

---

# Southern and Northern Methodism in Civil War California

By BARBARA McCLUNG MACVICAR

---

BECAUSE OF ITS newly acquired statehood, its geographical isolation, and its large minority of Confederate sympathizers, California during the Civil War presents an interesting field of study.<sup>1</sup> One aspect of the social and political scene which seems to have been largely ignored is the situation caused by the presence of both branches of Methodism actively at work within its borders—the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. While not unique in harboring both churches, California was the only Union state in which each branch had begun missionary work almost simultaneously. The proximity in California of both churches, separated since 1844 over the same question of slavery which later divided the nation, arouses curiosity regarding both the position of the Southern church and the relationship between the Northern and Southern clergy, whose purposes, doctrines, and disciplines were virtually identical.<sup>2</sup>

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the nature of Methodist relationships from their high point in 1856 through the Civil War and to determine the status of Southern Methodism in California during the difficult years. For clarity, the word “north” will be attached to the Methodist Episcopal Church, although it was never done so officially. Also, in addition to contacts between the churches as recorded in official church histories and conference minutes, any political activity on the part of Methodist clergymen has been included, since it would necessarily affect inter-church relationships.

---

BARBARA McCLUNG MACVICAR is presently a graduate student at Los Angeles State College. Mrs. MacVicar, a graduate of the Sarah Dix Hamlin School in San Francisco, attended Wellesley College in Massachusetts, and was graduated from Los Angeles State College in 1960.

Indeed, from the time the first missionaries with specific authority from the mother churches arrived—the Northerners in the fall of 1849 and the Southerners in the spring of 1850—the tensions between North and South on the national level were felt in the microcosm of California Methodism.<sup>3</sup> William Taylor, a prominent Northern missionary of the early years, expressed considerable doubt over the desirability of dividing Methodism in California, in spite of the great need for preachers and the large field for missionary work.

If the Lord has sent these men here . . . I pray that He may open their way for harmonious action with other Churches; . . . if the Lord has not sent them here, I hope He will send them back where they came from, and the sooner the better.<sup>5</sup> John C. Simmons, on the other hand, indicated the sentiment of the Southern missionaries as one who was on the scene from 1852. “For years we had to fight our way in whatever community we endeavored to establish our Church,” wrote Simmons, “the name—Methodist Episcopal Church, South . . . meant not only sectionalism, but slavery.”<sup>6</sup> Statistical evidence largely belies this statement—the Southerners found a great deal of ready sympathy in actuality—but the distrust on both sides is evident.<sup>7</sup>

While the clergy of both churches tried to resolve their differences as men of God in order to expedite His work in a territory obviously in need of it, cordiality became increasingly difficult, and the political flavor the question had assumed during the 1850’s added to tensions. The preachers of the Northern Church became identified with the Republican party, while the Southern Methodists, although avowedly eschewing political partisanship, became as firmly linked with the Democrats.<sup>8</sup> Naturally enough, the Church, South was strongest in the areas of the most intense pro-Confederate sympathy. Charles V. Anthony, official historian for the Northern Church in California, cites examples of the many hardships encountered by members of his clergy in trying to establish churches in such towns as Sonora, Benicia, Mariposa, and Watsonville, and, in general, rural agricultural and mining areas.<sup>9</sup> Conversely, the Southerners enjoyed their greatest successes in these same areas, partly because of their penchant for camp meetings as a proselyting device, to be sure, but also because of the political temper of rural California.<sup>10</sup> The geographical distribution of the Confederate sympa-

thizers in California can be shown simply in listing some of the newspapers which were denied the mails by military order in 1862: the Placerville *Mountain Democrat*, the Stockton *Argus*, the San Jose *Tribune*, the Visalia *Post*, and the Visalia *Equal Rights Expositor*.<sup>11</sup> The Dutch Flat *Enquirer* and the Marysville *Express* were also notoriously anti-administration. Thus several of the men who came to California in the name of Methodism between 1850 and 1856 were to figure fairly prominently in the political as well as the religious development of the state; among these were such men as Martin C. Briggs and Eleazar Thomas of the Northern Church and Oscar Penn Fitzgerald of the Church, South.<sup>12</sup>

Although the evidence indicates mutual suspicion from the start among the branches of Methodism, the years after 1850 saw considerable inter-church activity, culminating in a serious attempt to arrive at an amicable working agreement in 1856.<sup>13</sup> When the Pacific Conference of the Church, South assembled in November of that year with Bishop Hubert H. Kavanaugh of Kentucky presiding, a delegation headed by Eleazar Thomas, one of the leaders of the California Conference of the Northern Church, was immediately introduced, and announced itself ready to confer with a similar committee.<sup>14</sup> According to the report issuing from the ensuing meetings, the Northern Church offered to "receive and recognize such members of the . . . [Church, South] as may offer themselves . . . in the same grade and standing as they hold in the Pacific Conference."<sup>15</sup> The Southerners declined this proposition but presented two of their own: first, that each church request its respective general conference to re-establish the line of separation; secondly, that the Pacific Coast Conferences join to form a separate and independent organization of Methodism.<sup>16</sup> When both these proposals were rejected, the Southerners attempted to persuade their Northern colleagues to cultivate "more friendly relations between the two Churches" through (1) joint action of the conferences, (2) an "appeal to the preachers and congregations" from the presiding elders of both conferences, or (3) an address from the joint committee itself. The committee from the Church, North responded in turn to these suggestions: "We could not bind our Conference, not having been delegated to do such work."<sup>17</sup>

The uncompromising attitude of the Northern Church seems to show

a desire on its part merely to incorporate its Southern brethren rather than to achieve a more friendly relationship. The Northern offer bespeaks considerable magnanimity nevertheless, considering that not four years earlier one of its leading preachers had been apprehensive over an alleged plot to make California a slave state.<sup>18</sup> The Southerners, for their part, indicated increasing discomfort over their presence in a free state following the failure of the joint committee to reach any agreement. During this same conference session a committee appointed to "define the position of the Church in California" reported:

With these principles—that of preaching the pure Gospel of the Prince of Peace to men, irrespective of their political predilections or views—we claim the right to go into all the world. . . . We interfere with no civil government, we invade the rights of none. . . . Whenever our brethren of the North shall be disposed to unite with us upon this . . . platform, we shall be most happy to greet them with the right hand of fellowship.<sup>19</sup>

Also, at the close of the session, the members resolved to ask the next general conference to drop the word "South" from the title of the church, so that it might not "be placed in a position of seeming antagonism to any other Church by a mere name."<sup>20</sup>

There seems to be a decline in formal inter-church contacts after the close of this annual conference. Although visitors from the Northern Church are recorded in the minutes of the Church, South for the sessions of 1857 and 1860, no prominent Northern preachers are among them, and no record of activity such as reciprocal church dedications was found.<sup>21</sup> Perhaps in addition to the failure of the joint committee of 1856 to reach a solution, the heightened animosity between the mother churches contributed to the estrangement. "It is not Methodism to affirm that slavery is a political matter with which the Church and pulpit have nothing to do," wrote an editor of the *Methodist Quarterly Review* in 1857. "When we say Methodism, we mean not the . . . Methodism of the South, the genuineness . . . [of which] is recognized by no Methodist body on earth, and in whose pulpits John Wesley would not be allowed to preach."<sup>22</sup>

The Southern Methodists in California were, however, still connected with cooperative Protestant movements, necessarily involving the Church, North. An account reported in the *San Francisco Bulletin* in June, 1860, of a Sabbath school convention of all Protestant denomi-

nations presents an interesting example of increasing asperity characterizing relations between California Methodists. Controversy between Oscar P. Fitzgerald of the Church, South and Samuel D. Simonds of the Northern Methodists appeared from the outset, but the major quarrel occurred over the nomination of a standing state committee for Sabbath schools. While presenting the nominees' names, Simonds changed the list to omit a Southern Methodist, and the convention voted to adopt the altered list. Absent during this maneuver, Fitzgerald moved for a reconsideration of the vote immediately upon his return to the convention hall. After some discussion his motion was voted upon, but defeated. Being then repeatedly ruled out of order in demanding the floor, Fitzgerald, with some heat, expressed surprise at "the want of courtesy in this matter." An offer by a Presbyterian to withdraw from the standing committee in favor of the Southerner ultimately saved the day, though objected to by Simonds, but not before Fitzgerald had registered "regret over the disrespect shown his Church"—"Chairman: 'No disrespect was intended;' Fitzgerald: 'I hope not.'" The convention adjourned on an amicable note despite its difficulties, however, with the singing of the hymn beginning "Blest Be the Tie that Binds."<sup>23</sup>

Ten months later the nation was at war. For Methodism in California the beginning of the Civil War signaled a complete break—no record of further contacts of a formal nature appears during the war years—and the initial reactions of each church were characteristic. The 1861 session of the California Conference of the Northern Church adopted with cheers a committee report which said in part:

We deplore the necessity of war as we do the necessity of executing a felon. But the destroyers of free government and offenders against justice and liberty must be repulsed and punished whether robbers or rebels.<sup>24</sup>

The Annual Conference of the Church, South, on the other hand, reiterated its non-political stand as well as its determination to remain in California, cautioning its members to "avoid carefully exciting discussions and entangling associations," and to "cultivate peace with all men." The conference then predicted: "The hostility to us, . . . marked and intense as it is, has in all probability not yet reached a culminating point."<sup>25</sup>

Some dealings between the churches must have been unavoidable

even though formal relations apparently ceased during the war. In Sacramento, for example, the largest Northern Methodist church was located on Sixth Street, while the Seventh Street Methodist Church was Southern. In San Francisco, an editing duel was carried on between Oscar P. Fitzgerald and the Southern *Pacific Methodist* and Eleazar Thomas and the Northern *California Christian Advocate* until the suspension of the Southern periodical for financial reasons in the fall of 1862.<sup>26</sup> Fitzgerald, however, wrote with warm affection about Thomas in later years: "The war drove us farther and still farther apart in opinion, but every time we met we grew closer to each other in personal attachment."<sup>27</sup> Other relationships among the preachers were perhaps less happy; in any case the Southern Church evidently avoided or was denied participation in cooperative Protestant endeavor. Newspaper reports of such affairs as Bible society conventions and a Sunday school convention include no Southern names.<sup>28</sup>

Members of the clergy of both churches engaged in political activities, however, which must have influenced mutual attitudes. On the national level, both branches of Methodism threw themselves wholeheartedly into the war effort. The Church, North was even commended by Lincoln in 1864: "God bless the Methodist Church, bless all the Churches, and blessed be God who, in this great trial, giveth us the Churches!"<sup>29</sup> The fervor of the Northerners is seen in the 1864 Report to the General Conference by the Committee on the State of the Country:

A fearfully wicked rebellion, having no justification in its origin or continuance, and involving the crime of treason against the best of human governments and sin against God, is wasting the energies of the nation and destroying thousands of precious lives. . . . In such circumstances it becomes our duty as Christian ministers to do all in our power to sustain our government in this just cause of humanity and God.<sup>30</sup>

The Methodist Church, South was fully as active in its support of the Confederacy, and, as the largest Protestant denomination in the South, contributed no small amount of aid.<sup>31</sup>

In California, members of the Northern clergy entered the contest with an enthusiasm equalling that of the mother church. At the 1861 annual conference, a collection of \$100.00 was taken up and presented to two military companies organized in Sacramento "with assurances

of our continued sympathy and prayers.”<sup>82</sup> At least one former Northern preacher, Charles Maclay of Santa Clara, served in the state legislature, introducing a bill in 1862 calling for “the just punishment of traitors and treason, and all aiders and abettors.”<sup>83</sup> Both Nathan R. Peck and Martin C. Briggs, leading preachers of the Northern Church, acted as chaplains of the state assembly during the war years, and their prayers and sermons were noted in the Sacramento *Union* as “fervent and patriotic.”<sup>84</sup> An excerpt from one of Dr. Peck’s sermons illustrates the political purpose served by the pulpit: “I have seen this formidable defense of tyranny [i.e., the Confederacy] assaulted by the hosts of freedom. . . . I have said, let every muscle seize the implements of destruction, . . . let every power on earth and heaven be invoked to aid.”<sup>85</sup> Northern Methodists were also active in the so-called “Christian Commission,” organized late in the war for the purpose of “bringing the influences of evangelical religion to bear upon our Army and Navy,” and Martin C. Briggs visited the Army of the Potomac as a delegate in the winter of 1864.<sup>86</sup> Indeed, Briggs was by far the most active Republican of the Church, North, as well as its most popular preacher throughout the war.<sup>87</sup> The Union (Republican) State Convention of 1864, meeting in the Sixth Street Northern Methodist Church in Sacramento, elected Briggs one of the delegates to the national convention in Baltimore, whereupon the Sacramento *Union* remarked: “A pioneer of California as well as Republicanism, the clerical delegate is distinguished for vigorous oratory and thorough devotion to the cause of the country.”<sup>88</sup>

In spite of its non-partisan policy, the Southern Methodists of California also entered into political affairs, although they never approximated the intense patriotic activity of their Northern colleagues for obvious reasons. One unfortunate preacher, however, ran for the state assembly as a Breckenridge Democrat in 1862, but was publicly and severely reprimanded by the annual conference of the following year.<sup>89</sup> More significant, the Breckenridge Democratic State Convention of 1862 was held in the Seventh Street Southern Methodist Church in Sacramento. After adopting several “peace” resolutions, the convention nominated Oscar P. Fitzgerald as its candidate for State Superintendent of Public Instruction.<sup>40</sup> The minutes of subsequent annual conferences ignored both the use of the church for political purposes and Fitzger-

ald's campaign. Incidentally, although defeated, Fitzgerald polled over fifteen per cent of the vote cast—an indication, perhaps, that antagonism towards Southern Methodism was not as widespread as the church itself had feared.<sup>41</sup>

In fact, the hostility anticipated by the Church, South in 1861 resulted in only two recorded violent incidents, and even these appear to have been more in the nature of pranks than acts of violence. On the Fourth of July, 1861, a mob of enthusiastic Unionists succeeded in ringing the bell of a Southern Methodist church in Stockton over the frantic protests of its pastor, and, in a more serious incident at the war's end, the building of the Southern Methodist college in Vacaville was burned to the ground.<sup>42</sup> Threats of violence were undoubtedly more frequent. John C. Simmons, for example, wrote of being informed by the District Judge of Sonoma County shortly after Lincoln's assassination that there was a "strong talk" of destroying the Southern church in that town and of exiling Simmons. According to Simmons, he replied to the Judge that he had "no physical power" to resist, and continued: "But, sir, if you dare to touch God's house, or to harm a hair of my head, we will remand you to a higher Power who has promised to be our defense."<sup>43</sup> The Southern Church was not alone in receiving hostile treatment, however. According to the *Sacramento Union*, the house of a "loyal" minister in Petaluma was showered with rocks in July, 1864, and in the following month, also in Petaluma, a Northern Methodist preacher and others were "assailed with stones by concealed scoundrels" when leaving the church on the day proclaimed by President Lincoln for prayer.<sup>44</sup>

The war years took their toll in the membership rolls of both branches of California Methodism, but the Southerners suffered the greater attrition, both in numbers and in resources.<sup>45</sup> The complete isolation from the mother church caused acute problems as early as 1862, when the minutes of the annual conference of the Church, South record the sale of a church lot in San Francisco, the closing out of the Book Depository for lack of funds, and the suspension of publication of the *Pacific Methodist*, Fitzgerald's periodical.<sup>46</sup> The most serious difficulty encountered by the Southerners, however, was their failure to secure an episcopal visit for four years. According to the rules of the church, only an elder could administer the sacraments, and only a bishop could ordain an



elder. The cutting of communication with the mother church precluded the visit of a Southern bishop, and by 1863 the lack of sufficient qualified elders in California precipitated a severe crisis. At the annual conference for that year, the Santa Rosa circuit presented a "Memorial" proposing that:

As a matter of expediency in the present calamitous state of the country, we would modify our church relations and declare ourselves an independent organization on this coast, And that our young ministers might be ordained so as to administer the sacraments we would elect a Bishop from among ourselves.<sup>47</sup>

The Committee on the State of the Church, to whom the matter was referred for consideration, returned a lengthy opinion noting the desirability of such a measure:

Our independence may become a necessity. Should the Southern States be subjugated a continued connection with the Church would hazzard [*sic*] our usefulness here. Should the Independence of the Southern Confederacy be acknowledged a separation from that Church might become expedient, perhaps necessary—and in view of these facts, could we now be set off as an Independent Church your Committee think it would tend to our prosperity and usefulness.<sup>48</sup> Nevertheless, the committee rejected the proposition as too revolutionary and requiring a far greater majority favoring it than then existed. As an alternative, the committee recommended an intensified effort to persuade Bishop Hubert H. Kavanaugh of Kentucky, the only Southern bishop within Union territory at the time, to visit California.<sup>49</sup>

Bishop Kavanaugh consented to come, and, traveling by ship from New York via the Isthmus of Panama, arrived in San Francisco in the spring of 1864 to undertake the sorely needed episcopal duties.<sup>50</sup> As it happened, the Bishop's arrival coincided with a period of increased agitation on the part of pro-Confederacy Californians. During the summer of 1864 military arrests of several of the more vocal anti-administration men evoked endless comment in the newspapers. Letters to the editor of the Sacramento *Union* abound from July to September protesting or approving these arrests.<sup>51</sup> In a message to military headquarters in Washington, D.C., the commander of the Department of the Pacific, Major General Irvin McDowell, expressed concern over the situation in California, even mentioning the possibility of an armed insurrection by some of the more disgruntled citizenry.<sup>52</sup> Under these circumstances, the presence of Bishop Kavanaugh caused no little excitement. "*A Rebel*

*Bishop in California,*” said the Congregationalist newspaper, *The Pacific*, and continued:

The Bishop presides over a Church made up wholly of Rebels. . . . In what way he came through Union lines, . . . we know not; nor do we know what special occasion called him here. There is not a fragment of the Methodist Church, South, left in this State. It has long since ceased to be in the main a power for anything but evil. . . . What good can come, then, from this visit.<sup>53</sup>

In July, an undisclosed source testified before John S. Mason, the Provost Marshal in San Francisco, that Kavanaugh had come through military lines from Georgia on a Confederate pass, and that since he had “no visible business” in California, he could be presumed to be “a political emissary of Jeff. Davis.”<sup>54</sup> Kavanaugh was arrested at a camp meeting in Copperopolis (near Stockton) by a United States Army captain and taken to San Francisco for questioning, but he was given a full and unqualified release after a few days.<sup>55</sup> A letter to the provost marshal from the office of General McDowell explained this release and expressed the general’s satisfaction with the nature of Kavanaugh’s mission in California, adding that the term “South” attached to the name of the Church, while unfortunate, carried no political connotations.<sup>56</sup> Oscar P. Fitzgerald also wrote the provost marshal urging publication of all the facts of the matter in order to promote popular understanding of the church.<sup>57</sup>

One of the more tangible results of the Kavanaugh incident was the arrest of C. L. Weller, the chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee, on July 25, 1864. Urging the formation of secret societies to combat “the high arm of military tyranny in California” at a meeting in San Francisco, Weller said in regard to the arrest of the bishop, “And will you sit quietly by and see such things done, and not resist them?” (Cries of ‘No! No!’)<sup>58</sup> Weller was sent to Alcatraz, but later released on an oath of allegiance to the Union and \$25,000.00 bond.<sup>59</sup> More of the speculation and controversy concerning Kavanaugh was reported in the Sacramento *Union*. A nameless correspondent of the Marysville *Express*, as quoted in the *Union*, believed the charges against the bishop to have originated with a Northern Methodist preacher from San Jose.<sup>60</sup> The attitude of the Church, North as seen in its periodical, the *California Christian Advocate*, was one of approval:

What then, if one or a thousand citizens be arrested on report of disloyalty?

Temporary personal inconvenience is realized but the vigilance and purpose of the authorities are manifest; and if those arraigned are able to clear themselves of treasonable complications, utterances, and acts, it is well; if they are not, the arresting hand has been stretched out none too soon. . . . The arrest of Bishop Kavanaugh . . . will go far to assure all parties that we have a chief military officer . . . who . . . will execute his post.<sup>61</sup>

Kavanaugh himself, in a letter to the provost marshal, wrote: "That I am deeply pained by this proceeding I candidly confess—not so much because of personal injury to myself, as because of the reproach it brings on my sacred calling and on the Church with which I am connected."<sup>62</sup>

The comments caused by the arrest of Bishop Kavanaugh constitute the final evidence indicating mutual church attitudes during the war. After the cessation of hostilities, California preachers of the Northern Church were characteristically prominent in funeral services for Lincoln, while their Southern colleagues repeated once again their determination both to remain in California and to avoid civil affairs.<sup>63</sup> While the Congregationalist *Pacific* could term Southern Methodism "dead" in California, and the San Francisco *Call* speculated that "the Southern Methodist Church has received a wound from which it will not recover," the church in California had nonetheless survived the struggle.<sup>64</sup> In spite of an incident such as the burning of the Southern college building in the emotional turmoil following Lincoln's assassination, the Southern Church was beginning to regain its membership by 1865.<sup>65</sup> An indication of the firm status the Church, South had achieved in California was the immediate resumption after the war of press notices concerning Southern Methodist church services—for the most part ignored throughout the war.<sup>66</sup>

Thus the gulf widened between the branches of Methodism in California. Of course, the position to which the Southern Church adhered was never tenable; as in all armed conflicts, neutrality necessarily implied disloyalty. However, while the sophistry involved in the Southern insistence that slavery—at base a moral problem—was purely a political question became an irritation, it was probably the only possible stand the organization could take. On the other hand, the zeal with which the Northern Church espoused the Union cause appears rather sanguinary for a Christian body and undoubtedly contributed to mutual antagonism. Although such animosity seems to have increased throughout the

war, it never became as bitter as the circumstances might have warranted. The Church, South, while losing some members, fared remarkably well; above all, it stayed in California. The Northern Church displayed considerable restraint despite its enthusiasm for the Union and embarrassment over the presence of the Church, South. There was no attempt to drive the Southerners away, only to incorporate them. The large anti-administration minority in California was an important factor in this regard, of course. At any rate, the avoidance of bloodshed and the relative absence of violence certainly helped to facilitate the resumption of cordial relations between California Methodists.

In 1869, only four years after the end of the war, a fraternal delegation consisting of Martin C. Briggs and Eleazar Thomas visited the Southern annual conference, bearing the following message:

The harmony of union, communion, and co-operation must come of the charity that hopeth all things, thinketh no evil, never faileth—We are persuaded that this love, . . . is possessing in large . . . measure, hearts too long estranged. . . . The occasion or cause of our separation [*sic*] and the too passionate controversy thence arising, we would remember only as incentives to hearty and deep repentance and as the inclination to a higher and sublime devotion to our divine and cherished mission.<sup>67</sup>

Californians of both sides were apparently tired of the quarrel. Although the Southern bishop presiding at the conference grumbled that “as a man who loved righteousness, he could not ‘gush with sentiment until wrongs were righted and property restored,’” his counsel went unheeded—he was, after all, a visitor to California.<sup>68</sup> Oscar P. Fitzgerald described the resumption of formal relations between California Methodists thus: “As the interview proceeded, the tide of good feeling rose higher and higher, until, sweeping away all obstructions, fraternity triumphed amid a storm of Amens.”<sup>69</sup> On the national level, however, differences were not so easily resolved; formal unification of the mother churches did not occur for seventy more years.

APPENDIX

Comparative Statistics Taken from Conference Minutes (Approximate)

Year	M.E. Church		M.E. Church, South	
	Preachers	Members	Preachers	Members
1853 . . . . .	35	1344	21	568
1854 . . . . .	46	1659	22	731
1855 . . . . .	58	2039	29	838
1856 . . . . .	57	2112	35	1202
1857 . . . . .	72	2500	37	no record
1858 . . . . .	80	2739	52	no record
1859 . . . . .	82	3247	54	2011
1860 . . . . .	100	3441	56	2500
1861 . . . . .	96	3705	69	2451
1862 . . . . .	98	3501	69	1849*
1863 . . . . .	99	3948	64	1096*
1864 . . . . .	88	3912	44	1791*
1865 . . . . .	91	3879	60	1993*

\*Figures for the Oregon districts have been subtracted.

NOTES

1. John J. Earle, "The Sentiment of the People of California with Respect to the Civil War," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association*, VIII (Washington, 1908), pp. 123-35; Benjamin Franklin Gilbert, "The Confederate Minority in California," *California Historical Society Quarterly*, XX (June, 1941), pp. 154-70.
2. Methodist Episcopal Church, South, *History of the Organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South: Comprehending All the Official Proceedings of the General Conference, the Southern Annual Conference, and the General Convention* (Nashville, 1845).
3. John C. Simmons, *The History of Southern Methodism on the Pacific Coast* (Nashville, 1886), p. 65; William Taylor, *California Life, Illustrated* (New York, 1858), pp. 155-58.
4. William Hanchett, "The Question of Religion and the Taming of California," *California Historical Society Quarterly*, XXXI (June, 1953), p. 119.
5. Taylor, *California Life, Illustrated*, p. 157.
6. Manuscript Minutes of the Pacific Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1852-1869 (in possession of the Methodist Historical Society, Methodist Church Headquarters, Los Angeles, California), April 15, 1852. Cited hereafter as Minutes of the Church, South.

7. Simmons, *History of Southern Methodism . . .*, pp. 32, 65.
8. Charles Volney Anthony, *Fifty Years of Methodism: a History of the Methodist Episcopal Church within the Bounds of the California Annual Conference from 1847 to 1897* (San Francisco, 1901), p. 260.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 93, 111, 121, 131, 160-61, 212.
10. Simmons, *History of Southern Methodism . . .*, p. 128; Minutes of the Church, South, *passim*; San Francisco *Chronicle*, Dec. 1, 1855; Earle, *Annual Report of the American Historical Association*, VIII, pp. 123-35; Gilbert, *California Historical Society Quarterly*, XX, p. 166; John W. Winkley, *Methodist Pioneers of California* (Albany, California, 1947), p. 34.
11. San Francisco *Alta California*, Sept. 20, 1862; Sacramento *Union*, June 14, 1864; Aurora Hunt, *The Army of the Pacific; 1860-1866* (Glendale, 1951), p. 336.
12. Anthony, *Fifty Years of Methodism*, pp. 35, 149; Simmons, *History of Southern Methodism . . .*, pp. 54, 133.
13. Anthony, *Fifty Years of Methodism*, p. 47 and *passim*; Hanchett, *California Historical Society Quarterly*, XXXI, pp. 119-44; Minutes of the Church, South, April 17, 20, 1852.
14. Minutes of the Church, South, Nov. 6, 1856.
15. Simmons, *History of Southern Methodism . . .*, p. 205.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*, p. 206.
18. Anthony, *Fifty Years of Methodism*, p. 35.
19. Minutes of the Church, South, Nov. 6, 1856; Simmons, *History of Southern Methodism . . .*, p. 207.
20. Minutes of the Church, South, Nov. 10, 1856.
21. Minutes of the Church, South, Nov. 4, 1857; Oct. 17, 18, 1860.
22. "The Discipline as It Is and Slavery," *Methodist Quarterly Review*, Ser. IV, Vol. IX (July, 1857), p. 508.
23. San Francisco *Bulletin*, June 2, 9, 1860.
24. Anthony, *Fifty Years of Methodism*, p. 231.
25. Minutes of the Church, South, Oct. 8, 1861.
26. *Ibid.*, Oct. 7, 1862.
27. Oscar Penn Fitzgerald, *California Sketches* (2d ed.; Nashville, 1889), p. 136.
28. San Francisco *Alta California*, Feb. 22, Oct. 18, 1862; San Francisco *Call*, Jan. 11, 1865.
29. Lewis Curts, ed., *The General Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1792-1896* (Cincinnati, 1900), p. 164.
30. Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Held in Philadelphia, 1864* (New York, 1864), p. 380.
31. Halford E. Luccock and Paul Hutchinson, *The Story of Methodism* (New York, 1926), p. 355.

32. Anthony, *Fifty Years of Methodism*, p. 231.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 56; *San Francisco Call*, April 4, 1862.
34. *Sacramento Union*, March 28, April 17, 1863; Anthony, *Fifty Years of Methodism*, p. 34.
35. *Sacramento Union*, Jan. 13, 1863.
36. *Ibid.*, June 13, 17, July 8, 1864; *San Francisco Call*, Dec. 18, 1864; Anthony, *Fifty Years of Methodism*, p. 34.
37. See Rockwell Hunt's essay on Briggs in *California in the Making: Essays and Papers in California History* (Caldwell, Idaho, 1953).
38. *Sacramento Union*, April 2, 1864.
39. Minutes of the Church, South, Oct. 7, 1863; Simmons, *History of Southern Methodism . . .*, p. 289.
40. *Sacramento Union*, Jan. 1, 1863.
41. Richard Leupp, "Disloyal Sentiment in California during the Ante-Bellum and Civil War Period" (unpublished Master's thesis, San Francisco State College, 1958), p. 88.
42. *San Francisco Alta California*, July 13, 1861. Simmons, *History of Southern Methodism . . .*, p. 322; Minutes of the Church, South, Oct. 9, 1865.
43. Simmons, *History of Southern Methodism . . .*, pp. 321-22.
44. *Sacramento Union*, July 25, Aug. 15, 1864.
45. See Appendix.
46. Minutes of the Church, South, Oct. 6, 7, 1862.
47. *Ibid.*, Oct. 7, 1863.
48. *Ibid.*, Oct. 10, 1863.
49. *Ibid.*
50. Letter from H. H. Kavanaugh to J. C. Simmons, Feb. 14, 1878; quoted in Simmons, *History of Southern Methodism . . .*, p. 300.
51. *Sacramento Union*, July 29, Aug. 6, and *passim*, 1864.
52. United States War Department, *The War of the Rebellion: a Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (Washington, 1897), Ser. I, Vol. L, Pt. 2, p. 948.
53. Simmons, *History of Southern Methodism . . .*, pp. 308-09.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 300.
55. *Ibid.*
56. U. S. War Dept., *War of the Rebellion*, Ser. I, Vol. L, Pt. 2, p. 918.
57. *Ibid.*, pp. 920-21.
58. *Sacramento Union*, July 27, 1864.
59. Aurora Hunt, *The Army of the Pacific*, p. 349.
60. *Sacramento Union*, July 26, 1864.
61. *Ibid.*, Aug. 1, 1864.
62. Letter from H. H. Kavanaugh to General Mason, July, 1864; quoted in Simmons, *History of Southern Methodism . . .*, p. 311.

63. *San Francisco Call*, April 20, 1865; Minutes of the Church, South, Oct. 9, 1865.
64. Simmons, *History of Southern Methodism . . .*, p. 308; *San Francisco Call*, April 21, 1865.
65. See Appendix.
66. *San Francisco Call*, April, 1865, *et seq.*
67. Minutes of the Church, South, Oct. 8, 1869.
68. Simmons, *History of Southern Methodism . . .*, p. 358.
69. Fitzgerald, *California Sketches*, pp. 139-40.