

November 3, 1768.

NUMB. 2080.

The PENNSYLVANIA GAZETTE.

Containing the Freshest Advices, Foreign and Domestic.

THE ANATOMIST. Number IX.

How truly and plain might you make our defence! How clear and alluringly you have unfolded to us the truth, and how clearly you have shown the error of our way, which we were so ready to be taken from our own! If that which is true, being wrong in the maintenance of Scotland and Geneva, do we not see in it, that the Church of England were not to be...

COME now to that part of my undertaking, in which the General's address (by their repeated challenges) seem to think I shall be chiefly pressed. 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, if, what he says on this head has been scattered through his different papers, that, after reading through all of them, I find it almost impossible to get what I glean up, into any kind of form or connection.

After this pain, which I have taken without any desire of meddling or weakening what he has advanced, I can meet with force any thing that wears the semblance of argument. It would, indeed, be a pleasure, while we claim what we think a well-earned right, to be instrumental in removing the apprehensions which any fierce and candid man may entertain from our production of this claim. But, when called on to reason with a man, who will neither touch the faith of others, the justice of laws and statutes, nor any human liberty whatsoever, but will still cry out—"danger, slavery, persecution"—I find myself in the situation of a man, who is called on to contend with a mad dog, whose imagination was continually haunted with phantoms of blood.

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

These are, *arguenda*, he says, to suppose that Dr. Chandler has not given the 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 as a Bishop without the dependence of general courts, he cries out—"What is this, but to say, that an arbitrary spiritual jurisdiction unknown in the British constitution, and a violation of the rights of freedom, is about to be established in America?" He kindly adds,

"I am sensible, that the Clergy are not obliged to him for his plea; but they did not need it here. For Dr. Chandler has laid in the same sentence, and the General has quoted the words, that the Clergy are not to be governed arbitrarily, but by laws and customs 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 show, is derived from other laws, that neither have, nor are desired to have, any place here."

The few "arguments" of the General, will be sufficient, till I try whether they can be answered. Others that he quotes in their proper place, only they may be united to these before he begins, how, in these already quoted, he is explained and helped out by his associates, the *Remonstrant*, &c.---who tell us, "that there is a general consent, and that all judges and governors, who will not bow their necks to American Bishops, will be trampled down with stripes from their backs. And then we hear of LAWS, and Persecutions, and flying one more to the wilderness, as their PATRIARCH did;" for it seems every writer now aims but to injure, and can count his pedigree back to the first settlement of America!

Having thus cut out my work, the question is where to be. "If this cruel justice has any meaning, it may be the following, and answers itself, viz. The Ministers were first sent to America by the laws of England. Now, truly, if the laws of England have ever given any power to American Bishops, I am not certain it could be taken away by any law of the English Crown.

gin; for I have not a single *passé* to lay, but am surrounded with them.

"GORGANA, and HYDRA, and CHIMERA! dire!" I will begin then, at a venture; for it makes little odds where. The General'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 show 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 set up in America, without affecting the civil or religious rights of any person whatsoever; and that every pretension 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 show that every such objection 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 ungenerously our General has been pleased to traduce the Episcopal Clergy of America, in a conspiracy with *B- and C- and G- and H-*, to subvert their country; however basely he has associated 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 feel, and firmly believe, that what they ask is perfectly consistent with their rights, and those of the laity, they would not search the thoughts of becoming instruments in the ruin of their country. For what motive could induce them to such a conduct? Surely the present form of Ministers can expect no other benefit from any scheme of this kind. And they are not *Ascetics*, without children, nor wholly without property; nor is their priesthood, like the Levitical, to descend from father to son.

Surely then this adverse writer should have found foundations for such a horrible charge against the Clergy, as that of throwing one scheme to the world "plausible, specious, and calculated to amuse vain inconsistent hopes," while the real ends concealed under it, pregnant with every possible mischief. Let us see what their 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 non-sequitur, without any parallel in history, since the first establishment of a Church on earth."

Now both these assertions I utterly deny; and if the General 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 Prelates; and if the establishment of a Church in fact, is a necessary consequence of the first establishment of a Church on earth."

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 non-sequitur, without any parallel in history, since the first establishment of a Church on earth."

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

Christian Emperors, says he, out of a zeal to give us and honor learned and godly Bishops, were pleased to grant us, in case of *strife*, became paid to the men of the Church; in cases of matrimony, because marriage was, for the most part, solemnized in the Church; in causes testamentary, because testaments were many times made in *ecclesia*, 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?

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 dilute; and having dressed it in Italicks, and in double commas, they cry out, that the whole performance is written with a bitter intolerant spirit. If, in their controversies with any of the Millionaires, the Independent Ministers have for the sake of professions of these gentlemen to an interrupted succession, and the power which their Church claims to obtain or decree rites and ceremonies, &c. in a true light, there is no controversy, that they attack the whole body of the Church, her doctrine and discipline, and the principles of her clergy and members. It is to rotten a fabric, that it cannot bear to be touched. A Church, that is so very tender, should give no provocation. But does any of these quotations prove that the Independents would have crucified the Church of England, or that they were the first aggressors in any of these debates? No, it is well known that the Episcopal Ministers, their friends, first proclaimed the war; and when they were loudly doubted, they would make the world believe, that the whole Church of England has been too roughly handled; but what have these quibbles to do with Chandler's Appeal? Every colony, and religious denomination, are equally called forth by that challenge 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 1750. They were poor, and few in number, and were allowed the use of the Town-houses by the Independents, as he calls the Congregational Churches. Was not that 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 declared that they were the Church of England by law established; they would no longer afford to the Town-houses, but demanded the keys of the South Meeting-house. And when some gentlemen, proprietors of that house, refused to deliver them, Governor Andros's orders, *do what they please on their houses, and all the Meeting-houses in the country, and binder them from contributing the value of Five-pence towards the maintenance of any Non-conformity Minister*, 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 mass, and sometimes in the very parts of their worship, the whole town cried them 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. Lacey, their Minister gave with his gown and book, to read the service, and to settle his laudable custom in that barbarous country. One Mr. Fryar, a relation of the deceased, in the name of the rest, only that 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 real laws in support of it, were the established Church of England to pieces, and brought unnumbered millions 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 cheerfully praise, and give them due commendation, as far as they deserve it. But are things really so? Let us consider the Episcopalians of their conduct in New-York, since the *Toleration Act*, under the administration of Lord Cornbury*. Mr. Malmesbury, 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 professed 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 offends *rites, ceremonies, forms and manner of divine worship, that were established 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 foundation 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 right of educating their children according to their own sentiments in religion, and some taught 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 a moderate, a liberal, and a true spirit, and when High Church rode triumphant. And had not GOD in mercy placed the Haverfield family on the throne of Great-Britain, he might have forgotten that distressed England for near one hundred years, and ruined many thousands of families, had been felt once more, with seven-fold rage.

Having already transferred the bounds allotted me by my publishers, I shall, in my next, resume this subject, and show, by full authority, that the proposed plan for American Bishops, simply as it stands, is so several instances, one way contrary to the known sentiments of the Church of England.

* See *Predication of New-England*, Page 143. *Life of Dr. Cotton Mather*, Page 43. *Hobart's Second Address*, Page 24, 25, 26, 27, 28.
* See Mr. Malmesbury's *Trial*, Page 7; and Mr. Hobart's *Second Address*, Page 28, 29.

