bearing arms among most Baptists and Presbyterians. When David Thomas drew up a confession for Virginia Baptists, one section said that members would "bear arms in defense of their country, when unjustly invaded."[84] One Baptist church in Virginia at its meeting on September 16, 1775, made a specific decision on the propriety of bearing arms in the Revolution.

> 1. Query, Whether it is Lawful for Christians to take up Arms and go to War upon any occasion. Agreed that it is Lawful upon some occasions.
> 2. Query, Whether it is Lawful to take up arms in the present dispute with Great Britain and her colonies. Agreed that it is lawful.[85]

An attempt was made by a Presbyterian clergyman from Maryland, Robert Cooper, to justify war to the Christian. In a sermon to soldiers on the eve of the Revolution, he conceded that it was a mark of human depravity for man to want to take the lives of his own species. Yet there were times when it was inevitable to

---

[83]Chapter XXIII, Section II, "Of the Civil Magistrate" of the Westminster Confession.

[84]Thomas, *Virginia Baptist*, 20.

[85]Minute Book of Hartwood Baptist Church, 1775-1861, Va., Baptist Hist. Coll., Richmond.

> remove some out of this world, in order that those who survive may be the more comfortable; hence making war, or shedding the blood of those of our own kind, come to be a necessary business; and it is then as much our duty to go to the field of battle, as at ordinary times, to go to the field of labour.[86]

To Cooper, all lawful wars must either be undertaken by a special commission from God (a condition that no longer existed as in the Old Testament era), or as a defensive war occasioned by some injury inflicted. The latter might be between separate independent states, arising from one state's invasion of the lives, liberty, or property of another, or it might be a civil war between different parts of the same state. Cooper justified civil war when the governing part of the nation subverted the constitution and pursued tyrannical designs. Yet, in a moment of caution, he advised that more moderate measures should be tried first, such as representations, petitions, and remonstrances; the sword should come last, but to say that the sword should not be used against civil magistrates would be "repugnant to the great principle of self-preservation, and establishing a toleration of robbery and murder."[87]

The Scriptures, then, did influence the way the dissenting clergy looked at the political situation in their day. Religion not only provided a framework within which to interpret politics but also offered a moral justification for the break with England. Since government was sacred and there had been a violation of God's ordinances in

---

[86]Cooper, *Courage in a Good Cause*, 4.

[87]*Ibid.*, 11.

the enslavement of people, there was now a reason for resistance. By 1776, the choice was clear, either to submit to arbitrary laws which threatened civil and religious privileges, or to rebel against those enactments in the name of liberty. Reconcilation was no longer possible for most clergy, for how could a Christian compromise with evil? There was now no alternative but to join the patriot cause; and most of the dissenting clergy did.

As stated at the beginning of this chapter, what can be arrived at here is only a composite picture drawn from the recorded evidence. While the collective portrait does not represent a large segment of the dissenting clergy, it does show that the political statements of those mentioned were whig in nature with perhaps more reliance on the Scriptures as a basis for their tenets than was true of secular writers. The clergy's views on the origin of government and on the constitutional issues of sovereignty and representation were much the same as those of the political pamphleteers of the day. The southern dissenting ministers were, then, in the mainstream of American political theory on the eve of the Revolution, even if they were not among its principal spokesmen.

CHAPTER IV

THE REVOLUTION AS A RELIGIOUS MOVEMENT

While the American Revolution is most often considered as a political movement or as arising from economic dislocations within the empire, less attention has been given to its moral dimension. As early as 1905, however, the historian George Howard pointed to the agitation over the establishment of an American episcopate as a significant factor in creating colonial discontent.[1] In this respect, Howard drew upon Arthur L. Cross's detailed study of the issue of an Anglican bishopric.[2] Few historians followed this lead until Carl Bridenbaugh exhumed it in his *Mitre and Sceptre* (1962).[3] At about the same time, Perry Miller directed notice to the moral roots of American resistance, particularly the reminder on the part of Calvinist ministers that British oppression represented a new heavenly visitation on a people who had permitted themselves to become corrupt and sinful.[4]

---

[1]George E. Howard, *Preliminaries of the Revolution* (New York, 1905).

[2]Arthur L. Cross, *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies* (New York, 1902; reprint ed., Hamden, Conn., 1964).

[3]Carl Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Sceptre: Transiantic Faiths, Ideals, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775* (New York, 1962), xiv, concluded that "religion was a fundamental cause of the American Revolution."

[4]Perry Miller, "From the Covenant to the Revival," in James Smith and A. Leland Jamison, eds., *Religion in American Life* (4 vols., Princeton, 1961), I, 322-68.

Insofar as the southern dissenting clergy were concerned, the religious roots of the Revolution were clear; and they made the point emphatically in their sermons. Any type of natural calamity was usually interpreted by the clergy as a judgment of God. Ministers believed that earthquakes, floods, hail, wind storms, fires, war, or other disasters resulted from the sins of the people. Sometimes working through the corrupt passions of other men or nations, God would bring judgment on a sinful people. It is in this context that the Synod of New York and Philadelphia sent out a pastoral letter in 1766 to all Presbyterian ministers reminding them that the "faithless French, and their savage allies, were lately the rod of Divine displeasure for our many provocations." But instead of repenting, America, it was made clear, had become vain and dissolute.[5] God was now making a further trial of America; He had permitted the Stamp Act, the restriction of trade, and the stagnation of business, but He had also moderated the actions of the British Parliament. Therefore, His mercy should encourage penance.[6] A short time later, John J. Zubly of Savannah reiterated the theme that the Stamp Act and all British tyranny were results of the sins of the people, and he ended his sermon by a stirring call to repentance.[7]

The imperial problems arising after 1765 were similarly interpreted by the clergy as God's judgment. Commenting on Britain's colonial

---

[5]Engles, *Records of the Presbyterian Church*, 362

[6]*Ibid.*

[7]Zubly, *Stamp-Act Repealed*, 20-22.

legislation, William Tennent observed in 1774 that it represented

> the Prime Minister of GOD's Vengeance, and it has been called upon only in those Cases where less Scourges were unequal to the Demerit of Crimes, or when they had been used to no purpose.[8]

Christians should remember, he went on to note, that the hand of God lay in everything, especially public calamities. Since there were already signs of moral depravity, Tennent saw a coming disaster to the British Empire unless there was real atonement on the part of Americans, and the only reason that God had not already acted was explained by Tennent's text: "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not" (Lamentations 3:22). To Tennent the danger was not so much from the enemy as it was from America's own iniquities, for the best way to measure a country was by its morality. He added:

> When the mere Politician weighs the Danger or Safety of his Country, he computes them [*sic*] in Proportion to its Fortresses, Arms, Money, Provisions, Numbers of Fighting Men, and its Enemies; but when the Christian Patriot weighs the Danger and Safety of his Country, he computes them by its Number of sinful or praying People, and its Degrees of Holiness and Vice.[9]

In the same light, Richard Furman, the South Carolina Baptist minister, in his letter to the backcountry tories, warned them that they might become recipients of God's scourge for their own sins, no less than the patriots.[10] Tories were not immune from the displeasure of God, and there was no certainty of their success in opposing the American cause.

---

[8]William Tennent, *An Address Occasioned by the Late Invasion of the Liberties of the American Colonies* (Philadelphia, 1774), 7.

[9]*Ibid.*, 18.

[10]Furman, An Address.

When war actually arrived in 1775 many of the dissenting clergy viewed it as the clear result of colonial sinfulness. Caleb Wallace, Presbyterian minister in Virginia, expressed this view when he declared:

> I do not know that we have sinned against the King of England, but we have sinned against the King of Heaven, and he is now using Great Britain as the *rod of his anger*. By them he is executing repentance and humiliation.[11]

With Oliver Hart as moderator, the Charleston Baptist Association adopted a circular letter to the churches in 1779 urging humility before God because their sins were "the procuring Causes of all our Calamities."[12] Just a few months earlier Hart had preached a sermon in Charleston which could easily have been preached in Puritan New England. He claimed that the alarm of war, the sufferings of the northern brethren, along with the fire that destroyed Charleston, were signs of the judgment of God; but instead of contrition as soon as the fire was extinguished,

> we had Balls, Assemblies and Dances in every quarter: and even in some of those houses which miraculously escaped the flames. And who can believe that our youth are now taught to act plays publickly on the stage, while the theatre is crowded with spectators?[13]

---

[11]Caleb Wallace to James Caldwell, April 8, 1777, in William H. Whitsitt, *Life and Times of Judge Caleb Wallace* (Louisville, 1888), 39. Wallace was born in Virginia in 1742 and received the A.B. degree from the College of New Jersey in 1770. After his ordination as a Presbyterian minister in 1774, he served churches in Charlotte, Prince Edward, and Botetourt counties until 1783 when he moved to Kentucky. While in Virginia he had an important role in the struggle for religious freedom. In Kentucky he held many important political offices, rising to Judge of the Kentucky Supreme Court before his death in 1814

[12]*Minutes of the Charleston Baptist Association, November 8-9, 1779* (Charleston, 1779).

[13]Oliver Hart, *Dancing Exploded, A Sermon, Shewing the Unlawfulness, Sinfulness, and bad Consequences of Balls, Assemblies, and Dances in general* (Charleston, 1778), 3.

In identifying the reason for God's judgment, Hart referred to the "gay gentry" as the wicked who "swim in affluence and roll in pleasure." Similarly, American military defeats were interpreted as evidences of sin. Caleb Wallace and David Rice, Presbyterian ministers in Virginia, joined others to petition the General Assembly objecting to the manner of prosecuting the war. They were

> persuaded that the prevalence of Vice in our Camps, and too generally amongst all Ranks of People, has justly provoked the heavenly Majesty to correct us by continuing the War; and we have reason to fear that without Reformation the Scourge will be continued until we are absolutely subjected to our Enemies.[14]

The reformation implied was not merely a change in the organization of the militia but a reformation of the morals of the people as well.

The charge of wickedness was a general one, but at times specific sins were enumerated. Tennent spent several paragraphs in his 1774 sermon listing America's transgressions, among the most important being universal infidelity. Others were the heresies in the churches, the forsaking of prayers, and the neglect of religious instruction to children. Among the vices he identified were a desecrated Sabbath, which he saw as a "true mark of national Impiety," swearing and cursing, drunkenness and intemperance in eating and drinking.[15] Another list of wrong doings was offered by the Presbyterian Synod in its pastoral letter.

> When we think of the open disregard and violation of the holy Sabbath; the neglect of the ordinances of Divine worship, the

---

[14]"Petition to the Honourable General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia," in Julian P. Boyd and others, eds., *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* (19 vols. to date, Princeton, 1950-), VI, 57.

[15]Tennent, *Invasion of Liberties*, 11-16.

> abuse of gospel light and privileges, the profane swearing and cursing, intemperance and luxury, the various scenes of uncleanness and lasciviousness, the pride and vanity and every other evil so shamefully prevalent, what less could we expect than that an offended God would have made the gathering tempest to break upon us, and plunged us and our mother country in all the rueful calamities of a civil war?[16]

On the fast day proclaimed by Congress in 1775, Thomas Rankin, Methodist missionary, pointed out that the worst of all evils was "the dreadful sin of buying and selling the souls and bodies of the poor Africans, the sons and daughters of Ham."[17] Thus, the wickedness to which the war was attributed ran the whole gamut of moral depravity.

But God was seen as a benevolent overseer of the Americans as well as a vengeful critic. Some of the same clergy who called for repentance preceding and during the war also saw God's watchful care exercised over the nation during that experience. Writing about the military situation in 1779, Oliver Hart affirmed: "God knows what will be the Event of these things. If He is on our Side, all will end well."[18] Six months before this he had written to his brother that God was with America, and he foresaw the

> rising Glories of this Continent; its Inhabitants nourished by the most free, generous and perfect Form of government ever modeled; and cherished by the best of Rulers, chosen by ourselves,

---

[16]Engles, *Records of the Presbyterian Church*, 363.

[17]Diary of Thomas Rankin, July 20, 1775, Garrett Biblical Institute Library, Evanston, Illinois. Rankin was one of the missionaries sent to America by John Wesley. Born in Scotland, he came to America in 1772 and rode circuit from New York to North Carolina. He returned to England in 1778. See Sprague, *Annals*, VII, 28-34.

[18]Oliver Hart to Joseph Hart, January 14, 1779, Oliver Hart Collection, South Caroliniana Library, Columbia.

> whose Interest and Inclination will conspire to make the ruled happy. When Peace, like the swelling Tide, shall flow over the Mountains and cover the whole Land, When Religion, freed from its Shackles--Learning and Virtue, encouraged and promoted shall spread far and wide. Wisdom and Knowledge shall increase, and every Pe[a]sant be qualified for a Senator. Every Man shall sit down peaceably under his own Vine, and under his own Figtree; and the Trade, Favour and Protection of America will be counted by all Nations under Heaven. This is the Prize for which we are countending, and this is the Legacy we mean to bequeath to our Posterity.[19]

Hart demonstrated this same optimism in a 1791 Thanksgiving Day sermon in which he paraphrased his text from Numbers 23.23 as "What hath God wrought for America?" Going all the way back to America's beginnings, he traced God's actions in raising up Christopher Columbus to discover the continent, "intended in Providence, no doubt, for a theatre of great and marvellous events."[20] The decision for independence, however, had put American virtue to the test, because it resulted in a nation without money, arms, or ammunition. In addition to supplying all these necessities, God had raised up Washington as a leader and brought France to negotiate a treaty with America. Hart concluded that "unless our sins prevent, we shall certainly be the most favoured of all nations under Heaven; yes we are so already."[21]

This theme of God's benevolent concern for America was reemphasized in the sermons of other dissenting clergy after the war. John McKnight, a Presbyterian minister who had left Virginia for New York, preached an Independence Day sermon in which he reviewed the circumstances

---

[19] *Ibid.*, July 5, 1778.

[20] Hart, *America's Remembrancer*, 5-6.

[21] *Ibid.*, 12.

of the Revolution when America had had no army, no fleet, no alliances. When hope was at its lowest and only the actions of a few brave men sustained the American cause, God had raised up a commander, united the people, taught them to fight, "and, in process of time, through the assistance of that generous and power[ful] alley [*sic*] whom he raised up for us, he gave us Victory, Independence, Liberty, and Peace."[22] Richard Furman, invited to preach a patriotic sermon before the civic leaders in Charleston in 1796, also stressed the same theme, noting that

> a special, merciful providence has uniformly watched over the people of the United States, from their first migration to the Continent, to the present day; and that it has appeared to design this part of the globe for a theatre of great and virtuous actions.[23]

Just four years later, in a sermon on the death of George Washington, Furman continued the theme of God's guidance, especially in calling forth Washington as a military leader during the Revolution and as the first president. Furman was certain that America would "remain the object of divine care and favor."[24]

In a most unusual sermon in 1795, Samuel Eusebius McCorkle, Presbyterian minister in North Carolina, compared the history of the

---

[22]John McKnight, *God the Author of Promotion* (New York, 1794), 12. Born in Pennsylvania in 1754, McKnight received the A.B. and A.M. degrees from the College of New Jersey and a D.D. degree from Yale. He was pastor in western Virginia from 1775 to 1783, but moved back to Pennsylvania and later to New York City. See Sprague, *Annals*, III, 371-75.

[23]Richard Furman, *An Oration, Delivered at the Charleston Orphan-House* . . . (Charleston, 1796), 9-10.

[24]Richard Furman, *Humble Submission to Divine Sovereignty, The Duty of a Bereaved Nation* (Charleston, 1800), 19.

United States with that of Israel. On the day of thanksgiving and prayer appointed by the President, he likened the deliverance of the Jews from Egypt and the formation of the nation of Israel to the "great miracle" of America's deliverance. While McCorkle did not believe that Americans had been reduced to bondsmen like the Hebrews, he was convinced that George III

> was forging our chains and concealing them in darkness. We saw, we responded, we united, we took arms, and resisted. We have been honoured with being the first nation that reasoned before it felt--the first nation that reason roused to arms. We had no Caesar to arouse our enthusiasm, no Tamerlane to teach us to be cruel.[25]

And while Israel's history had commenced with bondage, America's history began with liberty. McCorkle saw similarities between Israel's deliverance from the Red Sea and America's escape on the banks of the Delaware, an event no less sudden or surprising than the earlier. In both cases, guardian angels were sent to the rescue. McCorkle also compared the fall of Jericho with the fall of Yorktown and the capture of Cornwallis, a scene more complicated than Jericho, for the former extended to two nations on two continents. Nor was the wisdom employed in winning the Revolution ascribed to the generals by McCorkle, but rather to the sagacity and power of God "who has thus visibly interposed in our behalf."[26] McCorkle compared the sin and detection of Achan in Israel's fight for the Promised Land with that of Benedict Arnold, "another sordid wretch, another troubler of the camp, whose plot and detection were more

---

[25]Samuel E. McCorkle, *A Sermon on the Comparative Happiness and Duty of the United States of America* (Halifax, 1795), 10.

[26]*Ibid.*, 11-16.

complicated than Achan's."[27] His sermon concluded by contrasting the land of Canaan with America:

> He has given us another Canaan not inferior to the former--a land flowing with milk and honey--a country inferior in natural advantage to no country on the face of the earth.[28]

To McCorkle, God had done more for America than He had done for Israel, and as a result America enjoyed three favors-- independence, a free federal government, and foreign and domestic peace.

The Revolution underwent a change in meaning, as the clergy came to view it in retrospect. During the war they had seen it as a consequence of sin, but the same men after the war stressed God's guidance of the nation. Had the Revolution failed, it certainly would have been a sign that the people had not repented of their sins. But the very success of the Revolution, soon followed by the Federal Constitution, was clear evidence of God's overseeing hand. Inherent in these sermons was the belief that the Revolution was fulfilled in the formation of a new government, chosen by the people. America now was truly the "promised land."

Another important religious issue that had substantial impact on the American Revolution was the controversy over the establishment of an American bishopric of the Anglican church. Some contemporary participants in the episcopate controversy saw the matter as of major significance in bringing on the Revolution. John Adams was certain that

---

[27] *Ibid.*, 16. Achan, against the orders of Joshua, kept some of the spoils of Jericho. Because of disobedience, God caused the Israelites to lose the battle at Ai. The sin of Achan was discovered and he was stoned. See Joshua 7:16-28.

[28] *Ibid.*, 18-19.

> the apprehension of episcopacy contributed . . . as much as any other cause to arouse the attention not only of the inquiring mind but the common people and urge them to close thinking on the constitutional authority of parliament over the colonies.[29]

Greater among the Congregationalists and Presbyterians of the northern and middle colonies, this apprehension does not seem to have aroused the same emotions in the South as it did in other regions.

Among the reasons the Presbyterian ministers in the Synod of New York and Philadelphia and the Congregationalist ministers of the General Association of Connecticut convened annually from 1766 to 1775 was to express common opposition to the threat of an Anglican episcopate. Since most Presbyterian ministers in the South were under the jurisdiction of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, they should have been active participants in the controversy. Examination of the minutes of the General Convention discloses, however, that only two southerners, Patrick Allison and Alexander McWhorter, attended these meetings.[30] A brother of Francis Allison of Pennsylvania, Patrick, a Presbyterian minister in Baltimore, was appointed by the Synod as one of two ministers to contact the Congregationalists about calling such a convention.[31] As a result of their visit with Ezra Stiles in New Haven and Charles Chauncy in Boston, the first General Convention was held at Elizabethtown, New Jersey,

---

[29]Charles F. Adams, ed., *The Works of John Adams* (10 vols., Boston, 1850-56), I, 185.

[30]William H. Roberts, ed., *Minutes of the General Convention of Delegates Appointed By the Synod of New York and Philadelphia and the General Association of Connecticut, 1766-1775* (Philadelphia, 1904).

[31]Engles, *Records of the Presbyterian Church*, 364; see also Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Sceptre*, 271-72.

November 5-7, 1766. At this organizational meeting the only southern minister present was Patrick Allison; in succeeding years Alexander McWhorter was in regular attendance at the General Convention. McWhorter, the Presbyterian minister in Newark, New Jersey, did not move, however, to North Carolina until 1779. Why was there not more representation from the South? Was it because of indifference to the issue or was it the distance required to travel to meetings always held in the North? Why was there not a comparable meeting in the South? The explanation appears to be simply that the issue of the bishopric did not arouse the emotions among the southern clergy as it did among the northern.

The major commotion on the matter in the South came when Commissary Horrocks in Virginia issued a summons for the Anglican clergy of the province to meet on May 4, 1771. Only a few attended the first meeting, and only twelve were present at a second meeting on June 4; but the assembly resolved to request the king to appoint an American bishop. Two leading Anglican ministers on the faculty at the College of William and Mary, Thomas Gwatkins and Samuel Henley, registered a formal protest. What followed was a series of newspaper articles among the Anglican clergy on the merits of the proposal.[32] Considering the plan as a "Project of a few mistaken Clergymen," the House of Burgesses voted a resolution of thanks to Henley and Gwatkins for their opposition.[33] The dissenting

---

[32]The Virginia opposition is amply covered by Cross, *Anglican Episcopate*, chap. 10, and George W. Pilcher, "Virginia Newspapers and the Dispute over the Proposed Colonial Episcopate, 1771-1772," *The Historian*, XXIII (1960), 98-113. See also Pilcher's article, "The Pamphlet War on the Proposed Virginia Anglican Episcopate, 1767-1775," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, XXX (1961), 266-79.

[33]Rind's *Virginia Gazette*, July 12, 1771.

clergy did not take part in the newspaper debate, and there is no other recorded evidence of their views on the issue. It may be fairly assumed that they opposed an episcopate, but it is impossible to determine the degree of their opposition.

Farther south there were some dissenting clergy who did comment on the subject. William Tennent of Charleston apparently accepted Charles Chauncy's position that the effort to secure an episcopate was a first move in a larger scheme to episcopize the colonies. Writing in the *Gazette* as "A Carolinian," Tennent sought to link the Anglican ministers with the tories, asserting that the Episcopal clergy were using the bishopric issue to bring the colonies under further English control. He believed that the only chance of success the Anglicans had

> in obtaining those *ecclesiastical principalities* lies in the support of parliamentary power. They therefore treat with disdain all our provincial assemblies, and are heated advocates for parliamentary taxation. Their pulpits, their conversation is only the echo to ministerial measures; and such has been their influence that shew me an Episcopalian in the New England colonies, and I will shew you an advocate for the present tyrannical measures of Lord N__th. These men have invariably joined the governors and loaded the colonies with eternal misrepresentations as disloyal and rebellious. They are to be considered, therefore, as highly instrumental in bringing down the present storm.[34]

Two days after this article was printed, Tennent wrote to Ezra Stiles that the Episcopalians

> here are highly enraged at your tory Clergy who are desirous of episcopal principalities, and many of the first in the province do declare to me that they will turn Dissenter in a Body

---

[34]"A Carolinian No. III," *SCG&CJ*, August 16, 1774.

> if the parliament offers to send Bishops over. The Spirit of constitutional Freedom runs too high here to admit of any check at present.[35]

John J. Zubly of Savannah earlier had taken about the same position as Tennent. Zubly supported Chauncy's views and, like Tennent, said that if a bishop came to America it "would make more dissenters in America in one year than many of us would make in an age."[36]

The only dissenting ministers who expressed any approval of an episcopate were the Methodist missionaries. Because they had a natural attachment to the Church of England, most were ready to support a bishop. Writing to Lord Dartmouth in 1774, one of them, Thomas Rankin, affirmed that

> such a person would certainly facilitate the work of God, and greatly promote the interest of the Church of England in these colonies: But I am ready to think, that our political troubles must first subside, before your Lordship will be able to be instrumental of making such an happy Era, to take place in this land.[37]

Rankin was correct in thinking that political problems adversely affected the drive for an episcopate. The Stamp Act greatly diminished the chances of securing a bishop; and indeed no Anglican bishop was established in the colonies before the outbreak of the Revolution.

Outside of the Methodists, only one other dissenting clergyman, Samuel Davies, favored an episcopate at an early stage. Writing to the

---

[35]William Tennent to Ezra Stiles, August 18, 1774, in Dexter, *Stiles Itineraries*, 576.

[36]John J. Zubly to Ezra Stiles, October 10, 1768, in *ibid.*, 598.

[37]Thomas Rankin to Lord Dartmouth, December 29, 1774, Dartmouth Manuscripts, Washington, D.C.

bishop of London in 1752 concerning the enforcement of the Toleration Act in Virginia, he expressed the opinion that an American bishop

> would have a happy tendency to reform the Church of England here, and maintain her purity: and therefore upon a report spread in Virginia, some time ago, that one was appointed, I expressed my satisfaction in it; and my poor prayers shall concur to promote it. I know this is also the sentiment of all my brethren in the Synod of New York, with whom I have conversed. I am, therefore, extremely surprised at the information your lordship has received concerning the reception of this proposal in New England, and 'that they used all their influence to obstruct it.' . . . If it be true, I think your lordship, that it is hardly consistent with a spirit of toleration, but it appears so unreasonable, and so opposite to the sentiments of all the dissenters whom I am acquainted with . . . that the informers must be persons of undoubted veracity, before I could credit it. However, my lord, I am not concerned: the Synod of New York, to which I belong, I am confident, have used no means to oppose it: but would rather concur to promote it, were it in their power.[38]

Davies was not one who enjoyed religious factionalism, and he thought that a bishop in America would aid in the improvement of the Anglican community. This was his sentiment in 1752 when he wrote to Benjamin Avery, a London minister, that he

> was not able to discern what injury the settlement of a bishop in Virginia or Maryland, where the Church of England is established, would be to the few dissenters in them; and I was not without hopes it might tend to purge out the corrupt leaven from the established church, and restrain the clergy from their extravagances, who now behave as they please, and promise themselves impunity as there is none to censure or depose them on this side the Atlantic.[39]

Davies may have been mistaken in stating that his ministerial colleagues in the Synod of New York viewed the possibilities of an

---

[38]Samuel Davies to Bishop of London, January 10, 1752, in Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 198-99.

[39]Samuel Davies to Benjamin Avery, May 21, 1752, in *ibid.*, 207.

episcopate as calmly as he did. Within a decade, the same Synod, after joining the Synod of Philadelphia, actively supported the General Convention called to oppose an episcopate. Nor did the dissenting ministers in London, with whom Davies corresponded frequently, support the idea of an American bishop; and one of them directly challenged the Virginian's assertion that others thought as he did. Dr. Benjamin Avery wrote to Davies:

> I shall not enter into any debate with you concerning the scheme proposed for erecting a Bishoprick in North America. The less is said on that head, either on your or on our side of the water, I believe the better. But one thing in yours addressed to his lordship greatly surprised me. You represent your friends in North America, particularly in New York, Virginia and Massachusetts, as far as your correspondence reaches, if not as desiring, yet as very willing to acquiesce, in having such an ecclesiastical superior officer sent over to America with power to ordain, confirm,&c. Now all my accounts from Connecticut, the Jerseys, & the [*sic*] Massachusetts, directly and strongly contradict this. They uniformly speak of it as a measure quite inconsistent with their peace and tranquillity. . . . Yours to his lordship is the first letter I have seen from those parts expressing a desire, or so much as an indifference and coolness on that head.[40]

Why did Davies favor an Anglican bishop? His position, as well as that of all dissenters, was a tenuous one in the 1750s. Dissenters in Virginia were in a minority, and Davies depended on the good offices of the Anglicans for his survival. In New York and New England, Presbyterians and Congregationalists were in a majority and could afford to be militantly anti-Anglican; Davies could not. Needing all the support he could get for his position on religious toleration, Davies expressed his sympathy for an episcopate in order to win the favor of the bishop of London.

---

[40]Benjamin Avery to Samuel Davies, 1752, in *ibid.*, 211-12.

His position was certainly different from the dissenters of the next decade and a half.

In general, not even the Anglican clergy or laity in the South took an active part in the agitation for an episcopate.[41] William Livingston, a New York lawyer and militant anti-Anglican, wrote in his newspaper column, the "American Whig," that, "From the best information I have been able to obtain, the clergy of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and the West India Islands had no concern in the late petitions transmitted on this subject."[42] William Nelson, President of the Virginia Council, declared that

> the Virginians, tho' almost all of the Episcopal Church, have as yet taken no part in the Dispute, the reason I believe is, that it is a matter of more indifference to us than to the other Provinces which are full of every kind of Dissenters inimical to Episcopacy.[43]

Zubly mentioned that there was only one Anglican minister, Samuel Frink of Savannah, who was in favor of a bishop, but beyond that, he did

> not know a Man in this Province & doubt whether a dozen be in South Carolina who are desirous of being blessed with any such Establishment, tho' I am acquainted with no inconsiderable

---

[41]Cross, *Anglican Episcopate*, 230.

[42]*New York Gazette*, June 6, 1768.

[43]William Nelson to Edward Hunt, May 11, 1771, in *William and Mary Quarterly*, V (1897), 149. Brydon, in his *Virginia's Mother Church*, II, 355-57, attempted to explain why the Anglican clergy in Virginia opposed a bishop. Among the reasons he gave were the following: (1) it was the wrong time to advocate a bishop as he would be a crown appointee and help to bind the colonies to England, (2) the power of the laity in appointing ministers had developed without a bishop, and (3) since the vestry was the political authority in a parish, laws in Virginia would have to be changed before a bishop could act at all.

number of episcopalians that would rather join against than for it.[44]

Why were the dissenting clergymen of the South not as aroused against an episcopate as were their fellow ministers in the North? Perhaps one reason was that by the 1760s they had little to worry about. Most of the agitation for an episcopate came from the North, and it was here that the Presbyterian and Congregationalist ministers rose in greatest opposition. If some of the leading Anglicans in Virginia opposed it, and if what Tennent and Zubly said was true about the small number advocating a bishop in their colonies, there was little need for the dissenting clergy to become involved in the matter. In principle, they opposed a bishopric, but their silence leads one to believe that it was not an important issue in the South.[45] The dissenting clergy there were more interested in whether their own local legislative assemblies would allow them to preach according to their conscience than in the possibility of a bishop in America.

A third religious issue that had a significant impact on the American Revolution was the reaction to the Quebec Act of 1774. This act extended the boundary of the province of Quebec southward to the Ohio River, accorded to the Roman Catholics free exercise of their religion, and also made provision for support of the Protestant clergy. One of

---

[44]Zubly to Ezra Stiles, October 10, 1768, in Dexter, *Stiles Itineraries*, 576.

[45]In regards to Georgia, Reba C. Strickland declared, "It is impossible to conclude, then, that this question [the episcopate] contributed anything in Georgia to the strengthening of opposition to British colonial policy." *Religion and the State in Georgia*, 140.

those opposing the act was John Zubly of Savannah. Writing as "Freeholder" in the *Georgia Gazette*, September 28, 1774, he charged that the Quebec Act established popery. Three months later he wrote that "every attempt to introduce Popish Principles and French law . . . was the result of *an unlawful combination*.'"[46] Inasmuch as British officials had used unlawful power to enslave Americans, Zubly concluded that the Quebec Act was only one in a series of acts designed to do just that. On July 14 of the next year, while a member of the Georgia Provincial Congress, he drew up a petition to the king stating that under the Quebec Act

> popery is not only tolerated (which we conceive would have been an act of justice), but an indulgence has been granted, little short of full establishment to a religion which is equally injurious to the rights of sovereign and of mankind.[47]

Later in the year, Zubly wrote to the Earl of Dartmouth requesting his aid in securing a reconciliation between the colonies and Britain. One of the American grievances he listed was the British "endeavor to stir up Popish *Canadians* and Savage *Indians* against the Colonists."[48]

When a group of Presbyterian ministers in Philadelphia wrote to their counterparts in North Carolina, appealing to the Presbyterians in the South not to desert the American cause, one example offered of the dangerous power of the British government was the establishment of "popery

---

[46]*Georgia Gazette*, December 14, 1774. Strickland in *Religion and the State in Georgia*, 140, thinks that the Quebec Act stirred up more resentment in Georgia than the episcopate controversy.

[47]Allen E. Candler, ed., *The Revolutionary Records of the State of Georgia* (3 vols., Atlanta, 1908), I, 265.

[48]John J. Zubly to Earl of Dartmouth, September 3, 1775, in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, VI, 637.

in Quebec and the arbitrary Law of France;" and the fear was expressed that the same might be done in Pennsylvania or North Carolina.[49]

Reactions to the Quebec Act revealed the virulent anti-Catholicism of the period. This prejudice was evident among the Protestant clergy of all the colonies, and the southern dissenting clergy were no exception. All the major dissenting groups in the South had creedal doctrines expressive of hostility to Roman Catholicism. Among them were the Westminster Confession of Faith, adopted by the Presbyterians; the Augsburg Confession and the Book of Concord, adhered to by the Lutherans and Salzburgers; the 1559 Confession of Faith held by the Reformed Church of France, or Huguenots; and the London Confession of Faith, adopted by the Regular Baptists in America. All of these doctrinal statements either called the pope the whore of Rome or looked upon the Mass as popish idolatry. Where there was not an open appeal to anti-Catholicism, the sentiment was implied in the statements about the defense of Protestantism. Such was the case when Charles Cummings, Presbyterian minister in Virginia, and others expressed their desire in the Fincastle Resolutions of 1775 to risk their lives in support of the Protestant religion, and to be loyal subjects as long as they could enjoy the free exercise of religion as Protestants.[50]

The Quebec Act aroused latent fears that had been dormant or long on the edge of consciousness. Before 1763, anti-Catholicism had been

---

[49]"An Address to the Ministers and Presbyterian Congregations in North Carolina," in Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 225.

[50]"Fincastle Resolves," in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, I, 1165-66.

connected with hostility to the French, such as that expressed by Samuel Davies and mentioned earlier. After the Quebec Act, anti-Catholicism became another device employed by the dissenting clergy to express their opposition to infringements on freedom of conscience. Expansion of Catholicism was viewed as a threat to the toleration already won by dissenters in the South. Any recognition of Catholicism represented a step in the direction of an eventual establishment of another state supported religion and the concurrent destruction of Protestantism in the English colonies. It was bad enough to live under the limitations of an established religion, but to establish popery, which most dissenters believed to be the anti-Christ, was something that could not be tolerated.

To what extent was this reaction to the spread of Catholicism in America a major cause of the Revolution? At least one modern historian regards the Quebec Act as a primary factor in the coming of the Revolution.[51] In general, there seems to have been a stronger reaction in the South against the Quebec Act than to the threat of a bishop, but it was still a milder response than that of the Congregationalists and Presbyterians of the North. In the South, even the press gave the matter much less attention.

---

[51]Charles Metzger says that "the Quebec Act was one of the outstanding grievances of the American colonists, and that the religious section of the bill, rather than the political, aroused fear and resentment" in *The Quebec Act, A Primary Cause of the American Revolution* (Vol. XVI of *the United States Catholic Historical Society Series*. New York, 1936), 90; however, Claude H. VanTyne ranks "religious bigotry" among the many causes of the Revolution in his article "Influence of Clergy, and of Religious Sectarian Forces, on the American Revolution," *American Historical Review*, XIX (1913), 44. See also Hilda Neatby, *The Quebec Act. Protest and Policy* (Scarborough, Ontario, 1972), chap. 4.

The major threat with which the dissenting clergy was concerned was limitations to their freedom of conscience. To think and to worship as one pleased were to them as important as any civil liberty. Under an established church the clergy felt they did not have the freedom to preach without restraint. They saw a definite connection between the struggle against the tyranny of the mother country and the fight for full religious liberty. Nowhere is this sentiment better revealed than in the words of a 1776 petition from the Hanover Presbytery:

> We would also represent, that dissenters from the Church of England, in this country, have ever been desirous to conduct themselves as peaceable members of the civil government, for which reason they have hitherto submitted to several ecclesiastical burdens, and restrictions, that are inconsistent with equal liberty. But now when the many and grievous oppressions of our mother country, have laid this continent under the necessity of casting off the yoke of tyranny, and of forming independent governments upon equitable and liberal foundations, we flatter ourselves that we shall be freed from all the incumbrances which a spirit of domination, prejudice, or bigotry, hath interwoven with most other political systems. . . .
>
> In this enlightened age, and in a land where all, of every denomination are united in the most strenuous efforts to be free, we cheerfully concur in removing every species of religious, as well as civil bondage. Certain it is, that every argument for civil liberty, gains additional strength when applied to liberty in the concerns of religion.[52]

A Presbyterian minister in Virginia, Caleb Wallace, made the connection between the Revolution and religious liberty plain when he asked:

> If this [established church] is continued, what great advantage from being independent of Great Britain? And is it not as bad for our Assembly to violate their own Declaration of Rights as for the British Parliament to break our Charter?[53]

---

[52]Petition of Hanover Presbytery to General Assembly of Virginia, 1776, in Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 323.

[53]Caleb Wallace to James Caldwell, April 8, 1777, in Whitsitt, *Caleb Wallace*, 40.

One Baptist clergyman who served in Virginia for six decades, William Fristoe, equated a monarchical government with an established church, calling them twins.[54] The implication clearly was that a republican government was best designed to promote religious toleration. So in the Revolution there was a double battle: against political enemies on the other side of the sea and against a religious establishment at home. Carl Becker's classic aphorism, then, had its religious as well as its political application.

In Virginia, religious toleration had been secured by the end of the French and Indian War, mainly because of the support given by Samuel Davies and the Presbyterians to the British during that conflict. As long as a dissenting minister applied to the General Court for a license and confined himself to the specified places for which he had been granted license, he could preach as long as he abided by the law. Thus the struggle for mere toleration was at an end. This first phase--toleration with restrictions--lasted until 1776 when a disestablishment law was passed. The period is characterized by imprisonment of Separate Baptists, a campaign to remove all restrictions, and finally an attempt to enforce the Declaration of Rights so as to secure complete disestablishment.

This form of toleration with restrictions was challenged only by the Separate Baptists who, on many occasions, did not secure the proper license. Believing that God was their sole authority, they thought that worship should take place whenever and wherever they desired. Generally, the Separate Baptists were considered a disturbing social element in the

---

[54]Fristoe, *History of the Ketocton Association*, 157.

community, agitating among that class of people which the upper class wished undisturbed.[55] As a result the Separate Baptist ministers were often arrested either as "disturbers of the peace" or for "raising Sedition & Strife amongst his Majesties Liege People."[56] It is estimated that from thirty to fifty arrests were made between 1768 and 1775, most of these on charges of "breach of the peace and good behavior." While the Baptist ministers Lewis Craig and John Waller were awaiting trial in Spottsylvania County, Virginia, in 1768, Deputy Governor John Blair wrote a letter on their behalf to the king's attorney, directing him

> not [to] molest these conscientious people so long as they behave themselves in a manner becoming pious Christians and in obedience to the laws, till the court, when they intend to apply for license, and when the gentlemen who complain may make their objections and be heard.[57]

An unidentified lawyer, in an open letter to the Baptist ministers in the Caroline County jail, attempted to explain why they were imprisoned for preaching: all men must abide by the laws of the community, he noted, but when a group goes

> about publickly preaching and inculcating their Errors, raising Factions tending to disturb the publick Peace, or

---

[55]Those who say the Baptists were arrested for being disturbers of the peace are H. J. Eckenrode, *Separation of Church and State in Virginia* (Richmond, 1910; reprint ed., 1971), 36-37; Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church*, II, 181; Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 315-18; Gewehr, *Great Awakening*, 128-34. On the other hand, Robert B. Semple, *A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Virginia* (New York, 1810), 14-25, thought the main persecutor was the Anglican church.

[56]See Court Order against Nathaniel Sounders, Culpeper County, Virginia, August 21, 1773, Va. Baptist Hist. Coll., Richmond.

[57]John Blair to King's Attorney of Spottsylvania County, July 16, 1768, in Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 316.

> utter Doctrines which in their Nature are subversive of all Religion or Morality, they become obnoxious to civil Punishment.[58]

Since the lawyer did not believe the ministers could give any evidence of their divine call to preach, their actions, he charged, removed all moral restraint from the people. The ministers, therefore, would be prosecuted if they did not live up to the law.

As a result of such ill-treatment, Baptists began to complain to the legislature, and their laments resulted in a 1772 "Bill for extending the benefit of the several Acts of Toleration." A digest of the various English acts of toleration regarding licenses, the bill provided for the doors of dissenter meeting houses to be open and prohibited night meetings as well as preaching to, teaching, or baptizing a slave without the master's permission. It further provided that all ministers should take the oath of allegiance and test oath.[59] This bill did not enlarge their liberties one bit, as far as dissenter ministers were concerned, and from this point on they began a campaign for full religious freedom without any restraints.

The Presbyterian and Baptist clergy actively opposed this proposed bill, their main concern being the partial and unequal treatment given the dissenter minister. The Hanover Presbytery on October 15, 1773, appointed Rev. John Todd and a layman to attend the House of Burgesses

---

[58]"An Address to the Anabaptists imprisoned in Caroline County, August 8, 1771," Purdie & Dixon's *Virginia Gazette*, Feburary 20, 1772.

[59]Bill printed in *ibid.*, March 26, 1772. It was not printed in Hening, *Statutes at Large*.

and express their opposition. Exactly what they said is unknown, for no copy of their protest has been found.[60] About the same time Baptist ministers meeting in Loudoun County petitioned the House to pass an act "giving the Petitioners and other Protestant dissenting Ministers liberty to preach in all proper places, and at all Seasons, without restraint."[61] In the fall of 1774 the Hanover Presbytery drafted another petition, believed to be the work of Rev. Caleb Wallace, in opposition to the bill.[62] Since Governor Gooch had promised full and free exercise of religion forty years before, the ministers thought that the present bill needed to be amended to be more liberal. They objected to being limited to a certain number of preaching stations and to the limitations on night meetings. The obligation to have unbarred doors, the ministers continued, cast suspicion upon them. Living up to their calling, they felt compelled to baptize a servant when he appeared truly penitent, and this was not teaching a servant to be disobedient. Among the requests the ministers made to the legislature were equal protection of the law, freedom to write and speak on religious subjects, and the right to hold estates and receive donations for the support of their churches and schools. This petition was presented to the House on June 5, 1775; it demonstrates that at this

---

[60]Minutes of Hanover Presbytery, October 15, 1773, Union Theological Seminary Library, Richmond.

[61]*Journals of House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1773-1776*, 102.

[62]Minutes of Hanover Presbytery, October 14, 1774; Whitsitt, *Caleb Wallace*, 34-38. The petition is printed in H. R. McIlwaine, *Legislative Journals of the Council of colonial Virginia* (3 vols., Richmond, 1919), III, 1590-93.

point the Presbyterian clergy believed they could live with the toleration laws, with certain modifications.

The House of Burgesses never acted on the 1772 bill because it became involved in political issues. So things stood when the Virginia Convention in June 1776 adopted a Declaration of Rights. The sixteenth article, on religion, declared

> that religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity towards each other.[63]

Stimulated by this broad definition of religious freedom, the Baptist and Presbyterian clergy flooded the October 1776 House of Delegates with petitions, markedly different from earlier ones. Instead of requesting equal treatment, the dissenter ministers now opposed church taxes entirely by appealing to the Declaration of Rights. Among these was the so called "Ten-thousand Name" petition, signed mostly by Baptists. The signers rejoiced at being delivered from British oppression but objected to being unfairly taxed while receiving no benefit from the state church.[64] A similar petition was sent from the Presbyterians in Berkeley County, signed by Hugh Vance, their pastor. They also hailed their deliverance

---

[63]Henry Steele Commager, ed., *Documents of American History* (8th edition, New York, 1968), 104.

[64]"Ten-thousand Name" petition, October 16, 1776, Religious Petitions Collection, Virginia State Archives, Richmond. Among the names signed to the petition are the Baptist ministers William Marshall, Samuel Harris, Lewis Craig, and David Thompson.

from Britain, saying that their hopes for complete liberty were confirmed by the Declaration of Rights. They stated further that

> the Ecclesiastical Establishment is what your Petitioners have ever looked upon as a grievous burden and inconsistent with the rights of humanity either civil or religious inasmuch as the supporting it while we cannot approve it is in our humble opinion, an infringement on our Civil Property, as well as our consciences.[65]

One of the important petitions was a memorial drawn up by Caleb Wallace, a Presbyterian minister. Sent to Williamsburg by the Hanover Presbytery to present this memorial to the House of Delegates, Wallace wrote later he was

> obliged . . . to make the case a particular study, which indeed I had done for sometime before, and to attend the General Assembly for six or eight weeks. . . . Thus has the affair ended, or rather proceeded, without producing any other consequences than a day or two's debating in the House and a little newspaper bickering.[66]

No doubt during his stay in Williamsburg Wallace consulted with at least three members of the Committee on Religion: Jefferson; his old friend, Madison; and his father-in-law, Samuel McDowell, the representative from Augusta County. In their petition, the Presbyterian ministers expressed their pleasure at the prospect of the removal of all religious restrictions yet emphasized that in the western part of the state dissenters

---

[65]Petition of dissenters from Berkeley County, October 25, 1776, Religious Petitions Collection, Virginia State Archives.

[66]Caleb Wallace to James Caldwell, April 8, 1777, in Whitsitt, *Caleb Wallace*, 41. Perhaps a part of this newspaper bickering that Wallace mentioned concerned the "Queries on the Subject of Religious Establishments" in Purdie's *Virginia Gazette*, November 8, 1776, believed to have been written by Wallace in reply to an article signed "A Member of the Established Church," in the *Gazette*, November 1, 1776. See Whitsitt, *Caleb Wallace*, 43.

still paid heavy church taxes despite the presence of only a few Episcopalians. They insisted that the existence of an established church greatly retarded the arts, science, and manufacturing by discouraging people from settling there. Virginia might have been the "Capital of America . . . had it not been prevented by her religious Establishment." In addition, the Gospel required no civil aid, as the Savior's kingdom was not of this world. Therefore, the petition concluded, all religious sects should be protected by exemption from any taxes for the support of religion.[67]

The only dissenting minister who favored maintaining the established church was the Methodist George Shadford.[68] His was the only signature "signed in behalf of the whole body of the people commonly called Methodists" to a petition presented to the House on October 28. The Methodists thought that "very bad consequences would arise from the abolishment of the Establishment;" therefore, they wished it to continue. The Methodist position is not surprising in view of the fact that the Wesley missionaries were still part of the Anglican communion.

These and other petitions were debated in committee and before the whole House beginning November 9. In this debate there was a real struggle between the proponents of disestablishment, Thomas Jefferson and James

---

[67]The petition is printed in Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 323-24.

[68]Petition of the General Convention of Methodists, October 28, 1776, Religious Petitions Collection, Virginia State Archives. George Shadford preached on the Brunswick Circuit in Virginia during 1775-76. He refused to sign the Loyalty Oath and returned to England in 1778.

Madison, and their chief opponents, Edmund Pendleton and Robert Carter Nicholas.[69] After much deliberation a bill was passed in December 1776 to exempt dissenters from church taxes and to suspend the salaries of the Anglican clergy.[70] The House made no decision on whether church and state, in view of their different origins and distinctive functions, should be separated, which left the door open for a general assessment.

Those opposing a general religious assessment regarded themselves as guardians of the purity of the church, best sustained by voluntary contributions. Fearing state control, a group of Baptist ministers declared on December 25, 1776:

> If, therefore, the State provides a Support for Preachers of the Gospel, and they receive it in Consideration of their Services, they must certainly when they Preach act as Officers of the State. . . . The Consequence of this is, that those whom the State employs in its Service, it has a Right to *regulate* and *dictate to*; it may judge and determine *who* shall preach; *when* and *where* they shall preach; and *what* they must preach.[71]

The Presbyterian ministers Samuel Stanhope Smith and David Rice drafted a similar memorial for the Hanover Presbytery, also objecting to governmental authority over churches as "entirely subversive of religious liberty."[72] Additionally, the Presbytery in June of 1777 appointed five

---

[69]For review of this debate see Eckenrode, *Church and State*, 47ff; Boyd, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, I, 525ff.

[70]Hening, *Statutes at Large*, IX, 164-67.

[71]"Declaration of the Virginia Association of Baptists," December 25, 1776, in Boyd, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, I, 660-61.

[72]"Memorial of Hanover Presbytery, April 25, 1777," in Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 326-27. For information on Rice see note 41 of Chapter III. Smith, born in Pennsylvania in 1751, received a bachelor's

ministers--Richard Sankey, John Todd, David Rice, Caleb Wallace, and Samuel Stanhope Smith--to meet and act on behalf of the Presbytery in this matter.[73] For unexplained reasons, however, nothing was done in the House in this subject for three years.

In 1779, the dissenting clergy were encouraged by a bill prepared by Thomas Jefferson and presented to the House at that time. This bill called for complete freedom of thought in matters of religion, providing

> that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer, on account of his religious opinions or beliefs; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion.[74]

In general, dissenters approved of Jefferson's bill. John Todd, a Presbyterian minister, thanked him for a copy of the bill, adding:

> I guess at the author of the bill and I love and esteem the man. The Sentiments are the Sentiments of my heart, and therefore cordially approve them. It is my wish the author of the

---

degree from the College of New Jersey in 1769, after which he was tutor until 1773. In addition to this school, two others, Yale and Harvard, bestowed honorary doctor's degrees on him. He was ordained into the Presbyterian ministry in 1775 and settled as minister in Cumberland and Prince Edward counties, Virginia. He was president of the Presbyterian academy, later known as Hampden-Sydney, from 1775 to 1779 and then became a professor of Moral Philosophy at Princeton. He later became president of that institution, 1795-1812. See *DAB*, XVII, 344; Sprague, *Annals*, III, 335-45; Willard Thorp, *The Lives of Eighteen from Princeton* (Princeton, 1946), 86-110.

[73]Minutes of Hanover Presbytery, June 19, 1777, Union Theological Seminary Library, Richmond.

[74]A copy of the bill is in Boyd, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, II, 545-47.

> bill may find men of like Sentiment and abilities enough to pass it safely thro' the Assembly.[75]

Meeting in Amelia County, October 1779, the Baptist Association adopted a resolution with similar sentiments:

> The said bill, in our opinion, puts religious freedom upon its proper basis; prescribes the just limits of the power of the state, with regard to religion; and properly guards against partiality towards any religious denomination; we, therefore, heartily approve of the same, and wish it to pass into a law.[76]

The wish was not fulfilled, however, until 1785.

In addition to the objection to general assessment the dissenting clergy sought certain changes in the marriage laws. Dissenting ministers were forbidden to perform marriage ceremonies, and in 1780 several Baptist petitions were sent to the Assembly on this subject. One such, approved by the ministers and laymen at an Association at Waller's Meeting House in May 1780, requested an act

> Declaring Mariges [*sic*] Solemnized by Dissenting Ministers either by License, or publication; Valid in law, for until such an Act shall take place; the Validity of Dissenters rights to officiate in the Same, is much disputed: as the following instances makes manifest of [Anglican] Ministers exacting the exorbitant Sum of Sixty Pounds for that Service from two very poor people; and two Barrels of Corn from a Baptist, who applyed to his Minister who refused because the Licence was directed to a Minister of the Church of England.[77]

---

[75]John Todd to Thomas Jefferson, August 16, 1779, in *ibid.*, III, 68-69. Todd, after receiving a degree from the College of New Jersey in 1749, was ordained a Presbyterian minister in 1751. He worked with Samuel Davies in Hanover and Louisa counties, Virginia, and also conducted a classical school in that area. See Sprague, *Annals*, III, 144.

[76]Quoted in Semple, *Baptists in Virginia*, 65.

[77]Petition quoted in Eckenrode, *Church and State*, 66. A similar petition from a Baptist Association held in Charlotte County, November 8, 1780, is also quoted in *ibid.*, 67-69.

Heeding these petitions, the Assembly in December 1780 passed a law to allow any minister to perform a marriage ceremony, provided there was a proper license or a publication of banns. Judges of the county courts were authorized to issue licenses to four ministers of each sect in a county to perform the marriage ceremony within the bounds of that county alone.[78]

This limitation on the place of performing marriage ceremonies was not satisfactory to the dissenting clergy, for quite often they served in more than one county. As a result, both Baptist and Presbyterian ministers requested the removal of these limitations in several petitions during the next four years.[79] Basing their appeal on the Declaration of Rights and the removal of all English restrictions as a result of the war, the petitioners generally expressed the hope that no religious oppression would "remain to damp the general joy, enervate the springs of liberty, and alienate the affections of the different denominations from each other."[80] As a result, the marriage act was changed in 1784 to allow all ministers to perform ceremonies according to the forms of their respective churches,[81] thus eliminating any exclusive privileges over marriage rites by Anglicans.

---

[78]Hening, *Statutes at Large*, X, 361.

[79]Among these are petitions printed in Eckenrode, *Church and State*, 69, 77, 84-85; Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church*, II, 582-87; Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 333.

[80]"Address of the Baptist Association Against Restrictive Laws," May 12, 1783, in Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church*, II, 582.

[81]Hening, *Statutes at Large*, XI, 503.

By 1784 the general assessment issue was raised again, but this time it was tied to the matter of incorporation of religious groups, inasmuch as the Episcopal clergy had asked for incorporation in June of that year. A Presbyterian minister and President of Hampden-Sydney College, John Blair Smith, wrote to James Madison asking him to lend his support against incorporation. Of the Anglican measure, Smith observed that this was

> an express attempt to draw the State into an illicit connection & commerce with them, which is already the ground of that uneasiness which at present prevails thro' a great part of the State. According to the spirit of that prayer, the Legislature is to consider itself as the head of that Party, & consequently they as members are to be fostered with particular care. . . . I am sorry that Christian ministers should virtually declare their Church a mere political machine, which the State may regulate at present; but shall be surprized if the Assembly shall assume the improper office.[82]

It is impossible to determine whether Smith influenced Madison or not, but Madison held the same view on incorporation.

The fall session of the House of Delegates was an important one because it dealt with several religious issues. It not only revised the marriage law, as mentioned above, but also passed the bill to incorporate the Episcopal clergy.[83] At the same time a general assessment bill was introduced which would have created a multiple establishment with the people declaring the denomination they wished to support. The latter

---

[82]John B. Smith to James Madison, June 21, 1784, in Eckenrode, *Church and State*, 81. Smith was a brother of Samuel Stanhope Smith and succeeded him as president of Hampden-Sydney College.

[83]Hening, *Statutes at Large*, XI, 532.

bill was deferred until the next session but was printed to allow the people to offer their opinions about it.

The reaction of the Hanover Presbytery is significant. When the Presbytery met at Timber Ridge on October 27, 1784, it requested William Graham and John Blair Smith to prepare a memorial on assessment and incorporation to be presented to the House.[84] The bill for incorporating the Episcopal clergy was condemned as it would

> establish an immediate, a peculiar, and for that very reason, in our opinion, illicit connection between government, and such as were thus distinguished. The Legislature would be the head of a religious party. . . . The principle too, which this system aims to establish, is both false and dangerous to religion.[85]

In regard to assessment, the Presbytery accepted the practice in a qualified way, when it stated that

> should it be thought necessary at present for the Assembly to exert this right of supporting religion in general by an assessment on all the people, we wish it to be done on the most *liberal plan*.[86]

The Presbytery also approved a plan of assessment and appointed three ministers--John Todd, William Graham, and John Blair Smith--to present both the memorial and the assessment plan to the House.[87]

---

[84]Minutes of the Hanover Presbytery, October 27, 1784, Union Theological Seminary Library, Richmond.

[85]The memorial is printed in Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 336-38.

[86]*Ibid.*, 337.

[87]Minutes of Hanover Presbytery, October 27, 1784, quoted in Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 338. Eckenrode, *Church and State*, 89-92, interprets the religious issues in terms of a conflict between the forces of conservatism and democracy. To him the conservatives reacted to the democratic excesses of 1776 by trying to get an assessment bill and thus the

This reputed support of a "liberal plan" of assessment has caused some confusion. Were the Presbyterian ministers actually advocating general assessment? This led Madison to comment that the "Presbyterian Clergy have remonstrated agst any narrow principles, but indirectly favor a more comprehensive establish[ment]."[88] A little later Madison found out that all the dissenting clergy opposed assessment

> except the Presbyterians who seem as ready to set up an establishment which is to take them in as they were to pull down that which shut them out. I do not know a more shameful contrast than might be found between their memorials on the latter and former occasion.[89]

The best explanation for the Presbyterian position is that the Presbyterian ministers assumed some form of an assessment bill would be passed by the Assembly, and they were willing to support it so long as the Anglican clergy were denied incorporation.

John Blair Smith and John Todd did appear before the House on November 18, 1785. Even though they did not object to incorporation by the state in a purely civil sense, they protested incorporating any order of men or any religious society. Incorporation was unnecessary because all ministers already had the right to meet and discuss ecclesiastical

---

eastern Presbyterian clergy were led to accept assessment while the western Presbyterian laity opposed assessment. The conservatives lost the battle when Patrick Henry left the Assembly to become governor of the state.

[88]James Madison to James Monroe, November 14, 1784, in Gaillard Hunt, ed., *The Writings of James Madison* (9 vols., New York, 1900-1910), II, 90.

[89]Madison to Monroe, April 12, 1785, in *ibid.*, 132.

matters; incorporation was dangerous because it would implicitly recognize the state's power in spiritual matters.[90] No mention was made of assessment, suggesting further that Smith and his co-religionists had come to accept it as a *fait accompli*.

By the spring of 1785, however, the Presbyterian ministers again began to oppose assessment. There is some evidence that the Presbyterian laity of the western part of the state influenced this change, for when the Hanover Presbytery met at Bethel in Augusta County, May 19, 1785, a petition was presented from the Augusta Church requesting an explanation of the term "liberal plan" of assessment in the memorial of the preceding fall. Thus, the Presbytery voted unanimously to oppose any kind of assessment.[91] This change among the Presbyterian clergy led Madison to comment a few days later that

> the Presbyterian Clergy too were in general friends to the scheme [assessment], [and] are already in another tone, either compelled by the laity of the sect, or alarmed at the probability of further interference of the Legislature, if they once begin to dictate in matters of Religion.[92]

---

[90]Petition printed in Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church*, II, 594; *Journal of House of Delegates*, November 18, 1784, p. 29.

[91]Minutes of Hanover Presbytery, May 19, 1785, Union Theological Seminary Library, Richmond.

[92]James Madison to James Monroe, May 29, 1785, in Hunt, *Writings of Madison*, II, 145. Later in the year, Madison wrote to Thomas Jefferson, August 20, 1785 (*ibid.*, 163-64), that

> the Presbyterian clergy, have at length espoused the side of the opposition [to general assessment], being moved either by *a fear of their laity* or *a jealousy of the episcopalians*. The mutual hatred of these sects has been much inflamed by the late Act incorporating the latter. I *am far* from being *sorry for it*, as *a coalition between them* could *alone endanger our religious rights*, and a tendency to *such an event had been suspected*.

The Presbytery also agreed to call a general convention of all Presbyterian churches to meet at Bethel on August 10 to discuss further the problem.

The forces opposing assessment gained strength during the summer of 1785, especially after Madison wrote his "Memorial and Remonstrance" on the relationship between religion and the state. Basing his views on the Virginia Declaration of Rights, Madison emphasized that the practice of religion was a right of conscience, an unalienable right and a duty towards the Creator. Since the privilege of free religion has the same basis as any other natural right, religion should not be abridged by civil society nor a legislative body. The rulers who are guilty of such encroachments, Madison said, are tyrants and the people who submit to it are slaves.

The Presbyterians made efforts to get full attendance at their fall convention by advertising in the *Gazette*,[93] and at Bethel on August 10 they approved a memorial, largely the work of William Graham, minister and rector at Liberty Hall Academy in Lexington. This memorial was a rejection of any connection between church and state. Relying heavily on Madison's "Memorial," it read, in part, that

> religion is altogether personal, and the right of exercising it unalienable; and it is not, cannot, and ought not to be, resigned to the will of the society at large; and much less to the Legislature.[94]

---

[93] *Virginia Gazette*, June 4, 1785.

[94] Memorial printed in Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 342.

The Presbytery did not oppose incorporation merely to deny the Episcopal church its property but rather to express objection to the idea of the state regulating concerns of the spirit. Any religious regulation by the state would invade the divine prerogative and also favor one church over another.

At a meeting of the general committee of ministers at Dupuy's Meeting House, August 13, 1785, the Baptists also opposed assessment because it was

> repugnant to the spirit of the gospel, for the legislature thus to proceed in matters of religion: that no human laws ought to be established for this purpose, but that every person ought to be left entirely free, in respect to matters of religion; that the holy author of our religion, needs no such compulsive measures for the promotion of his cause; . . . and that, should the legislature assume the right of taxing the people for the support of the gospel it will be destructive to religious liberty.[95]

Reuben Ford was appointed to present these sentiments to the House. In order to bring more pressure on the legislature, the Baptist committee recommended to the churches the preparation of petitions in their respective counties, if they had not already done so. For example, the Mill Swamp Church, Isle of Wight County, approved a petition against assessment and appointed men to present it to the inhabitants of that county and neighboring Surry County.[96] This protest and others reflect the influence of Madison's Remonstrance, in substance and phraseology.

---

[95]Quoted in Semple, *Baptists in Virginia*, 71.

[96]Minutes of the Mill Swamp Baptist Church, Isle of Wight County, Virginia, June 17, 1785, Va. Baptist Hist. Coll., Richmond.

The principal point made in all of them was that religion did not need the aid of the state for its existence.

When the House met in October 1785, it was flooded with remonstrances against assessment. There is some evidence, too, that John Blair Smith appeared before the committee of the whole House to speak against assessment.[97] The bill was accordingly lost in committee, and instead Jefferson's bill for establishing religious freedom was approved.[98] The Revolution had been fulfilled as far as the Virginia Baptist and Presbyterian ministers were concerned, and liberty of religion was complete.

In North Carolina the situation was not as complex, inasmuch as the established church there was not as strong as in Virginia.[99] Royal governors were given instructions to strengthen the Church of England, but the influx of the Scotch-Irish prevented progress in this direction. On account of the recognition given dissenters in the Vestry Act of 1715 and the lack of enforcement of the Toleration Act of 1689, dissenting ministers in North Carolina were free to preach wherever they wished.[100]

One method used to keep dissenters under control, however, was to enforce the Schism Act of 1714, which prohibited a schoolmaster from

---

[97]Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 345, 431; *Evangelical and Literary Magazine*, IX, 43. It has been suggested that Reuben Ford appeared there on behalf of the Baptists. *Virginia Historical Collection*, IX, 125n.

[98]Hening, *Statutes at Large*, XII, 27.

[99]A review of the religious issues in North Carolina is Stephen B. Weeks, *Church and State in North Carolina* (Vol. XI of *John Hopkins Studies*. Baltimore, 1893).

[100]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, II, 207.

conducting classes unless licensed by the bishop of London. The act had been repealed by Parliament in 1718, but royal governors continued to enforce it in North Carolina after that date.[101] Facing this difficulty, the Presbyterians of Mecklenburg County attempted to secure a charter for their school, Queen's College. Joseph Alexander, Presbyterian minister in Mecklenburg, had conducted a classical school since 1767; and in 1771 the General Assembly of North Carolina granted the school a charter. Consequently, Governor Tryon notified the Board of Trade in London that while the president of the college would be of the established church, the trustees and tutors would probably be Presbyterian.[102] Taking the hint from Tryon's letter, the Board, in recommending to the king that the charter be disallowed, said that the college would operate as a seminary "for the education and Instruction of youth in the Principles of the Presbyterian Church." The Board thought it a duty, however, to question whether His Majesty should

> add Incouragement to toleration by giving the Royal Assent to an Establishment which in its consequences promises with great and permanent advantages to a sect of Dissenters from the Established Church.[103]

The charter was thereupon disallowed, but Queen's College flourished nevertheless, its name being changed to Liberty Hall in 1777.

The most important issue to the dissenting clergy in North Carolina was the validity of marriages. By the Marriage Act of 1741, ceremonies

---

[101] *Ibid.*, III, 11.

[102] *Ibid.*, VII, 526.

[103] *Ibid.*, IX, 248-50.

were to be performed by Anglican ministers or magistrates, the Anglican minister receiving the fee. One of the problems that Governor Tryon saw with the 1741 act was

> the frequent abuses by rascally fellows who travelled thro' the province under the title of ministers of the Presbyterian and other sectaries and who being beggars in conscience as well as in circumstances sought all opportunities to perform that sacred office to the great prejudice of the country.[104]

These illegal marriages, however, were declared valid by the new Marriage Law of 1766, which made it possible for Presbyterian ministers, but not other dissenting clergymen, to perform marriage ceremonies as long as the fee was paid to the Anglican minister.

The injustice of this law was soon recognized, and the Presbyterians of Mecklenburg and other counties petitioned Tryon for repeal of both the vestry and marriage acts.[105] Tryon did show some concern for the petitioners, and the need for support during the Regulator movement caused him to compromise.

Controlled by the "Presbyterian Party," the Assembly of 1770 passed a law allowing Presbyterian ministers to perform marriage ceremonies without paying the fee to the Anglican minister. Governor Tryon seemed to be pleased at this action, as it would in effect reward the Presbyterian ministers for their recent support against the Regulators. When Tryon sent the bill to London to be reviewed, he recommended that it be

---

[104]Governor Tryon to Earl of Shelburne, January 31, 1767, in *ibid.*, VII, 432.

[105]Petition printed in *ibid.*, X, 1015-17. Other petitions in *ibid.*, VIII, 80; IX, 523.

allowed to stand. Realizing that the bishop of London might have some objection, Tryon explained that

> if it is not thought too much to interfere with and check the Growth of the Church of England, I am sensible the Attachment the Presbyterians have shown to Government merit the Indulgence of this Act. The House of Assembly by their Journals set forth at large their Reason for framing this Bill, A Testimony that plainly evinced the Presbyterians were the strongest party in the House.[106]

The Board of Trade nevertheless recommended that the act be disallowed, as it would "operate as a Bounty to the tolerated Religion at the expense of the established."[107] The attitude of an Anglican missionary, James Reed, is indicative of the position held by churchmen:

> it was good policy to keep the Dissenters in as good humour as possible, at such a critical juncture. Should this Act receive the Royal assent, it would be a fatal stroke to the Church of England. But as the Insurrection [Regulators] is entirely quelled I flatter myself with hope that the Act will meet with a repulse.[108]

The act was accordingly disallowed.

Even though Baptist ministers could not perform marriage ceremonies by the law of 1766, they did so anyway. T. S. Drage, minister of St. Luke's Parish, complained in 1771 that "Anabaptists" itinerant preachers were performing the ceremony and paying no marriage fees.[109] It was a

---

[106]William Tryon to Lord Hillsborough, March 12, 1771, in William S. Powell and others, eds., *The Regulators of North Carolina: A Documentary History, 1759-1776* (Raleigh, 1971), 364.

[107]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, IX, 251.

[108]James Reed to Secretary of Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, July 2, 1771, in *ibid.*, 6.

[109]*Ibid.*, VIII, 505.

Baptist minister, however, who paved the way for eventual freedom. Henry Abbott, member of the Fifth Provincial Congress, introduced a successful resolution in December 1776 empowering all ministers to perform the marriage ceremony according to the rites and ceremonies of their respective churches.[110]

Adoption of the new state constitution in 1776 brought disestablishment and considerable religious freedom in North Carolina. David Caldwell, Presbyterian minister, and Henry Abbott, Baptist minister, were members of the Fifth Provincial Congress which drew up the new constitution,[111] the latter being one of the members of the committee which drafted that document and a bill of rights.[112] It is difficult to determine just how much influence these men had in bringing about religious liberty, but there is a tradition that Caldwell helped to draw up Article XXXII of the constitution, declaring that no person who denied the being of God or the Protestant religion should hold an office in the state.[113] This is in agreement with his later recollections as a member of the convention in North Carolina to ratify the Federal Constitution, when he noted that

---

[110]Walter Clark, ed., *State Records of North Carolina* (26 vols., Goldsboro, 1886-1907), XXIII, 997. Abbott was born in London about 1745. Not much is known of his early life, but he became a Baptist minister and settled in Pasquotank County, North Carolina. He was one of the most active Baptists politically, serving in the North Carolina congresses. See Chapter VI below.

[111]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 914-15.

[112]*Ibid.*, 918.

[113]Foote, *Sketches of North Carolina*, 240; Caruthers, *David Caldwell*, 190.

> even those who do not regard religion, acknowledge that the christian religion, is best calculated of all religions to make good members of society on account of its morality. I think then . . . that in a political view those gentlemen who formed this constitution, should not have given this invitation [to hold public office] to Jews and heathen[s].[114]

Tradition also credits Abbott with Article XIX of the bill of rights which stated that all men had a right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, as well as Article XXXIV of the constitution which brought complete disestablishment of religion.[115] Lemuel Burkitt, another Baptist minister and a friend of Abbott, said of him, "we owe our thanks, in a measure, for the security of some of our religious rights."[116] There is no way to prove the truth of these traditional accounts.

In South Carolina there was also very little disturbance over religious issues, and no attempt was made there to place limitations on the dissenting clergy by requiring licenses. When the state constitution was approved in 1776, there was little agitation for disestablishment even though William Tennent, the Congregational minister in Charleston, was a member of the Provincial Congress. That the temporary constitution

---

[114]Jonathan Elliot, ed., *Debates in the Several State Conventions, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution* (5 vols., Washington, 1836-1845), IV, 202.

[115]George W. Paschal, *History of North Carolina Baptists* (2 vols., Raleigh, 1930-55), I, 455-59; Huggins, *North Carolina Baptists*, 97-98.

[116]Lemuel Burkitt and Jesse Read, *A Concise History of the Kehukee Baptist Association* (Halifax, North Carolina, 1803), 107-9. Weeks, *Church and State*, 58, agrees, stating: "Burkitt was a contemporary and an acquaintance of Abbott, and we may assume that the statement is substantially correct."

simply ignored the question is understandable, since a majority of the leaders of the Revolution were of the Anglican church. The records of the first General Assembly under the authority of this new constitution disclose no discussion of the disestablishment issue, even though there were three dissenting clergymen present, William Tennent, John Harris, and Paul Turquand.[117]

It was about the time of the adoption of this constitution in March 1776, however, that the dissenters began to advocate freedom from the church tax. Elhanan Winchester, Baptist pastor at Welsh Neck, proposed that a meeting of the clergy be held at the High Hills Church in April to choose delegates to attend the General Assembly in order to obtain some relief from ecclesiastical oppressions,[118] and he drew up some resolutions to be laid before the meeting.

The meeting was held on April 24, 1776, at the High Hills of the Santee Baptist Church, where Richard Furman was pastor. While it is not known whether dissenting clergy of all denominations or only Baptists participated, there is some evidence that ministers of different denominations were present.[119] Not much is known about what transpired here, but as a result of the meeting, petitions to the General Assembly were

---

[117]W. Edwin Hemphill and others, eds., *Journals of the General Assembly and House of Representatives, 1776-1780* (Columbia, 1970), 301-7.

[118]Minutes of Welch Neck Baptist Church, Society Hill, South Carolina, 1737-1952, microfilm in S. C. Baptist Hist. Coll., Greenville.

[119]Cook, *Richard Furman*, 11, 53, says ministers of all denominations attended, while David D. Wallace, *South Carolina, A Short History* (Columbia, 1961), 215, contends that only Baptist ministers were present.

probably circulated throughout South Carolina. One such, believed to have been written by William Tennent, is known as the "Dissenters' Petition."[120] Declaring religious liberty to be the most valuable of all liberties, it contended that abridgement not only denied the common rights of mankind but also tended to create discord and unhappiness. Since the legislature was framing a constitution to perpetuate the peoples' freedom, the best security against the encroachments of one denomination over another would be to insert a clause in the constitution to read

> that there never shall be any establishment of any one religious denomination or sect of Protestant Christians in this state by way of preference to another; that no Protestant inhabitant of this state shall by law be denied the enjoyment of any civil right merely on account of his religious principles, but that all Protestants demeaning themselves peaceably under the government established by the constitution shall enjoy free, and equal civil and religious privileges.[121]

Even though Tennent was not reelected to the General Assembly in October 1776, he did appear before the new House on January 11, 1777, to make a speech on behalf of the dissenter petition. In reiterating his opposition to an established church, he stated that

---

[120]Edward McCrady, *The History of South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780* (New York, 1901; reprint ed., New York, 1969), 106-7; Howe, *Presbyterian Church in South Carolina*, I, 370.

[121]An original of the petition is in the Tennent manuscripts, South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston. It is printed in Jones, "Writings of Tennent," 194-95. A slightly different wording of the above-quoted portion is in a letter of Richard Hutson to Isaac Hayne, January 18, 1772, printed in McCrady, *South Carolina, 1775-1780*, pp. 212-13. There is a printed copy with signatures of a similarly worded petition, dated November 25, 1776, Briton's Neck, in the Carver-Dargan Library, Southern Baptist Historical Commission, Nashville, Tennessee.

> the rights of conscience are unalienable, and therefore, all laws to bind it, are, *ipso facto*, null and void. Every attempt of this kind is tyranny, . . . Of all tyranny, religious tyranny is the worst.[122]

Tennent added that an established religion created legal distinctions and deprived some people of privileges enjoyed by others. To Tennent, inequalities were inconsistent with justice. As an example of such injustice, he cited the large sums of money which dissenters paid in taxes to support the Church of England even though there were only twenty Anglican churches in the state alongside seventy-nine dissenting congregations.[123] Rejecting both the proposed plan to tax only the Anglicans and the plan for a multi-establishment with a general assessment. Tennent believed each church should be supported by its own members. Finally, he insisted that religious establishments discouraged the growth of a free state and endangered its future peace and happiness. Tennent had no objection to the Church of England retaining its property; he simply wanted to insure that their privileges were not enlarged or the religious liberties of dissenters curtailed. Since the legislature was drawing up

---

[122]William Tennent, *Mr. Tennent's Speech on the Dessenting Petition, Delivered . . . January 11, 1777* (Charleston, 1777), 6-7. This speech by Tennent was one of his last public efforts on behalf of his state. He died on August 11, 1777, as he was returning from New Jersey bringing his widowed mother to Charleston. Oliver Hart said of him, while preaching his funeral sermon, "He had a just idea of the equal rights of mankind, with regard to conscience and religion; and in a masterly manner defended those rights, in the honourable House of Assembly. His benevolent heart was much set upon procuring full and equal *religious liberty*, to all the inhabitants of the state," in *The Character of a truly great Man delineated, and his Death deplored as a public Loss* (Charleston, 1777), 29.

[123]*Ibid.*, 8-12.

a constitution for the ages, now was the appropriate occasion to grant full religious liberty. Drawing upon historical examples to show how liberties had been put off too long by others, Tennent concluded that to delay justice was to deny it.[124]

Tennent was supported by William Henry Drayton and Christopher Gadsden, and during the winter of 1777-1778 the issue became merged with the larger one of writing a new constitution. In this effort, Gadsen took the lead in securing disestablishment.[125] The new constitution declared (Article XXXVIII) the "Christian Protestant religion" to be the established religion of the state but specified that all denominations should have "equal religious and civil privileges."[126] Provisions were made for any church to be incorporated as long as the beliefs of its members subscribed to five general articles of faith. This new constitution was approved in 1777 but did not go into effect until March 1778. No other ministers worked as hard as William Tennent and the two Baptist minister, Richard Furman and Oliver Hart, for complete religious liberty in South Carolina.

To show its pleasure, the Charleston Baptist Association sent out a Circular Letter to the churches, written by the minister Elhana Winchester, recommending the acceptance of the new constitution and expressing

---

[124] *Ibid.*, 21-54.

[125] William Dabney and Marion Dargan, *William Henry Drayton and the American Revolution* (Albuquerque, 1962), 142; Richard Walsh, *The Writings of Christopher Gadsden* (Columbia, 1966), xxiii.

[126] Francis N. Thorpe, ed., *The Federal and State Constitutions* (7 vols., Washington, 1909), VI, 3255-56.

satisfaction at "the Prospect of obtaining universal Religious Liberty in this State; an Event which must cause every generous Mind to rejoice."[127] Oliver Hart, the Baptist minister in Charleston, expressed his own hope a few days later for the achievement of religious liberty "in its full extent." Apparently concerned whether the Baptists in the backcountry would be friendly towards the new government, he commented:

> Therefore let all of us who are willing to stand up in support of our happy constitution unite together in one band; we shall thereby appear the more respectable in the eyes of government.[128]

In South Carolina the dissenting clergy seemed to have had little difficulty in performing marriage ceremonies, although some Anglican clergy claimed these marriages were invalid. Charles Woodsmason, Anglican minister on the frontier, argued that some couples who had been married by "Itinerant Dissenting Ministers" should be remarried according to the Episcopal liturgy to validate the ceremonies. He estimated that one dissenting clergyman married 140 couples in 1767, "all of whom ought to have come to me."[129] In his *Remonstrance*, a document on backcountry grievances presented to the General Assembly on November 7, 1767, Woodsmason recommended that all itinerant preachers be prohibited from performing the marriage ceremony.[130] Sometime in the late 1760s or early 1770s

---

[127] *Minutes of Charleston Baptist Association, February 3-5, 1777* [Charleston, 1777].

[128] Oliver Hart to Richard Furman, February 12, 1777, Furman Correspondence, Baptist Hist. Coll., Greenville.

[129] Hooker, *Carolina Backcountry*, 15, 41.

[130] *Ibid.*, 232.

the Anglicans succeeded in preventing dissenting ministers from performing marriages.[131] This is attested to by Josiah Smith, Jr., a merchant in Charleston, who noted in 1772 that he could not remember any instance in which a dissenting clergyman performed a marriage except a special case, and he added:

> nor can we Expect favour of this kind, which [while] we unhappily Remain under an Episcopal Establishment which our predecessors were cheated into about Fourty years ago.[132]

William Tennent, in his speech on the dissenter petition before the General Assembly, mentioned that licenses for marriages were refused to any except the Anglican clergy. Nevertheless, dissenting clergy on the frontier probably married couples regularly despite the prohibition, because of the absence of Anglican ministers in the backcountry.

Georgia had the most liberal attitude towards the dissenting clergy, because the establishment law here did not bar dissenting clergymen, and the Toleration Act of 1689 requiring licenses was not applied to the colony. As a result, Baptist, Lutheran, Congregational, and Presbyterian ministers were free to preach, especially on the frontier.[133] There is only one recorded instance of a dissenting clergyman, the Baptist minister Daniel Marshall, being arrested for preaching; but no law of Georgia

---

[131] See the conclusion reached by Wallace, *South Carolina*, 207; B. D. Barger, *Royal South Carolina* (Columbia, 1970), 37.

[132] Josiah Smith, Jr., to Oliver Deming, December 8, 1772, Josiah Smith Letterbook. Sou. Hist. Coll., Chapel Hill.

[133] Strickland, *Religion and the State in Georgia*, 108-13. She concluded, "The establishment does not seem to have been burdensome enough for any great protest to be raised against it by dissenters."

could justify such a proceeding. Dissenters could also secure land quite freely from the Council for the purpose of building churches and providing for a minister.[134] Consequently, there was little reason for religious liberty to become a major issue in the colony.

The major cause of concern among the dissenters in Georgia was the annoying fees for marriages and burial of the dead which were required by law to go to the Anglican minister. The fees presented no problem on the frontier, but in Savannah they were a cause of controversy. Always insisting that the proper fees be paid to him, Samuel Frink, the Anglican minister in Savannah, refused to speak at the funeral of John Zubly's child, and in 1769 Frink sued a dissenter for tolling the bell at another funeral. In the latter case Zubly appeared in court on behalf of the widow, protesting against the authority of the court to try such matters, and the case was dropped.[135] A bill was subsequently introduced into the Commons House to create a separate burial ground for the dissenters in Savannah. Zubly appeared in both houses in support of it, and it passed the lower but not the upper house.[136] Another bill was framed to allow all Christians except papists to be buried in the cemetery at Savannah, but it levied a fee on behalf of the Anglican minister whether he attended or not. Zubly petitioned the Commons House on April 11, 1770,

---

[134]Allen D. Candler, ed., *The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia* (26 vols., Atlanta, 1904-16), VII, 388; VIII, 539; X, 280-81; XI, 304.

[135]John J. Zubly to Ezra Stiles, 1773, in Massachusetts Historical Society *Proceedings*, VIII (1865), 217.

[136]*Ibid.*

and spoke against this requirement in both houses.[137] This bill also failed to pass, but dissenters were apparently able to bury in the cemetery without further being molested.

There was some problem concerning the marriage ceremony. The regulations in this respect generally followed in the southern colonies required a previous reading of the banns or a license from the governor before a minister could perform the ceremony. Zubly preferred the former but he demanded the power of marrying by license on the principle of religious freedom. On occasion, Samuel Frink would endorse a license to Zubly if Frink were given half the fee, a practice to which Zubly objected.

Frink made it a point to say that those married by Zubly lived in sin, but these marriages were never challenged.[138] Not until 1785 was an act passed that validated all marriages previously performed by all ministers and justices of the peace and empowering them to perform ceremonies from then on.[139]

Final disestablishment of the Anglican church in Georgia came with the passage of the 1777 constitution. Article LVI stated that

> all persons whatever shall have the free exercise of their religion; provided it be not repugnant to the peace and safety of the State; and shall not, unless by consent, support any teacher or teachers except those of their own profession.[140]

---

[137] *Ibid.*; Candler, *Colonial Recs. of Ga.*, XV, 178-80; XVII, 559-62.

[138] *Ibid.*, 217-18.

[139] Candler, *Colonial Recs. of Ga.*, XIX, Pt. II, 458.

[140] Thorpe, *Federal and State Constitutions*, II, 784.

This left the way open for a general assessment tax and such a law was passed in 1785, but it was never put into effect.

It appears, then, that religious issues contributed to the coming of the Revolution in the South. The dissenting clergy in the region were quick to point out that the constitutional and economic problems of the empire resulted from the sins of the people and that the problems would remain unless there was real repentance. The outbreak of fighting confirmed for the clergy that God was engaged in punishing a wayward people. These same clergymen saw God at work even in the coming of the war: He had a mission for America. In this respect the southern dissenting clergy interpreted the war in terms very similar to those of their counterparts in the North.

The issues that stirred the northern dissenting clergy, however, did not automatically excite their southern colleagues. While both groups generally had the same type of training and adhered to the same creed, each group responded to the immediate issues in its locality. The episcopate controversy did not arouse the emotions of the southern dissenting clergy as it did their northern counterparts; but there was more concern in the South over the expansion of Catholicism under the Quebec Act, mainly because the dissenting clergy here saw this measure as a threat to their own religious liberties. The issue, then, that presented the most direct threat was the one which caused southern dissenting ministers to be the most vocal. It was only the threat to religious liberty that joined northern and southern clergy in opposition, but that threat was manifested differently in each region.

Their aspiration for liberty of conscience caused southern dissenting clergy to participate actively in the struggle for disestablishment. In their minds, religious and civil liberty were closely intertwined. Presbyterian and Baptist ministers particularly assumed positions of leadership in this struggle. Reuben Ford, William Graham, John Blair Smith, Caleb Wallace, and John Todd of Virginia; Henry Abbott and David Caldwell of North Carolina; William Tennent, Oliver Hart and Richard Furman of South Carolina; and John Zubly of Georgia, all worked energetically in the effort to disestablish the Anglican church, and most of them at one time or another appeared before their respective legislatures on the matter. By the end of the Revolution, all of the southern colonies had eliminated religious privileges for any Christian denomination, an achievement that was not accomplished in New England until the nineteenth century. Perhaps this was the greatest contribution of the southern dissenting clergy to the revolutionary generation.

The dissenting clergy can scarcely be given sole credit for disestablishment. Apart from the leadership and support of such libertarians as Thomas Jefferson, George Mason, and James Madison, disestablishment may not have occurred in Virginia when it did. Many Presbyterian and Baptist clergymen were close friends of these political leaders, so that there was a semblance of a political alliance between dissenting ministers and libertarians on this issue. One prominent writer on the subject has stated that the victory in Virginia was due primarily to the work of Mason, Jefferson, Madison, and the dissenting ministers, Davies

and Leland.[141] The statesmen were probably most responsible for the legal changes that brought disestablishment, but it was the dissenters, through their spokesmen and their numerous petitions, who maintained pressure on the legislature and helped to arouse popular support to ensure success.

---

[141]Anson P. Stokes, *Church and State in the United States* (3 vols., New York, 1950), I, 396.

CHAPTER V

THE CLERGY AS A MODERATING INFLUENCE, 1763-1775

The clergy in the northern colonies took a leading role in the political ferment against Britain in the decade preceding the Revolution. While the ideology of the southern dissenting clergy was similarly revolutionary, they were not as active politically as their northern coreligionists. The New England Congregational ministers were a natural part of the social, intellectual, and political establishment, whereas the dissenters of the South were not. Instead, they shied away from political involvement and acted as a moderating force in curbing efforts at violent action.

Limitations of sources make it difficult to demonstrate any significant activity by the southern dissenting clergy in the active protests preceding the Revolution. At least there is very little recorded evidence of their leadership of those groups which have been generally regarded as radical. The pacifist doctrines adhered to by the German groups and the Christian teaching which emphasized the brotherhood of man caused the clergy generally to shun violence. For this reason, the dissenting clergy were not leaders of the mobs involved in destruction of property or persecution of those who did not follow the patriot line.

There is only one recorded instance of violence by a dissenting clergyman and even he was not a native of the South. Born in Greenwich, New Jersey, Philip Vickers Fithian was hired in 1773 by Robert Carter, III, a planter, as a tutor at Nomini Hall in Westmoreland County, Virginia.

Remaining in Virginia about a year, he made a short visit to New Jersey, but returned to the Valley of Virginia in 1775-1776 as a Presbyterian missionary, his only ministerial practice. During this visit to his hometown, he took part in the destruction of tea temporarily stored at Greenwich. Fithian briefly mentioned in his journal for December 23, 1774, that the tea had been burned by a number of persons in disguise. He wrote:

> Violent, & different are the words about this uncommon Manoeuvre, among the Inhabitants--Some rave, some curse & condemn, some try to reason; many are glad the tea is destroyed, but almost all disapprove, the Manner of the destruction.[1]

Fithian did not say that he was one of those engaged in the "uncommon Manoeuvre," but there is considerable evidence of his involvement; and a monument erected to commemorate the event included his name among the participants.[2] One wonders why he concealed his actions. Just licensed a month before, he may have feared losing his standing as a minister. Noting in his journal that most of the townspeople disapproved of the destruction, he may have feared community censure. Whatever the reasons, he appears to have joined with others in reacting forcibly to the landing of the tea. His reluctance to admit it links him with the moderate

---

[1]Robert G. Albion and Leonidas Dodson, eds., *Philip Vickers Fithian: Journal, 1775-76* (Princeton, 1934), 248.

[2]See the following as sources for evidence of his participation. *New Jersey Archives*, Series 1, X, 532; *New York Times*, December 21, 1924; Robert G. Johnson, *An Historical Account of the First Settlements of Salem, in West Jersey* (Philadelphia, 1839), 123-24; William C. Mulford, *Historical Tales of Cumberland County, New Jersey* (Bridgeton, New Jersey, 1941), 32-34. Joel Fithian listed in the above citation of *New Jersey Archives* was also a participant and a cousin of Philip V. Fithian. See Albion and Dodson, *Fithian Journal*, 2.

southern clergy. Since no other evidence can be found of dissenting clergy engaging in violence, Fithian's example makes him an exception rather than the rule in the South. Before the beginning of the war with the mother country, the dissenting clergy, like other ministers both North and South, generally preached obedience to authority.

Fithian's action contrasted vividly with that of the pacifist Moravians in North Carolina. Upon hearing of the bitterness in the colony as a result of the Stamp Act, the Moravian pastor at Wachovia reflected his denominational position by saying that

> in spite of the critical and apparently dangerous unrest in this province on account of the Stamp Act, the mighty arm of our Heavenly Father has been held over us, so that nothing has been demanded of us contrary to our conscience, but under His protection we have remained peaceful and undisturbed as the quiet people of the land.[3]

Even though a majority of the dissenting clergy were not pacifists, the way they viewed their roles as ministers barred them from involvement in political matters. They generally looked upon themselves as spiritual and not political leaders. One illustration of this fact is the exchange between Christian Rabenhorst, Lutheran minister at Ebenezer, Georgia, and Governor James Wright during the Stamp Act controversy. Henry M. Muhlenberg, Lutheran pastor from Pennsylvania, visiting Georgia in 1775, was interested in finding out why Rabenhorst was so respected by the governor. Muhlenberg learned that Governor Wright had written to Rabenhorst during the Stamp Act crisis suggesting that Rabenhorst instruct his congregation

---

[3]Fries, *Records of the Moravians*, I, 322.

> that the matter was very profitable and advantageous to them, etc. Mr. R[abenhorst] replied courteously, though without French compliments, as a Pomeranian and a sensible theologian, briefly but well, that he did not meddle in things that did not concern his office. He instructed his hearers in repentance, faith, and godliness, and when his instruction had good effect, his hearers would also be loyal subjects, good neighbors, and the like.[4]

Such attitudes regarding political activity were characteristic not only of the Lutherans but also of many other clergymen and explain much of their silence on the political scene. William Tennent, pastor of the Independent Church in Charleston, observed in a 1774 sermon that

> Political Subjects do not belong to the Pulpit, but to direct to a right Improvement of the Times is the Duty of every Minister of the Gospel.[5]

Three years later Caleb Wallace, Presbyterian minister in Virginia, confessed that he did not meddle much "with matters of civil concern only to countenance the recruiting business as far as I have it in my power."[6]

---

[4]Tappert and Doberstein, *Journals of Muhlenberg*, II, 678. Muhlenlenberg agreed with the actions of Rabenhorst and made these comments about a minister and politics:

> Occasionally when these lofty gentlemen, these politicans without unction, get into a tight corner, they are likely to cast a gracious glance upon the poor preachers who at other times are only disgusting creatures, and then they want to use and ride on their backs as on beasts with long ears. And when they have accomplished their purpose, they give the drudge a kick in the posteriors and think, "You're nothing but a wirepuller anyhow." On the other hand, credit is gained when ministers remain in their own sphere and live and act in accord with their calling.

Rabenhorst was ordained in Germany in 1752 and came to Ebenezer, Georgia, where he was one of the pastors among the Salzburger Germans until his death.

[5]Tennent, *Invasion of Liberties*, 6.

[6]Caleb Wallace to James Caldwell, April 8, 1777, in Whitsitt, *Caleb Wallace*, 40.

Likewise, a Methodist itinerant preacher, William Watters, said when he was accused of being a tory in 1775 that

> I did not think politics ought to be introduced into the sacred pulpit on any occasion; yet I did most seriously deny that there was one drop of Tory blood flowing through my veins. I firmly believed my business was to preach the Gospel, and not to meddle with those public affairs, which were in much better hands, and in my opinion was unbecoming men of my profession.[7]

In 1778, while on the Fairfax Circuit in Virginia, Watters stated that "though a friend to my country, I left politics to those better qualified to defend and discuss them. Preaching was my business: to teach men how to live and to be prepared to die."[8]

The political leadership of the clergy was also challenged by other clergy. When Charles Cummings, Presbyterian minister in Virginia, was elected to the Fincastle County Committee of Safety, his right to be on that committee was questioned by John Brown, a Presbyterian minister in the Valley:

> I question Mr Cumming[s]'s right to be one of the Committee and a Gospel Minister at the same time. Who made him a Ruler and a judge in civil affairs? My hand trembles when I ask the Question and I am apprehensive if he had considered the affair as he should have done he would not have undertaken it unless the love of fame that universal passion had prompt him to it.[9]

---

[7]William Watters, *A Short Account of the Christian Experience, and Ministerial Labors of William Watters* (Alexandria, 1806), 52. Watters was the first native born Methodist itinerant preacher. Born in Baltimore County, Maryland, in 1751, he traveled extensively in Maryland and Virginia. He died on his farm near Langley, Virginia in 1827. See Sprague, *Annals*, VII, 46-50.

[8]*Ibid.*, 70.

[9]John Brown to William Preston, August 24, 1775, Preston Papers of the Draper Manuscripts, Wisconsin Historical Society. Yet, it was said

When the dissenting clergy did take an active part, they usually supported the colonial government; and in those affairs characterized by violence, they stood firmly on the side of constituted authority. This was most evident in regions where there was an internal conflict within a colony, such as North Carolina, where the division was between East and West.

The dissenting clergy here supported the royal governor, William Tryon, against the Regulators, a conflict that has been interpreted as the forerunner of the Revolution in North Carolina.[10] The Regulator movement was strongest in the five Piedmont counties: Granville, Anson, Orange, Rowan, and Mecklenburg. This area had grown quite rapidly with the influx of dissenting groups in the preceding twenty years; and because the region was new, it was underrepresented in the colonial assembly. With half of the population of the colony in 1771, the six westernmost counties had only 16 members in the Assembly while the remainder of the colony had 50.[11] There were many local grievances, the most important

---

of Brown at his death that he took part in the struggle for liberty, though he was firmly convinced, that the pulpit ought never to be prostituted to the promotion of political parties; yet upon this grand occasion, he did not think it beneath him, often, by his discourses, to animate his countrymen, to resist the claims of unlawful power.

James Blythe, *The Death of the Good Man Precious in the Sight of God* (Lexington, 1804), 23.

[10]While older historians held this view, more recent historians have contended it was only the climax of a revolt of western people. See Hugh Lefler and Albert Newsome, *North Carolina* (rev. ed., Chapel Hill, 1963), chap. 11.

[11]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, IX, 14.

being excessive taxes, dishonest sheriffs, extortionate fees, and the scarcity of money.[12] As the local sheriff was dishonest, he quite often collected more taxes than he should, or extracted extra money from the taxpayer. Most frontier farmers were handicapped in paying their taxes and conducting business, a condition which resulted in a general hatred of the upper class, represented by the local county officers and the royal officials. Yet the dissenting clergy associated themselves with royal authority and acted as a moderating influence in this struggle between the eastern establishment and, in many cases, the people of their own congregations.

The Regulation proper began in the spring of 1768 when the people of Orange and Anson counties protested against the lack of representation and the method of collecting taxes. Refusing to pay taxes for the year until they were assured that the money would be applied to the purposes mentioned by law, the Regulators began to attack law enforcement officials. This resulted in the arrest of William Butler and Hermon Husband on May 1 and their imprisonment at Hillsborough. During the same month the Regulators petitioned Governor Tryon for redress of their grievances, but Tryon was not sympathetic. He arrived at Hillsborough in August 1768 with a small army of militia, dispatching the sheriff of Orange County to collect taxes. When this was unsuccessful, Tryon

---

[12]John S. Bassett, "The Regulators of North Carolina," *Annual Report of American Historical Association for 1894*, 150-55. In addition to this work, other important sources are Elmer D. Johnson, "The War of the Regulation: Its Place in History" (Master's thesis, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1942); Hugh Lefler and William S. Powell, *Colonial North Carolina* (New York, 1973), chap. 10.

censured the Regulators, saying that their actions were both "illegal and highly criminal." On August 17, Tryon left Hillsborough and marched through Orange and Rowan counties to Mecklenburg County, ordering out the militia.[13]

During this march, some of the dissenting clergy spoke out in support of Governor Tryon. In Mecklenburg, a sermon by a local German Reformed minister, Samuel Suther, chaplain to the Mecklenburg battalion, "recommended with warmth a due obedience to the Laws of the County, and a union of heart to support the Peace and Tranquility of the Province."[14]

The governor appealed for support from the Presbyterians in the area, and a warm response came from four prominent Presbyterian clergymen, Hugh McAden, James Creswell, Henry Patillo, and David Caldwell.[15]

---

[13]Johnson, "War of the Regulation," 42-46.

[14]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VII, 821. Suther was born in Switzerland and came to America in 1738 as a school teacher. Ordained into the German Reformed church in Philadelphia, he became a minister in Guilford, Orange, and Mecklenburg counties in North Carolina. After the war he lived in the Orangeburg area of South Carolina where he died in 1788.

[15]Hugh McAden, one of the first settled Presbyterian ministers in North Carolina, was a pastor in Duplin and New Hanover counties from 1759, and about 1768 moved to Caswell County. James Creswell, born in Ireland, preached in Granville County, North Carolina, but was also a pastor later in South Carolina. Henry Patillo studied under Samuel Davies before his ordination in Cumberland County, Virginia, 1758. He preached in Virginia until 1765, when he went to North Carolina and served the churches at Hawfield, Eno, and Little River in the Regulator country. Hampden-Sydney College conferred on him the A.M. degree in 1787. David Caldwell, born in Pennsylvania, graduated from the College of New Jersey in 1761. After his ordination four years later, he became pastor at Buffalo and Alamance churches in March 1768. He conducted a classical school, practiced medicine, and was a member of the state constitutional convention in 1776.

The latter two were directly involved in the Regulator movement, as their churches were located in the center of the Regulator area. The four addressed a letter on August 23, 1768, to Tryon demonstrating support of the governor and the laws of the colony and expressing their abhorrence of the turbulence among the people and their assurance that they would do all they could to prevent the infection from spreading.[16] They expressed their pleasure that Tryon had refused "to grant anything on compulsion to the demands of unreasonable men" and that he had promised redress of grievances in the way prescribed by the laws of the country. The ministers were thus decidedly against any violent actions designed to change the status quo.

Even more revealing was the letter these four ministers sent to the Presbyterian inhabitants of North Carolina.[17] Because they were not sure whether any Presbyterians were involved in the Regulator movement, they wanted to encourage the members of their congregations to support Tryon and to remind them that their ancestors had been zealously attached to the Protestant royal family.

Fearing that some might have been caught in the snare, the ministers declared that the Regulator oath against paying taxes was 'contrary to the Laws of our Country, and the plainword of God." Should anyone believe he were bound by the oath, the ministers warned that honoring it would involve the oathtaker in even greater guilt. Even if an oath were

---

[16]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VII, 813-14.

[17]*Ibid.*, 814-16.

sacred and a person were bound by it, breaking the oath in this case was considered the lesser of two evils. Obedience to the laws of the province was of greater importance. The letter concluded with the quotation from Romans 13, "let every soul be subject to the Higher powers." There could be very little doubt that these four Presbyterian ministers wanted their congregations to abide by the laws. To challenge constituted authority was a violation of God's ordinances. As they had already indicated to Tryon, they were confident that the Regulators' grievances could be settled within the framework of law.

The letter to the Presbyterian inhabitants apparently did a great deal to prevent some from joining the Regulators. On August 26, it was read at a muster in Rowan County and probably aided in securing volunteers for the royal forces.[18] Tryon himself recognized the importance of the letter when he wrote to Lord Hillsborough of the loyalty of Presbyterians and Anglicans and acknowledging

> the utility that the Presbyterian ministers' letter to their brethren had upon the then face of public affairs, when every man's affections seemed to be tainted with the poison of the insurgents.[19]

After touring these counties, Tryon returned to Hillsborough, where 1400 men were assembled in his support. While in this area in September, Samuel Suther, the German Reformed minister, preached to the Rowan and Mecklenburg regiments;[20] and Henry Patillo, the Presbyterian minister,

---

[18] *Ibid.*, 822.

[19] William Tryon to Lord Hillsborough, December 24, 1768, in *ibid.*, 886.

[20] Clark, *State Recs. of N.C.*, XXII, 873.

preached to the troops at Hillsborough.[21] These sermons apparently have not survived, but from what Patillo stated in letters to his fellow ministers, he apparently counseled loyalty to the government and reminded the soldiers of their duty to defend their country in much the same vein that Samuel Davies, under whom Patillo studied, had done earlier. These Presbyterian and German clergymen seem to have been solidly in Tryon's camp.

By their previous commitment, the Moravians were already on the side of the government, so they tried to remain aloof from the Regulator movement. They could not do so completely but were drawn in because of their aid to Tryon's forces. On September 15, 1768, two wagons loaded with zwieback from the bakers at Wachovia were sent to Hillsborough for Tryon's army.[22]

Baptist ministers also seem to have been on the side of law and order. At a meeting of the Sandy Creek Association of Separate Baptists in October 1769, the delegates present, largely composed of pastors, adopted a resolution declaring that "If any of our members shall take up arms against the legal authority or aid or abet them that do so he shall be excommunicated." The church at Haw River, with Elnathan Davis as pastor, also adopted a similar resolution specifically forbidding its members from joining the Regulators.[23] The warning did not keep Baptists from

---

[21]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VII, 835.

[22]Fries, *Records of the Moravians*, I, 380.

[23]Morgan Edwards, Materials towards a history of Baptists in North Carolina, S.C. Baptist Hist. Coll., Greenville; Paschal, *North Carolina Baptists*, I, 364-65.

participating in the Regulator movement; some names of Haw River church members appeared in the "Regulator Advertisement No. 9," among them Nathaniel Powell, a preacher of the Deep River branch of Haw River Church, and Francis Dorsett, later pastor of Rocky River Church.[24] Additionally, Shubael Stearns, the leading Separate Baptist minister in the colony, tried to intervene on behalf of some of the outlawed Regulators after the Battle of Alamance. In August 1771, he signed petitions for two men, Thomas Welborn and John Pugh, verifying the good character of the former and giving evidence that the latter was not present at the court disturbance in Hillsborough.[25] At least one Baptist historian, Morgan Edwards of Philadelphia, who traveled in the South in 1772 to gather materials for a history, seemed to think that the Baptists had nothing to do with the Regulation, that there were only seven of the Baptist denomination among the Regulators, and that only one of these was executed.[26] The estimate appears too conservative because a great deal of Regulator support came from those areas in which Baptists were strongest numerically. Nevertheless, Baptist clergymen did join other dissenting clergy in attempting to prevent armed rebellion.

By 1770, the Regulators were busy again in opposition to what they considered unjust government. In September of that year they gathered at

---

[24] *Ibid.*, 366.

[25] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, IX, 25-27, 29-30.

[26] Edwards, Materials towards a history of Baptists in North Carolina. Edwards was born in England and came into the South from Philadelphia. He was a tory during the Revolution, so naturally he would play down any Baptist participation in rebellion against royal authority.

Hillsborough and prevented the court from sitting. Judge Richard Henderson fled, and the Regulators held their own court. As a result the Assembly that met in December attempted to punish them by passing the Johnston Act, which stated that if ten men gathered unlawfully and refused to disperse at the orders of their local officers, they would be judged felons, liable to the death penalty. This act enraged the Regulators and, upon hearing that Hermon Husband had been imprisoned, a group prepared to march to Newbern. Tryon, in March 1771, responded by ordering the militia to march against the Regulators.

By May 16 both sides were drawn up to do battle at Alamance. David Caldwell, Presbyterian minister at Buffalo and Alamance Churches, acted involuntarily as a mediator because some members of his churches were part of the Regulation.[27] His loyalties were divided: some of his people were part of the Regulation; on the other hand, he had signed the letter with other Presbyterian ministers, recommending compliance with the laws. Attempting to prevent bloodshed, he went first among the Regulators and then to Tryon to try to mediate the dispute. Tryon promised a reply on the following morning; and as the militia began to move out on the 16th, the message was sent. Caldwell delivered Tryon's letter to the Regulators requiring them to lay down their arms, surrender their outlawed leaders, submit to the laws of the country, and rest on the mercy of the government. By accepting these terms within one hour the Regulators could prevent bloodshed; but they would not accept, and Caldwell returned to the governor in a last and unsuccessful effort to prevent

---

[27]Calvin H. Wiley, *History of Alamance Church* (Raleigh, 1880), 43.

an outbreak. Failing this, Caldwell again appealed to the Regulators to abide by the governor's orders, but they stood firm in their decision. Caldwell mounted his horse and rode away as did Hermon Husband, who also tried to make peace. Later in the day the Battle of Alamance was fought with a rout of the Regulators.[28]

After the battle, Tryon moved through the Sandy Creek community of Orange County where many Baptists were located. Here he extracted supplies and imposed an oath of allegiance. Moving westward, he arrived at the Moravian settlement and celebrated the king's birthday. On June 6, the Moravians delegated their ministers, Frederick William de Marshall, John Michael Graff, Richard Utley, and Lawrence Bagge, to deliver an address to Tryon which pledged complete loyalty to king and governor:

> May the Troubles which have of late unhappily torn this Province, be the last, that shall ever give any Uneasiness to the paternal Breast of the best of princes, & may this very Day be the very period from which this Province shall date the future Happiness through the Good Success of your Excellency[']s measures.[29]

In their quiet ways the Moravians had remained loyal to the government in the Regulator affair. It had not been easy; the Regulators expected Moravian support, and as Marshall commented in October 1770, "our quiet life is a thorn in the eye to them."[30]

---

[28]Powell, *Regulators of North Carolina*, xxiv. The letter of Tryon to the Regulators, May 16, 1771, is printed on p. 456. Bassett, "The Regulators of North Carolina," 203; Caruthers, *David Caldwell*, 148-49. Caruthers said that Caldwell went to Tryon with Alexander Miller, sheriff of the county.

[29]Powell, *Regulators of North Carolina*, 316.

[30]Quoted in Ruth Blackwelder, "The Attitude of the North Carolina Moravians Towards the American Revolution," *North Carolina Historical Review*, IX (1932), 7.

One evidence of the disorientation of life in North Carolina as a result of the War of the Regulation was the movement of ministers out of the colony, either into what is now Tennessee or southward into South Carolina and Georgia. Morgan Edwards, passing through North Carolina just after the battle of Alamance, noted that 1500 families fled the Sandy Creek area to escape the wrath of Tryon.[31] This seems to be an exaggeration, but many did move, including Baptist ministers Daniel Marshall and Philip Mulkey, who went south, as well as James Cresswell, a Presbyterian minister, whose destination was the South Carolina frontier.

Generally, those dissenting clergymen who were active in upholding the colonial government against the lawless element in North Carolina became whigs in the Revolution, as did a majority of the Regulators themselves. In South Carolina, while only one dissenter minister, the Baptist Evan Pugh, can definitely be associated with the Regulator movement, he became a whig just as a majority of the Regulators in that colony.[32] A firm generalization cannot be reached, but in spite of the fact that the clergy were on opposite sides in the Regulator movement in the two colonies, they became whigs in both cases.

By the end of 1774, Americans began to divide over the issue of impending war, and the dissenting clergy reflect this change. More and more of them began to take an active part in whig organizations. Some

---

[31]Edwards, Materials towards a history of the Baptists in North Carolina, S.C. Baptist Hist. Coll., Greenville.

[32]Richard M. Brown, *The South Carolina Regulators* (Cambridge, 1963), 123-24.

were more cautious than others, but most of the dissenting clergy still practiced moderation over the next two years, hoping for a reconciliation with Great Britain. As this became increasingly impossible, they came to accept the war they could not prevent. Like most Americans, they supported the British crown but began to express concern for the well-being of the colonial relationship. Illustrative of this change of viewpoint is the position of Thomas Rankin, a Methodist itinerant, who rode the circuit in most of the middle and southern colonies, especially in Maryland, but went into Virginia and North Carolina in 1776. Writing to Lord Dartmouth in the spring of 1774 on the state of religion in America, he chose to ignore political developments in the colonies:

> With regard to the political State of America, your Lordship has proper channels to convey all the intelligence you want; I only would observe, that the Americans Seem much prepossessed in favour of your Lordship, and hopes every thing that is good from your administration.[33]

By autumn of that year, however, Rankin had misgivings about the situation, writing in his diary that "God has a controversy with the inhabitants of the British colonies." In December he noted that his spirit was pressed down at the prospect of public affairs, that matters were "extremely gloomy." He was certain that "if the impending storm" did not soon blow over, the land would become a field of blood. "My soul laments that so few seem to lay it to heart."[34]

---

[33]Thomas Rankin to Lord Dartmouth, March 30, 1774, Dartmouth Manuscripts. Copy in Stewart Robinson Collection at Princeton University Archives.

[34]Diary of Thomas Rankin, October 2, December 18, 1774, Garrett Biblical Institute Library.

At the end of 1774 Rankin wrote to Lord Dartmouth again, denoting his moderation by reporting that some in the recent Continental Congress had carried matters too far. The friends of Britain had little to say, Rankin observed, for fear of death, but he assured Dartmouth that those who were silent then would stand by his Majesty to their last drop of blood if things came to extremes. He added, "There is nothing to be heard in some of the Provinces, but warlike preparations of every kind."[35] Continuing his letter to Dartmouth, Rankin urged the king to be lenient in his relationship with the colonies. Using illustrations of Roman emperors Theodosius and Constantine, who were lenient towards their subjects in time of trouble, he pleaded with his Majesty to follow the same practice, which would "endear his Majesty to his American subjects more than ever; and cause his memory to be loved to the latest posterity of these lands."[36] He requested Dartmouth to use his influence to try to bring peace and harmony between Great Britain and the colonies. Rankin, it should be added, became a loyalist and returned to England in 1778. At the time of these letters four years earlier, however, he was going through the agony of ministering spiritually to the people he loved and at the same time hearing his Majesty's "name and conduct reviled in the most opprobrious manner."

Rankin was part of a group of Wesley missionaries who were sympathetic to the British cause. Others, like William Tennent of Charleston,

---

[35]Thomas Rankin to Lord Dartmouth, December 29, 1774, Dartmouth Manuscripts. Copy in Stewart Robinson Collection at Princeton University Archives.

[36]*Ibid.*

were already drawing the lines in such a way as to encourage support of the First Continental Congress. Tennent praised Congress and concluded that "to speak against the struggles for liberty" was

> treason, not against the life of *one man*, but of millions. Every word, that tends to weaken the hands of the people is a crime of devilish dye. It is not a matter of indifference, my Countrymen, to be passed over by you with easy negligence. It is the *unpardonable Sin* in politics. What care I, whether you poison me with *arsenic*, or with infernal *breath*? whether you aim at my life with your sword, or your tongue? 'Tis no *Loss of Liberty*, that court-minions can complain of, when they are silenced. No man has a right to say a word, which may lame the liberties of his country; after she has determined in what those liberties consist.[37]

Just a week after the convening of the Second Continental Congress in May 1775, other significant actions resulted from the meeting in Philadelphia of two church bodies, the Presbyterians and Methodists. The Presbyterian Synod of New York and Philadelphia assembled on May 17, and two days later, "considering the present alarming state of public affairs," called for a day of prayer and fasting. The synod sent out a pastoral letter to all Presbyterian churches, including the Hanover and Orange Presbyteries in the South.[38] The document was a clear political statement by a leading denomination at a critical juncture in national affairs. Two hundred copies were distributed by Rev. Adam Boyd in North Carolina.[39]

The letter assured the general public that the Presbyterian clergy were not responsible for the recent acts of violence and disorder; yet

---

[37]William Tennent, writing as "A Carolinian No. VII," in *South Carolina Gazette*, December 19, 1774, hereafter cited as *SCG*.

[38]The letter is in Engles, *Records of the Presbyterian Church*, 466-69.

[39]Sauners, *Colonial Records*, X, 188.

the time had come for the clergy not to conceal their opinions but rather to speak out as a duty. Taking note of the recent battles at Lexington and Concord, the letter stated that if the British ministry were to continue to enforce their claims by violence, a lasting and bloody contest would take place, and men must prepare themselves for death in the cause of liberty. The synod made six recommendations to its pastors: (1) They should take every opportunity to express attachment and respect to King George. He had been misled into the present measures by those about him, and they had been deceived by false information from interested persons residing in America. (2) The union of the colonies should be preserved by supporting the Continental Congress, encouraging its service, and adhering to its resolutions. People of different religions should unite, for there was no example in history "in which civil liberty was destroyed and the rights of conscience preserved entire." (3) The clergy must watch over the morals of their members. The synod was quick to recall that the last Congress was determined to discourage luxury in living. "Reformation of manners is of the utmost necessity in our present distress." (4) The ministers must have a regard for order and public peace. The magistrates must defend and secure the rights of conscience in the most impartial manner. (5) There must be a spirit of humility and mercy. (6) The colonists should continue in the exercise of prayer. The synod called for repentance not only for sins in general but for national offenses.

The pastoral letter was an endorsement of the political platform of the American whigs, yet it was moderate in every aspect. It is significant that the synod recommended to the pastors that they help to secure

public order and peace. The southern Presbyterian clergy was responsible for the dissemination of this doctrine to the frontier counties.

Convening at the same time in Philadelphia was the Third Methodist Conference. Very little is known of what happened at the meeting, but the minutes show that the conference adopted a day of general fasting "for the prosperity of the work, and for the peace of America."[40] It was at this conference that the ministers decided to accept the authority of John Wesley, a decision that was to expose many of the Methodist ministers to hostility because of Wesley's tory views.[41]

Earlier in the year the Charleston Baptist Association met and recommended to member churches the taking of an offering for the relief of the brethren suffering under oppression in Massachusetts. The money was to be collected by Oliver Hart, Baptist minister in Charleston and moderator of the Association, and by him remitted to Isaac Backus, the leading Baptist minister in New England. The association recommended to the ministers the observance of three fast days in their churches within the next year not only for their sins, but for the "alarming Circumstances of Affairs" hanging over us.[42] It is unfortunate that the sermons preached on these occasions were not preserved.

Individual churches had been observing fast days in accordance with the request of the Continental Congress. The Meherrin Baptist Church in

---

[40] *Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Years, 1773-1828* (2 vols., New York, 1840), I, 7.

[41] See Chap. VII below.

[42] *Minutes of the Charleston Baptist Association, February 6, 1775* [Charleston, 1775], 3.

Virginia did so in 1774:

> We believed every Christian Patriot ought to show himself on the occation [*sic*], seeing what a dark cloud hung over not only our heads but our rising posterity, from the violent usurpation of a corrupted Ministry, Therefore believing that God had the Hearts of Kings & Rulers in his hands and could turn them whithersoever he pleased & that his Eyes were over the Ritious [*sic*] & his ears open to their complaints, Set that day apart as a day of publick fasting & prayer.[43]

The pastor was requested to preach from I Timothy 2:1-2:

> I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men: For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

The war had already begun and a decision had to be made. William Duke, a Methodist itinerant in Maryland, expressed his disdain for war in rough verse, the last portion being:

> They march with their artil[l]ery
> The bloody Instruments of Death
> In each the others Breast to sheathe
> On what a shocking bloody scene
> Such Woe as this had never been
> If Man had not been spoiled by Sin
> But O Thou Father of Mankind
> Change and renew the Carnal mind
> True Peace and Love to each restore
> And so shall we learn War no more.[44]

Yet it seemed that no amount of fasting, prayer, and hope for reconciliation would do any good. Even though the dissenting clergy had

---

[43]Minute Book of Meherrin Baptist Church, September, 1774, Va. Baptist Hist. Coll., Richmond.

[44]Journal of William Duke, November 17, 1775, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore. The complete poem is given in Appendix B. Duke was born in Maryland in 1757. He was converted to Methodism and became an itinerant preacher in Maryland and Virginia. In 1785 he was ordained an Episcopal minister and served as rector of several churches in Maryland before his death in 1840. See Sprague, *Annals*, V, 309-14.

been a moderating influence, they were now at the crossroads. They either had to continue as neutrals, resisting any violence towards Great Britain, or they could join the war effort and hope for some type of reconciliation with minimal bloodshed. Eventually, they chose the latter course.

But until early 1775 most of the Calvinists were not the fiery avatars of the revolutionary spirit suggested by Alan Heimert in his *Religion and the American Mind*. In every instance of conflict they had stood on the theological principle of obedience to those in authority. Neither did they wish to go beyond their self-imposed role as spiritual leaders. To be moderate in all things, especially in dealing with others, and not support those who would tend to extremism, was the only was to preserve liberty. As Josiah Smith, Presbyterian minister in Charleston, expressed it in a funeral sermon, the deceased was "a thorough Calvinist, *though* he was much *on the side of* liberty and moderation."[45] To Smith and to other Protestant ministers, there was a connection between moderation and liberty. Liberty could best be preserved through moderation and not by violent means. Calvinism may have aided in formulating a political ideology that would support a revolutionary spirit, but it was not until all hope of reconciliation was gone and war actually begun that the dissenting clergy, mostly Calvinists, agreed to take up arms, or become politically involved.

---

[45]Josiah Smith, *A Sermon on the Death of John Thomas* (Charleston, 1771), 19.

CHAPTER VI

PROMOTING THE REVOLUTION, 1774-1775

Despite their moderation in the decade preceding the Revolution, once the conflict began, the dissenting clergy put their political ideology into practice. Slow to start, some were actively involved in extra-legal agencies, such as the committees of safety and the provincial congresses; only a few took real places of leadership in such organizations. Only one dissenting clergyman from the South served among the members of the Continental Congress. On the local level, they were more active, at least fourteen dissenting clergy being included on committees of correspondence and safety, with two of them serving as chairmen.[1] Eight of these fourteen were Presbyterians, four were Baptists, and the remaining two were Lutheran-Anglicans.[2] Because of the paucity of records of these committees it is difficult to determine just what each of these men did or said in the course of their membership. Yet, the very fact that they were

---

[1] They were Richard Sankey, Samuel Stanhope Smith, Reuben Ford, John Todd, John Page, David Rice, David Allen, Adam Boyd, James Cresswell, Henry Patillo, William Hill, Paul Turquand, Charles Cummings, and Peter Muhlenberg. The latter two were chairmen.

[2] This combination resulted from two ministers serving two different groups of people. John Peter Muhlenberg was licensed by the Ministerium as a Lutheran minister and was pastor of a Lutheran church before going to London to receive Anglican ordination. Upon his return he preached to Anglicans and Lutherans in the Valley of Virginia. He considered himself a Lutheran after leaving the active ministry. Paul Turquand was also ordained by the bishop of London, but preached to both Anglicans and Lutherans in St. Matthews Parish, South Carolina.

elected by the freeholders of their communities was an indication of their position and of the regard in which they were held in their communities and of the degree to which their moderation had given way to more militant action.

On the colonial level, the extra-legal agency of revolutionary action was the provincial congress or convention. In the South, Virginia and North Carolina were the first to call such congresses, both in August 1774, followed by South Carolina in January 1775, and Georgia, the last, in July of that year. These congresses were set up to assert the rights of Americans, to enforce the Continental Association, and to take general control of governmental functions. Because of the importance of the dissenting clergy who did participate in all these extra-legal agencies--the local committee, the colonial congress, or Continental Congress--it is necessary to deal with them individually, by colonies.

In Virginia, the written records do not reveal a very active role by the dissenting clergy. During 1775 committees of safety were being organized all across the colony to enforce the Association. One dissenting clergyman who took a leading part was Charles Cummings, Presbyterian minister in the Holston area. When the freeholders of Fincastle County met on January 20, 1775, Cummings was the first to be nominated and elected to the committee of safety. After Washington County was formed two years later, he was named chairman of that county's committee. The Fincastle freeholders drew up resolves, attributed to be the work of Cummings, addressed to the Virginia delegates at the

Continental Congress.[3] Pledging their love and duty to George III, they stated that they did not want to shake off their allegiance to the king as long as they could enjoy the free exercise of their religion and liberties as British subjects. However, it was pointed out that unconstitutional power had stripped them of their liberty and property, and if harmony was not restored, they were determined never to surrender their privileges "to any power upon earth but at the expense of our lives." This group is believed to have been the first in the colony to pledge their lives to secure their liberties. The patriotic influence of Cummings was also felt during the next two years, as he accompanied troops to fight the Cherokee Indians at the beginning of the war.

Other dissenting clergy in Virginia serving on committees to enforce the Association were: David Rice, Presbyterian minister, elected to the committee from Bedford County, May 23, 1775;[4] Samuel Stanhope Smith and Richard Sankey, both Presbyterian ministers, elected to the committee of safety in Prince Edward County, November 20, 1775;[5] John Todd, also Presbyterian, a member of the Louisa County Committee of Safety;[6] and Reuben Ford, a Baptist minister, who served on the

---

[3]The Fincastle Resolves are in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, I, 1165-66; also Lewis P. Summers, *Annals of Southwest Virginia, 1769-1800* (Abingdon, Virginia, 1929; reprint ed., Baltimore, 1970), 673-75.

[4]Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, II, 388.

[5]*Ibid*., III, 1616

[6]*Ibid*., IV, 171.

Goochland County committee.[7] The six dissenting clergy on enforcement committees lived in areas of high dissenter density, which would be expected, but the number is disproportionately small compared with the twenty-four Anglican clergymen in the colony who also served on the same type of committee.[8] Unfortunately the records of these committees have not been preserved, for they would enlighten us on the thinking of these ministers.

In addition to the six mentioned above, John Peter Muhlenberg, a Lutheran minister in the Valley, was a member of the Virginia conventions. He had been active among the German population of the Valley and became a leading whig of that area. Meeting at the town of Woodstock on July 16, 1774, the people of Dunmore County considered the best method "to secure their liberties and properties" and to prevent the dangerous tendency of the Boston Port Bill to invade and deprive them of those liberties. Muhlenberg was elected moderator of this gathering, which proceeded to appoint a committee to draw up resolves. Designating Muhlenberg chairman, this committee, after deliberating a short time, returned to the town meeting with resolutions based on those approved by the inhabitants of Frederick County a week before. Because the resolutions undoubtedly represent the views of Muhlenberg they are given here in summary:

---

[7]Charles W. Coleman, "The County Committees of 1774-1775 in Virginia," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 1st Series, V (1896-1897), 254.

[8]Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church*, II, 434; Otto Lohrenz, "The Virginia Clergy and the American Revolution" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1970), 163, lists eighteen Anglican clergy as members of county committees.

1. That we will pay due submission to such acts of government as His Majesty has a right by law to exercise.

2. That it is the right of British subjects to be governed and taxed by representatives chosen by themselves, and that all acts of Parliament concerning the internal policy of the colonies are unconstitutional.

3. That the Boston Port Bill is repugnant to the fundamental laws of natural justice, calculated to enslave a free and loyal people.

4. That enforcing the said act by a military power will tend towards a civil war, dissolving the union, and they concur with their brethren in Boston to procure a redress of their grievances and to secure their common liberties.

5. That it is the unanimous opinion of this meeting, that a joint resolution of the colonies to stop all importation from Britain will prove the salvation of North America.

6. That the East India Company has lost all esteem of honest men and they will not purchase its tea.

7. That committees be appointed for the purpose of effecting a general Association and that the committees of the continent should correspond to form a general Association.[9]

At this meeting Muhlenberg also was appointed chairman of a committee to enforce the Association in the county.

---

[9]A copy of the resolutions is in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, I, 417-18; *Virginia Gazette*, August 4, 1774.

The preceding month the House of Burgesses had been dissolved by Governor Dunmore, but the delegates went to the local tavern in Williamsburg, adopted a non-importation agreement, and called for elections for a convention to meet in August 1774. Muhlenberg was elected one of the two delegates from Dunmore County to this August convention. During its deliberations, a provincial Association was adopted and the convention elected delegates to the Continental Congress. That same month, when Muhlenberg went to Philadelphia to see his father off on a trip to Georgia, the elder Muhlenberg probably advised his son not to become involved in political affairs. Consequently, the younger man resigned all his political offices shortly afterwards.[10] Early in January, however, he was reelected chairman of the Dunmore County Committee of Correspondence and Safety, and wrote to his brother, Frederick, "Whether I choose or not, I am to be a politician."[11] He surely must have been experiencing a struggle of conscience, since the members of his family were advising him to stay out of politics as a place unsuitable for a minister, while Muhlenberg always seemed interested in public life or a military career.

Muhlenberg was also present as a delegate from Dunmore County at the convention that met at St. John's Church in Richmond, beginning March 20, 1775. The convention adopted the proceedings and Association

---

[10]Paul A. W. Wallace, *The Muhlenbergs of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1950), 111-12.

[11]Quoted in Henry A. Muhlenberg, *The Life of Major-General Peter Muhlenberg* (Philadelphia, 1849), 46.

of the Continental Congress,[12] but just how much influence, if any, he had on this convention is hard to determine as its journals do not give the subject matter of the debates. Muhlenberg did second the motion of Patrick Henry to put the colony in a position of defense. One of his biographers thinks that he was greatly influenced by Patrick Henry's "liberty or death" speech.[13] If this were true, one can conclude that Muhlenberg was aligning himself with the more radical element within the colony, especially if his military appointment later in the year is considered. His brother, Frederick, continued to urge upon him the contrary position by rebuking him that he had

> become too involved in matters with which, as a preacher, you have nothing whatsoever to do and which do not belong to your office. . . . Nothing can excuse you.[14]

In August 1775, the Virginia Convention appointed a committee of safety which was controlled by the conservatives and, therefore, slow in preparing for defense and in dealing with the tory element. Lord Dunmore was gathering his forces in the Norfolk region, and by the end of the year fighting had begun in that area. In December another convention met in Richmond, and Muhlenberg was again a delegate. He served on an important committee which prepared an answer to Dunmore's proclamation declaring martial law and requiring all persons to report

---

[12]Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, II, 165; *At a Convention of Delegates. . . on Monday the 20th of March, 1775* (Williamsburg, 1775).

[13]Wallace, *Muhlenbergs*, 113.

[14]Quoted in *Ibid.*, 115.

to His Majesty's standard or else be considered traitors. The committee cautioned the people of Norfolk not to be led into opposing the colony and warned those who gave aid to the enemy to expect retaliation.[15] The only other evidence of Muhlenberg's activity is his appointment to three minor committees to consider private bills, all of which dealt with requests for money by individuals to compensate them for expenses incurred for defense purposes.[16] No other record has surfaced about Muhlenberg's political activities before his appointment as Colonel of the Eighth (German) Virginia Regiment in January 1776. His assumption of a military post shocked his brother, and Muhlenberg explained his actions thus:

> You say as a Clergyman nothing can excuse my Conduct, this excellent Doctrine is certainly a Product of that excellent City N.Y. which must be purged with Fire, before it is cleaned from Toryism; may there be none to pity it.--
>
> I am a Clergyman it is true, but I am a Member of Society as well as the poorest Layman, my Liberty is as dear to me as to any man, shall I then sit still & enjoy myself at Home when the best Blood of the Continent is spilling? Heaven forbid it.
>
> I am called by my country in its defence--the cause is just and noble--were I a Bishop, even a Lutheran one I should obey without Hesitation, and so far I am from thinking that I act wrong, I am convinced it is my Duty so to do & [which] I owe to God & my Country.[17]

Frederick's reply was not very understanding:

---

[15] *The Proceedings of the Convention of Delegates* (Williamsburg, 1776), 6, 10.

[16] *Ibid.*, 24, 29, 34.

[17] Muhlenberg's letter is not preserved, but part of it is quoted in his brother's reply. Frederick Muhlenberg to Peter Muhlenberg, March 1776, quoted in Wallace *Muhlenbergs*, 120-21.

> I think you are wrong in trying to be both soldier and preacher together. Be either one or the other. No man can serve two masters. . . . You think a man can be both preacher and colonel at the same time. How different are our ways of Thinking! . . . your letter attacking me with the godforsaken name of Tory was just too much--but rest assured I shall always think of you in my prayers. . . .[18]

John Peter Muhlenberg had made his decision, he would be a soldier; but to him it was a duty to God and country. He never returned to the active ministry but served in the military for the rest of the war and then as a congressman.

More dissenting clergy served in the extra-legal agencies of North Carolina than in any other colony, but surviving records do not show them to have been as active as men like William Tennent of South Carolina of John J. Zubly of Georgia. Altogether five dissenting ministers served in five different North Carolina congresses from August 1774 to the end of 1776. The five were Green Hill, Henry Patillo, William Hill, Henry Abbott, and David Caldwell.

After the Regulator movement was crushed, the main conflict in North Carolina was the struggle between the Assembly and Governor Josiah Martin who blindly followed royal instructions from London even though his actions sometimes ran counter to the wishes of the elected representatives of the people. This conflict came to a head in March 1774 over a court bill, and the governor dismissed the Assembly. Only one other Assembly met for a few days in April of 1775.

---

[18] *Ibid.*, 121.

In the meantime a call had been sent out to elect representatives to the Continental Congress, but Governor Martin was determined not to convene the Assembly until it was too late to elect delegates. To insure Continental Congress representation, a mass meeting at Wilmington sent out a call for other counties to send delegates to a Provincial Congress at Newbern, August 25, 1774.[19] Green Hill, a Methodist preacher, was elected as one of the delegates from Bute County to serve in this First North Carolina Provincial Congress.[20] His name was signed to the only major resolution of the three-day meeting, one which declared loyalty to George III, proclaimed that it was the essence of the British Constitution that no subject be taxed but by his own consent, denounced the several acts aimed at Massachusetts and Boston, set up a non-importation agreement, endorsed the proposal for a Continental Congress and elected three delegates to it, and pledged support to any recommendation of the Continental Congress.[21]

The second provincial congress was called to meet April 3, 1775, the Assembly meeting at the same time with the same group of delegates serving in both capacities. Green Hill was again a delegate from Bute County, and the only record of his service is his participation on

---

[19]R. D. W. Connor, *North Carolina, Rebuilding An Ancient Commonwealth, 1584-1925* (2 vols., Chicago, 1929; reprint ed., Spartanburg, S.C., 1973), I, 296-310.

[20]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, IX, 1042 The journal of this congress is in the above reference, IX, 1041-49.

[21]*Ibid.*, 1043-49.

the Committee of Privileges and Elections in the Assembly.[22] However, he did sign the Continental Association.

The body to enforce the wishes of the provincial congress was a committee of safety which in North Carolina was divided into a committee for each town, each county, each military district, and one for the province. At least five dissenting clergymen served on these committees: Henry Patillo, Presbyterian minister, on the committee of safety for the Halifax district;[23] John Page, Baptist minister, on the committee for Pitt County;[24] David Allen and William Hill both Baptist ministers, on the Surry County committee;[25] and Adam Body, a Presbyterian minister and editor of the *Cape Fear Mercury*, on the committee of correspondence for the town of Wilmington. Able to rally the support of most of the people of English and Scotch-Irish descent, these various committees in North Carolina were not as effective with the Highland Scots and the Germans who had a tendency to be tory or remain neutral.

Governor Martin attempted to unite these tory elements into a militia that would muster with the British troops when they landed in the colony. As a result the members of the Second Provincial Congress were concerned that many in the frontier counties would follow the leadership of the tories, a concern shared by the North Carolina delegates to the Continental Congress. Joseph Hewes, one of these

---

[22] *Ibid.*, 1197.

[23] *Ibid.*, X, 215.

[24] *Ibid.*, 37

[25] *Ibid.*, 215, 251.

delegates, persuaded four Presbyterian clergymen of the Philadelphia area, Francis Alison, James Sprout, George Duffield, and Robert Davidson, to write to their North Carolina counterparts, soliciting support for the American cause.[26] The Philadelphians reminded their friends in the South that they did not desire independence, neither were they disloyal to the king as some had reported. They recalled the recent pastoral letter sent out by the synod which emphasized this very point.

The four ministers admitted that Parliament had supreme power as long as its acts were reasonable and according to the British Constitution. But taxing without consent was an unconstitutional power which many in the House of Lords and Commons, as well as the best men of all religious denominations in America, admitted. Then they asked forcefully, "Shall it be said that you, . . . shall desert us in this mighty contest, and join with our enemies?" Advising North Carolina Presbyterians to trust in God and unite to maintain their rights, the four charged them not take up the sword and draw the blood of their fellow subjects. In the most compelling statement of the letter, the ministers warned that if the southerners deserted the cause of liberty the Philadelphians would have no fellowship with them, and

---

[26]Joseph Hewes to Samuel Johnson, July 8, 1775, in *ibid*, 86. The letter of the four clergymen was entitled "An Address to the Ministers and Presbyterian congregations in North Carolina," July 10, 1775, in *ibid.*, 222-28.

> our soul shall weep for you in secret, but will not be able any longer to number you among our friends, nor the friends of liberty, and of the house of Hanover, nor among the friends of the British Constitution.[27]

Just how much good the letter did is not easy to say.[28] From most indications it would seem that the Presbyterians supported the American cause, but some who were former Regulators, especially Highlanders, now supported the British. When the Third Provincial Congress met on August 20, 1775, with three dissenting clergymen as members, Henry Patillo and Green Hill from Bute County and William Hill from Surry County,[29] there was continuing concern about the former Regulators who might support the British. Henry Patillo was placed on a committee

> to confer with such of the Inhabitants of the Province, who entertain any religious or political Scruples, with respect to associating in the common Cause of America, to remove any ill impressions that have been made upon them by the artful devices of the enemies of America, and to induce them by argument and persuasion, heartily to unite with us for the protection of the Constitutional rights and privileges thereof.[30]

Patillo's work was made more difficult by the fact that he was one of the ministers who wrote the pastoral denunciation of the Regulators.[31]

---

[27] *Ibid.*, 227.

[28] This letter was printed in the *Cape Fear Mercury*, August 25, 1775. The editor of this paper, Adam Boyd, was a Presbyterian minister and seems to have distributed the letter widely.

[29] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 164.

[30] *Ibid.*, 169.

[31] See comments made by Saunders in Preface Notes in *ibid.*, X, viii.

Yet, this committee on "religious and political scruples" reported on September 9 that it had met with some of the Regulator leaders and that, even though some had misgivings about the oath of allegiance administered formerly to them by Governor Tyron, they were signing the Association. Therefore, the committee apprehended no danger from them.[32] Nevertheless, Governor Martin continued the attempt to win the support of the Highlanders and Regulators as a nucleus of a loyalist force.[33] The result was the Battle of Moore's Creek Bridge on February 27, 1776, in which the tories were defeated and scattered.

In addition to trying to win the Regulators to the American cause, Patillo was also active in other ways in the third congress. He, along with the two other clergymen, signed a resolution which pledged their loyalty to the king, stated that Parliament did not have the right to levy taxes to regulate the internal affairs of the colonies, and declared that the people ought to resist any attempts to exercise such claims.[34] Unanimously chosen chairman of the committee of the whole House, Patillo presided over the debate whether there should be a general confederation of the colonies.[35]

---

[32] *Ibid.*, 243.

[33] Meyer, *Highland Scots of N.C.*, 134-35, makes the point that the Highlanders were tory, but they did not participate actively in the Regulator Movement at Alamance, in contrast to the traditional view that the Regulators were tory during the Revolution as expressed by Robert O. DeMond, *The Loyalists in North Carolina During the Revolution* (Durham, 1940), 48-50 Johnson, "The War of the Regulation," 115, 155ff, says that the majority of them were whigs.

[34] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 171-73. [35] *Ibid.*, 191-92.

His position on the question is not known exactly, but the congress decided not to approve such a resolution at that time.

Concern over the tory element in the backcountry continued after the third congress; consequently the North Carolina delegates at Philadelphia convinced the Continental Congress of the necessity to send someone into the colony to help win over the waverers. Therefore, on November 28, 1775, the Continental Congress resolved "that two ministers of the gospel be applied to, to go immediately amongst the regulators and highlanders of North Carolina, for the purpose of informing them of the nature of the present dispute between Great Britain and the colonies."[36] Allowed to pick two ministers, the North Carolina delegates chose the Presbyterians, Elihu Spencer and Alexander McWhorter. After being advanced money for the trip, they left about January 4, 1776, going first into the Halifax area of North Carolina.[37] Two days later, Joseph Hewes wrote that the purpose of the trip was to persuade the enemies of America "to become active in support of those rights and privileges which belong to them in common with the rest of the Inhabitants."[38]

---

[36]Ford, *Journals of Congress*, III, 388.

[37]*Ibid.*, 438; Burnett, *Letters of Members of Congress*, I, 281, 196.

[38]Joseph Hewes to Samuel Johnson, January 6, 1776, in Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 390; Burnett, *Letters of Members of Congress*, I, 300-301.

Not much is known of the success of this trip, but the two ministers remained in North Carolina for several weeks.[39]

By the end of 1775 there was a growing sentiment for independence in North Carolina. Many of the whig leaders were openly advocating separation from Great Britain while the battle at Moore's Creek Bridge in February 1776 hastened the end of all talk about reconciliation.[40] Thus, by the time the Fourth Provincial Congress met at Halifax, April 4, 1776, the whigs were practically unanimous for independence. Green Hill was again elected as a delegate and Henry Abbott, a Baptist minister, was chosen to represent Pasquotank County.[41] Both of these ministers demonstrated their whig support by voting to recommend that the North Carolina delegates to the Continental Congress work for independence, and both signed their names to a resolution pledging secrecy in the deliberations of the congress.[42]

One of the main responsibilities of this fourth congress, along with the newly created Provincial Council of Safety, was to prepare for the defense of the colony against the threat of Indians on the frontier, tories in the interior, and British along the coast. Both of the dissenting clergy present were active on various committees in

---

[39]They were paid at the rate of $40 per month and the final account showed their salary was from December 14, 1775, to May 4, 1776. See Ford, *Journals of Congress*, VI, 898-99.

[40]Connor, *North Carolina*, I, 315-17.

[41]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 510.

[42]*Ibid.*, 512, 522-23.

defense preparations. Henry Abbott was on a committee "to take into consideration the defence and state of the sea coast,"[43] while Green Hill served on several committees relating to this problem: one to make a report concerning the quantity of ammunition in the province, another to consider military and naval claims, a third to regulate the militia, and a commission to sign bills of credit.[44]

The fifth and final congress met at Halifax in November 1776, with Henry Abbott again elected from Pasquotank County and David Caldwell from Guilford County.[45] Both of these men voted to approve a committee report concerning the manufacture of guns and the payment of soldiers. Abbott was placed on a committee to devise a way to apprehend deserters, but most important was his work on the committee to form a Bill of Rights and a constitution for the state.[46]

It is evident that the North Carolina dissenting clergy were represented in the whig organizations of the colony, and most came from the Piedmont section where dissenters were strongest. Although no dissenting minister was outstanding on the provincial level, the fact that several were elected by their local communities shows that they were respected whig leaders within their areas.

One of the most prominent dissenting clergyman of the entire South was William Tennent of South Carolina, pastor of the Independent

---

[43] *Ibid.*, 522.

[44] *Ibid.*, 502, 504, 555, 578.

[45] *Ibid.*, 914-15.

[46] *Ibid.*, 918, 958-60, 972.

or Congregational Church in Charleston. He did not come to Charleston until 1772 but within the next few months he had published articles of a political nature in the *South Carolina Gazette*. Concerned about colonial affairs, the citizens of Charleston began meeting in December 1773 to protest actions of the British, but whether Tennent participated in these meetings is not known. Early in July 1774, a general meeting with 104 elected representatives from various parishes of the colony assembled for a three day session at which time five delegates to the Continental Congress were elected and a general committee of 99 was created with power to call another meeting if needed.[47]

After the five delegates returned from Philadelphia, their report to the general committee necessitated the call for another "General Meeting of the Inhabitants" to be held January 11, 1775, the purpose being to consider the proceedings of the Continental Congress.[48] What resulted was the creation of the First Provincial Congress in South Carolina, four times larger and more representative than the Commons House of Assembly. This is the occasion on which William Tennent began his public career as a delegate from Charleston. Paul Turquand, a Lutheran-Alglican minister, was also elected from St. Matthew Parish.[49]

---

[47] *SCG&CJ*, July 12, 1774.

[48] *Ibid.*, November 15, 1774; *SCG*, November 21, 1774.

[49] Hemphill, *Journals*, 3, 7; *SCG*, January 23, 1775.

Because of the sketchy nature of the journals kept by this first session, it is difficult to determine exactly what these two dissenting clergymen thought on certain issues before the congress. However, it was this congress which approved the Declaration of Rights and the Association of the Continental Congress. Committees were appointed to carry into execution the Continental Association: Paul Turquand was appointed to the St. Matthew Parish Committee and James Creswell, a Presbyterian minister, to the committee for the district between the Broad and Saluda Rivers. Turquand was also asked to conduct divine services for the congress on several occasions.[50]

An interesting dispute occurred in the congress in which Tennent took part. It was over a clause in the fourth article of the Continental Association which stated that after September 10, 1775, America will not "export any merchandize or commodity whatsoever, to Great Britain, Ireland, or the West Indies, except Rice to Europe." This exception of rice caused considerable friction and jealousy in the Continental Congress and was also the source of much irritation among the indigo planters in South Carolina. Christopher Gadsden, one of the South Carolina delegates to the Continental Congress, denied that he had any part in placing this clause exempting rice in the Association; and because it caused so much ill-will, he felt that the clause should be removed. John Rutledge, another delegate from South Carolina at Philadelphia, defended the clause on the grounds that most

---

[50]Hemphill, *Journals*, 21, 23-24.

of the exports of the northern colonies did not go to the mother country anyway. To him, non-exportation of rice seemed like a scheme of the flour-producing colonies to hurt the rice producers. Instead of removing the clause on exporting rice, Rutledge advocated making compensation to the indigo planters. Those favoring the compensation plan were John Rutledge, William Henry Drayton, Edward Rutledge, and Thomas Lynch. Tennent, along with Gadsden and Rawlins Lowndes, opposed this compensation plan as impractical, arguing that to give compensation to the indigo planters would be unjust to the growers of other products. All should suffer together as they were one people. The debate raged for two days with a compensation plan finally being adopted.[51]

The important thing concerning Tennent's career is that very early in the Provincial Congress he aligned himself with the more radical element. This issue over rice exportation began to push him away from the more moderate leaders, such as John Rutledge and Henry Laurens, and moved him into the party led by Gadsden.[52] In this position, Tennent favored a strict interpretation of the Association and

---

[51]John Drayton, *Memoirs of the Revolution, From Its Commencement to the Year 1776* (2 vols., Charleston, 1821), I, 168-73.

[52]Richard Walsh, *Charleston's Sons of Liberty* (Columbia, 1959), 65-66. Henry Laurens, writing to his son, John, said of Gadsden, "I humbly think he was wrong on both sides andhis behavior underwent such censure; it seems to have confirmed a Serious Separation between him and the two Brothers [the Rutledges]." Henry Laurens to John Laurens, January 18, 1775, Laurens Letterbook, South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston.

would have been willing, along with Gadsden, to remove the clause allowing rice to be sold. Union of all the people was more important to Tennent, and, by implication, union of all the colonies.

Another instance just two months later confirmed Tennent's support of the Association and his stand with the radical element. It was the occasion of the return of a respected family of South Carolina from a trip to England and the landing of their furniture and horses. Approving the landing of these items as not being in violation of the Association, the general committee had to face a public outcry that the Association had been broken. After the people, by a petition, demanded reconsideration of the question, the general committee met on March 18th before a large crowd. Christopher Gadsden argued that the landing of their goods would be against the Association, that it would alarm the northern colonies, that the people were highly dissatisfied with it, and, therefore, that the previous vote should be reversed. He was supported by William Tennent and William Henry Drayton, but the Rutledge brothers, Rawlins Lowndes and Thomas Lynch favored the original decision. By a one-vote majority, the committee agreed not to land the freight.[53] Thus, the mechanic party of Gadsden had won again and Tennent had spoken in their favor, holding to the letter of the law.

Before the congress adjourned it passed a resolution recommending Friday, February 17, as a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer in

---

[53]Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, II, 163.

order "to inspire the king with true wisdom, to defend the people of North America in their just title to freedom, and to avert from them the impending calamities of civil war."[54] Requesting the ministers of the colony to deliver suitable sermons on the occasion, the congress specifically solicited Robert Smith, pastor of St. Philip's Church in Charleston, to preach a sermon to those members of congress who might be present in town. Services were held at all the churches of Charleston, including the Independent and Baptist meeting houses, at the appointed time, a day of importance to both Anglicans and dissenters.[55]

The Provincial Congress adjourned on January 17 but first made provisions for the conduct of government by the general committee, composed of the representatives of the congress from Charleston and any other members of congress who happened to be in town. This meant that Tennent regularly met with the general committee whose function was to explain the regulations of congress, cause them to be executed, and call the congress back into session.[56] Over the next six months Tennent became more and more active in political affairs by serving on committees appointed by this general committee.

It is difficult to determine the exact nature of Tennent's thoughts during his service on the general committee because very few

---

[54]Hemphill, *Journals*, 29.

[55]*SCG*, February 20, 1775.

[56]Drayton, *Memoirs*, I, 175.

minutes of the committee have been preserved and no printed or manuscript sermons of Tennent from this period have survived. Events moved quite rapidly in the next few weeks as news of British actions against the colonies was received and the conciliatory plan of Lord North was rejected. A secret committee was set up to place the colony in a posture of defense, and it was involved in the seizure of powder from the State House Armory.[57] Not a member of the secret committee, Tennent was probably not involved in this violent action led by Drayton.

On April 26, 1775, the general committee did appoint a committee of intelligence which included Tennent, William Henry Drayton, Arthur Middleton, C. C. Pinckney, and others. The purpose of the committee was

> to correspond with, and communicate to, the inhabitants of the interior and back parts of this colony, every kind of necessary information; and that they hire horses, and send expresses for that purpose, upon such occassions [*sic*] as they shall think proper.[58]

Sending out the first circular letter the following day to explain recent developments, the committee worked through the several parish committees to keep them informed of events in both the colonies and London.[59]

---

[57] *Ibid.*, 221-26.

[58] R. W. Gibbes, *Documentary History of the American Revolution* (3 vols., New York, 1855), I, 107; *SCG&CJ*, May 9, 1775.

[59] The circular letter is printed in *SCG&CJ*, May 9, 1775; also *South Carolina and American General Gazette*, April 28 - May 5, 1775, hereafter cited as *SC&AGG*.

Shortly after this, a letter arrived in Charleston from Arthur Lee in London in which he intimated that there was a plan by the British for instigating the Negroes to insurrection. Prompted by fears of a Negro rebellion as well as of a British invasion, the general committee on May 5th appointed a special committee to formulate plans "for the security of the good people of this Colony."[60] Tennent again was appointed to an important group, this one chaired by Drayton. Tennent's activities increased as he worked to aid in the defense of the colony, a role which was to reach its peak during the Second Provincial Congress. Only three days later, news arrived in Charleston that war had already begun in Massachusetts on April 19, and immediately the Provincial Congress was summoned to reconvene the first of June.

Over the next few days Tennent was assiduously engaged with the special committee drawing up a plan for defense of Charleston to be presented to the general committee. A plan was reported, but there were some on the general committee who were against taking any decisive step. Within the general committee a breach developed between the radicals led by Drayton and the moderates who were fearful of the consequences of extreme actions. The latter faction defeated the proposals for defense in the general committee, but the radicals were more successful in the forthcoming congress.[61] The special committee did prepare

---

[60]Drayton, *Memoirs*, I, 231; McCrady, *South Carolina, 1775-1780*, pp. 4-5.

[61]The radical position is discussed in Dabney and Dargan, *Drayton and Revolution*, 76-77.

plans for the defense of Charleston harbor, the arming of vessels, the raising of troops, and the creation of a general association, all to be laid before the congress.[62]

Therefore, when the Provincial Congress reconvened on June 1st, Tennent was actively involved with those who favored preparing for British aggression if it should come to South Carolina. At the beginning of the congress he was placed on a Committee of Ways and Means "for putting the colony in a posture of defence." Throughout the next three weeks this committee had the responsibility of recommending plans for the organization and financing of a militia, selecting officers of the military, encouraging citizens to train in the use of arms, and helping to secure ammunition.[63] A great part of the deliberations of congress in June had to do with activities which came under the jurisdiction of this committee.

One of the most important actions of the June congress was the establishment of a Provincial Association, and Tennent served on the committee that prepared these articles and presented them to the congress for signature on June 4.[64] This Association stated that the inhabitants of South Carolina were "justified before God and man, in resisting force by force," that the signers would unite for "defence against every foe," and, if congress thought it necessary, they would

---

[62]Drayton, *Memoirs*, I, 246-50.

[63]Hemphill, *Journals*, 36.

[64]*Ibid.*, 34. The Association is printed on p. 36.

"go forth, and be ready to sacrifice [their] lives and fortunes to secure her freedom and safety." This obligation was to continue until reconciliation had been made with Great Britain; all who refused to sign were to be held "inimical to the liberty of the colonies."

After Paul Turquand had conducted divine services on that Sunday, the members of congress proceeded to sign the Association. Before they began Henry Laurens, president of the congress, made a speech to explain his position. He had two reservations about the Association: (1) He thought that the term "inhabitants of this colony" should be replaced with "His Majesty's most dutiful and Loyal subjects," and (2) he disagreed with the statement holding all persons who refused to sign as "inimical to the Liberty of the colonies." Since he knew many men who were true friends of America but would not sign the Association for various reasons, he could not consider such individuals as enemies to the country. By turning his thoughts to the dogmatism of the Christian religion and its intolerance of other beliefs, Laurens seemed to be directly attacking Tennent. He was about to compare this type of intolerance with the reprobate clause in the Association when Tennent interrupted his speech, saying he was "out of order." Laurens replied to this:

> I will speak, I will be heard or I will be the first Man who will refuse to sign your Paper, I speak not merely as Your President, I speak as a member as a Freeman--if I am not heard as a Man, I will not sign as your President--the utmost of your resentment will be to take my Life--take it & deprive me of a very few Years--I will not hold a Life upon dishonorable terms--I will not be forced to

> sign any Paper contrary to the dictates of my Conscience to save my Life.[65]

Feeling that there should be more toleration, Laurens added that the spirit of persecution was hateful to him. In an apparent reference again to Tennent he continued, "Some Men can swallow the doctrine of Predestination without a gulp who hold that of transsubstantiation ab[surd] & blasphemous." In a footnote to his record of this speech Laurens commented that

> Mr. Tennent I am told holds the most absolute & rigid principles of the Doctrine of Predestination--he claims toleration, he is entitled to it--but alas! from my short acquaintance with him I have found him totally void of Charity for other Men.

After his objections were satisfied, Laurens and all the members of the congress, including the two dissenting clergy, signed the Association.

From this disagreement over the proper way to enforce the Association, it can be seen that Tennent once again sided with the radical group which sought strict enforcement. An ardent patriot on every major issue before the First Provincial Congress, he was on the side of the radicals with such people as Christopher Gadsden, William Henry Drayton, Arthur Middleton, and Charles Cotesworth Pinckney. Further evidence can be found in the references to Tennent by others. Since the radical group was uneasy about the loyalty of Charles Pinckney,

---

[65]The above account is taken from Henry Laurens' record of what happened, found in Miscellaneous Papers, Henry Laurens Collection, Charleston. It is also printed in "Miscellaneous Papers of the General Committee, Secret Committee, and Provincial Congress, 1775," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, VIII (1907), 142-50.

Peter Timothy wrote to Drayton that "Pinckney does not retreat; he comes forward bravely--wish you and Mr. Tennent were along side of him at the table."[66] Also, when Admiral Esek Hopkins was to come to Charleston, Gadsden recommended Tennent to him as one "to promote and give credit to the cause."[67] The work of Tennent in the general committee, the Provincial Congress, and other committees endeared him to those who were unafraid to speak out even though it might mean their lives in case Britain should put down the rebellion.

Before this second session of the congress adjourned in June 1775, Tennent was on another committee to draw up a declaration to be sent to Lieutenant Governor William Bull explaining the necessity of calling a congress. Denoting the warmest attachment to George III and wishing reconciliation with Great Britain, the committee stated that the present congress was "not the effect of levity and a desire for change."[68] The congress set aside another day of fasting and prayer to be observed on July 27, all ministers of the colony to preach suitable sermons.[69] Thus the first congress in South Carolina came to a close.

Most of the people in Charleston signed the Association, but the situation was different in the backcountry. In that area there

---

[66]Peter Timothy to William Henry Drayton, August 22, 1775, in Gibbes, *Documentary History*, I, 156.

[67]Christopher Gadsden to Admiral Eseck Hopkins, January 10, 1776, in Walsh, *Writings of Gadsden*, 109.

[68]Hemphill, *Journals*, 49, 52.

[69]*Ibid.*, 56.

were large numbers of people who were suspicious of the "planter gentlemen" of the coast and felt that they were trying to impose the actions of a radical congress on them. The Germans remained passive, but the Scotch-Irish of the Ninety-Six District rallied to support the crown under military leaders like Thomas Fletchall, Robert and Joseph Cunningham, and Joseph Robinson. About 1500 settlers did not join the Association but instead subscribed to a counter-association. Concerned about this situation, the council of safety in Charleston sought to do something to win the tory backcountry to the American cause.

On July 23, 1775, the council commissioned William Henry Drayton, one of its members, and William Tennent to go into the interior of the colony to explain to the people the nature of the unhappy disputes with Great Britain, to settle the political disagreements between the people, to quiet their minds, and to explain the necessity of a general union. The two were given power to call upon the officers of the militia for support and protection.[70] Three days later the council sent a letter to Oliver Hart, the Baptist minister in Charleston, requesting him to accompany the other two men.[71] It is significant that the council would call upon Tennent and Hart, two dissenting clergy, to go on a whig mission, rather than call on a minister of the Anglican church or some other outstanding laymen. Tennent had already served

---

[70]"Journal of the Council of Safety," *Collections of the South Carolina Historical Society*, II, 58.

[71]*Ibid.*, 64.

in the First Provincial Congress of South Carolina and had distinguished himself in that position, and Hart had been a religious leader in the city for twenty-five years. Both were ardent whigs and both represented the denominations which were most numerous in the backcountry.

The three men were gone from Charleston from early August until September, mainly in the region between the Broad and Saluda rivers. At their first important stop, in the Orangeburg District, they met opposition from the Germans who did not want to take up arms against the king. Hart was accompanied into this region by an unidentified Baptist minister. After being unsuccessful here, Drayton and Hart went into the area between the Borad and Saluda rivers, Tennent to the north side of the Broad River, thence to meet near Fairforest at Colonel Fletchall's.[72] Enroute they organized militia loyal to the council of safety, attempted to get people to sign the Association, and spoke to gatherings to convince them of the justice of the American cause--an activity which Tennent referred to as "harranguing" a group. Of the two dissenting ministers, more is known about Tennent's activities since Hart in his diary merely gave passing references to his mission. Tennent seemed to think that Hart was the weakest of the group, for he mentioned that on one occasion he stopped at a meeting house where Hart was preaching and even though he heard a good sermon, he thought

---

[72]Drayton and Tennent to Council of Safety, August 7, 1775, in Gibbes, *Documentary History*, I, 129.

> it providential that we came here, as some opposers had collected, who would have brow beat Mr. Hart, Took the Storm upon myself and did some good.[73]

Despite Tennent's reservations, Hart worked diligently among the Baptists, closely assisted by Richard Furman, a young Baptist minister from the High Hills of the Santee. Both sought to convince the tories of their faults, and on some occasions the two ministers narrowly escaped becoming the victims of tory vengeance.[74]

The Dayton-Tennent-Hart mission met with only relative success. In some places the people were convinced and signed the Association, while in other places they stood firm in their opposition. For example, on August 10, Tennent recorded that he had met with "some disaffected men, who became converts by proper arguments," yet the next day he preached and "harrangued" for an hour on the state of the country and commented that "some of the most sensible were the most refractory I had met with, obstinately fixed against the proceedings of the colony."[75] The following Sunday he had the pleasure to see all the people eagerly sign the Association after his sermon.[76] Very little is known of Tennent's activity between the Wateree and Broad rivers,

---

[73]William Tennent, "Fragment of a Journal. . .," *City of Charleston, South Carolina, Year Book--1894*, 304. Drayton mentioned also that Hart was "ridiculed by Fletchall." See Drayton letter in Gibbes, *Documentary History*, I, 143.

[74]Cook, *Richard Furman*, 51. Furman probably was the unnamed Baptist minister with Hart at the German settlement. See Gibbes, *Documentary History*, I, 129.

[75]Tennent, "Fragment of a Journal," 298.

[76]*Ibid.*, 299.

but Drayton mentioned that it was successful. Tennent appeared to be indefatigable in executing his duties, as he reported to Laurens: "I have forsook my chaise, and ride on horseback from day to day, meeting people."[77]

One highlight of the mission was the meeting of Drayton and Tennent with Fletchall, Cunningham, and Robinson on August 17. Drayton reported that he and Tennent had a three hour talk with Fletchall.

> We endeavored to explain every thing to him. We pressed them upon him. We endeavored to show him that we had a confidence in him. We humored him. We laughed with him. Then we recurred to argument, remonstrances and entreaties to join his countrymen and all America. All that we could get from him was this. He would never take up arms against the King, or his countrymen.[78]

Writing to Henry Laurens concerning the meeting, Tennent acknowledged that the "mighty nabob Fletchall" was surrounded by his court, who have him under their command. He commented:

> We soon found the unchangeable malignity of their minds, and the inexpressible pains they are at to blind the people, and fill them with bitterness. . . . We soon found that reasoning was vain.[79]

Finally, Fletchall was persuaded to call a meeting of his regiment on the twenty-third at Ford's on the Enoree and let the commissioners speak to them.

---

[77]Drayton, *Memoirs*, I, 369, 376.

[78]Drayton to Council of Safety, August 21, 1775, in Gibbes, *Documentary History*, I, 150.

[79]William Tennent to Henry Laurens, August 20, 1775, in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, III, 180

The commissioners attended this meeting with some apprehension about their safety. In their report to the council of safety the day after the meeting, Drayton and Tennent explained:

> Imagine every indecency of language, every misrepresentation, every ungenerous and unjust charge against the *American* politicks [*sic*] that could alarm the people, and give them an evil impression of our designs against their liberties and the rights of *Great Britain;* imagine all you can on these points, and you will not exceed what we heard.[80]

Yet some of Fletchall's captains came over to their side. After this meeting, Tennent proceeded to Long Cane while Drayton turned his attention to the people of Augusta.

At other times Tennent also expressed uneasiness because he knew that he was among violent men who would do anything to destroy the work of this mission. While at Enoree he met with a gang "all double armed with pistols" and he felt that "a terrible riot seemed on the point of happening." On one occasion, he rode through the woods "to avoid a place, where an ambuscade was suspected." He later mentioned fleeing to a fort in fear that Moses Kirkland, another tory leader, was to attack the place.[81] Yet Tennent did not seem to mind since he was on a mission of great importance, determined to fulfill the confidence that the council of safety had vested in him: I consider myself as running great risks, but think it my duty."[82]

---

[80]Drayton and Tennent to Council of Safety, August 24, 1775, in *ibid.*, 258.

[81]Tennent, "Fragment of a Journal," 301, 306-8.

[82]William Tennent to Council of Safety, September 1, 1775, in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, III, 621.

A part of the purpose of this mission was to organize a militia of volunteers who would be loyal to the council of safety. Even though a minister, Tennent had no hesitation in participating in this type of activity. On the morning of August 14 he lay the "foundation for a company of volunteer Rangers to serve on horse."[83] Later, at Long Cane, he reported that three volunteer companies had been formed for protection from the tories and the Indians.[84] Concerned about the threat of the Cherokee Indians, rumored to be preparing to fight with the tories, Tennent on several occasions requested the council of safety to send ammunition. He called this alliance a "helish plot" prepared for the friends of America.

During this mission, Tennent and Hart made contacts with other dissenting ministers, often holding meetings at their churches. On August 20 at King Creek, Tennent noted that he met with a hundred people who were "the most obstinate opposers of the Congress," and after being aided by "two gainsaying Baptist preachers, they all refused to sign the Association but ten."[85] The two preachers' names are not

---

[83]Tennent, "Fragment of a Journal," 299. This is undoubtedly one of the two companies mentioned in his letter to Henry Laurens, August 20, 1775, in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, III, 182.

[84]For military matters reported by Tennent, see his letters printed in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, III, 182, 621-22; see also Drayton, *Memoirs*, I, 385, for his activities in fortifying Fort Charlotte. Tennent's order to Captain John Caldwell to prepare Fort Charlotte is in Gibbes, *Documentary History*, I, 166-67.

[85]Tennent, "Fragment of a Journal," 300.

recorded, but at least this points up the role of ministers in influencing local people. At the beginning of the journey in the Dutch settlement of Saxe-Gotha the German captains refused to muster their troops and a Lutheran minister aided in gathering congregations, but with little success.[86] The name of this Lutheran minister was not mentioned, but it was most likely Christian Theus, a clergyman in the area for almost 50 years. A little later Tennent spent a day with a patriot Presbyterian minister, James Creswell of Little River. While in this area, Tennent spoke to Robert Cunningham's company, which he called some of the most fixed people he had seen. Creswell also spoke to the group and

> conjured them by all that was sacred that they would not give themselves up to be the dupes of ministerial artifice, or the instruments of opposition and slavery.[87]

Thus, Creswell, in the center of a tory settlement, held firm to the American cause. Towards the end of his trip at Long Cane Creek, Tennent spoke at one of the preaching sheds of John Harris who also addressed the group on the American cause.[88] Harris was a patriot Presbyterian minister who later served in the Second Provisional Congress from the Ninety-Six district. Thus, Tennent drew upon the resources he had at every location he visited; but, it is evident he

---

[86]Tennent and Drayton to Council of Safety, August 7, 1775, in Gibbes, *Documentary History*, I, 128-33; McCrady, *South Carolina, 1775-1780*, pp. 41-42.

[87]Tennent, "Fragment of a Journal," 302.

[88]*Ibid.*, 304-5.

did not always receive the complete support of all the dissenting clergy in the backcountry.

The main purpose of the mission being accomplished, Hart returned to Charleston during the first week in September; and Tennent, after a successful tour of the Long Cane settlement, returned to his home on September 15. He mentioned that on the journey homeward he took the liberty to nap in his carriage on the King's Highway, commenting, "I hope his Majesty will not be persuaded to get an Act of Parliament passed to constitute this treason."[89] In spite of the work done by the commissioners, the tory element remained strong in the backcountry. Yet the two dissenting clergymen did what they could, and congress passed a resolution thanking them "for the important services. . . respectively rendered to this colony, in their late progress into the Back Country."[90]

Drayton remained in the backcountry for some time, making agreements and trying to bring the Cherokee Indians to support the South Carolina government. On September 16, 1775, he met at Ninety-Six with Thomas Fletchall and deputies of the people of the region, at which time a Treaty of Neutrality was drawn up and signed. Among the deputies representing the loyalists was Philip Mulkey, a Baptist minister from Fairforest. His name appeared within the text of the treaty, but he did not sign it.[91] The part Mulkey played in the

---

[89] *Ibid.*, 310.

[90] Hemphill, *Journals*, 167.

[91] A copy of the treaty can be found in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, III, 720-21; Drayton, *Memoirs*, I, 399-403; Mulkey is also

negotiations is unknown, as is the reason why his signature does not appear at the end of the treaty, but it is significant that this Baptist minister was chosen as a representative of the loyalist element. Could it be that Mulkey did not agree with this treaty, refused to sign it, and joined the more radical element under Robert Cunningham who fled to East Florida? Or may it be that Mulkey was a part of the moderate Fletchall group? This latter conjecture would explain Mulkey's more moderate stand in regard to the relationship between the mother country and the colonies. Both hypotheses are further compounded by his disappearance from the scene about 1776.[92] In any case Mulkey, pastor at Fairforest, the area of strongest tory support, either fell under the influence of the loyalists or from his own convictions supported that element. Whatever happened, he was looked upon as a man who had leadership ability and who could represent the followers of Fletchall before Drayton. The tory tendency of Mulkey seemed to have been an exception to the whig sentiments of the dissenter clergymen on the frontier.

---

mentioned as a deputy in a letter of Thomas Brown to Lord William Campbell, October 18, 1775, Henry Clinton Papers, William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan.

[92]A biographer of Mulkey said that he probably died on his Fairforest plantation about that time. J. D. Bailey, *Reverends Philip Mulkey and James Fowler* (Gaffney, South Carolina, 1924), 15. Weis gives his death date as 1801 and there is some evidence that Mulkey went to the East Tennessee region. His son, Jonathan (1752-1826), was one of the earlier preachers in that area.

The mission of Drayton, Tennent, and Hart did not spell the end of British support in the backcountry. The Treaty of Ninety-Six being violated, some tories under Patrick Cunningham seized ammunition which the council of safety had intended for the Cherokee Indians; thereupon a body of militia was sent out under Colonel Richardson to apprehend the tory leaders. About the same time, the Baptist minister, Richard Furman, attempted to do what he could to win the loyalists to the American cause.

In November 1775, Furman wrote an "address" to the inhabitants between the Broad and Saluda rivers to offer "a few thoughts, that flow from a heart, which thinks it is influenced with the most tender and impartial concern for the good of the whole."[93] In the introduction of his "address," Furman mentioned that he had endeavored

> to make an impartial inquiry concerning the transactions of both parties, in order to find the truth. . . . My business therefore, shall be to set matters in a clear light, that an impartial judgement may be passed upon them.

Laboring under the difficulties of false and prejudiced reports by people who wished well to neither king nor America, Furman attempted to do two things: (1) to show that the reports against the congress were not true, and (2) to point out the consequences that would result from opposing the designs of America.

What followed in Furman's letter was a typical whig interpretation of the American position during the preceding decade. The sum

---

[93]The manuscript of this "Address" signed "Loyal Subject," High Hills of Santee, November 1775, is in the Baptist Hist. Coll., Greenville.

of what they opposed was comprised in the Declaratory Law, resulting in taxes, enslavement, unlimited governmental power, the Boston Port Bill which forbid them to trade, and the Quebec Act, with its threat to the Protestant religion. He reviewed the means of opposition used by the colonists: their refusal to receive the tea, the Association, and finally their taking up arms purely for defense. By doing this the colonists laid themselves open to the rage of the British ministry and to the loss of property from the British army and navy. Furman then asked why congress would deceive them. Every member of congress desired their welfare, so what further evidence did they need?

After showing the righteousness of the American cause, Furman proceeded to point out the consequences of opposition. All that the uncommitted would gain would be the shedding of blood. In addition they would bind themselves to an arbitrary power which would use them, but worse of all, they would be assisting those who conspired against liberty of conscience. Furman's final appeal was on the ground of the unlikely chance of success of the loyalists against the large number of South Carolinians who supported the actions of congress. The counsel he gave was not to take up arms, but, in moderation, to join in with other Americans, as friend with friend, and endeavor "to promote the good of the Whole." Appoint honest men to inquire about the truth of these things, he pleaded.

Furman felt that through his letter he had discharged his conscience in a private and involuntary matter, not for reward. By

unburdening his heart as a true patriot, he took his stand with the actions of congress. No doubt the Furman letter influenced the tories in the backcountry and the statement so impressed General Richardson that he had copies of it spread among the disaffected public as his army advanced. Thus, a young minister only twenty years of age played an influential part in the attempt to win over the tories in South Carolina.

By the fall of 1775, Governor Campbell had left Charleston and dissolved the House of Assembly, and the South Carolina militia had seized Fort Johnson. Consequently, the general committee saw the necessity for calling a Second Provincial Congress to meet on November 1, 1775. Three dissenting clergymen were elected to this congress: William Tennent from the District East of the Wateree River; John Harris, a Presbyterian minister, from the Ninety-Six District; and Paul Turquand from St. Matthew's Parish.[94] Again, Tennent was the most active, and his work in this session might be divided into three categories.

The first was his committee work concerning the organization of the government. At the beginning of the congress he was placed on a committee to prepare a resolution for regulating future elections of members of congress.[95] The need for this committee arose when two returns were sent naming delegates to the congress from the New Acquisition, a region west of the Catawba River. Tennent was also

---

[94]Hemphill, *Journals*, 75-77.

[95]*Ibid.*, 88.

appointed to the committee of intelligence to communicate with the inhabitants of the interior and to seize all persons who might endanger the public safety or prove injurious to the cause of America.[96] Actually a continuation of the work he had done on an earlier intelligence committee, his re-appointment is indicative of his previous efforts as well as an appreciation of his actions in the backcountry the preceding summer. Tennent also served on the committee to consider the division of the district between the Broad and Saluda Rivers into three parts and to recommend the number of representatives from each district.[97] The most important work Tennent did in the organization of government was his service on the committee to define the powers and authority vested in the new council of safety.[98] Previously these powers had not been defined, but now the matter was of utmost importance because of the flight of Governor Campbell and the dissolution of the Commons House of Assembly.

Defense of the colony was the second area in which Tennent was active. The congress was informed on the first day of its meeting that the tory Robert Cunningham had been taken prisoner and charged "with high crimes and misdemeanors against the liberties of America." Soon after this his brother, Patrick Cunningham, and others seized ammunition that the council of safety sent to the Cherokee Indians as

---

[96] *Ibid.*, 127.

[97] *Ibid.*, 181. The report of the committee was made by Tennent and is printed on pp. 182-83.

[98] *Ibid.*, 133. The report is given on pp. 154-56.

a gift to keep them loyal to the colonials. Tennent was placed on the committee to consider these reports and make recommendations as to what should be done. The committee recommended that Patrick Cunningham be apprehended, brought to Charleston, and every endeavor be made to recover the gunpowder.[99]

The third area of Tennent's activity was the encouragement of manufacturing. Both Tennent and Harris were on the committee to consider what manufactures should be established in the colony and the best means for doing so. Tennent made the committee report to congress recommending that the government give premiums for the production of saltpetre, sulphur, bar iron, bar steel, nails, gun locks, salt, lead, linens, cottons, and to those who would erect a paper mill.[100] All these articles were necessary for the war effort.

When the congress met for its second session in February 1776, Tennent again actively encouraged manufacturing. Among the committees he served on during this session were those to report the best method for promoting the manufacture of saltpetre, to report the best means of erecting a powder mill and promoting the making of gunpowder, to consider the proposal of William Bellamy that he undertake to erect a mill to make paper and cutting files, to erect and superintend a public salt work near Charleston, and to consider the petition of Joseph Buffington to acquire assistance in completing an iron work.[101]

---

[99] *Ibid.*, 101-2.

[100] *Ibid.*, 150, 161-64.

[101] *Ibid.*, 186, 190, 222, 239, 244.

Endorsing Buffington's petition for state assistance in completing the iron work in return for half of all the output, Tennent led the committee to recommend giving Buffington a loan to be paid off in four years.[102]

The course of the Revolution in South Carolina demonstrated William Tennent's versatility in not only leading his congregation spiritually but also politically. He served well in preparing for defense, organizing the government, and encouraging manufacturing, and he was willing to risk his life to go among those who opposed his politics. Well thought of by the citizens of Charleston, Tennent had the honor of preaching to people of various faiths. In all of the southern colonies, there was probably no other dissenting clergyman who was a more ardent whig. He died in 1777 at High Hills on a trip to bring his mother to Charleston.

Georgia's situation was different from that of South Carolina, because as a much younger colony, it was closely tied to the royal government led by Governor James Wright. This most capable man used his influence to keep Georgians under control as much as possible, but by mid-1777, in the flood of patriotism, Georgia joined the other colonies. The population of Georgia was only 33,000 in 1773, almost half of them slaves. While most of the whites were dissenters, there were only a few ministers of any denomination The strongest

---

[102] *Ibid.*, 249-50. The petition of Buffington is printed in A. S. Salley, ed., *Documents Relating to the History of South Carolina During the Revolutionary War* (Columbia, 1908), 1-4.

dissenting groups were the Congregationalists in St. John's Parish, the Lutherans at Ebenezer, and the Presbyterians in Savannah, with the Baptists belatedly limping behind. The Congregationalists were whigs but their leading pastor, John Osgood, died in 1773; the Lutherans at Ebenezer tended to be tories under their pastor, Christopher Frederick Triebner. No real church organization existed among the Presbyterians in the backcountry, but in Savannah they were led by John J. Zubly, the most prominent dissenting clergyman in the colony.[103] Scattered on the frontier, the Separate Baptists, led by Abraham and Daniel Marshall, did not take an active role in the events leading up to the Revolution. There was no organized circuit among the few Methodists in Georgia.

After the Stamp Act controversy things were relatively quiet in Georgia until the passage of the "Intolerable Acts." Concerned about this new threat, the more radical leaders at Savannah, Noble W. Jones, Archibald Bulloch, John Houstoun, and George Walton, issued an invitation for a public meeting at Tondee's Tavern on July 27, 1774.[104] It is not known if Zubly participated, but very little was accomplished because only a few parishes were represented. The meeting adjourned until August 10 at which time eight resolutions were adopted, typical

---

[103]For a contemporary account of the state of religion in Georgia in 1773, see a letter by Zubly printed in *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society, VIII (1864-1865), 214-19. See also Strickland, *Religion and the State in Georgia,* 36-43, 148-60.

[104]Candler, *Rev. Recs. of Ga.*, I, 11-12; *Georgia Gazette,* August 3, 1774.

of other colonies, concerning the constitutional relationship between the colonies and the mother country, and including a statement of grievances of loyal subjects.[105] Since the meeting did not result in the appointment of delegates to the Continental Congress, Georgia was the only colony not represented in that first congress.

Disliking both of these meetings, Governor Wright had petitions circulated throughout the colony in opposition to the resolutions adopted at the August meeting. Seven of the petitions containing 633 names have been preserved.[106] On the one from the Parish of St. Paul were the names of Daniel Marshall and Saunders Walker, Baptist ministers. The grievances included a distaste for the resolutions adopted at the August 10 meeting because only a few people attended, others were refused admittance, and a protest sent by the Parish of St. Paul was not presented.[107] The signatures of Marshall and Walker on this petition do not seem too significant because many who then thought that constitutional means could be used to settle the dispute later turned out to be ardent whigs. Revolution had not yet come to Georgia, but it was evident that two parties were forming.

Over the next four months sentiment increased for Georgia to adopt the Continental Association. The Congregationalists in St. John's Parish and the Presbyterian Highlanders in St. Andrew's Parish both

---

[105] *Ibid.*, 15-17; *Georgia Gazette*, August 17, 1774.

[106] See the analysis made by Coleman, *Revolution in Georgia*, 42-43.

[107] Candler, *Rev. Recs. of Ga.*, I, 22-23.

adopted the Association, but neither had regular pastors at the time. A call was sent out for a congress to convene in Savannah on January 17, 1775, but when it met, only five parishes were represented. Meeting at the same time as the Commons House, it elected three delegates to the Second Continental Congress and adopted the Association with some modifications,[108] but this First Provincial Congress did not feel it properly represented the sentiments of the whole colony. Thus, it was left to the Commons House to take action, but it failed to do so before Governor Wright prorogued it on February 10. Since they could not speak for the whole colony, the three delegates to the Continental Congress declined to serve.

Up to May 10, 1775, when news of the Battle of Lexington arrived in Savannah, Zubly's participation in these activities is unclear, for his name is nowhere recorded as a participant. This is no proof, however, that he did not participate, and because of his whig writings in the preceding decade, it is doubtful that he sat idly by during these years. By June 5, the whigs were active in Savannah, calling for the inhabitants of the city to sign the Continental Association and setting June 22 as a day to elect a committee to enforce the Association and to choose delegates to a congress to meet in July.[109] The next week Zubly did meet with thirty-three other whigs at which time resolutions were adopted saying that public peace should be preserved and that no person should be molested as long as he behaved properly.

---

[108] *Ibid.*, 42-48.

[109] *Ibid.*, 252-53.

The resolutions recommended that the future congress petition the king to protest recent Parliamentary acts on raising of revenue and also advised that Georgia should join with other colonies

> in every just and legal measure to secure and restore the liberties of all America, and for healing the unhappy divisions now subsisting between Great Britain and her Colonies.[110]

These words still held out hope for reconciliation, but they do tie Zubly to the liberty party in Savannah. Controlling the meeting held June 22, the party was instrumental in selecting a committee of safety and the Savannah delegates to the next Provincial Congress.

The Second Provincial Congress met on July 4, with Zubly one of the delegates from Savannah. After the organizational meeting, the congress adjourned to Zubly's church where he preached a sermon on "the alarming state of American affairs."[111] This sermon, *The Law of Liberty*, was taken from the text, James 2:12, "So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." A large part of the sermon dealt with the oppressive burdens and taxes that King Rehoboam of Israel laid upon his people, a condition obviously implying the relationship between George III and America. Speaking about the natural rights of man he noted that a people who

> claim no more than their natural rights, in so doing, do nothing displeasing unto God, and the most powerful monarch

---

[110] *Ibid.*, 232-34.

[111] *Ibid.*, 229-31. The minutes of this congress are in *ibid.*, 229-59.

> that would deprive his subjects of the liberties of man, whatever may be his success, he must not expect the approbation of God, and in due time will be the abhorrence of all men.[112]

Zubly emphasized that laws are necessary but concluded that the Gospel of Jesus was the law of liberty. Counseling the delegates to think before they spoke, he pleaded with them to "let the law of liberty by which you are hereafter to be judged, be the constant rule of all your words and actions." Explaining the present troubles as a work of the king's bad advisers, his recommendation to the delegates was to

> let neither the frowns of tyranny, nor pleasure of popularity, sway you from what you clearly apprehend just and right, and to be your duty. . . .Consider how much lies at stake. . . . Endeavor to act like freemen, like loyal subjects, like real Christians.[113]

He advised further that the colonists proceed with their task slowly, showing that they were not lawless and that they were not opposed to lawful government but to oppression. This sermon set the stage for deliberate but cautious actions.

This congress, for which Zubly was both member and inspirational speaker, approved the measures of the Continental Congress and agreed to abide by the Continental Association. Zubly was one of the five delegates appointed to attend the Continental Congress, causing him to express his surprise at being chosen, because "he thought himself

---

[112]Zubly, *Law of Liberty*, 2. It is also printed in Frank Moore, ed., *The Patriot Preachers of the American Revolution* (New York, 1862), 114-42, and in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, II, 1557-68.

[113]Zubly, *Law of Liberty*, 25.

for many reasons a very improper person." He refused to go unless his congregation gave approval; thus John Houstoun and Noble W. Jones were appointed to secure their consent. The congregation immediately voted "to spare their minister for a time, for the good of the common cause"; whereupon Zubly gave his consent, thanking congress "for so signal a mark of honour and confidence."[114]

In addition to being appointed a delegate to the Continental Congress, Zubly served on most of the important committees of the Provincial Congress. He was on a committee to apply to the governor to appoint a day of fasting and prayer, which the governor did.[115] He was also appointed to draw up a petition to the king on the unhappy state of affairs; and on July 8, congress approved the petition he had prepared.[116]

Because this petition is in Zubly's own words and shows his moderation, a brief review of its contents is worthwhile. First, the petition lists grievances similar to injustices in other contemporaneous petitions addressed to the king by loyal subjects. Drawing attention to the misconduct and poor advice of the king's ministers, Zubly accused them of finding new methods of distress "too shocking to human nature, to be even named in the list of grievances." In regard to the military situation, he remonstrated that the king's arms in America

---

[114] Chandler, *Rev. Recs. of Ga.*, I, 241, 248-49.

[115] *Ibid.*, 231, 240.

[116] *Ibid.*, 241, 243. The petition is printed on pp. 264-67.

"now every day make mothers childless, and children fatherless." Zubly then assured the king that America was not divided, as some had said, but was united in a common cause because the king's ministers,

> often introducing the deamon [*sic*] of discord into your empire, and driving America to the brink of despair, place all their dignity in measures obstinately pursued, because they were once wantonly taken. They hearkened to no information but what represented Americans as rebels or cowards. Time will everyday make it clearer how much they were infatuated and mistaken.[117]

Finally, Zubly requested the king to recall his troops and permit Americans to be ruled by the principles of the excellent British constitution. What Zubly had done was to offer a moderate whig statement, still holding out for reconciliation with no mention of separation from the empire.

The same is true in three other letters he helped prepare: one to the president of the Continental Congress giving an account of the Georgia congress; an address to the Governor of Georgia explaining the position of the congress; and an address to the inhabitants of the colony giving an account of the dispute with Great Britain and the proceedings of congress.[118] Before the provincial congress adjourned, it instructed the delegates to Philadelphia to pledge Georgia's support to the united colonies and also to contribute an adequate amount to the expenditures in defense of American rights.[119]

---

[117] *Ibid.*, 266-67.

[118] *Ibid.*, 242, 249-51, 257, 260-62.

[119] *Ibid.*, 258-59.

Zubly's role in the Provincial Congress was to take the middle ground, never wavering from the hope of a reconciliation with Great Britain even though he was a strong defender of American rights. His gift with words pushed him into a place of leadership in this congress and won him a position in the Continental Congress.

Zubly, John Houstoun, and Archibald Bulloch attended the Continental Congress on September 5, although their credentials were not presented and read until September 13.[120] Arriving before this date, Zubly wrote an important letter to the Earl of Dartmouth, dated September 3, from Philadelphia.[121] The purpose of the letter was to appeal to Lord Dartmouth as a man and a Christian to do all he could to secure reconciliation in the dispute. To Zubly the main question was whether Parliament had the right to bind the colonies; to do so was the method of despotism and made Americans the "hewers of wood and drawers of water." He enumerated many colonial grievances and assured Dartmouth that America was united:

> The Americans have been called "a rope of sand": but blood and sand will make a firm cementation; and enough *American*

---

[120] Burnett, *Letters of Members of Congress*, I, xliv; Ford, *Journals of Congress*, II, 240-41.

[121] Doctor Zubly to the Earl of Dartmouth, September 3, 1775, in Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, III, 634-39. One Georgia historian called it "one of the best state papers of that period, written with clearness, force, calmness, and a full knowledge of the position of American affairs, and a full vindication of American rights." William B. Stevens, *A History of Georgia* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1859; reprint ed., Savannah, 1972), II, 119.

> blood has been already shed to cement them together into a thirteenfold cord, not easily to be broken.[122]

Pointing out that America had already shown her power, Zubly expressed confidence that Americans had the advantage over men almost everywhere. Any further acts of violence on the part of Britain would strengthen the American spirit. Destroy America and what would happen to the British Empire? To Zubly, the question was whether the British troops would drive liberty from the empire, or whether America would be allowed to flourish and contribute to the empire. Whatever happened, Americans would never part with their liberty but with their lives.

It is difficult to determine the exact stand taken by Zubly as a member of the Continental Congress because the journals did not record debates. He was a member of the committee of accounts which reviewed all requests for money.[123] About the only knowledge we have of his debates is from the notes taken by John Adams, and from these Zubly's views can be determined on an important issue before the congress; that is, whether America should open its ports to trade again.[124] Zubly thought that trade was important but that America's policy should be one that would lead to reconciliation with Great Britain and not be used to threaten. After all, America still had friends in Britain. Believing that America had the choice of trade and reconciliation or

---

[122]Zubly to Dartmouth, *ibid.*, 637.

[123]Ford, *Journals of Congress*, III, 262.

[124]*Ibid.*, 481, 491-92.

developing the means of carrying on war, Zubly was of the opinion that a country could not carry on a war nor support a navy without trade. He concluded, "Wisdom is better than weapons of war."

On every issue before the Continental Congress, Zubly was for moderation. When the congress was debating the advisability of stopping the postal service operated by Britain, Zubly was against it and commented that "some gentlemen think all merit lies in violent and unnecessary measures."[125] In fact, he said that he came to the congress with two objectives in mind: (1) to secure the rights of America, and (2) to secure reconciliation with Great Britain.[126] Everything he did or said in the congress was determined by those two principles.

Naturally, Zubly was disturbed when some in congress began talking about separation from the mother country. Though a defender of American rights, he did everything he could

> to contradict and oppose every hint of a desire of independence or of breaking our connection with Great Britain. . . .
> A separation from the Parent State I w^{d} dread as one of the greatest evils & should it ever be proposed will pray & fight against it. Some good men may desire it but good Men do not always know what they are about. I have more than a little thought on this matter, being born & bred in a Commonwealth should not be unacquainted with republican Gov^{t} but wish never to see the day when the Q^{n} whether we ought to Separate sh^{d} be agitated.[127]

---

[125] *Ibid.*, 488.

[126] *Ibid.*, 482.

[127] Diary of John J. Zubly, October 24, 1775, Georgia Historical Society, Savannah.

Sometime in November he suddenly departed Philadelphia and returned to Savannah, leaving a letter to his fellow Georgians that he was

> setting off for Georgia greatly indisposed. You will doubtless reach home before me tho you should not depart these ten days. In case of my first arrival I think not to make any report to our Council of Safety till we are all present.[128]

Just why he left is a subject of dispute. There was some talk of his involvement in a treasonous plot. Ezra Stiles, Congregationalist minister in Connecticut, recorded the suspicion the following spring, on the authority of Francis Dana who had just returned from Philadelphia:

> Dr. Zubly left Congress last fall *abruptly*, because they would not come into his plan of *petitioning* again, and because he was against Independency which he plainly saw the Congress had resolved on. The Congress fearing he might do Mischief in Georgia, sent off one [John Houstoun] after him. It is said that Dr. Zubly has been detected in a Correspondence with Ld. Campbel, Gov. of So. Carolina, & thereupon was taken into custody. It had been more to Dr. Zubly's Honor to have kept to the Character of a Minister of Jesus Christ without assuming a political character.[129]

It does not seem, however, that Zubly was engaged in treason, but that in his zeal for the established order, he innocently wrote to a royal

---

[128] Zubly to John Houstoun and Archibald Bulloch, undated, Emmet Collection, New York Public Library. For a discussion of the date of his leaving congress, see Burnett, *Letters of Members of Congress*, I, xliv-xlv. He was in Savannah by December 19 for he appeared before the Council of Safety on that date. See Chandler, *Rev. Recs. of Ga.*, I, 77.

[129] F. B. Dexter, ed., *The Literary Diary of Ezra Stiles* (3 vols., New York, 1901), II, 10-11. There is some evidence he wrote to Governor Wright to report on the proceedings of congress and this caused a great deal of suspicion about him. See Stevens, *Georgia*, II, 120.

official and was discovered. Given the temper of the times, this was enough to brand him a tory. Rather than supporting independence, he left for home.

It has been said that Americans were reluctant revolutionaries, and this certainly was true of the southern dissenting clergy. Throughout the decade preceding the outbreak of war, they exerted a moderating influence, and the nature of their theological beliefs led them to be either pacifists in times of violence or firmly on the side of governmental authority. On the whole, they did not seem to be active in politics.

By 1774-1775, however, the situation changed rapidly. With the breakdown of royal government, it became necessary for the local communities to abide by the wishes of the Continental Congress and provincial congresses and to provide political leadership. A situation was created in which the leading dissenting clergy were thrust into these positions. No general conclusion is possible, as circumstances varied from colony to colony. In Maryland, for instance, the leading dissenting groups were pacifist. Methodism was stronger in Maryland than in any other southern colony, but the Methodists had tory tendencies, as will be discussed in the following chapter. Therefore, there was very little participation in the extra-legal agencies by dissenting clergy in Maryland. In Virginia, the Anglican church was politically strong but in the Piedmont and Valley, the dissenting clergy made their influence felt. In North Carolina, where the dissenters made up a large percentage of the population and Anglican ministers were few,

the dissenting clergy participated in politics. The most active clerical participants were in the urban centers of South Carolina and Georgia. There were no whigs more ardent than William Tennent and Oliver Hart of Charleston. The same can be said of Zubly's political philosophy, but because of his background and temperment, he rejected that role when it came time for independence from the mother country.

In spite of this increased political activity by the southern dissenting clergy in 1774-1775, it does not appear that they were as active in proportion to their total number as were the clergy in New England. In the Massachusetts constitutional conventions of 1779-1780 at least thirteen clergymen were representatives and in the New Hampshire Provincial Congress meeting in May 1775, there were nine representatives who were clergymen.[130] These figures far surpass any number of dissenting clergy in any southern colony. It points up the disinclination of the southern dissenting clergy to hold political office and to take active leadership roles in a revolution they wished was not occurring.

---

[130]Baldwin, *New England Clergy*, 145, 148. In Appendix B, Baldwin lists the clergy that were involved in town committees, provincial congresses and constitutional conventions. The number includes twenty-three clergymen from New Hampshire, thirty-eight from Massachusetts, and six from Connecticut.

CHAPTER VII

THE WINNING OF INDEPENDENCE, 1775-1781

However reluctant the dissenting clergy might have been during the decade leading up to the Revolution, this moderation seemed to diminish as soon as independence was declared. Many of them became enthusiastic participants in the war in a variety of ways--as recruiters, soldiers, and chaplains. When the war was brought to the South between 1778 and 1781, even some of those who were not active in the conflict fled from the British troops because of their vocal support of the American cause. Their role in the revolutionary war reveals how the dissenting clergy, as a group, put their political ideology into practice.

The change from a moderating influence to active participation in the war effort was slow in coming, and it did not happen simultaneously among all the dissenting clergy. The few diaries and letters surviving from this period indicate the real sorrow of this group over the course of events in 1775. Philip Fithian, a young Presbyterian minister on a missionary journey in June in the Valley of Virginia, expressed his bitterness over British policy of the preceding year:

> The melancholy Anniversary of a tyrannical Manoeuvre of the infatuated, or rather Hell-inspired British Ministry, in blocking up the Port of Boston is arrived!--This Day twelve-Month their dangerous & cruel Councels [*sic*] began to be executed!--All along the Bladder has been filled with Venom--Now it is distended with Poison,--full, ready to crack, to split with Rage![1]

---

[1]Albion and Dodson, *Fithian Journal*, 20.

Like most dissenting clergymen, Fithian did not desire war; but only a month later, he was quite willing to give his all for his country:

> O if Tears driven out by Grief and real Sorrow could bring any Help, I would with much Pleasure and Desire have passed the Night and wept with the Genius of this Water, till our Tears had increased the Flood--! If Grief and Sympathy will not do, I stand ready, and am willing to hazard *Life* and *Credit*, and *Property*, in the general, and needful contest for what is our *All*.[2]

One cannot read his diary for the rest of 1775 without feeling his sorrow at the martial spirit growing in the country. On New Year's Day, 1776, while attending a muster along the Cow Pasture River in Virginia, he observed the drinking, horse racing, and carousing of the men and thought this type of patriotism

> false, or at best visionary, . . . with so base a Conduct--talk of supporting Freedom by meeting and practicing Bacchanalian Revels.--preposterous and vain are all such Pretentions.
>
> It is serving the Father of Deception under the Colour of Patriotism. Forbid it Decency and Valour that sacred Patriotism should be so cursedly prostituted, to subserve such Diabolical Purposes![3]

Fithian was going through a period of trial, but when the time came, he knew his duty. By the summer of 1776, he had enlisted as a chaplain, saying, "I am willing to hazard and suffer equally with my Countrymen since I have a firm Conviction that I am in my Duty."[4] Before the end of the year he had died of dysentery contracted in camp at Long Island.

Thomas Rankin, one of the Methodist missionaries in the South, noted a similar confusion of mind as he heard the news of battle. "How long O Lord," he asked in January 1776, "till a period is put to the

---

[2] *Ibid.*, 44. [3] *Ibid.*, 158. [4] *Ibid.*, 197

effusion of human blood? My spirit is much affected at the prospect of these unhappy times."[5] By the end of that year he was certain that this was an unfortunate time for him and other "pious persons of different denominations." Even though he was one of the few dissenting clergymen to return to England, he was disturbed about events in America.

Among those slower to react to the political events of 1775-1776 was Oliver Hart, the Baptist minister in Charleston. He wrote only one sentence in his diary on the news from Lexington, and in 1776 he was just as brief about the news of the Declaration of Independence.[6] Yet his silence did not mean unconcern; it was in the summer of 1775 that he accompanied William Tennent on the mission into the backcountry against the tories and became one of the leading patriots of South Carolina. As the war news became more disturbing, Hart became more vocal. Expressing his pleasure at the good news from the North in 1777, he reasoned that

> Britain must begin to grow sick of this unnatural and cruel war. Sorry I am for the effusion of human blood; but I doubt not but that the issue will be happy for America.[7]

In the spring of 1778 Hart wrote to his brother in Pennsylvania, encouraging him not to give up serving his country. He showed his distaste for the British when he wrote:

---

[5]Diary of Thomas Rankin, January, 1776, Garrett Biblical Institute Library.

[6]Oliver Hart, "Extracts from the Diary of Rev. Oliver Hart, from 1740 to 1780," *Charleston Year Book, 1896*, pp. 391-92.

[7]Oliver Hart to Richard Furman, February 12, 1777, Furman Correspondence, S.C. Baptist Hist. Coll., Greenville.

> The Policy of Britain, in the present Controversy, would disgrace the most barbarous Nation; and the conduct of the British Army, in America, will remain in indelible Characters of Blood to future generations. Their cause is unjust, and their Measures diabolical. For my own Part, I cannot trace the Ravages of their Army, without Horror and Indignation. I hope however, that your Property hath not fallen into their unhallowed Hands. But I had much rather sacrifice my all, than that America should be enslaved.[8]

Later in the year Hart came to the conclusion that Americans were justified in retaliating against the violent ways of the British:

> I could think of nothing but Retaliation, and almost felt a Disposition to have them treated like Agag. Surely some signal Judgment awaits those bloody Butchers. Hitherto the Americans have been humane, as well as brave; but every Act of Indulgence has been construed into Cowardice. The Time may come when the Scene may change, and the lenient Americans, filled with Rage and Resentment may rake their Vengeance on the Heads of their Persecutors. Should this be the Case, they could not justly complain, for we might truly say--We only retaliate, You have taught, yea, compelled us thus to act. Accept a Requital of Services done us.[9]

Hart's growing activism was characteristic of a large number of dissenting clergymen.

Nothing evidences this change in attitude better than the tone of the pastoral letter sent out in 1775 by the Synod of New York and Philadelphia. Meeting at the same time as the Continental Congress, the Synod summarized the role of the Presbyterian ministers under its authority thus far and anticipated the future:

> It is well known to you . . . that we have not been instrumental in inflaming the minds of the people, or urging them

---

[8]Oliver Hart to Joseph Hart, March 24, 1778, Oliver Hart Collection, South Caroliniana Library, Columbia.

[9]*Ibid.*, July 5, 1778.

> to acts of violence and disorder. Perhaps no instance can be given on so interesting a subject, in which political sentiments have been so long and so fully kept from the pulpit, and even malice itself has not charged us with labouring from the press; but things are now come to such a state, that as we do not wish to conceal our opinions as men and citizens, so the relation we stand in to you seemed to make the present improvement of it to your spiritual benefit, and indispensable duty. Hostilities, long feared, have now taken place; the sword has been drawn in one province, and the whole continent, with hardly any exception, seem determined to defend their rights by force of arms. If, at the same time, the British ministry shall continue to enforce their claims by violence, a lasting and bloody contest must be expected. Surely, then, it becomes those who have taken up arms, and profess a willingness to hazard their lives in the cause of liberty, to be prepared for death, which to many must be certain, and to every one is a possible or probable event.[10]

By the time of the Declaration of Independence most of the Presbyterian clergy supported the American cause.

There is little recorded evidence of the specific reaction of the dissenting clergy to the news of the Declaration of Independence; it can be inferred, however, from the support a majority of them gave to the war effort. When the news reached Charleston, the Declaration was read midst cheers at a public meeting of the citizens of that town, and William Tennent wrote approvingly of the occasion:

> No Event has seemed to diffuse more general Satisfaction among the People. This seems to be designed as a most important Epocha in the History of South Carolina, and from this Day it is no longer to be considered as a Colony but as a State.[11]

---

[10]Engles, *Records of the Presbyterian Church*, 467.

[11]Interesting Events as they took place in the State of South Carolina, 1776, William Tennent Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Columbia (Entry for August 5).

John Zubly was the principal dissenter who opposed independence. Most dissenting clergy, however, supported the new constitutions drawn up in the various states and took the loyalty oaths in support of the new state governments. Oliver Hart expressed his approval of the new South Carolina constitution:

> South Carolina broke off the British yoke and established a new Form of Government upon a free and generous Plan, our Rulers being chosed from among ourselves. May we never again be enslaved.[12]

There is evidence of Presbyterian support of the so-called Declaration of Independence drawn up in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, on May 20, 1775. There has been much controversy concerning the authenticity of this Declaration, which may, in fact, have been a set of resolutions adopted by the Mecklenburg Committee of Safety eleven days later.[13] In any case, one Presbyterian minister, Hezekiah James Balch of the Popular Tent Church, was present at the May meeting and signed the "Declaration,"[14] and he may have been a member of the committee of

---

[12]Diary of Oliver Hart, March 26, 1776, South Carolina Library, Columbia.

[13]Chief defenders of the May 20 Declaration are James H. Moore, *Defence of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence* (Raleigh, 1906); Archibald Henderson, *North Carolina: The Old North State and the New* (Chicage, 1941); V. V. McNitt, *Chain of Error and the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence* (New York, 1960); George Graham, *The Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence* (New York, 1905); A. S. Salley, "The Mecklenburg Declaration: The Present Status of the Question," *American Historical Review*, XIII (1907), 16-43. The chief opponent is William H. Hoyt, *The Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence* (New York, 1907).

[14]A copy of the May 20 Declaration is in Saunders, *Colonial Records*, IX, 1264-65. Balch was born in Maryland in 1746 and graduated from the College of New Jersey in 1766. While in school he was one of the founders of the Cliosophic Society, one of the two debating societies. He became pastor in Mecklenburg County in 1769 and remained there until his death in the summer of 1776. See Sprague, *Annals*, III, 417.

three which drew up the document.[15] Another signer was David Reese, the father of Thomas Reese, a young minister raised in Mecklenburg who became an important clergyman in South Carolina.

It is interesting to note the reaction of the Moravian Bishop John Michael Graff to the Mecklenburg Declaration. News of it was brought to Wachovia by Captain James Jack on his return from Philadelphia.[16] Graff noted:

> In Mecklenburg County, where they have unseated all Magistrates and put Select Men in their places, they are threatening to force people, and us in particular, to sign a Declaration stating whether we hold with the King or with Boston, but we think for the present they are only threats. If a higher authority should ask such a Declaration of us, we think we will follow the form of the Declaration made by the Congress in Philadelphia concerning King George III, but say nothing whatever about the points at issue, which we do not understand.[17]

This declaration of Congress mentioned by Graff was the call for a day of fasting and prayer for the end of the disorder between Great Britain and the colonies. When the day arrived, however, Graff observed that there was "not the slightest sign that anyone has taken any notice of it."[18] The Moravians were obviously trying to remain neutral.

---

[15]McNitt, *Chain of Error*, 31.

[16]This corroborative evidence concerning the authenticity of the May 20 Declaration is discussed by *ibid.*, chap. 7; Archibald Henderson, "The Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, V (1918), 207-15; Fries, *Records of the Moravians*, II, 843-44.

[17]Report of John Michael Graff to the Unity Elders Conference in Germany, June 27, 1775, in Fries, *Records of the Moravians*, II, 875.

[18]*Ibid.*, 877.

The dissenting ministers gave of their time during the war in many ways. Patrick Allison, the Presbyterian minister in Baltimore, was chaplain to Congress when it met in Baltimore during the winter of 1776. It was said by Robert Purviance, a friend of Allison that he "lost no proper occasion to stimulate his countrymen to an unyielding resistance to the oppressors to which they were subjected."[19] Several clergymen became chaplains in the militia or at least, on occasion, preached informally to the troops.

In Virginia, the Baptist clergy petitioned the Provincial Convention on August 16, 1775, to allow them to preach to soldiers of that faith,[20] and Jeremiah Walker and John Williams were accordingly appointed by the Baptist Association for that purpose.[21] There is little record of their having done so, however, and since the established church was stronger in Virginia than in any other colony, there was only a token representation of the dissenting clergymen as chaplains. Each regiment in Virginia could elect its own chaplain, and all of them selected an Anglican except the Eighth (German-speaking) Virginia Regiment. In this regiment, Christian Streit, a Lutheran minister, was chaplain from August 1, 1776 until July 1777.[22] Another Virginian, the

---

[19]Ford, *Journals of Congress*, VI, 1034; Sprague, *Annals*, III, 258.

[20]Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, III, 383.

[21]Semple, *Baptists in Virginia*, 62.

[22]G. MacLaren Brydon, *The Clergy of the Established Church in Virginia and the Revolution* (Richmond, 1933), 14, 16-17, says that there were thirteen known Anglican ministers of Virginia who were chaplains. Lohrenz, "The Virginia Clergy," 163, reports the Anglican clergy having three legislative chaplains, fifteen military chaplains, two surgeons in the army, and six holding other military positions.

Presbyterian pastor Amos Thompson, was granted a commission as chaplain for Stephenson's Maryland and Virginia Riflemen beginning July 23, 1776.[23]

South of Virginia there seemed to be more opportunity for the dissenting clergy to participate in military affairs. Adam Boyd, Presbyterian minister in North Carolina, was chaplain to the 2nd North Carolina Battalion and was present at Valley Forge.[24] The Presbyterian James Hall of North Carolina was chaplain of a volunteer cavalry unit, and he accompanied the troops against the Cherokees in Georgia. Because he preached one of the first sermons in Indian territory, a frontier county in Georgia, Hall County, was named in his honor. General Greene is supposed to have offered him the position of Brigadier-General in 1780 at the death of General William Lee Davidson.[25] Another North Carolina Presbyterian, John Debow, was chaplain to Colonel Butler's militia on the expedition against the tories at Cross Creek.[26] The council of safety of North Carolina appropriated £10 to the Baptist minister Robert Nixon for his services as chaplain to the Onslow County militia.[27] In Georgia the leading Congregational minister at Midway,

---

[23]Francis B. Heitman, *Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army During the Revolutionary War* (Revised Edition, Washington, 1914), 539.

[24]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, XIII, 418-19; Heitman, *Historical Register*, 114.

[25]Joel T. Headley, *The Chaplains and Clergy of the Revolution* (New York, 1864), 246-48; *DAB*, VIII, 133; Sprague, *Annals*, III, 383.

[26]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 972.

[27]*Ibid.*, 625.

Moses Allen, was chaplain to the Georgia Brigade under General Robert Howe. He was taken prisoner by the British at the fall of Savannah.[28] A Baptist minister, Edmund Botsford, was chaplain with General Andrew Williamson in Georgia.[29]

Another group of dissenting ministers served as chaplains either before or after their ministries in the South. Daniel McCalla, a Presbyterian minister, was chaplain to the Second Pennsylvania Battalion under General Thompson. In Canada he was taken prisoner at Three Rivers on June 8, 1776, and was on board a prison ship until his parole in August. A little later the British issued an order to apprehend him on the pretense of violating his parole. Fleeing to Virginia, he was later released from his parole in an exchange of prisoners.[30] Following this McCalla settled in Hanover County, Virginia for twelve years and later lived in Charleston. Another Presbyterian minister, Alexander McWhorter from New Jersey, was sent by the Continental Congress into North Carolina in 1775 to help win over the tories. By the next winter, he was with George Washington in the Jerseys, being present at the battle at Trenton. In 1778 he became chaplain to General Knox's brigade but resigned later that year because of his wife's health. The

---

[28]Heitman, *Historical Register*, 68.

[29]Charles D. Mallary, ed., *Memoirs of Elder Edmund Botsford* (Charleston, 1832), 53.

[30]Heitman, *Historical Register*, 363; Headley, *Chaplains and Clergy*, 276-79; William Hollingshead, ed., *The Works of the Rev. Daniel McCalla* (2 vols., Charleston, 1810), I, 15; Sprague, *Annals*, III, 320.

following year he became pastor of the Presbyterian church in Charlotte, North Carolina, and president of Queen's College.[31]

Philip Vickers Fithian was from New Jersey but spent most of his adult life in Virginia. A traveling Presbyterian missionary in Virginia in 1775-1776, he became a chaplain in the summer of 1776 to Colonel Silas Newcomb's battalion. He went to New York with the New Jersey militia and served under General Nathaniel Heard. While on Long Island ministering to the troops he contracted dysentery in September and died on October 8.[32] James Latta, a Presbyterian minister at St. John's Island, South Carolina, from 1768 to 1770, moved to Pennsylvania before the Revolution; and during the war he served as a chaplain in the Pennsylvania militia.[33] A Baptist minister in North Carolina, John Gano, moved to New York City in 1762 and had a distinguished career as a chaplain there from 1776-1780.[34] The same was true of Hezekiah Smith, another Baptist minister, who began his ministry in South Carolina. Living in Massachusetts after 1765, Smith was probably the most important Baptist chaplain during the war, serving with the Massachusetts troops from 1775 to 1780.[35] A German Reformed minister in Maryland and

---

[31]E. D. Griffin, Funeral Sermon of Alexander McWhorter, 1807, Sou. Hist. Coll., Chapel Hill; Headley, *Chaplains and Clergy*, 328-29; Sprague, *Annals*, III, 210.

[32]Heitman, *Historical Register*, 228; Albion and Dodson, *Fithian Journal*, 185ff.

[33]Sprague, *Annals*, III, 203.

[34]Heitman, *Historical Register*, 242; Gano, *Memoirs*, 93-104.

[35]Heitman, *Historical Register*, 503.

Pennsylvania, John Conrad Bucher, was chaplain in the "German Regiment" under Baron von Arnt, but his health forced him to resign in August, 1777.[36]

In addition to those serving as chaplains, many other dissenting clergymen served as soldiers. Their numbers cannot be easily ascertained because of the incompleteness of the military records and because of the number of persons bearing the same name. Probably the most famous dissenting minister who served as a soldier was John Peter Muhlenberg of Virginia. While a member of the Virginia Convention from Dunmore County, he was appointed Colonel of the Eighth or German Regiment on January 12, 1776.[37] Proceeding immediately to his home on Sunday, January 21, 1776, he preached his famous sermon which resulted in the recruitment of Germans for the Eighth Regiment. Some sources state that at the end of his sermon, Muhlenberg opened his robe to reveal his uniform and then ordered the drums to beat for recruits.[38]

---

[36] *Ibid.*, 129; *DAB*, III, 220.

[37] *Proceedings of the Convention of Delegates* . . . (Williamsburg, 1776), 34; *Virginia Gazette*, January 13, 1776.

[38] The first publication of this event was by James Thacher, *Military Journal* (Boston, 1827) from information obtained at a dinner party given by Muhlenberg for the officers of his brigade at West Point, New York, November 3, 1778. Twenty-two years later the popular account was given by Muhlenberg, *Peter Muhlenberg*, 51-54 and has been repeated in various forms by several other authors. See Edward W. Hocker, *The Fighting Parson of the American Revolution: A Biography of General Peter Muhlenberg* (Philadelphia, 1936), 61-62, and Wallace, *Muhlenbergs*, 117-18. Theodore G. Tappert, Archivist at Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia and editor of the Henry M. Muhlenberg journals, believes the legend has been corrected in Klaus Wust, *The Virginia Germans* (Charlottesville, 1969), 80. Letter of Tappert to the author, March 30, 1973. Wust does not give much credence to the famous Muhlenberg sermon and emphasizes that the story was not published for the first time until forty-five years after the event.

There are many versions of what happened, largely apocryphal, but by March the ranks were full, and Muhlenberg marched his regiment to the Norfolk area. He was at Charleston in 1776 to aid in the repulse of General Clinton, after which he became Brigadier-General on February 21, 1777. He participated in the battles at Brandywine, Germantown, Monmouth, and later in the war had a prominent part in the battle at Yorktown. At the end of the war he was promoted to Major-General.[39] Not returning to the active ministry after the Revolution, he had a distinguished career in public life as a member of the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania and later as congressman from that state.

There were other ministers who were active soldiers in addition to those already mentioned. Joseph Anthony held a commission as Second Lieutenant in Bedford County, Virginia, in 1778.[40] John Blair Smith was chosen captain of a unit formed by the students of Hampden-Sydney College in 1777. He later served with Captain William Morton's forces from Charlotte and Prince Edward counties, Virginia, sent to aid General Nathaniel Greene in North Carolina.[41] Greene Hill served as Second Major in the militia of Bute County, North Carolina;[42] Jeremiah Moore

---

[39]Heitman, *Historical Register*, 406; Headley, *Chaplains and Clergy*, 124-25; Hocker, *Fighting Parson*, 68-122; Hamilton J. Eckenrode, *List of the Revolutionary Soldiers in Virginia* (Richmond, 1912), 323.

[40]John H. Gwathmey, *Historical Register of Virginians in the Revolution* (Richmond, 1938), 18.

[41]Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 400-401, 412.

[42]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 530.

was corporal of infantry in 1782;[43] and Adam Boyd, ensign in the First North Carolina Continental Battalion from January to March, 1776.[44] Even though the Presbyterian minister John Todd had served as colonel in the Louisa County militia in Virginia,[45] he wrote later to William Preston of the Augusta County militia of his desire to help in the frontier fighting:

> I am unhappy at being so remote from your parts, and incapable of doing any thing important in the case: else I would not tamely sleep now.
>
> Surely you have a number of the brave with you, among our transalpine brethren, not afraid to venture hard to save the exposed. May Heaven inspire them in multitudes! I rouse them forth.[46]

Other important work was performed by some of the dissenting clergy as militia recruiters, through their patriotic sermons and their leadership in their respective communities. One of the purposes of the 1775 trip of William Tennent and Oliver Hart into backcountry South Carolina was to recruit volunteers for a militia loyal to the patriot government.[47] In Virginia, John Blair Smith helped to recruit soldiers

---

[43]Revolutionary Soldiers, manuscript volume in Virginia State Archives, Richmond; William C. Moore, "Jeremiah Moore, 1746-1815," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 2nd Series, XIII (1933), 23.

[44]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, XIII, 474. Boyd was also Judge Advocate on several occasions at court martial trials for deserters. See *ibid.*, XI, 752-53; XII, 487, 493.

[45]Henry R. McIlwaine, ed., *Journals of the Council of State of Virginia* (3 vols., Richmond, 1931-1952), II, 89; Malcolm H. Harris, *A History of Louisa County Virginia* (Richmond, 1936), 66.

[46]John Todd to William Preston, May 16, 1777, Preston Papers in Draper Collection, Wisconsin Hist. Soc.

[47]See chap. VI above.

in Prince Edward County, while across the mountains William Graham of Augusta County recruited in 1777 in response to a call for volunteers. Graham volunteered himself, was chosen captain, and began drills at once. The company, however, was never called into service.[48] Caleb Wallace of the same state was also involved in recruiting.[49]

Baptist ministers also helped to enlist soldiers. In 1777 Virginia allowed Baptists and Methodists to form their own military companies;[50] and at least three Baptist clergymen in that state helped to enlist recruits. William McClanahan organized a company,[51] and Jeremiah Walker[52] and Elijah Craig[53] were both involved in recruiting, yet neither seems to have become a member of the militia himself. In North Carolina the Baptist minister Henry Abbott was a recruiter and also salt commissioner for Pasquotank County.[54]

Probably the most prominent recruiter was Muhlenberg, who kept the ranks of the Eighth Virginia Regiment filled. After he became the leader of all the Continental forces in Virginia, he was active in

---

[48]Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 451; Sprague, *Annals*, III, 366-67; *Watchmen of the South*, January 4, 1844, p. 78.

[49]Caleb Wallace to James Caldwell, April 8, 1777, in Whitsitt, *Caleb Wallace*, 40.

[50]Hening, *Statutes at Large*, IX, 348.

[51]McIlwaine and Hall, *Journal of Council of State*, I, 154, 168, 180.

[52]Boyd, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, I, 662.

[53]*Ibid.*; Hutchinson and Rachel, *Papers of Madison*, I, 183; Palmer, *Calander of State Papers*, VIII, 186.

[54]Clark, *State Recs. of N.C.*, XXII, 907, 928.

enlisting soldiers on several occasions, especially during the several months preceding Yorktown. On May 2, 1782, Washington appointed him general superintendent of recruiting in Virginia.[55]

When war actually came to the southern frontier, some of the dissenting clergy participated in combat against the Indians. The principal problem was whether the Cherokee Indians would ally themselves with the Americans or the British;[56] John Stuart, the British Indian agent, tried to keep the Indians loyal to the king. One of the concerns of William Tennent on his 1775 trip into the backcountry was to win over the Indians to the American side. This was an almost impossible task because the loyalists seized the gifts sent by the South Carolina Committee of Safety to the Cherokees. Consequently, by the spring of 1776, there were rumors all along the frontier from Virginia to Georgia of a combined Cherokee-loyalist attack. The Indians demanded the withdrawal of the settlers at Watauga and Nolichucky in what is now East Tennessee, and when news of this ultimatum reached the Fincastle County Committee of Safety in Virginia, the members responded:

> We are sorry to say this unprovoked Conduct so Contrary to your former Behaviour plainly shows that your Hearts are not good, and that you want some pretense to break off all Connection with your former Friends and allies.[57]

Charles Cummings, the Presbyterian minister, was a member of this

---

[55]Muhlenberg, *Peter Muhlenberg*, 75, 411.

[56]A thorough discussion of the Cherokee Indian War is given in James H. O'Donnell, III, *Southern Indians in the American Revolution* (Knoxville, 1973), chap. 2.

[57]Quoted in *ibid.*, 38.

committee. When news arrived of the approach of the Cherokee chief, Dragging Canoe, and his warriors, Cummings took the leadership in enlarging Black's Fort along the Holston. By July 20, 1776, 400 people had assembled there. In the midst of this Indian raid Jonathan Mulkey, a Baptist minister, and a friend tried to cross the North Fork of the Holston River and were overtaken by the Indians. The friend was scalped, but Mulkey jumped into the river and made his way to Eaton's Fort.[58]

In July the Cherokees made a concerted attack all along the Virginia and Carolina frontier. Cummings collected some of the men of his congregation, joined the company of Evan Shelby, and marched to the rescue of the Wataugans. That fall Cummings accompanied Colonel William Christian on an expedition deep into the Cherokee territory to punish the Indians.[59] Farther south, in July the Cherokees also attacked the troops of Colonel Andrew Williamson of the South Carolina militia at Lindlay's Fort. James Cresswell, Presbyterian minister at Ninety Six, reported the consequences:

> Ninety-Six is now a frontier. Plantations lie desolate, and hopeful crops are going to ruin. In short, dear sir,

---

[58]O. W. Taylor, *Early Tennessee Baptists, 1769-1832* (Nashville, 1957), 66.

[59]Richard B. Harwell, ed., *The Committees of Safety of Westmoreland and Fincastle, Proceedings of the County Committees, 1774-1776* (Richmond, 1956), 18; Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, II, 124; Mongle, *Sketches*,2; Sprague, *Annals*, ~~III~~, 285-88. The influence of Cummings is shown by the many references to him during Lord Dunmore's War and the Cherokee War among the letters of such frontier leaders as Arthur Campbell, William Christian, and William Preston in the Draper Manuscripts. See also Samuel C. Williams, *Tennessee During the Revolutionary War* (Nashville, 1944), 53.

> unless we get some relief, famine will overspread our beautiful country. As our army is now over the line, the dread of savages, and the disaffected, will deter the lovers of their country from looking after their affairs at home. Fences are thrown down, and many have already suffered great loss. . . . Your friendship, on our behalf, with our Governor, to procure us the rangers, or part of them, to assist us, will be acknowledged by all with gratitude.[60]

Upon the defeat of the Cherokees, treaties were made at Long Island in Tennessee and at Dewitt's Corner in South Carolina in 1777. Yet travel still was hazardous for ministers along the frontier during the war. John Alderson, Jr., was one of the first Baptist ministers to settle in Greenbriar County, Virginia, in 1777 and during times of Indian attack he preached from fort to fort, sometimes defended by a small guard.[61]

Most of the fighting during the early part of the war was in the North, but by 1778 the British turned their attention to the South, where they expected aid from the tories. A major military objective was the cities of Savannah and Charleston. General Augustine Prevost invaded Georgia from Florida, passing through the Congregational settlement at Midway. The pastor there, Moses Allen, was a whig leader and chaplain to the First Georgia Continental Battalion under General Robert Howe. In November 1778, the British destroyed the Midway Church, the homes of Allen and many others, and the rice fields. Savannah fell to the British the following month, and shortly thereafter Moses Allen was taken prisoner. He was placed on board a prison ship, where the appalling conditions spurred him to jump into the river on February 8, 1779, in

---

[60]James Cresswell to William Henry Drayton, July 27, 1776, in Gibbes, *Documentary History*, II, 31.

[61]Taylor, *Virginia Baptist Ministers*, I, 157-58.

an attempt to escape. He drowned before he reached shore.[62] John Zubly, the leading dissenting minister of Savannah, had already left the city under different circumstances.

The British moved up the Savannah River and captured Ebenezer, the settlement of the Salzburger Germans. One of their ministers, Christopher Frederick Triebner, advised the British to occupy the town, and he accompanied Major Maitland and the British forces to the settlement. Ebenezer became their headquarters, and the brick church was first used as a hospital and then as a stable for their horses. Yet the other Salzburger minister, Christian Rabenhorst, remained faithful to the American cause, as did the bulk of the congregation.[63] Most of Georgia was overrun after the fall of Augusta in January 1779, and the few dissenting ministers in Georgia reacted in various ways. Abraham Marshall, the Baptist minister at Kiokee, fought in the battle at Augusta but remained with his congregation,[64] while two other Baptist ministers fled. Silas Mercer had already left in 1775 for Halifax County, North Carolina, where he remained until 1781;[65] Edmund Botsford

---

[62]Coleman, *Revolution in Georgia*, 176; James Stacy, *History and Records of the Midway Congregational Church* (Newman, Georgia, 1951), 60-61; Oliver Hart to Mrs. Moses Allen, February 17, 1779, quoted in *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, LVIII (1957), 46-47; Headley, *Chaplains and Clergy*, 331-40.

[63]P. A. Strobel, *The Salzburgers and Their Descendants* (Baltimore, 1855; reprint ed., Athens, Georgia, 1953), 202-7.

[64]Sprague, *Annals*, VI, 169.

[65]Jesse Mercer, *History of the Georgia Baptist Association* (Washington, Georgia, 1838), 389.

escaped to South Carolina in 1779, losing his home and his library.[66]

Oliver Hart, the Baptist minister in Charleston, kept his brother in Pennsylvania informed of operations in the South. Soon after Georgia fell to the British, he wrote: "The poor Georgians are flying over into this State by hundreds; many of them leaving their ALL behind." Commenting on the British proclamation for all loyalists to meet in Savannah, he observed:

> How this Proclamation may operate on the Minds of People, I cannot say; but probably the infatuated Tories (who are too numerous in every State) will repair to the royal Standard, in Hopes of possessing their Neighbours Estates, by and by; to accomplish which, they would cut their Neighbours Throats.[67]

Just a month later Hart noted the effects the war had already had on Charleston in that men were "buying and selling, and preying on each other like Vultures. I wish we may not, in the End, have bartered away the State. . . . Our Country is all Confusion."[68] In the spring of that year he commented:

> We now feel the Effects of War in the Purchase of every Article of Life. Upon an average we pay eight hundred per-cent advance upon Marketing, Liquor and dry goods; which makes it hard upon the poorer sort, who have no Resources.[69]

---

[66]Sprague, *Annals*, VI, 140; Mallary, *Edmund Botsford*, 51. Botsford said later, "In the course of the war, I lost a pretty library, a fine home, and also four children. . . ." Botsford to John Rippon, April 25, 1790, in Rippon, *Baptist Register*, 1790-1794, p. 104.

[67]Oliver Hart to Joseph Hart, January 14, 1779, Oliver Hart Collection, South Caroliniana Library.

[68]*Ibid.*, February 16, 1779.

[69]*Ibid.*, May 5, 1779.

The British decided to advance into South Carolina to draw away the patriot forces from the Savannah area and to consolidate any aid they could obtain from the tories. As they came near the Charleston area Hart recorded his sentiments about the British:

> This rapid Maneuvre . . . will probably enrich Individuals of their Party, but can be of no real Service to the King, or Cause of Britain; for it will in no Sence strengthen Government, or tend to the Subjugation of America. It can hardly be supposed that the People of England will tamely consent to support such a Banditti of Robbers, at the Expence of so much Blood and Treasure, merely for the Purpose of their enriching themselves with the Spoils of America, while the Revenue of England is only drained thereby. I am persuaded these Plunderers never had the Pleasure of ravaging so opulant a Country before. . . . They give out that they will have Charlestown yet, but I trust Omnipotence will still defend us.[70]

Along the Pee Dee River Evan Pugh, the Baptist minister at Cashaway Neck, preached a sermon of thanksgiving for the deliverance of Charleston from the enemy. Later in the year, when an attempt was made to recapture Savannah by the American and French forces, Pugh preached the funeral sermon for the men lost in that unsuccessful attempt.[71]

The British did capture Charleston. Early in 1780 General Henry Clinton led the British in a series of attacks in the area around Charleston, and the city fell on May 12, 1780, General Benjamin Lincoln and other defenders being taken prisoners. Because of their loyalty to the American cause, about every dissenting minister in the city suffered at the hands of the British. Oliver Hart had already left in

---

[70] *Ibid.*, July 15, 1779.

[71] Alexander Gregg, *History of the Old Cheraws* (New York, 1867; reprint ed., Spartanburg, South Carolina, 1965), 296.

February to live with his son-in-law at St. Thomas. On the approach of the British army in April, he again fled northward. Of this event he recorded:

> I then packed up a few clothes in haste, and about 12 o'clock took leave of my dear Wife, (the most affecting Parting I had ever experienced) and mounting any Horse set off, but whither I was going, or when I should return I knew not; but endeavored to leave my connections and place myself in the Hands of the great and wise Disposer of all Events.[72]

He traveled to Georgetown but on May 1 moved on to Cashaway Neck where Evan Pugh was pastor.[73]

Other dissenting clergymen in Charleston were just as unfortunate. William Tennent, pastor at the Independent Church, had died in 1777, but there were two other ministers in Charleston who had been associated with that church. One was James Edmonds, an assistant among the Congregationalists at Midway, Georgia, but more recently an itinerant missionary in Charleston since 1770. Edmonds was taken prisoner at the fall of Charleston and along with 129 others detained on board the prison ship *Torbay*.[74] The other minister was Josiah Smith, who had been in ill-health and was not an active pastor for several years preceding the Revolution. Yet, because of his political beliefs, he was seized at the capture of Charleston and paroled. His son, Josiah Smith, Jr., was taken prisoner to St. Augustine, and at the time of the

---

[72]Hart, "Extracts from the Diary," 399.

[73]Journal of Evan Pugh, May 23, 1780, quoted in Gregg, *Old Cheraws*, 302.

[74]List of prisoners in letter of Lieut. Colonel Stephen Moore and Major John Barnwell to General Greene, May 18, 1781, in Gibbes, *Documentary History*, III, 74-75; Stacy, *History and Records of Midway Church*, 55.

exchange of prisoners in 1781, the families of the St. Augustine hostages were ordered out of the colony. Thus the ailing minister set sail on July 25 on the *Flagg Briggantine* with his son's wife and children. He died soon afterwards.[75] There were also two Lutheran ministers in Charleston who suffered for their support of America. John Nicholas Martin had two sons and a son-in-law in the German Fusilier Company, and his home outside Charleston was burned by the military in 1779 and again in 1780 when the city was attacked. After the occupation of Charleston he was not bothered at first, and the Hessian troops even attended his church. But when he was required to pray for the king, he refused, so his church was closed and he was compelled to leave the city.[76] The second Lutheran minister, Christian Streit, had moved to Charleston in 1778 after serving as a chaplain. He was taken prisoner and not allowed to return to his church. After the war he became a pastor in Pennsylvania.[77] All of the Charleston dissenting ministers, then, suffered for their whig beliefs.

After the capture of Charleston the British invaded the interior of the Carolinas, and for the next year there was a great struggle for control of the South. Some of the dissenting clergy participated actively in this phase of the war. There is a strong legend that Richard

---

[75]John L. Sibley and Clifford K. Shipton, *Biographical Sketches of Those Who Attended Harvard College* (16 vols., Cambridge, 1873-1972), VII, 582.

[76]Sprague, *Annals*, IX, 35-36.

[77]*Ibid.*, 48; Gotthardt D. Bernheim, *History of the German Settlements and of the Lutheran Church in North and South Carolina* (Philadelphia, 1872), 272.

Furman, the Baptist minister at High Hills of the Santee, marched to Charleston with a volunteer company commanded by his brother, Captain Josiah Furman, to aid in the defense of that city, but Governor Rutledge advised the minister to return to the interior where he could better serve his country. He did and was such a patriot that Lord Cornwallis, intending to make an example of him, placed a price of £1000 on his head.[78] At any rate, after the capture of Charleston, Furman moved his family to Virginia and lived there and in North Carolina until 1782 when he returned to High Hills. Two fleeing Baptist ministers, Edmund Botsford of Georgia and Oliver Hart of Charleston, remained at Welch Neck and Cashaway Neck, respectively, for some time. Botsford preached at Welch Neck from November 1779 until the approach of the British in June 1780, when he, his family, and Oliver Hart fled to Virginia.[79] Other ministers who fled at the approach of the British were Joseph Cook, the Baptist minister at Euhaw, who was reduced to poverty by his flight; Joseph Reese, the Baptist minister at Congaree, who fled to Fairforest;[80] and Thomas Reese, Presbyterian minister at Salem, who left the state with his family and remained in Mecklenburg,

---

[78]Cook, *Richard Furman*, 11-12. The legend concerning a price being put on his head cannot be documented from original sources and was first printed in Colyer Meriwether, *History of Higher Education in South Carolina* (Vol. II, No. 4 of *Contributions to American Educational History*, ed. by Herbert B. Adams, Washington, 1889), 93-94.

[79]Minute for September 5, 1780, Welch Neck Church Minute Book, 1737-1841, S.C. Baptist Hist. Coll., Greenville; Gregg, *Old Cheraws*, 439; Mallory, *Edmund Botsford*, 55-58.

[80]Townshend, *South Carolina Baptists*, 41-42, 177.

North Carolina, until 1782.[81] Farther north, James Hall, a Presbyterian minister in North Carolina, gathered his congregation and encouraged them to take up arms for the defense of their friends in South Carolina. Becoming the leader of a volunteer cavalry unit, in 1779 he led them on an expedition into South Carolina.[82]

The tories were the strongest in the interior of South Carolina, and here some dissenting clergy came into direct conflict with them. John Harris, a Presbyterian minister in Abbeville district and a member of the Provincial Congress, often had to flee from the tories to the fort at Bulltown near his home. They destroyed his property, driving off nearly all his slaves.[83] Another South Carolina Presbyterian minister, John Simpson, was instrumental in breaking up tory gatherings at both Mobley's Meeting House and Beckham's Old Field in May, 1780. The following month Captain Christian Huck, under Tarleton, went to Simpson's church intending to destroy it as a warning to the "disturbers of the King's peace." Simpson escaped by accompanying Captain John McClure, one of the young men of his congregation. As Huck's party went to the Simpson house, Mrs. Simpson fled with her four children. The house was burned, together with the minister's library and important manuscripts.[84] Similarly, a Baptist minister at Cashaway Neck, Evan

---

[81]Sprague, *Annals*, III, 331.

[82]*Ibid.*, 383.

[83]Howe, *Presbyterian Church in South Carolina*, I, 441.

[84]McCrady, *South Carolina, 1775-80*, pp. 588,591-92.

Pugh, was a victim of raiding parties which broke up services at his church and took the horses. His property being plundered, Pugh eventually surrendered to the British. He was paroled but was forced to take the oath of allegiance to the king.[85] The flight of these clergymen in the presence of British and tory troops is indicative of their loyalty to the American cause and the influence that they had in their locality. Had they been neutral, there would have been little reason for them to flee their homes and congregations.

From the fall of 1780 to early 1781 the British under Cornwallis continued to move towards North Carolina. The military activity in this state also affected the dissenting clergy. Alexander McWhorter, the Presbyterian minister at Charlotte and president of Queen's College, was forced to flee to Abington, Pennsylvania, in September 1780, having lost most of his belongings including his library. He preached there for a few months before moving to Newark, New Jersey, where he remained until his death in 1807.[86]

The disorder brought by the war is illustrated by the experience of a Baptist minister, John Williams. He had led his congregation from Virginia to settle in Surry County, North Carolina, in 1778, but when the war came to that region he led his congregation back to Virginia in

---

[85]Journal of Evan Pugh, June 11, 12, 22, 29, 1780, quoted in Gregg, *Old Cheraws*, 304; Joe M. King, *A History of South Carolina Baptists* (Columbia, 1964), 51, 91; Townshend, *South Carolina Baptists*, 86, 176.

[86]E. D. Griffin, Funeral Sermon of Alexander McWhorter, Sou. Hist. Coll., Chapel Hill; Neill R. McGeachy, *A History of the Suqaw Creek Presbyterian Church* (Rock Hill, South Carolina, 1954), 40-41; Sprague, *Annals*, III, 211.

1780.[87] During the encampment of Cornwallis's army at Red House, the papers of Hugh McAden, Presbyterian minister in Caswell County, North Carolina, were destroyed by British soldiers in January 1781. Only a brief part of McAden's journal survived.[88] Similarly, Adolphus Nuessman, the Lutheran minister in Alamance and Guilford counties, North Carolina, was pursued by tories who threatened to take his life.[89]

It was during this year that reinforcements were summoned from Virginia and other regions to aid General Nathanael Greene in the Carolina area. Some dissenting ministers aided in this recruitment and preached to soldiers as they prepared to leave. This was true of Charles Cummings and Samuel Doak, Presbyterian ministers in Southwest Virginia and East Tennessee. Many men from their congregations fought in the battle at King's Mountain.[90] John Blair Smith, of Hampden-Sydney College in Virginia, offered his services to the troops marching off to North Carolina, but he was advised to return home.[91] James Waddell, Presbyterian minister in Augusta County, Virginia, preached

---

[87]Meherrin Church Book, Lunenburg County, 1771-1844, Va. Baptist Hist. Coll., Richmond.

[88]Manuscript Sketch of the life of Hugh McAden, Princeton University Archives.

[89]Bernheim, *Lutheran Church in North And South Carolina*, 272.

[90]Lyman C. Draper, *King's Mountain and Its Heroes* (New York, 1929), 176. Cummings was a personal friend of Colonel William Campbell who led the troops at King's Mountain. Their friendship is noted in the detailed report Campbell gave to Cummings after the battle of Guilford Court House. See Campbell to Cummings, September, 1780 [1781], in Gibbes, *Documentary History*, II, 139-40.

[91]Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 402-3.

to the troops at Midway before they left to reinforce General Greene prior to the battle at Guilford Court House.[92]

It was about the time of this battle in March 1781, that the property of Presbyterian minister David Caldwell was destroyed. Because of his support for the American cause, he was sought after on many occasions, and Cornwallis offered a reward of £200 for Caldwell's capture. Once when he was not at home, the British soldiers came, and his wife hid in the smoke house for two days with little food. Caldwell's home was plundered and his library and papers destroyed. On another occasion Caldwell hired a thief to steal back his horse that had been taken by the British when they encamped near his house. He also practiced medicine and after the battle at Guilford Court House attended the sick and aided in the burial of the dead.[93]

By the summer of 1781 Cornwallis had decided that Virginia must be invaded to prevent provision of supplies and troops for the American forces. He therefore raided Richmond, sending the Virginia legislature fleeing westward. Dispatching Tarleton to pursue the government officials, he drove them out of Charlottesville. As Tarleton approached the mountains an alarm spread among the transmontane people. On Sunday, June 9, 1781, while James Waddell was preaching at Tinkling Spring

---

[92] *Ibid.*, I, 377; Joseph A. Waddell, *Annals of Augusta County, Virginia* (2nd Edition, Stanton, 1902; reprint ed., Bridgewater, Virginia, 1958), 281; Wilson, *The Tinkling Spring*, 200-202; James W. Alexander, ed., "Memoir of James Waddell," *Watchman of the South*, October 3, 1844, p. 25.

[93] *DAB*, III, 407; Caruthers, *David Caldwell*, 203-6, 218-26, 231; Sprague, *Annals*, III, 264, 267.

Presbyterian Church, news came of Tarleton's approach. Waddell urged his people to arm themselves and to move to Rockfish Gap to defend the Valley. On the same day, William Graham, Presbyterian minister and Rector of Liberty Hall Academy, met some members of the fleeing Assembly as he returned home from church. The next day he brought his Rockbridge militia from Lexington to Rockfish Gap, but the expected invasion of the Valley did not occur.[94] By October, Cornwallis had surrendered at Yorktown, and the major military operations in the South were over.

The dissenting clergy had taken an active role in the war--a war they did not want but one which a majority actively supported. Only a few left any written comment at the close of the conflict. Philip Gatch, the Methodist missionary, linked the war to religious freedom and the millenium, when he noted in his autobiography:

> In 1781 Sept. All Denominations were freed from their restrictions they were formerly under, and had the privileges of worshipping God as they chose, here begins the melinium [*sic*] Independency is obtained the revolutionary war at an end and we freed from every oppression, only that of sin and Satan. . . .[95]

Another minister, the Baptist Abraham Marshall, on a visit to Yorktown in 1786, reflected on the war thus:

> This is the place where the God of war wrought salvation for his American Israel. Here are remaining many signs of the great contest. Here artificial light-night flashed,

---

[94]Joseph Waddell, "Manuscript Paper on Tinkling Spring Church," Tinkling Spring Record Book, Virginia State Archives, Richmond; Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I, 454-55; Wilson, *The Tinkling Spring*, 203-5; *Washington and Lee Historical Papers*, (1890), 28-29; Waddell, *Annals of Augusta County*, 298-99.

[95]Papers of Philip Gatch, microfilm at Methodist Publishing House Library, Nashville, Tennessee.

> thundering cannons fraught with destruction roared aloud; the earth trembled; the heavens darkened; hundreds of heroick [*sic*] warriors wrapt in wreeking streams of purple gore, in awful agony bade the world farewell. Shall we trifle with our lives, and our civil and religious liberty, when blood--blood is the price of both? May the Governor of all the worlds forbid.[96]

That destruction was more than just physical, for the war itself greatly weakened the influence of religion on the population. So thought David Thomas, pastor of a Baptist church in Virginia:

> Several impediments being in the way, the Lord's Supper had not been celebrated among us, for several years past. Nor has a preached Gospel been attended with any apparent success. The ways of our Zion have long languished. And as yet, but few came to her solemn Feasts. It is winter! no wonder the birds are not heard to sing.[97]

The end of the war brought a day of thanksgiving, and the clergy of the Hanover Presbytery was one of the first ministerial groups to observe the occasion. Shortly after Yorktown, they set aside a day of thanksgiving because of the "signal interposition of divine providence in the capture of Charles Earl Cornwallis and his army at York."[98] Similarily, the Charleston Baptist Association designated November 7, 1782, as "a day of thanksgiving for the interpositions of providence in

---

[96]Jabez P. Marshall, ed., *Memoirs of the late Rev. Abraham Marshall containing a journal of the most interesting part of his life . . .* (Mountain Zion, Georgia, 1824), 18.

[97]Minute Book, Broad Run Baptist Church, Fauquier County, Virginia, 1762-1872, Va. Baptist Hist. Coll., Richmond.

[98]Minutes of Hanover Presbytery, October 26, 1781, Union Theological Seminary Library, Richmond.

favor of America."[99] Just as God had guided America during the war, so had He brought an end to the war in favor of America.

It is difficult to estimate the exact number of dissenting clergy who were whigs or tories. There are few sources which give enough information by which to classify a particular individual, and it was the active whigs and tories who left the best records. About 125 ministers alive at the time of the Declaration of Independence can definitely be classified, and this represents less than half of the dissenting ministers at that time. Nor does the number include individuals who participated in the Revolution and became ministers later. In any case, a study of these 125 may provide some general indication of the dissenting clergy as a group.

A large majority of the dissenting clergymen, at least 64 percent, were supporters of the American cause. This figure might be even higher if it were possible to classify a rather large group of Baptist ministers as to their political positions. Many Baptist ministers actively supported the movement for religious freedom, but this fact is not in itself enough evidence to classify them as whigs. Several undoubtedly belong in this group, but records permit identification of only about one-fourth of the total Baptist ministers as compared with over 60 percent of the Presbyterians.

The support which the Presbyterian clergy gave to the Revolution has long been attested; of those in the South, at least 64 percent of those living at the beginning of the Revolution were active whigs. There

---

[99]Wood Furman, comp., *History of the Charleston Association of Baptist Churches in South Carolina, 1683-1802* (Charleston, 1811), 18.

were more Presbyterian ministers serving on committees of safety and as chaplains and soldiers during the war than of any other dissenting denomination. The names of the two Presbyterian academies in Virginia provide additional verification of the Presbyterian role. Hampden-Sydney College was named after the famous English dissidents, John Hampden and Algernon Sydney. The academy at Lexington was named Liberty Hall, the predecessor of Washington and Lee University. Archibald Alexander, Presbyterian minister in Virginia just after the revolutionary war, summed up the Presbyterian ministers' role in the comment that

> our ministers were Whigs, Patriots, haters of tyranny, known abettors of the very earliest resistance, and often soldiers in the field.[100]

Charles Inglis, the Anglican tory of New York, stated that he did not know of a single Presbyterian minister of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia who was not an active whig.[101] At the approach of the Revolution, Governor John Martin of North Carolina contrasted the political positions of Anglicans and Presbyterians:

> Loyalty, Moderation and respect to Government seem to distinguish the generality of the Members of the Church of England. I am sincerely sorry to find they are by no means the character of the Presbyterians at large. . . .[102]

Nicholas Cresswell, the British traveler in America, did not have a

---

[100]Quoted in Hanford A. Edson, "John Todd of Virginia and John Todd of Indiana: A Home Missionary Sketch," *The Presbyterian Review*, VII (1886), 20.

[101]Hugh Hastings, ed., *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York* (7 vols., Albany, 1901-1916), VI, 4293.

[102]Governor John Martin to Lord Dartmouth, November 4, 1774, in Saunders, *Colonial Records*, II, 1086.

very high opinion of the loyalty of the Presbyterian clergy. He wrote on October 20, 1776, in his diary:

> The Parsons are not willing to expound the Gospel to people without being paid for it, and there is no provision made for the Episcopal clergy by this new code of Laws, therefore Religion as well as Commerce is at a stand. Indeed, the few that pretend to preach are mere retailers of politics, sowers of sedition and rebellion. . . . The Presbyterian Clergy are particularly active in supporting the measures of Congress from the Rostrum, gaining proselytes, persecuting the unbelievers, preaching up the righteousness of their cause and persuading the unthinking populace of the infallibility of success. Some of these religious rascals assert that the Lord will send his Angels to assist the injured Americans.[103]

No greater tribute could be paid to the Presbyterian ministers than the denunciation of their British enemies.

Baptist clergymen were also actively patriots. Even though it is difficult to classify a high percentage of Baptist ministers, of those who can be classified, a sizable majority were whigs. They were not quite as politically active as the Presbyterian ministers, except in North Carolina. Their social standing and lack of formal education, expecially among the Separate Baptists, may account for this. One Baptist minister in Virginia, however, recalled after the war:

> It is not to be wondered at, that the Baptists so heartily and uniformly engaged in the cause of the country against the king. The change suited their political principles, promised religious liberty, and a freedom from ministerial tax.[104]

---

[103]Macveagh, *Cresswell Journal*, 165. Cresswell also believed that *Commonsense* was written by "some Yankey Presbyterian, Member of the Congress." *Ibid.*, 136.

[104]John Leland, *The Virginia Chronicle* (Fredericksburg, Virginia, 1790), 32.

George Washington also attested to the Baptist support of civil liberty when he wrote to a Baptist gathering in Virginia in 1789:

> While I recollect, with satisfaction, that the religious Society of which you are members, have been, throughout America, uniformly and almost unanimously, the firm friends to civil liberty, and the persevering promoters of our glorious Revolution, I cannot hesitate to believe that they will be faithful supporters of a free, yet efficient general government. Under the pleasing expectation, I rejoice to assure them that they may rely upon my best wishes and endeavours to advance their prosperity.[105]

There has been a tendency among Baptist historians to overemphasize their role in the Revolution.[106] Republican principles as to church government did not necessarily produce support for a revolution designed to bring down governmental authority. Nevertheless, there is little evidence of Baptist toryism.

Moses Allen, Congregationalist minister in Georgia, was decidedly a whig.[107] He was one of the few who lost his life during his

---

[105]Jared Sparks, ed., *The Writing of George Washington* (12 vols., Boston, 1834-1837), XII, 155.

[106]William Cathcart perhaps overemphasized the Baptist influence in *The Baptists and the American Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1876), 88-89, when he wrote:

> Had not the Baptists planted the love of liberty in the hearts of the common people of Virginia, . . . it is more than probable that they would have kept Virginia loyal to England in the Revolutionary struggle, and if she had been, every Southern Colony would have stood by her side. . . . Without the Baptists of Virginia, the genius and glory of Washington might have been buried in the quiet home of an almost unknown Virginia planter.

Also Semple, *Virginia Baptists*, 62, said of the Baptists that "to a man they were in favor of the Revolution." Huggins, *North Carolina Baptists*, 93, said that other than Morgan Edwards of Pennsylvania, there was no other Baptist minister who opposed the Revolution.

[107]The people of Liberty County, Georgia took a lead in the move for independence and Lyman Hall, a signer of the Declaration of

chaplaincy. The role of William Tennent of Charleston before his death in 1777 has already been treated in detail. The only other Congregationalist minister in the South during the Revolution was John J. Zubly of Savannah. Though a whig in his political ideology, he could not come to accept independence.

The German groups also had several whig ministers but not as high a percentage as other religious groups. Approximately 40 percent of the Lutheran and German Reformed ministers can definitely be identified as whigs. One reason for their small numbers among the whig partisans was their unfamiliarity with the English language, their distressing experiences with the horrors of war in the old country, and their desire to preserve their own way of life. Many were also indifferent to the American cause because they had taken an oath of allegiance to the British king.[108] Yet the whig activities of John Nicholas Martin, Peter Muhlenberg, Adolph Nuessman, Christian Rabenhorst, and Michael Schlatter were genuinely significant.

Among the Methodist ministers, the English-born tended to be tories while the American-born were either whigs or neutral. Of the Methodists who can be identified, there was an even division among these three categories. The patriot activities of Green Hill in North Carolina

---

Independence, was a member of the Midway Congregational Church. See Stacy, *History and Records of Midway Church*, 101-2.

[108]During the Drayton-Tennent-Hart mission into the interior of South Carolina in 1775 it was reported that the Germans wanted to remain loyal to the king and were averse to taking up arms lest they lose their lands. See William Henry Drayton and William Tennent to Council of Safety, August 7, 1775, in Gibbes, *Documentary History*, I, 128; McCrady, *South Carolina, 1775-80*, pp. 41-42.

have been discussed earlier, but he was the only Methodist minister who held an important political position during the period of the Revolution. Another whig Methodist was Edward Droomgoole of Virginia, who took the oath of allegiance before a magistrate in Sussex County, Virginia, and carefully preserved the certificate as a testimonial of his fidelity to the American cause. While traveling near Halifax, North Carolina, he heard the news of independence and, it was reported, read the Declaration after preaching to a large congregation.[109] Philip Bruce, another Methodist, often collected information about the movement of British troops and gave it to the patriot forces for which he was often seized and punished by the loyalists. Present at the battle of King's Mountain, he was looked upon as chaplain even though not so officially appointed.[110] William Watters, while on a preaching circuit in northern Virginia in 1775, heard the sermon of an Anglican minister who denounced the Methodists as a set of tories. Mounting the pulpit, he preached his own sermon denying the charge and calling on the rector and his congregation to give proof for any "action in any one of us, which is unbecoming good Citizens."[111] Watters also denied that Methodists preached non-resistance. It was probably because of his support for the American cause that, unlike some Methodists, he was able to

---

[109]Sketch of Edward Droomgoole in Droomgoole Papers, North Carolina Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill; William L. Grissom, *History of Methodism in North Carolina* (Nashville, 1905), 49-50.

[110]Grissom, *Methodism in North Carolina*, 79-81.

[111]Watters, *A Short Account*, 51.

preach in peace. As he explained it later:

> Some few both of preachers and people were called to suffer in their persons, or property; but such instances were comparatively few, and their sufferings short. I do not know that I ever, before or since the war, travelled with more safety, amongst all sorts of people, and in every place, where I believed it my duty to go.[112]

Thus, dissenting ministers of all denominations were found in the American ranks, but clearly the Presbyterians contributed the largest number to the whig cause.

Only about 11 percent of the dissenting clergy can be classified as tories. They do not represent any one colony nor any one denomination but rather varied interests and locations. Probably the most active loyalist was Christopher F. Triebner, one of the Salzburger Lutheran ministers in Georgia. He supported the crown by taking the oath of allegiance and signed an address thanking the king when royal government was restored during the British occupation of Georgia. Even though some of the Salzburgers took the oath of allegiance to the crown under Triebner's influence, a majority of them remained loyal to the American cause. The tory element destroyed the property of the patriots, including the residence of Christian Rabenhorst, the other Lutheran pastor at Ebenezer. Through all of this, Triebner remained unmoved from his loyalty, and when the British left in 1782 he fled to East Florida and then to England.[113] He was declared a traitor by the Georgia

---

[112] *Ibid*, 70.

[113] Strickland, *Religion and State in Georgia*, 147; Strobel, *The Salzburgers*, 196-208.

legislature, his estate of over 900 acres was confiscated, and in July 1782 it was sold by the state.[114] Another minister among the Germans, Goerge Wallauer of the German Reformed Church in Baltimore, also expressed support for the British. He had come from Europe in 1771 and was pastor in Baltimore from 1772 until 1776, at which time he joined the British army and later returned to Europe.[115]

There were two Presbyterians who exhibited tory tendencies. One was a Highlander minister in North Carolina, John McLeod, who fought with the loyalists in the battle of Moore's Creek Bridge, February 27, 1776. Captured and imprisoned for a short time, he was released to the patriots on condition that he leave the colony. McLeod sailed for England and was never heard from again.[116] Alexander Miller of Virginia, the other tory Presbyterian minister, had been expelled from the ministry in May 1765 by the Hanover Presbytery and also the Synod of New York and Philadelphia; yet he preached following this ban under

---

[114]Candler, *Rev. Recs. of Ga.*, 373-88, 504, 506, 514. On December 5, 1800, the legislature repealed the act declaring traitors in respect to Triebner. See *ibid.*, I, 630.

[115]J. Thomas Scharf, *The Chronicles of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1874), 42.

[116]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, V, 1196, 1198; X, 577. There was a John McLeod who as a prisoner in Philadelphia signed a petition on October 31, 1776, requesting the North Carolina Secretary of State to allow him and other prisoners to return home. It is not known whether this was the same person. See *ibid.*, X, 888-89; XI, 295; Meyer, *Highland Scots of N.C.*, 116. There is a tradition that James Campbell, another Highlander minister and a patriot, intervened on behalf of McLeod, and McLeod was paroled into Campbell's hands on the condition that he leave the country. See Robert S. Arrowood, "Rev. James Campbell," manuscript paper at Historical Foundation of Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, Montreat, North Carolina.

the authority of the Synod.[117] He bought land and settled on the Cowpasture River in Augusta County. On October 3, 1775, Miller appeared before the Augusta County Committee of Safety to answer the following charges: that he declared the acts of opposition to Britain as rebellion and those involved in the acts as traitors; that he expressed the view that members of Congress and the Virginia Convention were seditious, living at the expense of America; and that the levies for ammunition were used by the members of the committee of safety for their own benefit. After the committee heard witnesses, they found Miller "to be a real enemy to the general struggle of all America" and recommended that the people of the county have no further dealings with him until he repented of his folly.[118] This must not have deterred him, for the committee of safety again brought him before the Augusta County court on July 16-17, 1776, when he was found guilty of "aiding and giving intelligence to the enemy" and fined £100. Ordered by the court to be incarcerated on his plantation, he was not "to argue nor reason with any person or persons whatsoever on any political subject." On April 19, 1777, however, he wrote to John Poage, member of the Assembly, opposing the revolutionary cause, contending that the allegiance given to Britain made independence wrong. The letter was taken instead to the justice of the peace, and Miller was charged with violation of

---

[117]Minutes of Hanover Presbytery, May 3, 1765, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond; Engles, *Records of the Presbyterian Church*, 394-96, 410.

[118]Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, III, 939; Purdie's *Virginia Gazette*, November 3, 1775.

the act, passed by the General Assembly on October 7, 1776, which made it a crime to assert the power of the king or Parliament, or to oppose the government of Virginia.[119] There is no indication of the outcome of this charge.

Perhaps the most important tory in the South was John J. Zubly. He was certainly one of the most prolific defenders of American rights up to 1775, but when the Continental Congress, of which he was a member, began to discuss independence, he left for home. Back in Savannah he entered into a newspaper debate with his fellow-delegates to the Congress on the advisability of raising troops in Georgia. Zubly was opposed to the measure on the ground that Georgia could not raise the quota of men and could not pay for their expense.[120] Because he would not take an oath renouncing the authority of the British king, he was taken into custody by the council of safety in July 1776, since his "going at large [would] endanger the public safety."[121] He was banished from Georgia and half of his estate was ordered seized.

In October 1777, Zubly appeared before the grand jury because he felt he had been wronged and that the government was exercising arbitrary

---

[119]Lyman Chalkley, ed., *Chronicles of the Scotch-Irish Settlements in Virginia, Extracted from the Original Court Records of Augusta County, 1745-1800* (3 vols., Rosslyn, Virginia, 1912; reprint ed., Baltimore, 1965), I, 504-7; Wilson, *The Tinkling Spring*, 202; Hening, *Statutes at Large*, IX, 170-71.

[120]*Georgia Gazette*, January 17, 1776. The three articles by the three delegates were published on January 3, 10, 17, the latter date being the one written by Zubly since it was written by a member of the Committee of Accounts. Zubly was the only Georgian on this committee.

[121]Candler, *Rev. Recs. of Ga.*, I, 146-48; Zubly to Henry Laurens, 1778, Laurens Papers, Long Island Historical Society, Brooklyn, New York.

power by forcing a person to take an oath. He said to the grand jury:

> If a man may be taken up without any previous accusation upon oath, all liberty is at an end.
>
> If a man may be condemned without any public trial or pretence of Violation of a law, all Law is at an End.
>
> If he may be determined against by his known and professed Enemies, whom he is not allowed to exc[e]pt against, all appearance of justice is at an End.
>
> If a man cannot preserve Liberty and Property, without taking an oath, which cannot be known whether it be true and in Part is known to be false, all Decency is at an End.[122]

Convinced that constitutional government in America was about to collapse, Zubly was sure the end was near when a person such as himself could be deprived of liberty and property and be forced to submit to judges who altered the constitution as they saw fit. Strange as it may seem, Zubly was probably one of the most consistent of whigs in principle. He argued against the arbitrary power of the British government, and now he was fighting the arbitrary government of his own countrymen. But the emotionalism of the times branded him as a tory.

He fled to South Carolina and lived in the region of Purrysburg. The Georgia legislature on March 1, 1778, passed an act to confiscate the estates of all those accused of treason, and Zubly's name was included.[123] After the British took Savannah, he returned to the city and was able again to preach in his church until his death on July 23, 1781.[124] His death notice recorded that

---

[122]John J. Zubly, *To the Grand Jury of the County of Chatham, State of Georgia, October 8, 1777* [Savannah, 1777], 1.

[123]Candler, *Rev. Recs. of Ga.*, I, 326-47. The record of the sale of his confiscated land is in *ibid.*, 434, 436, 506, 514.

[124]Josiah Smith Jr. to John Rodgers, October 10, 1779, Josiah Smith Letterbook, Sou. Hist. Coll., Chapel Hill.

> in his last moments he earnestly prayed for his King and Country, and that it would please the Divine Ruler of all things soon to put an end to this unnatural Rebellion.[125]

All of the dissenting clergymen mentioned immediately above were in some sense tories who could not accept independence. In addition to these, there were at least four Baptist ministers who, even though loyalists, were not as ardent about political independence. Three of them were from North Carolina: William Cook, James Childs, and James Perry. Cook was pastor of the Dutchman's Creek Baptist Church in Rowan County. In 1775 a tory paper, known as "the Protest" was circulated in the Dutchman's Creek neighborhood, condemning the activities of the patriots. Cook signed it, and on August 1, 1775, he was called before the county committee of safety, at which time he, "in the most explicit and humiliating terms," professed his sorrow at signing the paper. A committee of two was appointed to instruct him with regard to the conflict with Britain, and this seems to have quieted him.[126] His church was still suspicious of him, however, and the following month Cook had to make a public apology to the congregation before he could continue preaching.[127] At the November conference the church left the decision to join the Revolution to individual members and agreed that

> if any of the Brethren sees cause to join in it they had the liberty to do it without being called to an account

---

[125] *Royal Georgia Gazette*, July 26, 1781.

[126] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 134.

[127] Dutchman's Creek Baptist Church Records, September 3, 1775, North Carolina Baptist Historical Collection, Wake Forest University, Winston Salem, North Carolina.

> by the Church for it but whether join or not join should be used with brotherly love.[128]

In 1777 Cook was again called before the church to answer some unspecified charges, but since nothing could be proved against him he was allowed to preach as an assistant pastor.[129] It appears that Cook had been silenced and professed repentance for his tory beliefs.

The other two Baptist ministers got into trouble mainly because they preached the doctrine of non-resistance. James Childs had come from Virginia and settled in Anson County. When the state called on its citizens to bear arms against the British, he threatened excommunication to any of his church members if they heeded that call. Childs was accordingly summoned before the council of safety in Halifax on August 13, 1776, at which time he declared that he was a "preacher of the New Light Baptist Persuasion, [and] that one of the tenets of his church was not to bear arms." When he refused to take an oath of allegiance to the state, the council saw in this an "evil tendency;" and since he taught others the same doctrine, he was to be "considered as an Enemy to this State." He was paroled within the limits of the town of Edenton.[130] The following December he petitioned the Halifax Congress for an enlargement of his parole, and it was granted provided he would no longer preach non-resistance and would take the oath of allegiance.[131] He must have continued to preach the doctrine,

---

[128] *Ibid.*, November 3, 1775.

[129] *Ibid.*, March 15, 1777.

[130] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 699-700.

[131] *Ibid.*, 953-54.

nevertheless, for in December 1777, while he was in the Anson jail, he sent a petition to the legislature which it considered seditious and ordered burned.[132] Nothing more is heard of Childs after this. James Perry, also of Anson County, preached a doctrine similar to Childs, and he was brought before the Anson Committee of Secrecy on November 6, 1776. Refusing to give bail, Perry was held to appear before the Halifax Congress on November 10, 1776.[133] There is no record, however, of his appearance, but he may have been one of those who signed the seditious letter from the Anson jail. Both of these ministers suffered for their political beliefs, but there is some confusion as to their motivation. The doctrine of non-resistance was not a tenet of the Separate Baptists, and their preaching it was purely a matter of their own choice.

In addition to these, William Tennent, on his mission into backcountry South Carolina in 1775, found two or three unnamed Baptist preachers who opposed the American cause. Philip Mulkey also seemed to have supported the loyalists under Fletchall, the tory leader in South Carolina.[134] These ministers in South Carolina lived in areas of strong tory support, which may account for their political views. There is no evidence that any of them were brought before a committee of safety.

A final group that can be classified as tories were the Methodist missionaries sent to America by John Wesley. At the first American

---

[132]Clark, *State Recs. of N.C.*, XII, 217.

[133]*Ibid.*, XXII, 752.

[134]See chap. VI above.

conference in 1773 the Methodists adopted the principle that "the authority of Mr. Wesley" would extend to the colonies.[135] This was to have long range effect on American attitudes towards the Methodist missionaries. Since Wesley was a person with influence and prominence in England, his pro-British views influenced the Methodists in America. At first urging his associates to remain neutral in the conflict, by 1775 he had changed to support the British position. There is general agreement that this change came as a result of Wesley's reading of Samuel Johnson's pamphlet, *Taxation No Tyranny* (1775). His abridgement of that pamphlet, *A Calm Address to our American Colonies* (1775), became known throughout America and, as a result, placed a tory stigma on all Methodist missionaries. In this anti-British period, the logic of the common mind could only conclude that all Methodists were pro-British. Francis Asbury, one of those missionaries, admitted as much:

> I . . . am truly sorry that the venerable man [Wesley] ever dipped into the politics of America. . . . However, it discovers Mr. Wesley's conscientious attachment to the government under which he lived. Had he been a subject of America, no doubt but he would have been as zealous an advocate of the American cause. But some inconsiderate persons have taken occasion to censure the Methodists in America, on account of Mr. Wesleys political sentiments.[136]

As a result, most of the English-born missionaries followed in Wesley's footsteps, and all of them returned to England except Asbury. Joseph Pilmore and Richard Boardman had already sailed for England in

---

[135] *Minutes of the Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Years, 1773-1828* (2 vols., New York, 1840), I, 5.

[136] Elmer E. Clark, ed., *The Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury* (3 vols., Nashville, 1958), I, 181. The entry is for March 19, 1776.

January 1774. Pilmore accompanied Boardman out of friendship, he admitted:

> I resolved to sacrifice my own ease, interest, and inclination, and return with my fellowtraveller to Europe. Friendship had so united our hearts, that I could not bear the thought of letting him [Boardman] go alone, and therefore left all my own concerns unsettled, that I might accompany him to our native land.[137]

Richard Wright, who had been in America since 1771, also returned to England in 1774, but he gave no indication of his reason for returning.[138] Another Methodist missionary, Martin Rodda, returned in 1777. His pro-British attitude was shown by his spreading the royal proclamation while on his preaching circuit with Freeborn Garrettson, an American-born preacher.[139] At the Methodist Conference meeting in Maryland in that year, the American and English ministers met for the last time. It was a time of sorrow and anguish at the parting. Garrettson later remembered this occasion:

> I shall never forget the parting prayer put up by that dear servant of God, George Shadford, for surely the place was

---

[137]Frederick E. Maser, ed., *The Journal of Joseph Pilmore, Methodist Itinerant for the years August 1, 1769 to January 2, 1774* (Philadelphia, 1969), 232.

[138]Sprague, *Annals*, VII, 9.

[139]Freeborn Garrettson, *The Experience and Travels of Mr. Freeborn Garrettson, Minister of the Methodist-Episcopal Church in North America* (Philadelphia, 1791), 77. Jesse Lee, who became a circuit preacher during the Revolution, said in his *A Short History of the Methodists in the United States of America* (Baltimore, 1810), 62.

> Mr. Rodda had taken some imprudent steps in favor of the tories. . . . [His] conduct brought many sufferings and much trouble, on the Methodist preachers and people.

> shaken with the power of God. We parted, bathed in tears, to meet no more in this world.[140]

In 1778 George Shadford and Thomas Rankin sailed for England after coming to America together five years before. Shadford could not take the loyalty oath in Virginia, and when he went to Maryland's Eastern Shore, the oath was just as unpalatable, so he decided to return with Rankin.[141] Rankin ran into the same problem in Maryland. The threat of imprisonment probably explains his decision to leave America, though his fondness for Wesley and his friends in England undoubtedly hastened the process. When Rankin was offered a farm along the Potomac River in July, 1777, provided he remain, he wrote that

> no estate or plantation in America, should ever induce me to separate myself from Mr. Wesley and my brethren in Great Britain. . . . Altho' I and my English Brethren had been cut off from hearing from our Father in the Gospel with our other friends in England, yet I believed the time would come, when we should meet him, and then with pleasure once more.[142]

In the case of these English-born ministers, it was not their dislike for America but their affection for their native land which explains their removal to Great Britain.

A third group was neutral during the war and represented about 25 percent of the classifiable ministers. Some were actually in sympathy with the American cause but remained pacifists out of conscience.

---

[140]Freeborn Garrettson, *Substance of the Semi-Centennial Sermon, before the New York Annual Conference* (New York, 1827), 15.

[141]Sprague, *Annals*, VII, 39-40.

[142]Diary of Reverand Thomas Rankin (Typed), 228, Garrett Biblical Institute Library.

Thus their anti-militarism prevented them from participating actively in the war.

About half of the pacifists were Moravians in North Carolina. They felt an obligation to the crown because of the Act of Parliament in 1749 exempting them from taking oaths and serving in the military, provided they pay a sum in lieu of such service. As a peaceful people, they had nothing to do with the Regulator movement, and for conscience's sake they attempted to keep from bearing arms in the Revolution. They refused also to be involved in any political agencies, such as the committees of safety and congresses in North Carolina. This raised a great deal of suspicion, and on February 15, 1776, a group of soldiers under Colonel Martin Armstrong of the Surry County militia came to the Moravian villages to determine which side they supported. Upon being satisfied with the Moravians' answers, the militia drew up a declaration which was signed by two of the ministers, Bishop John Michael Graff and Reverend Nichol Lorenz Bagge. Their promise was

> to demean ourselves as hitherto as quiet people, who wish the welfare of the Country and Province, and that we nor either of us will not at any time intermed[d]le in political affairs, we will cheerfully assist and support the Country along with our other fellow Inhabitants in paying of taxes and anything else that is not against our conscience and the privileges upon which we have settled here and that we in no case whatever shall or will do any thing that shall be detrimental to the good Province we inhabit.[143]

In August, Graff, in his report to the Conference at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, mentioned receiving news of the Declaration of Independence but

---

[143]Fries, *Moravian Records*, III, 1348.

expressed the belief that nothing more would be expected of them except to have to give up their arms. He reported that three men from Bethany joined the militia but that the people did not consider them Brethren.[144]

During 1777 more pressure was put on the Moravians by the General Assembly to require them to serve in the military or pay a heavy fine, to furnish a quota of men or pay a tax, and to take an oath of allegiance to the state or denounce the king. As a result, early in 1778 and again in January 1779, the Moravians sent a petition to the Assembly, signed by Bishop Graff, that they be protected.[145] The main issue was whether they would actually renounce all loyalty to the king and whether they should pay a fine or only a tax as a substitute for military service. The Assembly did pass a resolution in January 1779, that if the Moravians would take an affirmation of allegiance to North Carolina they could retain possession of all their property and be exempt from military service, provided they paid a threefold tax.[146] Thus, while the Moravian ministers held their people faithful to their pacifist position throughout the war, they slowly moved to provide supplies to the Americans.

In addition, a few ministers of the German Baptists or Dunkards and the Mennonite groups were pacifist by doctrine. There were at least

---

[144] *Ibid.*, 1087, 1100.

[145] *Ibid.*, 1206, 1373-76, 1393-95.

[146] *Ibid.*, 1393-99; Saunders, *Colonial Records*, V, 1153-54.

four Mennonite ministers living in the Valley of Virginia and Maryland, one of whom was Marin Kaufman, a former Baptist who became a Mennonite because of his pacifism.[147] In Maryland, the Provincial Convention passed a resolution that all county committees of observation should distinguish between those who refused to pay a fine for not enrolling in the militia and those who did so from religious principles.[148] Virginia passed a law in October 1777 requiring Mennonites to pay a tax for failure to appear at muster but failed to mention the Dunkards at all.[149] North Carolina required the Moravians and Dunkards to dispose of their firearms on a voluntary basis.[150] Because of their pacifism, the Annual Conference of the German Baptist ministers in 1778 recommended that any member who had taken an oath of allegiance to America should recall it, apologize to the church, and repent of his error. The following year they gave their reason for this position:

> We cannot know whether God has rejected the king and chosen the state, while the king had the government; therefore we could not, with a good conscience, repudiate the king and give allegiance to the state.[151]

Since the Dunkard ministers did not take oaths they wanted to wait to learn what the will of God was. Among those of German background, only

---

[147]Harry A. Brunk, *History of Mennonites in Virginia, 1727-1900* (Staunton, Virginia, 1959), 26ff.

[148]Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series, VI, 1504.

[149]Hening, *Statutes at Large*, IX, 345.

[150]Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 526.

[151]Quoted in Rufus D. Bowman, *The Church of the Brethren and War, 1708-1941* (Elgin, Illinois, 1944; reprint ed., New York, 1971), 92.

one Lutheran minister, John Andrew Krug at Frederick, Maryland, was an outspoken anti-militarist. He hated every sort of force even when used for a good cause.[152]

About one-third of the Methodist preachers were pacifists, all of them American-born except one. This is understandable since John Wesley first advised his missionaries to be peacemakers. He wrote to them in 1775 that

> it is your part to be peacemakers; to be loving and tender to all; but to addict yourselves to no party. In spite of all solicitations, of rough or smooth words, say not one word against one or the other side. Keep yourselves pure; do all you can to help and soften all; but beware how you adopt another's jar.[153]

Rankin wrote concerning the conference of that year that the ministers "were decidedly of the opinion that we durst not countenance our people in taking up arms, either on the one side or the other."[154] This pacifism led many people to think the Methodist ministers were British agents, as shown by this comment made in 1781 by a colonel in the Virginia militia:

> A certain set of Preachers, called Methodists are preaching the doctrine of passive obedience, and point out the horrors of war in so alarming a manner, that it has caused many to declare they would suffer death rather than kill even an enemy--this is a new doctrine and inculcated by some sensible preachers from England, which I am told is

---

[152]Dieter Cunz, *The Maryland Germans* (Princeton, 1948), 185.

[153]John Wesley to Thomas Rankin, March 1, 1775, in John Telford, ed., *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley* (8 vols., London, 1931), VI, 142.

[154]Diary of Reverend Thomas Rankin, May 16, 1775 (Typed), 132, Garrett Biblical Institute Library.

> payed by the ministry through Wesley for this purpose--it must be discountenanced, or all torys will plead religion an excuse, and get license to preach.[155]

As a result of suspected toryism, there was persecution and imprisonment in Maryland of Freeborn Garrettson, Philip Gatch, and Joseph Hartley.[156]

Garrettson was one of the leading preachers of non-resistance, but he considered himself a supporter of the American cause. He refused to take the oath of allegiance while in Maryland because it was too binding on his conscience. On one occasion when he refused to muster, he commented:

> I was determined I would have nothing to do with the unhappy war; it was contrary to my mind, and grievous to my conscience, to have any hand in shedding human blood. Accordingly, I was brought before the officers at a general muster, because I refused to meet, as usual, to learn the art of war.[157]

Likewise, Jesse Lee, a young man who became a Methodist preacher during the war, refused to bear arms. When drafted for military service he responded:

> I told him [Colonel] I could not kill a man with a good conscience, but I was a friend to my country, and was willing

---

[155]Colonel J. Parker to Speaker of Virginia Assembly, June 9, 1781, in Palmer, *Calandar of Virginia State Papers*, II, 152.

[156]Garrettson, *Experience and Travels*, 79, 93-94; John MacLean, *Sketch of Rev. Philip Gatch* (Cincinnati, 1854), 45-46. Gatch was persecuted as a pacifist near Baltimore in 1775 and was seized by a mob which impaired the use of one eye.

[157]Quoted in Nathan Bangs, ed., *Life of the Rev. Freeborn Garrettson: Compiled from his Printed and Manuscript Journals and other Authentic Documents* (2nd Edition, New York, 1830), 38; Sprague, *Annals*, VII, 55-56.

> to do anything I could, while I continued in the army, except that of fighting.[158]

The only English-born Methodist missionary who remained in America, Francis Asbury, was also a pacifist. Not able to take the Maryland Test Oath and bear arms, he went to Delaware in 1778, remaining in isolation for the next two years at the home of Judge Thomas White. Of this experience, Asbury wrote that

> on conscientous principles I was a non-juror, and could not preach in the state of Maryland; and therefore withdrew to the Delaware state, where the clergy were not required to take the state oath: though with a clear conscience, I could have taken the oath of the Delaware state, had it been required; and would have done it, had I not been prevented by a tender fear of hurting the scrupulous consciences of others.[159]

Pacifism, then, did not necessarily mean rejection of the American cause; it meant only a disavowal of any active role in the war. Most of the pacifist clergy supported the Revolution in other ways, such as paying extra taxes.

Perhaps as many as two-thirds of the dissenting clergy were patriots. The figure is higher if pacifists sympathetic to the American cause and those Baptist ministers who were active in disestablishment of the Anglican church are included. This would mean that a higher proportion of dissenting clergy supported the Revolution than did the general population, if the traditional figure of one-third is employed. Similarly, the 11 percent figure for the pro-British among the

---

[158]Quoted in Grissom, *Methodism in North Carolina*, 77; Sprague, *Annals*, VII, 80-81.

[159]Quoted in Lee, *History of the Methodists*, 64.

dissenting clergy is also lower than estimates of tories among the general population.

It is interesting to compare these figures with those of the Anglican ministers in the South. One leading historian of the Episcopal church has made the generalization that most of the Anglican clergy in New England were loyalists, that they were divided but predominantly loyalists, and that in the South a higher percentage were revolutionary. Yet in the South, those favoring the American cause were not in a majority, except in South Carolina.[160] This generalization is substantially correct, except that the number of whig Anglicans in the South may be higher than once believed.

Specialized studies on the southern colonies have suggested that the Anglican patriots were larger in number than loyalists, except in North Carolina and Georgia. Brydon wrote that out of the 105 Anglican clergy in Virginia, about seventy of them were patriot, twenty were tories, and the remainder disappeared and cannot be classified.[161] A more recent study lists 129 Anglican clergy in Virginia during the revolutionary period with 32 percent (forty-one) being tories and 57 percent (seventy-four) whigs.[162] The Carolinas present a different picture. One study of the Carolina clergy has shown that the North

---

[160]William W. Manross, *A History of the American Episcopal Church* (New York, 1950), 173, 181-82.

[161]Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church*, II, 415-21.

[162]Lohrenz, "The Virginia Clergy," 22-23, 54-55, 81-82, 122, 134, 137, 163. Lohrenz classifies the 129 as follows: thirty-one ardent tories, ten milder tories who remained in Virginia, twenty-two passive whigs, twenty-one moderately active whigs, thirty-one active whigs, eight died, and six misplaced.

Carolina Anglican clergy were mostly tories because they were unhappy over the failure of the English church to become strongly established, apprehensive over their salaries, and annoyed at the large number of dissenters in the colony. The opposite was true in South Caorlina, where the establishment was better, their salaries more adequate, and the ministers themselves socially comfortable.[163] In the latter colony it has been estimated that 25 percent (five out of twenty) of the Anglican clergy were loyalists.[164] From these studies it can readily be seen that at least among the Anglican clergy in Virginia and South Carolina the patriots were in a majority, but not to the same extent as were the patriots among the dissenting clergy. Conversely, the percentage of tories among the Anglican clergy was somewhat higher than among the dissenting clergy.

The coming of war certainly changed the attitudes of the southern dissenting clergy. While they did not believe that violence was the way to solve the problems within the empire, once the war had begun and independence was declared a majority of them participated in the war effort. The dissenting clergy were of decided influence in the resistance to the British. Their patriotic sermons created an atmosphere of protest against an unnatural authority, but even more than

---

[163]Durward T. Stokes, "The Clergy of the Carolinas and the American Revolution" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1968), 265-66.

[164]*Ibid.*, 195-96; Frederick Dalcho, *An Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South Carolina* (Charleston, 1820), 206.

their sermons, their actions as chaplains, soldiers, and recruiters of troops aided the American cause. There is no way to tell exactly how much influence they had on their congregations, but they surely played leadership roles. Perhaps the Revolution would have been different without them.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS

In the preceding chapters an attempt has been made to demonstrate the role played by the southern dissenting clergy in the American Revolution. Such a study indicates that while the ministers developed no new political ideology, they did enunciate a politicial theory that was used successfully against Great Britain. Rooted in Calvinist theology, these political principles were employed to define the relative powers of rulers and ruled. There is no way to measure the influence of this ideology as expressed by the clergy, however, for the men of the cloth were not a class unto themselves. Many of them being farmers, like most American, they expressed the same hopes and fears for America and for their cherished civil liberties as did the rest of whig Americans. On one score, however, they were particularly outspoken--the need to preserve liberty of conscience.

Recently it has been argued by Alan Heimert that Calvinist philosophy was of greater importance in bringing on the Revolution than the rationalist liberal philosophy of the Enlightenment. Earlier, Alice M. Baldwin studied the role of Calvinist Congregational ministers in popularizing the doctrines of natural rights and constitutional government and called the southern Presbyterian ministers "sowers of sedition."[1] Both of these historians, then, placed the leadership of the Revolution squarely in the hands of Calvinist clergymen.

---

[1]See the works mentioned earlier: Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind*; Baldwin, *New England Clergy*; and Baldwin, "Sowers of Sedition."

But this theory is less applicable to the South than to the North. Even though a majority of the dissenting clergy in the South were Calvinist in theology, they acted as a moderating influence rather than as spokesmen of the revolutionary philosophy. Their actions and reactions to the events preceding the Revolution were foreign to those of the Sons of Liberty; neither was the clergy involved in the economic side of the Revolution as were the merchants. A few only having held any type of political office, the clergy did not participate in the politics of the day. Consequently, the southern dissenting clergy were not militant revolutionists. Instead they were interested largely in religious matters, counseling their parishioners to give allegiance to those in places of authority.

Why was there a difference between the Calvinists of the South and those of the middle and northern colonies? One of the most important reasons is that in the South, they were minority sects rather than part of the establishment. In New England the Calvinists, mostly represented by the Congregationalists, were directly connected with the religious and political establishments. The minister was the Lord's spokesman in matters of religion and morals and, on most occasions, interpreted the will of God in political affairs. Looked to for guidance by politicians, the minister preached political sermons on occasions such as the election of government officials and the mustering of the militia. This close association between politics and religion created a situation in which the minister was a recognized influence in the community. While there was no church establishment in the middle colonies,

the dissenters were still close to the center of power. In the decade before the Revolution, the Pennsylvania Presbyterians, with increasing support from the German sectarian groups, made up the "Proprietary party."[2] Opposed to them was the "Quaker party" led by Banjamin Franklin. When the Quaker party petitioned for a royal government, they pushed the Presbyterians into a position of opposition, a situation which lined them up firmly with the patriots during the Revolution. This led many of the Presbyterian clergymen--Francis Alison, Elihu Spencer, George Duffield--to take an active part in politics. In New Jersey, the Presbyterians and Quakers had the largest number of active congregations, and there was considerable interaction between the two groups. The Presbyterian minister John Witherspoon was certainly involved in politics, and other ministers, such as Jacob Green and Alexander McWhorter, were members of the radical independence party in New Jersey.[3] Religious rivalries also found expression in New York politics, the attempt to establish the King's College having been considered by Presbyterians as an Anglican conspiracy. Presbyterianism being strong in New York, a conflict developed between the "Presbyterian party" and "Anglican party" which climaxed in the Assembly election of 1769.[4] The

---

[2]Dietmar Rothermund, *The Layman's Progress: Religious and Political Experience in Colonial Pennsylvania, 1740-1770* (Philadelphia, 1961), chaps. 6 and 7.

[3]Trinterud, *The Forming of an American Tradition*, 243.

[4]Patricia U. Bonomi, *A Factious People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York* (New York, 1971), 248-54; Milton M. Klein, ed., *The Independent Reflector* (Cambridge, 1963), 32-43.

diversity of denominations and the strength of the various dissenter groups in the middle colonies created a situation which allowed the Calvinists to be politically influential.

This was not true in the South, where the dissenters were outside of the religious and political establishment. In all the southern colonies the Anglican church was the state-supported church, and the royal governors were given instructions to uphold and support it, a policy designed to keep the dissenters in check.[5] The local political unit was the Anglican parish, and even though some dissenters served as members of the vestry, there was a legal requirement that all vestrymen be Anglican. This caused friction between dissenters and churchmen, but it also insured the supremacy of the Anglicans in both political and ecclesiastical affairs. Since there was a religious establishment, other churches could not become incorporated bodies, thereby allowing them to hold property for their own benefit. Incorporation, in fact, did not come until the adoption of the new state constitutions. Denied formal recognition as religious groups and kept from political power, dissenters were merely tolerated. With the possible exception of the Carolinas, dissenters were not strong enough to become a political force in any southern colonial legislature.

A second reason that the Calvinists in the South were not a radical force was their social and economic standing. In New England the Congregational minister generally rated quite high socially and was

---

[5]Leonard W. Labaree, ed., *Royal Instructions to British Colonial Governors, 1670-1776* (2 vols., New York, 1935), II, 482-512.

looked upon as a community leader.[6] In the middle colonies, where the Presbyterians were strongest, there were many upper-class families of that faith, the Livingstons of New York, for example. Among the Quakers of Pennsylvania were several who became leading merchants. Even the governors of some of the northern colonies were from Scotch or Scotch-Irish backgrounds. This placed the dissenters in social positions in which they could exercise influence. In the South, however, this was not true, since dissenters were on the fringes of political leadership. Often referred to as "enthusiasts" or "itinerants," some were viewed as social deviants, expecially the Separate Baptists. Even among the Lutherans, a movement known as the Webberites resulted in Jacob Webber (personified as God) murdering two men personified as the other members of the Trinity.[7] In addition, the lack of formal education among the Baptists made them appear illiterate even though some of them were fairly well read. The very economics of dissenter status imposed a hardship on many, as they had to pay the official church tax as well as voluntarily contribute to the support of their own denominations. With the possible exception of men like Robert Carter of Virginia, who became a Baptist in 1778, or the Presbyterian merchant Josiah Smith, Jr., of Charleston, most of the southern dissenters were from the middle and lower class rather than the planter class. In most cases, the dissenter minister had to work his own land and had a difficult

---

[6]Baldwin, *New England Clergy*, chap. 1.

[7]Tappert and Doberstein, *Journals of Muhlenberg*, II, 577-80.

time collecting a salary from his church.[8] This social position caused the Anglicans, with upper-class support, to reject the leadership potential of the dissenters. Before the Revolution, therefore, any dissenter-led movement towards political and religious democracy was quickly suppressed by those who held power in the South.

A third reason for the inconsequential influence of the southern Calvinists was the nature of southern society and the distances from the frontier to the centers of power. In the middle colonies the greater concentration of population in the urban centers and the diversity of nationalities and religious groups led to struggles and compromises which produced political habits not experienced by other colonies.[9] No one religious group could dominate the others, and this heterogeneity allowed the Calvinists room to express their views. This was not true in the South. With the exception of the dissenters concentrated in the Virginia and Maryland Valley, in the North Carolina Piedmont, and in backcountry South Carolina, the Calvinists were scattered over a large area. Distance from the centers of governmental power and the printing presses diminished the influence which Calvinist ministers might have exerted. The South lacked the urban centers of the North;

---

[8]Jackson T. Main says that most clergymen belonged to the middle class and had a comfortable standard of living, but most of his examples were Anglican ministers. *The Social Structure of Revolutionary America* (Princeton, 1965), 97, 140-41.

[9]Patricia U. Bonomi, "The Middle Colonies: Embryo of the New Political Order," in Alden T. Vaughan and George A. Billias, eds., *Perspectives on Early American History: Essays in Honor of Richard B. Morris* (New York, 1973), 64-65.

and it may be significant that in the two urban regions in the South--Charleston and Savannah--the dissenting ministers were most whigish. Finally, the South had a more homogeneous population than the middle coloneis. It was basically English, dominated by an English church, and lacking the pluralism and competition which made it possible for minority groups to exert their influence. In such a society, culture was better integrated and more resistant to change.[10]

For all the above reasons, the Calvinists in the South were on the outside looking in. Denied a position in the religious and political establishment and inhabiting the frontier counties, they were not able to exert as much influence as their counterparts in the North. This does not necessarily mean that they were incapable of nor inadequate to the task but that their position made them less effective as revolutionary leaders.

Another general conclusion arising from this study is that the religious issues which aroused northern clergymen to join the revolutionary movement were not the same as those which stirred the southern clergy. Both the episcopate controversy and the passage of the Quebec Act have been viewed as major causes of the Revolution, but neither of them were that important to the revolutionary ferment in the South. As far as recorded evidence is concerned, the dissenting ministers were just not interested in these issues. There is an explanation for their attitude.

---

[10]Robert M. Weir, "The Harmony We Were Famous For: An Interpretation of Pre-Revolutionary South Carolina Politics," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, XXVI (1969), 498.

The episcopate controversy aroused much resentment among Presbyterian and Congregational ministers of the middle colonies. The more an ecclesiastical need for an Anglican bishop was expressed, the more it was dreaded; and the more ardently Anglican clergymen in America argued their point, the more hostility they excited. Since the Anglican church was not as strong in the North as in the South, the missionary agency of the church--the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel--sent missionaries into the middle colonies to bolster their cause. It was actually the SPG missionaries who were the leading advocates of an American bishopric, and there were only a few of them in the South, with the possible exception of the Carolinas.[11] There was therefore less emphasis on the necessity for a bishop among the Anglican clergy in the South. In addition, the Anglican church in the South was under the control of laymen who conducted parish affairs, including calling a rector, and these laymen did not favor the appointment of an American bishop who might reduce their power. As southern Anglicans displayed little enthusiasm for a bishop, so did dissenters develop little concern about the matter. Since there seemed to be little chance for an American bishop, the dissenters did not link the threat of a bishop to the fear of British tyranny.

The Methodist missionaries did advocate the appointment of a bishop, which is not surprising since they had not actually rejected the Church of England. At least one dissenting minister, Samuel Davies,

---

[11] H. P. Thompson, *Into All Lands* (London, 1951), 92-95. Rothermund, *Layman's Progress*, 50.

supported an episcopate in the 1750s but for reasons of expediency--to get the bishop of London to recognize southern dissenters. Whether Davies would have taken this position in the 1760s or 1770s is unknown; it is doubtful that he would have differed very sharply from his brethren in the South.

Neither did the Quebec Act stimulate the emotions in the South that it stirred farther north. The act extended the province of Quebec to the Ohio River and allowed Roman Catholics freedom of worship within the province's enlarged borders. Even though there was some opposition in the South, dissenting clergy there did not see the Quebec Act as a real threat. Distance from Quebec may be one of the reasons for this, as well as the small number of Catholics in the South.[12] The issue did serve to revive anti-Catholic feeling, but anti-Catholicism was not the result of the Quebec Act. Most of the opposition to the Quebec Act was in Georgia, which may be explained by the proximity of that colony to the Catholic Spanish.

A majority of the southern dissenting clergy were New Lights, and they were influenced by the Great Awakening. Evoking ideals which carried over into the political realm, the Awakening produced a levelling, democratic tendency in the realm of church government, serving as a model for the political world. Lay control of the dissenting churches reinforced the new ideal, making lay participation not only in the religious but also in the political sphere one of the important legacies of the Revolution.

---

[12]Gaustad, *Historical Atlas*, 32, shows only one Catholic church in the South outside of Maryland in 1750.

Not only did the dissenting clergy contribute to the Revolution, but the Revolution also affected the status of the dissenting clergy. The most important consequence was their increasing acceptance into positions of leadership. With the coming of disestablishment and the rapid growth of dissenter groups, the dissenting clergy came to be regarded as respectable, and by 1790 they were accepted in places of community leadership.

For the first time in the South, they came to hold major political offices. Preceding the Revolution, an occasional dissenter minister might hold a minor local office, and a few were even planters before they became ministers, but the Revolution saw several dissenting clergy selected for important positions in the provincial congresses and one in the Continental Congress. As a result of their political activity in the Revolution, the dissenting ministers came to take more interest in public affairs. Of those who are included in the present study, several held prominent political positions later, such as John Peter Muhlenberg, who was a member of the House of Representatives, 1789-1801, a Senator in 1802, and Collector of the Port of Philadelphia, 1802-1807. Although ministers were excluded from the legislatures in the new states, some of them were elected to later state constitutional conventions: one to the Ohio Convention in 1802;[13] three to the South Carolina Convention in 1790;[14] and two to the Kentucky Convention in

---

[13]Philip Gatch

[14]Evan Pugh, Joseph Reese, and Richard Furman.

1792.[15] In addition there were seven ministers in the North Carolina convention to ratify the Federal Constitution;[16] two became judges;[17] two served as members of the Virginia legislature;[18] one was a councillor in North Carolina;[19] and several held minor political offices elsewhere.

Another important result of the Revolution was the increased leadership of dissenting ministers in the field of education. Among the college-trained Presbyterian clergy, the conduct of classical schools had always been a part of their ministry. During the Revolutionary period such schools as Hampden-Sydney and Liberty Hall Academy (now Washington and Lee) in Virginia and Queen's College in North Carolina were founded. Even among the Baptists there was a new emphasis given to the education of its ministers. Richard Furman of South Carolina was instrumental in establishing a fund for such a purpose.[20] Evan Pugh and Elhana Winchester, Baptist ministers in backcountry South Carolina, served on a committee to establish schools in their

---

[15]David Rice and Caleb Wallace.

[16]Henry Abbott, Lemuel Burkitt, William Lancaster, Francis Oliver, Samuel Harrell, James Vinson, and David Caldwell.

[17]Caleb Wallace became judge in Kentucky Court of Appeals and Kentucky Supreme Court, and Philip Gatch became judge of The Court of Common Pleas, Clermont County, Ohio.

[18]Caleb Wallace served in the Assembly from Kentucky in 1783, and William Woods resigned his church in 1799 to become an assemblyman.

[19]Green Hill was elected councillor in North Carolina, 1783 and 1785.

[20]Furman, *Charleston Association*, 21-23, 44ff.

area.[21] The roll of others who served in places of educational leadership include six who served as trustees of institutions of higher education;[22] four who became college presidents;[23] two who were instrumental as founders of colleges;[24] one who endowed a seminary;[25] one who had a college named in his honor;[26] and several who served as trustees of academies. Such distinction had not come before the Revolution; in their new positions of social and political importance, the dissenting clergy gave evidence of the stature they had achieved by their role in the American Revolution.

While the dissenting clergy in the South were not as politically active as those in the North, there can be no doubt that they did contribute to the revolutionary movement. But if they did not supply the principal energy for the revolutionary spirit, what role did they play in the contest? Were they a passive minority? On the contrary, in

---

[21]These two Baptist ministers were members of the St. David Society in 1777-78, the purpose being to establish a public school. Gregg, *Old Cheraws*, 280-83.

[22]Robert Cooper at Dickinson College; Thomas Harris McCaule and Samuel Eusebius McCorkle at the University of North Carolina; Abraham Marshall at the University of Georgia; David Rice and Caleb Wallace at Transylvania University.

[23]Samuel Davies, Samuel Finley, and Samuel Stanhope Smith at the College of New Jersey; John McKnight at Dickinson College.

[24]Hezekiah Balch at Greenville College in Tennessee and Patrick Alison at Baltimore College.

[25]John Christopher Hartwig who left his estate to found Hartwick Seminary in New York.

[26]Joseph Alexander had Alexandria College named in his honor.

their own way they provided vital sinew to the body of patriots on the frontier, and upwards of two-thirds of them were definitely whigs in thought and action. As reluctant participants in the extralegal activities preceding the conflict, they supported the moderate principle of reconciliation with the mother country. But once the Revolution began, they set the example in their communities by taking part in recruitment of the militia and in inspiring their congregations, measures that were hazardous in some parts of the frontier, which had a strong loyalist element.

The dissenting clergy played a minor role in a number of other respects. The activity of men like William Tennent, Oliver Hart, and Richard Furman in the Carolina backcountry provided the necessary ingredient for keeping that area from falling under the complete influence of the loyalists. They lent their support to the extralegal agencies of government, even if it appears only modest in proportion to the total number of patriots thus involved. Of the dissenting clergy, fourteen were members of various committees of safety, ten were involved in provincial congresses, and one was a member of the Continental Congress. The dissenting clergy also gave their allegiance and support to the new state constitutions. Additionally, some gave of their time and a few their lives, such as Philip Fithian and Moses Allen, as chaplains and soldiers in the American army. There was only one who played a decisive role in the military aspects of the war, John Muhlenberg.

In addition, the dissenting clergy played a major role in two areas that were more closely associated with their profession and

training. Their enunciation of whig doctrines from the pulpit helped in creating the climate of resistance to British tyranny. Their natural rights philosophy stressed that man had certain inalienable rights, given by nature and nature's God, which no ruler might violate. It was a religious duty, they insisted, to resist a tyrannical king. The only form of government to which true Christians could submit was one based on the consent of the people, and to overthrow rulers who refused to recognize that fact was an inherent right. By propagating this doctrine, the clergy kept alive the burning desire for liberty until it became necessary to fight for it, and then they made the war a holy war. No other group of men in the South had the same opportunity to do this; and in this regard, the clergy made a great contribution. They reiterated an intimate connection between civil and religious liberty: one could not be preserved without the other. A religious sanction was thus given to the war, and the clergy's moderation melted away in the face of the need to preserve that God-given liberty.

Finally, the greatest contribution of the dissenting clergy was in the struggle to preserve freedom of conscience; and this was the principal issue that linked them firmly to the Revolution. Apart from the central role played by clergymen in the petitions of official church bodies, individual ministers like John Leland, Reuben Ford, Caleb Wallace, John Blair Smith, and William Tennent worked independently for religious disestablishment. In the middle colonies, where there was a multi-denominational system, an established church was not a problem. It was an issue in New England, however, where the Baptists petitioned the king for support against the Congregational churches, a move that

placed a tory stigma on the Baptists of that region.[27] In the South, on the other hand, the Baptists and Presbyterians used the Revolution to take a bold stand in favor of disestablishment of the Anglican church. Dissenters could not understand why they should be asked to resist the encroachments of the mother country on their civil liberties while they were being denied liberty of conscience, the greatest of all tyrannies, at home.

In most southern states, disestablishment came fairly easily with the adoption of the new state constitutions, but in Virginia the struggle for disestablishment was more complicated. The dissenting clergy did not achieve disestablishment on their own; they worked with libertarians such as Jefferson, Madison, and Mason to remove all restraints to freedom of religion. While Jefferson was an ardent advocate of full and complete religious liberty, other "rationalists" were not as zealous on this score. Washington favored general assessment in Virginia; Franklin favored an American episcopate; and John Adams defended the New England pattern. The low-pressure religion of these "rationalists" did not lend itself to crusading efforts, and an establishment of religion was often viewed as a good thing for the masses. On the other hand, it was the Baptist and Presbyterian clergymen in the South, through petitions and direct contact with legislators, who provided the necessary crusading spirit. While leadership was provided by

---

[27]William G. McLoughlin, *New England Dissent, 1630-1833: The Baptists and the Separation of Church and State* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1971), I, 569-87.

the "rationalists," the dissenting clergy supplied the ardor and political pressure to bring about disestablishment, and this was their greatest contribution to the revolutionary generation. They popularized the libertarian convictions expressed by Jefferson, and by doing so committed the war effort to the goal of "liberty, both civil and ecclesiastical."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

A. MANUSCRIPTS

There is no large collection of manuscript material for any of the dissenting clergy and what is available is widely scattered in many depositories. The manuscripts included here are not all those by or about them but only those used in this dissertation.

1. *Baltimore. Maryland Historical Society. Diocesan Library.*

   Ethan Allen Collection of Letters of Maryland Clergymen.

   William Duke Papers and Journal (1774-1776).

2. *Chapel Hill. Southern Historical Collection.*

   Edward Dromgoole Papers.

   E.D. Griffin. Funeral Sermon on the Death of Alexander McWhorter.

   Josiah Smith, Jr. Lettercopy Book (1771-1784).

3. *Charleston. Charleston Library Society.*

   Archibald Simpson Journal (1748-1782).

4. *Charleston. South Carolina Historical Society.*

   Henry Laurens Collection.

   Paul Turquand Papers.

5. *Columbia. South Caroliniana Library.*

   Oliver Hart Collection.

   Evan Pugh Diary and Papers.

   William Tennent Papers.

6. *Durham. North Carolina. Duke University Library.*

   Samuel Eusebius McCorkle Sermons.

7. *Evanston, Illinois. Garrett Biblical Institute Library.*

Ezekiel Cooper Manuscripts Relating to Early American Methodist History.

Thomas Rankin Diary (1773-1777).

8. *Greenville. Furman University Library. South Carolina Baptist Historical Collection.*

Edmund Botsford Letters, 1785-1819.

Cashaway Baptist Church, Minute Book, 1767-1805.

Morgan Edwards. Materials Toward a History of the Baptists in the Provinces of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, 1772.

Richard Furman Correspondence, 1777-1825.

Oliver Hart. Fragment of the Oliver Hart Diary, August 4, 1754 to October 27, 1754.

Welsh Neck Baptist Church, Minute Book, 1737-1952.

9. *Montreat. North Carolina. Historical Foundation of Presbyterian and Reformed Churches.*

William Richardson Diary and Journal, 1758-59 (Photostatic copy, original in New York Public Library).

10. *Nashville. Methodist Publishing House Library.*

Philip Gatch Papers (Microfilm). Original at Methodist Theological Seminary, Delaware, Ohio.

11. *Nashville. Southern Baptist Historical Commission.*

Kehukee Association Minutes, North Carolina, 1769-1778.

12. *Philadelphia. Presbyterian Historical Society.*

Minutes of the Protestant Dissenting Deputies, 1757-1774. (Photostats).

13. *Princeton. Princeton University Library. Manuscripts Division.*

Samuel Davies Papers.

Stewart Robinson Collection of Sermons of Colonial Clergy.

14. *Richmond. Union Theological Seminary Library.*

Minutes of the Hanover Presbytery, 1755-1823.

Henry Patillo Papers.

15. *Richmond. University of Richmond. Virginia Baptist Historical Collection.*

Broad Run Baptist Church Minute Book, 1762-1872.

Hartwood Baptist Church Minute Book, 1775-1861.

Meherrin Church Book, 1771-1844.

Mill Swamp Baptist Church Records, 1777-1790.

Nathaniel Saunders Papers.

16. *Richmond. Virginia State Archives.*

Briery Presbyterian Church Session Book, 1760-1840.

Religious Petitions Submitted to the Colonial and State Legislatures, 1774-1802 (microfilm).

Tinkling Springs Presbyterian Church Record Book, 1741-1793 (Typescript).

17. *Savannah. Georgia Historical Society.*

Midway Congregational Church Records, 1754-1863.

John J. Zubly Journal, March 5, 1770 - April 9, 1781.

18. *Washington, D.C. Library of Congress.*

Dawson Manuscripts

19. *Winston-Salem, Wake Forest University. North Carolina Baptist Historical Collection.*

Eaton's (Dutchman's Creek) Baptist Church, Record Book, 1772-1787.

20. *Madison. Wisconsin Historical Society.*

Draper Manuscript Collection. (Microfilm in McClung Collection, Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville, Tennessee).

B. PRINTED

1. Correspondence and Memoirs

A few of the clergymen wrote memoirs or autobiographies which help to provide a glimpse into their political attitudes. On some occasions, they corresponded with politicians and, in addition, others expressed opinions about them. Below is a listing of this type of printed material used as primary sources.

Albion, Robert G. and Leonidas Dodson, eds. *Philip Vickers Fithian: Journal, 1775-1776.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1934.

Asbury, Francis. *Journals and Letters.* Edited by Elmer E. Clark, J. Manning Potts, and Jacob S. Payton. 3 vols. London: Epworth Press, 1958.

Bishop, Robert H. *An Outline of the History of the Church in the State of Kentucky . . . containing the Memoirs of Rev. David Rice.* Lexington, Kentucky: Thomas T. Skillman, 1824.

Boyd, Julian P., ed. *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson.* 19 vols. to date. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950- .

Burnett, Edmund Cody, ed. *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress.* 8 vols. Washington: Carnegie Institute of Washington, 1921-36.

Craig, Lillian Kennerly, ed. *Reverend John Craig, 1709-1774, His Descendants and Allied Families.* New Orleans: Accurate Letter Company, 1963.

Davies, Samuel. *The State of Religion among the Protestant Dissenters in Virginia; In a Letter to the Rev. Mr. Joseph Bellamy, of Bethlehem, in New England.* Boston: Printed by S. Kneeland, 1751.

Dexter, Franklin B., ed. *The Literary Diary of Ezra Stiles.* 3 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901.

_____. *Extracts from the Itineraries and other Miscellanies of Ezra Stiles.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916.

Drayton, John. *Memoirs of the American Revolution, From Its Commencement to the Year 1776.* 2 vols. Charleston: Printed by A.E. Miller, 1821.

Gano, Steven, ed. *Biographical Memoirs of Rev. John Gano . . . Written Principally By Himself.* New York: Southwick and Hardcastle, 1806.

Garrettson, Freeborn. *The Experiences and Travels of Mr. Freeborn Garrettson, Minister of the Methodist-Episcopal Church in North America.* Philadelphia: Joseph Crukshank, 1791.

_____. "Memoir." *Methodist Magazine,* XI (1820), 92-99.

Graham, William. "A Memoir of the Late Rev. William Graham." *Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine,* IV (1821), 75-79, 150-52, 253-63, 397-412.

Hart, Oliver. "Extracts from the Diary of Rev. Oliver Hart, from 1740 to 1780." *Charleston Year-Book, 1896,* pp. 375-401.

Hinke, William J. "Diary of the Rev. Michael Schlatter." *Journal of Presbyterian Historical Society,* III (1905), 105-21, 158-76.

Hooker, Richard J., ed. *The Carolina Backcountry on the Eve of the Revolution: the Journal and Other Writings of Charles Woodmason, Anglican Itinerant.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.

Hutchinson, William T. and William M.E. Rachal, eds. *The Papers of James Madison.* 8 vols. to date. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962-19

Ireland, James. *The Life of the Rev. James Ireland, Who Was, for Many Years, Pastor of the Baptist Church at Buck Marsh, Waterlick and Happy Creek, in Frederick and Shenandoah Counties, Virginia.* Winchester: Printed by J. Foster, 1819.

Johnson, Joseph. *Traditions and Reminiscences, Chiefly of the American Revolution in South Carolina.* Charleston: Walker & James, 1851.

Leland, John. *The Writings of the late John Leland, including some Events in his Life, written by himself, with additional Sketches.* Edited by Mrs. L.F. Greene. New York: G.W. Wood, 1845.

"Letters of Patrick Henry Jr., Samuel Davies, *et al.*" *William & Mary Quarterly,* Series 2, I (1921), 261-81.

Macveagh, Lincoln, ed. *The Journal of Nicolas Cresswell, 1774-77.* New York: The Dial Press, 1924.

Mallary, Charles Dutton, ed. *Memoirs of Elder Edmund Botsford.* Charleston: W. Riley, 1832.

Marshall, Jabez Pleiades, ed. *Memoirs of the late Rev. Abraham Marshall containing a journal of the most interesting part of his life. . . .* Mount Zion, Georgia: Printed for the author, 1824.

Maser, Frederick E., ed. *The Journal of Joseph Pilmore, Methodist itinerant for the years August 1, 1769 to January 2, 1774. . . .* Philadelphia: Message Publishing Company, 1969.

Tappert, Theodore Gerhardy and John W. Doberstein. *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg.* 3 vols. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1942.

Taylor, John. *A History of Ten Baptist Churches, Kentucky-Virginia; A Journal of the Author's Life for More than Fifty Years, 1770-1818.* Frankfort, Kentucky: J.H. Holeman, 1823.

Telford, John, ed. *The Letters of the Reverend John Wesley.* 8 vols. London: Epworth Press, 1931.

Tennent, William. "Fragment of a Journal kept by the Rev. William Tennent, describing his journey, in 1775, to Upper South Carolina at the request of the Council of Safety, to induce the Tories to sign an Association to support the cause of the Colonists." *Charleston Year-Book, 1894*, pp. 295-312.

Watters, William. *A Short Account of the Christian Experience, and Ministerial Labors, of William Watters.* Alexandria, Virginia: S. Snoden, 1806.

Zubly, John J. "Letter of Rev. John J. Zubly, of Savannah, Georgia to Ezra Stiles." Massachusetts Historical Society *Proceedings*, VIII (1864-65), 214-19.

2. *Speeches, Pamphlets, and Collections*

In addition to memoirs, another source of information was the speeches and pamphlets of the clergy. Even though they did not make many purely political speeches there were times in which they spoke on political affairs, especially in the case of John Zubly. Also included are books of documents that throw some light on the opinions of the clergy.

Boyd, William K., ed. *Some Eighteenth Century Tracts concerning North Carolina.* Raleigh: Edwards and Braughton, 1927.

Craighead, Alexander. *A Discourse concerning the Covenants: containing the Substance of Two Sermons, preached at Middle-Octarara, January 10 and 17, 1741/2.* Philadelphia: Benjamin Franklin, 1742.

Craighead, Alexander. *The Reasons of Mr. Alexander Craighead's receding from the Present Judicatures of this Church, together with its Constitution.* Philadelphia: Benjamin Franklin, 1743.

Davies, Samuel. *An Appendix Proving the Right of the Synod of New York to the Religious Liberties and Immunities allowed to the Protestant Dissenters.* Williamsburg: William Parks, 1748.

Furman, Richard. *An Oration, Delivered at the Charleston Orphan-House, Before the Intendant and Wardens of the City, the Board of Commissioners, and a large assemblage of the benefactors to the institution, October 18, 1796, being the seventh anniversary.* Charleston: W. P. Young, 1796.

[Graham, William]. *An Essay on Government, By a Citizen of Frankland.* Philadelphia: Printed by Francis Bailey, 1786.

Leland, John. *A Circular Letter of Valediction, on leaving Virginia, in 1791.* Boston: John Asplund, 1794.

_____. *The Virginia Chronicle.* Fredericksburg, Virginia: Printed by T. Green, 1790.

_____. *The Rights of Conscience Inalienable, and therefore Religious Opinions not cognizable by Law: Or, The high-flying Churchman, Stript of his legal Robe, Appears a Yaho.* New London: Printed by T. Green and Son, 1791.

Powell, William S. *et als.*, eds. *The Regulators of North Carolina; A Documentary History, 1759-1776.* Raleigh: State Department of Archives and History, 1971.

Reese, Thomas. *An Essay on the Influence of Religion, in Civil Society.* Charleston: Printed by Markland & McIver, 1788.

Tennent, William. *Mr. Tennent's Speech on the Dissenting Petition, Delivered in the House of Assembly, Charleston, South Carolina, January 11, 1777.* Charleston: Printed by Peter Timothy, 1777.

Thomas, David. *The Virginian Baptist: or A View and Defense of the Christian Religion as it is professed by the Baptists of Virginia.* Baltimore: Enoch Story, 1774.

Zubly, John Joachim. *Calm and Respectful Thoughts on the Negative of the Crown on a Speaker chosen and presented by the Representatives of the People.* [Savannah: n.p., 1772.]

_____. *To the Grand Jury of the County of Chatham, State of Georgia, October 8, 1777.* [Savannah:] Lancaster and Zubly, [1777.]

Zubly, John Joachim. *An Humble Enquiry into the Nature of the Dependency of the American Colonies upon the Parliament of Great Britain, and the Right of Parliament to lay Taxes on the said Colonies.* [Charleston:] n.p., 1769.

3. *Sermons*

Even though only a few manuscript sermons have survived, there are several printed sermons to draw upon. Clergymen were reluctant to preach sermons on politics, but the sermons listed below did have political references. One significant source of the clergy's revolutionary activity was the funeral sermon, the speaker reviewing the life of the deceased, including his participation in the Revolution.

Alison, Hugh. *The Faithful Servant of Christ honoured and rewarded: A Sermon Sacred to the Memory of the Rev. William Tennent. . . .* Charleston: Printed by David Bruce, 1777.

_____. *Spiritual Liberty: A Sermon, Delivered at James Island, in South Carolina, October 9, 1769; In Consequence of the Late Resolutions.* Charleston: Printed for the Author, 1769.

Austin, David, ed. *The American Preacher.* 4 vols. Elizabeth, New Jersey: S. Kollock, 1791-93.

Blythe, James. *The Death of the Good Man Precious in the Sight of God. A Sermon Delivered at Pisgah occasioned by the death of the Rev. John Brown, late pastor of New Providence congregation, in Virginia.* Lexington, Kentucky: Printed by Joseph Charles, 1804.

Brantly, William Theophilus. *The Saint's Repose in Death. A Sermon, delivered on the Death of the Rev. Richard Furman. . . .* Charleston: W. Riley, 1825.

Cook, Joseph Bullein. *The good and faithful servant approved and honoured by his divine master. A Sermon occasioned by the. . . . death of Rev. Richard Furman.* Charleston: W. Riley, 1826.

Cooper, Robert. *Courage in a Good Cause; or The Lawful and Courageous Use of the Sword. A Sermon preached near Shippensburgh, in Cumberland County, on the 31st of August, 1775, to a large audience, in which were under arms several companies of Col. Montgomery's Battalions.* Lancaster: Bailey, 1775.

Davies, Samuel. *The Curse of Cowardice. A Sermon Preached to the Militia of Hanover County, in Virginia, at a General Muster, May 8, 1758.* Boston: Printed by Z. Fowie and S. Draper, 1759.

Davies, Samuel. *Religion and Patriotism the Constituents of a Good Soldier. A Sermon preached to Captain Overton's Independent Company of Volunteers, raised in Hanover County, Virginia, August 17, 1755.* Philadelphia: Printed by James Chattin, 1755.

_____. *Sermons on Important Subjects.* 3 vols. Third Edition. New York: Dayton and Saxton, 1841.

_____. *Virginia's Danger and Remedy. Two Discourses, Occasioned by the Severe Draught in sundry Parts of the Country; and the defeat of General Braddock.* Williamsburg: William Hunter, 1756.

Finley, Samuel. *The madness of Mankind, represented in a Sermon preached in the New Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia on the 9th of June, 1754.* Philadelphia: William Bradford, 1754.

_____. *Christ Triumphing, and Satan Raging.* Philadelphia: Benjamin Franklin, 1741.

_____. *The Curse of Meroz; or, The Danger of Neutrality, in the Cause of God, and Our Country. A Sermon Preached the 2nd of October, 1757.* Philadelphia: Printed by James Chattin, 1757.

Furman, Richard. *America's Deliverance and Duty.* Charleston: W. P. Young, 1802.

_____. *The Crown of Life Promised to the Truly Faithful. A Sermon Sacred to the Memory of the Late Rev. Edmund Botsford.* Charleston: Printed by William Riley, 1822.

_____. *Humble Submission to Divine Sovereignty the Duty of a Bereaved Nation: A Sermon occasioned by the Death of his Excellency General George Washington . . . Preached in the Baptist Church, in Charleston, South Carolina, on the 22nd of February, 1800, ...* Charleston: Printed by W. P. Young, 1800.

_____. *Rewards of Grace Conferred on Christ's Faithful People: A Sermon, occasioned by the decease of the Rev. Oliver Hart . . . preached at the Baptist Church in Charleston, South Carolina, February 7, 1796.* Charleston: J. M'Iver, 1796.

_____. *A Sermon Preached at the Baptist Church in Charleston, South Carolina, on the Fourth Day of July, 1802.* Charleston: W. P. Young, 1802.

_____. *Unity and Peace: A Sermon, Preached at the High Hills of Santee, November 4, 1793, Before the Charleston Association of Baptist Churches, and published at their request.* Charleston: Markland, M'Iver & Company, 1794.

Garrettson, Freeborn. *Substance of the Semi-Centennial Sermon, before the New York Annual Conference, at its session, May, 1826. . . .* New York: N. Bangs and J. Emory, 1827.

Hart, Oliver. *America's Remembrancer, with respect to her Blessedness and Duty. A Sermon delivered in Hopewell, New Jersey, on Thanksgiving Day, November 26, 1789.* Philadelphia: T. Dobson, 1791.

_____. *The Character of a truly great Man delineated, and his death deplored as a public Loss. A Funeral Sermon, occasioned by the Death of the Rev. William Tennent. . . .* Charleston: Printed by David Bruce, 1777.

_____. *Dancing Exploded, A Sermon, shewing the Unlawfulness, Sinfulness, and bad Consequences of Balls, Assemblies, and Dances in General, Delivered at Charleston, South Carolina, March 22, 1778.* Charleston: Printed by David Bruce, 1778.

Hewat, Alexander. *Sermons on Various Subjects.* 3 vols. London: T. Cadell and W. Davis, 1803-15.

Hollinshead, William, ed. *The Works of the Rev. Daniel McCalla, Pastor of the Independent or Congregational Church, in the Parish of Christ's Church, South Carolina.* 2 vols. Charleston: Printed by John Huff, 1810.

McCorkle, Samuel Eusebius. *A Sermon on the Comparative Happiness and Duty of the United States of America, contrasted with other Nations, particularly the Israelites.* Halifax: Printed by Abraham Hodge, 1795.

McKnight, John. *God the Author of Promotion. A Sermon preached in the New Presbyterian Church, New York, on the 4th of July, 1794, at the request of the Democratic Society and the Military Officers.* New York: William Durell, 1794.

Mercer, Silas. *Tyranny Exposed, and True Liberty Discovered, wherein is contained the Scripture doctrine concerning Kings; Their rise, reign, and downfall: Together with the total overthrow of antichrist.* Halifax, North Carolina: Printed by Thomas Davis, 1783.

Moore, Frank, ed. *The Patrict Preachers of the American Revolution, with Biographical Sketches.* New York: C. T. Evans, 1862.

Pilmore, Joseph. *The Blessings of Peace: A Sermon, Preached in Christ's Church, New York, on the Fourth of July, 1794, at the joint request of the Tammany Society or, Columbian Order, and the Society of Mechanics.* New York: Printed by John Buel, 1794.

Rogers, William. *A Sermon occasioned by the death of the Rev. Oliver Hart . . . preached at Hopewell, New Jersey, April 24, 1796.* Philadelphia: Land and Ustick, 1796.

Smith, Josiah. *A Sermon on the Death of Rev. John Thomas of Charleston.* Charleston: Printed by Peter Timothy, 1771.

Smith, Samuel Stanhope. *Sermons by Samuel Stanhope Smith.* Newark, New Jersey: Printed by Jacob Halsey & Company, 1799.

Tennent, William. *An Address Occasioned by the Late Invasion of the Liberties of the American Colonies By the British Parliament, delivered in Charleston, South Carolina.* Philadelphia: Printed by William and Thomas Bradford, 1774.

Thornton, John Wingate, ed. *The Pulpit of the American Revolution.* Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1860.

Toler, Henry. *The Faithful Minister's Work and Course Pursued and Finished: Being the Substance of Two Sermons, occasioned By the Death of Elder Lewis Lunsford, Late of Northumberland. . . .* Philadelphia: Printed by Ormrod and Conrad, 1795.

Zubly, John Joachim. *The Law of Liberty. A Sermon on American Affairs, Preached at the Opening of the Provincial Congress of Georgia.* Philadelphia: Henry Miller, 1775.

_____. *The Stamp-Act Repealed, A Sermon Preached in the Meeting at Savannah in Georgia, June 25, 1766.* Charleston: Peter Timothy, 1766.

4. *Government and Church Records*

On some occasions the dissenting clergymen were members of governmental bodies, therefore the records of these agencies are an important source of information about them. Listed below are those records of the colonies that offer evidence of this clerical activity. Also the printed records and minutes of certain church organizations are useful, especially when they reveal political opinions that can be associated with clergymen. Source books of religious documents are also included below.

At A Convention of Delegates for the Counties and Corporations in the Colony of Virginia, at the town of Richmond, in the county of Henrico, on Monday the 20th of March, 1775. Williamsburg: Alexander Purdie, 1775.

Baker, Robert A., ed *A Baptist Source Book.* Nashville: Broadman Press, 1966

Browne, William Hand and others, eds. *Archives of Maryland.* 72 vols. Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1883-1972.

Brumbaugh, Gaius Marcus, ed. *Maryland Records, Colonial, Revolutionary, County and Church, from Original Sources.* 2 vols. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Company, 1915-28.

Candler, Allen D., ed. *The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia.* 26 vols. Atlanta: C. P. Byrd, 1904-16.

_____. *The Revolutionary Records of the State of Georgia.* 3 vols. Atlanta: Franklin-Turner Company, 1908.

Carroll, B. R., ed. *Historical Collections of South Carolina.* 2 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1836.

Chalkey, Lyman, ed. *Chronicles of the Scotch-Irish Settlements in Virginia, Extracted from the Original Court Records of Augusta County, 1745-1800.* 3 vols. Rosslyn, Virginia: Commonwealth Printing Company, 1912; reprint ed., Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1965.

Coleman, Charles Washington. "The County Committees of 1774-75 in Virginia." *William and Mary Quarterly,* 1st series V (1896-1897), 94-106, 245-55.

"Dissenter Petitions in Virginia Legislative Papers." *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography,* XVIII (1910), 38-44, 140-50, 255-71.

Durnbaugh, Donald F., ed. *The Brethren in Colonial America: A Source Book on the Transplantation and Development of the Church of the Brethren in the Eighteenth Century.* Elgin, Illinois: Brethren Press, 1967.

Easterby, J. H., ed. *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Journals of the Commons House of Assembly.* 6 vols. Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1951-56.

Elliot, Jonathan, ed. *Debates in the Several State Conventions, on the adoption of the Federal Constitution, as Recommended by the General Convention at Philadelphia in 1787.* 5 vols. Washington: Printed by the author, 1836-45.

Engles, William M., ed. *Records of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America Embracing the Minutes of the General Presbytery and General Synod 1706-1788 Together with an Index.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1904; reprint ed., New York: Arno Press, 1969.

Force, Peter, ed. *American Archives.* 4th series, 6 vols. 5th series, 3 vols. Washington: Published by Peter Force, 1837-53.

Force, Peter, ed. *Tracts and Other Papers.* 4 vols. Washington: William A. Force, 1848.

Ford, Worthington C., ed. *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789.* Washington: U. S. Printing Office, 1904-37.

Fries, Adelaide L. and others, eds. *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina.* 11 vols. Raleigh: State Department of Archives and History, 1922-69.

Gibbes, Robert Wilson, ed. *Documentary History of the American Revolution.* 3 vols. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1853-57; reprint ed., Spartanburg, South Carolina: Reprint Company, 1972.

Gillette, A. D., ed. *Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association.* Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1851.

Harwell, Richard Barksdale, ed. *The Committees of Safety of Westmoreland and Fincastle, Proceeding of the County Committees, 1774-1776.* Richmond: Virginia State Library, 1956.

Hastings, Hugh, ed. *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York.* 7 vols. Albany, New York: J. B. Lyon, 1901-1916.

Hawes, Lilla M., ed. *The Proceedings and Minutes of the Governor and Council of Georgia, October 4, 1774 through November 7, 1775, and September 6, 1779 through September 20, 1780.* Vol. X of the Georgia Historical Society *Collections.* Savannah: Georgia Historical Society, 1952.

Hemphill, William Edwin and Wlyma Anne Wates, eds. *Extracts from the Journals of the Provincial Congresses of South Carolina, 1775-1776.* Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1960.

Hemphill, William Edwin, Wylma Anne Wates, and R. Nicholas Olsberg, eds. *Journals of the General Assembly and House of Representatives, 1776-1780.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970.

Hening, William Waller, ed. *The Statutes at Large: being a collection of all the laws of Virginia.* 13 vols. Richmond: Franklin Press, 1809-1823.

"Journal of the Council of Safety." *Collections* of the South Carolina Historical Society, II (1858), 22-64; III (1859), 35-271.

McIlwaine, Henry Read, ed. *Legislative Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia, 1680-1774.* 3 vols. Richmond: The Colonial Press, 1918-19.

McIlwaine, Henry Read and Wilmer L. Hall, eds. *Journals of the Council of the State of Virginia.* 3 vols. Richmond: Virginia State Library, 1931-52.

McIlwaine, Henry Read, Wilmer L. Hall, and Benjamin J. Hillman, eds. *Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia, 1680-1775.* 6 vols. Richmond: D. Bottom, 1925-66.

McIlwaine, Henry Read and John Pendleton Kennedy, eds. *Journal of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1727-1776.* Richmond: The Colonial Press, 1905-15.

Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Years, 1773-1828. 2 vols. New York: T. Mason & G. Lane, 1840.

Minutes of the Annual Meetings, Church of the Brethren, 1778-1909. Elgin, Illinois: Brethren Publishing House, 1909.

Minutes of the Charleston Baptist Association, February 6, 1775. [Charleston: n.p., 1775.]

Minutes of the Charleston Baptist Association, February 3-5, 1777. [Charleston: n.p., 1777.]

Minutes of the Charleston Baptist Association, November 8-9, 1779. [Charleston: n.p., 1779.]

"Miscellaneous Papers of the General Committee, Secret Committee, and Provincial Congress, 1775." *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine,* VIII (1907), 132-50, 189-94; IX (1908), 9-11, 67-72, 115-17, 181-86.

Perry, William Stevens, ed. *Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church.* 5 vols. Hartford, Conn.: Church Press Company, 1870-78.

The Proceedings of the Convention of Delegates, held at the Town of Richmond, in the colony of Virginia, on Friday the 1st of December, 1775, and afterwards, By Adjournment, in the City of Williamsburg. Williamsburg: Printed by Alexander Purdie, 1776.

Roberts, William H., ed. *Minutes of the General Convention of Delegates Appointed By the Synod of New York and Philadelphia and the General Association of Connecticut, 1766-1775.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1904.

Reformed Church in the United States. *Minutes and Letters of the Coetus of the German Reformed Congregations in Pennsylvania, 1747-92.* Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publishing Board, 1903.

Salley, Alexander S., ed. *Documents Relating to the History of South Carolina During the Revolutionary War.* Columbia: Historical Commission of South Carolina, 1908.

Salley, Alexander S., ed. "Papers of the First Council of Safety of the Revolutionary Party in South Carolina, June-November, 1775." *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, I (1900), 41-75, 119-35, 183-205, 279-310; II (1901), 3-26, 97-107, 167-93, 259-67; III (1902), 3-15, 69-85, 123-38.

Saunders, William L. and Walter Clark, eds. *The Colonial and State Records of North Carolina*. 26 vols. Raleigh: Printers to the State, 1886-1905.

Stacy, James. *History and Records of the Midway Congregational Church*. Newman, Georgia: S. W. Murray, 1903; reprint ed., Newman, Georgia: S. W. Murray, 1951.

Summers, Lewis Preston. *Annals of Southwest Virginia, 1769-1800*. Abingdon, Virginia: Printed by the author, 1929; reprint ed., Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1970.

Thorpe, Francis Newton, ed. *The Federal and State Constitutions*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1909.

5. *Newspapers*

Listed below are the southern newspapers that were used in this study. The dissenting clergymen were not prolific contributors to the newspapers, but occasionally one was mentioned there.

Cape Fear Mercury (Wilmington, N.C.), 1769-1775.

Georgia Gazette (Savannah), 1763-1776.

Maryland Gazette (Annapolis), 1763-1781.

North Carolina Gazette (New Bern), 1768-1778.

Royal Georgia Gazette (Savannah), 1779-1782.

South Carolina and American General Gazette (Charleston), 1764-1781.

South Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 1763-1775.

South Carolina Gazette and Country Journal (Charleston), 1765-75.

Virginia Gazette (Williamsburg), 1763-1780.

6. *Magazines*

The following religious magazines were useful in obtaining biographical information on important ministers.

Georgia Analytical Repository (Savannah), 1802-1803.

Presbyterian Advocate (Pittsburgh), 1838-1855.

Rippon, John, ed. *Baptist Annual Register, 1790-94* (London).

Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine (Richmond), 1818-1828.

Watchman of the South (Richmond), 1837-1845.

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

A. GENERAL SECONDARY SOURCES

Alden, John Richard. *The South in the Revolution, 1763-1789.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1957.

Baldwin, Alice M. *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1928.

Barker, Charles A. *The Background of the Revolution in Maryland.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.

Bowman, Rufus D. *The Church of the Brethren and War, 1708-1941.* Elgin, Illinois: Brethren Publishing House, 1944; reprint ed., New York: Garland Publishing, 1971.

Breed, William P. *Presbyterians and the Revolution.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1876.

Bridenbaugh, Carl. *Mitre and Sceptre: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Brown, Richard Maxwell. *The South Carolina Regulators.* Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 1963.

Carroll, Peter N., ed. *Religion and the Coming of the American Revolution.* Waltham, Mass.: Ginn-Blaisdell Company, 1970.

Cathcart, William. *The Baptists and the American Revolution.* Philadelphia: S. A. George and Company, 1876.

Coleman, Kenneth. *The American Revolution in Georgia, 1763-1789.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1958.

Cross, Arthur Lyon. *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies.* New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1902; reprint ed., Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1964.

DeMond, Robert O. *The Loyalists in North Carolina During the Revolution.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1940.

Eckrenode, Hamilton James. *The Revolution in Virginia.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916.

_____. *Separation of Church and State in Virginia.* Richmond: Davis Bottom, 1910; reprint ed., New York: Da Capo Press, 1971.

Foote, William Henry. *Sketches of North Carolina, Historical and Biographical.* New York: Robert Carter, 1846.

_____. *Sketches of Virginia, Historical and Biographical.* 2 vols. Philadelphia: W. S. Martien, 1850-55.

Gregg, Alexander. *History of the Old Cheraws.* New York: Richardson and Company, 1867; reprint ed., Spartanburg, South Carolina: Reprint Company, 1965.

Harrell, Isaac Samuel. *Loyalism in Virginia.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1926.

Hart, Freeman Hansford. *The Valley of Virginia in the American Revolution, 1763-1789.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942.

Headley, Joel Tyler. *The Chaplains and Clergy of the Revolution.* New York: Charles Scribner, 1864.

Hewat, Alexander. *An Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Colonies of South Carolina.* 2 vols. London: A. Donaldson, 1779.

James, Charles Fenton. *Documentary History of the Struggle for Religious Liberty in Virginia.* Lynchburg, Virginia: J. P. Bell Company, 1900; reprint ed., New York: Da Capo Press, 1971.

Johnson, Thomas Cary. *Virginia Presbyterianism and Religious Liberty in Colonial and Revolutionary Times.* Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publications, 1907.

Kegley, F. B. *Kegley's Virginia Frontier.* Roanoke, Virginia: Southwest Virginia Historical Society, 1938.

Labaree, Leonard W. *Royal Instructions to British Colonial Governors, 1670-1776.* 2 vols. New York: Appleton-Century, 1935.

Landrum, John B.O. *Colonial and Revolutionary History of Upper South Carolina*. Greenville: Shannon and Company, 1897; reprint ed., Spartanburg: Reprint Company, 1959.

Lefler, Hugh Talmage and William S. Powell. *Colonial North Carolina, A History*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973.

Little, Lewis Peyton. *Imprisoned Preachers and Religious Liberty in Virginia*. Lynchburg, Virginia: J. P. Bell, 1938.

McCrady, Edward. *History of South Carolina under the Royal Government, 1719-1776*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1899; reprint ed., New York: Russell and Russell, 1969.

_____. *The History of South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1901; reprint ed., New York: Russell and Russell, 1969.

McIlwaine, Henry Read. *The Struggle of Protestant Dissenters for Religious Toleration in Virginia*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1894.

McNitt, V. V. *Chain of Error and the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, a New Study of Manuscripts; Their Use, Abuse, and Neglect*. Palmer, Mass.: Hampden Hills Press, 1960.

Meyer, Duane. *The Highland Scots of North Carolina, 1732-1776*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961.

Morton, Richard L. *Colonial Virginia*. 2 vols. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960.

Ramsay, David. *The History of the Revolution of South Carolina. from a British Province to an Independent State*. 2 vols. Trenton, New Jersey: Printed by Isaac Collins, 1785.

_____. *History of South Carolina*. 2 vols. Newberry, South Carolina: W. J. Duffie, 1858; reprint ed., Spartanburg: Reprint Company, 1959.

Rogers, George C., Jr. *Church and State in Eighteenth Century South Carolina*. Charleston: Dalcho Historical Society, 1959.

Schaff, Philip, ed. *The Creeds of Christendom*. 3 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1877.

Scharf, John Thomas. *The Chronicles of Baltimore*. Baltimore: Turnbull Brothers, 1874.

Stevens, William Bacon. *A History of Georgia*. Savannah: W. T. Williams, 1847.

Strickland, Reba Carolyn. *Religion and the State in Georgia in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.

Strobel, P. A. *The Salzburgers and Their Descendants*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1953.

Thom, William Taylor. *The Struggle for Religious Freedom in Virginia: The Baptists*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1900.

Trinterud, Leonard J. *The Forming of an American Tradition: A Re-Examination of Colonial Presbyterianism*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1949.

Wallace, David Duncan. *South Carolina, A Short History*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1951; reprint ed., Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1961.

Wallace, Paul A.W. *The Muhlenbergs of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950.

Wayland, John W. *German Element of the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia*. Charlottesville: By the author, 1907.

Weeks, Stephen B. *Church and State in North Carolina*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1893.

Weir, Robert M. *"A Most Important Epocha", The Coming of the Revolution in South Carolina*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970.

Wust, Klaus G. *The Virginia Germans*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1969.

B. BIOGRAPHY

Bailey, James Davis. *Reverends Philip Mulkey and James Fowler; the Story of the first Baptist Church planted in Upper South Carolina*. Cowpens, South Carolina: n.p., 1924.

Bangs, Nathan. *Life of the Rev. Freeborn Garrettson: Compiled from his Printed and Manuscript Journals and other authentic documents*. 2nd Edition. New York: Emory and Waugh, 1830.

Caruthers, Eli Washington. *A Sketch of the Life and Character of the Rev. David Caldwell*. Greensboro, North Carolina: Swain and Sherwood, 1842.

Connor, Elizabeth. *Methodist Trailblazer, Philip Gatch, 1751-1834, his Life in Maryland, Virginia, and Ohio.* Cincinnati: Creative Publishers, 1970.

Cook, Harvey T., ed. *A Biography of Richard Furman.* Greenville: Baptist Courier, 1913.

Dabney, William M. and Marion Dargan. *William Henry Drayton and the American Revolution.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1962.

Dexter, Franklin Bowditch. *Biographical Sketches of the Graduates of Yale College.* 6 vols. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1885-1919.

Harbaugh, Henry. *The Life of Michael Schlatter.* Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1857.

Hocker, Edward W. *The Fighting Parson of the American Revolution: A Biography of General Peter Muhlenberg.* Philadelphia: Published by the author, 1936.

Hurley, James F. and Julia Goode Eagan. *The Prophet of Zion-Parnassus, Samuel Eusebius McCorkle.* Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1934.

Johnson, Allen, et al., eds. *Dictionary of American Biography.* 24 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928-1941.

Maser, Frederick E. "Robert Strawbridge, Founder of Methodism in Maryland." *Methodist History,* IV (1966), 3-21.

MacLean, John. *Sketch of Rev. Philip Gatch.* Cincinnati: Swormstedt and Poe, 1854.

Mongle, Mrs. James H. *Sketches: Rev. Charles Cummings, Fort Kinakronen, Black's Fort.* Abingdon, Virginia: Washington County Historical Society, n.d.

Moore, William Cabell. "Jeremiah Moore, 1746-1815." *William and Mary Quarterly,* 2nd series, XIII (1933), 18-25.

Moore, John B. "Adolph Nussmann, Pioneer Lutheran Preacher in North Carolina." *Lutheran Church Quarterly,* XIII (1940), 375-91.

Muhlenberg, Henry A. *The Life of Major-General Peter Muhlenberg.* Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1849.

Mulkey, Floyd. "Rev. Philip Mulkey, Pioneer Preacher in Upper South Carolina." South Carolina Historical Association *Proceedings,* 1945, pp. 3-13.

Owens, Loulie Latimer. "Oliver Hart, 1723-1795, A Brief Biography," *Baptist History and Heritage*, I (1966), 19-46.

Pilcher, George William. *Samuel Davies: Apostle of Dissent in Colonial Virginia*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1971.

Range, Ella Mulkey. *The Life of Reverend Philip Mulkey, His Ancestors and Descendants, 1650-1950*. N.p.: n.d.

Rives, William Cabell. *History of the Life and Times of James Madison*. Second Edition. 3 vols. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1859-68.

Sibley, John L. and Clifford K. Shipton. *Biographical Sketches of Those Who Attended Harvard College*. 16 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1873-1972.

Sprague, William Buell. *Annals of the American Pulpit*. 9 vols. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1857-69; reprint ed., New York: Arno Press, 1969.

Taylor, James Barnett. *Virginia Baptist Ministers*. Third Edition. Series I and II. New York: Sheldon and Company, 1859.

Thorp, Willard, ed. *The Lives of Eighteen from Princeton*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946.

Watters, Dennis Alonzo. *First American Itinerant of Methodism, William Watters*. Cincinnati: Curts and Jennings, 1898.

Whitsitt, William Heth. *Life and Times of Judge Caleb Wallace*. Louisville: J. P. Morton and Company, 1888.

C. HISTORIES OF CHURCHES AND CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS

Bangs, Nathan. *A History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*. 4 vols. New York: T. Mason and G. Lane, 1838-41.

Bernheim, Gotthardt Dillmann. *History of the German Settlements and of the Lutheran Church in North and South Carolina*. Philadelphia: Lutheran Book Store, 1872.

Bernheim, Dotthardt Dillmann and George H. Cox. *The History of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod and Ministerium of North Carolina*. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1902.

Betts, Albert Deems. *History of South Carolina Methodism*. Columbia: Advocate Press, 1952.

Brunk, Harry Anthony. *History of Mennonites in Virginia, 1727-1900.* Staunton, Virginia: McClure Printing Company, 1959.

Brydon, G. MacLaren. *Virginia's Mother Church.* 2 vols. Richmond: Virginia Historical Society, 1947-1952.

Bucke, Emory Stevens and others, eds. *The History of American Methodism.* 3 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1964.

Burkitt, Lemuel and Jesse Read. *A Concise History of the Kehukee Baptist Association, from Its Original Rise to the Present Time.* Halifax, North Carolina: A. Hodge, 1803.

Eisenberg, William Edward. *The Lutheran Church in Virginia, 1717-1962.* Roanoke: Virginia Synod, Lutheran Church in America, 1967.

Fristoe, William. *A Concise History of the Ketocton Baptist Association.* Staunton, Virginia: William G. Lyford, 1808.

Furman, Wood, comp. *History of the Charleston Association of Baptist Churches in South Carolina, 1683-1802.* Charleston: J. Hoff, 1811.

Garrison, J. Silor. *The History of the Reformed Church in Virginia, 1714-1940.* Winston Salem: Clay Printing Company, 1948.

Grissom, William Lee. *History of Methodism in North Carolina.* Nashville: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1905.

Howe, George. *History of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina.* 2 vols. Columbia: Diffie and Chapman, 1870-73.

Huggins, M. A. *A History of North Carolina Baptists, 1727-1932.* Raleigh: General Board, Baptist State Convention of North Carolina, 1967.

King, Joe M. *A History of South Carolina Baptists.* Columbia: South Carolina Baptist Convention, 1964.

Lee, Jesse, *A Short History of the Methodists in the United States of America.* Baltimore: Magill and Cline, 1810.

McGeachy, Neill R. *A History of the Sugaw Creek Presbyterian Church, Mecklenburg Presbytery, Charlotte, North Carolina.* Rock Hill, South Carolina: Record Printing Company, 1954.

Mercer, Jesse. *History of the Georgia Baptist Association.* Washington, Georgia: Jesse Mercer, 1838.

Morgan, Jacob L. and others, eds. *History of the Lutheran Church in North Carolina, 1803-1953.* N.p.: United Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina, 1953.

Mosteller, James Donovan. *A History of the Kiokee Baptist Church in Georgia.* Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1952.

Paschal, George Washington. *History of North Carolina Baptists.* 2 vols. Raleigh: General Board of the North Carolina Baptist State Convention, 1930-55.

Purefoy, George W. *A History of the Sandy Creek Baptist Association from its Organization in 1758 to 1858.* New York: Sheldon and Company, 1859.

Ramsay, David. *History of the Independent or Congregational Church in Charleston, South Carolina.* Philadelphia: J. Maxwell, 1815.

Reichel, Levin T. *The Moravians in North Carolina.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1857; reprint ed., Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1968.

Ryland, Garnett. *The Baptists of Virginia, 1699-1926.* Richmond: Virginia Baptist Board of Missions and Education, 1955.

Semple, Robert B. *A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Virginia.* New York: Franklin, Burt Publishers, 1810.

Shipp, Albert M. *The History of Methodism in South Carolina.* Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1882; reprint ed., Spartanburg: Reprint Company, 1972.

Stacy, James. *A History of the Presbyterian Church in Georgia.* Alberton, Georgia: Synod of Georgia, 1912.

Stone, Robert Hamlin. *A History of Orange Presbytery, 1770-1970.* Greensboro: Printed by Heritage Press, 1970.

Thompson, Ernest Trice. *Presbyterians in the South.* 3 vols. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1963-73.

Torbet, Robert G. *A History of the Baptists.* Revised edition. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1955.

Townsend, Leah. *South Carolina Baptists, 1670-1805.* Florence, South Carolina: Florence Printing Company, 1935.

Tupper, Henry Allen, ed. *Two Centuries of the First Baptist Church of South Carolina, 1683-1883.* Baltimore: R. H. Woodward and Company, 1889.

Watts, Joseph T. *The Rise and Progress of Maryland Baptists.* Baltimore: Maryland Baptist Union Association, 1953.

Weispampel, J. F. *History of Baptist Churches in Maryland.* Baltimore: privately printed, 1885.

Wiley, Calvin H. *History of Alamance Church.* Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1880.

Wilson, Howard McKnight. *The Tinkling Spring, Headwater of Freedom: A Study of the Church and Her People, 1732-1952.* Fishersville, Virginia: The Tinkling Spring and Herimate Presbyterian Churches, 1954.

D. ARTICLES

Applegate, Howard L. "Presbyterian Chaplains Assigned to the American Army during the American Revolution." *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society,* XXXIX (1961), 62-63.

Baldwin, Alice M. "Sowers of Sedition: The Political Theories of Some of the New Light Presbyterian Clergy of Virginia and North Carolina." *William and Mary Quarterly,* 3rd series, V (1948), 52-76.

Bassett, John S. "The Regulator Movement in North Carolina." American Historical Association *Reports,* 1894, pp. 141-212.

Blackwelder, Ruth. "The Attitude of the North Carolina Moravians Toward the American Revolution." *North Carolina Historical Review,* IX (1932), 1-21.

Brydon, G. MacLaren. "The Clergy of the Established Church in Virginia and the Revolution." *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography,* XLI (1933), 11-23, 123-43, 231-43, 297-309.

Daniel, Marjorie. "John Joachim Zubly--Georgia Pamphleteer of the Revolution." *Georgia Historical Quarterly,* XIX (1935), 1-16.

_____. "Anglicans and Dissenters in Georgia, 1758-1777." *Church History,* VII (1938), 247-62.

Edson, H. A. "John Todd of Virginia and John Todd of Indiana." *Presbyterian Review,* VII (1886), 16-26.

Gardner, John H. "Presbyterians of Old Baltimore." *Maryland Historical Magazine,* XXXV (1940), 244-55.

Hanley, Thomas O'Brien. "The State and Dissenters in the Revolution." *Maryland Historical Magazine,* LVIII (1963), 325-32.

Henderson, Archibald. "The Origin of the Regulation in North Carolina." *American Historical Review,* XXI (1916), 324-32.

Isaac, Rhys. "Evangelical Revolt: The Nature of the Baptists' Challenge to the Traditional Order in Virginia, 1765 to 1775." *William and Mary Quarterly,* 3rd series, XXXI (1974), 345-68.

Krammer, Leonard J. "Muskets in the Pulpit, 1776-1783." *Journal of Presbyterian Historical Society,* XXXI (1953), 229-44; XXXII (1954), 37-51.

_____. "Presbyterians approach the American Revolution." *Journal of Presbyterian Historical Society,* XXXI (1953), 71-86, 167-80.

Metzger, Charles H. "Chaplains in the American Revolution." *Catholic Historical Review,* XXXI (1945), 31-79.

Moehlman, Conrad Henry. "The Baptist View of the State." *Church History,* VI (1937), 24-49.

O'Donnell, James H. "A Loyalist View of the Drayton-Tennent-Hart Mission to the Upcountry." *South Carolina Historical Magazine,* LXVII (1966), 15-28.

Paschal, George Washington. "Morgan Edwards' Material Towards a History of the Baptists in the Province of North Carolina." *North Carolina Historical Review,* VII (1930), 365-99.

Perkins, Eunice Ross. "John Joachim Zubly, Georgia's Conscientious Objector." *Georgia Historical Quarterly,* XV (1931), 313-23.

Sengel, William R. "Rebellion in the Meeting House: Alexandria's Presbyterians were called 'Liberty Mad.'" *Virginia Calvacade,* XIV (Summer, 1964), 34-39.

Smylie, James H. "Presbyterian Clergy and Problems of 'Dominion' in the Revolutionary Generation." *Journal of Presbyterian History,* XLVIII (1970), 161-75.

Stokes, Durward T. "Adam Boyd, Publisher, Preacher, and Patriot." *North Carolina Historical Review,* XLIX (1972), 1-21.

_____. "The Baptist and Methodist Clergy in South Carolina and the American Revolution." *South Carolina Historical Magazine,* LXXIII (1972), 87-96.

_____. "Henry Pattillo in North Carolina." *North Carolina Historical Review,* XLIV (1967), 373-91.

_____. "The Presbyterian Clergy in South Carolina and the American Revolution " *South Carolina Historical Magazine,* LXXI (1970), 270-82.

Tonks, Alfred R. "The Baptist Struggle to Support the American Revolution." *The Quarterly Review,* XXXI (1971), 64-79.

VanTyne, Claude H. "Influence of Clergy, and of Religious Sectarian Forces, on the American Revolution." *American Historical Review,* XIX (1913), 44-64.

Weaver, Glenn. "The Moravians During the French and Indian War." *Church History,* XXIV (1955), 230-56.

Williams, Samuel. "Tidence Lane--Tennessee's First Pastor." *Tennessee Historical Magazine,* 2nd series, I (1930), 40-48.

E. UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS AND THESES

Alley, Robert Sutherland. "The Reverend Samuel Davies: A Study in Religion and Politics, 1747-1759." Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1962.

Baker, Gloria Beth. "Dissenters in Colonial North Carolina." Ph.D dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1970.

Gardner, Harold Warren. "The Dissenting Sects on the Southern Colonial Frontier, 1720-1770." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1969.

Gundersen, Joan R. "The Anglican Ministry in Virginia 1723-1776: A Study of Social Class." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1972.

Harvey, Marvin E. "The Wesleyan Movement and the American Revolution." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1962.

Johnson, Elmer Douglas. "The War of the Regulation: Its Place in History." Master's Thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1942.

Kramer, Leonard J. "The Political Ethics of the American Presbyterian Clergy in the 18th Century." Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1942.

Lohrenz, Otto. "The Virginia Clergy and the American Revolution " Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1970.

Quinlivan, Mary Elizabeth. "Ideological Controversy over Religious Establishment in Revolutionary Virginia." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1971.

Simpson, Robert D. "Freeborn Garrettson, American Methodist Pioneer." Ph.D. dissertation, Drew University, 1954.

Southerland, James E. "Religious Liberty in Virginia and Massachusetts: The Role of the Baptist Minister, 1740-1833." Ph.D. dissertation, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1949.

Stokes, Durward T. "The Clergy of the Carolinas and the American Revolution." Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1968.

Stranger, Frank Bateman. "The Life and Ministry of the Rev. Joseph Pilmore." D.S.T. thesis, Temple University School of Theology, 1942.

F. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AIDS AND INDEXES

Allison, William Henry. *Inventory of Unpublished Material for American Religious History in Protestant Church Archives and Other Repositories.* Baltimore: Lord Baltimore Press, 1910.

Batsel, John David, comp. *Union List of Methodist Serials.* Second Checking Edition. Evanston, Illinois: n.p., 1968.

Beecher, Willis J. and Mary. *An Index of Presbyterian Ministers, 1706-1881.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1883.

Blosser, Susan Sokol and Clyde N. Wilson, Jr., eds. *The Southern Historical Collection: A Guide to Manuscripts.* Chapel Hill: Southern Historical Collection, 1970.

Bristol, Roger P. *Supplement to Charles Evans' American Bibliography.* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1970.

Burr, Nelson R. *A Critical Bibliography of Religion in America.* Vol. 4: *Religion in American Life.* Ed. by James Smith and A. Leland Jamison. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Cappon, Lester J. and Stella F. Duff. *Virginia Gazette Index, 1736-1780.* Williamsburg: Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1950.

Case, S. J., ed. *A Bibliographical Guide to the History of Christianity.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931; reprint ed. New York: Peter Smith, 1951

Durnbaugh, Donald R. and Lawrence W. Shultz. "A Brethren Bibliography, 1713-1963. Two Hundred Fifty Years of Brethren Literature." *Brethren Life and Thought,* IX (1964), 3-177.

Easterby, J. H. *Guide to the Study and Reading of South Carolina History.* 2 vols. Columbia: Historical Commission of South Carolina, 1949-50.

Evans, Charles, ed. *American Bibliography . . . 1639 . . . 1820.* 14 vols. Chicago: Blakely Press, 1903-59.

Gaustad, Edwin S. *Historical Atlas of Religion in America.* New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Gregorie, Anne King, ed. *Calendar of the Tennessee and King's Mountain Paper of the Draper Collection of Manuscripts.* Madison, Wisconsin: State Historical Society, 1929.

Gwathmey, John Hastings, ed. *Historical Register of Virginians in the Revolution; soldiers, sailors, marines, 1775-1783.* Richmond: Dietz Press, 1938.

Heitman, Francic B. *Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army During the Revolutionary War.* Revised edition. Washington: Rare Book Shop Publishing Company, 1914.

Jones, Lewis P. *Books and Articles on South Carolina.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970.

Library of Congress. *A Guide to the Microfilm Collection of Early State Records.* Washington: Library of Congress, 1950.

Little, Brooks Bivens, ed. *Methodist Union Catalog of history, biography, disciplines, and hymnals.* Lake Junaluska, North Carolina: Association of Methodist Historical Societies, 1967.

_____. "Union List of United Methodist Diaries and Journals." (Mimeographed)

McAllister, Joseph Thompson. *Virginia Militia in the Revolutionary War.* Hot Springs, Virginia: McAllister Publishing Company, 1913.

Manross, William Wilson. *The Fulham Papers in the Lambeth Palace Library; American Colonial Section Calendar and Indexes.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

Mode, Peter G. *Source Book and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History.* Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company, 1921; reprint ed., Boston: J. S. Canner and Company Inc., 1964.

North Carolina Historical Records Survey. *Guide to the Manuscripts in the Archives of the Moravian Church in America, Southern Province.* Raleigh: North Carolina Historical Records Survey, 1942.

Palmer, W. P. and others, eds. *Calendar of Virginia State Papers and other Manuscripts Preserved in the Capitol at Richmond.* Richmond: Printed by James E. Goode, 1875-93.

Passano, Eleanor Phillips. *An Index of the Source Records of Maryland.* Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1940.

Pedley, Avril J. M. *The Manuscript Collection of the Maryland Historical Society.* Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1968.

Quaife, Milo M. *The Preston and Virginia Papers of the Draper Collection of Manuscripts.* Madison, Wisconsin: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1915.

Roster of Soldiers From North Carolina in the American Revolution. Durham: Daughters of the American Revolution, 1932; reprint ed., Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1967.

Shipton, Clifford K. and James E. Mooney. *National Index of American Imprints through 1800: The Short-Title Evans.* 2 vols. Worcester, American Antiquarian Society, 1969.

Starr, Edward Caryl. *A Baptist Bibliography, Being a Register of Printed Material by and about Baptists: Including Works Written against the Baptists.* 21 vols. to date. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1947-19 .

Swem, Earl Gregg. *Virginia Historical Index.* 2 vols. Roanoke: Stone Printing Company, 1934-36.

Trinterud, Leonard J. *A Bibliography of American Presbyterianism During the Colonial Period.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Historical Society, 1968.

Weis, Frederick Lewis. *The Colonial Clergy of Maryland, Delaware and Georgia.* Lancaster, Mass.: The Society of the Descendants of the Colonial Clergy, 1950.

_____. *The Colonial Clergy of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.* Boston: Society of the Descendants of Colonial Clergy, 1955.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

POEM BY JAMES IRELAND
Date Unknown, ca. 1780s

I

America! exult in God
With joyful acclamation;
Who has, through scenes of war and blood,
Displayed to thee salvation.
When armed hosts,
With warlike boasts,
Did threaten thy destruction,
And crossed the main,
With martial train,
To compass thy subjection;
Thy sole resource was God alone,
Who heard thy cries before his throne,
Beheld with hate their schemes of blood
Impending o'er thee like a flood,
And made them know it was in vain
To make thee longer drag their chain;
That thou shouldst be
A nation free
From their unjust oppression.

II

Hail! now ye sons of liberty,
Behold thy constitution!
Despotic power and tyranny
Have seen their dissolution.
No clattering arms,
No war's alarms,
Nor threats of royal vengeance;
Thy hostile foes
Have left off those;
Now own thy Independence.
Replete with peace, valiant we stand,
Freedom the basis of our land;
Blest with the beams of gospel light,
Our souls emerge from sable night;
Jehovah's heralds loud proclaim
Eternal life through Jesus' name,
Point out his blood
The way to God,
For our complete salvation.

III

Amid the blessings we enjoy
From God the gracious giver,
Let gratitude our hearts employ,
To praise his name forever;
Beware of pride,
Lest, like a tide,
It flows and gains possession;
'Mongst empire all,
Both great and small,
Pride always brought oppression;
Pride finds the way to rule and reign,
And forges the despotic chain;
Denies we should enjoy or have
The right that God in nature gave.
Against this baleful evil fight--
Resist its force with all your might,
And join as one,
Before the throne,
That God would keep us humble.

IV

Most gracious God, thee we adore,
Whose mercy faileth never;
Thy guardian care we now implore,--
Be thou our king forever;
May gospel rays
Divinely blaze
With an immortal lustre,
And teach us how
Our hearts to bow
To the Redeemer's sceptre!
Oh may the silver trump of peace
Within our empire never cease,
Until the ransomed, holy race,
Are called in by sovereign grace.
Then may the conflagration come,
And sinners rise to hear their doom!
Thy chosen ones,
In endless songs,
Will shout forth hallelujahs!

Source: Taylor, *Virginia Baptist Ministers*, I, 124-26.

APPENDIX B

PRESENT CRISES
November 17, 1775

What sound is this that strikes mine Ear
Of Terror and the rage of War
Commotions Blood-shed and distress
The Bane of Harmony and Peace
The Nations to the Battle haste
Eager to try the Bloody Test
Fearless upon the pointed Sword
The[y] boldly rush with one accord
In furious clamour to engage
In all the heat of martial rage
Whence showers of the Blood they spill
Upon the strained Earth distil
In which the Victims weltering lie
While groans express their misery
In which they breath their hotest Breath
and then resign to conquering Death
But their Survivors still pursue
With sword in hand the hated Foe
Resolved to Conquer or to die
To stand or fall courageously
Prompted by an Heroic Deal
To rush upon the pointed Steel
Though Death on every hand appears
To shock them and augment their fears
Their fury it can not abate
Nor make them dread approaching fate
Exerted is their utmost Power
Greedy each other to devour
Strangely athirst for Human Blood

Of which an All-Creating God
Had made all nations equally
Partakers of Humanity
Which they basely sacrifice
Forth for to slay inhumanly
They march with their artil[l]ery
The bloody Instruments of Death
In each the others Breast to sheathe
On what a shocking bloody scene
Such Woe as this had never been
If Man had not been spoiled by Sin
But O Thou Father of Mankind
Change and renew the Carnal mind
True Peace and Love to each restore
And so shall we learn War no more.

Source: Journal of William Duke, November 17, 1775, photostats at Library of Commission on Archives and History, United Methodist Church, Lake Junaluska, North Carolina.

VITA

Cline Edwin Hall was born in Roanoke, Virginia, on October 24, 1936. After graduating from William Fleming High School in that city in 1954, he went to Bluefield College and then to the University of Richmond, where he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1958, and the Master of Arts degree in 1959. After attending the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, he taught for one year in the Louisville Public Schools and for five years in private junior colleges.

In the fall of 1968 he entered the Graduate School of the University of Tennessee for further graduate study and taught part-time in the University of Tennessee Evening School from 1971-1975. In March 1976, he received a Doctor of Philosophy degree from the University of Tennessee.

He is married to the former Beverly Gale Walts of New Albany, Indiana, and they have one son.