

R E M A R K S

O N A N

A N O N Y M O U S T R A C T,

E N T I T L E D

A N A N S W E R T O D R. M A Y H E W ' S

O B S E R V A T I O N S

O N T H E

C H A R T E R a n d C O N D U C T o f t h e S O C I E T Y
f o r t h e P r o p a g a t i o n o f t h e G o s p e l i n F o r e i g n P a r t s.

B E I N G A

S E C O N D D E F E N C E o f t h e O B S E R V A T I O N S.

[In which the Scheme of sending Bishops to *America* is particularly considered; and the Inconveniences that might result from it to that Country, if put into Execution, both in *civil* and *religious* Respects, are represented.]

By J O N A T H A N M A Y H E W, D. D.

Pastor of the West Church in Boston.

Boston in New England, printed, MDCCLXIV.
London, Reprinted for W. Nicoll, at the Paper
Mill, in St. Paul's Church-Yard.

MDCCLXV.

Price One Shilling and Six Pence

R E M A R K S
O N A N
A N O N Y M O U S T R A C T

The Author of the Tract before me, has thought proper to conceal his name and quality, in common with others who have written against the *Observations*: So that whatever may be his real dignity, I cannot with propriety speak of him under any higher title than that of *gentleman*. He is doubtless a person of excellent sense, and an happy talent at writing; apparently free from the sordid, illiberal spirit of bigotry; one of a cool temper, and who often shews much candor; well acquainted with the affairs of the Society, and, in general, a fair reasoner. To say this, is but doing justice to the merits of an opponent; a species of justice too seldom found in controversial writers. And all this I acknowledge with much more pleasure than ever I had in exposing the contrary qualities in an adversary: It being far more agreeable to me to praise, where praise is due, than to blame, even where blame is highly deserved.

It is not my intention, in the following pages, to examine every thing which this respectable writer has offered in opposition to my *Observations*. Some, which I thought did not very materially affect the merits of the cause, are passed over for the sake of brevity. Others are left unnoticed, because the same things in effect were sufficiently considered in my *Defence* of the *Observations*, published in Boston some time ago. I have neither so much leisure nor health, nor such an itch for altercation, as to protract
A 2 a dispute

a dispute upon circumstantial matters. Nor do I conceive that an argument increases in strength by being frequently repeated, as a snow-ball does in magnitude, by being often rolled over. If what was offered in my *Defence* against a certain *Examiner* and *Letter-writer*, was valid, it will be equally so against this gentleman, so far as their objections are alike: If not, it would be no advantage to me to say the same things again. For these reasons I request, that it may not be supposed, or taken for granted, that I concede to every thing in the Tract before me, which I do not take a particular Notice of; or that I pass any over, that are material, from a consciousness of my inability to answer them. Not these, but those which I have already assigned, are the true reasons of my conduct in this respect.

I must observe, though with reluctance, that there are some passages in this *Answer*, which I do not well know how to reconcile with that candor and ingenuity, which have already been allowed to the author. The first paragraph is one of them. He is there pleased to say, that my book was written, partly against *the church of England in general*; partly against *the conduct of the Society*; and partly against *appointing bishops for America*. He indeed grants, immediately after, that the *first* of these three, was *not formally proposed by me as one head of my work*. By which distinction he plainly leads his reader to suppose, that both the other points were *formally proposed* by me, as coming within my design: Whereas the affair of *bishops* was not, but altogether as incidental as what relates to *the church of England in general*; respecting which latter, I said expressly, ‘It was by *no means* my design in this publication, to enter into the controversy betwixt the church of England and us *.’ Notwithstanding this declaration, and the gentleman’s own confession, he begins with a formal defence of the church of

* *Observations*, p. 126.—As the gentleman has all along referred to the London Edition of the *Observations*, I shall do the same, whenever I have occasion to refer to them. I shall also refer to the London Edition of his *Answer*.

England against some of my casual remarks thereon; saying, ‘ If satisfaction be previously given to candid persons on *this point*, they will be *better prepared* for considering the other two † :’ Still suggesting that there were *two* other points formally discussed by me, contrary to fact. In *him* let this pass for an instance of *inadvertence* only : *Aliquando bonus*, &c. But had some other persons set out in the same manner, multiplying *one* design into *three*, representing it as having been *in my view throughout the whole of my book* ‡, to oppose the church of England, and undertaking to give previous satisfaction to candid persons on this point, that they might be the *better prepared* to consider the *other two*; had some other persons taken this method, it might naturally have been considered as a mere piece of craft, or an unworthy artifice, to prepossess their unwary episcopal readers in favour of their design, to prejudice them against me and mine, and thereby to render them very *partial* judges of the true and only point which I undertook to debate. Did his readers, who are probably almost all of them episcopalians, need to be thus *prepared* for considering the argument respecting the Society? But I am very unwilling to suppose, this gentleman had a design that would be *so little to his honour*, and would make my encomiums have the appearance of *flattery*. The reader is therefore desired to put the most favourable construction he can, on this conduct; and by that means, if possible, to justify my commendations: For I would not have any one construe them into *adulation*, equally to the dishonour of my worthy *Answerer* and myself.

In pursuance of this design, duly to *prepare* his readers for considering the main point, he proceeds to a vindication of the church of England, and of the hierarchy, in opposition to certain expressions which I occasionally made use of. Some of these might perhaps be too harsh and irritating. Had episcopalians in general shewn the same love to religious liberty, and the same moderation towards non-conformists, that this gentleman has, I am confident

† P. 3. ‡ Ibid.

he would not have thought, that he had any ground of complaint in this respect. I have the honour to agree with him in what he says in different places, concerning the intolerant spirit that formerly prevailed, even among protestants of almost every denomination, and the better spirit of mutual forbearance, that has for some time been growing among them. Would to God that they may continue to cultivate the latter, without abating in a zeal that is *according to knowledge*, for the great, indisputable doctrines and duties of christianity, or degenerating into a state of indifference and scepticism about all religion ; the opposite extreme, and not a more innocent one, though less pernicious to the peace of society, and common rights of mankind, than bigotry and persecution.

But my real sentiments concerning the constitution, worship and discipline of the church of England, are no ways altered by any thing which this gentleman has said. If the Lutherans prefer her communion to the Calvinistic, the Calvinists to the Lutheran, and the Greeks to both, which, by the way, *is asserted without proof*, or if most, or even all of them *blame the English dissenters for separating from it* † ; yet this carries no proper ground of conviction with it, that her communion is the *best*. A true protestant judges, not by the majority of votes or numbers, but by scripture and reason. The Gentleman says, I seem to entertain the worse opinion of the church of England, ‘because the members of the church of Rome likewise *esteem* it more than they do others.’ Truly I can hardly think any church a very pure or scriptural one, which has the *esteem* of so corrupt and antichristian a church as that of Rome, the *mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth*. He immediately subjoins ; ‘But we have to reply, that they *bate* it more also, as the most dangerous enemy to their cause, and strongest bulwark of the reformation ‡.’ So that this gentleman seems to draw an argument for the excellency of his church, not only from the *esteem*, but from the *hatred* of that of Rome : Neither of which considerations have any tendency

† P. 4.

‡ Ibid.

to make me think the better of her. Because this esteem of the church of Rome on one hand, and her hatred on the other, are most naturally resolved into such causes, as are rather dishonourable to the church of England, than the contrary; her esteem, into the remaining similitude between them, and her hatred, into a rivalry for power, worldly splendor and preeminence. What the gentleman thinks the church of Rome esteems that of England for, whether her excellencies or blemishes, he has not told us; I am satisfied, it is on account of the latter; and leave others to conjecture as they please. But he himself has observed, that the Roman-catholicks hate the church of England, considered *as the most dangerous enemy to their cause*. It is as natural for them to do so, as for one gaily-attired lady to look with an evil eye upon another; especially considering that the church of England has a mighty King for her head, and lays claim to some of the highest powers and prerogatives asserted by the other; ‘power to decree rites and ceremonies, and ‘authority in controversies of faith †.’ Here is a foundation laid, broad enough to support almost any superstructure, though as enormous a one, as that which is raised on the supposed infallibility and power of *St. Peter’s successor*. Who then can wonder, if the church of Rome hates that of England, as a dangerous enemy and rival?

And hath not the church of England acted as if she were really possessed of this extraordinary power and authority, respecting rites, ceremonies and controversies of faith? The gentleman indeed allows, that that church hath *some appointments in it, which the scripture doth not require*. This is candidly, though very cautiously said. But when he subjoins, a little after, ‘Ours ‘hath not *many things* of this kind, nor lays *great stress* ‘upon them ‡,’ I am a little surprised; though, to return one of his compliments to me, ‘One must suppose ‘that *he believes himself, and as far as possible,* I would ‘believe him also *.’ But it is no easy matter for a per-

† Article 20.

‡ P. 4.

* P. 8.

son who duly considers the offices of baptism, confirmation, the Lord's supper, ordination, matrimony and burial; the numerous fasts and festivals, saints days and fanners, the creeds, the liturgy and the canons of that church in general, to think that *appointments* of the kind he speaks of, are not *many*, or that no *great stress* is laid upon them. Can any one live in regular communion with that church, without submitting to many such? Can people come into the world, tarry in, or go out of it? can they be born, live or die, without them? And for how many things which, to *non-conforming* understandings at least, appear extremely trivial, do the canons still in force declare, that people shall be *ipso facto* excommunicated, and not restored till they retract those their *wicked errors*?

The gentleman seems to think that appointments of this nature, if they are not such as the scripture expressly forbids, though it doth not require them, ought to be complied with. In which I cannot agree with him; because, though they may not be expressly forbidden, yet they are implicitly, and by natural construction. The law of God may be in a great measure *made void* by the traditions, and numerous inventions of men in his worship, not one of which is perhaps directly repugnant to any particular precept. And it is said, partly with reference to appointments of that kind, which some think so innocent, comely and expedient, *In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.* Some of our English episcopalians have shewn a laudable zeal in this respect, against the church of Rome; for departing from the scriptures as the only rule of christian faith, worship and discipline; not perhaps considering how justly this charge might be retorted upon them, in a degree, by protestant dissenters. For example; 'The thing I would recommend to the consideration of all *papists*,' says a learned and able writer, 'is *their departure from scripture.* Why do they command abstinence from *flesh*, on so many days

‘ in every week ? Why abstain from *meats*, which God
 ‘ *hath ordained to be received by all with thanksgiving ?*
 ‘ Why is such a fast enjoined, as may be kept with drink-
 ‘ ing of *wine*, and other, even stronger liquors ? I do
 ‘ not charge them with allowing of excesses in liquors,
 ‘ but with enjoining so many fast and meagre days, on a
 ‘ *spiritual*, not a *medicinal* account ; and this, *without*
 ‘ *authority from Christ or his apostles **.’—If such reason-
 ing as this will hold good against the church of Rome,
 as doubtless it will, let it be fairly considered, whether
 it will not be unanswerable, if applied to another church ;
 and fully justify a secession from her ; especially if many
 of her appointments, on which great stress is laid, are ap-
 parently superstitious, and not only unscriptural, but
 antisciptural.

I humbly conceive, the gentleman goes a little too far,
 when he intimates that there are similar appointments *in all*
the churches in the world †. I know of some churches at
 least, in which there are none such. But if this were fact,
 it would be no justification of them ; but rather a proof,
 that all churches and nations have *drank* too deeply of a
 certain *poisonous cup*, and departed from the simplicity
 that is in Christ, and which was in the truly apostolical
 churches. Very great corruptions were introduced much
 earlier than many are willing to allow ; and were con-
 firmed even by general councils. For, to use the words of
 the same learned episcopalian divine, to whom I just now
 referred, in another important tract, ‘ What have gene-
 ‘ ral councils been, I speak of all *universally* from the
 ‘ council of *Nice* to the council of *Trent*, but the meet-
 ‘ ings of *corrupt, ambitious, intriguing, contentious* men ;
 ‘ who never once attempted to serve the cause of *Christ*,
 ‘ but *themselves* : Who have ever, by fraud and craft,
 ‘ and cunning, aimed at *superiority* and *power* over those
 ‘ whom they had a mind to oppress, and who never at-

* See an excellent and very important Tract, entitled, *An Enquiry how far Papists ought to be treated here [in England] as good Subjects*, &c. By the late Dr. Sykes.

† P. 4.

‘ tempted to establish truth as it lies in Christ : Who have
 ‘ endeavoured to gain a majority by art and power,
 ‘ *without regard to the bible, or what is there enjoined:*
 ‘ Who have always contended for some *addition* or other
 ‘ to the gospel, but never to leave the word of God to
 ‘ *its own native simplicity:* Who, lastly, have wrested and
 ‘ perverted the *scripture*, but never have taught it *pure*
 ‘ and *uncorrupted* ? *’

But to proceed to other matters. Speaking of the hierarchy, the gentleman says, that in my *favourite comparison* of the churches of England and Rome, *I quite mistake the matter*; because, ‘ not *one*, but *two* prelates preside over the church of England;’ and this, he says, ‘ grievously spoils the similitude †.’ I should have thought that an episcopalian would rather have supposed the disparity to consist in the pretended *powers* of his Holiness, and those of an English Archbishop. Does the difference lie principally in this, that Rome has but *one* such great prelate, and England *two*? I think not. And the gentleman would doubtless have spared this critical remark, had he recollected that I made use of Mr. *Apthorp*’s expression, who spake of the Archbishop of Canterbury only as *presiding*;—‘ the excellent *prelate*, who now so worthily *presides* over the church of England, and the Society itself ‡.’ It is enough for me to be answerable for my own mistakes and inaccuracies. As my *Answerer* has undertaken that gentleman’s defence in some other respects, it is at least as incumbent upon himself, as it is upon me, either to justify, or to apologize for that expression. The gentleman adds, that I knew the Archbishops preside *in subordination to the king*; though he is pleased to say, that I *disingenuously hint a doubt of it* ||. I indeed well knew, that the King is the legal head of the church of England, that all her bishops and clergy take the oath of supremacy, and that they solemnly disclaim all spiritual

* See *The Reasonableness of mending and executing the laws against Papists*, p. 21.

† P. 5.

‡ Confid. on the Charter, &c.

|| Ans. p. 5.

power and jurisdiction, but as under, and derived from him. Of these things I intimated no *doubt*; but only, whether the bishops and clergy were always consistent with themselves, in reference thereto; or whether they have not often claimed such an independency on the crown and state, as to shew them very insincere in their oaths and subscriptions. And let those who are acquainted with the writings of many high-flyers, and their jure-divino-pretensions, judge whether there was any *disingenuity* or not, in hinting a doubt in this respect. Besides, the gentleman is mistaken if he supposes, I meant to draw an *exact* parallel between the churches of England and Rome. And if any person of a tolerable capacity, could be supposed so ignorant and presumptuous as to undertake this, he would not, surely, compare an English archbishop to his Holiness: An Archbishop in the church of England, is not equal even to a Cardinal in that of Rome. Another person might, with much more *plausibility*, be compared to the Pope, however *absurd* the comparison would appear upon due examination. For is it not declared, 37 Hen. VIII, ‘ That archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, and
‘ other ecclesiastical persons, have no manner of jurisdiction *ecclesiastical*, but by and under the *King’s* majesty,
‘ the only undoubted supreme head of the church of
‘ England, to whom, *by holy scripture*, power and authority is given to hear and determine *all manner of causes ecclesiastical*, and to correct *all vice and sin whatsoever*; and to all such persons as the *King’s* majesty shall
‘ appoint thereunto’—? And is it not also declared, 1 Ed. VI, c. 2, That ‘ *all authority of jurisdiction spiritual*, is drawn and deducted from the *King’s* majesty,
‘ as supreme Head—and so justly acknowledged by the
‘ clergy of these realms?’ And have not the Roman-catholics maliciously reproached the English nation with setting up, in effect, another Pope, in opposition to him, whose supremacy they renounced? But I am far enough from making any such odious comparison myself; being very sensible how unjust it would be in *many respects*, whatever malice may suggest.—To the gentleman’s surmise, that *I would deny it to be in subordination to the*

King,

King, that I preside over the West-Church in Boston *, I shall at present only say with the Apostle, ‘ Let every soul be subject to the higher powers ;’ and that I endeavour to conform to the true spirit of that christian precept, ‘ Give unto *Cæsar* the things which are *Cæsar’s*, and to *God* the things which are *God’s*.’

The gentleman goes on to speak of our right reverend Lords the bishops. Amongst other things he says, those with whom they live, find not that they are so high as, by their elevation, *to do harm, or cause fear* ; and that they wear no *mitres*. He adds, ‘ If they are stiled Lords, it is because, by the ancient constitution of our country, they sit in the upper house of parliament; *where, I believe, they are thought as useful members as the rest.* And I know not whether the Doctor’s *modesty* would propose, that our constitution should be altered in this respect, or whether a much wiser man could foresee the consequences of such an alteration †.’ As to their being *as useful members as the rest*, I am very far from being a competent judge. It is however, pretty evident from our history, that in arbitrary reigns, and foolish and wicked administrations, the bishops have commonly been *the most useful members, or instruments*, that the crown or court had, in establishing a tyranny over the bodies and souls of men. But yet when Kings have crossed their ambitious and avaritious designs, they have been as forward as any men, if not more so, to give them disquietude. In the words of a spirited writer, well versed in matters of this sort, ‘ Loyalty is not confined to the mitre. Bishops have given more disturbance, and occasioned more distresses to princes and people, than any other set of men upon earth. This I can prove. Our own bishops, for near an hundred years before the revolution, were in every scheme for promoting tyranny and bondage.’ I can assure the gentleman, however, that my *modesty* is much too great to *propose such an alteration* in the constitution, as he speaks of; though I know it has often been wished by much *wiser* men; and, that such ar-

* P. 5.

† P. 5, 6.

guments have been used, as might perhaps puzzle one *near as wise* as himself to answer. The old cry, *No bishop, no king*, has indeed been of mighty efficacy in times past. ‘ This solid argument, says one, was used with royal success, by King *James* the first, when he sat *deputy* for the clergy, and disputed with the puritans, at the conference of *Hampton Court*. It was indeed the best he could use; however he strengthened and embellished it with several imperial oaths, which he swore on that occasion, to the utter confusion of his antagonists, and the great triumph of the *genuine clergy*, and the *Archbishop*; who bestowed the Holy Ghost upon his Majesty, for his zeal and swearing on the church’s side.’ Few, I believe, can see the *absolute necessity* of bishops having a seat in parliament, except bishops themselves, and such as hope to be so. I am far from pretending to such Sagacity, as to be able to foresee all the consequences of that *alteration* in the English constitution, which this gentleman speaks of. I fully agree with him, that a much wiser man, could not; but even one who is so simple, might pretty easily foresee and predict *some* of these pernicious consequences: I mean particularly, that certain grave and venerable personages would think themselves much injured, and, in resentment, endeavour to throw the nation into a flame; that they would probably be for introducing a popish pretender, or for any other measures, however destructive to liberty and the protestant religion, in order to regain their former dignity: Which they might also claim *jure-divino*, with as much propriety as they do some other things. But if not, yet after there has been such a solemn, sacred ALLIANCE *between the church and the state*, as has been most *profoundly* argued; this alteration in the constitution would probably be considered as a notorious violation of treaty; such a breach of it, as would give the church a right to resume her supposed natural *independence* and *supremacy*, and refuse any longer to ‘ confer on the state the *application* of the efficacy of religion, and put it under the magistrate’s direction.’ And who can tell which would be the greatest loser, the church or the state, by a total dissolution of this ancient and famous Alliance?

Alliance? from which each of them in its turn has received so many important advantages; and by means of which, both have been the better enabled to crush the proud, dangerous spirit of liberty and faction, heresy and schism *. —

I agree with the gentleman in almost every thing which he says in several pages afterwards, relating to the bigotry and persecutions of former times; and therefore pass the whole over without any particular remarks, notwithstanding some harsh censures of myself, which I find in this part of his performance. He comes to the main business, or to speak about the conduct of the venerable *Society*, page 9. And it is perhaps more than time, that I should come to it myself.

The gentleman is under some mistake in saying I own, ‘ that in *three* districts of New-England, i. e. New-Hampshire, Rhode-Island and Providence, *much less care hath been taken for the support of a public worship,* than in the rest; and that a few missions from the Society *might be needed* in these †.’—Now Rhode-Island and Providence together, make but one district; I mean but one colony or government, and that, a very small one; there being in all but four in New-England. In that, it was indeed acknowledged, some missions might be needed. As to New-Hampshire, another small government, though I spoke of it in the former part of the *Observations*, as a government in which less care had been taken for the support of God’s worship, than in the Massachusetts and Connecticut; yet I formally corrected my own mistake herein, page 135, where it is said, that in ‘ New-Hampshire there is a legal provision made for the support of a public religion, similar to that in those two other New-England governments.’ So that in the four N. England colonies, where the Society have so many

* See a particular account of this *Alliance* between the church and the state, and the reciprocal advantages which the high contracting Parties receive from it, in a Treatise upon the subject, by a profoundly learned critic, divine and politician, now a bishop also, Dr. Warburton.

† P. 9.

missions, only one very small one was actually destitute of a legal support for protestant ministers. And it seemed proper to set this matter in a true light, lest it should be supposed, from the gentleman's representation, that the greater part of the New-England missions were in places, where I had myself acknowledged in effect, they were proper and needful: whereas there are near ten times so many in those three governments, in which I supposed them needless, as in the small colony of Rhode-Island, in which it was owned, there might be occasion for them *.

The gentleman is displeased with me for attributing to the Society a design to root out presbyterianism, &c. from the colonies, and to introduce episcopacy on the ruins thereof; and for intimating, that it is partly at least with this view, that they have been sending missionaries to New England. [See *Ans.* p. 10, 11, &c.] Now I conceive, that I produced clear and sufficient evidence of such a design. One thing alledged by me to this purpose, was a standing *Instruction* of the Society to their missionaries, viz. ‘ That they frequently visit their respective parishioners; those of our own communion, to keep them steady in the profession and practice of religion, as taught in the church of England; those that oppose, or dissent from us, *to convince and reclaim them.*’—Upon which I made the following remarks. ‘ This clearly shews what they are after. It will also be observed here, that WE are considered as *parishioners* of the missionaries, no less than professed episcopalian: And we are often spoken of *as such* by them, in their letters to the Society, as appears by the *abstracts*. How *assuming* is this!’—On which occasion the gentleman exclaims, ‘ How *unfair* is this! The *Instruction* plainly relates, not to missionaries settled in *presbyterian* or *congregational* parishes,—but for’ (doubtless he means *to*) ‘ incumbents of episcopal parishes,

* There is one mission also on the eastern frontier of the Massachusetts, about 300 miles from the capital, Boston, which is not objected against by me,

though

‘ though with a mixture of dissenters*.’ But, with submission, I had a right to understand this as a *general Instruction* to all the missionaries, settled where there were any nonconformists to the church of England; as for other reasons, so particularly for this, that I found the New-England missionaries understood it so themselves, and spoke of non-conformists *here*, as their parishioners. But the gentleman intimates a doubt, whether they have done so. He says, I *quote no instances of this*, and that he *remembers none*; allowing that, if they have done so, they have *expressed themselves improperly*, &c.† Though I before made no formal citations, to shew how *assuming* the missionaries were in this respect, he may perceive by the following, that this was not said without grounds. In the *abstract* printed 1739, p. 46, are these words. ‘ The reverend Mr. *Usher*, minister at *New-Bristol*, ‘ writes, *Sept. 22, 1738*, That *in obedience to the orders* ‘ *of the venerable Society*, he sends a true and faithful ‘ account of the spiritual estate of *his parish*; there are ‘ in it a hundred and fifty families, reckoning about ‘ four to a family, and fifty of these families *are of his* ‘ *congregation*—The other hundred families consist of *dif-* ‘ *senters of various names*‡.’ In the same *abstract* and page, it is said, ‘ The reverend Mr. *Johnson*, minister ‘ of *Stratford in Connecticut* [N. E.] writes, *Oct. 20,* ‘ *1737*, That since his last, he hath—one good family ‘ *added to his church*. That there are above three hun- ‘ dred families in *his parish*, of which sixty-one are of ‘ *his congregation*, the rest being generally *independents* ‘ or *congregationalists*, &c.’ It is needless to quote other *abstracts* for my vindication in this respect, though it were easy. The missionaries certainly knew, that there were no legal episcopal *parishes* in New-England; and yet they write in this manner about their *dissenting parishioners*. Let me also remark, that the Society, by quoting with apparent approbation, such extracts from

* P. 11.

† P. 12.

‡ *New-Bristol* was then reckoned to belong to the Massachusetts, but since to Rhode-Island government; both of them being in New-England.

the letters of their New-England missionaries, seem themselves to consider us as their parishioners, and therefore among those persons, whom they are instructed *frequently to visit*, in order to *convince and reclaim them*. The impartial are now left to judge, whether this gentleman had good reason to accuse me of *unfairness*, either for saying that the missionaries were *assuming* in this respect; or for arguing from the aforesaid *Instruction*, compared with such letters and the use made of them, that the Society as well as they, had it partly in their design, to proselyte the New-England congregationalists, &c. to the church of England. To charge me with a *mistake*, is one thing; to charge me with *unfairness*, is another, which I take unkindly; and, I conceive, he had no good reason for either, in the present case.

To prove that the Society had the design aforesaid, I also produced a passage from the historical *Account* of the Society, printed 1706, which I considered as little or nothing short of a formal declaration from themselves, that what they had in view, in sending missionaries into these American colonies, was not merely providing for the people of their own communion, as this gentleman would persuade us, but also making proselytes to the church of England. The gentleman says, he hath ‘not been able to procure this *Account*, or to learn by whom, or whose order it was compiled*.’ This is somewhat strange, from a person who sometimes speaks as a member of the Society, and one who has had *recourse* to its books and records on this occasion. The *Account* itself is so very advantageous to the Society, as to leave but little room for doubt in this respect. It appears to have been compiled and published by order, and in the name of the Society; particularly from the last page—
 ‘Thus have we given a true and faithful *Account* of the
 ‘Society—And we publish it to the world, not for
 ‘ostentation of what has been done,—but to shew what
 ‘a mighty trust is committed to us; how sincerely we

* P. 12.

‘ have endeavoured to discharge it; how willing we are
 ‘ to labor in the prosecution of it; and how much we
 ‘ want a farther assistance and supply from *all good and*
 ‘ *pious christians*, who may depend on a just disposal of
 ‘ their charity, in promoting the best design in the world,
 ‘ that of the *conversion of souls*, by the *propagation of the*
 ‘ *gospel*, &c.’ Besides, the Society formally adopted this
Account six years after its publication. For in the
abstract 1712, p. 44, they say, ‘ The Society apprehend-
 ‘ ing that nothing would more effectually tend to justify
 ‘ their good endeavours, and to promote the success of
 ‘ them, than to inform the world of their foundation,
 ‘ establishment and continual progress; did agree,
 “ That the book called *An Account of the Society for pro-*
 “ *pagating the Gospel*, &c. printed 1706, in quarto, should
 “ be reprinted, with a continuation down to the present
 “ time.”

But the gentleman thinks that the passage to which I referred, in this *Account*, is not to my purpose. He assigns two reasons for this, of the force of which the reader will judge, after I have cited the passage more at large, as follows—‘ It was the unhappiness of New-
 ‘ England and the adjoining parts, to be first planted
 ‘ and inhabited by persons who were *generally disaffected*
 ‘ to the church by law established in England, and had
 ‘ many of them taken refuge or retirement in those
 ‘ parts, on account of their suffering for non-confor-
 ‘ mity here at home. So that they fell *there generally*
 ‘ into *independent congregations*: And there was no face
 ‘ of the church of England till about the year 1679,
 ‘ when upon questioning the charter of that country,
 ‘ the lord bishop of London, upon an address from se-
 ‘ veral of the inhabitants of Boston, did prevail with his
 ‘ Majesty, that a church should be allowed in that town,
 ‘ for the exercise of religion according to the church of
 ‘ England, towards the maintenance of which, his late
 ‘ Majesty King *William* was pleased to settle an annual
 ‘ bounty of one hundred pounds a year, which is still
 ‘ continued, and two ministers are now supported in it.
 ‘ Several other ways of division and separation did so
 ‘ much

‘ much obtain in other of our colonies and plantations,
 ‘ that this made it *more necessary* to think of providing
 ‘ for a regular and orthodox ministry to be sent and set-
 ‘ tled amongst them ; to remove those prejudices, un-
 ‘ der which the people *generally laboured*, and to pro-
 ‘ mote, *as much as possible, an agreement in faith and wor-*
 ‘ *ship*, in order to the recommending our holy religion
 ‘ to unbelievers *.’ The gentleman’s first objection
 against the argument which I drew from this passage,
 relative to the design of the Society, in sending mission-
 naries to New-England, is, That it *expressly speaks, not*
of independent or any congregations in New-England, but
of other ways of division and separation in other colonies,
and therefore is nothing to my purpose †. Now if that part
 of the passage, which I before quoted in form, does not
 speak expressly of *New-England*, or of independent, or
 any other congregations *here* ; yet surely the gentleman
 will not deny, but that as it is here more largely cited,
 it speaks expressly of these also. Let the reader review
 the former part of it, if he doubts. The gentleman’s
 other objection is thus expressed. ‘ Besides, that *as*
 ‘ *much agreement as possible, in faith and worship*, might
 ‘ be far *less than a general conformity to the church of Eng-*
 ‘ *land*, which it might be *impossible* to obtain, &c.’ ‡
 How very acute and subtle a way of reasoning is this?
 Because it might in fact be found *impossible, or impracti-*
cable, to reduce the people in these colonies to a general
 conformity to the church of England ; therefore the So-
 ciety had never any design to do this ; but to do *just so*
much as, and no more than, was possible! Nothing but
 making the trial, and seeing the event, could shew them
 whether it was, or was not *possible*, to effect a general
 uniformity of religion in these colonies. Surely this
 might be in their view and design, while it remained, as
 it still remains, doubtful, whether it be practicable or
 not. And the expression used in the passage aforesaid,
to promote, as much as possible, an agreement in faith and

* *Account*, p. 10, 11.

† *Ans.* p. 12.

‡ *Ibid.*

worship, most naturally conveys the sense which I put upon it; especially when the words immediately preceeding, are considered—a *regular and orthodox ministry to be sent and settled amongst them, to remove those prejudices under which the people generally laboured, and to promote, &c.* And does not this plainly relate, not only to *other ways of division and separation in other colonies*; but also to the way of the New-Englanders, who, as it was before observed, were *generally disaffected to the church, and fell generally into independent congregations*? It cannot be reasonably doubted.

Besides, Dr. *Bearcroft*, the secretary of the Society, and who is supposed to have been thoroughly initiated into all its mysteries, does in effect avow this design which I am speaking of, in his sermon before the Society, published by its order. He laments, that though the government in New-England had indeed *taken care for God's publick worship, and erecting schools for the education of youth*; yet this was *not according to the true orthodox principles of the church of England*. And, after speaking of their charity in attempting to bring back their brethren in America to *good manners, &c.* how does he glory in it, that ‘the word of God mightily grows and prevails in New-England, according to the liturgy—?’ Both the conduct of the Society's missionaries here, and many of their letters published in the *Abstracts*, clearly shew that they consider it as one principal part of their business, in compassing sea and land, *to make proselytes from among us*. And though it were allowed, that the Society had it really much at heart, that we should be *convinced and reclaimed*, and all become episcopalians; yet it would not be easy to shew what methods they could have used, more adapted to, and more clearly declarative of, such a design, than those which they have actually taken. Neither Mr. *Apthorp*, nor my very candid (N. England) *Examiner*, so far as I can at present recollect, pretended to disown that the Society actually had this design; but seemed rather to justify it, as what the Society had a right to attempt, if not by the most obvious scope of their charter, yet by virtue of the discretionary

cretionary power therein granted. And it is well known that many episcopalians among us, have asserted this to have been one primary, original design of the Institution; being, as I suppose, ashamed either to deny a thing so manifest, as that the Society were actually endeavouring to accomplish it, or that they had not good authority to do so, by their charter.

Now, can it be supposed that my *unknown Answerer's* assertions, that the Society have not been endeavouring to promote a general conformity among us to the church of England, are sufficient to counter-balance the evidence of such a design, arising from the words of their own *Account*, from the *Instructions* aforesaid, from Dr. *Bearcroft's* sermon, from the practices of the missionaries, and their letters to the Society, by which it appears that they look on the making proselytes, as a material part of their business, if not the greatest of their merit? In such a case as this, the assertion of an unknown person will not be sufficient with impartial men. Nothing short of the Society's direct, formal disavowal of such an intention, is sufficient to over-balance the joint evidence of it, resulting from all circumstances. And indeed, this evidence is so strong, that I do not believe they will ever risque any part of their reputation, by declaring that they have not had this, at least partly in their view, in sending so large a proportion of their missionaries into New-England.

But the gentleman, after mentioning something which Dr. *Johnson* and Mr. *Beach* have said upon this subject, adds, that *a very respectable missionary* uses the following words, in a paper *not printed*, but which he hath seen, viz. ‘ I believe very few instances, if any, can be produced of any missionaries beginning with any dissenter, with a view of reclaiming him to the church. I have long known the affairs of the Society, and know of no such instance *.’ The paper here cited, and said not to be *printed*, is doubtless the same that was published in Boston some time ago, under the title of *A letter*

* *Ans.* p. 15.

to a friend, containing a short vindication of the Society, &c. By one of its Members; and annexed to a rather more virulent performance, called, by a usual catachresis, *A candid Examination*: For the passage which the gentleman cites, is in page 82 of that abusive pamphlet. Whoever the *very respectable* missionary was, that wrote that *Letter*, it seems he had too much regard for his reputation, to prefix his *name* to, or subscribe it, when published here. My remarks upon it, and particularly upon this passage, may be seen by those who think it worth while, in my *Defence of the Observations*, Sect. 12; where there is a brief account of Mr. commissary *Price's* managements, in order to build up the church of England at *Hopkinton*. It is really astonishing that any gentleman will pretend to say, the missionaries do not endeavour to make profelytes from our churches; though it would not be strange if they were, if possible, even more solicitous than they are, to conceal the mean and scandalous methods which they sometimes take to that end, and, I believe, not seldom. The aforesaid commissary's behaviour is a flagrant example. And since publishing that account, I have received such further informations as render it almost impossible not to believe, that the Society knew something of that unhappy man's vile conduct, even when they confirmed him as a missionary at *Hopkinton*; though I can truly say, it gives me great pain to make a supposition, which appears so highly dishonourable to that venerable body.

Let me now add, upon good authority, though not upon my own knowledge, that other New-England missionaries have received, not to say courted, to their communion, persons under censure in our churches for their disorderly and unchristian practices, before and without any satisfaction given: And that being applied to, and expostulated with by the congregational ministers of these churches, those missionaries have answered to this effect, that they received these persons as never having belonged to, or been subject to the discipline of, any *christian* churches; they considering us as
very

very little, if at all better than mere heathens. One of those zealous missionaries, as I am credibly informed, went to preach to some people at a distance, who were inclining to the church of England, but still commonly attended the public worship and ordinances in our way: But there being no episcopal church then in the town where they lived, the congregational minister and people very readily obliged them, on this occasion, with the use of the *Meeting-house*, in which that missionary accordingly preached. On his taking leave of them, to make a suitable return for the civility shewn him and to discover *what spirit he was of*, he advised those people by no means any more to attend the public worship with dissenters, as they had hitherto done; but rather to tarry at home upon the Lord's day, when there was no episcopal minister to preach to them. If I am called upon, I intend to mention *names*; and give a more particular narrative of these transactions.—If these are real facts, can it be pretended that the missionaries do not endeavour to make profelytes from our churches? or can it be thought strange, if we are much disgusted at such uncharitable and unchristian behaviour toward us?

The gentleman dislikes what I said of the church newly set up at Cambridge; particularly, *that scarce ten families in that town usually attend the service of the church*. This was strictly true; and I challenge any person to mention more such families, on penalty of his being publicly exposed. But then the gentleman says, ‘it was represented to the Society that 50 families in the town and *neighbourhood* were desirous to attend it*.’ He speaks to the same purpose respecting the number of petitioners to the Society, in other places, in opposition to what I intimated. And indeed I have reason to think, it has been the common way, to get as many names as possible to the petitions sent home; the names of persons living at 20 or 30 miles distance from the proposed seat of the missions; and of some, who lived in towns where there were already episcopal ministers; as in the

* P. 16.

dirty affair of commissary *Price* at Hopkinton. So that the Society has been greatly imposed on, being made to believe that all the petitioners lived within such a distance, that they could ordinarily and conveniently attend the service of the church. As to Cambridge, the case was briefly and plainly this. There were five or six gentlemen of figure, each of whose income, it is commonly supposed, was so large, as to have admitted of his maintaining a *domestic chaplain*; there not being as many more episcopalian families in that town. Those gentlemen used sometimes to come to Boston to church, in their coaches or chariots; at others, to attend the public worship in the congregational church in Cambridge, I presume without *hurting their consciences* by doing so. But preferring the church of England, for what reasons I will not guess, lest I should not *hit right*, they were desirous to have a church built, and a missionary fixed there. Subscribers were to be procured; and, *very opportunely*, there was a disagreement in a neighbouring town *, about the place of setting up a new *Meeting-House*: This difference was the means of procuring some; where or who the rest were, I know not. But I am well informed, whatever was represented to the Society, that there are not commonly at that church, in the winter season, more than 20 *persons*, sometimes not more than 10; and in the summer, not more than 30 or 40, except upon some extraordinary occasions. If I am misinformed in any of these points, I am willing, and even desirous to be set right: If not, let the world judge, whether fixing a church and missionary at Cambridge, one of the most antient towns of New-England, and within about a quarter of a mile of the congregational meeting-house, is conformable to the true intent of the Society's charter; or whether, supposing them to be apprised of the true state and circumstances of things, their continuing to support a missionary there, would not discover a *design* different from that, which this gentleman would have us think the true and only

* Watertown,

one—a design to encourage, strengthen and increase a party.

The gentleman thinks I had no just cause for saying, that the *episcopalians affect to reproach us under the name of independents*. He says Mr. Neal, himself an *independent*, calls us so; that it is ‘proper, and not reproachful at all †.’ Whatever Mr. Neal might be, or say, our churches have all along disowned that *title*. Their *platform* of church discipline expressly disclaims it ‡. And while we declare our dislike of it, we may well consider it as a term of contempt and reproach, at least as it is often used by episcopalians. But enough of this.

I see no reason, from any thing this gentleman has said in several pages ||, to change my opinion about the *motives* which *generally* induce people among us, to go over to the church of England: And I know who, and *what sort* of persons they are, at least as well as he can be supposed to do. However, I never denied, but that some of them could truly plead *conscience* in the case. He says I extend the possibility of this no further than to allow, that there may be *some things or circumstances* [in our way of worship, &c.] *which they cannot entirely acquiesce in or approve of*. This language I made use of, as being in effect the same that the present Archbishop of Canterbury used in his sermon before the Society, as quoted by Mr. Apthorp. For one thing which he summoned his Grace to bear *testimony* to, was, that in the least exceptionable of our christian assemblies, there were *some things which the consciences of many could not ‘acquiesce in.’* See *Considerations*, London Edit. p. 162. The gentleman says, ‘Without maintaining ‘*they* [the people of New-England] *have no gospel ministers, or sacraments, or ordinances, or churches, we ‘may apprehend, whether justly or not, is not to be ‘now disputed, that episcopacy is of apostolical institution, &c.’* It is true, they *may* apprehend so; for

† P. 17.

‡ See the attestation to Dr. C. Matber’s *Ratio disciplinæ fratrum Nov-Anglorum*.

|| P. 18—22.

what are not people capable of supposing, however groundless. He adds, ‘ We may apprehend that after
 ‘ the ceasing of *extraordinary* spiritual gifts, *forms* of
 ‘ prayer were also used, more or less, throughout the
 ‘ church of Christ, and are needful for the observance
 ‘ of the scripture rule, *Let all things be done decently*
 ‘ *and in order.*’ This also they may apprehend. But if
 those *extraordinary gifts* ceased as early as Dr. Middleton,
 and many others suppose, I presume the gentleman can
 bring no proof, that forms of prayer were introduced
 from that time, or even till long afterward. As to the
scripture rule which the gentleman speaks of, respecting *de-*
cency and order; if forms of prayer may be supposed to
 come under it, so as to be *needful for the observance thereof*;
 why may not the sign of the cross also? Why may not
 square caps, or any usages in the worship of God, which
 fanciful men think conducive to order and decency?
 Where will people stop in introducing their own inven-
 tions, in this lax way of expounding scripture rules?
 or what bounds will be set to their censoriousness, if they
 allow themselves to censure those, who decline the use of
 any uninstituted modes and forms, which they conceive
 to be decent and orderly? I am, indeed, myself far
 from being zealous against all forms of prayer, as such;
 but to suppose they are necessary, that God cannot be
 orderly and decently worshipped without them, or that
 it is sinful to decline them, is highly unreasonable and
 superstitious.

I do not think myself concerned particularly to con-
 sider the several causes, to which the gentleman ascribes
 the growth of the church of England among us. He
 mentions one, however, which I cannot but take a cur-
 sory notice of. He says, that when the episcopalians
 among us were *attacked and reproached* for their religious
 principles, *it was natural that they should endeavour to de-*
fend themselves, and procure such books as would enable them
to do it better. He immediately adds; ‘ Some of the
 ‘ *more candid and inquisitive* among the presbyterians and
 ‘ congregationalists *adventured* to hear their defences,
 ‘ and to read their authors; were convinced by them,
 ‘ and

‘ and became churchmen †.’ So, that according to this gentleman, the profelytes to the church of England here, have been some of our *most candid, inquisitive and bookish* men; such as have taken the most pains to understand the merits of the controversy! Doubtless he takes his information in this respect, from the good missionaries, who had a right to speak as they thought. I have the same right; and accordingly declare, from what I have observed, that I suppose very few inquisitive persons, or studiers of this controversy among us, have become churchmen in consequence thereof. Some such there may have been; but, I believe, these profelytes have much more generally been young and thoughtless persons; the volatile and unstable; such as had but a very moderate share of understanding, or but little sobriety; and who hardly ever read a book in their lives, really with a view to inform themselves about the true state of this controversy—But it is not worth while to dispute about such things as do not, in their nature, admit of a decision on either side; especially such as have little relation to the present argument.

Wherefore,

To come directly to the main point; the gentleman acknowledges ‘ that the case of the *New-England episcopals*, is not particularly described and provided for ‘ in the [Society’s] charter ‡.’ I conclude he means, what is certainly true, that the charter does not expressly make provision for supplying with episcopal ministers, persons in such circumstances as they are; or people who live scattered here and there, in towns of non-conforming protestants, where due provision is made for the administration of God’s word and ordinances, after the presbyterian or congregational mode. I cannot suppose he intended only to acknowledge, that New-England and the episcopals here, are not mentioned by name in the charter; or that their case is not very largely and particularly spoken of therein. This would be saying nothing of consequence: For neither is any other parti-

† P. 22.

‡ P. 23.

cular colony, or country, or the people therein, thus provided for in exprefs terms. But then the thing insisted on, as I conceive with great reason, is, that though the charter does not distinguish the colonies by name, saying that the episcopalians in *this* or *that*, should be provided for, but not those in *others*; yet it is so expressed, as to amount to the same thing. For it describes the religious circumstances of those places and people, which were to be relieved, as destitute of the *administration of God's word and sacraments*, &c. Now, if the episcopalians in some of the plantations are actually in such a state; but those in others of them, whether the New-England colonies, or any other, are not; it may be properly said, that the charter *expresly* makes provision for the former, but not for the latter; not even by *implication*, or any just *construction*. That the New-England episcopalians were not in such a destitute condition, is evident: Nor can this gentleman consistently say they were. Whatever he may think about the apostolic institution of episcopacy, or the antiquity and usefulness of liturgies; yet he does not speak of these, as essential to the being of christian churches: He has far too much candor and good sense, to suppose them so. And speaking of us congregationalists, he says expresly, ‘ Without maintaining that they have *no gospel ministers, or sacraments, or ordinances, or churches*, we may apprehend, &c.’ We have a right to consider this as a concession from him, that though we reject episcopacy, the liturgy, and peculiar rites and usages of the church of England, yet we have still truly *gospel ministers, sacraments, ordinances and churches*. And if so, no persons inhabiting these parts, whether episcopalians or others, can justly be said to *lack, want* or to be *destitute* thereof; and for that reason, in danger of falling into *atheism* or *infidelity*, or *popish superstition* and *idolatry*. So, that by his own concession, it appears that the charter makes no provision, whether expresly or implicitly, for supporting episcopal missionaries in these parts, for the sake of the few episcopalians living among us.

The gentleman, having acknowledged that the case of
the

the New-England episcopalians *is not particularly described and provided for in the charter*, endeavours to guard against any use that might be made of this concession, to the prejudice of his argument; which is not strange. But I a little wonder at the method he has taken, to this end: For he immediately subjoins—‘ But so neither is the
‘ case of any other *Indians*, than such as are the King’s
‘ *subjects, and people living in his plantations and colonies*;
‘ for to these only the letter of the charter extends, &c.’ And yet the gentleman says, *I am so far from blaming the Society for applying part of their benefactions to the instructions of such Indians as only border on his Majesty’s dominions, that I blame them greatly for not applying more of it (them) to that use.* He goes on to argue, that the case of the N. England episcopalians may *much more be looked on as comprehended within the intention of the charter*, than the case of the bordering Indians†. But these cases are by no means so nearly parallel, as they are supposed to be, by this way of reasoning. For though neither these episcopalians, nor those Indians, are *in terms* provided for, or even mentioned in the charter, in which respect they are on the same footing, yet the Indians very fairly, and most obviously come within the intent of it; but the others do not. The Indians are unquestionably destitute of *God’s word and sacraments*; many of those only bordering on our colonies, have actually professed themselves, and been for a long time treated with, as the King’s *subjects*; and besides, the charter expressly authorizes the Society to use their best endeavours to *propagate the gospel in those parts*, where the King has any plantations, &c. Which clause has all along, and on all hands, been considered as having a special reference to the Indians, not only within the limits of the British colonies, but bordering on them. There is then, no room for doubt, but that the Society act conformably, not only to the true design, but even to the expression of the charter, in using means in order to their conversion: Since though these Indians *themselves* are not particularly men-

† Ibid.

tioned,

tioned, yet *their case* is expressly provided for. This is not applicable to the episcopalians among us: Neither *themselves* are mentioned, nor *their case* provided for, either expressly, or by just implication; they not being destitute of the administration of God's word and ordinances. And, indeed, this gentleman, in order to vindicate the Society in sending missionaries to them, is forced to have recourse to the plea of a *large discretionary power* vested in them; so large, as to allow of their *making alterations in their institution*: For this position of Mr. *Apthorp* he endeavours to palliate and defend†. He says, 'the rules of law require that grants of princes, and particularly grants in favour of religion, be interpreted as *liberally as they may be* ‡.' Agreed: But still it may be doubted, whether it is not to interpret this particular grant *more liberally* than may [justly] be, to suppose the Society empowered to *alter* their institution, and to make provision for those, for whom the charter makes none. And having recourse to this argument, shews a consciousness, at least that such a conduct is not *easily* and *naturally* reconciled with the charter: For if it were, surely the defenders of the Society would not plead for so extraordinary a power, or so very *liberal* a way of interpretation. Besides, this is really prejudicial, not advantageous to religion, in *favor* of which, as is hinted, the charter was granted.

The gentleman himself does not appear to be intirely satisfied with this, which he calls an argument *à fortiori*. He therefore attempts, in the next place, to justify the Society, as to these missions, by the very expressions of the original charter; referring to a clause of which, he says, 'Now must not they who lack support for such ministers, as they can with a *good conscience* attend, *want the administration of God's word and sacraments, &c.*' ‡ This he applies to the New-England episcopalians, in order to bring them within the design of the charter. Several things were said upon this point, first in the *Observations*, and then in the *Defence* of them. Let it now be further remarked, that if these episcopalians could pro-

† P. 24.

‡ Ibid.

perly be said to *lack* the administration of God's word and sacraments, they would come, not only within the design, but, in some sort, within the letter of the charter; since it *expressly* provides for such of his Majesty's subjects in the colonies, as *lack the administration*, &c. Whereas the gentleman, before, *seemed* at least to allow, that the charter did not make provision for the case of these people. But not to insist on this concession at present, I think these people cannot be properly said to *want* the administration, &c. upon his own supposition, but to *decline* and *disapprove* of it. For he does not deny, but that we have *gospel ministers, sacraments, ordinances* and *churches* here; of which they might enjoy the benefit, in common with their christian brethren, if they *chose* to do so. How then could the episcopalians among us, though there were no episcopal churches here, be properly said, in the general terms of the charter, to *want*, or *lack*, the administration of God's word and sacraments? If there had been any thing in the charter, to shew that it meant the administration of God's word, &c. according to the particular usage of the church of England, in opposition to, or distinction from, all other protestant churches, as well as that of Rome; it is readily acknowledged, that this reasoning would be good. But this is not the case. What may be justly said of these episcopalians, is, that they *dislike*, and therefore will not attend on, the administration of God's word and sacraments in our way; which is quite a different thing from saying, that they *want*, or are *destitute* thereof: The difference is as great, as between a man's *lacking* daily food, and *refusing* that which is before him, because it is not cooked and dished up *a la mode*, or in a manner to please his fancy.

To say that the episcopalians here, cannot with a *good conscience* attend upon our ministers and their administrations; and therefore that they *want* the administration of God's word and sacraments, is by no means satisfactory. As to the fact itself, that they cannot in *conscience* attend upon them; I do not believe there is one in an hundred of them, who has ever declared, or that will *seriously* declare, that he thinks it *sinful* to do so. They may generally, in
their

their judgment, be it right or wrong, *prefer* the worship and communion of the church of England to ours ; and therefore think themselves bound in *conscience*, when both are in their power, usually to attend the former, as more for *their* edification. This they may be supposed to do, and in that respect be justifiable in their conformity to the church of England, though it were allowed that they do not think it absolutely unlawful or criminal to worship in our way, or to have communion with us in christian ordinances ; and could therefore do so with a *good conscience*, if there were no episcopal churches in these parts. I know, some of the weaker, the more bigotted and censorious sort of them, declare that they could not in *conscience* do this : But of the far greater part of them, I have not so ill an opinion. Nor have I any reason to think, that in their applications to the Society for missionaries, they have commonly made use of this plea ; or gone any further than to declare in general, their approbation and choice of the church of England communion, as most for their edification : Which is a very different thing from supposing ours absolutely unlawful and sinful.

If I am right in what I have here suggested, this argument, drawn from *conscience*, is of no force, being grounded on a false supposition. But allowing that these episcopalians are generally so simple, bigotted or superstitious, that they cannot with a *good conscience* attend upon God's word and sacraments with us, as this gentleman seems to suppose ; though they may be real objects of pity and compassion, it appears not that they have any right to expect relief from the Society, their case not being provided for in the charter, nor coming within the general design of the Institution : Which, plainly, was not the assistance of protestants of any particular denomination, living scattered among greater numbers of other protestants, where provision was made for the support of ministers, and the administration of God's word and ordinances ; but *only* for persons destitute of these advantages. The Scottish Society is of the two less limited by its charter, than this in England. And yet if that Society should annually expend perhaps a third part of their revenue,

revenue, in supporting, I will not now add, *increasing*, the presbyterian party, in those plantations where the worship of God is duly provided for, according to the church of England, and proportionably neglect people who were actually destitute of God's word and sacraments in every protestant form; episcopalians would, without doubt, universally exclaim against this, as an abuse and misapplication of their charitable fund; and as discovering too great a fondness for a party or particular sect of protestants. Their pleading that the presbyterians, provided for by them, could not with a *good conscience* acquiesce in, or conform to the church of England, would, I am persuaded, be of very little weight with episcopalians. Nor can any man shew why this way of reasoning is not as just, when applied to the episcopal Society in England, as when applied to the presbyterian Society in Scotland. The church of England is no more the established religion in one part of Britain, than the kirk is in the other; King *William* was equally King of both parts; a charter conceived in the identical terms with that we are speaking of, would have answered as well for a presbyterian, as for an episcopal Society, only the names and titles of the Grantees being changed, though some of these were actually presbyterians. Nor does it appear that the Grantor had it any more in his royal intention, that episcopalians in such circumstances as are here supposed, should be provided for, than that presbyterians should, in the like circumstances. From whence it may be concluded, that he either designed both, or neither: Let this gentleman make his choice—

But if there are numbers of episcopalians among us, who cannot with a *good conscience* hold communion with our churches in gospel ordinances, it may be asked, What is to be done? is there no regular way of relief for them? I answer, the same and no other than there would be for presbyterians or congregationalists in the like case. If their numbers and abilities are such, that they can support episcopal ministers for themselves, they not only have a right, but ought to do it. Or if they can make such representations of their case, which, on

the aforeſaid ſuppoſition, is really an unhappy one, as to induce charitable people, in their *private* capacity, to give them aſſiſtance, no one will object againſt it. But if they can do neither of theſe things, there appears no *regular* way of relief for them; they muſt patiently ſubmit to the providence of God, who has placed them in ſuch circumſtances; waiting, either till *more light* removes their miſtakes and prejudices, or till their numbers and abilities are ſufficiently increaſed, to ſupport ſuch miniſters as they chuſe to have. A Society incorporated for different purpoſes, not for the ſupport of any particular proteſtant ſect, as ſuch, has no right to provide for them, to the neglect of ſuch perſons as are indisputably the proper objects of their institution.

But the gentleman, after obſerving that the Society was incorporated, primarily, to prevent the King's ſubjects falling into *atheism* or *infidelity*, or into *popiſh ſuperſtition* and *idolatry*, ſays, ' Now doth not the Dr. think the
' episcopalianſ, when they have no miniſters in whoſe
' miniſtrations they can acquieſce, muſt be *grievouſly*
' *liable* to the one or the other *?' Upon which let me obſerve, as to thoſe who are episcopalianſ upon principle, or thoſe people ſpoken of by this gentleman, who cannot with a *good conſcience* worſhip God with us; that they muſt be ſuppoſed, at leaſt by episcopalianſ, to be converſant in the holy ſcriptures, ſerious believers of them, devout worſhippers of God in their houſes, and real, practical chriſtians. Now ſuch perſons as theſe, perſons of ſo tender a *conſcience*, cannot ſurely be thought in any imminent danger of apoſtatizing into *atheism* or *infidelity*; eſpecially as they have the *common-prayer-book* to aſſiſt them in their daily private devotions, and other *pious* books, not to ſay the Bible, to read and meditate on. Can ſuch chriſtians as the gentleman ſuppoſes our episcopalianſ to be, and living in a chriſtian land, where the public worſhip of God is upheld, be *grievouſly liable* to turn atheiſts or infidels, even though they cannot acquieſce in our way of worſhip? I think not; and there-

* P. 25.

fore, that the New England missions cannot be vindicated upon this footing. I hope this gentleman will not, for the sake of his argument, deny the episcopalians here to be such good christians as he has all along supposed them; or say that they have so little knowledge or sobriety, that they are already on the brink of infidelity and atheism; so that being without such ministers as they can attend, they would be *grievously liable* soon to plunge into that horrible gulph. This would be, for the sake of his logic, *grievously* to reproach those, whose cause he is pleading. Besides, if they are supposed to be such a profligate sort of people, and so void of *conscience*, the argument which he draws from their supposed *conscientious* non-compliance with our way of worship, would be at once overthrown: It would destroy itself, by its own inconsistency; and, indeed, taken any way, his reasoning is self-repugnant.

But some of these good, conscientious people, it is said, are grievously liable, if not to *atheism* and *infidelity*, yet to *popish superstition* and *idolatry*. ‘Particularly,’ adds the gentleman, ‘must not those of them be in great danger of popery who, as he [*meaning myself*] tells us, prefer that to the worship of the prevailing party in New England †?’ Let me observe, that I did not suppose there was a *great* number of episcopalians here, so deeply prejudiced against us, or who think so favourably of the mass. Supposing there may be 20 or 30 such persons in New England, scattered over a country of 3 or 400 miles in extent, can this be thought a substantial reason for supporting 20 or 30 missions here, at a great expence? especially when it is considered, that there are *here* no popish priests or emissaries known of, further to pervert and to confirm them papists; but many people to dissuade them from those errors, and all worldly motives on the other side. There is no reason to think that the Society ever had the case of these New England *high-flyers* in their mind, or consequently, that they have sent the more missionaries hither on their ac-

† P. 25.

count. And if not, this cannot be properly used as an argument to justify their sending them. I can hardly think the gentleman is in earnest, or thinks it a solid one. He seems to have laid hold on what I have said of some few of the more bigotted episcopalians among us, (whether he believed it or not, I cannot tell) as a plausible pretext for supporting missions here. But the Society have *apparently* acted upon different principles, with other views and motives; not to keep the people of New England from turning *roman catholicks, deists and atheists*; (of all which there now is and ever was MUCH LESS DANGER than of the people of London doing so,) but to support and strengthen the episcopal party, and gradually to bring us into the bosom of the church; or, in the language of their own *Account*, ‘to remove those *prejudices* under which the people generally laboured, and to promote, *as much as possible, an agreement in faith and worship.*’——

Let me add, that this plea of *conscience*, as it has of late years been used by the defenders of the Society’s numerous missions in these parts, is the less satisfactory upon this account: There would, in all probability, have been hardly any of these *scrupulous* people among us at this day, had it not been for the Society; and if the missions were withdrawn, it is likely the far greater part of them might soon return to the communion of our churches. Is it reasonable that the Society, when there was but a handful of these people, as one may say, in all New England, should cherish their discontent, and, by their conduct at least, encourage them in their prejudices against us, and afford them assistance, till their numbers became much more considerable: And then avail themselves of those prejudices, to justify their numerous missions here, under a notion that there are *many* people among us, who cannot with a *good conscience* worship God with us, and who are, for that reason, *grievously liable*, without episcopal missionaries, to become *atheists, infidels, or roman-catholicks*? It may possibly deserve to be considered, I say it with much respect and deference to that venerable body, whether it would not
have

have well become the Society, when applications were first made to them for missionaries by people here, to hint to them, that their opposition to our way of worship might be too great; that they had better be content with it, till they should be sufficiently numerous and able to support ministers themselves, more agreeable to their principles and inclinations; that many other people stood in much greater need of the Society's charitable care and assistance, being either still in a state of heathenism, or wholly destitute of the administration of God's word and ordinances in *any* protestant way; and that therefore it ought not to be taken unkindly, if their requests were not complied with. Had some such method been taken at first, instead of countenancing a party spirit, the Society would have had much more money to expend in supporting the worship of God in places destitute of it, and christianizing the Indians and Negroes; and there probably would have been but few persons among us at this day, but what could with a *good conscience* hold communion with us; in which they would be as effectually guarded against atheism, infidelity and popery, as in that of the church of England. But the Society have really contributed much towards strengthening prejudices against us, and increasing this party; till their prejudices are grown to such an height, and their numbers are so considerable, that a necessity is now pleaded for continuing to give them large assistance, to prevent their becoming roman-catholicks, infidels or atheists; because, it is said, their *consciences* will not allow them to attend the administration of God's word and sacraments in our churches. In which way of proceeding and reasoning, the more missions are established here the greater will probably be the demand for them; since it is likely there will be some increase of *proselytes* to the church, to say nothing of its increase by *natural, ordinary generation*, and therefore more such tender *consciences* to be considered: Till, in process of time, the Society's whole fund may be too little to supply New England only with missionaries; unless perhaps, by the episcopal party's becoming a majority in these colonies, the church of England should also become the established religion,

religion, and a common tax be imposed by law for the support of her clergy, so as to render any further assistance from the Society unnecessary, in which case, the unprovided colonies and the heathens may reap the whole advantage of its benefactions; of which they have hitherto been in so great a measure deprived, for the sake of the episcopalians among us, at first but few, and those not, in any just or proper sense, destitute of the administration of God's word and sacraments.

The gentleman sometimes argues that the Society has formed no such design as I have supposed, from this circumstance, that they did not send missionaries *earlier* into New England, when there were but *few church people* here, and consequently *more need of missionaries* than afterwards, if making proselytes had been the point in view *. This is more plausible than solid. They may be supposed to have had that design before they sent missionaries to prosecute it; waiting only for a favourable occasion and opening. It would have been a romantic, *Don-Quixote* enterprize, for them to send missionaries hither for that purpose, before there were a number of people ready to receive and embrace them. They must have some footing, some ground *to stand on*, in order, by their *engines* aforesaid, to shake this part of the earth; and they were not, I conclude, such strangers to the art and principles of *Archimedes*, as to attempt it without. Nor does it appear, but that the Society embraced the first opportunity that offered, to establish missions here. It is, I think, sufficiently plain, that they had the design aforesaid, as early as their *Account* was printed, 1706. But even though it could be proved, that they had it not for several years after the first missions, it will not follow that they have not formed it since; being encouraged by the increase of the episcopalian party here. And such a design might very plausibly be carried on, under the notion of *only* providing for those episcopalians, who could not with a *good conscience* attend on the administration of God's word and sacraments in our way. But enough of this.

From page 25 to 29 the gentleman speaks of orthodoxy, heterodoxy and heresy, in opposition to what I said

* P. 29,

concerning the terms *orthodox ministers*, in the charter ; which, I supposed, stand there in opposition to *Romish priests and jesuits* only ; but he, it seems, thinks *orthodox ministers* can mean only those of the church of England, in opposition to those of all other denominations, even among protestants. It is only from this sense of the terms, that he can deduce any consequences to the advantage of his cause. But he has offer'd nothing in confirmation of it, which appears to me of any weight ; I am therefore content to submit this matter to the judgment of our impartial readers, without adding any thing further upon it. But I cannot but take a brief notice of one or two personal reflections on myself, in this part of his performance. He has, without grounds, and very ungenerously, represented it as my opinion, *that whoever dissents from me in any point relative to christian faith, is an HERETIC* *. And what a candid use he would make of this remark, appears from his words immediately following : ‘ His New England brethren, *if indeed they will acknowledge him for a brother*, are DESIRED to consider the consequences of this way of thinking. *We have not so learned Christ.*’ Now, I am very far from thinking all those heretics or heterodox who dissent from me in *any point* relative to christian faith. I have never given the least occasion for such an aspersions. There is, I believe, no professed christian, of any denomination, less disposed to entertain hard thoughts of other people, merely on account of differences in opinion relative to points of faith, or who has been more remote from censuring and reproaching those who think differently, as heterodox or heretical ; neither of which opprobrious epithets is, in my opinion, properly applied to any, but those who *pertinaciously* deny some one or more of the most plain, indisputable and important doctrines of the gospel. It is thus, that I have *learned Christ*, and the spirit of his religion. And whereas the gentleman intimates, that they of the church of England are not accustomed to censure as heretical, or rashly to judge and condemn others ; let the *Athanasian* creed, and the *canons* of that church (according to many of which, people are to be *ipso facto* excommunicated for mere

* P. 28.

trifles) witness, how very unlucky he was in setting up those of that communion, for patterns of christian forbearance, or a catholic disposition; unless to *catholic* we prefix another epithet, very often *joined* therewith. In this, and several other places, the gentleman insinuates plainly enough, that I am an heretic myself, and so accounted by my *brethren*, if indeed they will at all *acknowledge* me for a brother. This piece of scandal was taken up, as I suppose, upon the credit of some of the profligate writers who have lately appeared against me in New England. It is no honour to this gentleman to repeat it after them; nor would it be at all to his advantage if one were, from such passages *only* as this, without considering the general tenor of his writing, to conjecture *how he himself has learned Christ*. And these reproachful innuendoes I take to be the less ingenuous, and more injurious, as coming from him, because, if I have received *unfraternal* treatment from a *few* of my brethren, as indeed I have, this was chiefly because I was supposed, whether truly or not, to approach too near, in some of my religious opinions, to those of certain of the most eminent bishops and other divines of the church of England, who were despitefully treated as heretics by many of *their* brethren; and whose names will be remembered with veneration, when those of their [supposed] more orthodox revilers will either be forgotten through contempt, or remembered with execration, like those of the *Lauds* and *Sacheverells* of former times. These personal reflections of the gentleman, seem to me quite unworthy of *his* pen; especially since I think them unworthy of a more particular reply from so mean a one as *mine*.

The gentleman blames me, in the page last referred to, for intimating that our congregational ministers generally adhere more closely to the doctrinal articles of the church of England, than even her own clergy do. ‘We can only deny the charge’, says he, ‘and put him on the proof, as we do.’ To which I shall only say at present, that I appeal for the truth of it, to the sermons, &c. published by them respectively; not thinking it worth while, by making large extracts from each to swell this publication, in which I aim at brevity.

In

In page 29 and 30 the gentleman speaks of Dr. *Bray's* testimony respecting N. England, and of some supposed misrepresentations of the missionaries here; endeavouring to invalidate what I said upon these points. I am willing to leave our readers to judge, without adding any thing further upon them. In answer to what I intimated about the Society's continuing to support missions in N. England, in places where the episcopalians were able to maintain their own ministers, the gentleman says: 'Now the Society hath always been desirous to know, when any congregation became able to support itself without their help—If their friends have been too slow in giving them intelligence, which may have happened, and the Doctor will favour them with any, which on inquiry shall appear to be well grounded, they will both be thankful to him, and shew the world that they are far from wishing to increase the church party by profuse liberalities *.' This is very candidly said, and I take the gentleman at his word, though without flattering myself, that I can ever merit the *thanks* of that venerable body, however ambitious I may be of it.—The people of the church of England in Newport on Rhode-Island, where the Society have long had a missionary, are numerous, and very wealthy. There are but few churches or congregations of any denomination in America, so able to maintain a minister as this. I give this account upon good authority; and particularly upon the credit of a gentleman of principal distinction, belonging to that congregation, who, since the publication of my *Observations* and former *Defence* of them, gave me this account in conversation. He also frankly owned, that he looked on the Society's continuing to support a minister for them, at Newport, as an evident misapplication of their charity; and not the only one of the kind, in New-England. Without speaking at present of any of the episcopal congregations in Connecticut, let me just observe, that the good people of *Christ's Church* in Boston, though not so rich or numerous as those of the church at Newport, are yet, without doubt, more able to support a minister, than divers of our congregational churches in

* P. 30, 31.

this metropolis. And if supporting a missionary for them, be at all an abuse, considering their own ability, and the exigence of other places, the abuse is still the greater, because there are two other churches of England in the same town; which churches are neither so remote, nor so thronged, but that the people of *Christ's Church* might be accommodated in them; if not with such *high pews* or *seats* as they might possibly chuse, yet such as, I should think, humble and good christians would rather take up with, than either violate their *consciences* by going to *dissenting meetings*, or receive the Society's charity, of which so many other people stand in far greater need. If the venerable Society should condescend to pay any regard to these representations, either some other person or myself, may probably be encouraged to mention other instances of abuse of a similar nature. But this I can hardly hope, when I consider what treatment the representations of other *non-conformists* have met with in times past: This gives me less ground to expect *thanks*, than either silent neglect, or blame and reproof.

What follows, in several pages, relates to the piety and good morals of those in general, who, from among us, become proselytes to the church; to the reformation, or better state of religion here, compared with what it formerly was; and to the extermination of a spirit of persecution in the New-Englanders; all attributed by Mr. *Apthorp*, and by this gentleman after him, to the increase of the church of England here. The whole of which, to one who has a right understanding of things and facts here, must appear such a *jest*, that he can hardly speak *seriously* about it. And yet I will not now venture to speak merrily or ludicrously of it, lest I should again displease this good gentleman, who is already disgusted with me in that respect; thinking it a proof that I have not a duly *serious heart*. For it is upon this occasion, that he says; 'What the Doctor's *counenance* is, I know 'not' [none of the most *jocular*, I can assure him] 'but 'I wish he gave as good proofs of a *serious heart*, as the 'missionaries generally do *.' And can it be wondered at, if those reverend gentlemen, who received the *Holy*

* P. 33.

Ghost at their ordination, by means of the hands or breath of a bishop, should have more *serious hearts* than a person, who has had only what thorough-pac'd churchmen account lay-ordination, in one of those *unconsecrated* places, in which some zealous episcopal divines have supposed, the *Holy Spirit never was* †. And yet I cannot think with this gentleman, that speaking jocosely about some sacerdotal superstitions, rites and forms, is a proof that a man hath not a *serious heart*. But some men conclude all those profane and impious, who have not the same reverence for such things, that they have themselves, or that they would have the common people entertain, for the honour of an establishment and the hierarchy.

In speaking about *toleration*, and the growing esteem of it, the gentleman says, *he hopes the generality of the missionaries carried that esteem with them into N. England* ‡. If so, I wish they had generally, by their meekness and charity towards non-conformists, given *better proofs* of it than they have. He adds; ‘ Their *need of toleration* must recommend it still more to their good opinion, &c.’ Neither the clergy nor laity of the church of England here, will, I believe, thank him for arguing their esteem of toleration, from this circumstance; it being a plain concession, that that church is not the *established* religion of New-England. For certainly those of the established religion in any country, cannot properly be said to *need toleration* therein. And many, if not most of our episcopalians, triumph exceedingly in a presumption, that their church exclusive of all others, is established here; and consequently that, not they, but we, *need toleration*. The virulent *Examiner* of my *Observations* harped long upon this string, and was very confident: And it is, I suppose, in a great measure on the same presumption, that the episcopalians here, especially the clergy, have been so haughty, disdainful and overbearing in their carriage toward us; giving themselves airs of superiority, as if we did not by any means stand on equal ground with them: Though I do not intend

† This was said by a great and zealous churchman of the dissenting Meeting-Houses.

‡ P. 35.

this as a general charge, there being persons among them of a very different temper and behaviour, and who are accordingly to be much respected.

The gentleman comes, p. 37, to speak of the supposed neglect of the *heathen*; which he thinks a groundless imputation. And here he taxes me with misapplying bishop *Williams*'s words, in his sermon before the Society. 'Unhappily for the Doctor, says he, bishop *Williams* doth not speak of the Society, in the words which he quotes, but of the English nation.—But the bishop's words founded so *plausibly* for a charge upon the Society, that he *could not forbear misapplying them* ||.' Now, if the gentleman will be pleased to review the passage in the *Observations*, p. 98, he may find himself under a mistake. I did not say, that the Society had in some sort allowed the complaint against *themselves* to be just, as he supposes; nor quote bishop *Williams* to prove this, but that the natives had *actually* been neglected. However, I acknowledge I did, both just before and after, speak of the Society's neglecting them; so that I can easily account for the gentleman's thinking, I cited bishop *Williams* to prove this; and therefore do not accuse him of wilfully injuring me in this respect. After citing bishop *Williams*, I added; 'It is unnecessary to confirm and justify this complaint, by an appeal to any of the later sermons before the Society; which would be no difficult matter.' Upon which words the gentleman hath put a wrong construction, by saying that I affirm, *it would not be difficult to justify this complaint by an appeal to any of the later sermons*; as if my sense was, that *all* the later sermons might be cited in justification of it. This is the import of the word *any*, as used by him; whereas it means only *some*, as used by me in the clause aforesaid; as any one who understands the English idiom, may easily perceive. So that the gentleman has here fallen into a double error in representing my sense; which, however, I do not impute to any ill design. But he has perverted my words and meaning in the same page, in a way that I cannot so easily apologize for: I mean, by saying, that *in one place I express a doubt whether the*

Society have ‘ so much as begun to use methods of converting either the Negroes or the Indians.’ Now, in the place alluded to in the *Observations*, p. 135, what I expressed a doubt concerning, was not, whether the Society had begun to use *any* methods to this end, as his words plainly imply; but whether they had begun ‘ to study, and to *use diligently* the most probable methods of converting, &c.’ In which sentence the chief emphasis is put upon the words *use diligently*, which were accordingly before printed in *italics*, but which he has intirely omitted in his representation of my sense; whether for any better reason, than that he might make me appear to charge the Society with more negligence than I did, or thought of, he himself can best tell.

The gentleman goes on, from page 37 to 49, to speak of the endeavours used by the Society to christianize the Indians and Negroes; of the difficulties and discouragements attending this good work; and of the supposed injustice done the Society by me, in accusing them of any negligence in this respect. He has said many things very judiciously and solidly upon this head. And I frankly own, that, taking for truth what he has produced from Dr. *Humphrey’s History*, which I *never saw*, relative to what the Society have done for the Indians, I used several expressions, much too diminutive of the pains taken by them in this department. I am sorry I used any expressions, whether for want of better information, or through haste in writing, which tended to lead my readers to think the Society had taken less pains than they actually have, toward the conversion of the Indians. Their endeavours to this end have been very considerable, according to that *History*, as cited by this gentleman. But still I must beg leave to think, that, all things considered, much less has been done in this matter, than might have been reasonably expected; and that much more probably would have been done, to the spiritual good of the natives, and the great benefit of the British colonies, had not the Society been so deeply engaged, and spent so much of their revenue, in supporting and increasing the episcopal party, as such, in New-England. What the gentleman has offered as to Mr.
(now

(now Dr.) *Barclay's* mission to the Iroquois, his small encouragement from the Society, and being refused a school-master and interpreter to assist him, appears to me unsatisfactory. I will not, however, spend time in controverting that matter; but am willing all should form a judgment, by comparing the extracts from Mr. *Barclay's* own letters in the *Observations*, with what this gentleman has offered upon the point.

He proceeds, page 49, 50, 51, to speak of what the Society has done for the support of God's public worship in the *unprovided* colonies. I shall not go into a particular consideration of what he has offered upon this head; partly, to avoid prolixity, and partly because it is sufficient for my purpose, if those colonies and the natives have actually had so much the less care taken of, and the less money employed for their benefit, in proportion to what has been taken of, and expended for, the New-England Episcopalians; *which is undeniable*, since this money could not be employed in both these ways at once. Let me, however, just observe, that I can prove by a substantial living witness, that I received the account given by me of the repeated ineffectual applications of the *North Carolinians* to the Society for missionaries, from a gentleman of principal distinction of that country; though I did not recollect, when I wrote the *Observations*, that I could bring any person to attest to the truth of it, and spoke with a degree of caution, being unwilling to trust my own memory too far; at which this grave gentleman is pleased to make himself a little merry. If I am publicly called on, by any person who has a right to further information, I will, for my own justification, mention the *name* both of my informer, and the witness to whom I refer; though I flatter myself, that with those who know me, this will be needless.

The gentleman objects, page 52, against what I said of the *sum* expended by the Society in New-England; and says, *I shew the same inclination to exaggerate in this, as in every thing*. Now he knew, because I expressly said, I did 'not pretend to be very exact as to the *quantum*.' But yet he has offered nothing, to shew I was under any mistake in this respect; and I am persuaded that I rather
kept

kept much within bounds, than exceeded them. But I own that I was much out, in saying that 40 or 50 millions might have been comfortably maintained among the Indians, and in heathenish places, with 35,000*l.* sterling, for more than 30 years past. I know not how to account for this error; but sure I am, that I was deceived myself, and had no design to deceive others; as may well be supposed, from the very nature of the error. I willingly stand corrected as to this. But let it be observed, that this is a mistake, which does not affect the main argument. For though but half, or much less than half so many millions could have been supported with the sum aforesaid, as I then supposed; still a considerable number might, and, as I humbly conceive, ought to have been, for the benefit of the Indians, &c. The question is not, *how much* money has been misapplied, or *how many* millions might have been supported therewith, where they were most needed; but whether any considerable sum has been, and whether that might not have been employed in ways plainly conformable to the charter. Unless these things are disproved, it is of little consequence to shew, that I was mistaken as to the other points.

The gentleman proceeds to object against what was said respecting the English dissenters being induced to assist the Society, upon a presumption that their fund was employed, not for the support and increase of the episcopal party, as such, but for the common cause of protestant christianity. He says, it cannot be supposed that they were ignorant what the Society was doing in New-England; that the present Archbishop of Canterbury mentioned the case of the Episcopalians here, very explicitly, above 20 years ago, in his sermon; and that it was taken notice of in other of the anniversary sermons, and in the *abstracts*. This, he says, is very remote from *fraudulent dealing*; and that the dissenters must be presumed to have done whatever they did to assist the Society, *with their eyes open* *. But from accounts which I have received from England, and from persons *whose characters I am acquainted with*, I have good reason to think, not only

* P. 53, 54.

that many dissenters, but even many episcopalians there, have contributed their help to the Society, without any distinct knowledge of the ways, in which the money was employed; particularly, without suspecting that any of it was expended in the manner that so much has been, in these parts, where the support of God's public worship was so well provided for. And if the gentleman is right in his supposition, 'that the dissenters, at least for many years past, have contributed little or nothing †;' to me this is an evidence, that their *eyes are*, of late years, *more opened* than they were before; and that their withholding their charity, is owing to their both *seeing* and *disliking* the use that was made of it, in building up the church of England here, in opposition to churches of their own denomination. This is rendered the more probable, by what the gentleman adds a little after, supposing him not to be mistaken in point of fact, viz. that 'some, if not many of them, have taken *great pains* to dissuade members of the church of England from giving on such occasions.' If any of them have really done so, the most natural account and solution that can be given of it, is, that this money was, in great part, now found to be misapplied, in supporting and strengthening the cause of episcopacy, to the neglect of the heathen, &c. and to the prejudice of their brethren in New-England. Surely, it cannot be supposed that the dissenters would have had any objection against the Society's being assisted in propagating the gospel among the Indians and Negroes, or in supporting the public worship of God in places destitute of it. There is no reason to doubt, but that they would have readily contributed themselves to these pious designs, instead of dissuading episcopalians from doing so. We are well informed, indeed, that the episcopalians, not to say the Society, lately made great opposition to our having a charter *merely* for propagating the gospel among the Indians, at our own expence; but I do not believe that the English dissenters have shewn the same spirit against the established church, or the Society; though the gentleman says, with a degree of acrimony, that 'on the whole, the Society would certainly

† P. 53, 54.

‘ come off very well in respect of the dissenters, if they
 ‘ would neither do it good nor harm*.’

He says further, in vindication of these missions, that
 ‘ probably much more money hath been given to the So-
 ‘ ciety by the members of the church of England, on
 ‘ account of the provision which it hath made for the
 ‘ episcopalians in the Massachusetts and Connecticut, than
 ‘ they would have given if it had made none:’ That
 therefore ‘ other parts have not suffered on their account;’
 and that ‘ should these benefactors be brought to think
 ‘ the Society an *improper channel* for such their bounty,
 ‘ or should it be *forbidden* to employ in this manner any
 ‘ share of what it receives, the consequence *might be*, that
 ‘ they would withdraw a proportion of their present li-
 ‘ berality—and establish a separate fund, &c.’ † Let it
 be observed, that however plausible this reasoning may
 appear, it is grounded on mere suppositions and conjec-
 tures. The gentleman thinks these things *probable*, and
 that they *might* take place: Others may think them im-
 probable, and perhaps with greater reason. But even
 supposing them certain, though they may be pleaded by
 way of apology, they cannot be pleaded as a full justifi-
 cation of the Society, unless it is authorized by its char-
 ter, to employ a part of its fund in this way; which is
 the main point in dispute. And this the gentleman does
 in effect acknowledge, by saying, ‘ If indeed the case
 ‘ of the episcopalians in the Massachusetts and Connec-
 ‘ ticut doth not, by the charter of the Society, come
 ‘ under its care, bounties to them are at present convey-
 ‘ ed through wrong hands ‡.’ That is, in plain Eng-
 lish, then the Society apply a great part of their fund im-
 properly, and without authority for so doing, or misap-
 ply it. So that he allows the consequence to be just; let others judge of the premises.

In the next place, the gentleman expresseth his dislike
 at my supposing, some would justify these missions under
 a pretext, that rectifying the state of religion among us,
 or, in other words, supporting and propagating the
 church of England in *these colonies*, is one necessary
 means of converting the Indians. He says, he questions

* P. 54.

† Vid. p. 54, 55, 56.

‡ Ibid.

whether the defenders of the Society have ever applied this *to the New-England presbyterians or congregationalists*; that *the bishop of St. David's, whom alone I quoted, intimates no such thing*; and that I *must be understood to put this plea into their mouths, only as an opportunity of introducing my wit, and abusing the missionaries* *. Now, let it be observed, that if such a plea has actually been used, this gentleman owns it to be a weak one. But Mr. *Apthorp* cited the bishop of St. David's sermon, apparently with this view; I mean in part. And though New-England is not particularly mentioned; yet, I think, the expressions quoted by Mr. *Apthorp*, will fairly admit of this construction. I therefore took them in the sense which, I supposed, that gentleman did. Speaking of the Society's care to *remedy the ill state of religion in our colonies*, his Lordship says, 'without this care, the conversion of the neighbouring Savages can hardly be effected.' Mr. *Apthorp* applied this, as his argument required, to those colonies, against the episcopal missions in which, objections had been made; and these, all know, are principally the New-England colonies. With the same view he cited bishop *Berkley's* sermon, in which it is said, 'It should seem the likeliest step towards converting the heathens, would be to 'begin with the English, &c.' And part of his citation from the present Archbishop of Canterbury's sermon before the Society, has so much the appearance of being to his purpose in this respect, that I cannot think it very strange, if he conceived this to be the real scope of it, though it might not be so. For, after speaking of the episcopal missions in places *where there were already christian societies established and supported*; which, as he intimates, had proved happily *instrumental to bring people over to the church*, his Grace subjoins; 'Indeed, *unity of profession* amongst ourselves—will greatly recommend our religion to the infidels; who else may be tempted to continue as they are, for want of knowing *with whom to join*.' All these are Mr. *Apthorp's* authorities, produced by him to justify those episcopal missions, which are objected against; and these, as was before observed, are the New-England

* Vid. p. 56, 57.

ones. And when the tenor of these passages is considered, together with his more manifest design in introducing them, am not I improperly accused of putting a ridiculous plea into the mouths of the Society's defenders, for the pleasure of laughing at, and exposing it? But what if the Society have expressed themselves, in their own printed *Account*, in such a manner, that it may be well supposed, they judge it a good one? I think they have actually done so, in the passage cited by me, page 18 and 19 of these *Remarks*. For after speaking explicitly of the *independent congregations in New-England*, as well as of *other ways of division and separation in other colonies*, and the need of providing for a *regular and orthodox ministry among them*; they express the proposed end thereof, in these words, viz. 'to remove those *prejudices*, under which the people generally laboured, and to promote, *as much as possible*, an agreement in faith and worship, *in order to the recommending our holy religion to unbelievers*.' Now, if this is a weak plea, as the gentleman seems to allow, I leave him to shew *his own wit*, either in making the best of it, or in excusing himself for insulting me, as if I had invented, and *put it into the mouths* of the Society's defenders, as an opportunity to introduce *mine*, in exposing it to ridicule.

This respectable gentleman having said thus much, by way of *Answer to me*, proceeds very candidly and obligingly, page 57, *to answer himself*; at least, to make such concessions, and to apologize for the Society in such a way, as in a great measure to justify the complaints against its conduct. He says, 'In all that I have hitherto said, I am far from intending to affirm, that the Society hath not laid out in the Massachusetts and Connecticut too large a proportion of the money put into their hands, considering the necessities of other provinces.' It seems then, that the controversy between him and me, is no longer, whether there has been *just cause* of complaint given, with reference to these missions; but whether there has been *so much* as I have supposed. Again; speaking of the Society's having a discretionary power *within the bounds of their trust*, which I never denied, though I denied a power to *make alterations in their institution*, he

says, ‘ But still they ought to use their power *judiciously*,
 ‘ and in that they *may have failed* *.’ And the gentleman well knows, I did not impute to them any *known*,
wilful abuse of their power, or misapplication of monies ;
 but studiously guarded against such a construction of my
 words: So that he has here acknowledged, in substance,
 the main point which I laboured to prove. He adds,
 just after, with a sarcastic air; ‘ Even the Doctor’s two
 ‘ *blameless Societies* might possibly exhibit some tincture
 ‘ of human frailty, if they did not *warily* keep their
 ‘ transactions *unpublished*, whilst those of ours *lie open to*
 ‘ *the world.*’ The Societies to which he alludes, can
 never need any defence of mine; especially, not before
 he accuses them of any thing, and only insinuates that
 there *might* be grounds for it, if their transactions were
 made public. But since he speaks of these, as *warily*
 kept in the dark, while those of the episcopal Society
lie open to the world; I cannot but observe, that though
Abstracts of their proceedings are annually *printed* with
 the sermons, it is no easy thing for us non-conformists
 to get a sight of them. It has been taken notice of by
 others, as well as myself, that the episcopalians here are
 often very shy and reserved as to lending them; as if they
 apprehended, there were some things in them, which
 should not be *too narrowly* looked into; perhaps the mis-
 sionaries letters; I know not. But it was partly for this
 reason, that in the year 1759, I applied to a Book-seller
 in Boston, to send for 25 of the anniversary sermons and
 abstracts for me. He accordingly wrote for them to
 his correspondent, a noted Book-seller in London,
 whose answer is now in my hands, with his name sub-
 scribed. In this he says, that *the annual sermons are things*
which are not to be bought; that *had they been so, money*
would have purchased them; ‘ but as they are’ (so he ex-
 presses himself) ‘ it is *solicitations* that must do it.’ He
 adds, that *he applied to Dr. Barecroft, the Society’s secre-*
tary, for the sermons, who told him, he had not the *five*
first sent for; and *as for the twenty last, unless he knew*
 ‘ *the person* they were for, he could not part with them;
 ‘ for as the Society printed them to distribute, and not

‘ to sell, they had ordered him to do *so as to be of service to the Society.*’ If need be, I will hereafter mention both the London and the Boston Book-seller by *name*. And from the foregoing little anecdote it may be inferred, that though *some* of the Society’s transactions are annually printed, yet they do not lie altogether *so open to the view of the world*, that the gentleman had any reason to boast thereof, in comparison with the *wary* conduct of the other Societies. And one who deals in suspicions and innuendoes like his, might hint, that if *all* of them did so, this episcopal Society might *possibly exhibit some tincture of human frailty*, even *beyond* what he has so candidly acknowledged. But I cannot think insinuations of this nature, justifiable, by whomsoever used.

The gentleman goes on to *excuse* the Society’s sending so many more missionaries to New-England than was proper, even in his own opinion. He intimates that the episcopalians here, have been more *pressing solicitors* than those in other plantations: That when the earlier applications were made, it could not be *foreseen whether more would follow*; so that the *missions became insensibly numerous*; and that *when many requests had been granted, it was the harder to refuse others, for which the same plea could be made* *. It is owned that these things have weight, considered as an apology for what does not, strictly speaking, admit of a justification. It is apparently with the former view, not the latter, that they are here introduced; and, considered in that light, I hope no man shall be found more ready than myself, to acknowledge their pertinence, or to allow them their due force. The gentleman immediately adds another circumstance of moment, considered in the same view: ‘ Some members of the Society approved this increase [of missions;] others thought it was going *too far*. And in all bodies of men, whose opinions differ, there must be mutual condescensions, and time allowed for one side to come over into the sentiments of the other, else they cannot proceed together.’ This is still apologizing, not justifying. And hence it appears, that not only many people out of the Society, but a considerable number of its

* P. 58.

own members; have long thought its proceedings amiss in this respect. The gentleman ought therefore, methinks, to judge candidly of the former; especially since it seems, by what he says, that those members of the Society, who so nearly agree with us in the main point, have at length convinced the others, induced them to *come over into their sentiments*, and thereby ratified the judgment of all, who thought those proceedings unjustifiable. This is but a natural construction of the gentleman's words; who adds, a little after, 'And now, for some time past, the Society have *excused* themselves from complying with *any application from that quarter*.' This, being compared with what was said just before, about *difference* of opinion in the Society, and the need of *condescensions*, and *time for one side to come over into the sentiments of the other*, is saying in effect, that the Society are now generally convinced, that those of their members, who were against multiplying missions here, were in the right; and that, in consequence hereof, they have *excused* themselves from sending missionaries into these parts. I cannot but be very glad of these important hints. They at once justify myself and others, who have objected against these missions, at least in some measure; and also afford grounds to hope, that this charitable fund will, for the future, be employed in ways more agreeable to its original design, more beneficial to the world, and therefore more honourable to the Society. The gentleman adds; 'Surely this alone is no inconsiderable argument, that proselyting those two districts to episcopacy, hath not been the point in view.' I confess, that if the Society should discontinue their missions here, it would be a good argument that they are *no longer* prosecuting that scheme; but, how it would prove that they *never* had any such design, is as much beyond my poor capacity, as to reconcile this supposition with their past conduct, or with their own *Account*.

There is so much good sense and candor in the gentleman's next paragraph; such a plain concession that the Society's conduct has been unjustifiable, and such clear intimations that an alteration of measures is intended; that,

that, notwithstanding some blame is laid upon me in it, I cannot forbear citing it at large.

‘ *What is past*, as the Doctor observes, *cannot be re-*
‘ *called*. But if mistakes have happened, they may be
‘ avoided for the future, and the Society *is not above al-*
‘ *tering its Measures*. Doubtless it would have liked,
‘ and might have expected, civiler and fairer Treatment,
‘ than he hath vouchsafed to give it. But however, *fas*
‘ *est & ab hoste doceri*. It cannot desert and abandon the
‘ Congregations which it hath taken under its Protec-
‘ tion, unless they should become either too rich to need
‘ its Assistance, or too inconsiderable to deserve it. But
‘ more Care may be used to know, when either of these
‘ Things falls out. All Forwardness in Missionaries to
‘ molest Persons of other Persuasions, and all Encourage-
‘ ment of Parties and Factions in order to serve Eccle-
‘ siastical Schemes, may be strictly prohibited, and on
‘ reasonable Complaint severely checked. The eyes of
‘ the Society may be turned more attentively to the dark
‘ Corners of the Colonies, to the Methods which pro-
‘ mise well for the more effectual Instruction of the *Ne-*
‘ *groes*, and to the openings for doing good amongst the
‘ *Indians*, which his Majesty’s new Acquisitions will pro-
‘ bably disclose. A friendly Correspondence may also be
‘ carried on between some of the Members of that Body,
‘ and some of the *Presbyterian* or Congregational Mini-
‘ sters, whose Dispositions are mild and ingenuous; and
‘ thus Animosities and Jealousies may by Degrees be
‘ extinguished, of which, I am persuaded, the Society
‘ is very desirous *.’

One can hardly too much praise the candor, and chris-
tian temper, appearing in the foregoing passage. I am
very sorry, however, that the gentleman should speak of
me as an *enemy* to the Society, for endeavouring to set
some of their conduct in a true point of light. And he
had the less reason for this, because he has plainly con-
ceded *in general*, that my objections were not without
foundation. I say, *in general*; for I cannot pretend to
the honor of having him, who appeared so opposite to
me in the former part of his Answer, *intirely* of my opi-

* P. 58, 59.

nion before he got to the end of it. Thus far, I think, we are agreed, *viz.* That considering the necessities of the Indians, Negroes, and some of the colonies, the Society have expended too great a proportion of their revenue on the New-England missions; and consequently, that an alteration of measures in this respect, was much to be desired. The chief remaining differences, I take to be these, *viz.* He thinks one *principle* on which my argument proceeds, is false; *namely* this, That a few episcopals living among congregationalists, where the administration of God's word and sacraments is duly provided for *in their way*, cannot properly be said, in the *general* terms of the charter, to *want the administration of God's word and sacraments*, merely because they have it not after the *particular* mode of the church of England. He thinks they may. Another disagreement is the necessary result of this; *viz.* That I suppose *all* the money expended by the Society, in the assistance of episcopals here, who are in those circumstances, misapplied: Whereas he supposes, that *part* of it applied rightly, though not *so much*; and though he acknowledges that *their case is not particularly described and provided for in the charter* †.

If the aforesaid *principle* is right, my conclusion from it cannot be wrong; both are submitted to the judgment of the intelligent and impartial. But let it be remembered, that though I lay great stress upon this principle; yet I never have rested, nor do now rest the controversy, *wholly* upon the truth of it. In the *Observations* I repeatedly put in a caveat to this purpose. And agreeably hereto, this gentleman, though he disallows this principle, which I think so just a one, yet is *far from affirming that the Society hath not laid out*, in these parts, *too large a proportion of their money*; and says, that *mistakes may be avoided for the future*. If the grounds of complaint are removed, as he intimates they are likely to be, all ought to be content; though this should not be done for the same *formal reason*, that some suppose it ought to be. I am confirmed in my general opinion, that the Society's conduct has been justly exceptionable,

not only by what this gentleman grants, whose judgment has great weight with me ; but by the credible intelligence which I have had, concerning the sentiments of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, expressed at a meeting of the Society the last summer ; which, as I am informed, were exactly agreeable to this gentleman's, in the *concessionary* part of his performance. And it may be worth considering, whether these do not come so near to mine at last, that in case of a *third* edition of this Tract, some more proper title may not be found for it, than that of *An Answer* to me ; though I cannot agree with some who have hinted, that it might nearly as well be intitled, *An Answer to Thomas à Kempis*, or to *Don Quixote*.

The gentleman proceeds, page 59 and onward, to speak largely of the proposal for American bishops ; of which he is a warm favourer. This is a matter which I did not undertake to discuss, and only touched upon, *en passant*. And yet the gentleman is at once so desirous to have me for his opponent herein, and so very obliging, that he has undertaken to *propose my objections distinctly for me* ; because, he says, *I was a great deal too vehement to do it myself* *. How can I refuse, after such a piece of courtesy, and so great an obligation laid upon me, to say something further upon this point ? But instead of particularly considering what he has said in answer to those objections, which, as he intimates, he so kindly put into proper order for me, (some of which, by the way, *I did not so much as think of* when I mentioned this affair of American bishops) I will briefly state his scheme relative to bishops here, and make a few remarks upon it. And if I should be *too vehement*, or have my ideas too confused, to make these remarks *distinctly* enough, I may well be thought very happy, in having an opponent of so cool and clear a head, and so benevolent a heart, as to supply that defect for me, without taking any ungenerous advantage of it, or upbraiding me with the *favour* afterward.

The gentleman briefly mentions the good ends proposed, in having bishops in America. These are in sub-

* P. 60, 61.

stance the same with those which are *more distinctly* mentioned in the *Abstract*, printed 1715, and which are chiefly these; viz. 1. ‘To rule and govern well those people who are desirous to be committed to their charge.’ 2. ‘To defend and protect both the clergy and the laity.’ 3. ‘To unite the clergy themselves, and reduce them to order.’ ‘And lastly, to confirm new converts from schism—“That the laity who have been initiated into the christian faith by baptism, may not only have the benefit of confirmation; but also in conjunction with the rest of the members of the church in those remote parts, be partakers of the benign influences of the episcopal function;” ‘in ordaining ministers from amongst themselves; in confirming weak brethren, and blessing all manner of people susceptible of such holy impressions, as are made by the imposition of the bishop’s hands †.’ As these are the reasons for bishops here, which the Society has published, it may be concluded this gentleman approves them all, though he has not so particularly mentioned them. It might be thought foreign, perhaps presumptuous, distinctly to examine the force of them; how much the episcopalians here, need to be well ruled and governed; how much both the clergy and laity need defence and protection against non-conformists; how much the clergy need to be united, and reduced to order. I was going to say something about the confirmation of new converts from schism, and of other weak brethren and sisters; the necessity of having episcopal ordination here; the benign influences of episcopacy in general; and of the blessings which all manner of people, susceptible of such holy impressions, might receive by the imposition of the bishop’s hands. But I forbear; and the rather, because I might probably express myself in such a manner, as to confirm this gentleman’s suspicion about the seriousness of my heart. For I am so conscious of my own infirmity, as to be almost certain that I could not speak of these things with quite so much gravity and solemnity, as he would think proper, in treating of matters so sublime, mysterious and sacred. They are therefore passed over with a bare mention.

† *Abstract* 1715, p. 53, 54.

The gentleman, I must own, has, in his scheme, set this proposal for American bishops in a more plausible; and less exceptionable point of view, than I have seen it placed in before. For,

First, He proposes that they should ‘ have no concern
‘ in the least with any *persons* who do not profess them-
‘ selves to be of *the church of England* ‡.

Secondly, He says, ‘ it is not desired in the least that
‘ they should hold courts to try matrimonial or testa-
‘ mentary causes, or be vested with any authority, now
‘ exercised either by provincial governors or subordinate
‘ magistrates, or infringe or diminish any *privileges* and
‘ *liberties* enjoyed by any of the laity, &c. ||’ but that
they should be intirely confined to such *religious* and
sacred offices as the aforesaid.

Thirdly, As to the place or places of the episcopal residence; he believes no *single person hath once named or thought of* New England, as a proper *place for the residence of a bishop*; ‘ but *episcopal colonies* have been always proposed *.’ And he thinks that such persons should be sent in this character, ‘ as are least likely to
‘ cause uneasiness †.’

This, he assures us, ‘ is the real and only scheme that
‘ hath been planned for bishops in America; and who-
‘ ever hath heard of any other, hath been misinformed
‘ through mistake or design §.’

To speak for myself, then, I am one of those who have been thus *misinformed*; and I know of others who have been so, in common with me. I did not suppose, the *true* scheme was, that American bishops should have no concern, but with *episcopalians*; or that they should be wholly confined to the *sacred offices* aforesaid. As to the *place* of the episcopal residence; I thought it not improbable, that if several bishops were sent, one of them would be stationed in *New England*, to confirm and ordain; and to *bless all manner of people* here, *susceptible*, &c. Let me add; since a mission was established at Cambridge, and a very sumptuous dwelling-house, for this country, erected there, that town hath been often talked of by episcopalians as well as

‡ P. 60. || Ibid. * P. 66. † P. 67. § P. 60.

others,

others, as the proposed place of residence for a bishop; which I thought not improbable. And I have reason to take it amiss that this gentleman, speaking of what I hinted about Mr. *Apthorp*, and a *superb edifice in a neighbouring town*, has impeached my integrity; suggesting that I did not entertain any such apprehension, as I expressed. He says, with a sarcastic air, on this occasion, 'So much *wit* and *archness*, how greatly soever the Doctor abounds in it, would have been too great a sacrifice to make to *dull truth* and *fact**.' He may be pleased to know, that he casts this aspersions on a man, who, unless he is quite a stranger to himself, would not sacrifice what he calls *dull truth* and *fact*, for any worldly consideration, not even to be an *Archbishop*; much less for the airy reputation of *archness*. Nor is this the only time by several, that he has accused me of being *witty*; a charge, but very little, if at all, deserved by me. However, I will not *retort* the accusation, though it is my real opinion, that if this gentleman never degenerates from good sense into down right wit himself, he sometimes makes alarming approaches towards it, and shews at least a strong *inclination* thereto; in which, I suppose, the essence of the *sin*, if it be one, chiefly consists.

But to return. I pretend not particularly and certainly to know, what the real scheme is, as to bishops in America. But certainly the non-conformists at least, of all denominations, have great reason to deprecate the appointment of any *such bishops* here, as not only I had an idea of, when I transiently touched upon this subject before, but as I suppose, people here have generally had in view, when this affair has been discoursed of. The scheme mentioned by this gentleman is, without doubt, liable to fewer objections; and he speaks of it with great assurance, as if he were at *head-quarters*, and certainly knew this to be the *real* and *only* one. Possibly this may be the case. But he is not *known*; nor has he informed us, upon what ground or authority he goes, in giving this account of the matter. The declaration of an *anonymous* writer, how confidently soever he may express himself, is not, surely, sufficient to satisfy us, that this is the *true*

* P. 66.

scheme planned. How much regard soever he might justly claim, if he were known to be a person of that eminence and dignity, which some of his expressions intimate him to be; yet while this is unknown, he will excuse us if we do not intirely rely upon his word, that no *other* scheme has been proposed. This may possibly be only his own scheme, the scheme of a private man: And, till it comes from better authority, or in a more authentic way, we may consider it as an imaginary one, calculated to serve a present turn, or to lull us into security as to bishops here, till, by the *real*, and much more *fatal* scheme's being carried into execution, it is too late to remonstrate.

But let us for the present take it for granted, that this gentleman's is the *real* and *only* scheme. Let us suppose, that bishops are to be *at first* sent to America with such limited powers, to reside in episcopal colonies, and to have no concern, but with episcopalians. Have we sufficient ground to think that they and their successors would, to the day of doom, or for a long time, remain contented with such powers, or under such limitations? in a word, that they would continue such inoffensive, harmless creatures, as this gentleman supposes; only diffusing *blessings* around them, on all manner of people *susceptible of such holy impressions* as are made by their *hands* on the good people in England; so that we can reasonably apprehend no mischief from them? Has this order of men been remarkable for a quiet, inoffensive behaviour? Have they usually been free from ambitious views and projects? from a disposition to intermeddle in secular, worldly matters, and to enlarge the sphere of their domination?—from attempts to encroach upon the rights of mankind, religious or civil? from intriguing with princes, or the governors of countries, for their own advantage? from lending their assistance, and joining with them, in carrying on schemes of oppression? Is it natural to suppose, that American bishops would long content themselves in a condition so inferior to that of their brethren, the *successors* of the apostles in England?—without any of their temporal power and grandeur, so as, in the eyes of most people, to appear of a lower order;

der ; and consequently wanting that authority and respect which, it might be pleaded, is needful ? Ambition and avarice never want plausible pretexs to accomplish their end. The gentleman says, he cannot perceive why the people, even of New England, ‘ might not as safely *‘ breathe the same air with a bishop, as their brethren in* *‘ Old England do. However (as he goes on) we are* *‘ unwilling to disquiet any of them, by importing and* *‘ settling amongst them a creature, which it seems some* *‘ of them account to be so noxious. Only we hope, that* *‘ his occasionally travelling through the country, cannot* *‘ infect it very dangerously ‡.’* One, of such a disposition as he proposes, might not. But what if, instead of this, he should be another *Sacheverel* ? no impossible supposition ! And such a man would probably be the most acceptable to the major part of the episcopal clergy, if not of the laity, in New England. Might not *He* be a very *noxious* creature, *infect* the country in travelling through it, and diffuse *plagues* instead of *blessings*, in his progress ? What the gentleman says upon this head, brings to my mind what I have read of that great church-man : ‘ When the *spiritual hydra* began to belch *‘ forth his poison, when the—priest went his progress,* *‘ the air was corrupted with his breath, and the fell con-* *‘ tagion spread itself far and near. The snakes which had* *‘ lain long in the grass, began to show their heads, and* *‘ hiss ; they stung many, and did much mischief, &c. *’*

I am very remote from suspecting, that this gentleman would think such a person a proper one for a bishop in America, or any where else ; since he appears to be of a very different spirit himself. And it is intimated by him, that we shall have no ground for apprehensions, since bishops here, if any there are, will be appointed by the crown, and intirely dependent on the government in England ; that *the smallest attempts towards an oppressive enlargement of spiritual power would be immediately crushed with indignation by the legislature there ;* and that *both the moderation of the clergy, and the watchfulness of the laity over them* [God be thanked, if it be so] *are much more likely to increase than diminish †.* These are good words, and

‡ P. 66.

* A Tract intitled *Priestianity, &c.*

† P. 65.

fair speeches ; nor do I doubt, but that the gentleman speaks his real sentiments. But supposing all this ; taking it also for granted, that in the *present administration*, there has been a discovery of so much wisdom and integrity, of such a great regard to the *liberties and privileges* of the subject, and, particularly, of *such a tender concern for the interest and prosperity of his Majesty's American colonies*, as leaves us no room to fear an *oppressive enlargement of spiritual, or any other power*, during the continuance of it : All this being taken for granted, yet may not times alter, and administrations change ? Who knows what the next reign and administration may be ? or whether attempts towards an oppressive enlargement of power, may not be as much encouraged, as it is supposed they would be frowned on, during the present ? We are certainly much more secure against such oppression, in the absence of bishops, than we should be if they were once fixed here. *Obsta principiis*, was never thought an ill maxim by wise men. Bishops being once fixed in America, pretexts might easily be found, both for encreasing their number, and enlarging their powers : And these pretexts might probably be hearkened to, and prevail ; on such a change of times as may be supposed. To say the least, this is much more to be apprehended, than it is, that, on such a change, bishops should be sent hither at first with such oppressive powers, or powers that interfere with the present rights and privileges of the *Colonists*. People are not usually deprived of their liberties all at once, but gradually ; by one encroachment after another, *as it is found they are disposed to bear them* ; and things of the most fatal tendency are often introduced at first, under a comparatively plausible and harmless appearance. It cannot therefore be thought strange, if we like the aforesaid maxim, as to *opposing the first attempts*, in the present case ; and are desirous to keep the apprehended evil at as great a distance as may be. All prudent men act upon the same principle : Nor can I bring myself to reason as he did, who said, *What hath posterity done for us, that we should be concerned for posterity ?* And should bishops be once fixed here, to me it is highly probable, that *our posterity* would not find it half

so difficult as this gentleman thinks it is for us now, before the experiment is made, to answer his *spirited* demands, ‘Where are the *persecutors*? Where is the *dragon*†?’ Especially if it be true, as many affirm, that *high-church, tory-principles* and maxims are lately *revived* in England; and favoured *greatly* by some, whose influence may go far toward bringing them into as much reputation, as they have been in disgrace since the death of Queen *Anne*.

The gentleman considers as perfectly chimerical, the apprehensions which I formerly hinted, respecting the inconveniencies that might result from the appointment of bishops in America. Particularly, that by the increase of the episcopal party, they might get a majority in our houses of assembly; that in consequence thereof the church of England might become the established religion of all these colonies; that a sacramental test or something like it, might ensue, to exclude non-conformists from places, preferment, and civil offices, *as in England*; and that taxes might be imposed on us all in common, for the maintenance of these bishops, and the episcopal clergy. I could not, however, imagine that these dangers were very near at hand in New England; nor do so now, considering the small proportion that episcopalians bear to protestants of other denominations. Should bishops be sent, and the Society bend its whole force to increase the church among us, it is not probable that these events would speedily take place. But even remote evils may be reasonably apprehended, as well as those which are imminent; and are to be guarded against, as much as may be. That appointing bishops for America, would be a probable means of increasing the episcopal party here, will not be denied. This is doubtless one principal reason, why it is so much desired; though neither this gentleman, nor the Society, so far as I can at present recollect, has particularly mentioned it. There is, however, something which looks a little this way in the *Abstract* before-cited, wherein the reasons for bishops here are enumerated; one of which is, ‘to confirm *new converts* from *schism* ‡.’ But even supposing a majority

† P. 65.

‡ *Abstract*, 1715. p. 54.

of episcopalians in the legislative body, in any [*I must not say either, because there are more than two*] of these colonies, the gentleman asks, ‘ Why should a test law follow? Is there any such law in the episcopal colonies? Or even though there were, can it be imagined, that if a prevailing party in New-England were wild enough to propose, his Majesty would ever be advised to pass one for that country *?’ Whether there is any such law already in any of the episcopal colonies, is with me a doubt. But by what I have observed of the over-bearing spirit of episcopalians *among us*, it is strange to me if there is not. The very *Candid Examiner* of my *Observations*, plainly enough intimated his desire of such a law here. And if there were a considerable majority of episcopalians in the legislature, with a zealous, not to say *bigotted* and *oppressive* episcopalian Governor at their head, and bishops in these parts to countenance and forward so *pious* a scheme for edifying the church; I make no doubt, but that the church of England would soon be established here by a provincial law, and a test-act speedily passed. Nor am I able to see any ground for the gentleman’s great confidence, that the King would not be advised to allow that test; seeing there is such a one in our mother-country. I presume, the gentleman could assign no solid reason for a test-law in England, by which *protestant* dissenters are excluded from offices there, which would not hold good in favor of a law of the same tenor here; I mean on the supposition of such an increase and majority of the episcopal party. Can what is supposed reasonable and equitable in Old-England, be supposed unreasonable and injurious in New? Or is it to be imagined, that the Head of the church of England would, at the desire of the legislative body in any of his colonies, refuse to allow of laws for establishing that church therein, and for introducing a test? laws manifestly adapted to the worldly grandeur, if not to the spiritual good of that church, which is as it were *his body*; and to bring in, if not to *convince* schismatics? If the gentleman was able, I could wish he had done something more to-

* P. 63.

ward removing our apprehensions in this respect, than to treat them with scorn; which is not the most likely method to convince those that think calmly of the matter.

He treats as still more wild and chimerical, the supposition of our ever being taxed in common, for the support of bishops and their clergy. Says he, ‘The terror of being taxed for bishops, &c.—is yet *more chimerical* than the former *.’ But in case of such an increase of the episcopal party, of the government’s coming into their hands, and of the church of England’s being here established by a provincial law, which things must be presupposed; where is the absurdity of such an apprehension? I can see none, except it lies in the *injurious* and *oppressive* nature of such a supposed tax: But this consideration will never prevent the doubts and fears of those, who reflect on what has been done in almost every age and country in christendom, by the prevailing religious party, for their own ease, and the further weakening and vexing the minority. The gentleman observes, that ‘tithes are paid in England to the clergy by virtue of grants, which laid that burthen upon estates many ages before the present possessors enjoyed them †.’ i. e. in the days of popery. He also expresses himself very positively, that if this had not been done, an act of parliament could not now be obtained, *of this or the like nature*, by which *dissenters* in common with others, should be taxed for the maintenance of the hierarchy. And having, for ought I can see, merely by his *peremptoriness*, compleated his victory in this respect, he immediately begins his triumph, by saying: ‘With what *modesty* then can the Doctor suggest, that such a thing might be feared in New-England ‡?’ I am very glad, if the governing part of the nation have so much moderation respecting protestant dissenters, that such an act could not now be obtained there; which might, as it appears to me, be justly looked on as a great hardship; or instance of oppression. It may naturally be supposed, this gentleman is of the same opi-

* P. 63.

† Ibid.

‡ P. 64.

nion:

nion: Why else could not an act of that nature be now obtained, if the hierarchy were not already provided for, by virtue of grants, when Popery was triumphant, which laid the *burthen* of tythes on estates? But I do not pretend to have a thorough understanding of the *doctrine* of tythes, as *professed* and *preached* in the church of England; never having made this any, much less a principal part of *my study*, however important an *article* it may be.

Be this matter as it may, while there is a law in force, which bears so hard on protestant dissenters, as the test does, I shall not easily be persuaded, that it would be impossible, if the hierarchy was not already provided for, to obtain an act for that purpose, by which the burthen should be laid upon dissenters in common with others; which, in some respects, might be thought a less grievance than the other: Particularly as it would be much less *reproachful* and *ignominious* to them, to be only obliged to pay to the support of a clergy disapproved by them, than to be treated as if they did not merit the character, and were therefore unworthy to enjoy the privileges, of British subjects; though it is well known, his Majesty, whom God preserve, *has none more loyal and faithful*.

But to return. If bishops are sent to America, they must be well supported; this is beyond doubt. By whom? or by what means? I suppose there is not yet a fund provided by legacies, near adequate to the support of one; it not being a *small matter*, that suffices such dignified and *apostolical* persons. The Society will probably think, this burthen should not lie upon them; as they are not able to support a sufficient number of missions among people, whose necessities are great and urgent. Is it likely then, that the British nation, so deeply plunged in debt, and in which there is scarce a possibility of laying any new taxes, will undertake to maintain bishops for America? No surely. Will the bishops and rich clergy in England do it, *out of their abundance*? This is at least as improbable; especially since it is supposed, that many of them cannot, to this day, be in-

tirely perswaded, but that it is rather *more blessed to receive than to give*. Will American bishops then, trust to the generosity of the people here; depending upon *providence* and *alms*, or, in other words, upon the goodwill of the Americans? Will they be content without *reaping* any other *carnal things* here, than what the people may judge an adequate recompence for the *spiritual things sown* by them; particularly, since bishops seldom *preach*, for *confirming weak brethren*, and for *those holy impressions* made by their hands, on *all manner of people susceptible thereof*? If this is all, or the principal part of what they receive, their maintenance will not probably half *satisfy* them; except perhaps at first, while wonderful effects are expected from their *blessing*, and the *benign influence of their function*. Nor will they run this risque, unless they have more faith in God, and less love to the *world*, than most of their order have had, since *Constantine the Great* became a *nursing father* to the church, and the pious, *maternal council of Nice* suckled her with the clear and pure, the uncorrupt and ‘*sincere milk*’ of *Homôousianity*, that she might ‘*grow thereby*.’ Can there then be a more probable supposition than this; that in consequence of the episcopal party’s increasing in these colonies, and becoming a majority in the legislatures, the church of England would be established by provincial laws, and the people in common taxed for the support of bishops and their clergy? Have we reason to think that, from brotherly affection and tenderness, for *schismatics*, they would exempt them from bearing a part of this burthen? I wish there was not more reason to apprehend, that they would oblige non-conformists to bear a double proportion of it; not, to be sure, out of any enmity, but only as an instance of *wholesome severity*, and a probable means of bringing them into the bosom of the church, to their eternal salvation—However, if a law for an equal tax upon conformists and non-conformists were passed in any British colony, for the purpose aforesaid, there is scarce any room to doubt, but that it would be confirmed by the crown: The Head must take care for the good of the body,

body, and all its members. Nay, if bishops were speedily to be sent to America, it seems not wholly improbable, from what we hear of the *unusual* tenor of some late parliamentary acts and bills, for raising money on the poor colonies *without their consent*, that provision might be made for the support of these bishops, if not of all the church clergy also, in the *same way*.

The gentleman having endeavoured to expose to ridicule the aforesaid apprehensions, as perfectly *chimerical*, and called my *modesty* as well as understanding in question, even for hinting them, immediately adds, ‘ Besides, ‘ would it have been a good reason at the *revolution*, for ‘ debarring the dissenters from the full exercise of their ‘ church government and worship, that if they obtained ‘ it, they might perhaps increase till they got a *major* ‘ *vote* in both houses, and then enact no mortal knows ‘ what *.’ These cases, it is conceived, are much too dissimilar, to argue thus from one to the other. The church of England had an exclusive legal establishment, at the time spoken of; the King for her Head, and sworn Protector, and almost all persons of interest and power for her members. Conformity was almost, if not the only path to preferment, civil honors, offices and emoluments. In short, the constitution both in church and state was so secured, so guarded both by laws and numbers, and non-conformists were so few, and under such disadvantages, that there was not room for any fear that they would ever increase so as to become the major and leading part in parliament, or be able, if they desired it, to over-turn the establishment, and oppress episcopalians. Apprehensions of this sort, would indeed have been perfectly *chimerical* at that time; especially considering the disunion of non-conformists among themselves, and the moral impossibility of their uniting, in establishing any other particular form of church government. What parity? what similitude is there between the circumstances of New-England and Old, in these respects? The cases are so widely different, that it is strange a gentleman of so much penetration and acumen

* P. 64.

should, by his manner of reasoning, suppose them parallel. We have no *such* ecclesiastical establishment, as that of England; and, I hope, never shall. Our churches have no royal Head and Protector, in the sense which that has;—*only ONE in heaven*, whom we pray to be the *Protector* of the other. We are not an independent people, or sovereign state, but dependent on England, wherein episcopacy is established, and which we honor and obey, as our mother-country. Our Governor, and all provincial Governors appointed by the crown, I suppose are, and by law must be, conformists to the church of England. A considerable number of persons, even in the N. England colonies, are persons of much wealth, influence and power. In most of the colonies, the respective Governors have all military offices at their free disposal, and the nomination to civil; and in some, a negative on the choice of counsellors. They must also be supposed, as a thing of course, most to favor episcopalians; so that conformity, instead of being a bar to preferment here, is perhaps generally found the readiest way to it. Episcopalianism may be, and often are, chosen members of both houses of assembly in the colonies of New-England; nor is there either law, or any thing else, to prevent this, if, by their qualifications and good behaviour, they can recommend themselves to the electors. And I hope this gentleman would not have the people *obliged* by law to chuse them, whether they approve of them or not; though this seems to be the amount of what he some-where says. Besides, the episcopalians here are more united among themselves than we are, being of different sects and parties. And should they [the episcopalians] hereafter approach any thing near to an equality with us in point of number, they will have the advantage greatly in this respect; since they may more easily unite their strength, in pursuing measures for their separate advantage, and to *our* common detriment, than we shall ours, in any particular methods of opposition to them: So that they may carry their points, even with *inferior* numbers; especially being most favoured by an episcopal Governor, whose

whose influence is ordinarily very great *out of court*, as well as his proper constitutional power *in it*.

Our circumstances being such, is there not a hundred, a thousand times, more reason to apprehend that episcopalians may in time become the major and governing party here, and enact such laws as I have been speaking of, than there was at the *revolution*, that the non-conformists in England might do the like there? I can hardly think that the gentleman, upon a little reflection, will disown it. Which being the case, the grand principle on which he sets out, in speaking of American bishops, is not applicable to the state of these colonies; at least, not by far, very far, so applicable as it was and is to that of England. The principle I intend, is this: That ‘all members of every church are, according to the principles of liberty, intitled to *every part* of what they conceive to be the benefits of it, intire and compleat, *so far as consists with the welfare of civil government* †.’ It is readily owned, that our apprehension of what may possibly or probably be the consequences of bishops being sent hither, ought not to put us on infringing the *religious liberty* of our fellow subjects, and *christian brethren*, if they will pardon this freedom: Neither have we any power to do so, if we were unreasonable and wicked enough to desire it; *our charter* granting such liberty to *all protestants*. But the episcopalians here may enjoy this liberty, as they now do, without bishops in America, though under some inconveniencies; principally perhaps, for want of *holy impressions* made by their *hands* in the ceremony of confirmation; their *lack* of which, it must be owned, is sometimes but too visible in their *behaviour*. We are therefore, methinks, very excusable, if we express a *reluctance* at the proposal of a scheme, which we really apprehend may bring great trouble and temporal inconveniencies upon us; and be the source of much division, discord and confusion: Especially, if it be also a scheme tending to promote that particular mode or profession of christianity among us, which we cannot but think, on the whole, much less conform-

† P. 59.

able to the gospel, and therefore less conducive to the eternal happiness of mankind, than that which at present generally prevails among us,

But one thing mentioned by this gentleman, in order to reconcile us to this scheme, had almost escaped me. It is this. ‘*Popish bishops reside here,*’ says he, ‘and go about to exercise *every part* of their function, without offence and without observation †.’ But this has a much less tendency to reconcile us to the proposal about American bishops, than to give us an alarm for the welfare of our mother country; with which, we are very sensible, our own is connected. If popish bishops exercise their function in England *without observation*, as the gentleman says, it is not indeed strange, if they do it also *without offence*. But I cannot readily comprehend what he means by saying, that they do this *without observation*, when at the same time he speaks of it as a notorious fact: Though his meaning cannot be mistaken, when he says, this is done *without offence*. It must be, that it gives no considerable umbrage or jealousy, but that the people, at least *those of higher rank*, are contented it should be so. For he speaks of this as an instance and proof of the mutual candor, forbearance and moderation, which prevail at this day in England, among christians of different denominations; and so, as a reason why we should be well satisfied with having bishops of the church of England in these parts. But if this proves any thing, it proves too much; *viz.* that we should be content to see, not only English, but Popish bishops, freely exercising their functions among us; the latter of which is not agreeable to our charter and laws. And though I am a warm friend to religious liberty in the largest sense; and though mutual forbearance cannot be too much recommended, where the differences are *merely* of a *religious* nature, or such as do not affect the liberty, safety and natural rights of mankind; yet I must own, I hope never to see popish bishops thus going about *without offence*, in New-England; being persuaded, from the very nature of divers popish tenets, that roman catholics cannot be *safely* to-

lerated in the free exercise of their religion, in a protestant government.

If I may be permitted to make a sort of digression here, does not the prevalence of popery in England, afford matter for *very serious reflexions*? The papists, only in London, were by computation an hundred thousand, in the year 1745. Since which, their numbers are vastly increased there, and in other parts of the kingdom; the people being, as it is said, perverted by popish bishops, priests, jesuits, &c. by hundreds and thousands, if not ten thousands, yearly. Nor is this, as it seems, done in secret, and in corners; but openly and boldly, as this gentleman intimates. And has not a *large* mass-house been built since 1745, in Stanhope-Street, May-Fair, London, contiguous to the house of the Neapolitan ambassador; which has a door always open to another street, on purpose to *accommodate the public*? What is become of the small, old, crazed popish chapel, called the Sardinian chapel? Was it not burnt two or three years ago, probably with a politic design, by the papists themselves, presuming that they had many friends, and but few zealous powerful enemies? I mean, with a design to rebuild, greatly enlarge and adorn it. Has not this actually been done? though, to be sure, not intirely *without observation*; since the chapel has now an organ, to catch the attention of the lovers of music. And has not that chapel been boldly spoken of in a public advertisement, doubtless by the papists, to invite the idle and curious thither, as *one of the HANDSOMEST places of WORSHIP about town*? Is it not surprizing, if these and such like things are, indeed, transacted in the metropolis, without any opposition from, or *offence* to, persons of rank? even the venerable bishops and Society, who are so zealous to support and propagate the protestant church of England *abroad*; and, according to this gentleman, so very solicitous to preserve the British colonies from *popish superstition and idolatry*?—even those colonies, in which there are *no popish bishops nor priests*, and hardly a *papist*! While they are so charitable to us remote Colonists, are these things done before their eyes *without offence*? Particularly

ticularly, do the popish bishops, without giving them any umbrage, go about to exercise EVERY PART of their function?—such as ordaining priests, uniting the [popish] clergy, making proselytes, confirming new converts from schism, with other weak brethren of that communion; and blessing all manner of people, susceptible of such holy impressions, as are made by the imposition of bishops hands; with many *et caetera's*! What? All this, without offence to such zealous protestants! How can that be?—Is popery more harmless in its nature and tendency, and therefore less offensive, now than formerly? Is it less dangerous, either to the souls or bodies of men? less perillous to the eternal salvation of its proselytes and professors, or to the temporal safety of protestant communities? If not, how can we account for these things being transacted without offence to such good protestants, as the venerable Society and bishops? How would America be better secured against popery, by having such bishops here? And if not against popery, how, against other pernicious errors? Or do their Lordships and the Society love New-England better than Old? or America better than Europe? Are they more solicitous for our welfare, than for their own, and the safety of the good people of England? Is the infernal gun-powder plot? are other treasonable and execrable conspiracies of English papists, forgotten? Is the horrid massacre of the protestants in Ireland? is that on *Black-Bartholomew* in Paris, one of which at least was ever applauded by the popes and papists*; no more remembered? Are all their diabolical treacheries and cruelties buried in oblivion? Can they who believe the Pope's supremacy over all Kings, and consequently deny the independency of the British crown and empire, possibly be good loyal subjects to King GEORGE, or any other protestant King? Are there no laws now in force against papists? or is there no-body to execute

* Le successeur de St. Pierre et son consistoire ne peuvent errer. Ils approuvèrent, célébrèrent, consacrerent l'action de la St. Barthelmi. Donc cette action était très sainte. Donc de deux assassins égaux en piété, celui qui aurait éventré vingt-quatre femmes grosses huguenotes, doit être élevé en gloire du double de celui qui n'en aura éventré que douze. *Traité sur la Tolérance.* By M. Voltaire.

them?

them? Is the sword of the law rusted in the hands of the magistrates, as well as that of the Spirit, where it is said so *rarely* to come, in the mouths of the prelates? One would suspect both, from the account this gentleman gives of popish bishops going about, to perform *every part* of their function *without offence*! But how will the gentleman well reconcile this with what he elsewhere says; that the Roman catholics *hate* the church of England *more* than they do others, ‘as the *most dangerous enemy* to their cause, and *strongest bulwark* of the reformation?’ * Surely, they have no reason to do so, if such things are transacted in England *without offence*. I could wish he had explained himself a little further, upon so interesting a point.

Possibly the gentleman, who can be very *arch* when he pleases, intended by writing thus, to give a public hint, that there was a blameable remissness in the protestant bishops and their clergy, if not in some *other persons*, with reference to popish bishops going about so freely, and to the great and dangerous increase of popery in England, without any *offence* taken thereat. I can, sometimes, hardly forbear looking on this as a designed, severe, and cutting, though disguised *satire*, on the prelates at least, if not on the administration. But whatever might be his real design, as to which I am in some doubt, one would think, that, according to the representation he has given, whether just or not, there was at this day in England great occasion for

‘honest zeal,
 ‘To rouse the watchmen of the public weal,
 ‘To virtue’s work provoke the tardy hall,
 ‘And goad the prelate slumb’ring in his stall.’

I am far enough from pretending to know, further still from presuming to say, what the true state of things *now* is in England. But it is sufficiently apparent, what have in times *past* been the reasons why the pernicious practices of papists, and the increase of popery there, have been winked at. At some times the King and the ministry, the principal bishops, and other ecclesiastical

dignitaries, together with some of the magistrates, have seemed really inclined to a thorough coalescence with the church of Rome: Witness some, at least, of the *Stuart-reigns*. At other times, it seems, a *corrupt, abandon'd* ministry have both had occasion for, and by concert received, the parliamentary interest of the wealthier papists: In consequence of which, and as a grateful return for the favor, if such persons can be supposed to have any gratitude, they have wholly connived at the practices and perversions of papists. The magistrates of course became less watchful, more remiss and inactive. The clergy, especially those of superior rank, and who aimed at riches or higher preferment, or both, observing this conduct of the ministry, and the path necessary *in commendam*, wholly connived also at the practices of papists, and the progress of popery; except perhaps they *coldly* appeared against them on certain days and occasions, of mere necessity and form. So that, at such times, cruel, *blood-thirsty* and *rebel-hearted* roman-catholics, had hardly any opposition made to them, or any thing to fear in England, either from law or gospel. A few learned, honest and active men, who aimed less at preferment in the church, than at the safety and good of their country, have indeed stepped forth at such times, to oppose this master-hydra of popery: But being mostly poor, with little influence or interest, and unsupported by their superiors, who ought to have been FOREMOST in this opposition, the public received but little benefit from their virtuous and heroic endeavours, exerted to a certain detriment in their promotion, and to their personal disadvantage. By such-like means has the *Scarlet-Whore*, with whom the Kings and great men of the earth have committed *fornication*, at certain seasons got fairly mounted on her *horned beast*, and rode, with the cup of *abominations* in her hands, almost triumphant through England: Seeming to want only a little more time, and a favourable concurrence of circumstances, by means of foreign or domestic broils and jarrings, to shew her execrable, infernal face in its most hideous attitudes, and to exert a bloody, fiery, diabolical strength; the

the utmost consequences of which, no one could foresee, but all had great reason to dread! Such has heretofore been the state of things in England. How it is at present, I pretend not particularly to know. But, as was intimated before, I could wish that my penetrating and able opponent, who is on the spot, had explained himself a little further, when he hinted that popery was fast gaining ground there, and appeared so boldly, yet *without offence!*

For this digression, methinks, he ought to be partly responsible, since he gave the occasion; and I hope he will be so good as to share the blame with me. It is not, however, I think, entirely foreign from my subject, as was hinted before: For, surely, bishops, or other persons, who are so little inimical to popery, as to take no *offence* at popish bishops going about to exercise *every part* of their function in England, if this be really the case, are not likely to be of much service to the protestant religion, in the character of bishops in America. I am very sure, there are none of our *unorthodox* New England clergy, but what would be both greatly *offended* and *alarmed* at such things; SOUND A LOUD ALARM to the people of their pastoral charge, and exert themselves to the utmost, to prevent the fatal effects that might be apprehended from the practices of *his* ministers and agents, *who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; and whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish.* But notwithstanding the great elevation and authority of the English bishops, this gentleman says, ‘That any of them are so high, as to *do harm*, or *cause fear*, by their elevation, the persons amongst whom they live, *find not* †.’ And in this, it is likely, the papists and popish bishops will agree with him, if it be true, as he intimates, that the latter exercise *every part* of their function *without offence* to them: Which may, perhaps, help to explain his meaning in these words.

† P. 5.

Possibly,

Possibly, though I am not willing to suppose, the gentleman may say of me on this occasion, as he did on another: ‘But why—such dismal apprehensions? why such outcries? where are the persecutors? where is the dragon? All the world must see, the Doctor himself must see, that this *declamation* is foreign from the purpose; and on his first recollection, he should have *been ashamed of it*, and have *struck it out*. But paternal tenderness would not let him destroy so *pathetic a rant* on so *darling a subject* †.’ The former, and this present *subject*, are not wholly *dissimilar*; I thank God they are not more nearly *alike*. With me they are both important, though in very unequal degrees. But if this gentleman and I had taken each other’s council as to *striking out*, on one side *pathetic rants* and *declamations*, and on the other, I will not say *unanimated*, but *cool*, yet *inconclusive reasonings*, it is probable that both our *Traacts* would have been reduced to a much *smaller* size: And who, on this supposition, would have had most grief, resulting from *paternal tenderness*, I cannot, and presume he will not, very positively determine.

I have freely and fully laid open my thoughts, such as they are, respecting the New England missions. I have also explained myself as to the proposition concerning bishops in America; and though not so fully, yet more particularly than I intended to do; having been almost compelled to it, at once by this gentleman’s formal attack upon a few expressions, which occasionally dropped from my pen, and by his great courtesy in attempting to propose my objections *distinctly for me*, because he thought I was *a great deal too vehement* to do it myself. By what has now been said, he may perceive, at least that he has not wholly dissipated ‘the poor man’s fears ‡,’ either by his reasoning or rallying on the subject. I have attended to his serious request, at the conclusion of his Argument—‘if he is *still dissatisfied*, I intreat him to consider, for all men ought, *what manner of spirit he is of* *.’ STILL DISSATISFIED I am;

† P. 65.

‡ P. 64.

* P. 67.

and,

and, I hope, from such a *spirit* as he will not wholly disapprove, however wrong he may think my *opinions*:—from a love to *truth*, cultivated in my early days; from a love to what I take to be the *most primitive christianity*; from a sincere concern for the *welfare of my country*; and an apprehension that this scheme of bishops, if put in execution, will be greatly *detrimental* to it, both in *civil* and *religious* respects. This, I think, is the *spirit*, from which my *dissatisfaction* chiefly arises. The gentleman has doubtless well considered, from *what spirit it is*, that he is *so much set upon this scheme of bishops*; and it would be very uncharitable in me, to conclude it a *bad one*; as I do not, whatever I may think of the scheme itself. However, I think it but justice to him to acknowledge, that if such a scheme as he has proposed were to be put in execution, and *only* such consequences were to follow, as he *professedly* has in view, as the ends aimed at, I could not object against it; except only upon the same principle, that I object against the church of England *in general*, and should be sorry, from a regard to what I suppose a more scriptural way of worship, to see that church prevail here: Which yet, I solemnly declare, I would not prevent, though it were absolutely in my own power, by any methods inconsistent with that full, entire liberty in religious matters, which I desire for myself; and which all men, whose principles or practices are not inconsistent with the safety of Society, have a right to enjoy. Thus far I have the honor fully to agree with this gentleman.

I hope I have not treated the gentleman with any rudeness or indecency. There is much good sense, good temper, candor and christian catholicism discovered in various parts of his Tract. The venerable Society, I believe, never had so able, and never will have a more able defender:

‘ Si Pergama dextrâ
Defendi possent, etiam hæc defensa fuissent.’

He has, I think, once or twice expressed himself *civilly* even of me, though never without blaming me at the
same

same time. I would not be wanting in a suitable return: But if it so happens, that the necessary consequence of attending to any gentleman's reasoning, is his appearing sometimes in a less advantageous light than at others, it is not difficult to see where the blame lies. Nor is the difference small, between going out of one's way, on purpose to give murderous thrusts to the *reputation* of a writer, and barely not preventing him from being too careless of it himself, and using it very unkindly, by undertaking to defend what is not defensible. This performance is doubtless, in all respects, much superior to any of those which *first* appeared against the *Observations* in America. And, upon the whole, by what I can learn, it is written with too much catholicism, and too little rancor against *me*, to be generally acceptable to the episcopalians among us: Which are probably the chief reasons, why there was so much difficulty in obtaining a *subscription* for reprinting it in Boston.

But though there is too much charity and moderation discovered in many parts of this Tract, to please the taste of some among us; yet, methinks, the gentle author has at times, *when off his guard*, used me in such a manner as might almost have *satisfied* them; and, possibly, upon a review of some passages, they may have an higher opinion of this performance in that respect; among which, I beg leave particularly to recommend to them the following, all relating to me and my *Observations*—‘ He contents himself with—reproachful names, and ludicrous representations; a likely method to please the prejudiced, and lead the thoughtless along with him.’ *Answer* p. 4.—‘ What he means—besides indeterminate abuse,’ p. 5.—‘ had better judge by the experience of others, than by his own heated imagination.’ *Ibid.*—‘ he hath not explained what his own [trade] is. But certainly reviling his brethren is a very bad one,’ p. 6.—‘ Some persons are strangely subject to violent gusts of passion—his malady hath a deeper root in his frame, and influenceth him more constantly’ p. 9.—‘ an artful design to procure him-
self

‘ self a dispensation for his outrages,’ *Ibid.*—‘ frequent
 ‘ and copious effusions of a bad spirit in his work,’ p. 10.
 —‘ place some part of his religion in railing at episco-
 ‘ palians,’ p. 31.—‘ according to the old custom of his
 ‘ party—of discharging misapplied texts of scripture in
 ‘ the faces of such as happened to offend them,’ p. 55.
 —‘ The poor man’s fears, if you will believe him, run
 ‘ to vastly farther lengths yet,’ p. 64.—‘ so pathetic a
 ‘ rant on so darling a subject,’ p. 65.—‘ wit and arch-
 ‘ ness— would have been too great a sacrifice [for him]
 ‘ to make to dull truth and fact,’ p. 66.

These and some other of his *compliments*, however agreeable they may be to others, I own, I do not very well relish myself; and the less, because they may possibly serve *in some measure*, to keep in *countenance* my American antagonists in this controversy; who have observed *no measures* in their abuses and invectives. But I can bear, without returning, such language as this; especially as this courtly gentleman intimates, that these ‘ freedoms’ should ‘ not be imputed to any *unkinder* motive *,’ than that *of shewing me to myself*; and that, if I ‘ amend upon admonition,’ so *tenderly* administered, I may be entitled to some *respect*. I desire to amend all my faults, which are far, very far, too many. Nor will I deny, but that I am in some measure desirous to procure respect, by fair and honorable means; especially respect from a person, for whom I have so sincere a one myself, as I have for my *kind* admonisher.

The gentleman, after having spoken of me in such terms as the aforesaid, is so charitable as to make an *apology* for me, by observing, that I *seem to have naturally a most vehement spirit*, and to have *imbibed, perhaps in my early days, equally vehement prepossessions against the very name of bishops, and every thing connected with them.*—‘ I am sensible,’ adds he, ‘ that these things plead in his ‘ *excuse* †,’ &c. My natural temper is perhaps too warm: And I own, that early in life, I imbibed strong *prepossessions* against diocesan bishops; i. e. if a full persuasion, the result of free enquiry and reading, that their

* P. 67.

† *Ibid.*

order itself is unscriptural, and that they have generally been a pernicious set of men, both to church and state, may properly be called *prepossession*. And if these things plead in my *excuse* for any unwarrantable expressions used by me, I am much obliged to the gentleman for his candor in suggesting it. What his own *early prepossessions* might possibly be, in *favour* of episcopacy, and some things *connected with it*, I forbear to conjecture; lest I should fall into a mistake that might be *offensive* to him: Which I chuse to avoid. If the gentleman labours under any *natural* foible, similar to that which he supposes in me, I am extremely desirous that he should reap all the advantage from it, as a plea in his *excuse*, that he charitably supposes I should reap from mine; and so, while he is far happier in many excellencies, may also have more cause to *glory in his infirmities* *. But if, on the contrary, he is naturally of a *cool, dispassionate temper*; though I sincerely congratulate him on his felicity in that respect, yet I cannot but express my sorrow, that this puts it out of my power to return his civility, by making as handsome an apology for some expressions that have escaped him, as he has made for some of mine.

I am indeed, even literally, a 'poor man,' as this gentleman calls me, I suppose, in another sense: And in that respect I have been publicly upbraided by some of the *very decent* writers against the *Observations*; nor has even the honest, irreproachable memory of my *Father* wholly escaped their insults. However, through the goodness of God, and the generosity of his people, I have a comfortable subsistence, with contentment; which, if but attended with *integrity* and *godliness*, is all the *gain* that my soul aspires after in this world. Let me add, on this occasion, that I had much rather be the *poor* son of a good man, who spent a long life and his patrimony in the humble and laborious, though apostolical employment of preaching the 'unsearchable riches of Christ' to *poor Indians*; and One, as I suppose, now at rest from his labours with 'the spirits of just men made perfect;'

* II Cor. XII. 5 & 10.

than even the *rich* son and heir of One who had, by temporizing in religion, and tampering with politics, by flattering the Great, and prostituting his conscience, made his way to a bishoprick, and the worldly dignity of a peer; how large a *bag* soever he had carried with him through a life of idleness and pride, of intrigue and luxury, or left behind him at death, the *black period* of all his greatness and glory.

The good gentleman concludes his performance in such a sensible, candid and charitable way, as does him great honor; and shews the amiable spirit of christianity in an advantageous light. I can, however, hardly suppose, that if he had ever seen certain outrageous publications of the American episcopalians against me, relating to the Society and the church, he would have expressed himself in so cautious and tender a manner as he has there done, after having reproved and admonished me, with some severity, *though only for my good*: Since he is doubtless as *kindly* disposed toward *them*, as toward me. ‘IF
‘ any writers on *our side*,’ says he, ‘ have been *less cool*,
‘ or *less civil*, than they ought, and *designed* [*to be sure*]
‘ to have been, we are sorry for it, and exhort them to
‘ *change their stile*, if they write again *.’ Methinks, One that appears partly in the character of a *moderator* and *peace-maker* among warm disputants, ought, not only to abstain from all such contemptuous and opprobrious language as he blames in them, but to be *impartial* in his reproofs and admonitions. For which reason I conclude, this worthy gentleman was an utter stranger to some late writings of the episcopalians here; which would, no doubt, if he had seen them, have extorted from a person of his mild, meek and gentle disposition, a *sharp rebuke*, instead of such a *gingerish exhortation*.

Though Mr. *Apthorp* kept to his prudent resolution, ‘ once for all;’ and has been *dead* as to this dispute, ever since he began it in form; this gentleman has revived the *remembrance* of him, by sometimes mentioning him, endeavouring to defend divers of his most unjustifiable positions, and blaming me for treating him ‘ un-

* P. 68.

‘mercifully; &c.’ All which I consider as the effect of his great *humanity*, rather than the result of his *deliberate* judgment. And though I have had frequent occasions, yet I have, as much as possible, avoided speaking of that gentleman; lest, in my own vindication, I should have been almost obliged to transgress the old maxim, *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*.

Plausible colors may be put upon almost any thing, however false or wrong in itself, by men of great ingenuity, and *fine sense*. But *plain, common sense*, with a competent knowledge of *facts* and *circumstances*, (which, to be sure, is the utmost that I can pretend to) and much more, an equal capacity on the side of truth and right, will ever have the advantage in an argument. This will, commonly at least, be able to shew, that round is not square, or black white; to strip a bad cause of the *ingenious* glosses put upon it; to puff away the dust, and brush off the flimzy, cobweb reasonings that are spread over it, to keep it from appearing what it is.

‘Spin all your cobwebs o’er the eye of day!
 ‘The muse’s wing shall brush them all away.—
 ‘All, all but *truth*, drops dead-born *from the press*,
 ‘Like the last *Gazette*, or the last *Address*.—
 ‘Not Waller’s wreath can hide the nation’s scar,
 ‘Nor Boileau turn the FEATHER to a STAR.’

‘That which is *crooked* cannot be made *strait*.’ I will not apply this; it will be done by others, if it is in any measure applicable to the case in hand.

But to draw to a close of these *Remarks*. Having, for some years, been not unacquainted with the religious state of New-England, nor unknowing to many transactions relative thereto; I have sincerely aimed at setting things in a true light, as to the missions here. A child may hold a candle to a man, or a weak and simple man to a wise one; and thereby be of service to him, while employed about matters of great importance and difficulty. If any thing has been offered by me, which, from the nature of it, justly claims attention, I hope it will not be entirely disregarded, on account of any disagreeable

able appendages. If I have said nothing that deserves any regard, I beg the venerable Society candidly to excuse my well-meant officiousness; as also to pardon any expressions used by me, which may seem not sufficiently respectful. I think, whatever faults I may have, (would to God they were much fewer!) I am not of a temper deliberately to justify any thing, too hastily said or done by me, after being convinced of the error. Though I may be thought to have said some harsh things about the members of the church of England, and am often blamed in that respect by my worthy *Answerer*; I have repeatedly declared, and again declare, that I highly respect and honor many of them, as persons of great probity, piety and goodness; particularly among those who were *educated in that way*. Whatever my opinion may be of the constitution and worship of that church, I should be extremely glad to see a friendly, obliging intercourse preserved between her members among us, and people of our own persuasion: And notwithstanding I am taxed with being uncharitable to, and *vehement* against them; I can say, with the sincerity becoming a christian, that whenever I happen to have any concern with any of them, who appear to me to be persons of principle and candor, not over-bearing and assuming, but willing to treat non-conformists as their fellow-christians and brethren; I take a very particular pleasure in shewing them all the tokens of affection, esteem and honor. But, I say it at once with grief and reluctance, I have much *seldom* found persons of this character among them, than I could have wished to do; and contempt and disdain on one side, very often produce the same on the other. However, I recollect a very just observation of the gentleman, to this purpose, That people of different religious sects and parties may *think* much too *ill* of, without at all *wishing ill* to, each other. Both these are faults, which ought to be carefully guarded against: If I have ever fallen into the *first*, I hope I am not chargeable with the *second*; which is far the most criminal and inexcusable. I likewise hope, we shall on all hands, as far as possible, put on that charity which *thinketh no evil*; which *suffereth long*,

long, and is kind; which envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up; which doth not behave itself unseemly; rejoiceth not in iniquity; but rejoiceth in the truth. No one can read the sacred oracles, unless he is spiritually blind, without clearly seeing that though we had all faith, as well as all knowledge, so that we could remove *mountains*, as well as understand all *mysteries*; though we had also the tongues of *angels*, as well as of men, and declaimed ever so loudly with them, either for or against any particular church; and yet had not *charity*, we should be but empty, noisy formalists in religion; mere *sounding brass*, and *tinkling cymbals*. And the words with which this gentleman concludes, though he may be but a *lay-man*, are certainly worthy the pen of the most eminent bishop in England, not excepting even his Grace the Metropolitan and Primate of ALL England*; whose christian *moderation* is not the least shining part of his respectable character: ‘It is the duty of all men,’ says he, ‘how much soever they differ in opinion, to agree in mutual *good will*, and *kind behaviour*.’ Would to God that all bishops had, and that all protestant bishops at least, would, preach the same good doctrine, and practise according to it: The former might in a great measure have prevented uncharitable divisions in the christian church; the latter might go far towards healing the present animosities among protestants; and lead them to unite in love, and point their force against infidelity on one hand, and popery on the other: Both how necessary!

And thus I take leave for the present, I hope for ever, of this controversy, of which I am heartily weary; though

* This being a title commonly given to the Archbishop of Canterbury, may be one reason why Mr. *Apthorp* spoke of him only, as *presiding over the church of England*, [See page 10, 11, of these *Remarks*.] For this, doubtless, gives his Grace some pre-eminence above the Archbishop of York, who is stiled only, *Metropolitan and Primate of England*. And this seems to have been long a settled point; though in former ages there was much *graceless* contention between their Graces predecessors, for *the highest seat in the synagogue*, and *the uppermost room at feasts*; or for rank and precedence in the CHURCH and COURT.

not from a conviction that I have been on the wrong side, in any material point. If any person, without having something that is both *new* and *weighty* to offer upon it, shall write and publish, merely for the sake of having the *last word*, I beg to excuse myself from being his opponent: I will not contend with him for that *point of honor*; especially if he will be so *ingenuous* as to own, that he writes for *that end*. The author is not solicitous, on whose side the *last word* is, if barely the *truth* is on his. If, by any thing hereafter published, he should be convinced that he has been materially in the wrong, he will publickly acknowledge it; and give the venerable Society all the satisfaction in his power: But One who has written so much upon the subject already, may surely be contented hereafter with only *thinking himself in the right*, without again telling the world his opinion. And if he had used as much *art* on one side, as *some persons* have on the other; and played the hero as successfully as they seemed very sure *They* had done, he might not improperly put a period to this *Second*, and, as he hopes, *Last Defence*, with,

—————Hic Victor caestus *artemque* repono.

But instead of that, he submits the whole, with all proper deference, to the judgment of the reader.

T H E E N D.

ADVERTISEMENT

THE foregoing *Remarks* may possibly fall into the hands of some public-spirited gentlemen of ample fortunes abroad, who heartily wish well to New England in all respects, and particularly to the encouragement and increase of *Learning* there. The Author therefore, not without the advice and request of some gentlemen among us, whose opinion has much weight with him, takes this opportunity just to mention, the very grievous loss which *Harvard College* in *Cambridge*, near *Boston* in *New England*, lately sustained in the entire destruction of one of its buildings by fire, together with the whole and valuable *Apparatus* for experimental Philosophy, and the whole public *Library*, a very valuable one, excepting a few books which happened to be out of it at that time; and how gratefully and respectfully any expression of their good-will to that College, toward repairing so heavy a loss, would be received.

Boston, June 20, 1764.

J. Mayhew.