Newspapers.com
https://www.newspapers.com/image/39408539

Downloaded on May 13, 2017

November 3, 1768. NUMB. 2080.

The PENNSYLVANIA GAZETTE.

Containing the Freshest Advices, Foreign and Domestic.

The ANATOMIST. Number IX.

How easy and plain might we make our defence? How clear and allowable even unto themselves; if we could but obtain of them to admit the same things conformant to equity in our mouths, which they require to be so taken from their own? If that which is truth, being accused in maintenance of Scotland *and* Geneva, *do not cease to be truth, when the* Church of England *once alledgeth it.*----

HOOKER.---

I COME now to that part of my undertaking, in which the *Continent*'s adherents (by their repeated challenges) seem to think I shall be chiefly prestd---I mean, in answering his arguments "on the danger of introducing (or, as they phrase it, *importing*) a Bishop, or Bishops to *America*"----And, I confess, I have no small difficulties to encounter with. For, 1st, What he says on this head lies so scattered through his different papers, that, after wading through all of them, I find it almost impossible to sort what I glean up, into any kind of form or connection.

2dly, After this pains, which I have taken without any desire of mangling or weakening what he has advanced, I can meet with scarce any thing that wears the semblance of *argument*.

It would, indeed, be a pleasure, while we claim what we think a *natural right*, to be instrumental in removing the apprehensions which any sincere and candid man may entertain from our prosecution of that claim. But, when called on to reason with a man, who will neither trust the *faith of nations*, the *sanctity of laws and charters*, nor any *human security* whatsoever, but will still cry out---"*danger, slavery, persecution*"---I find myself in the situation of *one* who foolishly undertook to reason a man into his senses, whose imagination was continually haunted with *ghosts, and hobgoblins*.----

"Come, says he, who undertook this work, shew me the chamber where they are---*For* GOD's sake, replies the other, enter not in. See how it flares! It is ready to devour you!---Where, where, says the former? I see no such thing. In yonder corner! I beseech you, continues the haunted man, go not near it!---Sir, says the former, it is no such thing. It is a *fleet*, a *fleet*---It is a *ghost*, a *ghost*! continues the other---Sir, says the former, it is a *fleet*. I assure you, it is a *fleet*. I feel it, I handle it---a *ghost*, a *ghost*! still, continues the other." And thus might the dialogue proceed for ever, without conviction on the part of the poor distempered man.

That I am doing no injustice to what is called the *Continent*'s "arguments," I hope to shew to every candid reader. I shall, therefore, endeavour, with the utmost impartiality, to gather them into one view.

"There are grounds, he says, to suspect that Dr. *Chandler* "has not given the plan on which Bishops are to be sent to "*America*, with that openness and candor that might have been "expected.---It is *plain, beyond a contradiction*, that the desire of "the Missionaries is to have such suffragan Bishops IMPORTED "into *America*, as shall have authority to exercise all the powers "given THEM * by the laws of *England*."---Now, altho' here he seems to make the Episcopal Clergy desire a Bishop in *America*, who has already "powers by the laws of *England*," yet No. 11, and elsewhere, he intimates, that they want to introduce him "by an act of Parliament," and new laws. In short, he takes it for granted all along (for it would be needless to quote particular papers, because, if he denies this, we have no contest) that the design of the Episcopal Clergy is a general establishment, as in *England*, through all *America*; that the sending out a Bishop is an establishment of himself, as well as his Clergy; that whatever may be pretended, he must have jurisdiction over the laity; that *arbitrary spiritual courts* must inseparably accompany him, &c. "The laity, says he, are amused with the false "and inconsistent hopes of being entirely exempted from the "jurisdiction of the *American* Bishop. We call it an incoh-"sistent hope, as it is contradictory, not only to the known "sentiments of the *English* Episcopal Church, but also to the "sentiments of every other Christian Church in the World. "This plan of *American* Bishops is a mere *novel invention*, with-"out any parallel in history, since the first establishment of a "Church upon earth."

Nevertheless this consistent writer, No. 15, "wonders at "those who have no idea of a Bishop separate from the appendages "of the office,"---but still, when he finds Dr. *Chandler* has this idea as well as himself, and speaks of a Bishop without the appendage of *spiritual courts*, he cries out---"What is this, but "to say, that an *arbitrary spiritual jurisdiction* unknown in the "*British* constitution, and abhorrent of the rights of freemen, is "asked, and about to be established in *America*?" He kindly adds, "Alas! for the *poor Clergy*!" Indeed the Clergy are *once* obliged "to him for his pity; but they did not need it here. For Dr. *Chandler* has said in the same sentence, and the *Continent* has quoted the words, that the Clergy are not to be governed arbitrarily, but "by laws and consent of the Church," clear and explicit in themselves, which the Clergy have voluntarily bound themselves to obey, and which may be executed in respect to them, without any jurisdiction over the laity, because such jurisdiction, as I shall fully shew, is derived from other laws, that neither have, *nor are desired* to have, any place here.

These few "arguments" of the *Continent*, will be sufficient, till I try whether they can be answered. Others shall be quoted in their proper place; only it may not be amiss to shew, before I begin, how, in those already quoted, he is explained and helped out by his associates, the *Remonstrants*, &c.-------who tell us, "that there is a gathering storm ready to burst on them, and "destroy them;" that they *fear* "Episcopacy, and its courts, "will certainly be established together; and that all judges and "governors, who will not bow their necks to *American* Bishops, "will be tumbled down with disgrace from their stations."---And then we hear of "LAWS, and *Persecution*, and flying "once more to the wilderness, as their FATHERS did;" for it seems *every* writer now stays had *fathers*, and can count his pedigree back to the first settlement of *America*!

Having thus cut out my work, the question is where to begin; for I have not a single *sophistic* to lay, but am surrounded with them----

"GORGONS, and HYDRAS, and CHIMERAS dire!"

I will begin then, at a venture; for it makes little odds where. The *Continent*'s main argument seems to be---that "ecclesiastical courts, and slavery, and persecutions," are a necessary consequence of the introduction of *Bishops* into *America*; and I am called on to shew that his apprehensions on this head are not well grounded. Hard it is to prove a *negative*, but in all fair argument, I shall do what may be equally satisfactory, if I prove this *affirmative*,---viz.---that it is *possible*, and even certain, that a Bishop can be settled in *America*, without affecting the civil or religious rights of any person whatsoever; and that every presumption which can be adduced to the contrary, would militate equally against every institution in society, even down to the appointment of a petty constable. And I will engage to shew much greater security against any arbitrary proceedings on the part of a Bishop, than I think our antagonist will be able to shew on the part of *such self-made*, and *self-delegated things*, as *Synods, Presbyteries, and Kirk-Sessions*, in *America*.

However unagreeably the *Continent* has been pleased to traduce the Episcopal Clergy of *America*, as in a conspiracy with *Bo-ne* and *Gr-n-lle*, to *enslave* their country; however basely he has affected attempts for an *American* Bishop with plans of rebellion, and the introduction of Popery, and the Pretender; however wickedly he has endeavoured to prejudice the vulgar, by jumbling our claim of natural right to the privileges of a *Christian Church*, with odious *Stamp-Acts*, and arbitrary *Courts of Admiralty*, yet I am bold to say, that if the Episcopal Clergy did not clearly see, and firmly believe, that what they ask is perfectly consistent with their own rights, and those of the laity, they would detest the thoughts of becoming instruments in the ruin of their country. For what motive could induce them to such a conduct? Surely the present sett of Ministers can expect little personal benefit from any scheme of this kind. And they are not *Anchorites*, without children, nor wholly without property; nor is their priesthood, like the *Levitical*, to descend from father to son.

Surely then this abusive writer should have some solid foundations for such a horrible charge against the Clergy, as that of shewing one scheme to the world "*plausible*, specious, and calculated to amuse with inconsistent hopes," while the real one lies concealed under it, pregnant with every possible mischief---Let us see what these foundations are---

He says, "the exemption of the laity from the jurisdiction of "the Bishop is contradictory, not only to the known sentiments "of the Church of *England*, but of every other Christian Church "in the world----and is a mere novel invention, without any "parallel in history, since the first establishment of a Church "on earth."

Now both these assertions I utterly deny; and if the *Continent* was in earnest in them, or meant any thing more than to impose on the ignorant, he must give me leave to pronounce him wholly unacquainted with *Church-history*, as well as the constitution of the *Church of England*, and the foundation of that temporal jurisdiction, with which it has been thought proper to vest her Bishops.

What meaning the *Continent* designs to have put on the words---"since the first establishment of a Church on earth"---I know not. For he often writes, as if he chose to keep a back-door for an escape, in case of detection. But if CHRIST can be said to have established a Church on earth, or if there was a Christian Church during the three first centuries, then there were Bishops during that period, such as we desire for *America*, that had no jurisdiction over the laity, different from what every Presbyter had, as essential to the office of a pastor.

I shall give an authority for this, which will not be denied. It is the learned and accurate Christian DRAKE---"For the first 300 years after CHRIST (he says) the distinction of ecclesiastical and spiritual causes, in point of jurisdiction, did not begin. At that time, no such distinction was heard of, in the Christian world. For the causes of testimony, matrimony, bastardy, adultery, and the rest, which are called ecclesiastical or spiritual causes, were merely civil, and determined by the rules of the civil law, and subject only to the jurisdiction of the civil magistrate."

What has BEEN, is *possible* to BE again; and the same author proceeds to shew how Bishops came to have jurisdiction over the laity, even in causes called spiritual; which were never claimed as inherent in their spiritual character, or derived from CHRIST; but given by the powers then in *being*, for what they esteemed salutary purposes.

"Christian Emperors, says he, out of a real to grace and "honor learned and godly Bishops, were pleased to *single out* "certain causes, wherein they granted them jurisdiction,---viz. "in case of *tithes*, because paid to the men of the Church; "in causes of matrimony, because marriages were, for the most "part, solemnized in the Church; in causes testamentary, because testaments were many times made *in extremis*, when "Churchmen were present giving spiritual comfort;---and in "all these causes, the Bishops proceeded according to the imperial law, and as the civil magistrate did in other causes."

Who then will say that they assumed this jurisdiction, as inseparable from their office, or that it was arbitrary, or could have been exercised without law?

In the same manner did the *English* Bishops derive jurisdiction over the laity in certain causes ecclesiastical. It is no doctrine of our Church, as the *Continent* would assert, that they hold it inseparable from their office, and immediately of CHRIST. This proud boast is indeed made by Independents and Presbyterians, though they have never yet produced their charter. But the latter, I mean the Presbyterians, in the *new* national Church of *Scotland*, hold this doctrine with much as bad a grace, as they accuse our Church of Sham-elections, dictated by the King's *Congé d'Elire*. For tho' the General Assembly of the Church of *Scotland* pretend that they meet yearly with CHRIST as their head, and from him alone derive their authority to determine causes, civil and ecclesiastical, yet the King, by his Commissioner, first at least as their visible head, and when in his royal prerogative, he thinks fit to adjourn them to a certain day, they always find (and good worldly wisdom it is) that CHRIST approves of what the King has done, and they adjourn themselves to the same day accordingly.

Having already transgressed the bounds allotted me by my publishers, I shall, in my next, resume this subject, and shew, by full authorities, that the proposed plan for *American* Bishops, simply as it stands, is no *novel invention*, nor any way contradictory to the known sentiments of the Church of *England*.

* *If this confused sentence has any meaning, it must be the following, and answers itself, viz. "The Missionaries wants such suffragan Bishops in* America *as shall have authority to exercise the powers* given them *(the said suffragan Bishops, that are to be imported into* America*) by the laws of* England." *Now, truly, if the laws of* England *have given any powers to* American *suffragans, I cannot see that it would be illegal to exercise those powers. But I do not know that such suffragans are once mentioned in all the* English *laws.*

The REMONSTRANT. No. IV.

THE Anatomist, and his friend Horatio, have raked together abstracts of pamphlets, written in the New-England provinces, from which they have picked an expression, here and there, which they dislike; and having dressed it in italicks, and double commas, they cry out, that the whole performances are written with a bitter intolerant spirit. If, in their controversies with any of the Missionaries, the Independent Ministers have set the vain pretensions of these gentlemen to an uninterrupted succession, and the power which their Church claims to ordain or decree rites and ceremonies, &c. in a true light, there is a loud outcry raised, that they attack the whole body of the Church, her doctrine and discipline, and the principles of her clergy and members. Is it so rotten a fabrick, that it cannot bear to be touched? A Church that is in very bad order, should give no provocation. But does any of these quotations prove that the Independents would have crushed the Church of England, or that they were the first aggressors in any of these debates? No, it is well known that the Episcopal Missionaries, of their friends, first proclaimed the war; and when *they* were soundly drubbed, they would make the world believe, that the whole Church of England has been too roughly handled; but what have these squabbles to do with Chandler's Appeal? Every colony, and religious denomination, are equally called forth by that champion for an American Episcopate. They are to make their objections, if they have any, or all parties are supposed to acquiesce in his plan.

The first Episcopal Church set up among the Independents in New-England, was about the year 1680. They were poor, and few in number, and were allowed the use of the Town-house by the Independents, as he calls the Congregational Churches. Was not this an instance of brotherly love? It was an evidence of no malignity of spirit, or a desire to crush them. But how did they requite this kindness †? Under the administration of Sir Edmund Andros, they desired the use of the South Meeting-house. And when some gentlemen, proprietors of that house, refused to deliver them, Governor Andros told them, *he would presently seize on their house, and all the Meeting-houses in the country, and hinder them from contributing the value of Two-pence towards the maintenance of any Non-conformist Minister.* And when this threatening could not prevail, they thrust themselves into the Meeting-house, and there continued, until, by interrupting the people of the South Congregation, often in the *rites*, and sometimes in the very *parts* of their worship, the whole town cried shame upon them. Here was a sample of the same persecuting spirit, from which the Independents fled to this wilderness. At the funeral of one Mr. Lilley, their Minister, came with his *gown* and *book*, to read the service, and to settle this laudable custom in that barbarous country. One Mr. Frayray, a relation of the deceased, in the name of the rest, only with fit words, desired him to forbear; but Mr. Frayray was bound over to the Court for this offence, where they intended to have ruined him, had not the *unlucky Revolution* prevented these designs.

And, that the Ministers might have their share, Mr. Cotton Mather was prosecuted upon the *Act of Uniformity*, and illegally condemned, but the Revolution prevented the execution of the sentence against him. For on that very day on which he was to be committed *to half a year's imprisonment*, those that would have wronged him, were justly taken into custody. This beloved *Act of Uniformity*, and the penal laws in support of it, tore the established Church of England to pieces, and brought unnumbered mischiefs on many of its own Ministers and people, which it drove from their communion. And this same *Act of Uniformity*, which the Episcopal Church determined to establish in New-England, began all those controversies, that the Anatomist complains of, and it had been for his honour, and for the benefit of his cause, rather to have let them sleep in silence, than to have so spitefully revived them.

It is urged, that since the Act of Toleration an exemplary spirit of moderation and Christian charity have prevailed among the Episcopalians. For this we thank GOD, and for this we chearfully praise, and give them due commendation, as far as they deserve it. But are things really so? Let us remind the Episcopalians of their conduct in New-York, since the Toleration Act, under the administration of Lord Cornbury *. Mr. Makemie, a worthy Presbyterian Minister, preached a sermon in New-York, at the desire of a number of the inhabitants, who were Presbyterians. And though he produced a certificate of his having qualified himself according to the Act of Toleration, he was committed to prison, and prosecuted upon an indictment that says, *that he unlawfully used other rites, ceremonies, form and manner of divine worship, than what are contained in a certain book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, &c. against the form of the Statute, &c.* Here the attack was vigorously begun by the Church of England, against the Presbyterians, in open defiance of the Act of Toleration, and in a city that was originally settled with Dutch Presbyterians, and where the Episcopal Church, in its infant state, had been kindly cherished, and had received many favours. Was not the unmerciful, and scandalous Schism Bill, enacted in the last year of Queen Anne, and enacted in open defiance to the Toleration Act, by which the friends of this *beloved Act of Uniformity* deprived all parents that were not of the established Church, of the great trust committed to them by GOD, and nature, to train up their own children according to their own sentiments in religion, and the fear of GOD. No catechism was to be taught to children, but that of the Church of England, and no man, under severe penalties, was allowed to teach even an English school, who did not, in all things, conform to that Church. Let our Anatomist call this unmerited abuse, it is the truth, and it was done when High Church rode triumphant. And had not GOD in mercy placed the Hanover family on the throne of Great-Britain, all the severities that distressed England for near one hundred years, and ruined many thousands of families, had been felt once more, with seven-fold rigor.

[*For the Remainder, see the Fourth Page.*]

† *See Vindication of New-England, Pages 13, 14. Life of Dr. Cotton Mather, Page 43. Hubart's Second Address, Pages 24, 25, 26, 27, &c.*

* *See Rev. Makemie's Trial, Page 17, and Mr. Hubart's Second Address, Pages 28, 29.*

Copyright © 2017 Newspapers.com. All Rights Reserved.
POWERED BY Newspapers.com

Newspapers.com
https://www.newspapers.com/image/39408590

Downloaded on May 17, 2017

Copyright © 2017 Newspapers.com. All Rights Reserved.
POWERED BY Newspapers.com™