

Mabel Louise Keller

7.5
D

The Jews of South Carolina...

III.

The Jews in the Revolution.

• Copyright The News and Courier, 1903.

I have brought my story down to a most interesting period. To describe the part played by the Jews of South Carolina, or rather by the Jews of Charleston, for there is nothing in the records, with one or two exceptions, as far as I have been able to ascertain, of any other Jews of South Carolina who saw service in the field, is a task quite easy and yet difficult. Till now the story has not been written. A few traditional tales, distorted according as the imagination of the story-teller was more or less vigorous and still further distorted by the imagination of the editor, are all that we now possess. No attempt has hitherto been made to go to original sources. Hence it is that the list of traditional items that found their way into the scrappy notices in Leeser's "Occident" of fifty years ago have gone the rounds of the newspapers and the books, and have been so often repeated that they have come to be looked upon as narratives of fact. Read the story of the Jews of Charleston where you will, you will find nothing but the same old stories told over and over again. The trouble with all past writers without exception has been that they have made no attempt to ascertain the facts. Our present data

are all of them traditions which, while containing a germ of truth, are like all traditions, largely unreliable. This is strange in view of the fact that historical material in Charleston is so abundant that it is possible to write the story of the Jews of Charleston in the eighteenth century in almost as complete detail and with the same historical accuracy that one could write their history of twenty years ago. The newspapers are here almost complete. The records are here almost complete. All the historian needs is to know where to look, how to look and for what to look. This will furnish him with the facts and these will testify quite as eloquently to the value of the Jew as a citizen, as the glittering generalities and the specious absurdities that have till now passed current as history. We are, it seems to me, far enough removed from the scene to view the story in its true perspective. I shall continue, as before, to let the records as far as possible speak for themselves.

THE JEW A GOOD CITIZEN.

If it be the verdict of history that the Jew has been an important factor in the material development of every country in which he has lived, it is equally true that he has everywhere manifested his appreciation of the protection and freedom which have been vouchsafed to him by his willingness to bear the full burdens of citizenship even to the extent of ungrudgingly laying down his life in his country's defence. One needs no better illustration of Jewish patriotism than the story of the Jews of South Carolina. To appreciate the part that the Jews of this State played in the Revolution, however, one must possess an adequate knowledge of the history of South Carolina as well as a knowledge of the local field. Without this

local knowledge one can at best only evolve a more or less imaginative picture from his inner consciousness—an unworthy performance in these days of scientific attainment and honest research. But to come back to the story.

In my last article I printed a list, which I am satisfied is practically exhaustive, of all the Jews who were in Charleston between 1770 and 1782. I omitted a couple of names of men who, like Moses Lindo, died prior to 1775. In all there were 68 names. I would leave my readers under an entirely wrong impression, however, if I did not give them some further information about this list, information that will change the aspect of this number materially.

Of these 68 names I am morally certain that one at least is not a Jew—Solomon Pollock. He was an express rider in the country and I obtained his name from a Revolutionary "indent" in Columbia. I have my doubts also about Moses Harris. Mordecai Myers belongs to Georgetown and is only here at the latter part of the Revolution. So does Abraham Cohen, though he was in the militia of Charleston during the siege. Ezekiel Levy has a letter waiting for him at the postoffice on April 21, 1779, which is still there on July 9. He probably does not belong here at all. Mordecai Harris should be stricken from my list. His name appears on a petition printed in the South Carolina and American General Gazette for November 26, 1778. This petition is half destroyed and I have since discovered is a Georgia petition. The name of Joseph Solomon should be added. Benjamin Tores did not come here till 1782. What has more bearing on our discussion, however, is the fact that of this number no less than 21 do not appear in Charleston prior to 1779. Many of them came from Savannah in that year.

Some came still later. Here is the list:

Abrahams, Joseph.
De La Motta, Emanuel.
De Lyon, Abraham.
De Lyon, Isaac.
De Palacios, Joseph.
Jacobs, Jacob.
Levy, Hart.
Levy, Michael.
Levy, Samuel
Minis, Philip.
Moses, Barnart.
Moses, Jacob.
Moses, Philip.
Myers, Joseph.
Pollock, Samuel.
Sasportas, Abraham.
Seixas, Abraham.
Sheftall, Levi.
Simons, Sampson.
Simons, Saul.
Spitzer, Bernard Moses.

Joshua Hart left Charleston in 1779 and did not return until 1784, when he makes an announcement to his old friends and customers. Bernard Moses Spitzer likewise leaves for the West Indies in that year. It must not be forgotten, too, that there were Jews at this time in Georgetown, Camden, Black Mingo and Beaufort, whose names appear in Charleston from time to time. With this preliminary explanation the way is now clear for a better understanding of our inquiry.

THE STATUS IN 1775-6.

I will now very briefly indicate the position of South Carolina in the Revolution. This is necessary for a correct understanding of what follows. I shall make no attempt at fine writing, as my entire concern is to bring out the facts.

South Carolina was a favored colony. She had none of the grievances, e. g. of Massachusetts. Her trade with the

mother country was large. Her agricultural products were sold at good prices to England and her industries were fostered by generous bounties on the part of the home Government. Her only grievance was the question of "home rule" and that question was of little concern to the people at large. The only aggrieved ones were the intellectual and ambitious classes and with such a commercial population could scarcely be expected to be in sympathy. The masses were naturally hostile to a revolution which threatened to disturb the quiet progress of a trade of which, having interests unlike those of New England, they had nothing to complain.

The population of South Carolina, too, was a very mixed one. South Carolina was an English colony and the English are by nature loyal. So are the Scotch and they were numerous. The foreign settlers were opposed to the Revolution, and it is only what is to be expected, therefore, that public opinion in South Carolina should have been well divided.

Not that the sentiments of the masses were always known. To use a homely illustration: A merchant to-day, if he is wise, does not go out of his way to proclaim his political views to every customer that enters his store. He could talk freely with far more impunity to-day than he could have spoken at the beginning of the Revolution. The commercial population simply watched the course of events, awaited developments and later on showed unmistakably where they stood. These facts are forcibly set forth in two brilliant articles from the pen of W. Gilmore Simms in the July and October numbers of the Southern Quarterly Review for 1848—articles which ought to be read and read again by all who are interested in the history of South Carolina.

Jews are proverbially loyal to the ruling Power. As was the case with the rest of the population, Jewish sentiment was divided. We shall see later that there were a number of Jews whose sentiments were known to be Pro-British. The number of Jews who served in the field, however and who rendered other service to the Revolutionary cause—in proportion to their total number—was phenomenally large. Of this the records leave no doubt.

THE MILITIA LAWS.

Before referring to these records, however, it would be well to glance at the militia system of South Carolina at the outbreak of and during the Revolution. I shall only take note of pertinent points.

Every man between the ages of 16 and 60 who was able to bear arms was compelled to enroll himself in some militia company. Prior to 1775 he could enroll himself in any company he pleased, but subsequent to November 20, 1775, he could only enroll himself in the district of the regiment to which he belonged. (S. C. G. November 28, 1775.)

By a resolution of the Provincial Congress, dated June 17, 1775, volunteer companies of not less than fifty might organize themselves into a company of foot, choosing their own officers. (Supplement to S. C. G. September 7, 1775.)

By the Act of 1778 a company consisted of 60 men. (Statutes of South Carolina, Vol 9, p 667.)

In the same Act is it further enacted: "That there shall not be formed any volunteer company in this State after the passing of this Act." * * * (Ibid p 667.)

The duties of a militiaman were "to appear completely armed once in every fortnight for muster, train and exercise," to do patrol duty and to be drafted for a limited time—usually 30 or 60 days accord-

ing to the season of the year, when deemed necessary by the Governor or Commander-in-Chief. (Ibid. See also Gazette of the State of South Carolina, March 10, 1779.)

A man could furnish a substitute and thus be himself exempt from militia duty. S. C. G. March 10, 1779.)

Amongst those exempt from military service are clergymen and teachers. (Statutes of South Carolina, Vol 9, p 620.)

And here I would remark that it would seem that these militia laws were not very carefully observed. I find one presentment after another of the grand juries calling attention to their neglect. I would likewise point out that every man was not physically able to do military duty. Many were excused. Moultrie himself tells us this in referring to those who surrendered after the siege.

*** "This threat brought out the aged, the timid, the disaffected and the infirm, many of them who had never appeared during the whole siege. *** I saw the column march out and was surprised to see it so large; but many of them we had excused from age and infirmities." (Memoirs, Vol 2, pp 108-9.)

We can now proceed intelligently to deal with the records. These records are by no means as incomplete as we have hitherto thought. We have so many side sources of information that I may claim that it is possible to present a picture of the part that the Jews of South Carolina played in the Revolution with almost absolute fidelity. We must, however, dismiss completely the fictions of the early writers.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

What are these side sources of information? We have first of all the record and pension office and the bureau of pensions

at Washington; we have a vast number of Revolutionary records in this State. There is that wonderful Emmet Collection in the New York Public Library. There are a number of contemporary diaries available to us. There are the tombstones in our cemetery, and lastly the files of the newspapers, which rarely fail to mention military services in the obituary notices of deceased patriots. We have seen what Jews were here during the Revolution. We shall soon see what a large portion of them we can account for. Let us now proceed with the story, which is plain sailing.

The first real fighting in which the Charles Town militia were called into service—but the Charles Town militia took no part in the fight—was the battle of Fort Moultrie in June, 1776. Fort Moultrie was garrisoned by South Carolina regulars and the battle was fought by them alone. Of course the militia were in service in Charles Town, but they took no part in the engagement. There were quite a number of Jews in the Charles Town militia. Who they were I shall tell later. There do not appear to have been any Jews amongst the South Carolina regulars.

The result of the battle of Fort Moultrie was to insure undisturbed peace to South Carolina from June, 1776, to May, 1779. Trade went on pretty much as usual. The people married and gave in marriage, and beyond internal dissensions on account of the Loyalists there is nothing to be noted of interest.

LUSHINGTON'S COMPANY.

Between 1776 and 1778 Richard Lushington was promoted to be captain in the Charles Town regiment of militia. His company included nearly all of the Jews of Charles Town who fought in the Revolution, and that for reasons we have al-

ready seen. Soldiers had to enroll themselves in the district in which they lived. Richard Lushington's district extended on King street, from Broad street to Charles Town Neck—the modern Calhoun street. King street was then as now a principal business street and most of the Jews had their stores there. I could give the list of Jews who lived on King street, but this would serve no useful purpose. Of the names of Lushington's company that have come down to us I have in a former article pointed out, the Jewish names are in a decided minority.

Lushington's company took part in several engagements. It fought in the battle of Beaufort in February, 1779. Here Joseph Solomon was killed. (Gazette of the State of South Carolina. March 10, 1779.) The Charles Town militia likewise took part in the attempt to recapture Savannah in the same year. Here David Nunez Cardozo distinguished himself. (See inscription on his tombstone here, also obituary notice in the Charleston Courier of July 10, 1835.)

That the Jews both of Charles Town and Savannah had done their full duty to the patriot cause is attested by a splendid piece of uncontradicted contemporary testimony.

AN EXTRAORDINARY LETTER.

I remember listening some twenty years ago—long before I left England—to a powerful Jewish sermon on the subject of "How Shall we Answer Calumny?" The preacher referred to the over-sensitiveness of Jews and their tendency to rush into print whenever any allusion was made to them which might be construed into a real or imaginary offence. He warned his hearers that we Jews should be careful not to manifest irritation at the writings

of every anonymous scribbler. If the defence becomes perpetuated, so does the attack. He illustrated his theme by a reference to the book of Josephus against Apion. This blundering ignoramus would never have been heard of but for Josephus's reply. I was forcibly reminded of both the sermon and the illustration when I came across the following letter in the South Carolina and American General Gazette of December 3, 1778. Mrs Crouch's paper containing the libel is no longer in existence, and while the attack has come down to us by reason of the reply, we have in this instance at least no cause to regret it. The style of the letter is quaint, but its contents are telling. Here it is:

MR WELLS,

On perusing Mrs Crouch and Co's paper of the 1st instant, I was extremely surprised to find, in a piece signed AN AMERICAN, a signature sufficient to lead every honest and judicious man to imagine, that whatever was said in so publick a manner, should be ingenuous and true, assertions directly contrary. Here are his words:

"Yesterday being by my business posted in a much frequented corner of this town, I observed, in a small space of time, a number of chairs and loaded horses belonging to those who journeyed, come into town.—Upon inspection of their faces and enquiry, I found them to be of the **TRIBE OF ISRAEL**—who, after taking every advantage in trade the times admitted of in the State of Georgia, as soon as it was attacked by an enemy, fled here for an asylum, with their ill-got wealth—dastardly turning their backs upon the country when in danger, which gave them bread and protection—Thus it will be in this State if it should ever be assailed by our enemies—Let judgment take place."

I am apt to think, Mr Printer, that the gentleman is either very blind, or he is willing to make himself so; for I am well convinced, had he taken the trouble of going closer to the chairs, he would have found that what he has thus publickly asserted was erroneous and a palpable mistake, as he might have been convinced they were of the female kind, with their dear babes, who had happily arrived at an asylum, where a tyrannical enemy was not at theirs or their dear offsprings heels. I do, therefore, in vindication of many a worthy Israelite now in Georgia, assert, that there is not, at this present hour, a single Georgia Israelite in Charles Town; and that so far to the contrary of that gentleman's assertion, I do declare to the Publick, that many merchants of that State were here on the 22d ult, and on being informed of the enemy landing, they instantly left this, as many a worthy Gentle knows, and proceeded post haste to Georgia, leaving all their concerns unsettled, and are now with their brother citizens in the field, doing that which every honest American should do.

The truth of this assertion will, in the course of a few days, be known to gentlemen of veracity, who are entitled to the appellation of Americans. The Charlestown Israelites, I bless Heaven, hitherto have behaved as staunch as any other citizens of this State, and I hope their further conduct will be such as will invalidate the malicious and designing fallacy of the author of the piece alluded to.

I am, Sir, Yours, etc,

A real AMERICAN,

and

True hearted ISRAELITE.

Charleston, Wednesday, December 2,
1778.

We next meet with Lushington's company at the siege of Charles Town in 1780. Here our information concerning the Jews who fought in the militia is most complete. The original papers of Gen Lincoln, who was in command of the American army in South Carolina in 1780, are still in existence and are to be seen in the "Emmet Collection" in the New York Public Library. Appreciating the value of this priceless collection, our Ex-Mayor Courtenay, whose services in preserving and rendering available rare documents relating to South Carolina cannot be overestimated by our people, and with him our present Mayor J. Adger Smyth, incorporated many valuable documents from this collection, relating to the siege of Charlestown, into the "Year Book" for 1897. Three of these documents are especially interesting in our investigation.

JEWES IN THE SIEGE.

The defence of Charles Town is unique in the history of beleaguered cities. That it withstood a siege of two months against such overwhelming odds must excite the admiration of all who read the story. Its doom was sealed from the first, but not until provisions had given out and all the ammunition was practically spent; not until the British were within twenty yards of the American lines, and every hope of assistance was cut off, was there ever a thought of surrender. But the inevitable came at last. All hope being gone and further resistance being impossible, to avoid a useless slaughter the principal inhabitants of Charles Town and a number of the country militia petitioned Gen Lincoln to surrender. These petitions have come down to us and on them are many Jewish names. There are three lists—one of civilians containing 300

names appended, including many Jews, another of country militia with 111 names, but no Jews, and a third, of country militia, with 345 names appended, including many Jews. I reproduce the two petitions that contain the names of Jews with their fac simile signatures. One of these signers, Joseph Myers (?)—the name is illegible—it will be seen, tries to make "his mark" in script Hebrew. From his Hebrew signature "Joseph," he appears to be almost as illiterate in that language as he was in English. I am indebted to Mayor Smyth for his courtesy in permitting these reproductions and for the loan of the cuts. Here, then, are the petitions:

PETITIONS TO GEN LINCOLN.

I.

To the Honorable Major General Lincoln—

The Humble petition of divers Inhabitants of Charleston in behalf of themselves and others, their fellow citizens—
Sheweth

That your petitioners being inform'd the difficulties that arose in the Negotiation yesterday, and the day preceding, related wholly to the Citizens, to whom the British Commanders offer'd their estates, and to admit them to their parole as Prisoners of War; and your petitioners understanding it is an indisputable proposition, that they can derive no advantage by a perseverance in resistance; with every thing that is dear to them at stake, they think it their Indispensable duty, in this perilous situation of affairs, to request your Honor will send out a flag, in the name of the people, intimating their acquiescence in the terms propounded.

Charleston, 10th May, 1780.

(Three hundred names are attached to this petition. Among them are:)

Markes Lazarus.
Solomon Aaron.
Phillip Minis.
Is Da Costa, Jr.
Joseph Solomons (x.)
Gershon Cohen.
Jacob Jacobs.
Zadok Solomo?
Meyer Moses.
Joseph de Palacios.
Phillip Hart.
David Sarzedas.
Abraham Moses.
Joseph De Palacios.
Joseph Myers (x)

II.

To the Honorable Major General Lincoln

The Humble petition of divers Country Militia on behalf of themselves and others their fellow citizens—

Sheweth

That your petitioners being inform'd the difficulties that arose in the negotiation yesterday and the day preceding related wholly to the Citizens to whom the British commanders offered their estates and to admit them to their parole as prisoners of war, and your petitioners understanding it as an indisputable proposition that they can derive no advantage from a perserverance in resistance, with every thing that is dear to them at stake, they think it their indispensable duty in this perilous situation of affairs, to request your Honor will send out a Flag in the name of the people intimating their acquiescence in the terms proposed.—

To the Honorable ~~Major~~ General Lincoln

The Humble Petition of divers Inhabitants
of Charleston in behalf of themselves & others their fellow
Citizens.

Sheweth

That your petitioners being informed the difficulties that
arise in the Negotiation yesterday, and the day preceding,
related wholly to the Citizens, to whom the British Commanders
offer their Estates, and to admit them to their Parole as
Prisoners of War; and your petitioners understanding it is
an indisputable proposition, that they can derive no advantage
by a perseverance in resistance; with every thing that is
dear to them at stake, they think it their Indispensable
duty, in this perilous situation of affairs, to request your
Majesty will send out a flag, in the name of the people,
intimating their acquiescence in the terms proposed,

Charleston 10. May 1780.

Charles Legerus	Perkins Robyn	Philip West
Solomon Aaron	Leopoldus	Edward Lloyd
Philip Morris		
J. Dabota	Ladock Salasco	Horham Nejes
	Henry Nejes	Joseph De la Harpe
Joseph ^{his} Nelemans	Joseph De la Harpe	
mark		

Joseph ^{his} Nelemans
mark

To the Honorable Major General Lincoln

The humble petition of several Country Gentlemen who of themselves
and their friends have petitioned

Sheweth

That your petitioners being informed the difficulties that arose in
the negotiation yesterday and the day preceding relating to the
Citizens, to whom the British command had seized their estates and to
admit them to their parts, as persons at large, and your petitioners
understanding it as an indisputable proposition that they can derive
no advantage from a perseverance in resistance, with every thing that
is dear to them at stake, they think it their indisputable duty in
this critical situation of affairs, to request your Honor will send
out a Flag in the name of the people, certifying their Resignation
in the terms proposed

Philip Mays

Jacob Mays

Abraham Cohen

Moses Cohen

Mayer Salomons

Israel Abraham

Moses Harris

Samuel Harris

Philip Jacob Cohen

Isaac Harris

Samuel Harris

Samuel Harris Junr.

Samuel Harris

(Here are appended the names of Field-officers and men—in all 345 names, amongst which are the following:)

Philip Moses.
Abraham Cohen.
Myer Salomons.
Moses Harris (?)
Philip Jacob Cohen.
Jacob Moses.
Juda Abrahams.
Moses Cohen.
Emanuel Abrahams.
Samuel Polak.
Samuel Jones.
Barnard Moses, Junr.
I. Cohen.
Samuel Mordecai.

OTHER JEWISH SOLDIERS.

We have on this last petition the names of 13 and possibly of 14 Charles Town Jews who served in the militia during the siege. There are several others whose names have come down to us.

Marks Lazarus, who is apparently a civilian, in May 1780, saw service in 1776, 1779 and 1780. He was a sergeant major. I have before me a copy of his war record from the bureau of pensions. (See also obituary notice in the "Southern Patriot" of November 7, 1835.) He was afterwards one of the petitioners to Clinton.

David Nunez Cardoza was also a sergeant major. I have already referred to him. His obituary notice informs us that "he marched with the Grenadier corps from Charleston to the Lines before Savannah, and as first non-commissioned officer of Capt Boquet's company, volunteered and led the Forlorn Hope in the assault on the British lines."

Abraham Seixas was a captain of militia here, but fought as a lieutenant in the Continental line in Georgia. He went to

Philadelphia in 1782, but returned to Charleston later.

Joseph Solomon we have already seen was killed at the battle of Beaufort.

Jacob Cohen we are told in the "Diary of Josiah Smith, Jr.," was "one of the prisoners on parole, that were sent on board the prison ship Torbay and Schooner Pack Horse, the 17th of May, 1781." It is worthy of note that his name is not mentioned in any of the lists of these prisoners in Garden, Moultrie, Ramsay, Drayton, Gibbes or McCrady.

Of Jacob I. Cohen, who is referred to by all writers, I have till now found no mention in any of the records here. Nor have I found anything with reference to Capt Jacob De Leon, or Capt Jacob De La Motta, of Charleston, who are supposed to have fought at the battle of Camden. I would like to have some authority for the story that these men together with Major Nones carried off the wounded De Kalb from the field. It is strange that none of the contemporary writers mention it. It is remarkable, too, that Lossing, who has preserved so many traditions in his "Field Book of the Revolution"—and he is particularly gossippy in his story of this battle—should know nothing about it.

The names I have mentioned are all that I have till now been able to discover in the records. There may be some more that I may yet find, but these will not be many. It would be unreasonable to expect it. An entire population never fights, but those who don't fight or who are physically unable to fight—and these will always form a goodly portion of a population—are able to render other service that is equally valuable. As a matter of fact, during the siege of Charleston, the trouble was not the lack of men. All the early writers have noted the fact that had there been more men, the only purpose they

could have served would have been to make provisions scarce in a shorter time. Of men who rendered good service to the American cause and who were not fighters we have also documentary evidence.

PATRIOTIC CIVILIANS.

In the North American Review for July, 1826, p 73, Isaac Harby referring to the Jews in the Revolution writes: "My maternal grandfather contributed pecuniary aid to South Carolina, and particularly to Charleston, when besieged by the British. My father-in-law was a brave grenadier in the regular American army, and fought and bled for the liberty he lived to enjoy, and to hand down to his children." The maternal grandfather of Isaac Harby was Meyer Moses and his father-in-law was Samuel Mordecai. To the services rendered by Meyer Moses Gen Sumter testified in after years in a letter to Franklin J. Moses, a grandson of the Jewish patriot, who had died in 1787. There were, and I believe still are, in Columbia the original letter and a testimonial from Gen Sumter of similar purport. I reproduce only the latter:

South Mount, October 11, 1831.

I certify that I was well-acquainted with Myer Moses, Esq, Merchant in Charleston, So. Ca. I understood and believed that he was friendly and attached to the American cause during the Revolution. I further understood and believe that his treatment to the American wounded and prisoners were such as to entitle him to the good wishes and gratitude of all those who had the success of the Revolution at heart. After the fall of Charleston his treatment to the wounded and prisoners who were taken and sent to Charleston was extremely friendly and humane, they being in the greatest possible distress.

Moreover I have understood and believed that on these occasions he expended a considerable sum in relieving them.

(Signed) Thos Sumter.

Mordecai Myers, of Georgetown, was another man who furnished supplies to the American army. (See Gibbes's "Documents," (1781-2,) pp 182-3. See, however, also Gibbes (1776-1782,) p 160, "Gen Marlon to Col P. Horry.")

LOYALISTS IN CHARLESTON.

I have already referred in this article, to the division of sentiment that existed among the population of South Carolina and of Charleston at the outbreak of and during the Revolution. The Gazettes print the names of some who "embarked under an unhappy delusion" for other parts. (See list in Gazette of the State of South Carolina for July 8, 1778.) We read of many who "left the State to join the enemies thereof." (Ibid November 24, 1778.) Charleston, in fact, was full of British sympathizers—witness the large lists of petitioners to Clinton, of addressors of Cornwallis and of Clinton and Arburthnot. In conversation with Moultrie, after the surrender, Capt Rochfort, a British officer, remarked: "Sir, you have made a gallant defence, but you had a great many rascals among you who came out every night and gave us information of what was passing in your garrison." (Moultrie's Memoirs, Vol 2, p 108.) Many at first, naturally enough, were very careful as to how they betrayed their real sentiments. When Charleston surrendered, however, they did not hesitate to show what their sentiments really were, others thinking that South Carolina would finally remain a British province, and hoping to save their property, sincerely returned to their allegiance. Still others were by necessity compelled to accept British pro-

tection. (See Ramsay's South Carolina, pp 120 et seq.)

Referring to the Jewish merchants, Ramsay remarks that: "While prisoners, they were encouraged to make purchases from the British merchants who came with the conquering army, and after they had contracted large debts of this kind, were precluded by proclamation from selling the goods they had purchased, unless they assumed the name and character of British subjects." (Ibid.) This could only have been the case with a minority. The majority did not take protection or swear allegiance, but left Charles Town after the surrender.

PETITIONS TO CLINTON.

About August or September, 1780, many citizens of Charles Town presented a petition to the Commandant setting forth "that they were very desirous to show every mark of allegiance and attachment to his Majesty's person and Government, to which they were most sincerely well affected, and, therefore, humbly prayed that they might have an opportunity to evince the sincerity of their professions." This petition was referred to "gentlemen of known loyalty and integrity, as well as knowledge of the persons and characters of the inhabitants, in order to report the manner in which the Memorialists had heretofore conducted themselves." This committee reported favorably in the cases of 166 citizens, including the following Jews:

Joseph Myers.
Saul Simons.
Abraham Alexander.
Moses Ellazer.
Philip Cohen.
Marcus Lazarus.
Philip Moses.

(The Royal South Carolina Gazette, September 21, 1780.)

Of these Marcus (Marks) Lazarus and Philip Moses had been soldiers in the war, and for some or other reason now swore allegiance. Abraham Alexander was the minister of Beth Elohim and the Synagogue constitution of 1820, (Rule XX,) tells us that Rabbi Moses Eleizar was "a learned man in the laws of God, and until his death had taught the youth of this congregation and manifested unremitting zeal to promote religion in this country." There is no evidence to show and no reason for supposing that these men were not expressing their real convictions when they signed the petition to Sir Henry Clinton. It is worthy of note that in a subsequent petition for protection of 211 citizens, published in the Royal Gazette of July 11, 1781, nothing is said about the petition being referred to a committee of citizens of known loyalty and integrity, etc. In this second petition such a reference was unnecessary. The petitioners had been admittedly Anti-British.

The Royal Gazette and the Royal South Carolina Gazette, published during the period of British occupation, show the following Jews as doing business here during that period:

Joseph Abrahams.
Jacob Jacobs.
Delyon and Moses
Isaac Delyon.
Gershon Cohen.
Emanuel Abrahams.
Abraham Cohen.
Abraham Da Costa.

Of these Emanuel Abrahams and Abraham Cohen had fought in the war. All of these men, however, must either have taken protection after the surrender or have been known to have been well affected or at least not openly hostile to the British cause. Most of them had been doing business here right along since 1779.

Those whose sentiments were known to have been hostile were sought out by the British and banished. Amongst these was Isaac Da Costa, Sr, whose estates we have seen were promptly seized and confiscated by the British and himself banished. We have likewise seen Jacob Cohen put on board the prison ship.

Isaac Delyon was a known Tory and his property was amerced after the Revolution. He came here in 1779. There would doubtless have been other ameracements, but the records do not show any wealth among the Jews who remained here in business during the period of British occupation. Levi Sheftall was likewise a Loyalist. Be it ever remembered, however, that there was as much true patriotism in the Loyalist as there was in the most ardent Revolutionist.

In my search in Columbia I examined many thousands of "indents," or certificates entitling the holder to payment of sums due for services rendered in the war. There was not a single one made out in favor of a Jew. The date of these indents explained the reason. They were all for services rendered subsequent to 1780. After May, 1780, the Charles Town militia were prisoners on parole and very few afterwards took the field. Some did, but there was a special reason in their case. We know what became of the Jewish population.

THE MAJORITY STEADFAST.

Most of the Jewish merchants did not and would not take protection, but left for Philadelphia after the surrender of Charles Town, and in 1782 we find 10 Charles Town Jews in the list of original members of the Mickveh Israel Congregation. There were other Jews, doubtless, who do not appear on the list. (See Morais "Jews of Philadelphia," p 15.) The ten

names I refer to are those of Isaac Da Costa, Sr, Isaac Da Costa, Jr, Samuel Da Costa, Philip Moses, Israel Jacobs, Jacob Cohen, Ezekiel Levy, Abraham Sasportas, Abraham Seixas and Solomon Aaron. These men came back afterwards when peace was restored. So much, then, for the evidence of the records.

I must now say a word about the traditional story. The most careful investigation has failed to reveal the large number of Jews who are supposed to have borne arms in the Revolution. Men who write history ought to have some sense of proportion. I believe that my list is practically exhaustive and that I am perfectly safe in asserting that never at any time during the Revolution were there 60 Jews in Charleston between the ages of 16 and 60. It is highly improbable that there were 50, and of these, of course, many did not fight. This we know positively.

There is another way, however, in which we arrive at the same conclusion. We are told that in 1791 Beth Elohim Congregation consisted of 53 families, numbering upwards of 400 persons. So complete has been my investigation that if I desired to do so I could enumerate these and go even into the details of their family history. We know who came here after the Revolution, when they came here and where they came from. By this double method of calculation the chances of error are reduced to very narrow limits. Three or four names may yet be brought to light and perhaps as many who served in the militia, but more than this number I do not believe will ever be found.

TRADITIONS UPSET.

But how about the company of Jews which is referred to by every past writer and the company of volunteers commanded by Capt Richard Lushington and organized in 1779? Prior to 1779, in which

year, as we have seen, there was a large accession from Savannah, a company composed entirely or almost entirely of Jews is a manifest impossibility. A company of volunteers in 1779 is likewise an impossibility, in view of the Act of 1778, which declared that "there shall not be formed any volunteer company in this State after the passing of this Act." This is surely conclusive. Of Lushington's company we have information from several sources. He must have commanded about 80 men. Several rolls of militia companies are in existence and they all contain about this number and the Act itself prescribes this number as a company. I have the names of over 20 Non-Jews in his command. This speaks for itself.

It is easy enough to account for the tradition in this case. We have seen that nearly all the Jews of Charleston who fought, fought in Lushington's command. We have seen also the reason of this. From the number of Jews in this company it got the name of the "Jew Company." Forty years afterwards, time enough for legend and fancy to have had full play, we find the writers and speakers—and there was some excuse for them—referring to Lushington's company of Jews. In furnishing material for a plea for toleration for the Jews of Maryland a little exaggeration was pardonable, particularly in the early days, but there is no such excuse for men who undertake to write history. Historians do not incorporate news paper clippings into their work without investigation, nor do such newspaper clippings even when used in debate become authoritative sources of reference. Such "authorities" are good enough for men who only use second-hand sources of information in their work and who undertake to write a hundred years of history in as many minutes. It is not to the

credit of our time that such superficial work is received with approbation.

Need I say anything about that other statement—the "remarkable fact" that nearly all the Jews who served on the field served as officers? It is on the face of it so puerile that I will not even discuss it. With the exception of Capt Seixas, there were a few non-commissioned officers, but these are only officers by courtesy. A company of Jews—and nearly all officers! Kentucky is not as original as we have been led to believe.

And is not the tale that the facts unfold glorious enough? The Jews of South Carolina furnished the Revolution with Francis Salvador, one of its most trusted leaders. In proportion to their numbers they furnished at least as many men as did their neighbors and gave as freely of their means to the cause. I claim no more, but is it not enough?