

W. N. 12

EARLY PRESBYTERIANISM IN MARYLAND.

By REV. J. WILLIAM McILVAIN.

The object of this monograph is to give an account of Presbyterianism, as it existed in the early days of Maryland. The period covered by this expression extends from the founding of the colony to the year 1706, the date of the formation of the first presbytery. At this time the Presbyterian church in America entered into a new phase of her existence, one which is more generally known and much more easily studied.

In writing an account of the Presbyterians in Maryland prior to 1706, a great difficulty presents itself at the very outset. This is the entire absence of any church records. All that we know of the existence of any church organization is to be gathered from a few meagre hints in the public documents of the colony, an occasional letter, or a passing notice by some secular historian. So fragmentary is the knowledge gathered from these sources, that the historian longs for the skill of the geologist, who is able to reconstruct for us the living animal from a single bone.

Another complication arises from the fact that it is difficult to distinguish between the Presbyterians and the Independents, both of whom were embraced under the term Puritan. In England, as is well known, they formed two parties. In Maryland also there exists in some instances a clear distinction between them. Not infrequently, however, they must be treated as forming one party.

The germs of Presbyterianism came into the colony at a very early period of its existence; possibly with the arrival of the Ark and the Dove. We learn from the letter of Henry Moore, the Provincial of the Jesuits writing from Rome in 1642 that "in leading the colony to Maryland by far the greater part were heretics."¹ Presbyterianism, it is true, did not yet exist in an

¹ *Records of the English Province, S. J.*, Parts V-VIII, p. 364. See also Lord Baltimore's letter to the Privy Council, 1677, which speaks of a great part of the early colonists being non-conformists. *Archives of Maryland*, Council Proceedings, 1667-1688, p. 267.

organized form in England. Yet in the large towns, especially in London, there were a number of congregations of such decided Presbyterian tendencies, that their members might fairly be called Presbyterians. From London, afterward the stronghold of Presbyterianism, many of the mechanics and servants came. It is certainly very possible, if not probable, that some of these came from the congregations of the divines, who afterwards sat in the Westminster Assembly. To mention some of the early colonists who were known to be Presbyterians, Walter Beane, or Bayne, and his brother Ralph were evidently members of that party. William Stone, appointed governor by Lord Baltimore after the triumph of the Parliamentary party in England is known to have had decided leanings in the same direction.

The proportion of the Presbyterians to the rest of the colonists is something which can not be definitely determined. There are good reasons, however, for believing that their numbers were very considerable, larger indeed than has been generally supposed. Because Lord Baltimore and some of the more prominent of the men in the colony were Roman Catholics, it has often been taken for granted that the majority of the colonists were of the same faith. This is so far from being true, that it will be evident to any one, who will study the early history of Maryland, that almost from the very beginning the overwhelming majority of the colonists were Protestants. This majority soon assumed the political control.¹ Of this majority a very large number must have been Puritans.² Take, for example, the assembly which passed the famous Act concerning Religion, the large majority of the members were Protestants. And of the Protestants, a large number were Puritans.³ This we conclude from what we know of the individual members, from the letter of Lord Baltimore to the Privy Council in 1677, from

¹ "The Assembly in Maryland (of 1638), composed with few exceptions of heretics." *Letter of More, English Province, S. J.*, p. 365.

² Lord Baltimore's letter, quoted above, speaks of "a great part" of early colonists as "such as could not conform in all particulars to the laws of England relative to Religion," such persons must have been either Roman Catholics or Puritans.

³ Hammond, *Leah and Rachel* (1656), pp. 22-23. Force's *Tracts*, Vol. III. See Bozman, Vol. II., p. 354.

contemporary testimony, and from the language of some of the acts passed by them. The Act itself is plainly a compromise between a Roman Catholic Lord Proprietor and his Protestant subjects.¹ That the idea originated with Lord Baltimore himself, is more than probable. He was a very prudent man, and to have attempted anything else than granting entire freedom of conscience to the people of Maryland would have been an act of the most consummate folly under the circumstances. His policy from the beginning had been complete religious toleration. Such a policy was rendered more imperatively necessary by subsequent events. The Presbyterian church had been declared the Church of England by the Parliament. The Puritans were in entire possession of the state. He himself was not in good repute with the government. The passing of such an act at such a time was a most masterly stroke of policy on his part as tending to remove all suspicion from himself, and making the state of affairs in religious matters in Maryland conform as far as possible to that in Puritan England, and at the same time securing liberty of worship for the members of his own church. A compromise had recently been entered into by the Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists of Germany in the famous Treaty of Westphalia, by which they had all secured religious toleration. Might not a similar law in Maryland secure similar results?

And may we not learn something of the religious situation in Maryland from the language of the Act itself? We think so. The main object of the law was to secure liberty of conscience to all Roman Catholics on the one hand, and all orthodox Protestants on the other. One section is particularly significant, the one which punishes the calling of names "in a reproachful manner relating to matter of religion." It would appear from this, that there was danger of this kind of thing in the province. Indeed there was a great deal of bitterness of feeling upon this very subject. A list of the names of religious parties is given, which must not be used reproachfully, and it is curious to notice that they embrace only those which would be applied to Roman Catholics or Puritans.

¹ This seems clearly to be the view taken by Hammond, a friend of Lord Baltimore. His tract was written against the Puritans in Maryland.

This can scarcely be an accident. Is it not a fair inference, especially when we have other proof upon the same subject, that a very large number of the Protestants of the province at that time consisted of those who might be reproached with the fact, that they were "Puritans, Independants, Prespiterians, Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Brownists, Antinomians, Barrowists, Roundheads, Separatists?" Still another section of the Act throws, we think, some light on the situation; that which punishes any person "that shall prophane the Sabbath or Lord's day called Sunday by frequent swearing, drunkenness, or by any uncivill or disorderly recreation, or by working on that day, when absolute necessity doth not require it." This is the language not of the Roman Catholic, nor of the Anglican, but of the Westminster divines. It is possible that Lord Baltimore might have used such language purposely in drawing up the law, in order to propitiate the powers that be. But is it not more likely, that this wording had its origin in the Assembly itself, where there were some freemen, who would not hesitate to add to or alter any law proposed by the Lord Proprietor? At any rate the Act gave to Maryland a Sunday law modeled on a strict Puritan Sabbath.

The strength of the Puritan party in the province will further appear from the fact that after the Commonwealth was firmly established, they proceeded to take possession of the government, and pass laws contrary to the well known wishes of the Lord Proprietor. Among them was a new Act concerning Religion, which undid the generous provisions of the former one, and restricted the liberty of public worship to those who were neither "Papists, Prelatists," nor Antinomians, in other words, to the Puritans. The language used is of interest as showing, that there were divisions in that party, and therefore that Presbyterians as well as Independants were included under its provisions. The fact that the Puritan government lasted for a number of years shows that they must have had the majority of the colonists on their side in their political if not in their religious sympathies.

The presence of so many Puritans in Maryland will scarcely be thought strange, when we remember all the circumstances in the case. Lord Baltimore had always pursued the policy of toleration, and had invited some of the Puritans of New England to

settle in his dominions. A glance at England will also show us that the Established Church was Presbyterian. The middle classes, from whom the colonists would mainly be drawn, were in sympathy with the Puritans. The towns from which came the merchants who traded with Maryland were the centers of Presbyterianism. Some of these who are mentioned as trading with the colony are known to have been connected with prominent Presbyterian families in England.¹ Scotch emigrants had begun to arrive, and these were of course Presbyterians.

Of the large number of Presbyterians in the colony at a somewhat later time we have strong proof in the testimony of Lord Baltimore himself. There was in 1677 some talk in the Privy Council of England of establishing the Church of England in Maryland. This Lord Baltimore resisted earnestly. In a letter addressed to them dated July 19, 1677, he writes, "The greatest part of the inhabitants of that province [three of four at least] do consist of Praesbiterians, Independants, Anabaptists and Quakers, those of the church of England as well as those of the Romish being the fewest, so that it will be a most difficult task to draw such persons to consent unto a law, which will compel them to maintain ministers of a contrary persuasion to themselves."² That Lord Baltimore speaks with knowledge and authority can not be doubted, for in his letter he goes into several particulars in regard to the religious state of the province. He speaks of their building churches or meeting houses, and maintaining their ministers by voluntary contributions. This gives us valuable testimony to the presence of a large number of Puritans including of course Presbyterians in Maryland at that date. This statement is further borne out by the letters of members of the Church of England, which speaks of the small number of their clergy and their inadequate support. A number of minor facts point in the same direction.

Indeed it is apparent that we must so far modify our conception of the religious life in early Maryland as to believe that for

¹ As for example Benjamin Whichcote, merchant, a relative of the famous Dr. Whichcote.

² *Archives of Maryland*, Council Proceedings, 1667-1688, p. 133.

a long series of years, extending from the rise of the Commonwealth to the revolution of 1688 or perhaps to the reign of Queen Anne, the majority of the people of the colony were decidedly Puritan in their sympathies. In Maryland there was also a rise and fall of Puritanism, a sort of picture in miniature of the great struggle in England.

We have shown then that the existence of Presbyterians in considerable numbers in Maryland can not be doubted. But when we come to the question of church organization, the matter is involved in great obscurity. Protestant ministers were very few in number for many years after the founding of the colony. There was no one to provide for them, as there was in the case of the Roman Catholic priests. For awhile any church organization must have been an extremely difficult matter. No doubt there were private meetings in the various houses conducted by laymen, a form of worship very congenial to the Puritans. There does not seem to have been any church organized by the Presbyterians prior to the arrival of Doughty, the first minister of that church to visit the province, which was somewhere about 1657.

There are some who think that we ought to date the existence of organized Presbyterianism with the arrival of the Puritans at Providence, now Annapolis. But it is evident that these were of the Independant party.¹ They had indeed elders, but so had many of the New England churches. Hammond, who knew them in Maryland, says that they were Independants.² The fact that many of them afterward became Quakers,³ would also seem to indicate that they belonged to the extreme wing of the Puritan party rather than to the conservative Presbyterians. Certain it is, that while Quakerism was subsequently strong in Anne Arundel County, no discoverable trace of Presbyterianism can be found there at that early date.

We will date the organized existence of Presbyterianism in Maryland by the arrival of Rev. Francis Doughty, the first

¹ Their minister in Virginia, Harrison, was an Independant.

² *Leah and Rachel*, p. 22.

³ Randall's *A Puritan Colony in Maryland*, pp. 41-42. Also Neill's *Terra Mariæ*, p. 148.

Presbyterian clergyman known to have visited the colony. His story reads like a romance. It is almost an epitome of the church history of that stormy time. He is believed to have been the son of an alderman of Bristol,¹ who while holding the living of Sodbury in Gloucestershire was ejected by the high church bishop, in 1625, ostensibly for speaking treasonable words against the king. Like thousands of other Puritans, he fled the country and came to America. He first appears in America about the year 1637, where we find him settled at what is now Taunton, Massachusetts.² There he lived and preached. But he soon found that things were not much smother there than they were in England. In 1640, the Independant ministers of Boston sent down two of their number to be the pastor and teacher of a church, which they organized at Taunton. From these Doughty received but scant courtesy. Doughty preached a sermon in which he laid down the law as to whose children were to be baptized. It was the Presbyterian doctrine upon the subject, but it does not seem to have commended itself to the approval of Master Hooke and Master Stout. So, according to Lechford, "Master Doughty was overruled, and the matter carried somewhat partially as it is reported."³ Doughty thinking no doubt that he had some rights as having already labored in the field, and that possession was nine points in the law, was inclined to resist. Whereupon the Boston ministers appealed to the magistrate. "The magistrate commanded the constable, who dragged Master Doughty out of the Assembly. He was forced to go away with his wife and children."⁴ This was certainly a highhanded proceeding, and exhibits a union of church and state, which seems strange to our generation. That Doughty had the right on his side appears from the fact that Richard Smith, one of the elders and a number of others went into exile with him.

He emigrated to New Amsterdam. Here again new trials awaited him. A contemporary speaking of his leaving New Eng-

¹ Neill's *Founders of Maryland*, p. 118.

² Emory's *History of Taunton*, Vol. I, p. 19.

³ *Plain Dealing*, &c., Thomas Lechford, 1641, p. 54.

⁴ *Plain Dealing*, page 41.

land to avoid trouble, says: he had put himself "under the protection of the Netherlanders in order that he might, according to the Dutch Reformation, enjoy freedom of conscience, which he unexpectedly missed in New England,"¹ but adds: "he found that he had gotten out of the frying pan into the fire." The director Kieft granted him a patent of land with manorial rights on Long Island, where Newtown now stands. But this colony was broken up by the Indian wars, and the church there scattered. He then came to New Amsterdam, and gathered a congregation of the English inhabitants of the place. He seems to have been the first English clergyman, who ever preached regularly in New York. Soon a new trouble overtook him, this time for political reasons. His daughter had married Adrián Van der Donk, the principal lawyer of the colony and a political rival of Stuyvesant. There soon arose trouble about the grant of land on Long Island. Doughty was arrested for debt, and only released on the condition, that he would not give the authorities any trouble. One can not help surmising that Doughty was not a very prudent man to get himself into all these troubles. In each case however he had some very warm friends, who have left their testimony, that he was badly treated by those in authority.

After his release Doughty resided with his daughter, the wife of Van der Donk. In 1655 his son-in-law died, and shortly afterward he went with his daughter and other members of his family into "the English Virginias."² Perhaps he was afraid to remain with the Dutch after the death of his powerful protector, or he may have well been induced to go to Maryland by the freedom of conscience, which was enjoyed in that province. Some while before August 1657 he left for Maryland. He was well received there, purchased land,³ and enjoyed the freedom for which he so longed. Just how long he remained in Maryland we have not been able to discover. He appears several times in the year 1659, once as a witness of Governor William Stone's will, whose sister Ann he had married. We have only vague reports of what he

¹ Holland's *Documents*, Vol. I, p. 305.

² *Doc. History New York*, III, p. 106.

³ Of Giles Thompkins, Jan. 1659, Liber S, 1658-1662, p. 340.

did in his capacity as a clergyman. His headquarters were at Nanjemoy, Charles County, where Stone resided. It is probable that he gathered a church at that place. Clergymen were scarce in the province, and his services would be gladly accepted. We know how zealous he had been in New England and in New York. Although he was now an old man, he was still vigorous enough to go about the country preaching and baptizing. We find him holding services in Accomac County, Virginia. His daughter the widow of Van der Donk, married in Maryland Hugh O'Neill. The place and date of his death, we have not been able to discover. His widow died in Maryland 1683.¹ The traces of his work in Maryland are provokingly small. It is however highly probable that he was the first pastor of the first Presbyterian church in Maryland. It is a pleasure to note that the liberty of conscience, which he had so long sought, but sought in vain, Doughty at last found in the liberal-minded religious policy, which made Maryland a place of refuge for all victims of ecclesiastical tyranny.

His successor in the work was Rev. Matthew Hill. His story is better known to us than that of Doughty. Hill's history is given at some length in Calamy's *Non-Conformist's Memorial*.² He was a native of York. He graduated at Magdalene College, Cambridge, and was noted for his knowledge of Hebrew. Ordained at York in 1652, he obtained the important living of Thirsk, Yorkshire, whence he was ejected for non-conformity in 1662. For awhile he was extremely poor. He managed to eke out a living by a private chaplaincy, but in 1666 he lost his little all in the great fire of London. In a letter at this time he subscribes himself: "Your brother *sine re, sed non sine spe*." We quote from Calamy, "He had several relations who from the first pressed him to conformity; but no necessities could tempt him to think of offering violence to his conscience. At last, though he had a very tender constitution, he determined upon a voyage to the West Indies. [Maryland was presumably one of the West Indies in those days.] He embarked with little besides a few

¹ Ann Doughty was almost certainly his widow. See her will, Liber G (Wills), p. 210.

² Calamy's *Non-Conformist Memorial*, London, 1803, Vol. III, p. 471.

clothes, a Bible, a concordance and a small parcel of MSS. He fixed at Charles County in Maryland in 1669, where a brighter scene began to open, and he had a prospect of considerable usefulness in the ministry and of a good advantage in temporal respects. But new troubles arose, which greatly disappointed his hopes; so that it may be said as truly of him as of most in modern times, that 'through many tribulations he entered into the kingdom of God.' He was a man of ready abilities, a serious, warm and lively preacher, and of free and generous spirit."

We are able to supplement this account of Calamy by several facts found chiefly in the colonial records. The most important of these facts are given in a letter to the celebrated Baxter, dated April 3, 1669.¹ [It would seem from this letter that Hill had reached Maryland somewhat earlier than 1669, although Calamy may be correct in assigning that date for his arrival.] The letter is a very interesting one. It appears that Baxter had furnished Hill with the means of paying his passage. He begins by gratefully acknowledging this kindness. "I am sure that the blessing of him that was ready to perish doth reach you though at this distance; what you have lost in your purse, I hope that you will regain in a better place." He gives a very favorable account of the people among whom he is called to labor, whom he calls "a loving and willing people." He speaks of the fact that, "under his lordship's government we enjoy a great deal of liberty and particularly in matters of religion." He also speaks of a large number of those of the reformed faith, and adds that they have no fondness for "the liturgy or ceremonies," which agrees with what we have already quoted from the statement of Lord Baltimore. He begs Baxter to use his influence in sending out three ministers, who should itinerate among the people, who are "as sheep without a shepherd." Then he does a little begging on his own account for a few books, a very natural request for a bookless minister in a bookless province. At the close of the letter he remarks that he will have to wait for any salary until the tobacco harvest, "which is the only current money of our province." That Baxter responded favorably to the letter is evident from the

¹ *American Presbyterianism*, Briggs, Appendix VIII.

fact, that that a considerable number of books are found in the inventory of Hill's goods.

His lot in Maryland, for a time at least, was a very pleasant one. Shortly after the penning of his letter, he married Edith, the daughter of Walter Bean or Bayne,¹ one of the wealthiest planters of the county. The lady was a widow, for she had already with a vast show of love and theology espoused Jonathan Marles in a marriage vow couched in strongly Puritanical language, which is one of the curiosities of the early records of the province.² In addition to this he obtained a grant of an estate, which he called Popleton³ in memory of a village near York, where Dr. Sherwood his instructor in theology had resided. The estate is in the neighborhood of Port Tobacco, and is still known by that name. He signs himself Matthew Hill, Gentleman.

His peaceful career was interrupted by what Calamy calls "fresh troubles," the nature of which, however, he does not state. These troubles probably grew out of the arrival of George Fox, the celebrated Quaker preacher, and the large number of proselytes whom he gained. There was great bitterness of feeling in those days between the unordained ministers of the Society of Friends, and the ordained minister, whether Anglican or Presbyterian. Hill had encountered much opposition from the Quakers in his parish in England. And upon their arrival in great force in Maryland the conflict begun in England, would naturally be renewed. No doubt the doctrine of the unlawfulness of a hireling ministry interfered, possibly seriously, with the support of those who had to look entirely to the voluntary contributions of their parishioners. Whatever these troubles may have been, his delicate health must have added very much to them. After ten years of labor, the results of which we can only conjecture, Hill died in 1679. We are in possession part of legal documents,⁴ which show that he

¹ Mentioned in Bean's Will, dated April 10, 1670.

² Article by the author in *Magazine of American Church History*. Volume for 1890, p. 91.

³ See Liber 16 (Land office, Annapolis), p. 421.

⁴ Oct. 7th, 1679. Elinor Bayne appears in behalf of the orphan children of Matthew Hill, who died intestate. See Liber 17 (1679), p. 214 (Wills office), Annapolis.

left children, and a considerable estate,—a part of which was a library of seventy volumes.

Thus we see that for some twenty years at least the Presbyterians of Charles County were supplied with regular preaching, with an interval of five or six years, possibly less, between Doughty and Hill. Doughty undoubtedly preached in other parts of the State, as on the Eastern Shore. Perhaps Hill followed his example. It was an easy matter in those days to visit in a small vessel nearly all the parts then settled of the province. It has been customary to regard Somerset County, where Makemie, Traill and others preached in 1683 and even earlier as the cradle of American Presbyterianism. But it is now evident that nearly a quarter of a century earlier Presbyterianism had been planted on the Western Shore of Maryland by Doughty and maintained successfully by Hill. The liberty in the matter of religion of which Hill speaks in his letter was undoubtedly the cause of this. The Presbyterians could not lay any special claim to the sympathies of those in power in any of the colonies, as for example the Independants could in New England, the Episcopalians in Virginia, the Quakers in Pennsylvania, or the Dutch Reformed in New York. Hence they sought in Maryland a privilege, which they could find in no other colony, of absolute freedom of worship. Thus it happens that, at *first* on the shores of the Potomac, and *later* on the shores of the Pocomoke, we find the first attempts to organize American Presbyterianism.

After the death of Hill in 1679 the history of the Presbyterians on the Western Shore is largely a blank. Church organization continued as we learn from such incidental proofs as the following. In 1683 Peter Archer died, leaving a plantation and the services of a negro man "towards the maintainance of a godly minister and the good of his church."¹ He names as one of his executors Ninian Beall, a well known Presbyterian elder. What was done by the Presbyterians to carry out this bequest it is impossible to say. But that there was an organization among the Presbyterians, which continued after the death of Hill can scarcely be doubted. The government in the individual church under the Presbyterian

¹ Liber 4 G (1682-88), p. 19.

form of government, is the session or board of elders. Where they exist, a church exists. Now we know that such elders did exist, and we know the name of at least one of them. It is very improbable, that after a number of years of organized existence, the Presbyterians would allow all traces of such organization to disappear. Godly ministers such as Archer desired being hard to procure, some prominent laymen would come forward, and keep the church together, until a suitable minister could be found.

Such a man we find in Ninian Beall,¹ a well known planter in the province, and prominent in military affairs. Coming to Maryland in 1657 a poor mechanic, he rose at last to be a wealthy planter, a brave soldier, whose services were rewarded by a special grant from the Assembly, and one of the founders of manufactures in the colony in the shape of flour mills and iron furnaces. He is also very interesting from his connection with the church history. He was in Maryland when Doughty arrived. And living to a great age [he died in 1717, aged 92], he was well acquainted with the men who formed the first presbytery. He may lay claim to be called the father of Presbyterianism in Maryland, indeed in America. He was present at its birth, sustained it in the days of its weakness, and gave it a handsome endowment of land at Upper Marlboro or Patuxent. He lived to see a single church grow into a vigorous synod. That he was an elder we know, and it is almost certain that he is the "ancient and comely man, an elder amongst the Presbyterians," who entertained Thomas Wilson, the famous Quaker preacher at his house in 1692.² Who were the clergymen, who preached to the scattered flock on the western shore of the Chesapeake after the death of Hill, is not known. That there were preachers, not of the church of England, who could have performed this service we know from incidental references. Such a reference we find couched in very contemptuous terms in the letter of the clergy of Maryland to the bishop of London, dated May 18, 1696, which speaks of "a sort of wandering pretenders to preaching that came from New England and other places, which deluded not only the Protestant dissenters from our church,

¹ See article by author, *Presbyterian Review*, Vol. IX, p. 380.

² *Life of Thomas Wilson*, Friends' Library, Vol. II, p. 326.

but many churchmen themselves, by their extempore prayers and preachments, for which they were admitted by the people, and got money of them.”¹ We find two such “wandering pretenders” in the persons of Mr. Davis and Mr. Bartlett on the Western Shore, but of what denomination they were, it is impossible now to determine. It is quite possible, that although not Presbyterians, they may have preached for them at times. It is quite possible also, that the Presbyterian ministers, who were settled on the Eastern Shore may have paid flying visits to their brethren across the bay. It is evident, however, that until the establishment of the church of England in Maryland the number of Protestant ministers of all denominations was lamentably small.

Let us now turn our attention to the church on the Eastern Shore. This has long been regarded as the birthplace of American Presbyterianism. We have seen, however, that it was on the Western Shore that the first ministers, Doughty and Hill, first landed and established churches. This was at least twenty years before the arrival of the famous group of Scotch-Irish clergymen in Somerset County. It is true of these latter that they did their work in a more vigorous manner, and with more lasting results. The materials for their history is fortunately more abundant, although still very scanty.

Church historians have generally dated the origin of Presbyterianism in Maryland, indeed in America, with the arrival of the celebrated Francis Makemie in Somerset County in 1683. From recent discoveries we shall show that he built on foundations previously laid.

The first Puritan church on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, so far as known, was founded by the Rev. Ezekial Fogg, “practitioner in medicine and divinity,” as he styles himself in his will.² It is doubtful whether he was a Presbyterian or Independant, but more probably the latter. We can trace his history back to 1674, when he is found preaching in Westchester county, New York.³ His ministry in Maryland can not have been a long one, as he

¹ W. S. Perry's *Historical Collections*, Maryland, 1878, p. 8.

² Liber No. 2, 1674-1704, p. 82. (Wills, Annapolis.)

³ Briggs' *American Presbyterianism*, p. 105.

died in January, 1680. All that we know of his work is derived from his will, which speaks of his living in Dorchester County, near the Great Choptank. This will is, by-the-by, a pleasing contrast to the usual dreary and verbose language of such documents. Indeed the style is quite sprightly, especially, where he is giving directions to his executors as to the collecting of his debts. He gives them the sensible advice "not to meddle in the law to fling good money after bad," but "by all means to take a half loaf rather than no bread." Nothing further is known of the congregation gathered by Fogg.

We now come to that very interesting group of churches planted in Somerset county by Francis Makemie and his fellow-laborers. As we have said, this is the spot to which Presbyterians have turned as the birthplace of American Presbyterianism, and Makemie has been regarded as its apostle. Recent investigations have shown that we must somewhat modify this traditional opinion. There were Presbyterian churches founded in Charles County at an earlier period. And Makemie must share his honors not only with Doughty and Hill, but also with his fellow-workers on the Eastern Shore, Traill, Wilson and Davis. If Makemie was not the first Presbyterian minister in point of time, he was undoubtedly the most prominent minister of that church in America in his generation. If not the founder of American Presbyterianism, he was at least the moving spirit in the successful effort to bind together the scattered churches into a presbytery, and thus establish the church on a firm basis.

Makemie's name is closely associated with the Eastern Shore. Yet very little of his time was really spent in Maryland. We shall give but a brief outline of his history, partly because so much of it lies outside our present purpose, but chiefly because the details of it so far as known, have been often written about, and can be found in any history of the Presbyterian Church.

Francis Makemie¹ was born near Rathmелton, County Donegal, Ireland, about 1660. He studied at Glasgow, appearing there as a student in 1676. In 1681 he was examined before the presby-

¹ Consult Briggs' *American Presbyterianism* and Bowen's *Days of Makemie* for the following facts.

tery of Laggan, Ireland, and ordained in 1682 to go to America. This ordination was the result of a letter of "collonell Stevens in Maryland beside Virginia," who wrote from Somerset County to the presbytery for a "godly minister." Makemie was probably induced to this course by Rev. William Traill, the moderator of the presbytery, who when persecution broke out in Ireland, came to Maryland himself. Makemie arrived in Somerset some time in the year 1683. In May, 1684, he left, and labored among the Puritans of Elizabeth river, Virginia, who had settled there many years previously. The probable reason for this was that there were already several Presbyterian ministers in Maryland at the time, and he went where he supposed he was most needed.

Makemie's work was mostly of an itinerant character, founding new churches and encouraging feeble ones. We find him as far South as the Barbadoes, as far North as New England. In order to support himself in these journeys he engaged in trade. It is plain, however, that he did not make money-making the chief end in this matter, but rather became a merchant as St. Paul became a tentmaker, lest he should be chargeable to his congregations. Wherever he went, he labored earnestly as a minister of the gospel. In 1690 he returned to the Eastern Shore, and settled on the border line between Maryland and Virginia. He married, and became the pastor of the church at Rehoboth in 1691. He did not remain very long, but left in 1692 for Philadelphia, and afterwards went to the Barbadoes, where he remained for several years. Again in 1698 he returned to his old home on the Eastern Shore, and made it his home until he died.

He did not stay there all the time by any means. He seems to have regarded himself as the servant of the whole church. In the interests of Presbyterianism he journeyed to the northern colonies, Pennsylvania, New York and New England. It is interesting to notice the interest which the Boston ministers took in Presbyterianism. Makemie was in constant correspondence with Increase Mather. Not content with his efforts in America he went abroad in the summer of 1704 to obtain help from the Presbyterians of England and Scotland. The ministers of that church in London raised funds to assist him, and, having obtained the means of their support for two years, he set sail for America,

taking with him two young men, John Hampton, an Irishman, and George McNish, a Scotchman. These men began to labor in Somerset County, in Makemie's old field. In the spring of 1706 Makemie succeeded in realizing his long cherished dream, and accomplished the greatest work of his life, in persuading six other Presbyterian ministers to join with him in forming the Presbytery of Philadelphia, the first Presbytery of the American Presbyterian Church. With this meeting its history as an organized body begins, and Makemie, as the originator and zealous promoter of the plan, may justly be called the "Father of American Presbyterianism." It is interesting to note that of the seven ministers who formed this Presbytery five were then, or had been, laboring in Maryland, Makemie, his two protégés, Hampton and McNish, Taylor, pastor at Patuxent, and Davis, who for several years had labored at Snow Hill. If Makemie be the father of Presbyterianism in this country Maryland was its cradle.

Makemie deserves notice as the promoter of what he regarded the material interests of Maryland. During his sojourn in London he published a book dedicated to the governor of Virginia, entitled, "Plain and friendly persuasive to the inhabitants of Virginia and Maryland for promoting towns and cohabitation."¹ There were no towns then in either colony, and Makemie had the good sense to see what a great advantage they were to the northern provinces. He naturally felt that there ought to be in the South something corresponding to Boston, New York or Philadelphia. Especially was the lack of them felt from the standpoint of religion, it being very difficult to gather congregations in the open country. The idea was an excellent one, and one which the assembly in Maryland tried several times to carry out. But the old English idea that the landed proprietor was the gentleman, and the tradesman was not, so prevailed, that villages grew up very slowly. It may be remarked in passing, that the genius of Presbyterianism was specially adapted to towns, where people met frequently, and discussed the intellectual side of religion. It certainly has always fostered the intellectual in those who professed it. One writer² has gone so far as to assert,

¹ See an account of it in Briggs, p. 139.

² Neill, *Terra Mariæ*, p. 198.

that the reason why Presbyterianism, after so excellent a start did not make more progress in Maryland was that there were no towns to give the mental stimulus necessary to appreciate the doctrinal side of religion, which that church so prominently presents.

There is one other incident in the life of Makemie so famous and so characteristic of the period in which he lived, that, although it lies outside of his experiences in Maryland, it ought not to be omitted. This is his famous trial before Lord Cornbury, the governor of New York. Makemie and Hampton arrived in New York in 1707, and were invited by the Presbyterians to preach. The Dutch kindly offered their church. But Cornbury forbade his preaching there. So he preached in a private house in Pearl Street on January 20. Cornbury was a man, whom Bancroft describes as "joining the worst form of arrogance to intellectual imbecility." He was indeed a most intolerant bigot, and had already seized several of the Presbyterian and Independant churches, and handed them over without any legal right to the clergy of the Church of England. His trial of Makemie reads like one of the infamous assizes of Jefferys. Makemie, having the law on his side in the shape of a license to preach from the governors of Maryland and Virginia, pleaded his cause so well, that although he was treated in an arbitrary, not to say brutal manner by Cornbury, he was compelled to release him on bail. On his appearing later on for trial, Makemie was acquitted. Yet the governor in spite of it, forced him to pay all the costs of the trial, amounting to over £83, a very large sum for those days. This was one of the last events of his life. He returned to his plantation in Accomac County, Virginia, and died there in the summer of 1708. He left a large property, and a fine library, which latter he bequeathed to Rev. Mr. Andrews of Philadelphia.

Makemie's work in Maryland was but a small part of his life's work. A man of truly apostolic character, all the British colonies in America felt his influence. His works which have come down to us show him to have been a man of decided intellectual ability. To him belongs the noble distinction of those who have been martyrs for the truth. Both in Ireland and in America he showed himself willing to suffer for his faith.

Turning now to the men, who with Makemie laid the foundation of the churches in Somerset County, we come to William Traill, the most conspicuous man among them after Makemie himself. Traill¹ was born in Edinborough in 1640, the son of a Scotch clergyman, Robert Traill. After graduating from Glasgow he went to Ireland, and was the pastor of a church in the presbytery of Laggan, the same presbytery as Makemie and Wilson. He was a conspicuous man, and accordingly suffered persecution for conscience sake. Upon his release from prison in 1682 he came to America, probably directly to Maryland, as he had been invited thither by Col. William Stevens. Unfortunately we know very little of his work in Maryland. We read of his buying land in the neighborhood of Stevens' place, Rehoboth,² and it is probable that he was the founder of that church. He seems to have been much esteemed by his parishioners, as he received bequests from John White in 1685,³ and again from John Shipway,⁴ in 1687. In Nov., 1689, he, with Wilson, Davis and other Presbyterians, signed a petition to William and Mary, asking "protection in securing our religion, lives and liberty under *Protestant Governors*." The presence of so able a man could not but produce a great impression upon the religious life about him. Indeed, during his stay of somewhat more than seven years in Maryland, it is probable that his influence was much greater there than that of Makemie. After the revolution of 1688 he was called to Scotland, and returned there in 1690⁵ to become the pastor of the church of Borthwick, near Edinboro.

We now come to the name of a man, who is little more than a name, although it is very probable that his influence in his day was a great one, the name of Rev. Thomas Wilson. There can be little doubt that he was the Thomas Wilson, pastor at Killybegs, County Donegal, where the poor man was nearly starved to death on £12 a year.⁶ Still less doubt can there be, that he is

¹ Briggs, pp. 116-117.

² *Days of Makemie*, p. 137.

³ Liber G, p. 200 (Wills). Annapolis.

⁴ Liber G, p. 273 (Wills). Annapolis.

⁵ The last mention of his name in this country occurs in February 1690. *Days of Makemie*, p. 180.

⁶ *Days of Makemie*, p. 524.

the Thomas Wilson to whom Col. William Stevens in May 20, 1681, assigns "a parcel of land called Darby, containing 350 acres."¹ He seems to have been the first "godly minister" who accepted Stevens' invitation to come to America. To him then we owe the founding of the first of the famous Somerset County churches. His career in Maryland is unknown to us outside of the record books. Until very recently his presence in this country was unknown. He was the first pastor of the church at Manokin, now Princess Ann. He appears as its pastor in several documents, such as the will of John Galbraith, 1691,² the sheriff's report to Governor Nicholson in 1694, and the will of David Brown in 1697.³ In 1695 he signs his name as a non-conformist minister to a congratulatory address sent to King William III. on his escape from assassination. In 1692⁴ he declares his willingness to take the oath of allegiance, and even to conform to the church of England except in "some small matters." His brother Ephraim Wilson was sheriff of the county for several years, an ancestor of Senator Ephraim K. Wilson. There is a will dated April 20, 1702, of a Thomas Wilson,⁵ but it appears to be that of his son. As he is not mentioned in the will, he was almost certainly dead at that time. These are the few bare facts of his life, so far as the writer has been able to discover them.

With these three names there is closely association the name of Samuel Davis. It is probable that he was an Irishman.⁶ He came to Maryland as early as 1684, in which year he celebrated a marriage in Somerset County.⁷ In September of the same year he received from Col. William Stevens a warrant to

¹ Land Records, Annapolis, Liber 21, p. 314.

² *Days of Makemie*, p. 205.

³ Liber H, p. 150, (Wills, Annapolis).

⁴ A petition from Somerset County, signed by 112 persons, "praying the continuance among them of their 3 ministers, viz., one of the church of England, and the other two dissenters, only in some small matters, but willing to qualify themselves so far as in conscience they can by taking the oath of allegiance and adhering." Liber K, p. 45, Sept. 30, 1692.

⁵ Liber T. B., p. 320.

⁶ See Briggs, p. 124 note.

⁷ *Days of Makemie*, p. 114. There appears the name of Samuel Davies in 1678 as residing in Somerset County. This is possibly Samuel Davis. *Archives of Maryland*, Proceedings of Council, 1666-88, p. 98.

have laid out "500 acres called Inch, east side of the Chesapeake Bay, southeast side of the Pocomoke River, upon St. Martin's Creek."¹ His labors were in the northern and eastern parts of Somerset, extending into Delaware, where Keith says that he saw him in 1692, and where he ultimately went and settled. He was pastor of the church at Snow Hill in 1691, and how much earlier we do not know. He was probably the founder of that famous and venerable church, and continued as its pastor until 1698. His name occurs a number of times upon the colonial records, as for example among the signers of the address of congratulation to William III in 1695. In 1697 Davis and James Brechan, an Episcopal clergyman, got themselves into a disagreeable scrape at an entertainment given by Squire Layfield, where several of the party, according to their story, were "overtaken in drink." Layfield had married the widow of William Stevens, and being made a widower by her death, proposed to console himself by marrying her niece. A marriage service was jestingly performed, in which both the clergymen took part. The matter became at once a scandal, as the marriage was against the laws of England. Both the clerical gentlemen had to stand a trial in consequence. They explained that it was all a joke, and begging pardon, they were let off without the fine, which Layfield had to pay. Whether this had anything to do with Davis's leaving Maryland it is impossible to say, although he evidently thought himself badly treated in the affair. At any rate he soon moved to Hoarkill, now Lewes, Delaware, where he resided and preached for a number of years. He was one of the ministers summoned to form the first presbytery, but he does not seem to have taken a great interest in this important matter, as he only attended twice,² although he survived the formation of the presbytery a number of years. As the presbytery sent him word, that his excuses for non-attendance were not sufficient, we may conjecture that it was not ill health, but either indifference or his being engaged in trade, that detained him from the church courts. His name appears as one of the three ministers set apart to form the presbytery of Snow Hill in 1716. From

¹ Liber 22, p. 262 (Land office, Annapolis). The place still exists.

² In 1708 and 1714.

that date we lose sight of him, and the date of his death is uncertain. It is impossible to form any just estimate of his career as a minister, but from one or two hints it would appear that he was scarcely the peer intellectually or spiritually of the fellow ministers with whom his name is so associated.

The ministers who thus so successfully labored in Somerset were greatly aided by several prominent laymen, notably Col. William Stevens, at whose invitation and expense they were brought from Ireland. There were also other prominent men, such as David Brown, John White, and the leading men in fact of that section of the province. They built regular churches, not being satisfied to worship in private houses. These were but plain structures, but they had three of them, one at Snow Hill, one at Monokin, and the other, rather vaguely described as being "at the road going up along the seaside," was either Rehoboth, or possibly at St. Martin's.¹ So strong were the Presbyterians in this section, that it was with great difficulty that the Church of England found a lodgment there. In 1695 Rev. James Brechan, our friend of the mock marriage, complains that "the people will not pay him his dues, but will do so to the dissenting ministers." As late as 1711 Rev. Alexander Adams writes to the Bishop of London that he is the only clergyman of the Church of England in Somerset County, and very poorly paid, while the Presbyterian churches are carefully supplied. Presbyterianism is still strong in this section.

Returning to the Western Shore we have seen how, from the death of Hill in 1679, the history of the Presbyterian Church there is involved in great obscurity. So great is the obscurity that some have taken it for granted that there was no such thing as organized Presbyterianism until the beginning of the eighteenth century. We have tried to show that this could scarcely be the case, when so many prominent laymen were Presbyterians, and also by the fact that among the few notes on the religious condition of the country, we find at least one notice of a Presbyterian

¹See note, *Days of Makemie*, p. 533. Davis's estate, called Inch, was on St. Martin's Creek, two miles north of the present village of St. Martin. Dr. Bowen, in a letter to the author, thinks this conjecture a probable one.

elder. This period of uncertainty suddenly comes to an end with the year 1704, when we discover a full-fledged Presbyterian church with a pastor and a large number of adherents at Patuxent. This is mentioned at great length in a deed giving the church a lot in what is now Upper Marlboro from Col. Ninian Beall.¹

How long this church had been organized, it is impossible to say. So large a number of persons are mentioned as the officers of the church that it must have existed for some little time, perhaps for a number of years. It was the heir of the church that Hill founded, and Ninian Beall forms the connecting link between the two congregations. As we find the church described in this deed, it must have been a strong congregation, for sixteen men are named as the trustees, some of whom were among the most prominent men in Prince George and Charles Counties. As we find the erecting of a church spoken of in the grant, it is probable that this was their first house of worship, although the language of the latter part of the deed leaves this somewhat doubtful. We find a session of several elders, some of whom we find in the minutes of the presbytery of Philadelphia, such as James Stoddard, Alexander Beall. The parish was a very large one, extending over all of Prince George County and into Charles. Even in 1719, when the church at Bladensburg was built, and the parish divided, it included part of Charles County. Ministers had to ride far afield to visit parishioners in those days.

There was a strong Scotch element in the congregation, as the names would indicate. Probably then the church was organized strictly on the Scotch model. But there was also a strong English element, and of the three clergymen known to us as pastors of the church, all came out from London, and two, Taylor and Orme, were Englishmen.

The pastor mentioned in the deed—and probably the first pastor of the church—was Rev. Nathaniel Taylor. Very little is known of Taylor. We do not know the date of his coming to Maryland, but it was hardly much before the granting of the property by Beall. A worthless tradition says that he was a Scotchman

¹ For a full account of this deed discovered by the author, see Briggs, Appendix XII.

who came over in 1690, but this is plainly wrong. Another ingenious guess says that he came from New England. But of this there is no proof. An examination of the inventory of his goods,¹ which includes a fine library, reveals these two facts; that he was a bachelor, and that he had just such books as an English non-conformist clergyman of that period would be likely to have. The meagre facts so far as we have them, would seem to point to his being the son of the famous non-conformist divine, Rev. Nathaniel Taylor, who preached at Salters' Hall, London, so eloquent that he was known as the Dissenting South.² An intimate friend of Dr. Reynolds, who sent a number of young men to the struggling Presbyterians of America—it is quite likely that Taylor came out to Maryland, in this way, shortly after the death of his father in 1703.

The library referred to is such a fine one, that one feels much disappointed that we know so little of the owner of these well selected 500 volumes. The man who took so deep an interest in science as to have in his library several of the most recent works by Boyle, Bently, Newton and Locke, was no ordinary man. The theological works were well chosen, containing a number of foreign authors, although naturally the writings of the Westminster Divines occupy a conspicuous place. Outside of the deed and the inventory we know nothing of Taylor, except that he took an active part in the proceedings of the presbytery, which he attended with great regularity. At his sudden death, about January 1st, 1710, he was deeply mourned by his congregation. It is probable that he was a young man, before whom lay years of usefulness. The loss of such a scholar at such a time was, no doubt, a great blow to his people. We may feel sure that it was also a great loss to the infant Presbyterian church.

With the organization of the first presbytery we bring this sketch to a close. After that date the original documents for church history are far more accessible, and the facts are generally well known. It will be well to take a glance at the state of the

¹ *Vide*, article by the author in the *American Magazine of Church History*. For inventory see Liber W. B. 9, p. 159.

² Wilson's *Dissenting Churches*, Vol. II, p. 13.



Presbyterian Church in Maryland at this date, 1706. On the Western Shore we have but one organized Presbyterian Church, the one at Patuxent. There was a considerable number of Presbyterians in Baltimore County, as is shown by the fact that soon after this they organized a church, and called a pastor. On the Eastern Shore we have the flourishing group of churches at Snow Hill, Rehoboth, and Monokin, with Makemie, Hampton, and McNish as their pastors. There were also in Cecil County a number of Presbyterians, who had not, however, yet organized. But shortly after this period we find in this part of the country, and in adjoining parts of Pennsylvania and Delaware, a number of churches organized from the Ulster Presbyterians and the remains of the churches which had been founded by the Dutch Reformed.

Small as this little group of churches was, it was by far the strongest then existing in the colonies among the Presbyterians. It seemed to have before it a great future, and that Maryland would be a stronghold of Presbyterianism. This has not been the case. To what are we to attribute its failure to fulfil this promise? I. The principal cause was undoubtedly that mentioned in a letter from the Presbytery of Philadelphia to the Presbytery of Dublin in Ireland, dated September, 1710. "Not long ago there was a probability of doing more good in Maryland before episcopacy was established by law."¹ This was the main cause, a very sufficient one for the comparative failure in Maryland after so excellent a start. No church establishment was better off, and few as well off, as that of Maryland. The clergymen were well paid, the churches built at the expense of the State. The church indeed became a department of the colonial government with the Governor at the head. Having thus plenty of money it was a comparatively easy matter to obtain ministers to fill all the parish churches. On the other hand the Dissenters in Maryland, although thanks to the interference of William III, they were granted many privileges, were yet under considerable disadvantages. It was a small matter perhaps, that they were obliged to leave their meeting houses unlocked. But when it came to making them support the clergymen of the parish as well as their own, it required considerable zeal for

¹ Published Minutes of Presbytery of Philadelphia, p. 20.

Presbyterianism for a man for conscience sake to give double tithes, especially if that man was poor. The dissenting minister was thus placed at a great disadvantage compared with his government-paid brother of the establishment.

Another fact that told against the Presbyterian clergy of the colonies was that for many years there was no college, no theological seminary for the raising up of a native ministry among them. This lack of educational machinery was particularly felt by the church, which demanded above all things that her clergy should be an educated clergy, with knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. For awhile they were obliged to look to the mother country for their supply of ministers. In this, too, they were at a disadvantage as compared with the Episcopal Church, as the Church of England had far greater wealth and a far larger number of men in her ministry, than the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland and Ireland. Had the Presbyterians been in the decided majority in any one colony, as the Congregationalists in New England, or the Episcopalians in Maryland and Virginia, some Presbyterian Harvard or Yale would have been founded at a very early date. But unfortunately for them, they were scattered and nowhere possessed great wealth or political power. One cannot help regretting that some of the wealthy laymen of early Maryland, as Beall or Stevens, had not seen the pressing need of such an institution, and devoted some of their numerous acres to the founding of some Nassau Hall, which would have been not only the pride of the Presbyterian Church, but would have had a most important influence on the whole colony. Augustine Herman, the Bohemian Presbyterian, had some such scheme in his mind, as may be seen from his will. What a pity it was never carried out.

The colleges of New England were drawn on to a certain extent. But although in the beginning there was great cordiality and considerable correspondence between the New England divines and their Presbyterian neighbors to the south, notably with Makemie, later on there grew up a coolness, possibly because there was no longer the bond of a fellowship in suffering at the hands of the English Church. At any rate it was to Glasgow and Edinboro that the Presbyterians in America usually looked for their supply of ministers previous to the founding of the college at Princeton.

Another reason for the decrease of the number of Presbyterians

in Maryland must be sought in the fact, that their supply from Europe was to a great extent cut off. A glance at the history of England will help us to understand this. When Maryland was founded England was Puritan, so far, at least, as the great middle class was concerned. When the century ended, the Church of England, re-established under Charles II, had so far regained her strength that the number of dissenters was reduced to a feeble minority. A corresponding change must therefore be looked for in her colonies, and in no place perhaps more than in Maryland, where the waves of religious opinion closely followed those of the mother country. In her earliest days the tolerant policy brought persecuted Puritans to the province. Under the Puritan supremacy in England, the colonists came from the very classes most thoroughly leavened with that doctrine.

After the Restoration the religious freedom enjoyed in Maryland offered a place of refuge to the Presbyterians of England and Ireland. We need not be surprised then that such men as Doughty, Hill, Nicholet, and others found refuge from the storms of persecution in Europe in the liberally governed province, where there was liberty of conscience and no established church. For a time, even in England, there remained a strong Presbyterian element, from which the colonists to the New World would naturally be largely drawn. But times changed. There grew up a new generation, who had been educated under the Establishment, not under the preaching of the great Puritan divines. A corresponding change took place in the colonies, at least among the English settlers. The descendants of the Puritans had become admirers of the Establishment. And this cry for a similar establishment affected almost all the colonies except, of course, New England. The people of Maryland demanded an Establishment. Lord Baltimore, being a Roman Catholic, warded off any movement in that direction for a time. But the demands of the colonists grew louder and louder. Even the Presbyterians joined in these demands, or at least were not in the first instance opposed to such a scheme.¹ This may appear to us strange. But there

¹ We find such Presbyterians as David Brown, Ninian Beall, and others, signing a petition to King William for an Establishment "according to the fundamentals of the Church of England."

was such a prejudice against the Church of Rome, and such a fear, that under the liberty enjoyed in Maryland, the Roman Catholics might be taking advantages which would be denied them under an Establishment, that all the Protestants made common cause. This is less surprising, also, when we remember the terrible persecutions which the Huguenots of France were then enduring. All Protestants then believed in the union of Church and State, and the benefits of their separation under the liberal policy then adopted by Maryland were not so evident as they might have been, because of the inability of the people to support their clergy, which had resulted in a deplorable scarcity of churches. Besides all this, the people expected great things from the admirable plan submitted by Bray, and the Presbyterians were not so selfish as to oppose that which seemed so plainly for the public good. And so the Church of England became the Established Church of Maryland, and those churches which had not long before formed the majority, were reduced to dissenting sects. The Presbyterians soon discovered to their sorrow, how much they had lost by the change. But it may be doubted whether, with the great change in the religious sentiments of the English people, powerfully affecting public sentiment in Maryland, together with the evident need of some adequate provision for the support of the clergy, it was possible to prevent the English Church from becoming the established church of the colony.

It is interesting to note the difference between the action of the English Presbyterians and their Scotch co-religionists at this juncture. The first Presbyterians to come to Maryland were of English origin—Doughty, Hill, and such laymen as Bean and Stone. But English Presbyterianism never had so strong a hold on the hearts of the people as had its sister church in Scotland, which had never known any other form of Protestantism. Moreover the English divines generally held only to a presbytery which was agreeable to Scripture,¹ not strictly “*jure divino*.” Hence it was comparatively easy to conform to the re-established church in England, and the newly established church in Maryland. The

¹ The language of the Westminster Assembly is, “It is lawful and agreeable to the Word of God.”

English Puritans in Maryland generally, with the exception of the Quakers, followed the example of their brethren in the old country, as was only natural. Some few, as at Patuxent, remained faithful to the Presbyterian preferences of their ancestors. But after 1700 the English element in Maryland Presbyterianism becomes a very small one.

Quite otherwise was it with the Scotch and the Scotch-Irish. Presbyterianism had been the religion of their fathers from the time of the Reformation. It was thus hallowed to them by a thousand sacred memories. For it they had been obliged to fight and suffer terrible persecutions. It had been the object of the long and bitter struggle which had been waged against them by the monarchs of the house of Stuart, to force Episcopacy on them. Hence they hated Prelacy, as they called it, with a perfect hatred. It was only natural then that they should remain loyal to Presbyterianism, organizing churches of their own, wherever they settled in considerable numbers, and cheerfully supporting their pastors.

One reason for the failure of Presbyterianism in Maryland to grow rapidly may be found in the location of their strongest churches. Somerset County was the most remote part of the province, and was itself isolated from the rest of the world. Had the churches planted there been nearer the centres of influence, they would have had a much wider influence. The church at Upper Marlboro though alone became the mother of a number of other churches, which still exist in Prince George and Montgomery Counties.

A word or two in regard to the church buildings, style of worship, &c. Most of the churches were extremely plain, much like the "houses" described by the sheriff of Somerset County in his report, as existing at Snow Hill, and Monokin; "about thirty feet long, plain country buildings, all of them."¹ Most of the churches were built of wood, and that very roughly prepared, in some cases not having even a plank flooring. At the lower end of the church there was often a gallery, where the servants sat.

¹ The Rolls office, London, *Maryland Documents*, III, B. 39. Sheriffs' report from all the counties in Maryland in 1697.

In some cases the building was of better description. The church at Patuxent was of English brick, according tradition. There was an entire lack of anything like ornament. There was no organ in use in any of the churches, it being an article of luxury, and organists being very rare. The Scotch would not have used them if they could have been procured owing to the sentiment against them. The singing was conducted by a precentor, as in the Scotch Kirk, and was lined out by the minister, as few of the congregation possessed hymn books, and many could not have read them. As to the books used, we find that at Patuxent they used Tate and Brady,¹ as in the English church, but on the Eastern Shore they probably sang the psalms according to the version of Rous, in orthodox Scotch fashion. One relic of that time has come down to us in the shape of the remains of a handsome communion service of English plate made in 1707, once used at Patuxent, possibly a gift of Ninian Beall.²

Of the political influence of the Presbyterians residing in Maryland upon its history during the period embraced by this sketch it is difficult to say anything certainly. We have spoken of their influence in the matter of passing the famous Act concerning Religion. It is impossible to distribute the honors for that most sensible and most christian legislation at this late day. All that we contend is, that the part that the Puritans played in the matter should not be ignored, when we know that they composed a large part, if not the majority of the Assembly, which passed it.

In regard to their legislation, when for awhile they held the reins of government, only one adverse criticism can be made in regard to it, the one act where the liberty granted under the Act concerning Religion is repealed, and Papists and Prelatists excluded from the free enjoyment of their religion.³ From our point of view this was a piece of bigotry, peculiarly unkind, after the liberality shown by Lord Baltimore. But in this act they were but applying the law passed by the English Parliament

¹ Taylor's library contained a number of them.

² The tankard and cups having been sent to the church at Bladensburg are still in use by that congregation, now located at Hyattsville.

³ *Archives of Maryland*, Assembly Proceedings, 1637-1664, pp. 340-341.

to the colony, a not unnatural proceeding. In regard to their attitude toward the Lord Proprietor or in secular matters they are to be admired, not condemned. It was impossible for them to have acted in any other spirit. Their party in England had overthrown the monarchy. Baltimore was practically a sovereign in Maryland.¹ No wonder then that some of them hesitated to take the oath of allegiance to him, and still others wanted to get rid of the title, "Absolute Lord and Proprietor." During the eight years that the Puritans held possession of the province, a practical democracy prevailed. The laws passed by them were of a wise nature. Even the law against "Papists and Prelatists" does not seem to have been enforced.

A decided trace of Puritanism may be found in the strict Sabbath laws passed, all of which even that of November, 1678, "for keeping holy the Lord's Day" are couched in Puritan language. The tradition in Maryland has always been for the strict keeping of Sunday. How much of this is due to the Puritan ideas of the early settlers?

There was naturally considerable feeling between the Presbyterians and the Roman Catholics, owing to the corresponding violence of feeling in Europe, where, especially in France and Ireland, the reformed churches were suffering bitter persecutions. Very little of this feeling appears, however, upon the surface in Maryland, except perhaps on two occasions. Coode, the "Titus Oates of Maryland," as he has well been called in his rebellion in 1689, managed to arouse a great deal of bitter feeling against the Roman Catholics by false reports and appeals to prejudice. He so far duped Beall, a leader among the Presbyterians, as to induce him to join his forces. But there was no general movement among the Presbyterians, and Beall himself took a much less active part in the plot than some of his companions. It would be unfair to blame the Presbyterian party generally for the action of one or two of their members. Again, the readiness with which the Presbyterians acquiesced in the establishment of Episcopacy may have

¹ Lord Baltimore's sovereign power was frequently complained of at a later period, as by the Episcopalians, when in 1677 he opposed the establishing of the church of England.

originated in their distrust of Lord Baltimore and his Roman Catholic friends, who would be deprived of what power they had, to a great extent at least, by the act of establishment. Yet this is but a matter of conjecture. If it existed it may have been due to a feeling of "*Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*," a suspicion which was certainly justified by the conduct of James II.

After the restoration in England anything like democracy in Maryland was of course impossible. Yet the spirit which led the Puritans to demand their rights in the great civil war of England was not dead either in the old country nor in the colonies. Occasional flashes of it may be seen in Maryland, as when the Puritan Nicholet, in a sermon before the Lower House on April 26, 1669, endeavored to stir up the people to demand their rights.¹ He got a severe reproof, had to beg pardon, and quitted the province. It slumbered on until a century later, when it burst forth in the demand for liberty by all the colonies. In that great movement the Presbyterians everywhere took a most prominent part, their ministers and laymen being with scarcely an exception ardent patriots.

After the establishment of the English Church in Maryland, the number of Presbyterians was, as we have said, proportionately much smaller. But there is one legacy which the old Puritan families, whose descendants went into the English Church, left to them, which we think we can trace in the later religious history of the province. The rise in the next century of Methodism was but the reappearance of Puritanism under a different guise, and with a somewhat altered theology. The sympathy of many of the Presbyterians of this country, such as the Tennents, Jonathan Edwards, and others with this movement is well known. Whitefield came to this country, gladly welcomed by the Presbyterians. He preached in the church at Upper Marlboro, where however he found the people "in a dead sleep."² John and Charles Wesley had for their grandparents Presbyterian divines on both sides of the house. May there not have been a similar ancestry in Maryland, and the Methodism there be the descendant

¹ *Maryland Archives*, Vol. II, pp. 159-163.

² Letter to Noble of New York, Dec. 8th, 1739.

of early Puritanism? In no state did the early Methodists gain greater success, and this in the face of an all-powerful established church. This may be ascribed to the earnest zeal of the first preachers, to the fact that the church had suffered from the evils of establishment, where the governor was the head of the church, and also to the fact that many of the established clergy sympathized with England in the struggle with the colonies. But may not its success be in part, at least, due to a Puritan tradition within the establishment itself, coming down from the early settlers, who formed the congregations of Doughty and Hill, Fogg and Taylor?

Socially, the Presbyterians were among the best elements in forming the character of the people of Maryland. The morality preached by their ministers was of a high type. It is well known that wherever Presbyterianism has gone, it has fostered education. Its type of religion is a very intellectual one. The children in their early childhood are taught the Shorter Catechism, a body of divinity in itself. The clergy preach doctrinal sermons and expect the people to discuss at length afterward the points brought forward. The most intelligent body of men in the colonies before the Revolution was the clergy of the Presbyterian and Congregational churches. They were the ablest, almost the only educators of prominence. In this general intelligence the Presbyterians of Maryland partook as a matter of course. Although being less wealthy and powerful than some of their northern neighbors they founded no college to be the rival of Princeton, from the earliest time they took a great interest in the matter of education. One of their leaders on the Eastern Shore, Daniel Brown, showed that interest by leaving £100 to the University of Glasgow. Would that he had left it to found a good school in Maryland. In the 18th century the Presbyterians founded more than one academy in Maryland, which did good work in their day. In general we may say that there were two great objects which the Presbyterian church in Maryland has always been most zealous in maintaining, a love for personal and political liberty, and the cause of popular education.