

“Loyalists Speak for Themselves,” five Loyalist letters from 1775 to 1780 reprinted from G.N.D. Evans (ed.) *Allegiance in America: The Case of the Loyalists* (Addison-Wellesley Publishing, 1969).

A) Samuel Seabury

Many Loyalists, not born and educated in England or committed by the holding of royal office, were as distressed with the growing rupture between the mother country and the colonies as many of those on the Patriot side. They had not been much happier with British policies since 1763 but whatever their discontent they stopped short at rebellion. Consequently, they emphasized the need to stay within the bounds of the law, and more and more in the last two years before the war broke out they stressed the possibilities of legal redress and the illegality of several actions embarked upon by various groups of colonials.

Samuel Seabury, Jr., (1729-1796) was born in Groton, Connecticut, but when he was nearly thirteen the family moved to Long Island, New York. Two years later Samuel went to Yale, where he graduated in 1748. He was interested in missionary work and the better to prepare himself studied “physic” (medicine) for a year at Edinburgh University before his ordination in 1753 by the Bishop of London, who was responsible for the activities of the Anglican or Episcopalian church in the American colonies. Although his father had been a Congregational minister before becoming an Anglican in 1730, young Seabury from the first took the side of the New York’s established church in the literary battles which had been waged on and off since the last years of the seventeenth century. Protagonists in these disputes tended to inject secular notes into their religious debate. Certainly a number of the Anglican clergy saw themselves as fighting for the unity of the church and state and keeping the colonies within the British Empire, as well as the successful defense of their denomination.

Since religion was the major path to Seabury’s stand on the Revolution, the form and style of his contribution to the Loyalist position may come as a surprise. He adopted the titled of “A Westchester Farmer” and stayed true to his pseudonym by taking pains to write in the words and sentiments of an educated yeoman. His statements are bluntly phrased, direct, to the point, and pitched to appeal to property loving classes who did not want to see their prosperity and prospects overturned by a bunch of reckless political plotters.

The following extract was taken from three pamphlets published in 1774 by the New York printer James Rivington who tried, with little success, to keep his newspaper, the *Gazetteer*, an impartial forum for the views on both sides. The excerpts are from Seabury’s “Free Thoughts on the Proceedings of the Continental Congress,” which was released on November 24, 1774. Much of the work dealt with the specific problems created for farmers by the congressional ban on the exportation of flax seed and the slaughtering and sale of sheep. Passages of more general interest have been chosen for inclusion here.

Anarchy and Confusion, Violence and Oppression, distress my country; and I must, and will, speak. Though the open violator of the laws may escape punishment, through the pusillanimity of the magistrates, he shall feel the lash of my pen...

But perhaps you will say, that these men are contending for our rights; that they are defending our liberties; and though they act against law, yet that the necessity of the times will justify them. Let me see. I sell a number of sheep. I drive them to New York, and deliver them to the purchaser. A mob interposes, and obliges me to take my sheep again, and drive them home for my pains, or sell them there for just what they please to give me. Are these the rights, is this the liberty, these men are contending for? It is a vile, abject slavery, and I will have none of it. These men defend our rights, and liberties, who act in open defiance of the laws? No. They are making us the most abject slaves that ever existed. The necessity of the times justify them in violating the first principles of civil society! Who induced this necessity? Who involved the province in discord, anarchy and confusion? These very men. They created that necessity, which they now plead in their own justification.

Let me entreat you, my Friends, to have nothing to do with these men, or with any of the same stamp. Please and quietness suit you best. Confusion and Discord, and Violence, and War, are sure destruction to the farmer. Without peace he cannot till his lands, unless protected by the Laws, he cannot carry his produce to market. Peace indeed is departed from us for the present, and the protection of the laws has ceased. But I trust in God, there is yet one method left, which by prudent management, will free us from all our difficulties, restore peace again to our dwellings, and give us the firm security of the Laws for our protection. Renounce all dependence on Congresses, and Committees. They have neglected, or betrayed your interests. Turn then your eyes to our constitutional representatives. They are the true, and legal, and have been hitherto the faithful defenders of your rights, and liberties; and you have no reason to think but that they will ever be so... You can trust their wisdom and prudence, that they will use the most reasonable, constitutional, and effectual methods of restoring that peace and harmony, between Great Britain and this province, which is so earnestly wished for by all good men, and which is so absolutely necessary for the happiness of us all...

B) Joseph Galloway

Joseph Galloway (1731-1803) personified the sort of blind neglect which has been accorded the Loyalist leaders. Few appreciate that his statesmanlike political thinking is worthy of a place for higher than that customarily given such patriotic heroes as Patrick Henry or Sam Adams. Galloway also reflected the interesting split among colonial lawyers.

At a very early age he rose to prominence at the Bar of Pennsylvania and this, together with his marriage to the daughter of one of the colony's wealthiest and most influential merchants, propelled him toward a successful political career. After his first election to the provincial Assembly in 1756 he served continuously for two decades. The only exception was the year 1764-1765 when he joined with Benjamin Franklin in a move against the Penn family by petitioning the Crown to change the colony's form of government from proprietary to royal.

During the period when the British government tried to reorganize the administration of its American colonies, Galloway came to occupy an increasingly important role in Pennsylvania affairs. Each year between 1766 and 1775 he was elected Speaker of the Assembly, a position which gave him probably the most powerful single voice in the colony's politics. He also served as chairman of the Assembly's committee for correspondence with the colony's agent in London. Galloway tried to maintain harmony between Great Britain and his colony, but while acknowledging the need for the British to raise more revenue from within North America, he was no advocate of parliamentary taxation and disapproved of many of the regulations imposed upon colonial commerce.

On the other hand, he found it impossible to reject the basic premise of parliamentary supremacy. Equally, however, as a product of the English common law, he placed emphasis on citizens' rights and the necessity of exercising all power constitutionally. Looking at what was actually taking place he concluded that in some matters the British government was acting unconstitutionally and, looking to the remedy, he sought a written constitution for the empire. Indeed, his most significant contribution as a delegate to the First Continental Congress (1774) was a scheme for an imperial legislature which would thrash out the details of such a document. For a time it seemed that Galloway's plan had a chance, but consideration of it was postponed, as he claimed "by a majority of one colony." Eventually it was rejected and not even allowed to be entered into the minutes. Congress then proceeded on the radical course Galloway had feared, coming up with such measures as a non-exportation plan to add to the resolution on non-importation which it has passed on September 27, the day immediately preceding its hearing of Galloway's plan and motion. Many have since wondered whether the passing of his instrument for a balanced distribution of legislative power, a means for legal and orderly redress of grievances, might not have prevented or at least postponed the rebellion.

When war did break out Galloway, even though he fled to the country because he thought Philadelphia was too hot to hold him, desired to stay neutral. He loved his native Pennsylvania, yet he could not believe that the American Revolution was any more constitutional, any more just, than some of the actions of British ministries had been. He joined General Howe not so much because he liked the British or was enamored of their cause but with the hope of retrieving America from the disorder into which it had fallen. After Philadelphia was taken he headed its civil administration.

Too late, Joseph Galloway was made to realize that he was too vocal a spokesman, too honest a person, and too involved in a war for independence, not a war for a new disposition of imperial power. When the Continental army reoccupied the city in 1778, he sailed to England and there became the chief apologist for the Loyalists. He had already produced a severe criticism of the First Continental Congress in "A Candid Examination of the Mutual Claims of Great Britain, and the Colonies" (1775), and now he gave a critical analysis before the House of Commons of the way in which the war was being waged. More positive efforts were his continued attempts to bring about a reconciliation between Britain the colonies on the same bases as he had proposed earlier.

The peace of 1783 finally killed his hopes, and speaking for the Loyalists in general he put into words their shock and dejection. He also expressed their bitter conviction that the British, who

during the war had not fought hard enough, were now lightly selling their allies down the river. Shame and deceit were the two characteristics of the treaty most evident to Loyalist eyes. His American estates confiscated, Galloway became dependent upon his pension from the British government, an unhappy existence which encouraged him to petition the government of Pennsylvania to permit him to return. He was not allowed to do so, and therefore spent his last years in England. The following extract is taken from Galloway's speech to the Continental Congress on September 28, 1774. What position does Galloway take concerning the relationship between Britain and its North American colonies? What arguments does he use to support his position? The original appears in *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789*, edited from the original records in the Library of Congress and published by the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1904-37.

If we sincerely mean to accommodate the difference between the two countries, and to establish their union on more firm and constitutional principles, we must take into consideration a number of facts which led the Parliament to pass the acts complained of, since the year 1763, and the real state of the Colonies. A clear and perfect knowledge of these matters only can lead us to the ground of substantial redress and permanent harmony. I will therefore call your recollection to the dangerous situation of the Colonies from the intrigues of France, and the incursions of the Canadians and their Indian allies, at the commencement of the last war. None of us can be ignorant of the just sense they then entertained of that danger, and of their incapacity to defend themselves against it, nor of the supplications made to the Parent State for its assistance, nor of the cheerfulness with which Great-Britain sent over her fleets and armies for their protection, of the millions she expended in that protection, and of the happy consequences which attended it.

In this state of the Colonies it was not unreasonable to expect that Parliament would have levied a tax on them proportionate to their wealth, and the sums raised in Great Britain. Her ancient right, so often exercised, and never controverted, enabled her, and the occasion invited her, to do it. And yet, not knowing their wealth, a generous tenderness arising from the fear of doing them injustice, induced Parliament to forbear to levy aids upon them--It left the Colonies to do justice to themselves and to the nation. And moreover, in order to allure them to a discharge of their duty, it offered to reimburse those Colonies which should generously grant the aids that were necessary to their own safety. But what was the conduct of the Colonies on this occasion, in which their own existence was immediately concerned? However painful it may be for me to repeat, or you to hear, I must remind you of it. You all know there were Colonies which at some times granted liberal aids, and at others nothing; other Colonies gave nothing during the war; none gave equitably in proportion to their wealth, and all that did give were actuated by partial and self-interested motives, and gave only in proportion to the approach or remoteness of the danger. These delinquencies were occasioned by the want of the exercise of some supreme power to ascertain, with equity, their proportions of aids, and to over-rule the particular passions, prejudices, and interests, of the several Colonies.

To remedy these mischiefs, Parliament was naturally led to exercise the power which had been, by its predecessors, so often exercised over the Colonies, and to pass the Stamp Act. Against this act, the Colonies petitioned Parliament, and denied its authority. Instead of proposing some remedy, by which that authority should be rendered more equitable and more constitutional over

the Colonies, the petitions rested in a declaration that the Colonies could not be represented in that body. This justly alarmed the British Senate. It was thought and called by the ablest men and Britain, a clear and explicit declaration of the American Independence, and compelled the Parliament to pass the Declaratory Act, in order to save its ancient and incontrovertible right of supremacy over all the parts of the empire. By this injudicious step the cause of our complaints became fixed, and instead of obtaining a constitutional reformation of the authority of Parliament over the Colonies, it brought on an explicit declaration of a right in Parliament to exercise absolute and unparticipated power over them . . .

In order to establish those principles, upon which alone American relief ought, in reason and policy, to be founded, I will take a brief view of the arguments on both sides of the great question between the two countries--a question in its magnitude and importance exceeded by none that has been ever agitated in the councils of any nation. The advocates for the supremacy of Parliament over the Colonies contend, that there must be one supreme legislative head in every civil society, whose authority must extend to the regulation and final decision of every matter susceptible of human direction; and that every member of the society, whether political, official, or individual must be subordinate to its supreme will, signified in its laws: that this supremacy and subordination are essential in the constitution of all States, whatever may be their forms; that no society ever did or could exist, without it; and that these truths are solidly established in the practice of all governments, and confirmed by the concurrent authority of all writers on the subject of civil society.

These advocates also assert, what we cannot deny--That the discovery of the Colonies was made under a commission granted by the supreme authority of the British State, that they have been settled under that authority. and therefore are truly the property of that State. Parliamentary jurisdiction has been constantly exercised over them from their first settlement; its executive authority has ever run through all their inferior political systems: the Colonists have ever sworn allegiance to the British State, and have been considered, both by the State and by themselves, as subjects of the British Government. Protection and allegiance are reciprocal duties; the one cannot exist without the other. The Colonies cannot claim the protection of Britain upon any principle of reason or law, while they deny its supreme authority. Upon this ground the authority of Parliament stands too firm to be shaken by any arguments whatever; and therefore to deny that authority, and at the same time to declare their incapacity to be represented, amounts to a full and explicit declaration of independence.

In regard to the political state of the Colonies, you must know that they are so many inferior societies, disunited and unconnected in polity. That while they deny the authority of Parliament, they are, in respect to each other, in a perfect state of nature, destitute of any supreme direction or decision whatever, and incompetent to the grant of national aids, or any other general measure whatever, even to the settlement of differences among themselves . . .

You also knew that the seeds of discord are plentifully sowed in the constitution of the Colonies; that they are already grown to maturity, and have more than once broke out into open hostilities. They are at this moment only suppressed by the authority of the Parent State; and should that authority be weakened or annulled, many subjects of unsettled disputes, and which in that case, can only be settled by an appeal to the sword, must involve us in all the horrors of civil war . . .

Having thus briefly stated the arguments in favour of parliamentary authority, and considered the state of the Colonies, I am free to confess that the exercise of that authority is not perfectly constitutional in respect to the Colonies. We know that the whole landed interest of Britain is represented in that body, while neither the land nor the people of America hold the least participation in the legislative authority of the State. Representation, or a participation in the supreme councils of the State, is the great principle upon which the freedom of the British Government is established and secured. I also acknowledge, that that territory whose people have no enjoyment of this privilege, are subject to an authority unrestrained and absolute; and if the liberty of the subject were not essentially concerned in it, I should reject a distinction so odious between members of the same state, so long as it shall be continued. I wish to see it exploded, and the right to participate in the supreme councils of the State extended, in some form, not only to America, but to all the British dominions; otherwise I fear that profound and excellent fabrick of civil polity will, ere long, crumble to pieces . . .

As to the tax, it is neither unjust or oppressive, it being rather a relief than a burthen; but it is want of constitutional principle in the authority that passed it, which is the ground for complaint. This, and this only, is the source of American grievances. Here, and here only, is the defect; and if this defect were removed, a foundation would be laid for the relief of every American complaint; the obnoxious statutes would of course be repealed, and others would be made, with the assent of the Colonies, to answer the same and better purposes; the mischiefs arising from the disunion of the Colonies would be removed; their freedom would be established, and their subordination fixed on solid constitutional principles.

Desirous as I am to promote the freedom of the Colonies, and to prevent the mischiefs which will attend a military contest with Great-Britain, I must intreat you to desert the measures which have been so injudiciously and ineffectually pursued by antecedent Assemblies. Let us thoroughly investigate the subject matter in dispute, and endeavour to find from that investigation the means of perfect and permanent redress . . . I would therefore acknowledge the necessity of the supreme authority of Parliament over the Colonies, because it is a proposition which we cannot deny without manifest contradiction, while we confess that we are subjects of the British Government; and if we do not approve of a representation in Parliament, let us ask for a participation in the freedom and power of the English constitution in some other mode of incorporation: for I am convinced, by long attention to the subject, that let us deliberate, and try what other expedients we may, we shall find none that can give to the Colonies substantial freedom, but some such incorporation. I therefore beseech you, by the respect you are bound to pay to the instructions of your constituents, by the regard you have for the honour and safety of your country, and as you wish to avoid a war with Great-Britain, which must terminate, at all events in the ruin of America, not to rely on a denial of the authority of Parliament, a refusal to be represented, and on a non-importation agreement; because whatever protestations, in that case, may be made to the contrary, it will prove to the world that we intend to throw off our allegiance to the State, and to involve the two countries in all the horrors of a civil war.

C) Robert Proud (1728-1813)

Like many of the Loyalists, Robert Proud was born in England, but unlike others in this group he was able to remain in America after the hostilities of independence ended. Well regarded among Friends (Quaker) circles, in England, he came to Pennsylvania in 1759. Two years later he became master of the Friends Public School in Philadelphia. Although the war disrupted his career by compelling him to the Loyalist side, he was able to resume his position at the school in 1780. He held it for another decade at the not inconsiderable salary of two hundred and fifty pounds per annum.

Slowly gathering together an outstanding collection of source material, he began long-range labors to prepare a history of Pennsylvania. It was published in two volumes in 1797-1798, but unfortunately it was almost entirely devoted to the colony before 1742. Proud tacked on a sort of epilogue, titled "A View of the Province of Pennsylvania....between....1760 and 1770," but he never really examined the Patriot-Loyalist quarrel.

In the following "letter" we deal with another aspect of wars (especially civil ones) which is frequently forgotten in the epics of valor and glory, the harsh tales of ravage and death. This is the role of Fortune. On the battlefield who lives may be no more skillful, no more courageous than the friend or the enemy who dies. This may also be true of those who try to stay out of the thick of things. The letter from Robert Proud to his brother William, then in England, shows this point very well. Its date is December 1, 1777.

...On the Commencement of open Rebellion here, I had so great Reason to fear, having not only been obnoxious to the Incendiaries and Usurpers, but also particularly pointed out and threatened by them, more than many others, who are now suffering more than I do, thro the Anarchy and Tyranny that has reigned here for their not joining in the Rebellion and acknowledging the Usurption. But as I have always since that time lived in a very private and retired Way, even like a Person dead amidst the Confusions, and conversing more with my Books than with Persons, who are so universally tainted more or less with the general Evil, and scarcely ever departing above two Miles from my Place of Abode for several years. Contrary to my Expectation I have suffered no Abuse, more ever been molested, which I consider as a Providential, and very remarkable Favour; and tho this Manner of Life may have subjected me to much Disadvantage as to my temporal Interest, by accustoming myself so much to an inactive Habit, to which I have been thought to be naturally too much addicted, yet I believe it has been a great Means of singularly preserving me from imminent Danger, to which I considered even my Life to be nearly Engrossed.

But it has not fared so well with a Number of my Friends and Acquaintances; twenty of whom, mostly Friends, and all Citizens of this Place, a few days before the King's Troops approached nigh the City, were suddenly seized by the usurpation and banished into the back Parts of Virginia...It will perhaps be needless here to say, that these Persons, who were thus banished from their nearest Connections were regarded as not favoring the Rebellion, and by their Persecutors called Enemies to their Country, otherwise to their Proceedings; but that they with

many others, notwithstanding the general Revolt, had remained entirely inactive either for or against it, excepting some of them, I mean such as were Quakers, occasionally using their Persuasions to Peace; which was the most that could prudently be expected from Persons in their Situation, is, I believe, a truth, that may, with great Certainty be mentioned and relied on; and that nothing criminal was, or could be proved against any of them even by their Enemies nor the supporters of the Usurpation itself; of which they were so conscious as to send them into Exile without so much as a Hearing tho' loudly called for by the sufferers. But the Arrival of the Royal Army prevented further Proceedings of this kind...

I have done little or nothing in my private Affairs during these Troubles, on Account of which principally, since Bro. John's Departure, I have with so much Reluctance staid in this Country; my debts being mostly yet uncollected by Reason of the distressing Circumstances of the Times, and no present Prospect of getting them in, all Paper Currency having long ago depreciated several times its value occasioned by the large Quantity of the new Continental Cash, which every Body's obliged to take in Payment, where the King's Troops are not in Possession; no other Money being scarcely to be seen; and as, for the same Reasons, I expect never to receive a great Part of the Principal due to me in this Country, so I have still less expectation of recovering any Interest; which it is here expected the Merchants of England will duly consider and favour their Creditors here accordingly, is that particular; hence and in Consideration of the present Dubiousness of being able to buy Bills even with our lawful Paper Currency, the only Capital that many of us have, and which seems now to be at a stand...

D) William Eddis,

His loyalty thrust William Eddis into a bit part on the stage of history. Not even the dates of his birth and death can be given, and almost everything we know about him comes from his own correspondence with friends in England which was published in London in 1792 as *Letters from America... Comprising Occurrences from 1769 to 1777*.

He came to Annapolis, Maryland in the autumn of 1769 and at once took up the duties of secretary to the governor, Robert Eden. From this vantage point he developed an informed view of the colony's affairs, close relationships with its political leaders and, from his frequent travels, love for the beauty of the countryside and seashores. All these were reflected in his letters which minutely describe the life and times. He had an artist's eye for detail whether he was speaking of marriage or menus, Maryland's economic resources, or the elegance of its ladies. The events leading up to the Revolution were invariably a subject of great concern to Eddis. We see in him a moderate man who, despite his official positions, recognized the virtue of meeting many of the colonial demands. For example, he believed all the Townshend Acts should be repealed without qualification, so that Great Britain and American colonies might again enjoy harmonious relations. He accepted the validity of many of the colonies' grievances but felt that their way of obtaining redress was neither good sense nor good law. In 1777 Eddis was forced to leave Maryland, and back he went to his native England and obscurity.

[Letter XIX, March 13, 1775] I have attempted to moderate the enthusiasm of interpretive zeal, by the following appeal to Common Sense and Common Equity, which, through the medium of the Maryland Gazette, has been submitted to public inspection...

To the Printers

The present unhappy contention between the mother country and her colonies, is a matter of the deepest concern to every honest, every feeling mind: it is, therefore, the indispensable duty of every friend to society, to study and to pursue those methods, which may lead to a perfect reconciliation, and the establishment of a permanent union between Great Britain and America...

It is certain that there are many in this, and other provinces, who object to the spirit of violence, which seems at this time too predominant. Convinced of the propriety of their sentiments, and the integrity of their hearts, they conceive the cause of America may be totally injured by a precipitate, and unnecessary defiance of the power of Great Britain; they firmly believe, that a respectful behavior to their sovereign and their mother country—a dutiful and constitutional application to the throne—and a firm perseverance in virtuous, though pacific principles, will, in the issue, be productive of the most felicitous consequences...

If I differ in opinion from the multitude, must I therefore be deprived of my character, and the coincidence of my fellow-citizens, when in every station of life I discharge my duty with fidelity and honour? Death—the certain tax on all the sons of men, were preferable to so abject a state—No—'twere better to suffer all that “age, ach[e], penury, imprisonment, can lay on nature,” than resign that glorious inheritance of a free subject—the liberty of thinking—speaking—and acting, agreeable to the dictates of conscience! I frankly acknowledge no man has a right to disturb the peace of the community, by broaching tenets destructive to the true interests and welfare of his country; but at the same time, it cannot be justifiable to compel others to adopt every system which we esteem conducive to the public good. Let us therefore be unanimous in virtue—in frugality—and in industry; let us conduct ourselves on the Christian principle of “doing to others as we would have done to us,” let us not, in the frantic moments of intemperate zeal, mistake libertinism for liberty, and commit outrages, which we shall recollect with shame, and condemn with heart-felt anxiety. While we contend for the inestimable blessings of British subjects, let us not assume a tyrannical authority over each other. In a word, let reason and moderation hold the scale in every important determination—so shall every real grievance be effectually redressed—every man shall sing the song of gladness under his own vine, and we shall at once be free—be loyal—and be happy!...

Annapolis, Feb. 14, 1775

A Friend to Amity

E) Jonathan Odell, “A Birthday Song”

The Revolution produced an astonishing amount of poetry, but hardly one piece can be classed as a great work and most of it does not rise above the level of doggerel. The bulk of this poetry was written in the interests of propaganda. Below is a poem by Jonathan Odell, one of the two best versifiers on the Loyalist side.

Odell was a graduate of the College of New Jersey (now Princeton) who served as a surgeon in the British army during the Seven Years War. He then trained for the ministry in England and came back to Burlington, New Jersey. To help his family's finances he also practiced as a doctor. When his verses made him well-known, the Patriots limited his movements. However, after some months of such circumscribed living, he broke parole and escaped to the British lines in New York City in 1778. From there he continued to pour out sharp poetical slaps at the Patriots. Many of his verses appeared in the newspaper the *Royal Gazette*. In addition, he became involved in a number of military-political matters. He played an important role in the discussions between Benedict Arnold and the British, served as chaplain to a regiment of Pennsylvania Loyalists, and was assistant secretary first to the Board of Associated Loyalists and then to Guy Carleton, the British commander-in-chief. When New York was evacuated Odell left with Carleton for England, but shortly afterward came back to New Brunswick, Canada in 1784. In its newly created government he was appointed registrar and clerk of the province and occupied a seat on the governor's council. He held public office for nearly three decades.

The following poem was written by Jonathan Odell in honor of the King's birthday, June 4, 1777.

A Birthday Song

*Time was when America hallow'd the morn
On which the lov'd monarch of Britain was born.
Hallow'd the day, and joyfully chanted
 God save the King!*

*Then flourish'd the blessings of freedom and peace,
And plenty flow'd in with a yearly increase.
Proud of our lot we chanted merrily
 Glory and joy crown the King!*

*With envy beheld by the nations around
We rapidly grew, nor was anything found
Able to check our growth while we chanted
 God save the King!
O blest beyond measure, has honour and truth
Still nurs'd in our hearts what they planted in youth!
Loyalty had chanted merrily
 Glory and joy crown the King!*

*But see! How rebellion has lifted her head!
How honour and truth are with loyalty fled
Few are there now who join us in chanting
 God save the King!*

*And see! How deluded the multitude fly
To arm in a cause that is built on a lye!
Yet are we proud to chant thus merrily
 Glory and joy crown the King!*

*Though faction by falsehood awhile may prevail,
And loyalty suffers a captive in jail,
Britain is rous'd, rebellion is falling,*

God save the King!

*The captive shall soon be releas'd from his chain,
And conquest restore us to Britain again,
Ever to join in chanting merrily*

Glory and joy crown the King!