

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY

LOYALIST PREACHERS DURING  
THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION (1765-1783)

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS IN HISTORY

BY

CHRISTENA RENE LEAVERTON

LYNCHBURG, VIRGINIA

MAY 2021

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
This page intentionally left blank. Do not delete.....	iii
Introduction and Historiography.....	1
Chapter One Commonality: Christianity, Culture and Countries.....	9
Christianity.....	9
Culture.....	11
Countries.....	13
Chapter Two The Preachers and the Bible.....	18
Introduction.....	18
The Preachers.....	19
Denominations.....	27
Biblical Themes and Verses.....	32
Conclusion.....	35
Chapter Three: Propaganda, Pamphlets and the <i>Holy Bible</i> .....	37
Introduction.....	37
Propaganda.....	38
Pamphlets.....	41
The <i>Holy Bible</i> .....	45
Conclusion.....	49
Chapter Four: Conclusion.....	51
Bibliography.....	57

## Abstract

### LOYALIST PREACHERS DURING THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION (1763-1783)

By

Christena Renea Leaverton, MA

Liberty University, May 2021

Thesis Chair: Dr. Matthew Hill

“Loyalists were those who remained loyal to the British Crown and did not support America’s fight for independence leading up to, and during, the American Revolution. Being loyal to the crown was the normal practice for all Americans prior to the increasing call for independence.”<sup>1</sup> In the time leading up to and during the American Revolution (1765-1783), Loyalist preachers defended their stance on remaining loyal to Great Britain utilizing Bible themes and specific verses. Oftentimes, as with the Patriots, these Loyalist preachers took these themes and verses out of context or misquoted them. They also used Bible themes and verses to fuel propaganda for their cause. It is important to understand the justification for these preachers and the Bible themes and verses they stood on. It is also important to understand *why* they remained loyal in the first place and how their religion played a role in that decision. Repeated history, more often than not, concentrates on the victors. In the case of the American Revolution, the Patriots were the victors and the Loyalists were seen as treasonous and were often exiled. Despite violent opposition, these men and women stood firm in their conviction and remained loyal to Great Britain and to God.

---

<sup>1</sup> Christena Leaverton, “The Loyalist Culture,” HIST 512, Liberty University, April 27, 2020.

**This page intentionally left blank. Do not delete.**

## **Introduction and Historiography**

Popular history isn't always accurate history. There are schools of thought and interpretations that place their own spin on historical research, depending on the perspective of the person conducting the research. One of the most prevalent subjects, in American history, where these various perceptions are displayed, is the American Revolution – specifically as it relates to Loyalist studies. Even in elementary school, I learned that Benedict Arnold was a “traitor” and therefore, I did not like him. In my mind, he had betrayed our country. There is no doubt that the predominant interpretation that is taught in public elementary schools is one of Loyalists betraying our country. However, Loyalists were considered just as “American” as Patriots prior to 1765.

“The time leading up to, and during, the American Revolution saw a significant number of American Colonists turn against Great Britain and come into their own country.”<sup>2</sup> As the Patriots (those for the Revolution) gained strength, it would seem that it would have been much easier for the Loyalists (those against the Revolution) to go along with the status quo. However, the Loyalists chose to remain loyal to their interpretation of the Bible, God and Great Britain and some paid a heavy price for that. Understanding the biblical themes that the Loyalists stood on and how they applied those beliefs in their effort to remain loyal, will allow one to understand how this influenced and shaped beliefs and culture today.

---

<sup>2</sup> Christena Leaverton, “The Loyalist Culture,” HIST 512, Liberty University, April 27, 2020.

## Historiography

In order to gain a better understanding on the various ways that the American Revolution, and specifically, the Loyalists, have been studied and understood over time, one would first have to briefly take a look at some of the prominent schools of thought. There are many studies on the American Revolution, in general. There are many schools of thought – Progressivism, Neo-Consensus, New Left, the Peoples’ History – the list goes on and on. Each of these schools of thought brings a different light to the study of the American Revolution. Progressivism emphasizes the struggle of social classes and class conflict. Neo-Consensus emphasizes the theme of one people, one nation, one history. New Left scholars emphasize the parts of history that they felt earlier scholars had left out – oppression, violence, racism, etc. The Peoples’ historians emphasize the ordinary person; the marginal person who may have left a diary or letters that shed light on family, environment and social beliefs. But, what about Loyalist studies during the Revolutionary era? While these schools of thought can (and should be) applied to Loyalists, studies on the Loyalists have been largely ignored. “The voices and ideas of the losers – of those who remained loyal to England during the American Revolution – are virtually unknown.”<sup>3</sup>

The Loyalists were the losers. Their history has been largely deemed unimportant. This could be, in part, simply because, as losers, their cause no longer mattered. It could also be, in part, because many of them fled the new United States when the Patriots came to victory.

“Confronting real doubts about their lives, liberty, and the potential happiness in the United States, sixty thousand loyalists decided to follow the British and take their chances elsewhere in the British Empire. They took fifteen thousand black slaves with

---

<sup>3</sup> Gregg L. Frazer, *God Against the Revolution: The Loyalist Clergy’s Case against the American Revolution (American Political Thought)*, Kansas. University Press of Kansas, 2018, 1

them, bringing the total exodus to seventy-five thousand people – or about one in forty members of the American population.”<sup>4</sup>

The American culture is one of a proud Patriotic history. We were the winners.

Therefore, it stands to reason that the history we choose to embrace is the one where the Patriots, the winners, the underdogs, fight for and gain their independence from a powerful bully. For the most part, we all proudly espouse that story. We celebrate it every year with parades, backyard barbecues and fireworks that light up the night sky. We won. We are still celebrating.

But, what of the Loyalists? Loyalists were also “Americans.” They were colonists who settled in the New World, due to religious persecution, economic upheaval and indentured servitude – just like the Patriots. They played a part in the first civil war in the United States. The American Revolution was truly brother against brother and father against son. “...most famously Benjamin Franklin, the founding father, from his only son William, a loyalist – this was the longest war Americans fought before Vietnam and the bloodiest until the Civil War of 1861-1865.”<sup>5</sup> With this in mind, it is somewhat surprising that more historians have not tackled Loyalist studies in a more neutral tone. It is also important to understand the historians who have contributed to Loyalist studies and their focus. It goes without saying that scholarship in countries such as Canada and Great Britain appears differently than scholarship in the United States. For the purposes of this work, United States scholarship will be the focus.

One cannot discuss American Revolutionary or Loyalist studies without discussing Charles Beard. Charles Beard (1874-1948) is arguably one of the most well-known historians during the Progressive school of thought (late 19<sup>th</sup> century through the 1940s). The Progressive

---

<sup>4</sup> Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf Publishers, 2011, 6

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, 9.

school of thought focused on the struggle of opposing groups – mainly social conflict and class warfare. Concerning the American Revolution, Progressive historians claimed that this time in our history was driven by self-interest of those in power. Beard was a professor of political science at Columbia University. His most notable work was *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* (1913). Beard alleged that the elite group of founding fathers based the Constitution of the United States on their own financial self-interests. Beard said that Revolutionary era people could be placed in two distinct groups; “...the merchants, money lenders, security holders, manufacturers, shippers, capitalists and financiers and their professional associates.”<sup>6</sup> The other group, he claimed, were “...the non slave holding farmers and debtors.”<sup>7</sup> Beard’s work, as a Progressive historian, was to emphasize this class conflict and the struggle that ensued. This school of historiography was the prevalent theme for several decades.

In direct contrast to the Progressive school of thought, the Neo-Whig school of thought became popular in the 1960s and continues even today. Neo-Whig historians are often critical of Progressive historians. They claimed that the Revolutionary era was more about the people, as generational and cultural, and the ideology that they shared. One of the most well-known Neo-Whig historians was Bernard Bailyn (1922-2020). Bailyn was a professor of history at Harvard University. He won a Pulitzer prize for his work in 1968 and 1987. His most notable work was *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (1967). In this work, Bailyn argued directly against Charles Beard and his Progressive view. Cecilia M. Kenyon points out that Beard’s work was *the* accepted view on the American Revolution and the United States Constitution until the

---

<sup>6</sup> Charles Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States*, New York, The MacMillan Company, 1913, 16

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid*, 17

mid 1950s. She says, “It was then savagely attacked.”<sup>8</sup> Bernard Bailyn was one who did the attacking. In direct contrast to Beard’s claims of social and class warfare, Bailyn argues that, despite opposing sides of the American Revolution, the people were united in a common ideology – one of distrust of government.

“For the primary goal of the American Revolution, which transformed American Life and introduced a new era in human history, was not to overthrow or even the alteration of the existing social order but the preservation of political liberty threatened by the apparent corruption of the constitution, and the establishment in principle of the existing conditions of liberty.”<sup>9</sup>

Where Beard divided the Revolutionary era people into elite vs. ordinary/marginal people, Bailyn united them in one theme based on distrust of government.

Historiography of Loyalists in the American Revolution was concentrated in these two main schools of thought until much later. Even though there were scholars who attempted to insert new life in Loyalist studies, it wasn’t until the late 2000s that more complex and long withstanding studies were done. Some scholars have termed this study “New Loyalist” historiography. These scholars maintain a more neutral position, somewhere between Progressivism and New-Whigism. “They have also sought to reframe the American Revolution as a colonial civil war contained within an imperial conflict by re-writing Loyalists back into the story.”<sup>10</sup> One of these New Loyalist scholars is Ruma Chopra, a current professor of history at San Jose State University. Chopra’s most well-known work relating to Loyalists in the American Revolution is *Unnatural Rebellion: Loyalists in New York During the Revolution* (2011). Chopra states, “Recent works turn away from the personality and psychology of elites to examine

---

<sup>8</sup> Cecilia M. Kenyon, “An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution after Fifty Years,” *The Centennial Review*, Vol. 7 No. 3, Summer 1963, 328

<sup>9</sup> Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origin of the American Revolution*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967, 21

<sup>10</sup> James Patrick Ambuske, “Reviewed Works: Unnatural Rebellion; Loyalists in New York During the Revolution,” *Essays in History*, Corcoran Department of History at the University of Virginia, Vol 45, 2012

ordinary people's pragmatic considerations for choosing allegiance."<sup>11</sup> This is what is considered the New Loyalists school of thought.

At about the same time that Chopra was working on her scholarly studies on Loyalists, Maya Jasanoff was also working on one of her most well-known books, *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World* (2011). Jasanoff is a professor of history at Harvard University. In this work, Jasanoff tackles the Loyalists who sought refuge (and were exiled) after the American Revolution. Jasanoff discusses the many reasons that Loyalists stayed loyal to the British crown. She embraces the "New Loyalist" school of thought. She states, "They could be royal officials as well as bakers, carpenters, tailors, and printers."<sup>12</sup> She also states, "A range of reasons, ideological and otherwise, led all the people in these pages to the same defining choice: to leave revolutionary America."<sup>13</sup> Right away, Jasanoff disputes Beard's claim on class and social warfare, as well as Bailyn's claim on ideology. Jasanoff's work is, in effect, a defense of Loyalists.

Another scholar that picks up on the New Loyalist school of thought and defense is Gregg L. Frazer. Frazer is a professor of history and political studies at The Master's University. His most well-known work concerning Loyalists is *God Against the Revolution: The Loyalist Clergy's Case against the American Revolution (American Political Thought)* (2018). Frazer's work concentrates on religion and religious leaders in the Revolutionary era. He contends that, "Several of the Loyalist clergymen are generally considered to be the best spokesmen for their cause, and their sermons and pamphlets are particularly valuable because they cover the full

---

<sup>11</sup> Ruma Chopra, *Unnatural Rebellion: Loyalists in New York During the Revolution*, Charlottesville and London, University of Virginia Press, 2011.

<sup>12</sup> Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World*, New York. Alfred A. Knopf Publishers, 2011, 8

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* 9

range of Loyalist arguments.”<sup>14</sup> He further states, “Contrary to popular belief and to popular history, there were no particular social, economic, or religious groups that were entirely Whigs or entirely Tories.”<sup>15</sup> He then notes Maya Jasanoff’s suggestion that choosing sides involved many things, including as Jasanoff noted, “. . .more than 700 people signed the little-known Loyalist “Declaration of Dependence” and that a majority of them were “ordinary people” such as “tavern keepers and carpenters, farmers.”<sup>16</sup> Frazer is also considered a “New Loyalist” scholar that defends the Loyalists.

While this only touches on the many historians and schools of thought concerning Loyalist studies in the Revolutionary era, it is a preliminary summary of the main schools of thought that I will concentrate on in this work. Another aspect that needs to be considered is two distinct schools of study concerning historical research. One is the dialectical school of study and the other is the empirical school of study.

In the dialectical school of study, there is always a conflict or struggle and the interpretations of historical research are centered around the historian’s theme of thought. This can be focused on Marxism, feminism, ethnic or environmental history. For instance, pertaining to the American Revolution, a dialectical historian may concentrate solely on racial divide between slave and slave owners or between Loyalist and Patriot slave. One of the most famous dialectical theorists was George Frederick Hagle who believed that the past must be characterized by the various broad movements or philosophies or idea. The belief among dialectical historians is that there is a great idea that is propelling history forward.

---

<sup>14</sup> Gregg L. Frazer, *God Against the Revolution: The Loyalist Clergy’s Case against the American Revolution (American Political Thought)*, Kansas, University Press of Kansas, 2018, 2

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid*, 3.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid*, 3

In contrast, the empirical school of study is rooted in only what we have for evidence related to our remembered past. In other words, we use facts to look at the evidence directly related to the historic person, place, event, idea or phenomena. Empiricists do not believe in making interpretations of the past when there is no legitimate evidence that supports that interpretation.

It is important to consider the type of evidence and the historian's alignment with dialectical or empirical schools of study when investigating any type of history. This paper will look from an empirical, evidence-based, view on the research that will be used.

## Chapter One

### Commonality: Christianity, Culture and Countries

#### Christianity

While there are many differences between Loyalists and Patriots in the Revolutionary era, there are many commonalities as well. The colonists in Colonial America were from Britain, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, France – the list goes on and on. Very simply put, they were all from another country. By the time of the Revolutionary era, there had been several familial generations born in America, but there continued to be significant ties to their own home countries. These families may have made the trek to America for conceived better opportunities, economic reasons, familial reasons, indentured servitude – again, the list goes on and on. They all had close ties to those who made that long trek, or they had made the trek themselves. They shared commonality in how and why they came to America. Robert Middlekauff puts it best, “They had been selected by desperate conditions at home and, surely, as important by something within themselves.”<sup>17</sup> Studies of Loyalists during the Revolutionary era involved understanding that they did not want a war. It should also be stated that a large majority of Patriots did not want a war either. They shared the commonality of hoping for some kind of reconciliation. The Continental Congress held off as long as possible in implementing any Acts. “By February 1776, when Congress received the Prohibitory Act, the possibility of a reconciliation was remote.”<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Robert Middlekauff, *The Glorious Cause: the American Revolution, 1763-1789*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2005, 35

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* 322

A commonality of religion was also something the Loyalists and Patriots shared. The majority were Christians. It is important to understand that within the Christian religion, there are significant differences between denominations and sub denominations. During the Revolutionary era, when Acts were being passed and taxes were being levied, individuals were forced to choose a side – regardless of the serious implications of that chosen side. Religious affiliation played a part in that decision. Christianity is most widely accepted as the following of the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. The Loyalists and the Patriots, of the Christian faith, were followers of this view. However, within the Christian faith, there were a variety of denominations. For the purposes of this research paper, the main denominations that will be discussed are Anglican, Congregationalist and Presbyterian, as that is also the preachers that will be covered in chapter two. A brief introduction will be given here, with a more detailed look at belief systems in chapter two.

To touch briefly on Anglicanism, it is defined as “...one of the major branches of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Protestant Reformation and a form of Christianity...”<sup>19</sup> Anglicans are also referred to Episcopalians. Their belief is:

“...that there is only one God, but there are three elements to this one God: God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Spirit; that human beings' decision to reject this eternal God and live according to their own standards (sin) causes a relational breakdown between them; that God the Son, Jesus Christ, lived and died to give people a model and a way to be reconciled with God.”<sup>20</sup>

This does not differ from most Christian faiths that believe in the Trinity.

---

<sup>19</sup> William L. Sachs and Dean, Ralph Stanly, “Anglicanism,” *Encyclopedia Britannica*, April 02, 2020. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Anglicanism> Accessed 11 December 2020

<sup>20</sup> Anglican Communion, <https://www.anglicancommunion.org/theology/doctrine.aspx> Accessed 11 December 2020

To touch briefly on Congregationalism, it is a Protestant system based on local churches being self-governing. They were based on the Puritan church in New England originally. According to William T. J. Youngs, in *The Congregationalists* (1998), basis for the churches was formed along the lines of the New England democratic institutions and Congregationalist pastors were trained at both Harvard University and Yale University. Congregationalists do practice baptism, to include infant baptism, and the Lord's Supper.

To touch briefly on Presbyterianism, it is also a Protestant system, but differs from Congregationalism, in that the governance is through a system of church elders and is most prominently recognized as having a basis in the Church of Scotland. The Presbyterian faith emphasized God's sovereignty, scriptural authority and the need for grace through Jesus Christ.

To touch briefly on the Baptist religion, it is also a Protestant denomination. The belief is generally a full immersion of believers for the baptism. They generally do not believe in infant baptism.

The commonality of these denominations is the belief in Jesus Christ and faith in the Holy Bible. They have much in common – their differences are based, in part, on governance. For instance, the main difference between Congregationalists and Presbyterianism is what entity oversees governing the church, whether it is on a local level or through a larger, “elder” level.

### Culture

Loyalists and Patriots also shared a culture. This author has conducted previous research on the culture of Loyalists in the Revolutionary era in a paper titled “The Loyalist Culture.”<sup>21</sup>

Excerpts from that research are as follows:

---

<sup>21</sup> Christena Leaverton, “The Loyalist Culture,” Liberty University, HIST 512, April 27, 2020

Culture is often (mistakenly) defined in terms of traditions and ethnicities. In *Culture Making: Recovering our Creative Calling*, Andy Crouch defines culture as, "...what we make of the world."<sup>22</sup> He describes it best as, "It is what human beings make of the world. It always bears the stamp of our creativity, our God given desire to making something more than we were given."<sup>23</sup> It needs to be understood that we are given a culture that is already created, but we do not create a new culture until we make something of what we are given. In applying this to Loyalists and Patriots, we can see where one created new culture from what they were given, while the other attempted to remain in the only culture they knew.

With the understanding of what culture truly means, we can see that this cultural division played an important role in the ideology of both Loyalists and Patriots. In essence, it allows us to gain a better understanding of why and how decisions were made pertaining to what side of the American Revolution a person may have aligned with.

We must also consider what we deem "culture" in the everyday lives of people who were thrust into the war for Independence, whether they wanted to be or not. The American Colonies in the Revolutionary era were largely European in ownership, culture and influence. Colonists attempted to keep pace with Europe in cultural aspects such as theater, education and the sciences. This was often to no avail as resources were limited in America. But it is important to understand that the colonists were influenced culturally and there was a desire to be surrounded with a cultural identity.

For instance, consider the cultural aspect of tea. In America, tea was preferred due to culture, but was also admonished due to it having ties to culture in England. "In the United States, tea was not an instant hit, largely because it symbolized England, from whom Americans were seeking independence."<sup>24</sup> With this understanding, one has to wonder if Loyalists and Patriots differed on the cultural consumption of something as simple as tea. Great Britain then

---

<sup>22</sup> Andy Crouch, *Culture Making: Recovering our Creative Calling*, Illinois, InterVarsity Press. 2008. 23

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid*, 23.

<sup>24</sup> Destination Tea, <https://destinationtea.com/teastory/#america> Accessed 12 December 2020

implemented the Tea Act in May 1773, which subsequently led to the Boston Tea Party. “In 1773, the English forced their extra tea onto the American colonies by sending three tea ships from the East India Company to Boston. Angered by this attempt to control their market, colonists decided to rebel. A band of patriots disguised themselves as Mohawks, attacked the tea chests with axes, and emptied 342 of them into the water. The Boston Tea Party was one of the main events that led to the American Revolution.”<sup>25</sup>

The commonality of the culture of tea was present in America in the Revolutionary era. Whether for or against it, there was a unique culture present in the everyday lives of the colonists.

Tea is just one example of the culture that was under attack in the Revolutionary era. When we think of our culture, today, there are many things that we may take for granted. When we think of the culture of baseball games, public education, trick or treating, Black Friday shopping, and a host of many other things that we consider very “American,” we can see that if those things were under attack, we may have a difficult time deciding if we are for or against those very things that we may have participated in without much thought or introspection.

### Countries

Of course, we also have to consider the various countries that were in play during the Revolutionary era. Great Britain is well known to be a major actor in the American Revolution as it governed New America in the Revolutionary era. There were other countries at play as well. Spain, France and Canada all play important roles. However, in looking at the four men that are being covered in this research (Charles Inglis, Samuel Seabury, John Joachim Zubly and David

---

<sup>25</sup> Tanya Napier, *The Totally TEA-rific TEA Party Book*, San Francisco, Barron’s Publishing, 2002

George), they all had the commonality of being Loyalists, but their country of origin was different. In order to gain a better understanding of the countries where Loyalists were born and raised, we must take a look at these men.

Charles Inglis was born in County Donegal, Ireland in 1734. Inglis was an Ulster Irish-Scotsman, commonly referred to as Scots-Irish in America. He sailed to America in 1758 and worked under the Society of Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. As previously discussed, Inglis was an Anglican Bishop and was appointed the rector of the Trinity Church in New York in 1777.

Samuel Seabury was the first American Episcopal bishop and a leading Loyalist, He was born in 1729, in Connecticut. His father had also been born in Connecticut. Seabury came from at least one generation of an American born resident. Seabury studied at Yale College where he studied theology. As previously discussed, Samuel Seabury was Episcopalian minister, but his father had been a Congregationalist minister. Therefore, we have evidence that he had a variety of religious influences.

John Joachim Zubly was born in Switzerland in 1724. He was ordained in the German Reformed Church in London in 1744 after which he sailed for America. Zubly settled in Savannah, Georgia where his father had settled. It was there that he became the first pastor of the Independent Presbyterian Church of Savannah. As previously discussed, Zubly was a Presbyterian minister and a well-known Loyalist.

David George was born in Virginia in 1742. He was a slave to a master called Chapel. After running away from his master, he was caught by a Creek Indian named Blue Salt and became his servant. He then became a servant to a Natchez Chief named King Jack. He eventually made his way to a man named George Galphin, who was a Scottish fur trader.

Galphin's children taught David George how to read and write by using the *Holy Bible* and he became exposed and converted to Christianity. He later became a Baptist minister in Savannah, Georgia. According to Mark A. Noll:

"The first continuing black church was the Silver Bluff Church in Aiken County, South Carolina, where an African-American preacher, David George (1742-1810), established a congregation around 1773 or 1774. George's pilgrimage marked him as one of the most remarkable religious figures of his century. After serving as a slave, he was converted through the influence of another slave named Cyrus. Soon George began to exhort his fellow bondsmen, an activity that led to his becoming, in effect, the pastor of the Silver Bluff Church. ... American patriots were trying to throw off the "slavery" of Parliament, but for those in chattel bondage like David George, the British were the agents who combated racial, chattel slavery."<sup>26</sup>

Each of these men came from different countries and walks of life. However, they each remained loyal to the British Crown during the American Revolution. They also each remained steadfast in their allegiance to God and were instrumental in leading others to find their own faith.

On the surface, the commonality of these men appears to show a bond of kinsman fighting to remain a part of a force greater than themselves. But that is only the surface. In reality, the only things common among this small sampling is that they were Christian preachers, and they were Loyalists.

Their differences were far greater. They came from varied backgrounds. Two were born in America – but one of those was born a free white man while the other was born a black slave. One of the American born was raised in the northern state of Connecticut, while the other was raised in southern influenced Savannah, Georgia. Two were immigrants to America – one of those tough Scots-Irish raised in Ireland, while the other was raised in Switzerland.

---

<sup>26</sup> Mark A. Noll, *The Old Religion in the New World: The History of North American Christianity*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans Publishing, 2002, 56

With these four different homelands came obvious differences in culture. The culture of Savannah, Georgia was far removed from the culture of Switzerland.

Even in the commonality of the Christian religion they each aligned with different denominations. This created differences, no matter how small, in their beliefs and practices.

With all these differences, these men all stood on the same *Holy Bible* and often the same scriptures. They all had to wrestle with their own understanding of these Bible verses – specifically Romans 13: 1-7:

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.

<sup>2</sup> Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

<sup>3</sup> For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same:

<sup>4</sup> For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.

<sup>5</sup> Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.

<sup>6</sup> For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.

<sup>7</sup> Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.”<sup>27</sup>

Loyalists generally lived by the instructions in Romans 13. They believed they were to honor and submit to the governing authority. They believed this so abundantly that they would have remained loyal even to a tyrannical government. They reminded others that, historically, Christians have always remained loyal, even in the face of evil. For resisting power was resisting

---

<sup>27</sup> *The Bible*, Holman Study Bible, KJV, Holman Bible Publishers, 2015.

God as it is pointed out in verse two. Regardless of their differing denominations, they believed in the absolute truth of Romans 13.

## **Chapter Two**

### **The Preachers and the Bible**

#### Introduction

In this chapter we will take a more in depth look at the preachers introduced in chapter one as well as the denominations associated with those preachers. We will also take a look at the two main Bible passages that the Loyalists, and a lot of colonists, stood on: 1 Peter 2 and Romans 13.

In chapter one we discussed the commonalities and the differences in our preachers and in the colonists in general, concerning countries, culture and Christianity. It is very important to understand that the colonists were, first and foremost, individuals. They were men and women and children who all had lived a life to the point of the Revolutionary era. It was quite an internal struggle to identify with one side or the other – Patriot or Loyalist. There were many things that influenced that struggle – preachers, denominations and Bible passages being among the most prevalent in those times.

Chapter two takes a look at the preachers, denominations and Bible passages that were from a Loyalist perspective. It will also allow us a glimpse of how the Patriots responded, especially to the main Bible passages used at the time. Once again, the commonalities and differences will play an important role. Sometimes these might be subtle, while other times these might be significant.

## The Preachers

To get a better understanding of the men chosen for a representation of Loyalist preachers during the Revolutionary Era we will need to take a closer look at each of them. As discussed earlier in this paper, the men were chosen due, not only to their commonality as Loyalist preachers, but for their differences as well. Charles Inglis, arguably the most well-known Loyalist preacher during the Revolutionary era, was an Irishman and the first Anglican bishop in America. Samuel Seabury was originally a Congregationalist preacher and later an ordained deacon in the Church of England. Seabury was born in Connecticut to a minister and had studied at Yale College. John Joachim Zubly was born in Switzerland and was ordained in the German Reformed Church in London. David George was born a slave in Virginia. George later became a Baptist minister in Savannah, Georgia. These men were vastly different, however united in a common belief and cause.

### Charles Inglis

Charles Inglis was born in County Donegal, Ireland in 1734. Inglis was an Ulster Irish Scotsman, commonly referred to as Scots-Irish in America. He sailed to America in 1758 under the Society of Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts<sup>28</sup> and was sent to Dover, Delaware to teach. After moving to New York City, Inglis, an Anglican bishop, became the assistant rector at Trinity Church. “This position put him at the center of political and church activity and gave him contact with notable clergymen such as Chandler and Samuel Seabury.”<sup>29</sup> Inglis rose to

---

<sup>28</sup> William H. Nelson, *The American Tory*, Oxford, 1961, 186.

<sup>29</sup> Gregg L. Frazer, *God against the Revolution: The Loyalist Clergy's Case against the American Revolution (American Political Thought)*, Kansas, University Press of Kansas, 31.

prominence in the Trinity Church and would become a substantial force to be reckoned with as the Revolution took hold.

For a glimpse into the steadfastness of Inglis, Robert Batcholder offers the following:

“Soon the Revolution was creating havoc among the Anglican clergy, especially those who continued to read the prayers for the Royal family. Some were imprisoned, others assaulted, or banished. Churches were burned, barricaded or deserted...It was during this period that Charles Inglis courage was tested b American troops stationed in the New York area. On one occasion word was sent to him that “General Washington would be at church and would be glad if the violent prayers for the King and Royal Family were omitted.” But the state prayers were used in the service. When later he remonstrated with Washington over this message, the General’s apology indicated to him that he personally had not authorized it. On another Sunday more than one hundred American troops, accoutered with uniform, guns and bayonets in position, and accompanied by a band, marched into one of Inglis’ services. Upon their entrance into the church, the congregation began to panic and several women fainted. He only raised his voice above the noise until the sexton gathered his senses and showed the soldiers to their seat.”<sup>30</sup>

Inglis remained the rector of the Trinity Church until 1783 when personal tragedy struck him and he sought exile in Nova Scotia, Canada. However, while he was at Trinity Church, his leadership remained as portrayed by Batcholder.

It should be noted that, “Charles Inglis did not believe in subjugation to the King; he affirmed the right of petition. Yet, when the choice was between either submission to the King and the laws of Parliament or open resistance through rebellion, Inglis preached that one’s religious duty required subjugation.”<sup>31</sup> It appears that Inglis viewed remaining Loyal to the British Crown as the lesser of two evils.

Most of Inglis’ preaching during the Revolutionary era was done at Trinity Church. However, he did travel to preach, “...throughout Dutchess and Ulster counties between 1774 and

---

<sup>30</sup> Robert C. Batchelder, “Charles Inglis: First British Colonial Bishop,” *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, Vol. 32, No. 1, March 1963, 21.

<sup>31</sup> Mary F. Gunter and James S. Taylor, “Loyalist Propaganda in the Sermons of Charles Inglis, 1770-1780,” *Western Speech*, Vol. 37 No. 3, January 1973, 49.

1776 “to warn his Friends in the Country as well as City of the evils that were approaching...”<sup>32</sup>

So we can see that a majority of his preaching took place at the pulpit where he was rector. He did not appear to hold revivals or necessarily preach publicly.

To get a better understanding of the themes and verses that Charles Inglis used in his preaching, we will need to take a look at his sermons. In one of his most important sermons, *The Duty of Honoring the King*<sup>33</sup> Inglis concentrates on I Peter 2:17, “Fear God. Honor the King.”<sup>34</sup>

In this sermon, we can see Inglis stating:

“BUT that professing Christians, who really believe in a divine Revelation, and acknowledge its Authority---that these would be the Dupes of such Men---that they should make no Conscience of dishonouring their King, and rebelling against him--that they should knowingly trample on the Law of God, and act as if no such Law existed---that instead of obeying this Law, they should be Trumpeters of Sedition and Rebellion: This is astonishing indeed! Did not melancholly Experience convince us of its Truth, we should think it impossible that any who profess Christianity, could pursue a Conduct so diametrically opposite to the Spirit of their Religion!”<sup>35</sup>

Inglis is questioning “professing Christians” on their love and loyalty to God as an extension of their love and loyalty to the King. This sermon was delivered on January 30, 1780 - the anniversary of the execution of Charles I. The execution of Charles I led to the English Civil War and “Such condemnation of civil war had special importance for loyalists in the throes of the American Revolution...”<sup>36</sup> Inglis knew to capitalize on this particular time and use this in his sermon.

---

<sup>32</sup> Philip Davidson, *Propaganda and the American Revolution, 1763-1783*, North Carolina, University of North Carolina, 1941.

<sup>33</sup> Charles Inglis, *The Duty of Honoring the King*, New York, H. Gaine, 1780.

<sup>34</sup> I Peter 2:17, *The Bible*, The Holman Study Bible NKJV, Holman Bible Publishers, 2015.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid*, Inglis.

<sup>36</sup> James P. Byrd, *Sacred Scripture, Sacred War: The Bible and the American Revolution*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1965, 120.

Inglis continued in his sermon *The Duty to Honour the King*, by describing what honoring the King meant:

“To honour the King is to entertain respectful Sentiments of his Authority and Person – to speak always with Deference of both – to promote the Peace and Stability of his Reign, and pay a cheerful Obedience to his Laws – to check, as far as we are able, the Calumnies which Sedition or Malice would propagate to his Disadvantage, to oppose the Proceedings which would disturb or endanger his authority – and to promote these Sentiments and Conduct among others.”<sup>37</sup>

In this, he clearly laid out what he considered God saying to the people – that it was against God’s will to go against the King.

The most controversial work of Charles Inglis was his response to Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense*. In *The Deceiver Unmasked; or, Loyalty and Interest United: an Answer to a Pamphlet Called Common Sense*, Inglis penned it as “By a Loyal American.” Inglis says, “I find no *Common Sense* in this pamphlet, but much *uncommon* frenzy.”<sup>38</sup> In this pamphlet, Inglis responds to each point brought up by Thomas Paine and provides a rebuttal defending loyalty to the British Crown. It was advertised in a local newspaper and the Sons of Liberty broke in and destroyed all of the copies. Inglis later rereleased it under *The true Interest of American Impartially Stated, in Certain Strictures on a Pamphlet Intituled Common Sense*.

One noted concern that Inglis had during the Revolutionary era was that preachers wanted to be “popular” and they may “...misinterpret the Bible to suit their own purposes.”<sup>39</sup> Inglis was a well-studied man and appeared to place high expectations on others who claimed to be a Christian.

---

<sup>37</sup> Charles Inglis, *Duty of Honouring the King*, New York, H. Gaine, 1780.

<sup>38</sup> Charles Inglis, *The Deceiver Unmasked; or, Loyalty and Interest United: in Answer to a Pamphlet Called Common Sense*. New York, Samuel London, 1776.

<sup>39</sup> Gregg L Frazer, *God against the Revolution: The Loyalist Clergy’s Case against the American Revolution (American Political Thought)*, Kansas, University Press of Kansas, 2018, 10.

On November 25, 1783, at the end of the American Revolution, British soldiers evacuated New York City. Charles Inglis and his family evacuated with them. Inglis returned to England. In 1787, he was appointed the first bishop in Nova Scotia, Canada, where he remained until his death in 1816.

### Samuel Seabury

Samuel Seabury was born in 1729 in Connecticut. He was the first American Episcopal bishop in America. Seabury was educated at Yale College where he studied theology. Seabury, an Anglican bishop, was the rector of the Christ Church in New Brunswick, New Jersey. He had a strong and determined personality and was a devout Christian. He was so popular that "...his church was described as always crowded & often so that all have not room to sit."<sup>40</sup>

Seabury penned several pamphlets as "A Westchester Farmer" in which he defended and called upon the "farmer" to oppose the "elite." In his first pamphlet, *Free Thoughts on the Proceedings on the Continental Congress held at Philadelphia (1774)*, Seabury writes from the point of view of a farmer, for farmers. It is a response to the First Continental Congress and he defends the right to trade with other countries under the authority of Great Britain.

"The manufacturers of Great-Britain, the inhabitants of Ireland, and of the West-Indies, have done us no injury. They have been no ways instrumental in bringing our distresses upon us. Shall we then revenge ourselves upon them? Shall we endeavour to starve them into a compliance with our humours? Shall we, without any provocation, tempt or force them into riots and insurrections which must be attended with the ruin of many—probably with the death of some of them? Shall we attempt to unsettle the whole British Government—to throw all into confusion, because our self-will is not complied with? Because the ill-projected, ill-conducted, abominable scheme of some of the colonists, to form a republican government independent of Great-Britain, cannot otherwise succeed?—Good God!"<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Gregg L Frazer, *God against the Revolution: The Loyalist Clergy's Case against the American Revolution (American Political Thought)*, Kansas, University Press of Kansas, 2018, 42.

<sup>41</sup> Samuel Seabury, *Free Thoughts on the Proceedings on the Continental Congress held at Philadelphia*, 1774.

Seabury followed with a second pamphlet, *The Congress Canvassed or, an Examination into The Conduct of the Delegates at their Grand Convention* (1774) in which he writes as A. W. Farmer (A Westchester Farmer), but from the point of view of ‘a plain countryman.’ In this pamphlet, he argues the other side of trade and it is addressed to the merchants.

“You, sometime ago, Gentlemen, joined with the other citizens of New-York, in sending Delegates to represent your city in the Congress at Philadelphia. Let me intreat you to reflect a little upon the motives on which you then acted.--Did you expect that the Congress would consult upon, and enter into some reasonable and probable scheme for accommodating our unhappy disputes with our mother country, and of securing and rendering permanent our own privileges and liberties?”<sup>42</sup>

This second pamphlet inspired a response by Alexander Hamilton titled *A Full Vindication of the Measures of Congress*. Hamilton said that the Westchester Farmer was not a farmer, but a sophist. This started the pamphlet war between Samuel Seabury and Alexander Hamilton that resulted in one more pamphlet from each of them.

In his sermon, *A Discourse on II Tim III 16*, he attempted to “...recall people to the study of the scriptures themselves, and to the proper use of their reason and understanding.”<sup>43</sup> With this he intends to connect people to studying scripture and then to apply them to their lives, including their thoughts on the American Revolution.

#### John Joachim Zubly

John Joachim Zubly was born in Switzerland in 1742. After being ordained in the German Reformed Church in London in 1744, he came to America and settled in South Carolina. He became the first pastor of the Independent Presbyterian Church of Savannah.

---

<sup>42</sup> Samuel Seabury, *The Congress Canvassed or, an Examination into The Conduct of the Delegates at their Grand Convention*, 1774.

<sup>43</sup> Samuel Seabury, *A Discourse on II Tim III 16*, New York, Hugh Gaine, 1777.

Unlike the other preachers discussed here, Zubly did not start out as a Loyalist. In fact, he began by writing pamphlets in defense of the colonists and their conflicts with Great Britain. After the Stamp Act of 1766, Zubly wrote a series of pamphlets addressing the atrocities of Great Britain on the colonies. Even though he believed in liberty, he never supported true independence. “He preached liberty and constitutionalism, and delivered endless assaults on the established church, yet he never embraced separation.”<sup>44</sup>

Zubly’s pamphlet *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*, was his first, and most well-known, pamphlet. It was in response to the Stamp Act of 1766. Zubly authored it as “a freeholder of South Carolina”. In it, Zubly lays out his argument for the American Colonies, as well as his defense of Great Britain.

“The argument on which the *Americans* seem to lay the greatest stress is, they say that it is a principle of the *British* constitution that no *Englishman* ought to be taxed but by his own consent, given either by himself or his representative. I find it admitted by such as disapprove the *American* claims, that no man is bound by any law to which he hath not given his consent either in person or by a representative”<sup>45</sup>

With this, Zubly shows that he does not support taxation without representation and that he aligns with the colonists that are beginning to rise up against Great Britain. However, Zubly also supported remaining under the authority of Great Britain and did not want to see independence. In the same pamphlet, he goes on to say:

I confess I should be sorry to see *America* independent of *Great-Britain*, and if any of the arguments the *Americans* make use of imply an independency on the mother state, I should shrewdly suspect there must be some fallacy couched under an otherwise specious appearance. The sum and strength of this inference I conceive lies thus: The *British* legislature must be the supreme power in all the *British* dominions, and if so, all the

---

<sup>44</sup> Joseph Locke, “Compelled to Dissent: The Politicization of Rev. John Joachim Zubly, 1760-1776,” *The Georgia Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 94 No. 4, Winter 2010, 457.

<sup>45</sup> John Joachim Zubly, *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*, 1769.

*British* dominions ought to pay obedience in all cases to all the laws in which they are mentioned that may be enacted.”<sup>46</sup>

In closing, Zubly united Great Britain and the American colonies with, “Those whom God hath joined together, (Great-Britain and America▪ Liberty and Loyalty) let no man put asunder: And may peace and prosperity ever attend this happy union.”<sup>47</sup>

Zubly served as a member of the Provincial Congress of Georgia in 1775 and delivered his most widely circulated sermon and pamphlet at its opening. In *The Law of Liberty, A Sermon on American Affairs* Zubly solidified his reputation as being in defense of what was becoming the Patriot side of the American Revolution. *Law of Liberty* was so well received that it was printed in Philadelphia and London.

Because of his stance in *Law of Liberty*, Zubly was appointed to the Second Continental Congress and took his seat in Philadelphia on September 15, 1775. Even though he continued to argue for independence, he remained against separation from Great Britain. When calls for independence began to increase, Zubly decided that it was time for him to go. By November 1775, he was labeled a traitor and removed from his seat.

#### David George

David George was born a black slave in Virginia in 1742. A master’s children taught him to read and write by using the *Holy Bible*. It was through this that he became exposed and converted to Christianity. He later became a Baptist minister at the Silver Bluff Church, in Savannah, Georgia, widely known as the first black church in America.

---

<sup>46</sup> John Joachim Zubly, *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*, 1769

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

Although preserved copies of his sermons are not readily available, there is record of an accounting of his life that offers a glimpse into David George. In *An Account of the Life of Mr. David George*, George stated that, while at Silver Bluff, preachers were not permitted to visit, "...lest they furnish us with too much knowledge."<sup>48</sup> It was at that time that George was promoted to preacher at Silver Bluff.

On November 7, 1775, Lord Dunmore, royal governor of Virginia, issued a proclamation offering freedom to, "...all indented Servants, Negroes, or Others (appertaining to Rebels) free, that are able and willing to bear Arms, they joining His Majesty's Troops..."<sup>49</sup> David George was one of, "...approximately twenty thousand black slaves joined the British during the revolution – roughly the same number as the whites who joined loyalist regiments."<sup>50</sup> In 1783, George left America, as promised by the British, and settled in Shelburne, Nova Scotia. He did not have a church there, so he preached in the woods. A white man in Nova Scotia felt sympathy for him and allowed him to set up a church in Shelburne. He became so popular as a preacher that he was invited to travel to preach to both whites and blacks alike.

### Denominations

Religion played a substantial role in the American Revolution and denominations within religion helped to fuel the fight. "These earliest colonies founded in America brought with them from the Old World the religious hatreds and competitions they had known across the ocean."<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> David George, "An Account of the Life of Mr. David George," *Unchained Voices: An Anthology of Black Authors in the English-Speaking World of the Eighteenth Century*, Lexington, University of Kentucky Press, 1996, 333.

<sup>49</sup> Lord Dunmore, *Dunmore's Proclamation*, Early American Imprint, Series 1 No. 14592

<sup>50</sup> Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World*, New York, Alfred A Knopf Publishers, 2011.

<sup>51</sup> Robert A. Baker, "Baptists and the American Revolution," *Baptist History and Heritage*, Vol. 11 No. 3, 1976, 151.

Some denominations were formed out of the dishevel that occurred in England that drove colonists to the New World, so it stands to reason that the animosity would continue.

In the American colonies, as in England, Anglicans looked to the church as a source of strength and stability. The Church of England was central to everything in their lives. American Anglicans were in favor of establishing the hierarchy, including bishops to lead the churches. “Dissenter” religions were those denominations that opposed the hierarchy, including establishing bishops, of the Church of England. Dissenter denominations were Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Methodist and many others. The argument for and against bishops and the Church of England helped fuel the outrage that led up to the Revolutionary era.

On the one hand, Anglican clergymen thought that allowing these dissenter denominations to gain traction would also allow for less than desirable traits in people and would cause radicalism. Samuel Seabury said the colonies would be, “...overrun with infidelity and deism, Methodism and New Light, with every species and every degree of skepticism and enthusiasm.”<sup>52</sup>

In looking at the four preachers introduced in this research, it should be noted that they were all Loyalists, but not all of the same denomination. Charles Inglis and Samuel Seabury were Anglican bishops. John Joachim Zubly was a Presbyterian minister. David George was a Baptist preacher. As we take a look at the denominations outlined here, we will see that they do not have denominational ideology in common.

---

<sup>52</sup> Samuel Seabury, to the Society of Propagation of the Gospel, April 17, 1766.

## Anglicanism

As touched on in chapter one, Anglicanism is defined as, "...one of the major branches of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Protestant Reformation and a form of Christianity."<sup>53</sup> Anglicanism was formed out of the Church of England and was the most controversial denomination during the American Revolution. This was in part because Patriots viewed the Church of England as being so attached to Great Britain that it was against freedom. Interestingly enough, though, is that George Washington and Thomas Jefferson were both of the Anglican faith.

In religion, it was generally considered that the Anglican faith were Loyalists and the Congregationalist and Presbyterian faith were Patriots. This was, in part, due to those of the Anglican faith having taken an oath of allegiance to the king of England.

Anglican churches were protected through the Church of England – the "official" church of the American colonies – and were supported through tax dollars. This, of course, became an issue during the Revolutionary era due to separation of church and state.

The Anglican church was a result of Protestantism and had separated itself from Roman Catholicism. However, it retained the role of bishops in the church and in politics.

After the passing of the Stamp Act in 1765, Anglican clergy in New England stated that they did not want their parishes to resist the Stamp Act. This both solidified their alignment with Great Britain and drove a wedge between them and the American colonies. The New England clergy also, "...chose to redouble their efforts to secure a bishop for America, using the

---

<sup>53</sup> William L. Sachs and Dean, Ralph Stanley, "Anglicanism," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, April 02, 2020 <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Anglicanism> Accessed 11 December 2020.

argument that...by strengthening the Anglican church in America, loyalty to the crown would be increased.”<sup>54</sup>

### Congregationalism

As touched on in chapter one, Congregationalism is a Protestant system based on local churches being self-governing. It was originally based on the Puritan Church in New England. Congregationalists were generally considered Patriots, but there were Loyalist Congregational churches, too, as they generally followed the lead of their pastor. As a sub denomination of the Puritan faith, Congregationalist knew, all too well, the controversy with the Church of England that found Puritans fleeing to the American colonies in the first place.

Congregational ministers tended to side with their congregations, and vice versa, which were predominantly Patriots. The ministers also did not support appointing bishops in the American colonies. “The bishop question was one issue that united Old Light and New Light Congregationalists and Presbyterians against Anglicans.”<sup>55</sup> These two issues were at the core of the position that Congregationalists took during the Revolutionary era.

Of the preachers discussed in this research, Samuel Seabury, an Episcopal (Anglican) bishop, notably opposed Congregationalists. Even though he aligned with the Loyalist movement, he had a vision of a republic; however, “...the New England Congregationalists and Presbyterians will be the cause of civil wars in an independent America.”<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> William Warren Sweet, “The Role of the Anglicans in the American Revolution,” *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 11 No. 1, November 1947, 53.

<sup>55</sup> Gregg L Frazer, *God Against the Revolution: The Loyalist Clergy’s Case against the American Revolution (American Political Thought)*, Kansas. University Press of Kansas. 2018, 23.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.* 24.

## Presbyterianism

As touched on in chapter one, Presbyterianism is also a Protestant system, but differs from Congregationalism, in that the governance is through a system of church elders and is most prominently recognized as having a basis in the Church of Scotland. Presbyterians were generally considered Patriots.

Because the Presbyterian religion evolved directly from conflict in England and was labeled a “dissenter” religion, King George III even called the American Revolution, the “Presbyterian Rebellion.”

Of the preachers discussed in the research, John Joachim Zubly was a Presbyterian. However, despite Presbyterians being considered mostly Patriots, this might help to see why Zubly was not for actual independence from Great Britain.

## Baptist

As touched on in chapter one, the Baptist religion is also a Protestant denomination that believes in the full immersion of believers for the baptism and do not, generally, believe in infant baptism.

Just before the onset of the American Revolutionary war, the colony of Rhode Island, a Baptist colony, formally withdrew allegiance to Great Britain and King George III. “Baptists were among the first of all religious denominations to recognize the validity of the work of the First Continental Congress.”<sup>57</sup>

Baptists were also likely the most persecuted in the Revolutionary era. Baptist churches and preachers refused to get a license to preach or to pay taxes to support the Church of England.

---

<sup>57 57</sup> Robert A. Baker, “Baptists and the American Revolution,” *Baptist History and Heritage*, Vol. 11 No. 3, 1976, 156.

Oftentimes when they did attempt to get a license to preach, they were refused. It was then that they sought places to preach anyway – fields, rivers, barns, etc. This often led to mocking by the crowd that gathered.

Of the preachers researched here, David George was Baptist. Considering that Baptists were predominantly Patriots, it is unusual for a Baptist preacher to align with the side of the Loyalists. In the case of David George, his reasons for becoming a Loyalists had more to do with the promise of freedom.

#### Biblical Themes and Verses

In his book, *Reading the Bible with the Founding Fathers*, Daniel Driesbach says, “Following an extensive survey of American political literature from 1760 to 1805, political scientist Donald S. Lutz reported that the Bible was referenced more frequently than any European writer or even any European school of thought...”<sup>58</sup>

For the purposes of this research, we will look at the two most well-known Bible passages used during the Revolutionary era: 1 Peter: 2 and Romans 13. These two passages were heavily used by Loyalist preachers because they discuss government and obedience. During the Revolutionary era, government and obedience were two of the main conflicts, so it stands to reason that sermons would revolve around this. Gregg L. Frazer tells us, “Ministers who remained loyal to Great Britain argued from the ‘very simply constructed text’ of 1 Peter 2 and the accepted, literal reading of Romans 13.”<sup>59</sup>

The main part of the passages embraced by Loyalists were 1 Peter 2: 13-17 and Romans 13: 1-7.

---

<sup>58</sup> Daniel L. Driesbach, *Reading the Bible with the Founding Fathers*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2017, 2.

<sup>59</sup> Gregg L. Frazer, *The Religious Beliefs of America’s Founders: Reason, Revelation, and Revolution (American Political Thought)*, Kansas, University Press of Kansas, 2014, 82.

## 1 Peter 2

*Therefore, submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether to the king as supreme, or to governors, as to those who are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers and for the praise of those who do good. For this is the will of God, that by doing good you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men as free, yet not using liberty as a cloak for vice but as bond-servants of God. Honor all people. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the King – I Peter 2: 13-17*

## Romans 13

*Let every soul be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and the authorities that exist are appointed by God. Therefore, whoever resists the ordinance of God, and those who resist will bring judgement on themselves. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil. So you want to be unafraid of the authority? Do what is good, and you will have praise from the same. For he is God's minister to you for good. But if you do evil, be afraid; for he does not bear the sword in vain; for he is God's minister, an avenger to execute wrath on him who practices evil. Therefore, you must be subject, not only because of wrath but also for conscience sake. For because of this you also pay taxes, for they are God's ministers attending continually to this very thing. Render therefore all their due: taxes to whom taxes are due, customs to whom customs, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor. – Romans 13:1-7*

Loyalist clergy used these verses as a resounding point of remaining loyal to Great Britain. They claimed that God had ordered his people to submit to authority and that, by seeking independence from Great Britain, they were going against God.

As an example, Samuel Seabury used 1 Peter 2 and Romans 13 in a sermon to his congregation:

“Our duty to obey our Rulers and Governors arises from our Duty to obey God. He has commanded us to obey Magistrates; to honor all Men according to their Degree in Authority. If we fear God we shall obey his Command from a Principle of Duty to him. – Civil Government is the Institution and Ordinance of God: -- He hath ordained and the Powers that are.”<sup>60</sup>

In this example, Seabury is pointing out, that according to the Bible, God made the hierarchy of the Government and that the people should not question that authority. This use of 1 Peter 2 was commonly used by Loyalist preachers as a way to convince people that they should not go against Great Britain. A sermon such as Seabury’s would certainly convince people that they should remain on the side of Great Britain.

“Eighteenth-century Americans lived in a culture shaped by Christianity and its sacred texts...the Bible, more than any other written word, informed the world of the founding fathers and the society around them.”<sup>61</sup> With that being said, how, then, would Patriot preachers respond to these sermons?

One answer is found in John Locke’s “popular sovereignty” in saying that no rule or law is legitimate unless it was given by consent of the persons concerned. In discussing popular sovereignty, Gregg L. Frazer, says that some preachers also used a combination of popular

---

<sup>60</sup> Samuel Seabury, *St Peter’s Exhortation to Fear God and Honor the King, Explained and Inculcated*, New York, H. Gaine, 1777.

<sup>61</sup> Daniel L. Driesbach, *Reading the Bible with the Founding Fathers*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2017, 5.

sovereignty and liberal democratic theory, "...others tried to find popular sovereignty in biblical texts and, thereby, "harmonize" liberal democratic theory with Scripture."<sup>62</sup>

Some Patriot preachers took on the task of reevaluating 1 Peter 2 and Romans 13 and offering a different explanation. John Tucker, pastor of the First Church of Newbury, gave an Election Day Sermon in 1771 that included the following:

"For, even a Christian people who, from their character, as servants of God, are bound to submit to the higher powers, and to obey Magistrates, are not, out of courtly complaisance to their Rulers, or from a mean, timorous, and slavish temper, to resign up their just rights, when imperiously demanded, or craftily sought after. Remembering they are freemen and not slaves, they should act as free. They have an undoubted privilege to complain of unconstitutional measures in government, and of unlawful incroachments upon their rights, and may, while they do it, with becoming decency, do it with -- that noble freedom and firmness, which a sense of wrong, joined with the love of liberty, will inspire."<sup>63</sup>

The clear argument that Tucker was presenting was that, God did not make people to be slaves of government and that the people had the right to stand up to a tyrannical government. In the Revolutionary era, these arguments concerning scripture helped to further the divide between the people and Great Britain, and were instrumental in choosing whether to be a Loyalist or a Patriot.

### Conclusion

In this chapter, we have taken a look at four preachers who remained loyal to Great Britain, as well as a sampling of the most prevalent denominations and biblical verses of the time. It should be noted that our four preachers do not necessarily fit the mold of the denomination that they represented. For instance, Baptists were predominantly Patriots;

---

<sup>62</sup> Gregg L. Frazer, *The Religious Beliefs of America's Founders: Reason, Revelation, and Revolution (American Political Thought)*, Kansas, University Press of Kansas, 2014, 90.

<sup>63</sup> John Tucker, *Election Day Sermon*, 1771. <https://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/document/an-election-sermon/> Accessed 10 February 27, 2021

however, David George, a Baptist preacher, remained loyal to Great Britain. As a black slave promised his freedom, it is no surprise that George chose to be a Loyalist. He also chose to remain a Baptist. One has to wonder if that is due to the Baptist religion being the one he was exposed to.

In looking at biblical verses and themes, we can see how particular verses were taken in a literal as well as a figurative sense. The way they were taken was determined by which side was using the verse.

## Chapter Three: Propaganda, Pamphlets and the *Holy Bible*

### Introduction

As we have learned in previous chapters, the colonists in the Revolutionary era had many commonalities: Christianity, culture and countries. Christianity was very prominent in the lives of the colonists. Loyalists and Patriots shared the commonality of Christianity as the majority were of the Christian faith. As united as they were in Christianity, they were divided on which side they chose to stand on. Culture was also a commonality that the colonists shared. Andy Crouch states, “It is what human beings make of the world. It always bears the stamp of our creativity, our God given desire to making something more than we were given.”<sup>64</sup> The colonists were all creating culture in a new world. At the same time, being largely European in ownership, the colonists were clinging to the culture that they were familiar with. Loyalists and Patriots had a commonality of culture, but were still divided on which side they aligned with. The third commonality discussed was that of countries. The four preachers discussed in this paper varied in their country of origin and birth, but they were all closely aligned with the European culture. However, in looking at the Colonists as a whole, we see that there were many Patriots with the same country of origin and culture as our Loyalist preachers. Yet, again, they were divided on which side of the American Revolution they aligned with.

In looking at our four Loyalist preachers, we can see that their loyalty to the British crown and their base of Christianity as a religion are about all they had in common. Charles

---

<sup>64</sup> Andy Crouch, *Culture Making: Recovering our Creative Calling*, Illinois, InterVarsity Press, 2008, 23.

Inglis was born in Ireland and was an Ulster Irish-Scotsman. He was an Anglican bishop at Trinity Church in New York. Samuel Seabury was born in Connecticut, studied theology at Yale College and was an American Episcopal bishop. John Joachim Zubly was born in Switzerland and was ordained in the German Reformed Church in London. He was the first pastor of the Independent Presbyterian Church of Savannah. David George was born in Virginia and was a black slave. His master's children taught him to read and write using the *Holy Bible*. He became a Baptist minister in Savannah.

As we can see, the colonists in the Revolutionary era had many things in common. Those of Christianity, culture and country are considered commonalities that bond people to one another. Our Loyalists preachers show that there were also many differences when they are looked at in an investigative way – yet, they were united in their cause to remain loyal to Great Britain.

What was it that caused one person to choose one side and another person to choose another side? It was not the things they had in common – nor was it the things that they differed on. It is important to understand that many historians consider the American Revolution as the first civil war in America. It truly was brother against brother and father against son. Benjamin Franklin's own son, William, was a steadfast Loyalist. So, it wasn't familial ideology that determined whether a person chose to be a Patriot over a Loyalist either. One answer lies in the propaganda of the time.

### Propaganda

According to the Merriam Webster dictionary, propaganda is defined as: the spreading of ideas, information, or rumor for the purpose of helping or injuring an institution, a cause, or a

person; and ideas, facts, or allegations spread deliberately to further one's cause or to damage an opposing cause.

Propaganda is also considered “emotive language” that evokes an emotional response to a subject, rather than a rational response. In this emotive language, there might be a play on words or an image that tugs at the emotions of various people. Usually, words that elicit emotion are used: freedom, justice, hope, suppress, conquer, conspiracy, loyalty, duty, command. In the Revolutionary era, the Patriots may have used freedom, justice and hope to persuade people to join their side. They may have also used suppress, conquer and conspiracy to invoke emotion to what might happen if Great Britain remained in control. Loyalists may have used loyalty, duty and command to describe what God had ordered His people to do in 1 Peter 2 and Romans 13. All of these words, and many more, can be used as emotive language to get the response that is desired.

In looking at a brief historiography of propaganda, we can see that propaganda was not a new thing. It has been used throughout the history of people trying to influence other people. For instance, in ancient Greece, Themistocles used propaganda to lure Xerxes into battle. Ancient Greeks also successfully used theater and drama as a form of propaganda.

One example of propaganda surrounding an actual event is that of Jane McCrae. During the American Revolution, a young lady named Jane McCrae was killed and her death was used extensively as propaganda. Jane lived with her Patriot brother, John McCrae, at the outbreak of the American Revolution. However, her fiancé, David Jones, was a soldier in the British army and served under Lt. General John Burgoyne. In the summer of 1777, General Burgoyne launched an attack through Lake Champlain and the Hudson River. Most colonists in that area fled before the British could reach them. Jane had received word that her fiancé, David Jones,

would be meeting up with her at Fort Edward, so she stayed there with her friend, Sara McNeil. Burgoyne had sent an advanced party of Native Americans to attack Fort Edward – and these Native Americans either captured Jane and Sara or were escorting them so Jane could meet up with her fiancé. There are varying accounts of what happened to Jane and Sara, but Jane was killed and most likely scalped. It was also said that David Jones saw Jane's scalp and recognized her hair and hairline.

General Burgoyne had to make a decision. Since the British troops were supposed to be more civilized, Burgoyne needed to punish the person or persons who had killed Jane. However, he also couldn't break his allegiance with the Native Americans. Burgoyne chose to relent and take no action against the Native Americans. This caused an enormous amount of propaganda surrounding Jane's death – deemed a “romantic tragedy” – and helped raise recruiting efforts of Patriot troops for the next several years.

The tragic death of Jane McCrae spread throughout the colonies and Great Britain, where she gained immense sympathy and support. Jane had become a heroine of the American Revolution. Her story is depicted in James Fenimore Cooper's *Last of the Mohicans* as the maiden named Dora.

Horatio Gates, a leading general for the American army, used Jane's death as propaganda in support of the American cause for freedom:

“That the savages of America should in their warfare mangle and scalp the unhappy prisoners, who fall into their hands, is neither new nor extraordinary; but that famous Lieut General Burgoyne, in whom the fine gentlemen is united with the soldier and the scholar, should hire the savages of America to scalp Europeans and the descendants of Europeans; nay more, that he should pay a price for each scalp so barbarously taken, is more than will be believed in England until authenticated facts shall in every gazette convince mankind of the truth of this horrid tale – Miss McCrae, a young lady lovely to the sight, of virtuous character and amiable disposition, engaged to be married to an officer of your army, was with other women and children taken out of a house near Fort

Edward, carried into the woods, and there scalped and mangled in the most shocking manner.”<sup>65</sup>

There are no known surviving portraits of Jane McCrae – and Horatio Gates had never seen or known her. But, his use of propaganda in describing her as virtuous, lovely and with an amiable disposition was invented to gain more sympathy for her demise. Even though her manner of death was never established, and it is unknown if she was actually scalped, through propaganda, her death had a direct impact on the American Revolution.

### Pamphlets

Every means of communication during the Revolutionary era was subject to the use of propaganda. Pamphlets, speeches, sermons, newspapers, cartoons, art and music were all used to spread messages, including propaganda, during the American Revolution. However, pamphlets were so widely used that they became the voice of the American Revolution. “It was in this form – as pamphlets – that much of the most important and characteristic writing of the American Revolution appeared.”<sup>66</sup> The pamphlet could be any size and had no set pattern. This made it the most versatile means of communication at the time. It could be just a few lines or ideals, or it could be many pages long. Pamphlets could contain sermons, speeches, political thought and tirades against whatever Act had been enforced on the colonies. Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* was published as a pamphlet. In discussing our four Loyalist preachers, we saw that some of

---

<sup>65</sup> Horatio Gates, letter to General John Burgoyne, September 16, 1777.

<sup>66</sup> Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press, 1967, 2.

their sermons had been published in pamphlets. This shows how versatile pamphlets were in the Revolutionary era.

Pamphlets could also be depictions of current events that were controversial. A drawing or engraving of a current event would include propaganda that generated an emotional response that the author was trying to illicit. It should be noted that the American Revolution was not a typical revolution in the sense that one side stood up against the other side. Instead, it was more of an event followed by another event. The Acts imposed by Great Britain began to show some resistance by the colonists. Then the Boston Massacre and the Boston Tea Party occurred that also caused colonists to resist Great Britain. These were followed by the Intolerable Acts. The Intolerable Acts were passed after the Boston Tea Party and were meant to be punitive to the colonists. The Acts within the Intolerable Acts that caused the most controversy, included the Boston Port Act, which closed the port of Boston until the tea that was destroyed was paid for; the Massachusetts Government Act which said that only the governor (who was on the side of Great Britain), Parliament or the King could appoint positions in the colonial government; and the Quartering Act which required the colonists to house British soldiers in barracks, ale houses, local inns, etc., at the expense of the colonists. With each one of these events, there was more and more resistance to Great Britain. There was a full decade between the Stamp Act and the “shot heard round the world” at Lexington and Concord. It was another eight years after that before the Revolutionary war was finally over.

These “current events” depicted in propaganda pamphlets were spread out over that course of time and allowed the Patriots to gain more and more support.



Figure 1: The "funeral" of Miss Ame-Stamp. Born 1765; Died 1766. Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Washington, D.C. 20540 USA

In Figure 1, this depicts a “funeral procession” on the banks of the Thames River after the repeal of the Stamp Act. According to the Library of Congress, one of the warehouses in the background is inscribed with "The Sheffield and Birmingham Warehouse Goods now ship'd for America." There are also two large bales on the wharf with inscriptions. One is inscribed with “Stamps from America” (Stamps that were no longer needed so were being sent back to England) and one is inscribed with “black cloth from America” for the “funeral procession.” George Grenville, Treasury Secretary, is carrying a child’s coffin labeled “Miss Ame-Stamp born 1765 died 1766.”



Figure 2; The bloody massacre perpetrated on King Street on March 5<sup>th</sup> 1770 by a party of the 29<sup>th</sup> Regt.  
 Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Washington, D.C. 20540  
 USA <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/p.print>

Figure 2 was engraved, printed and sold by Paul Revere after the Boston Massacre. According to the Library of Congress, on the right is a group of seven British soldiers who have fired into a group of civilians. The British soldiers are smiling. Three of the civilians lie bleeding on the ground and two are being lifted into the air. Behind the British soldiers, there is a building depicted as the Royal Custom house, with “Butcher’s Hall” on it. There is writing beneath the print that begins “Unhappy Boston! See thy Sons deplore, Thy hallowed Walks besmeared with guiltless Gore.” The “unhappy sufferers” depicted are listed as Saml Gray, Saml

Maverick, James Caldwell, Crispus Attucks, and Patrick Carr (killed) and it is noted that there were "Six wounded; two of them (Christr Monk & John Clark) Mortally."<sup>67</sup>

These are just two examples of the propaganda portrayed in pamphlets during the Revolutionary era. There were hundreds of pamphlets produced during this time. But, they show a small example of the emotive response that pamphleteers were attempting to achieve in order to sway one's opinion toward their side of the fight for independence.

### *The Holy Bible*

As previously discussed, biblical themes and verses were widely used to propagate views that would persuade a person to give allegiance to either the Loyalists or the Patriots. 1 Peter 2 and Romans 13 were two of the most used and recognized Bible verses as they dealt directly with allegiance to the King of England. The Loyalists used those Bible verses as a direct duty from God to honor and obey the King. For many people, this was a contentious area to argue. After all, the Bible did actually say exactly what the Loyalists stood on. Another biblical theme used by Loyalists was the Sermon on the Mount. "You have heard that it was said, "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth". But I tell you not to resist an evil person. But whoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn the other to him also."<sup>68</sup>

However, Patriot preachers began to find Bible verses and themes to contradict what the Loyalist Preachers were using. According to James Byrd, "Colonial ministers did not shy away

---

<sup>67</sup> Library of Congress Call Number: FP - XVIII - R452, no. 1 (A size) [P&P], Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Washington, D.C. 20540 <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/p.print> Accessed March 25, 2021.

<sup>68</sup> 5 Matthew 38-39, *The Bible*, Holman Study Bible KJV, Holman Bible Publishers, 2015.

from biblical violence. They embraced it, almost celebrated it, even in its most graphic forms.”<sup>69</sup>

Another biblical theme used by Patriot preachers was that of the Song of Deborah found in the book of Judges. In the Song of Deborah, the Patriot colonists found sacrifice and courage that they could identify with. They had no experience as soldiers, so embracing sacrifice and courage allowed them to fight with all they had, even in a biblical sense. The Song of Deborah also celebrated killing and to fight through military means. Another theme that the Patriots used was Moses – Moses had led God’s people from a tyrannical and oppressing land.

In an answer to the Loyalist use of Romans 13, Patriots reasoned that the governmental *system* was ordained by God, not the person who was in government at the time. The Patriots also countered Romans 13 with Acts 4-5 where the Apostles said they would obey God as opposed to civil authority.

Over time, the Patriots developed responses to the Loyalists using biblical themes and verses.

---

<sup>69</sup> James P Byrd, *Sacred Scriptures, Sacred War: The Bible and the American Revolution*, Oxford, United Kingdom, Osprey Publishing, 2008, 73.



Figure 3: Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-Resistance to the Higher Powers. Jonathan Mayhew. Library of Congress Rare Book and Special Collections Division. Library of Congress Call Number 25019814.

In Figure 3, Jonathan Mayhew, a Congregationalist preacher from Boston, delivered this influential sermon in which he argues that resistance to a tyrant (the King) is a “glorious” Christian Duty. Jonathan Mayhew preached this sermon on the anniversary of King Charles I’s death. This was one of the most read sermons during the Revolutionary era and gained support for the Patriot side during the Revolutionary era. In this sermon, Mayhew said, “Rulers have no authority from God to do mischief. It is blasphemy to call tyrants and oppressors God’s ministers.”<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Jonathan Mayhew, *Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-Resistance to the Higher Powers*. 1750.



All of these examples use emotive language and pictures. People responded to them and they persuaded them to align with a “side.” Because of this, they became one of the most successful ways to debate issues in the Revolutionary era.

This is just a few examples of the propaganda pamphlets used during the Revolutionary era. These offer a glimpse into the emotive language and drawings used to illicit support for each side. They offer a glimpse into the state of mind of the authors of these pamphlets. And possibly the state of mind of the colonists in general.

The Holy Bible was used in fiery speeches and sermons, too. Preachers from both sides used the Bible and emotive language to prompt an emotional response. Men, who weren't Christian, used the Bible to solicit an emotionally charged response during a speech. Some areas were more heavily Patriot and some areas were more heavily Loyalist. So, it stands to reason that where there were more Patriot or Loyalist speeches and sermons, the more likely it was to choose that side and that particular side would be more prominent in that area.

During the Revolutionary era, the majority of the colonists were Christian. So, this propaganda that was centered around the Bible was most persuasive for the colonists.

### Conclusion

In this chapter, we have taken a brief look at propaganda, and some of the forms propaganda took, during the Revolutionary era. Pamphlets, speeches and sermons are the forms that have been covered here. But it was the propaganda surrounding the Bible that was most persuasive.

Of our preachers discussed in previous chapters, Charles Inglis and Samuel Seabury are most associated with propaganda. Although, Inglis used propaganda more than any of our

preachers, due to his pamphlet war with Thomas Paine. Inglis said of *Common Sense*, “I find no *Common Sense* in this pamphlet, but much *uncommon* frenzy.”<sup>71</sup>

This propaganda also surrounded the two verses previously discussed, Romans 13 and 1 Peter 2. These were the two themes that had to most controversy and propaganda surrounding them.

---

<sup>71</sup> Charles Inglis, *The Deceiver Unmasked: or, Loyalty and Interest United: in Answer to a Pamphlet Called Common Sense*, New York, Samuel London, 1776.

## Chapter Four:

### Conclusion

The introduction of this research started out with; *Popular history isn't always accurate history*. At this time, I would like to add that the Revolutionary era was a complex mixture of all the things discussed here and so much more. The decision to align with a “side” during the Revolutionary era, was never a cut and dry, black and white decision. There was a jumble of many shades of grey that every person had to – and was made to – consider. Persons reading this paper have learned about the American Revolution in, most likely, elementary school. What each of us learned may be slightly or significantly different depending on the era we were taught in or the textbook chosen by their school district. A person learning in the 1960s may have learned from the Progressive school of thought. A person learning in the 2000s may have learned from the New Loyalist school of thought. Our *experience* with learning may vary greatly and our conclusions may be vastly different.

In discussing commonalities, we also had to take a look at differences. There was no single religion that was all Loyalist or all Patriot. That goes for country of origin and culture, too. While there were areas in the colonies that were predominantly Loyalist or Patriot, the people who lived in those areas were a mixture of different forms of Christianity, culture and countries.

The American Revolutionary “era” timeline is loosely defined as 1763-1783. In 1763, Britain was victorious over France and this set a precedent for the struggle over the North American colonies. The Stamp Act was passed in 1765, which created more controversy between Great Britain and the colonists. The Revolutionary war officially began in 1776 and ended in 1781. This conflict that culminated in the birth of the United States of America was

spread over a twenty-year span. There were many mishaps, events, skirmishes, arguments, Acts passed, and so on, that caused a divide in the Colonists and how they perceived the influence by Great Britain. In the beginning of the Revolutionary era, the majority of the Colonists shared the commonality of not wanting to go to war. As each Act was passed by the British crown, a wedge was driven further and further between the Colonists. “By February 1776, when Congress received the Prohibitory Act, the possibility of reconciliation was remote.”<sup>72</sup> At that point, there had already been thirteen years of Acts, arguments and hope for reconciliation. There had been thirteen years of people being influenced one way or another and for anger to build. There had been enough time that any commonality the Colonists may have had with one another, was far outweighed by the need to establish which side of this revolution they were going to align with.

In discussing our preachers – Charles Inglis, Samuel Seabury, John Joachim Zubly and David George – we also discussed their commonalities and differences. There were many Loyalist preachers. When this research was begun and I was looking at Loyalist preachers, I couldn’t help but notice these four preachers did not align with what is considered normal for who they were, where they preached and if they chose to be a Loyalist or Patriot. For instance, the majority of Baptists were Patriots. Yet, David George, who was born a black slave, became a Baptist minister. Did he choose to be a Loyalist because of the opportunity presented by Lord Dunsmore? One would think that was more likely than not. This put him out of the normal for a Baptist preacher in the American Revolution.

Charles Inglis, an Anglican minister, would be considered normal for his denomination. But, as noted before, he did not believe that the colonists should just bow down to the King.

“Charles Inglis did not believe in subjugation to the King; he affirmed the right of petition, Yet,

---

<sup>72</sup> Robert Middlekauff, *The Glorious Cause: The American Revolution, 1763-1789*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2005, 322.

when the choice was between either submission to the King and the laws of Parliament or open resistance through rebellion, Inglis preached that one's religious duty required subjugation."<sup>73</sup> Inglis varied from the normal because he didn't fit the mold of most Anglicans and most Loyalists. He believed that the people had the right to question and petition Great Britain for what they felt was right in the Colonies. However, he did not believe that an act of rebellion was the answer if it came down to it.

Samuel Seabury most aligned with the Loyalist thoughts and was an Anglican bishop. However, his father was a Congregationalist minister, and the majority of Congregationalists were Patriots. Seabury also came from at least one generation of American born resident. Therefore, he had always been in America and far removed from Great Britain. Due to his father's influence, as a Congregationalist minister, and that he had been born and raised in America, one would think that he would align more with the Patriots. Seabury's pamphlets as "A Westchester Farmer" and his popularity as a preacher, helped to sway many to the Loyalist point of view.

John Joachim Zubly was a Presbyterian minister. The majority of Presbyterians were Patriots as the Presbyterian religion evolved from conflict in England. King George III often referred to the American Revolution as the "Presbyterian Rebellion." As previously discussed, Zubly was not actually for separation from Great Britain. He argued for the rights of the colonists, but not separation. Zubly was a great pamphleteer. In the beginning, his pamphlets defended the colonists and their arguments against Great Britain. Zubly also served as a member of the Provincial Congress of Georgia in 1775 and was appointed to the Second Continental

---

<sup>73</sup> Mary F. Gunter and James S. Taylor, "Loyalist Propaganda in the Sermons of Charles Inglis, 1779-1780," *Western Speech*, Vol. 37 No. 4, January 1973, 49.

Congress. As the colonies moved toward a rebellion for independence, Zubly made the decision to align with the Loyalists.

Our four preachers chosen here were examples of the multifaceted decision to fight for independence or remain loyal to Great Britain. Even though they had the commonality of being Preachers and being Loyalists, they were vastly different in culture and country and how they got to the decisions they made.

All of this brings us to what was arguably the most influential thing in the American Revolution: Propaganda. Propaganda was especially prevalent in the form of pamphlets. “It was in this form – as pamphlets – that much of the most important writing of the American Revolution appeared.”<sup>74</sup>

As discussed earlier, propaganda used emotive language. It is designed to illicit an emotional response to a given event or situation. As we can see, the decision to declare oneself a Loyalist or Patriot was quite incredibly involved. It was never an easy decision and many colonists struggled mightily with it.

In looking at Jane McCrae, her fiancé was a British soldier and her brother, whom she lived with, was a Patriot. Benjamin Franklin’s son, William, was a Loyalist. There were many colonists, perhaps even the majority of them, that found themselves in the same situation as Jane McCrae and Benjamin Franklin. Many had close family in Great Britain and felt an allegiance to them, as well as to the King. Many had been immersed in the culture of Great Britain and that played a part in their decision.

Propaganda laden pamphlets allowed the writer to attempt to tug at the heart strings of the reader. In the examples of pamphlets included in this research, we can see the emotional

---

<sup>74</sup> Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, Cambridge, Mass Harvard University Press, 1967, 2.

aspect of the propaganda and how that could have swayed someone who had not made a decision. We can also see how this propaganda could have caused someone who had made a decision to change their mind – sometimes many times. There was almost a constant barrage of reactions and propaganda to Acts, events and situations, from both Loyalists and Patriots.

The propaganda surrounding the *Holy Bible* was one of the most widely used forms of propaganda. During the Revolutionary era, the majority of the colonists were Christian in their religion. The discussion in this research of the interpretations and propaganda surrounding I Peter 2 and Romans 13 shows that the colonists had to be in constant conflict over what to believe.

The two main Bible passages discussed here dealt directly with the government and what God tells us to do. When the Patriots began to evaluate and take on a different interpretation of I Peter 2 and Romans 13, the colonists had to reevaluate their own beliefs. Loyalists and Patriots, including preachers, interpreted the passages in both a literal and a figurative sense – and then created propaganda pamphlets surrounding their interpretation.

In the introduction to this research, this author stated: *“The time leading up to and during, the American Revolution saw a significant number of American colonists turn against Great Britain and come into their own country.”*<sup>75</sup> *As the Patriots (those for the Revolution) gained strength, it would seem that it would have been much easier for the Loyalists (those against the Revolution) to go along with the status quo. However, the Loyalists chose to remain loyal to their interpretation of the Bible, God and Great Britain and some paid a heavy price for that. Understanding the Biblical themes that the Loyalists stood on and how they applied those*

---

<sup>75</sup> Christena Leaverton, “The Loyalist Culture,” HIST 512, Liberty University, April 27, 2020.

*beliefs in their effort to remain loyal, will allow one to understand how this influenced and shaped beliefs and culture today.*

The hope in this research is that the reader gets a glimpse of the many struggles that colonists faced, as well as some of the reasons that they – Loyalist and Patriot alike – made the decisions that they did. The hope is also that instead of casting away Loyalists as Tories and traitors, that we can gain a better understanding of the many conflicting things that went into their individual decisions.

The hope is also that we can see how propaganda, which has been around since ancient times, was so prevalent during the American Revolution and influenced many people into making a choice – much like it does today.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources:

- Unknown. "An Address to the People of Great Britain from the Oppressed Loyalists of America. *The Public Advisor*. London, Greater London, England. 97 Novemer 1775.
- Unknown. *The True Interest of America, Impartially Stated, in Certain Scriptures on a Pamphlet Called Common Sense*. Philadelphia. James Humphrey. 1776.
- Andrews, Samuel. *A Sermon Preached at Litchfield, in Connecticut, before a Voluntary Convention of the Clergy of the Church of England of Several Provinces in America.* 1770.
- Auchmuty, Samuel; Chandler, Thomas B.; Cooper, Miles; Ogilvie, John; Charlton, Richard; Seabury, Samuel; Inglis, Charles; Beach, Abraham. "An address from the Clergy of New-York and New-Jersey, to the Episcopalians in Virginia; Occasioned by Some Late Transactions in that Colony Relative to an American Episcopate." New York. Hugh Gaine. 1771.
- Boucher, Jonathan. "A Farewell Sermon." *View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution; In Thirteen Discourses, Preached in North America Between the Years 1763 and 1775*. 1797.
- Corn-cob, Jonathan (fictitious name). *Adventures of Jonathan Corn-Cob, loyal American refugee. Written by himself*. London, 1787.
- Cox, Francis Augustus. *History of the Baptist Missionary Society, from 1792-1842*. 2 Vols. London. T. Ward and Co., and G. J. Dyer. 1842.
- Cruden, John. *An Address to the Loyal Part of the British Empire, and the Friends of Monarchy Throughout the Globe*. London. 1785.
- Gates, Horatio. Letter to General John Burgoyne. September 2, 1777.
- George, David. "An account of the Life of Mr. David George." *Unchained Voices: An Anthology of Black Authors in the English-Speaking World of the Eighteenth Century*. Lexington. University of Kentucky Press, 1996. 330-334.
- Inglis, Charles. "A Sermon on Philip. III. 20, 21." New York. H. Gaine. 1777.
- Inglis, Charles. "The Christian Soldier's Duty Briefly Delineated." New York. H. Gaines. 1777.
- Inglis, Charles. *The Duty of Honoring the King*. New York. H. Gaine. 1780.
- Inglis, Charles. *The Deceiver Unmasked; or, Loyalty and Interest United: in Answer to a Pamphlet Called Common Sense*. New York. Samuel London. 1776.
- Inglis, Charles. *The True Interest of American Impartially Stated, in Certain Strictures on a Pamphlet Intitled Common Sense*. Philadelphia. James Humphreys Jr. 1776.
- Library of Congress Call Number PC 1 - 4140f (A size) [P&P]. Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Washington, D.C. 20540 USA <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/pp.print>  
Accessed March 25, 2021

Library of Congress Call Number: FP - XVIII - R452, no. 1 (A size) [P&P], Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Washington, D.C. 20540  
<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/p.print> Accessed March 25, 2021.

Library of Congress Call Number: 25019814. Library of Congress Rare Book and Special Collection Division. <https://lccn.loc.gov/25019814> Accessed March 26, 2021.

Lydekker, John Wolfe. *The Life and Letters of Charles Inglis.* London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1936.

Mayhew, Jonathan. *Observations on the Charter and Conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.* Boston. Richard and Samuel Draper. 1763.

Seabury, Samuel. *The Congress Canvassed or, an Examination into The Conduct of the Delegates at their Grand Convention.* 1774.

Seabury, Samuel. "A Discourse on II Time. III. 16." New York. Hugh Gaine. 1777.

Seabury, Samuel. "Discourse on Brotherly Love." New York. Hugh Gaine. 1777.

Samuel Seabury. *Free Thoughts on the Proceedings of the Continental Congress held at Philadelphia.* 1774.

Seabury, Samuel. *St. Peter's Exhortation To fear God and honor the KING, Explained and Inculcated.* New York. H. Gaine. 1777.

Smith, William. "A Sermon on the Present Situation of American Affairs." Philadelphia. James Humphreys, Jr. 1775.

Tucker, John. *Election Day Sermon.* 1771.

Zubly, John Joachim. "An Humble Enquiry." 1769.

Zubly, John Joachim. "The Law of Liberty." Philadelphia. 1775.

### **Secondary Monographs:**

Bailyn, Bernard. *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution.* Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press. 1967.

Baldwin, Alice M. *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution.* New York. Frederick Ungar. 1958.

Bangs, Nathan. *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church from its Origin in 1776 to the General Conference of 1840.* 4 Vols. New York. T Mason and G Lane. 1839-42.

Byrd, James P. *Sacred Scripture, Sacred War: The Bible and the American Revolution.* New York. Oxford University Press. 1965.

Chartrand, Rene. *American Loyalist Troops 1775-84 (Men at Arms).* Oxford, United Kingdom. Osprey Publishing. 2008.

Chopra, Ruma. *Unnatural Rebellion: Loyalists in New York During the Revolution.* Charlottesville and London. University of Virginia Press. 2011.

- Crouch, Andy. *Culture Making: Recovering our Creative Calling*. Illinois. InterVarsity Press. 2008.
- Davidson, Philip. *Propaganda and the American Revolution, 1763-1783*. North Carolina. University of North Carolina. 1941.
- Driesbach, Daniel. *Reading the Bible with the Founding Fathers*. New York. Oxford University Press. 2017.
- Frazer, Gregg L. *God against the Revolution: The Loyalist Clergy's Case against the American Revolution (American Political Thought)*. Kansas. University Press of Kansas. 2018.
- Frazer, Gregg L. *The Religious Beliefs of America's Founders: Reason, Revelation, and Revolution (American Political Thought.)* Kansas. University Press of Kansas. 2014.
- Frey, Sylvia R. *The British Soldier in America: A Social History of Military Life in the Revolutionary Period*. Texas. University of Texas Press. 1981.
- Jasanoff, Maya. *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World*. New York. Alfred A Knopf Publishers. 2011.
- Middlekauff, Robert. *The Glorious Cause: the American Revolution, 1763-1789*. New York. Oxford University Press. 2005.
- Napier, Tanya. *The Totally TEA-rific TEA Party Book*. San Francisco. Barron's Publishing. 2002.
- Nelson, William H. *An American Tory*. Oxford. 1961.
- Noll, Mark A. *The Old Religion in the New World: The History of North American Christianity*. Grand Rapids. Eerdmans Publishing. 2002.
- Rosenberg, Chaim M. *The Loyalist Conscience: Principled Opposition to the American Revolution*. North Carolina. McFarland & Co. Inc., Publishers. 2018.
- Taylor, Alan. *The Civil War of 1812: American Citizens, British Subjects and Indian Allies.* New York. Alfred A. Knopf Publishers. 2010.
- The Bible*. Holman Study Bible NKJV. Holman Bible Publishers. 2015.
- Van Tyne, Claude Halstead. *The Loyalists in the American Revolution*. New York. The MacMillan Company. 1902.

### **Secondary Articles:**

- Baker, Robert A. "Baptists and the American Revolution." *Baptist History and Heritage*. Vol, 11 No. 3. 1976. 149-156.
- Barnes, Timothy M. "Loyalist Newspapers of the American Revolution 1763-1783: A Bibliography." *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*. ". Vol. 83 No. 2. October 1973. 217-240.
- Batchelder, Robert C. "Charles Inglis: First British Colonial Bishop." *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*. Vol. 32 No. 1. March 1963. 17-25.
- Brown, Wallace. "Loyalist Historiography." *Acadiensis IV*. Autumn 1974. 133-138.

- Brown, Wallace. "The View at Two Hundred Years." *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*. Vol. 80. 1970. 25-47.
- Calhoun, Robert M., Barnes, Timothy M. and Davis, Robert S. *Tory Insurgents: The Loyalist Perception and Other Essays*. Columbia, South Carolina. University of South Carolina Press. 2010.
- Calhoun, Robert M. and Chopra, Ruma. "Religion and the Loyalist." *Faith and the Founders of the American Republic*. Edited by Daniel L. Driesback and Mark David Hall. New York. Oxford University Press. 2014.
- Dickinson, H. T. ed. "The Poor Palatines and the Parties." *English Historical Review*. Vol. 82 No. 324. 1967. 454-485.
- Errington, Jane. "Loyalists and Loyalism in the American Revolution and Beyond." *Acadiensis*. Vol. 41 No. 2. Summer 2012. 164-173.
- Godbold, Albea. "The Beginnings of Methodism in America." *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*. Vol 35. No 5. 1966. 106-9.
- Gunter, Mary F. and James S. Taylor. "Loyalist Propaganda in the Sermons of Charles Inglis, 1770-1780." *Western Speech*. Vol. 37 No. 3. January 1973. 47-55.
- Jasanoff, Maya. "The Other Side of Revolution: Loyalists in the British Empire." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Vol. 65, No. 2, 2008, 205–232. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/25096784](http://www.jstor.org/stable/25096784). \ Accessed 20 Nov. 2020.
- Levis, Barry. "'Wild Mobs, to Mad Seditious Prone': Preaching the American Revolution." *Sermon Studies* (Journal) 3.1: 19-39.  
<https://mds.marshall.edu/sermonstudies/vol3/iss1/3>
- Locke, Joseph. "Compelled to Dissent: The Politicization of Rev. John Joachim Zubly, 1760-1776." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly*. Vol. 94 No. 4. Winter 2010. 445-462.
- Mason, Keith. "Localism, Evangelicalism, and Loyalism: The Sources of Discontent in the Revolutionary Chesapeake." *The Journal of Southern History*. Vol. 56 No. 1 (1990): 23-54. Accessed November 21, 2020. doi:10.2307/2210663.
- McDonnell, Michael A. and Waldstreicher, David. "Revolution in the *Quarterly*? A Historiographical Analysis." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 74, no. 4, 2017, pp. 633–666. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/10.5309/willmaryquar.74.4.0633](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5309/willmaryquar.74.4.0633). Accessed 20 Nov. 2020.
- Sachs, William and Dean, Ralph Stanley. "Anglicanism." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. April 02, 2020. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Anglicanism> Accessed 11 December 2020.
- Schmidt, Jim. "The Reverend John Joachim Zubly's 'The Law of Liberty' Sermon: Calvinist Opposition to the American Revolution." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly*. Vol. 82 No. 2, Summer 1998. 350-368.
- Smith, Paul H. "The American Loyalists: Notes on their Organization and Numerical Strength." *The William and Mary Quarterly*. Vol. 25. No. 2. April 1968 259-277.
- Sweet, William Warren. "The Role of the Anglicans in the American Revolution." *Huntington Library Quarterly*. Vol. 11 No. 1. November 1947. 48-56.
- Turner, Charles. "1773 Election Sermon." *They Preached Liberty*. Edited by Franklin P. Cole. Indianapolis, IN. Liberty Press. 1977.

## Archived Sources:

- Anglican Communion. <https://www.anglicancommunion.org/theology/doctrine.aspx> Accessed 11 December 2020
- Black Past – Global African History. *David George 1742-1810*.  
<https://www.blackpast.org/global-african-history/george-david-1742-1810/>
- Destination Tea. <https://destinationtea.com/teastory/#america> Accessed 12 December 2020.
- Dickinson, Jonathan. *Familiar Letters to a Gentleman, Upon a Variety of Seasonable and Important Subjects in Religion*. Boston: Printed and sold by Rogers and Fowle in Queen street, next to the prison: and by J. Blanchard at the Bible and Crown in Docksquare, 1745. Print.
- Dunmore, Lord. *Dunmore's Proclamation*. Early American Imprint. Series 1 No. 14592.
- Harriet Irving Library. *Loyalist Collection*. The Loyalist collection [electronic resource] / [Kathryn Hilder and Stephen Sloan]. [Fredericton, NB] : UNB Libraries F1058. Library of Congress. <https://lccn.loc.gov/2005544190>
- Keane, Kevan. D. "Radicals in the Revolution: The Persecution of Christians During the Revolutionary War." *Fidei et Veritatis: The Liberty University Journal of Graduate Research*. Vol. 1 No. 1 Article 7. 2016. Jerry Falwell Library at Liberty University.
- Library of Congress Call Number MSS21840. Manuscript Collections. *Joseph Galloway Family Papers 1743-1823*.
- Lushington, Stephen Rumbold. *Papers relating to American loyalists : viz, an account of the dates and descriptions of all communications that have taken place between His Majesty's government and any of the persons styling themselves American loyalists or their agents, since the 4th of April 1812, to the present time : together with copies of such of the said communications as bear date respectively on or about the 5th April and 3d December 1812, the 21st April, 6th and 10th July 1813, 26th May and 2d September 1814, 31st January and 17th May 1815, 19th June 1817, 8th April 1819 and 1st May 1820 : Nos. 1-to-13*. Great Britain, Parliament, House of Commons. American Antiquarian Society. Gale Document Number: GALEICY0110415680.
- National Humanities Center. *Travel Journal of Nicholas Cresswell, 1774-1777*. America In Class Collection. <https://americainclass.org/sources/makingrevolution/rebellion/text3/vacresswell.pdf>
- Online Library of Liberty. *Political Sermons and the American Revolution*. A Collection of Scholarly Works about Individual Liberty and Free Markets. Ellis Sandoz. 1998.
- Prince, Thomas. *The Christian History, Containing Accounts of the Revival and Propagation of Religion in Great Britain & America ...* No. 1-104, Mar. 5, 1743-Feb. 23, 1744, 5.  
Boston: Printed by S. Kneeland and T. Green, for T. Prince, junr, 1747. Print.
- Sabin Collection. *The Case and claim of the American Loyalists Impartially Stated and Considered*. London. 1783. Sabin Collection Number: 11306. Gale Document Number : GALEICY0103220898.
- Sachs William L. and Ralph Stanley Dean. "Anglicanism." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. April 2, 2020.

**Unpublished Secondary Works:**

Leaverton, Christena. "The Loyalist Culture." HIST 512. Liberty University. April 27, 2020.

## Appendix

Figures 1, 2 and 3 are available on the Library of Congress website. The Library of Congress lists these figures as “no known restrictions on publication.”

Figure 4 is available on the British Museum website. The British Museum lists this figure as not having restrictions on publication.

This page intentionally left blank to ensure proper placement of page numbers in the body of the document.