## Individual Rights and Accusations: Insult of King William by John Philpott, 1694

## Transcription

## Albemarle

The Jurors for our Sover[eign]: Lord & Lady the King and Queen doe present

that John Philpott of the precinct of Pasquotank in the County aforesaid did

at or about the 14th day of Sept. 1694 at the house of [Major] Allexd: Lillington

in the precinct of Pequimmons in the County above said; [Adversely] Mallitiously and

devlishly in the presents of divers persons utter and declare these words following

Saying God dam King William and also at the aforesaid time and place did utter

him self farther saying Ill drink King James Health for he is the right

King and did farther at the same place and time utter his [???] mallice against

their maijesties for being admonished of what he had said against their majiesties

he asked what he had said and answer being made that he ha[d] said god dam King

William to which he did in most mallitious manner reply then god dam him

again and the said John Philpott did sence upon his examination ^upon^ the above said

matter before the Honble Deputy Gov[erno]r & Councell then offer to dispute against <del>King</del>

Their present maiesties right to the Crown and for King James Contrary to

the peace of our Soveraigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen their Crowne & Dignity and

is Contrary to an act off parliment made and in the Case provided in the first yeares of

the reign of King [???]: the 6th & 13 Chap[ter]



## Reflect & Discuss

Take note of the phrase, "the jurors . . . doe present." What does that indicate about this document?

King William III and Queen Mary (Protestants) came to power peacefully in 1689 after the Glorious Revolution, when King James II (a Catholic) was forced into exile in France.

What can this event tell us about religious values in colonial North Carolina?

This charge predates the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution. How might stories like John Philpott's have influenced freedom of speech in the new United States?

John Philpott was found guilty of treason. His original sentence is that all his land and possessions would be sold and he would be put in jail for a year. Because of his advanced age, his charge was later reduced to the cost of the trial fees. Why might the punishment for treason be so high?

Source: