AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PERIODICAL LITERATURE BEARING UPON LOYALIST ACTIVITIES IN THE MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES, 1775-1783

BY GEORGE W. KYTE

There are many books and articles which discuss the part played by the Loyalists of the Middle Atlantic States in the War for American Independence. Most of the books are fairly easy to find through the use of card catalogues in various libraries. Unfortunately, however, the periodical literature is scattered and in some cases rather difficult to locate. It is possible that a number of excellent articles may have been overlooked by would-be readers. It is the author's hope that the following pages will call the attention of interested readers to a number of articles and pamphlets which bear upon some phase of Loyalist activities in the Middle Atlantic States. Some books will have to be mentioned, but our primary object will be to direct attention to periodical literature.

The reader who is interested in studying the role of the Loyalists in the War of 1775-1783 should commence his investigations by perusing the pages of Professor Leonard W. Labaree's splendid article, "The Nature of American Loyalism."1 Professor Labaree's study is the basic work on its subject. It explains how some Americans remained loyal to the British connection when many of their neighbors were rallying to establish and defend an independent nation. The article should be read in conjunction with Professor Labaree's book, Conservation in Early American History.2 Without the background information furnished in the publications


2 (New York, New York University Press, 1948.) 182 p. The book is based upon a series of lectures which Professor Labaree was invited to deliver at New York University in 1947.
just mentioned, the reader may have some difficulty in understand-
ing the sincerity of the viewpoint of the Loyalists—it must be clearly understood that they were not traitors to the American cause, but that they were patriotic Americans fighting to defend a government under which they had prospered and to which they had long been loyal.

There are many publications which describe the attitudes and activities of Loyalists in Pennsylvania. Before consulting the mass of materials on the subject, the reader should turn to the pages of Wilbur H. Siebert's fine book, The Loyalists of Pennsylvania. Professor Siebert's study was written many years ago, but it is still a most useful and instructive monograph. It is one of a dozen or more studies which its distinguished author has published from time to time on Loyalists and their activities. Dr. Siebert was particularly interested in the flight and re-settlement of Tories who became displaced persons as result of the defeat of British arms. Most of his publications are very specialized, and it would appear to the writer that they do not fall within the scope of the present study. However, one of Dr. Siebert's studies is of sufficient general interest to be mentioned here; the study in question is entitled, "The Dispersion of the American Tories." It may be startling to some readers to learn that nearly 100,000 Americans fled from their country in order to put themselves under the protection of the Crown.

There were many Loyalists in Pennsylvania and in the neighboring states of New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. However, the Middle Atlantic area was fortunate in that the Loyalists and their anti-British neighbors did not fight a major civil war similar to that which took place in North Carolina in 1776 and 1780-81. There was, however, considerable Tory activity in parts of New Jersey throughout the war, and many of the Loyalists of Pennsylvania became active in the interest of the Crown during the British

A number of articles are available on various aspects of Tory activities during the British occupation of Philadelphia. An article containing "Letters of Robert Proud" gives us an account of events in the Quaker City in 1777-1783 as they were seen by an intelligent Tory schoolmaster. Additional source material was made available with the publication by Raymond C. Werner of the "Diary of Grace Growden Galloway." Mrs. Galloway was left behind when her husband fled from Philadelphia; she tried to save her property and some of her husband's, but the "miserable Whigs" —as she called them—seized the property, and the British army failed to put in a re-appearance to rescue the Galloway fortunes. It is interesting to note that Joseph Galloway estimated his total property loss as £40,000, exclusive of his wife's property which, like his own, was confiscated by the Whigs.

William O. Mishoff's fine article, "Business in Philadelphia during the British Occupation, 1777-1778," gives us an interesting account of the supplying and entertaining of the British forces by various merchants. Many of the merchants fled from Philadelphia when the British army evacuated the city. However, some Loyalists remained in Philadelphia, hoping against hope that they would not be imprisoned and that their property would not be con-
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7 (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941.) 185 p. See also Dr. Boyd's "Joseph Galloway's Plans of Union for the British Empire, 1774-1788," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, LXIV (October, 1940), 492-515.
8 *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, XXXIV (1910), 62-73.
10 See p. 79 of *The Examination of Joseph Galloway, Esq., Late Speaker of the House of Assembly of Pennsylvania, before the House of Commons* . . . (London, printed for J. Willkie, 1779).
fiscated. Some of the suspected Loyalists were sent to internment camps in Virginia, but numbers of them remained in the city as is made clear in “A Loyalist’s Account of Certain Occurrences in Philadelphia after Cornwallis’ Surrender in Yorktown.” The “Loyalist’s Account” was that of a Miss Anna Rawle, a Quaker-Loyalist, who was distressed by what was to her the bad news of the defeat of Lord Cornwallis’ army. Miss Rawle recorded that those Philadelphians who were tardy in illuminating their windows in honor of the victory had their windows smashed or even had their houses pillaged by the jubilant mobs which swept through the streets. Some Loyalists seem to have saved their windows and their furniture by swallowing their pride and lighting up a host of candles in the nick of time.

Miss Rawle and some of her friends were the helpless targets of some barbed sentences from the pen of Tom Paine. Robert P. Falk has written an excellent article on the subject, entitled, “Thomas Paine and the Attitude of the Quakers to the American Revolution.” Tom Paine would have been even more irritated at the conduct of certain Philadelphians if he had ever had opportunity to read “Muster Rolls of Three Troops of Loyalist Light Dragoons raised in Pennsylvania, 1777-1778.” Of the 306 men who enlisted in the Light Dragoons, some were raised in New Jersey, but the majority were raised in the Philadelphia area. Another account of Loyalist troops raised in the Philadelphia area is Louis E. Thompson’s “An Introduction to the Loyalists of Bucks County and Some Questions Concerning Them.” The most prominent of the Bucks County Loyalists was Joseph Galloway; he owned land and at least one very fine house in the county.

A very grim note is struck in William T. Johnson’s “Alan Cameron, A Scotch Loyalist in the American Revolution.” Cameron had fled from South Carolina in order to try to join some Loyalists in Virginia. Unfortunately for him, he failed to get in touch with the Virginia Tories whom he had sought, and he was captured while trying to make his way across Maryland. He was imprisoned in Philadelphia during the years 1776-78,
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12 Ibid., XVI (1892), 103-107.
13 Ibid., LXIII (July, 1939), 302-310.
14 Edited by Carlos E. Godfrey, in ibid., XXXIV (1910), 1-8.
15 The Bucks County Historical Society Papers, VII (1937), 204-234.
16 Pennsylvania History, VIII (January, 1941), 29-46.
and his health was broken for some time as result of the hardships of life in prison. However, he recovered later in life and served with distinction as one of the Duke of Wellington's generals in the Peninsular Campaigns.

Walter R. Hoberg's "Early History of Colonel Alexander McKee" gives us additional insight into the motives and actions of the Loyalists. Colonel McKee was an Indian agent in British service who remained loyal to the Crown during the Revolutionary War. He gave his parole to remain "neutral" in the conflict, but he left Western Pennsylvania in 1778 to join the British garrison at Detroit. During the war, he led a number of Indian raids from the Detroit area and helped divert American strength from General Washington's army to the frontier areas.

Rather more general in scope than some of the foregoing articles is the present author's "Some Plans for a Loyalist Stronghold in the Middle Colonies." Various plans were suggested from time to time for a Loyalist "redoubt" in Maryland, in New Jersey, in the Philadelphia area, and in the Middle Colonies in general. Had any of the plans been carried out, it is probable that the Middle Atlantic area would have been the scene of some desperate civil warfare such as that which took place in the Carolinas during Lord Cornwallis' campaigns of 1780-81. Fortunately, however, the British concentrated their efforts elsewhere, and the populous and prosperous Baltimore-Washington-Philadelphia area was spared from the ravages of war after the retreat of Sir Henry Clinton's army into New York and New Jersey in 1778.

The aftermath of the war for many Tories was a heart-breaking migration to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Upper Canada (Ontario). Dr. Arthur J. Mekeel's "The Quaker-Loyalist Migration to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in 1783" gives us an account of one of the groups which departed from the United States after the war. A number of Quakers from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York embarked from New York City in 1783 to found a settlement in New Brunswick. They encountered severe hardships, and, by 1790 or a bit earlier, they were forced

17 Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, LVIII (1934), 26-36.
18 Pennsylvania History, XVI (July, 1949), 177-190.
19 Bulletin of Friends' Historical Association, XXXII (Autumn, 1943), 65-75.
to disperse into various parts of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Some of the Quaker-Loyalists abandoned altogether their efforts to settle in the Maritime Provinces and traveled westward to resettle in what is now Ontario Province.

One of the emigrants from Pennsylvania was James Humphreys, Jr. Ralph A. Brown's "The Philadelphia Ledger: Tory News Sheet" gives us an analysis of his career. Humphreys edited a newspaper during the British occupation of Philadelphia. His editorials lambasted the Continental Congress and praised the policies of the Lord North ministry. However, his journalistic activities were interrupted when the British army marched out of Philadelphia; he was forced to abandon his press and his property in order to seek safety in New York; he emigrated to Nova Scotia at the end of the war, but he returned to Philadelphia in 1797. Evidently, the citizens of the Quaker City did not harbor resentments indefinitely; they permitted Humphreys to remain in their midst and he prospered as a book-printer.

Loyalist activities in Pennsylvania were curtailed after the withdrawal of the British army from Philadelphia. Most of the active Loyalists of Pennsylvania fled to New York City and its immediate vicinity, and a number of those who remained in their homes were arrested and transported to internment camps in Virginia. However, the Loyalists of New Jersey were able to remain active throughout the war because of the support which they received from the British armies based upon New York, Staten Island, and such outposts as Perth Amboy. A number of books and articles have been written about the activities of New Jersey's Tories. One of the most useful of the works on the subject is Edward Alfred Jones' *The Loyalists of New Jersey in the American Revolution.* The author lists more than 1,700 Loyalists and gives a paragraph or two of information about the services, property losses, and eventual fate of each of 419 men who played a prominent part in the war or who were prominent by virtue of their social and economic standing in their communities. The information about indi-
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20 *Pennsylvania History,* IX (July, 1942), 161-175.

vidual Loyalists was obtained from materials available in the Audit Office and War Office files in the Public Record Office, London.

Another useful study is that of A. Van Doren Honeyman, entitled, "Concerning the New Jersey Loyalists in the Revolution." The author estimates that, counting men alone, there were at least 5,000 unyielding Tories in New Jersey, and that some 3,000 of them saw active military service at one time or another. Cornelius C. Vermeule's "The Active Loyalists of New Jersey" supplements the findings of Mr. Honeyman. It is made clear in Mr. Vermeule's article that there were never more than 1,100 New Jersey Loyalists in military service at any one time. Some of the men who served in New Jersey's Loyalist units were residents of other states, and there were times when no more than 700 actual residents of New Jersey were enrolled in Loyalist units. However, it occurs to the present author that there may have been a considerable number of New Jerseymen serving with the British regular forces. In that case, the number of men serving in purely Loyalist organizations would not reflect the total effort made by New Jersey Tories in support of the British cause.

Charles W. Parker's study, "Shipley: The County Seat of a New Jersey Loyalist," explains how an elderly citizen of Perth Amboy managed to hide his pro-British sentiments during the war by living in seclusion on a farm. Since he was not an active Loyalist, and since he took care to keep his opinions to himself, his neighbors did not deprive him of his property. He managed to remain in the United States after 1783, although most "known" Loyalists were forced to emigrate at that time. It will never be known how many Loyalists managed to conceal their sympathies during the war, but it is probable that many of them managed to do so and thereby escaped the painful experience of becoming refugees when British arms met defeat.

Harold B. Hancock's *The Delaware Loyalists* tells us that many of the inhabitants of New Jersey's tiny neighbor faced the same problems and the same penalties which were experienced by
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22 *Proceedings* of the New Jersey Historical Society, 51 (April, 1933), 117-133.
Loyalists elsewhere.\textsuperscript{25} The author asserts that half the people of Delaware were active or passive Tories and that many of the remainder were "neutral." However, the Loyalists were unable to control Delaware, partly because they were not as well organized as their opponents, and partly because considerable numbers of Continental troops and Pennsylvania militia were stationed in their midst during the course of the war. Under the circumstances, the local Loyalists were fairly ineffective, except insofar as some of them managed to leave their towns or farms to join various units which were co-operating with the British armies.

It should be noted that the ineffectiveness of the Loyalists of Delaware was duplicated elsewhere and was the subject of bitter comment by British officers and officials. Examples of such comment are to be found in the pages of \textit{The American Journal of Ambrose Serle, Secretary to Lord Howe, 1776-1778}.\textsuperscript{26} Serle was an Englishman whose duties as secretary to a British admiral and peace-commissioner brought him into contact with many Loyalists, including Joseph Galloway and many of his friends and associates. Serle was strongly in sympathy with the Loyalists, but he soon lost confidence in their ability to organize themselves and to act effectively.\textsuperscript{27} Whatever his feelings toward the Loyalists may have been, however, he was deeply shocked when the British army evacuated Philadelphia, thereby forcing a host of the people of that city to abandon their property.\textsuperscript{28}

Whatever may be said about the effectiveness of the Loyalists during the war, their ultimate fate is one of the saddest chapters in our history. Numerous case studies of the sufferings of individual Loyalists have been published in the quarterlies and proceedings published by the historical societies of the various states on the Atlantic Seaboard. Many more case studies are as yet unpublished, but the would-be researcher could amass dozens of manuscript accounts or collections of letters of Loyalist exiles from the archives of various historical societies in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, and the British West Indies. Many of the letters and

\textsuperscript{26} Edited by Edward H. Tatum (San Marino, California, Huntington Library, 1940). xxx, 369 p.
\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 164, 223-224.
\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 295-296.
diaries tell heartrending accounts of shattered hopes, military defeat, exile, and loss of property.

Many Loyalists suffered loss of property, defeat, and exile several times over. They fled from their homes, abandoning most of their property when they did so, in order to seek shelter in British fortified cities or posts at Newport, Rhode Island, Philadelphia, New York and vicinity, and Charleston. In 1778, the refugees who had gathered in Philadelphia were forced to retreat to New York. In 1780, the British garrison of Rhode Island was evacuated, and the Tory exiles who had gathered there from all over New England withdrew to New York. Further heartbreak was in store for the displaced Tories, however, because New York itself was evacuated by the British in 1783. Meanwhile, the same kind of tragedy unfolded in the South; refugees crowded into Charleston during the period of British occupation in 1780 to 1782, but Charleston was evacuated before the end of December of the latter year, and more than 9,000 Loyalists were embarked on board the British fleet, before General Anthony Wayne’s Continentals marched into the city.\(^{29}\)

It would be instructive to make some comparisons between the experiences of Loyalists from different parts of the country. There is room for scholarly studies to be made along such lines, and it is to be hoped that such studies will be undertaken in the future. However, the purpose of the present study is restricted to directing attention to some of the works which have already been written about the Loyalists of the Middle Atlantic States. So far, we have examined a number of publications bearing upon Loyalist activities in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware. It remains for us to consider some of the books and articles which deal with the Tories of New York and Maryland.

No study of the activities of Loyalists in the Middle Atlantic States is complete without considerable attention being paid to living conditions and military activities in and around the city of New York during the years 1776 to 1783. The literature on the subject is too bulky to be analyzed in detail within the compass of

\(^{29}\) See Joseph Barnwell, “The Evacuation of Charlestown by the British in 1782,” *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, XI (January, 1910), 1-26. See also Robert W. Barnwell, “The Migration of Loyalists from South Carolina” and “Reports on Loyalist Exiles from South Carolina, 1783,” on pp. 34-42 and 43-46 respectively of *Proceedings* of the South Carolina Historical Association (1937).
the present study, but an effort will be made to mention certain books and articles which will serve as guides or introductions to the subject and the published and manuscript source material which is available. Perhaps as good a starting point as any will be found by consulting the pages of Oscar T. Barck’s fine book, *New York City during the War for Independence.*

Professor Barck’s monograph describes life in New York during the British military occupation. It is interesting to note that New York was under military government during the entire occupation, despite the ardent desire of the Tories to establish a civil government in the city. Large numbers of refugees were crowded into the city and into communities on Long Island throughout the period when New York was the principal British military base in North America. Many Loyalist military units operated in the vicinity of New York during the war, and a considerable number of Loyalist militiamen were raised for garrison duty in the city and its ring of forts and redoubts. Numerous raiding parties were sent from New York and Long Island against settlements in Connecticut, Virginia, and elsewhere, and New York was the staging area from which British and Loyalist troops were sent to invade the Carolinas and Virginia in the years 1780 and 1781. Tories in New York published newspapers and circulated propaganda material which was designed to encourage those Americans who favored the British connection and to discourage those who were in arms against it. Finally, New York was the nerve center of a military intelligence organization in which a number of Loyalist espionage agents played an important role.

Professor Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker’s recent book, *Father Knickerbocker Rebels: New York City during the Revolution,* gives us an interesting and useful account of the history of New York from 1765 to the British evacuation in 1783. Professor Wertenbaker paints a vivid picture of life in an overcrowded city in which there was an acute housing shortage, severe economic inflation, and much human misery on the part of the townspeople and the Loyalist refugees. In the midst of misery and sorrow, there was much gayety and there were many formal balls, plays, athletic contests, and the like, among the British officers and the army
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26 (New York, Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1948.) 308 p.
contractors and the owners of privateers. There was considerable
corruption among the commissaries and supply clerks attached to
Sir Henry Clinton's headquarters, but some of the corruption was
curtailed by Sir Guy Carleton at the very end of the British occu-
pation. An orderly evacuation was carried out by British author-
ities at the end of the war, and the majority of the Tories who were
concentrated in and around the city were taken by British trans-
ports to Nova Scotia or to neighboring and newly-founded New
Brunswick. The Tory refugees lost all of their property upon leav-
ing New York, except for such items as they could carry with
them on board the crowded ships which carried them away from
their former homes.

The story of the confiscation of Loyalists' property in New York
and elsewhere is a dismal and distressing one. Each of the various
states passed laws at one time or another whereby the property of
known and active Loyalists was made subject to confiscation. Dr.
Harry B. Yoshpe's scholarly monograph, The Disposition of Loyal-
ist Estates in the Southern District of the State of New York, gives
us a clear account of the seizure and sale of Loyalist property in
one of the original thirteen states. It is refreshing to note that
discriminative legislation against former Loyalists was repealed by
1788, and that political exiles were allowed to return to New York
after 1792. One exile, Cadwalader Colden, was permitted to re-
turn to New York by a special legislative act which was passed
in 1784.

Additional information about Loyalist activities in New York is
available in various publications which are cited in the bibliographies
of Professor Oscar Barck's New York City during the War for
Independence, and Professor Thomas J. Wertenbaker's Father
Knickerbocker Rebels. . . . No effort will be made by the present
author to discuss in detail the various secondary works and articles
which appeared on New York Loyalism before the appearance of
the latest (Dr. Wertenbaker's) of the two works mentioned above.
However, there is one recent article which is of particular impor-
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33 See Oscar Zeichner, "The Loyalist Problem in New York after the
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34 For information concerning these two books, see footnotes 30 and 31.
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tance and which should be discussed at least briefly. The article in
question is R. W. G. Vail’s “The Loyalist Declaration of Depend-
ence of November 28, 1776.” The Declaration of Dependence
was a pledge of allegiance to the Crown signed by more than 700
Tories of New York City. In an earlier pledge, signed by 948 New
Yorkers, the Tories had petitioned for civil government to be re-
stored in their city. Unfortunately for the New York Loyalists,
their city was in the heart of the war zone and was blockaded, al-
most besieged, for a number of years. Under the circumstances,
civil government was not restored and New Yorkers, whether
Loyalists or otherwise, were obliged to live under military govern-
ment from the beginning of the British occupation in 1776 to the
evacuation of the garrison in 1783.

Another publication of value to the student of New York Loyal-
ism is Howard Swiggett’s fascinating book, War out of Niagara:
Walter Butler and the Tory Rangers. The story of Walter Butler
and his Rangers reads like a historical novel. However, the story
is a grim one; Butler led Upstate New York Tories and their
Indian allies in a series of bloody raids upon settlements in and
near the Mohawk Valley. Butler and his followers brought death
and terror into various frontier settlements during 1777, 1778, and
succeeding years, until at last, in October, 1781, the Tory leader
was killed during a retreat from an unsuccessful raid. Justly or
unjustly, Walter Butler has been accused of complicity in the
Indian massacre at Cherry Valley in 1778. However, Mr. Swiggett
points out that there is no real proof that Butler was responsible
for the massacre. In any case, such incidents were inevitable when
Indians were employed in white men’s wars; one needs only to
recall the similar experience of the Marquis de Montcalm when his
Indian allies slaughtered some of his prisoners of war after the
taking of Fort William Henry in 1757.

Further information upon Loyalists and their activities in Up-
state New York is to be found in George B. Upham’s article,
“Burgoyne’s Great Mistake.” The author points out that there
were numerous Loyalists residing in the Upper Connecticut Valley.
They were eager to bear arms in the British cause, but General
John Burgoyne neglected the opportunity to raise them in support

of his march toward Albany in 1777. As a consequence of his neglect, General Burgoyne found the left flank of his army exposed to attack by New England militiamen. The New Englanders annihilated a detachment of Hessians at Bennington, and then pressed forward to participate in the entrapment of General Burgoyne's army. The Connecticut Valley Loyalists, who might have been able to cover the left flank of the British army effectively, were left without support, and were either driven from their homes or forced to conceal their true feelings toward the Crown.37a

A fascinating aspect of Tory activities is described in Kenneth Scott's interesting article, "New Hampshire Tory Counterfeiters Operating from New York City."38 A number of Loyalist refugees from New Hampshire were actively engaged for several years in counterfeiting Continental currency with the hope of creating economic inflation, confusion, and collapse of morale behind the enemy's lines. The bogus money was circulated in New Hampshire by confederates of the counterfeiters. Unfortunately for the success of the scheme, several of the men who were engaged in the circulation of the counterfeit bills were captured, and the printing presses in New York were deprived of an outlet for their products. It is likely that further research upon the circulation of counterfeit money would show that the practice was fairly widespread throughout the several states which acknowledged the authority of the Continental Congress.

No discussion of publications bearing upon Loyalism in New York would be complete without mentioning a book which was first published half a century ago. The book in question is Alexander C. Flick's splendid pioneer study, Loyalism in New York during the American Revolution.39 A considerable amount of information has come to light since Dr. Flick's study was written.


39 (New York, Columbia University Press, 1901.) 281 p. This book is volume XIV, number 1 in the Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law. It is interesting to note that Dr. Flick was for many years the official historian of the State of New York.
Nevertheless, his book is still a useful guide to an understanding of the motives and actions of the many New Yorkers who worked or fought on the side of King George III and his ministry during the Revolutionary War.

A few published accounts are available concerning Loyalist activities in Maryland, the southernmost of the Middle Atlantic States. It is clear that there were many Loyalists in Maryland. However, a definitive account of their activities has yet to be written. Dorothy M. Quynn’s “The Loyalist Plot in Frederick” gives some indication of the nature and seriousness of the plans and actions of Maryland Loyalists. The Marylanders were unable to organize and to operate as effectively as were their Tory friends in states such as New York and South Carolina where British garrisons and armies were stationed at one time or another during the long war. However, there were many Tories of the uncompromising stamp of Jonathan Boucher, onetime rector of the church at Annapolis, who was forced to flee to England late in 1775 after having had to protect himself for a time by keeping two loaded pistols on his pulpit during the delivery of his sermons. The Reverend Boucher’s *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist, 1738-1789* have been edited and published for us by Jonathan Bouchier.

Not all of the Jonathan Bouchers were driven from Maryland during the Revolution. On the contrary, there is considerable evidence to show that many Loyalists remained in the state during the war. The peninsula or “Eastern Shore” of Maryland was reputed to have been populated almost exclusively by Loyalists, many of whom were willing to co-operate with British forces whenever the latter should make an attempt to seize and hold the tongue of land on which they lived. There is room for further research on this subject, and considerable study will be required before there is a study of Loyalism in Maryland which is compar-
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40 *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XL (September, 1945), 201-210.
42 Anonymous to [Lord George Germain ?], “Remarks on the Peninsula or Eastern Shore of Maryland” [1779 or 1780], *Germain Papers*, XVII, William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan. See also Major Charles Cochran to [Sir Henry Clinton ?], “Thoughts relative to the present State of our Affairs in America with remarks on the advantages which may be derived to Great Britain, from giving up the Northern Colonies and drawing the line of our present possessions by the River Delaware” [December, 1780?], *Germain Papers*, II, Supplementary.
able in scope and in quality to the fine study by Isaac S. Harrell of *Loyalism in Virginia*. Many additional titles could be introduced, but the discussion on the foregoing pages should serve as a useful introduction to the numerous secondary works and periodical articles which have been written about some phase of Loyalist activities in the Middle Colonies. The bibliographies and footnotes of the various works which have been cited will help to inform the reader of additional publications bearing upon Loyalists and their problems, plans, and achievements. Likewise, the bibliographies and footnotes will help to bring to the attention of interested scholars the presence of vast collections of source materials which are readily available in various archives and special collections in New York, Philadelphia, Ann Arbor, and elsewhere. New York City alone is rich in documentary archival materials bearing on Loyalism in general and especially upon Loyalist activities in the metropolitan area. The Clinton, Gage, Knox, and Germain collections at the William L. Clements Library are rich in memorials, suggestions, plans of campaign, and the like written by Loyalists. There are still serious gaps in our knowledge of Loyalists in general and of those of the Middle Atlantic States in particular. There is room for further research, and, quite fortunately, the source materials for such research exist in abundance in libraries, archives, and historical societies which are readily accessible to research scholars. It is to be hoped that the results of additional research will cause the present study to be completely “dated” within five years, or preferably, within a year or two.