

A
SECOND LETTER

To the CONGREGATIONS of the
Eighteen *Presbyterian* (or *New-Light*)
MINISTERS,

Who wrote the late Contradictory LETTER to the
Archbishop of Canterbury ;

With some REMARKS on the
TWO PERFORMANCES
That have appeared in THEIR DEFENCE:

By an old Covenanting and true Presbyterian LAYMAN.

A Whip for the Horse, a Bridle for the Ass, and a Rod for the
Fool's Back. PROV. of SOLOMON xxvi. 3.

P H I L A D E L P H I A :

Printed by ANDREW STEUART, at the Bible-in-Heart in
Second-street : 1761.

Where may be had, I. A true Copy of the genuine Letter, with
the Remarks thereon. II. The Machanicks-Address to the
Farmer. III. The Conduct of the eighteen Ministers set in
a clear Light.——all on the same Subject.

A Second Letter, &c.

My dear Brethren and Fellow Christians,

✱✱✱ **I** T is the greatest happiness and satisfaction I can enjoy in this world, next to the testimony of a good conscience, to find that my poor endeavours to open your eyes and rectify your understandings, have been so remarkably blessed, and favoured with such a candid reception from so many thousands of my fellow christians. The general call for my Letter, from all parts, and the many editions it has passed through in the space of a few months, has indeed not only exceeded my warmest hopes, but is the strongest proof, that the voice of the public is in my favour.

Encouraged by the approbation which my first performance has met with, I beg leave to address you a second time, and humbly intreat you to hear me with coolness, and to exert yourselves like honest *Presbyterians*, in support of the doctrines and discipline of our church, in opposition to all the undermining timeserving and low cunning of these eighteen men and their abettors, who are privately endeavouring to sap the credit of both.

I consider it as a happy omen of my success, to find that the scales of strong delusion, which formerly blinded your eyes, begin now in a great measure to be removed; that you can exercise the powers

powers and faculties of your own minds without prejudice or partiality; that an implicit faith doth not prevail so much as formerly; that you are become cool and dispassionate, and are willing to weigh the force of every argument by the plain rules of *scripture* and *reason*.

I know my brethren, that these men, who find many of their selfish schemes discovered, and their spiritual dominion like to be destroyed by means of my labours among you, have taken uncommon pains to represent me as an enemy to *Presbyterianism* in general, and as an undermining *Churchman*; nay, as a many-headed monster, made up of the whole *Prelatical Clergy* combined together as one man---But to do what? Why, to expose eighteen *new-light Ministers*.

But this requires no formidable combination, and the quiet behaviour of these prelatical clergy towards their Presbyterian brethren, and more especially when our disputes were at the highest in this country, shews the great rashness and impropriety of charging any thing of this kind upon them as a body without the fullest proof. Could my word be taken in this case, I do assure the world, that what has been published under my name, is the work only of *one* man, and such as I profess myself to be, namely an *old Covenanted and true Presbyterian Layman*, notwithstanding the false aspersions published against me in a late pamphlet, wherein the author appears as void of truth, as justice and candour. He charges the covenanters with being as great enemies to the synod of Philadelphia as the papists:--*with being Enemies to the civil Government*--and finds fault with me for giving the eighteen
new,

new-light ministers no other title, than “ your teachers, &c.” But does any Roman Catholick acknowledge presbyterian ordination? And if his first assertion be true, that we no more acknowledge the synod than the papists do, where is the impropriety of calling them, your teachers? but these are trifling charges, in comparison of being accused, as rebels, and enemies to our king and country. This in plain English is, that we ought all to be hanged out of the way, to make the more room for our new-light pretended brethren, whose *holiness* gives them a better title to the things of this world than any other denomination. But to wipe off this persecuting aspersions which smells strong of popery and the inquisition, let any one read the Rev’d. Mr. Thomas Clark’s *New-light set in a clear light &c.* wherein our loyalty and affection for the Hannoverian succession is fully demonitratred against the same malicious accusations in *Ireland*, more especially during the whole time of the last rebellion in *Scotland* (*b*). This author asserts that the Covenanters are under the care of Mr. *Cutbberston* in this country ; But what can be more untrue? Did ever the *Seceders* acknowledge him as

(*b*) By an act pass’d and printed at Edinburgh, 1745, the covenanting ministers expressly say, “ We assert and declare
 “ that we ought to acknowledge the present civil authority
 “ over these nations, and subjection thereto in lawful com-
 “ mands ; And Do Hereby Condemn the dangerous Extreme
 “ that some have gone into, of impugning the present civil
 “ authority and subjection thereunto on opinion and practice
 “ contrair unto the plain tenor of scripture, and to the known
 “ principles of this church in her confession and Covenants.”
 Now did ever the New-lights pass a more express act of loyalty and duty to civil authority than this?—or have they ever passed any public act at all :————— their

their Head? And are they not as good covenanting Presbyterians as any in the world? But such is the ignorance, or malice of this new-light pedagogue that has undertaken to write against me. But be my profession what it will, how does this in the least affect the merits of the cause? The conduct of these eighteen men is exactly the same, neither more nor less, better nor worse.

The only question with you, my brethren, should be, Whether I have represented them fairly and justly? This ought at least to be *supposed, till the contrary is proved*: Nor have I any other view in this second Address to you, than to defend my first, and treat you as a skillful physician does weak patients; namely, by the frequent application of cordials to prevent a relapse, and restore you to your primitive soundness in the faith, from which you have been sadly led astray these many years, by men pretending to have found a shorter and safer *cut* to heaven than their neighbours, or than reason and scripture seem to direct.

So far am I from being an enemy to *Presbyterianism*, that I profess myself a most sincere friend to it in its truly ancient and proper sense; but then I freely declare that I am no friend to those professors of it who have been distinguished these many years for nothing so much as being devouring caterpillars in God's heritage; and who, in this last instance of writing privately to the arch-head of the prelatical church, ascribing to him the vain titles of Grace, and *declaring that they do not differ from him in essentials*, have given a stab to the very vitals of our good old cause, and verified all that has been alledged against them these

twenty years past by their own brethren ; namely, that they were busy medlers in other men's matters, and common disturbers of the peace of all churches, in order to advance their own worldly views.

It was my real dislike to the principles and practices of these men, that first drew me into print ; and judge now, whether I am not justly called upon in this second Address, to publish truths which I would willingly have suppressed, were it not to avoid the charge of acting from prejudice or caprice.

I would intreat you yourselves, my Brethren, as impartial persons no way attached to a party to reflect upon the follies, contradictions, and absurdities of these men since their first springing up among us : and how strangely they have bewildered their followers and led them away after a Jack-a-Lantern that conducted oftner through sloughs, ditches, & destructive precipices, than in the beaten path, or on plain ground.

What wretched folly was it for these men to publish to the world that they had a commission from above to judge of people's spiritual attainments, conversation, experience, &c. and with an air of assurance pronounce them happy or miserable according to their whim, caprice, or as they might be paid for it. Will future generations believe that there were men in the present, that called themselves protestant ministers, who dared to pronounce (what you yourselves have often heard) *That there were children in hell not above a span long ? And that Damnation was painted in your locks ?* Or will they believe that in a protestant free

free country, there could be people so stupidly ignorant as to credit such horrible doctrines, calculated for no other meridian than the dreary regions of Popery, or Mahometan and Egyptian Darknes.

How often have these men, and their abettors, shifted principles, both in doctrine and discipline?

Are not the Altars erected against Altars in the different parts of *America*, lasting monuments of their enmity to the peace of the Presbyterian church?

---Have not they gone from congregation to congregation, from one province to another, compassing sea and land to make a proselyte; persuading people to erect new meeting-houses within call of, and in order to demolish, the old ones, under a notion that the settled ministers of these places, were carnal unconverted wretches, and therefore they and their families ought to be turned out of their congregations, and sent a begging, to make room for these blessed saints?--

Have they not tossed about their own wild-fire, instead of that light which came from above?

----Have not all the madness of a disturbed brain, the phrensies of a deluded imagination, deliriums and convulsions, been deemed so many tests and marks of conversion?----Have they not asserted that a progress through immorality, infidelity, atheism, spiritual desertions, despair, doubtfulness, deadness, dryness, darkness, and barrenness, was the gate of happiness, and the way to life?---Have they not taught that the new birth must be brought to pass by means of real tortures, and some of the most exquisite pangs and sufferings that can affect human nature, even a willing-
ness

ness to be damned and suffer all the pains of Hell-fire before they are capable of receiving grace? Have not the Heroes of this scheme cried up Arminians, Antinomians, Moravians, Quakers, and Episcopalians, as dear children of God, and at the same time condemned pious and sound orthodox Calvinists? Have not these Sampsons of the age, mounted the pulpit, and each with the jaw-bone of an ass, knocked down his thousands among his hearers, like pigeons from a corn stack?---some tumbling and kicking; some lying without sense or motion, grinding their teeth, foaming at the mouth, lolling out the tongue, and screaming in such a frightful manner, that a stranger at a distance would have been apt to imagine that there were five hundred women in labour, or as many men cutting for the stone!---and yet after all, have they not agreed to join the synod of *Philadelphia*, whom they condemned as wicked and unconverted, and preached to their people to avoid hearing them, at the peril of their damnation?---Nevertheless, has the old synod given any other signs of conversion at the late union than they did twenty years ago?---Have they not rather all along maintained the same steady principles both in doctrine and discipline?---Now the original separation, and all the clamour made by these eighteen men and their associates for so long a time to keep it up, must either have been right or wrong. If right, why did they not persevere in it? If wrong, why don't they make a publick and candid recantation of all the wild doctrines they have taught? How must they imagine that you their hearers felt, when you saw the ministers
of

of the old side first introduced into your churches again, after all the clamour that had been raised against them ; and against whom, both in public and private, they had been pouring forth so many bitter and reviling speeches to you ; and who, after being *be-deviled* by them for almost twenty years, were *All sainted* in a day ? These teachers of yours must all this while have been paid for weaving you a fine spiritual web. Will you pay and employ them as long, in un-raveling and taking it to pieces ? If you do, you will certainly mis-spend both your time and your money very foolishly, and discover a greater degree of implicit faith than all the Catholics in the world. What ! *un-preach* to-day what they preached yesterday ? The first or the last must certainly be false ; and we may cease to wonder at the prodigious progress of the *Alcoran* over the Eastern world, when we find contradictions and impostures fondly received among protestants-Christians in the Western world.

I am sure, if any people under the sun have a just claim to pity and the prayers of true christians, it is you who are the new-light Laity. You have been taught that a sanctified appearance, a whining cant, strong lungs, and an holy twang of the nose, were principal requisites in a compleat preacher. But, thanks be to God, you have so far got the better of this strong delusion, which was heretofore cast before your eyes, that you do not now pin your *faith* to the sleeves of any particular set of men, and have opportunities of hearing those who have far higher accomplishments than the above, and have all along been uniform in their conduct. Beware, therefore, of a

R

relapse

relapse into your former error. It is said of the prophet *Mahomet*, that on a journey he was once taking to heaven, he refused every kind of vehicle to be conducted thither with, excepting his *Ass*. Let not the moral of this story be applied to you in the future choice you may make of your spiritual conductors : Nor yet the vulgar story of *fies*, who, after they have by chance, been feasting on a honey-pot, will return with the same relish, to finish their meals on an excrement.

So far by way of Introduction.----- Let us now take a more particular view of the *fimley* performances which, after several months hard labour, with hammer and tongs, have appeared against me.---The first, tho' father'd upon a poor Mechanick, is the well-known performance of a certain reverend Gentleman, whose toes, it is said, the witches carried away one night while he was asleep. (a) What a pity they did not take his fingers also, as in that case I might have been saved the disagreeable task of wading through his dirty scribble.---The other is the product of a very great man, heretofore known by the name of the *juggle-finger'd jidder* and *dridling dancing-master*; but of latter days, better known by the title of *Siabbering S---m*, or the CURSING PROPHET.

But, my Brethren, you your selves being judges; what have these men said in defence of their

(a) However ludicrous this story may appear, it is a fact well known to all the gentleman's neighbourhood, and a certain ballad was made on the occasion; beginning as follows;

“ Come listen to my story,
 “ A woeful tale I tell;
 “ A certain wight, one frosty night,
 “ Went to his bed with ten toes on,
 “ Ea. in the morning wak'd and found one half gone.”

their fellow teachers? Why just nothing at all! The first sets out very learnedly indeed, for a Mechanick; and makes a great pother about what he calls ten Postulates; by which some of his readers have been led to conclude that I have ten Postules on my nose; and others, that ten of the Apostles are against me.

In this part of his work the reverend Mechanick has shewn a wondrous talent at reasoning. He quotes scraps of sentences from my letter, suppresses the conclusions I had made, and palms any thing that strikes his own senseless fancy, for conclusions, not made by me indeed; but to use his own words, "gathered from my letter." I will give an instance or two of his faithful way of gathering.

I say, (p. 5, 6) That "they allow Grace to a
 " prelate of another church, a title never given
 " to Christ or his apostles---that this is either a
 " sin, or not a sin. If it be a sin, why do they
 " allow it? If it be no sin, why do they not
 " take it to themselves." The plain inference from all this was, that out of worldly views and horrid adulation, they allowed an arch-prelate that which they had never allowed to a true old Presbyterian minister. [See p. 7.] But what does our reverend Mechanick, in his way of Gathering, conclude from all this? You have it in his own words, as follows, viz.---"The A--h-b----p is a
 " prelate of the church of England, therefore
 " he cannot be supposed to have any grace."

Again when they say, "This A--h-b----p is a
 " catholick friend to truth, and that they agree
 " with him in fundamental doctrines;" I mention
 some

some *fundamental* truths and doctrines of his, which they must be church betrayers if they agree with him in; namely, “denying a parity of
 “gospel ministers, and the divine right of Pres-
 “byterian ordination.” But what does our Mechanick gather from this? Why, something directly opposite to it; for he makes me write thus--

“The A--h-b---p denies a parity of gospel
 “ministers, and holds episcopal ordination to be
 “apostolical; therefore he can be no friend to
 “truth at all.”---

This is a rare way of reasoning, and after such specimens of our Mechanick’s honesty, it would be needless to wade thro’ his insipid performance any further. The charges which I brought against the Eighteen, stand yet wholly unanswered, and in order to refresh the reader’s memory, I shall just repeat the substance of them:

1. They allow grace to a man out of vile flattery, and without ever sending a deputation of their own body to examine his spiritual experiences, at the same time that they deny that title to our own godly ministers; and therefore they are deceitful double dealers.

2. They call him a catholic (or universal) friend to truth, that is a friend to all truth; and yet by the principles of *his Church*, he denies the fundamental truths that distinguish us as true Presbyterians; and therefore they are our secret enemies.

3. They sign a letter, requesting him to *induct* one of his own clergy into a church, without any *election* or *call* from the people; which *induction* they must be sure he would perform in the usual method

method of *indulging* in his own church, by meer authority, and in a manner directly opposite to Presbyterian-church-government ; and therefore they presume to sap the very foundation of our discipline, and the sacred right of the people, to chuse and settle their own ministers.

4. Out of their unlawful desire to have this abominable thing done, they *pray* earnestly to this A--h-b---p, as if to some superior Being ; and therefore they seem guilty of a sort of idolatry.

5. They recommend a man as very pious, who has renounced his ordination vows when he was a Presbyterian minister, trampled upon the discipline of our church compiled by our godly Reformers ; and gone over to the prelati cal church of England. Nay, after he had entered into that church, they declare further, “ That he was a
 “ successful and popular advocate for religion,
 “ that remarkable blessings attended his ministry,
 “ in some striking instances of unquestionable
 “ reformation from vice and infidelity ; and that
 “ they themselves were *witnesses* of those things,” when not above one or two of them had the least acquaintance with the man before, or had been *witnesses* to any part of his conduct, and therefore they have been guilty of a very great and premeditated falshood in their Letter.

6. These eighteen new-light ministers represent to this A--h-b---p, that they are so happy as to agree in the fundamental doctrines of religion with that church over which his Grace [N. B. here they call him *Grace* again] presides ; and that so extensive and warm is their regard for these fundamental doctrines of the said church,
 that

that no *lesser matters or selfish attachment* to a party can extinguish. From all which strange language I concluded, my dear Brethren, that these Eighteen were no Presbyterians at all; that they looked upon all our consciencious scruples as a *selfish attachment to a party*; and that seeing we were agreed with the English church in fundamentals, it was very weak and idle to differ from her for lesser matters. And thus have these men, in one fullsome undermining, crafty and time-serving letter, complimented away to that church all that we and our fathers, and our godly reformers have been so long contending for.

Our Mechanick says, he wants *clearness* in these things, and this may possibly be true, for he that has no *clearness* in his own arguments will scarcely have it in the arguments of another. Being convinced therefore of his own incapacity for a work of *clearness*, he next tries his hand at a work of *darkness*; namely, at railing, calumniating and defaming the characters both of the dead and living,---a sure sign of a weak and disappointed foe. Tho' he had before signed a Letter declairing his agreement with the prelatical church in fundamentals, and that he loved the church of England so vehemently, that no *selfish attachment to a party should extinguish it*: Yet now that he meets with a rub from that quarter, he falls foul of all her clergy at once, as the only method left to convince his people he was no church of England man. Only one man living, and but two dead, are found to have grace and soundness; others are "vain and vicious in their lives, insipid and "unsound in their doctrines, scandalous creatures,

“ tures, liars, dunces, *Arminians*,” and the like. All this is nothing but dirt pick’d out of the *Nottingham* [alias *Crow-Egg*] sermon, and others of the same stamp, thrown at the old Presbyterian ministers this twenty years past, and now made use of for the same purpose against the prelatical church; specimens of which I gave in my former Letter. But in my opinion, such gross and general calumnies seem to deserve no answer, because they prove nothing at all; nor would I have given myself any trouble about them, had I not become the innocent cause of their being thrown out.

This Mechanick and his *supple-finger’d* *fidling new-light brother*, have been a scribbleing and bespattering almost every denomination of protestants in this country these many years; (*Roman-Catholicks* they have said nothing against, how far they are in league with them let the world judge) *covenanting and old Presbyterians, Baptists, Quakers, and now prelatical Church-men*, have all been asperied by these men. The excrements of their brains are flung indiscriminately at every profession they don’t like, just like *bedlamites* who cast about that of the *Os-sacrum*, as they suppose, at the by standers, but it generally returns upon their own heads.

Two of the prelatical clergy are, however, more particularly pointed at, with seeming bitterness and wrath. “ The first is said to have got £ 20
 “ annaxed to his salary for writing *a lie* to En-
 “ gland, respecting exploits done by others in de-
 “ fending the frontiers,” which exploits he called his own. As this is something foreign from my
 present

present purpose, I shall only beg leave to ask a few questions of our reverend *Mechanick* on the subject, with a view still further to shew his stupidity and inconsistency. When he thus gave the lie to another, how could he be possibly sure that he was writing truth himself? How could he tell what any person wrote to England unless he had seen their private letter. If an addition of *twenty pounds* was given in this case, might it not have been bestowed for the same reason that the like additions were said to have been made in many other frontier missions, as well as for writing a lie; namely, because in such times of public calamity the people were unable to perform their contracts to their missionaries? But I am told that this matter was quite otherwise, and that there never was any additional salary given to the prelati cal missionary hinted at, and that his salary was from beginning to end £.50 per annum and no more, for the truth of which the society's books are quoted.

As to exploits done on the frontiers, I cannot but laugh to hear our reverend *Mechanick* mention them; for whatsoever else he may alledge against the prelati cal missionary he is so angry at, one thing I myself am certain of, that he stuck by his people and his post to the end of our disturbances; while our *Mechanick*, on the first breaking out of them, was so tender of his *skeleton* and his few remaining *toes*, that he packed off bag and baggage, and left his people and the Savages to fight it out between them.

The charges brought against the other of these prelati cal clergy, are "his having studied the
" law,

“ law, his being too vain and dull to be accept-
 “ able to Presbyterians, his forging their creden-
 “ tials, preaching to an ignorant people till he
 “ got a little money, and then marching to the
 “ Bishop for orders.” Now I cannot see how any
 of these things help to vindicate the Eighteen
 from the charges I have brought against them,
 nor how they came here at all ; but since our Me-
 chanick will offer such things as answers, I must
 take some notice of them. And in the first p ce
 then, I think I never before heard that the study
 of the law was reckoned a crime in any man.
 Are not the laws systems of morality, composed
 by wise men for the good of society ? And was
 not our great *Calvin* himself, and others of our
 godly reformers, eminent lawyers and *civilians* ?
 As to the gentleman’s being too vain and dull to
 be acceptable to the new-light Presbyterians, I
 think I remember the time when he passed muster
 with approbation among them ; prayed and read
 in their private meetings, and was in high esteem
 with them ; and it must be something else than
 dullness that enabled him to break thro’ the fetters
 of an education received so early in his youth a-
 mong them. As to his forging their credentials,
 he would have been very silly to have chosen
 theirs, because he could not but know that the
 credentials of the whole party were in so small
 esteem that they would not procure a man a pint
 of beer all the way from *Nisbamary*(a) to *Boston*.
 And I am well informed that such as their creden-
 C tials

(a) A place in Pennsylvania, the original seat of the new
 light Log-College, that is now become a great building at
 P...t-a in New-Jersey.

als were, he received them freely from them, as well as from others of more consequence.

But what is all this to the business in hand? And I wonder that when our wrathful Mechanick betook himself to this manner of bringing *railing accusations*, instead of fair answers, he did not consider what an opening he has given to these prelati- cal clergy, to pay him back in his own way.

Suppose they in return for the treatment they have received, should also call from the *dead* some of the most soul-ravishing, sin-confounding, heart-purging preachers (according to our Mechanick's scheme) that this country ever produced; men denominated sons of thunder, who besides the common requisites for converted ministers, pretended to extraordinary calls from heaven to set a whole country in a flame; sentencing the settled ministers where ever they went, as carnal dumb dogs, unfit to lick up their spittle, &c.---And suppose they should go farther, and make the records of civil courts speak, as well as the records of your own presbyteries, producing to the world prosecutions for adultries, fornications, perjuries, and the like. Suppose they should muster up also prosecutions for burning of pious books, petticoats and laced hats, under the pretence that every man and woman should burn their god, with such-like freaks of religious madness that exceeded even that of the *Munster Enthusiasts*--- I say, supposing all this, what chance do you think your teachers would stand? Do you imagine that even the righteous Eighteen themselves would escape? No, my Brethren! for some of the most eminent of them, though afterwards acquitted, were the
unfortunate

unfortunate subjects of some of these prosecutions, and that too in the midst of all their pretensions to superior sanctity and divine illuminations; and against many of the rest, sufficient matter for scandal might be raked up. One, for instance, might be shewn taking out above fifty warrants for his stipend, and begging hard to be appointed *Constable* to execute them also; with many other things of the like kind, which would, I am sure, enable these prelatical men, if they knew the Eighteen as well as I do, to take ample amends for this Mechanick's abuse---And would I not be justified to do so myself at this time, considering the heavy charge brought by these men against the *Covenanters*? But what would the cause of truth or religion be benefitted by all this? *Personal scandals*, and raking into the ashes of the *dead*, are what I would not willingly be drawn into, unless by great provocation. The cause of Presbyterianism, and not the characters of men, is now the subject of controversy. I have laid before you, my Brethren, an original letter, and many stubborn facts relating to your teachers, and these I conceive are far from being answered by the scurrilous attempts that have been hitherto made for that end.

The next thing the author of the Address takes offence at, is my asserting that several of the eighteen new-light ministers are illiterate mechanics; "the world, he says, are too well acquainted with their abilities"---At the *shuttle*, the *needle*, and the *last*, he must certainly mean. But will, this prove (says he) that "they had not a regular education?"---To be sure it will.--For do these
men

men pretend to have such prodigious gifts and endowments of nature that they may jump from behind a *screen*, or *hide of leather*, in a year or two, without a regular education in a college, and spring up an Apostle, and go forth a preacher of the Gospel?—"But this calumny, we are told, strikes at the great apostle *Paul* himself, for he was a tent-maker." But notwithstanding all this, he was brought up at the feet of *Gamaliel*, one of the most learned Rabbies of the Jews, and was regularly taught many languages, and instructed in the sciences to such a degree, that the Roman governor thought that *much learning made him mad*.---I shall readily grant that the same power which was able to call the prophets and apostles, is still able to call men from the *shop-board*, or *pedling-pack*, and make them sound preachers of his word.---But if God thought it necessary in the first ages of his Gospel to bestow his gifts upon the *simple* and *illiterate*, is it to be inferred from thence that he does so still? or does the church of *Scotland* believe, or practise any such doctrine?---does she not prescribe strict rules for the education of youth for the ministry, and the examination of candidates for ordination? are they not to be set aside, let their spiritual pretensions be what they will, without full proof of their abilities in human learning? did ever she countenance such mad enthusiastic rant?

The apostles went not forth to preach before they were endowed with power from on high---A testimony of which they produced wherever they went.---St. *Paul* could raise the dead---St. *Peter* could cure diseases---they were all filled with the Holy-

Holy-Ghost, and in a moment spoke Latin, Greek, and all the languages of the East. Now if your eighteen ministers can do such things, let them shew their commissions---let them work a small miracle or two; let any one of them weave me twenty yards of linen in an hour; make a pair of shoes out of a turnip, or give some other instances of their power, and I shall soon become one of their proselytes.

Here I doubt not, our reverend Mechanick will be ready to curie me a second time, as an enemy to the *saints of the Lord*, and endeavour to frighten me out of my senses, by a repetition of the following tremendous question,---“Have you
“not reason to fear that the blast of divine pro-
“vidence will consume your designs?” Such questions may frighten the good women and nurles of *****; but I am now an old resolute fellow, not to be scared in this enlightened age with either *popish* or *new-light* anathemas, and can leave myself at the disposal of divine providence, while I am conscious of pursuing the dictates of truth and reason. However, it is to be hoped that divine providence will blast the designs of these men and their brethren, in attempting to divide protestants, and destroy the Presbyterian profession in this country.

I have now done with this Mechanick, excepting only that I cannot pass over a stroke of verse that he has given us in his 8th page.

“Will they not be apt to tell you that you have belied

“Them, in saying that they denied,

“That their brethren had grace,

(*fact.*)

“And that they had a method of judging a man's state by his

This

This was certainly the form in which these lines were intended to stand, if the silly printer had not thrown them into such order, as to make them neither prose nor verse.----- I come now to the production of the *Presbyterian Elia*, (as he calls himself) alias the CURSING PROPHET. And I confess I cannot but laugh in my sleeve (to use his own words) to see him labouring and tugging through six pages to prove that I cannot be a *Presbyterian Covenanter*, but a Church-man or *prelati- cal Clergyman*. Some of his arguments to shew that I cannot be a Covenanter, have been already taken notice of.---I shall only add, That he conjectures that I am a churchman, “from the
 “ ready reception my first Letter met with from all
 “ the prelati- cal clergy, and that they were so chari-
 “ table As to Give them away by handfuls on the
 “ Sabbath day.” I am really glad that any thing from a Presbyterian is read by Church-people; if they have laid aside prejudice; perhaps this may be a means that more of our writing may get among them, and possibly answer some valuable end.---Now, whether it was for the sake of the labours of the Eighteen, or of my Remarks, that they were so fond of them. is best known to themselves; but I am apt to believe it was chiefly to let their people see what eighteen Presbyterian ministers had wrote to the A-b-b-p:---As the thing was a novelty, it was no wonder they were curious--But if there be any thing in this argument, it proves me a Presbyterian---because there was twenty bought by Presbyterians, for one, by a Church-man.---But his principal argument to insinuate that I am a church-man is, that none could have the

the

the opportunity of the original Letter “sent to the
 “ A--h---p, long enough to write these Remarks
 “ but a Church-man.” But this is a poor reason,
 it being well known to hundreds, that the original
 Letter of the Eighteen, had been returned to *Phi-*
ladelphia six months before the publication of the
 Remarks, and had been lent and copied, toge-
 ther with the papers attending it, by every body
 that was desirous to take that trouble. If it
 will be any satisfaction to our Elder, I can tell
 him that I saw the Original in the hands of a lead-
 ing member of the old Presbyterian church in *Phi-*
ladelphia.

As this Elder pursues much the same tract with
 the Mechanick his new-light brother, the same an-
 swers will serve for both. Taking it for granted,
 that he has proved me a *Church-man*, he then
 goes on to throw about him the charges of *Armi-*
nianism, &c.---a stale method with these men, of
 endeavouring to prejudice and alarm their followers.

For my part I detest the errors of *Arminius*,
 and cannot see how any thing of this kind is lug-
 ged into the present dispute: Tho', by the bye,
 it astonishes me to hear any of the Eighteen ob-
 jecting this as a crime. It was but the other day
 that they were crying up rank *Armenians* as dear
 brethren and *fellow-labourers in the Lord*: Nay,
 they were crowding, hugging, kissing, and mak-
 ing entertainments for them as angels from heaven.

The errors of *Arminius*, my dear Brethren, are
 certainly detestable *Heresies*; yet still many things
 he has taught, will far better stand the test of rea-
 son than some of the horrible doctrines which New-
 lights have been preaching and publishing these
 twenty years past. Indeed

Indeed, I can scarce help pitying the Eighteen, so see what poor shifts they are reduced to, in order to impose upon their congregations, and apologize for their strange conduct in writing this Letter: And yet my regard for truth, and for such a respectful body of *Christians* as you are, obliges me to expose them.

Let then all unprejudiced and impartial Presbyterians in the world, judge who are their greatest enemies ;---those men who with a fair appearance are poisoning the very vitals of their discipline, and undermining the fundamentals of their church-government, or I, who am endeavouring to open the eyes of my dear Fellow Christians, unmasking these hypocrites, and defending the Presbyterian cause from their stabs in the dark.----Indeed had these Eighteen themselves but common gratitude, I humbly presume that instead of abusing me, they would look upon me as their faithful friend. Have not my poor labours brought them in a manner to a sense of their errors?---The Elder “declares it was a well-designed mistake,” and the Mechanick says, “they had not duly “considered all the circumstances of the case.”---Now to what are they indebted for finding out their mistake? or for being obliged to acknowledge it so *publickly*, when they had found it out?--Is it out possible that if I had not interposed they might have proceeded from one mistake to another, till your religion was no more? I confess I have strong suspicions of them still, for I find this *learned Prophet* imposing upon you with a definition of the word *Induct*. [“Its primary and strictly proper signification, he says,] is no more, than to *introduce*,
“ or

“ or bring in; and when applied to the settlements of ministers, is the same thing with their being *settled* or *installed* in a congregation.” I now challenge him and all his party, to shew in any one writer upon church-government in the church of Scotland, that the word *Induct*, is made use of, or applied to the settlement of Presbyterian ministers in their congregations.

A *Briton*, seventeen hundred years ago, was understood to be a man painted like an American Savage.---Is it so understood now? And would not any one be laughed at for his ignorance, to say that a *Briton* and an *Indian* was all one? because the word *Briton* originally signified *painted*?—I grant that the Latin word *Induco* sometimes signifies to introduce, or bring in, and it as often signifies *to put on one's shoes*, to *casole*, or *deceive*, (in which last sense I believe he intends to use it)—But the English *law* tells us that when the word *Induct* “ is applied to the settlement of ministers,” it signifies giving possession to an Incumbant of his church, by leading him into it, and delivering him the Keys by the commissary, or other person appointed by the *Bishop*, and by his ringing one of the bells.—The manner and form of *Induction* is this—The minister who is to be *inducted*, is to exhibit his mandate from the *Bishop* to the *Arch-deacon*, or other person to whom it is directed;—The *Inducter* then takes the minister by the hand, and lays it on the Key of the Church, and says, *By Virtue of this instrument I induct you into the real, actual, and corporal possession of the rectory or vicarage of ——— with all its fruits, profits, members, and appurtenances.* This done, he opens the door, and puts the minister in possession of the church; after which the minister is to read the *Common Prayer* and thirty-nine *Articles* of the church, and declare his assent and consent to them. He must also read the *Bishop's* English certificate, in which is a declaration of his conformity.---And of all this he must have two or three witnesses, who must sign that they heard him do it, and be ready to attest it *Viva Verba*. And within three months after *Induction*, he must also appear at the Quarter-Sessions, and take the Abjuration oath.”—This you may depend upon, is a true account of *Induction* as it is explained and enforced by the laws of *Great-Britain*, which I hope will have more credit and authority with you than the senseless explanation of this Trisler, which was never heard of in either the Scotch or English churches—But he says, if the church of England uses it in any other sense (than his) where they have an establishment,

—does it thence follow, that Presbyterians must not use it in its proper sense, when speaking of places where they have no establishment?—Certainly when they were writing to the A--h-b---p of *Canterbury*, they were sure he would understand *Indulgence* in the sense of his church, the sense of the laws, the sense he had always been used to take it in, especially when they applied it to the settlement of one of his own clergy.—And if they had any other meaning in it, or intended that he should understand it in any other light, they ought to have sent him a paraphrase, with annotations to explain it.

The Presbyterian Elder, (p. 14) accuses me of “being very apprehensive that the Eighteen, or others of their brethren, will go for the gown. Poor soul, (says he) let him set his heart at ease, and stay at least till some of them do go.”—Now I do not remember that I have expressed any such apprehension; but since he has put the thing into my head, I am prodigiously pleased with the notion of it. Nay, I think I see them already on their way, and cannot withstand the temptation of penning the *dialogue* which must be held between the Bishop and them, on the occasion.

1. *Candidate*. J--bn Bt-r, (to the Bishop's porter) Please your worship, Sir, are you the Bishop?

2d. *Candidate*, J--bn R-w-n. Pogh! worship! that there is the title of one of our Justices: Let me speak to him—Please your Sir-Reverence, Sir, are you the man they call the Bishop?

Porter. Hah! hah! hah!

[*Laughing.*]

3d *Candidate*. Ch-rl-s T-nx-st. We don't come here, Sir, to be laugh'd at. We are come for the gown, and expect to be used like gentlemen.

Porter. I beg your pardon, I did not think you had been candidates for the ministry—I am not the Bishop:—I am only his Lordship's porter—but if you will walk into the hall, his Lordship's man will acquaint him that you want to see him.

1. *Candidate*, J--bn Bt-r. We have committed a nation blunder, [*sic*]—Sirs, let us take care,—this man is to shew us the Bishop, and we must call him his Lordship,—

[*They are all introduced.*]

Bishop. Your humble Servant, Gentlemen; how do you do?

2d *Candidate*. J--bn R-w-n, (*snatching the hair out of his eyes*) Thank your Lordship, and his Lordship, we are stirring through mercy—how is all concerns with yourself?—

Bishop. [*He*] Pray gentlemen sit down.—

3d *Candidate*. J--bn Bt-r, Thank his Lordship, we chuse
to stand. Ej, ej.

Bishop. Have you any business with me, Gentlemen?

3d *Candidate.* C——s T——s, If we had not business with you, we would not come here:—Yes, we are come to get the gown.—

Bishop. What! You are Candidates for holy orders:—

All. Ay! ay! we are *Candidatus* for orders.—

Bishop. Pray Gentlemen, what college or university were you educated in?—

3d *Candidate.* Ch-rl-s T-xx-nt, Please your *Bishop-prick*, we were learned in my father's own college and *versity* at *Shemmy*.

Bishop. I never heard of it before—what part of the world is it in?—

3d *Candidate.* Ch-rl-s T-xx-nt, Why, it was in *America*, it was near twenty feet long, and almost ten wide—but the logs are all rotten long ago. Indeed, I think, I have heard lately, that the *wicked* people that live there, have made a *log-fire* of it. Dear Sir, what a wicked world is this?—

Bishop. Have you any *credentials*, or testimonials of your good life, and christian behaviour?—

1st *Candidate.* J-bn Bl-r, As to that there thing about *credentials*, d'ye see me, we didn't trouble our heads about them, —for we heard, may it please his *Lordship*, that *Doges* and *Duxes*, or even *Debauchers*, might get the gown.—

Bishop. I am very sorry, Sir, that you have been so ill informed, or that there should be any person in the christian world so ignorant and wicked as to represent our church in so unjust a light—we take uncommon pains to keep all such as you mention, from getting into the church,—we never admit any but such as we are well acquainted with ourselves; or have proper credentials from persons of known veracity;—And as to *abilities*, we examine them strictly.—

1st *Cand.* J-bn Bl-r. As to abilities—I shall answer for myself—I have learn'd all *Ovid*, except his *A-j-e Amandi*, which is too carnal:—

2d *Cand.* J-bn R-u-n, I have learned as far as *Propy-quo merribones*, I think they call it. I've forgot almost aw my Latin:— But I serv'd my time, quo' she, w' as guid a weaver as any in the North of *Ireland*.—If his *Lordship* wants a piece of guid ten hundred linen for your ain shirts, I'll undertake, wi' the face of clay, d'ye see me, to work you one, and it shan't cost ye a farthing.—

4th *Cand.* Akat-re B-y--- Please your Excellency, Sir, I am as good a weaver as ever threw a shuttle, not that I say it myself.—

5th *Cand.* *J-b-n T--d*, Brag, they say, is a good dog, but Holdfast is better. I am as good a *weaver*, brother *B-y--* as ever you were.

4th *Cand.* *Andr-w B-y--* Indeed you tell a story, I can beat you at that, and making *whisky* too——does your Excellency want a dram in the morning? I have got a kegg of my double distill'd at your service——

6th *Cand.* *B-n-j-m-n Cb-j-n-t*, I have learned as far as the *seven* parts of speech——

1st *Cand.* *J-b-n Bl-r*, (The eight parts, you fool!)

6th *Cand.* *B-n-j-m-n Cb-j-n-t*, Ay! ay! the *eight parts*—— But I always thought it sinful to spend my time in reading these Heathenish authors——I have been bred a *shoe-maker*, and if your Honour and Worship has any old shoes or boots to heel-tap, I should be glad to serve con.——

7th *Cand.* *Ch-r-l-s M-Kn-ght*,—And so should I too—I have served my time to the same trade—And I can answer for brother *L-w-r-n-c* here, as well as myself, (for he is a man of slow speech) that he can work at the shoe-making trade as well as any of us.——

8th *Cand.* *Andr-w H-x-t-r*, Please your Wisdom, Sir, I have been bred thirty years to building of houses—if any of your cabins or any other of your *necessary* houses are out of order, I can soon mend them, for, d'ye see me, I am a *carpenter*.——

10th *Cand.* *H-g-b* ~~—~~ *d-m*, (*scratching his* ——) I am a *Taylor* at your service,——If your *Bishop* *ship* wants a pair of *breeches* made, I can ~~cut~~ you to a hair——

2d *Cand.* *Ch-r-l-s T-m-x-t*, Please your *Bishop-trick*, I am a *Sadler*—do you want a new pad, girth, or crupper to your saddle?—I should——

11th *Cand.* *M-j-s T-t-l*, Labskous! I believe you intend not to let me speak among you at all——*Mr. Moderator*, I am a *Sailor*, I can hand, reef, and steer, and box the compass with any lad that ever stopp'd the deck; and I can speak Latin as fluently as any of them—I learned as far as *Ajs-in-pu-jenti*, I think they call it, which my master told me, signified, the *dog* *first* *d in the entry*.——The Moderator knows whether my master taught me right.——

Bishop. I find that none of you were ever designed, or educated for the ministry.——Tradesmen in their proper spheres, ought to be encouraged and valued— but ministers of the Gospel require *abilities* of a different nature,—they ought to understand the learned languages, natural and moral philosophy, and divinity.

1st Cand. *J. bn Bl.*,—Divinity!—why we all understand that—we have read the most pious and learned systems that are extant, —Such as—*The Pilgrim's Progress—The Kifs-breech of Christianity—Mr. Whitfield's Journals—A three-legged Stool for crippled Christians—Crumbs of Comfort for Christ's Chickens—Hooks and Eyes to bad up a Christian's Brecks—A gentle shove to a heavy-ars'd Christian—Heegh-beel'd spoon for Dwarfs in Christ—The Godly Sayings of a female Child of thirteen Years old, as it spoke themself to its own Mother—and Mr. T———let's Sermons.*

Bishop. I am a stranger to these books.—My advice to you is, that you would pursue your respective trades and occupations, and quit all thoughts of preaching in any society of christians.—So I bid you farewell.

And now my brethren, these are some of the men whom the *Elder* tells us are “men of liberal education, and solid learning,” these are some of the men among whom he could find but *two Mechanics*! Is it not astonishing to find men that pretend to common honesty, venturing to advance such palpable falsehoods, to you who knew these men in their original meaness, following their various occupations to which they were bred, and many of them, either thro' laziness or ignorance, making but scurvy figures even in those occupations? With the like assurance we find this *Elder* asking “what law of God or of man have the eighteen broken?” why will he force me to answer this question! Has not their whole conduct for many years been a violation of that *Charity* and subordinations by which the order and peace of the church of God is to be preserved? Have they not been the means of dissolving many church societies, of breaking the solemn ties and contracts between pastors and their people; thrusting themselves into the congregations of the settled ministry, martyring and destroying their characters, taking the very bread out of their mouths and the mouths of their children, and stuffing it into their own?—After playing this game for a number of years among Presbyterians, they then attempt the same thing among Episcopalians. With this view (privately and hoping their names never might be known) they wrote their famous letter to a A---hp---p of the prelatical church, praying him to countenance a scene of division and disturbances, made by an intruder into a peaceable church in these parts; and in order to induce him to do this bad thing, they fulsomely compliment away to him the fundamental Principles and doctrines of true Presbyterianism

I say

I say they did this thing fulsomely and basely ; for it seems they never intended that one word of their letter should be understood in the common acception of languages. On the contrary it appears from the production of our *learned Elder*, that the following paraphrase and annotations ought to have gone along with it, which I have collected from sundry parts of this mighty sophister's works, and thrown into one view, for the readers ease,—

“ To the a---b---p of Canterbury”---(whom we do not acknowledge as an a---b- p ; but as the *President*, and yet not as the *President*, but as the *Moderator* of the society for the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts, and therefore do *accidentally*, though very unwillingly call A--h-b----p.)

“ May it please your Grace,”---(not gracious, for that we do not believe you are, as you have never declared your experiences and conversion. But your grace so called from being a Peer of the Realm.)

“ Encouraged by the amiable character we have received
“ of your Grace, as a sincere and catholic friend to truth and
“ practical religion,”---(Please to understand us---We will not be *assayed* or calling an A--h-b----p a friend to truth and practical religion---we say no such thing---we only say we have received such a character of your Grace, without supposing that you are such.)---

“ We ministers &c. providentially conven'd---(not in synod ; for every man of common sense knows that when we are *Conven'd* in synod, we are not conven'd by *Providence*. But we the eighteen ministers who are conven'd thro' providence) “ *unsolicited by the gentleman concerned*” (for indeed not above one or two of us ever saw him, and know almost nothing about him, and are therefore very proper judges, and persons to recommend him) “ *Beg leave to address your grace and witnesses,* to the truth of what we are going to say. Do not misunderstand us, for what we have been *Witnesses* to we have only seen by *hearsay*, as *Sancho Pancha* saw his mistress. And that is, that Mr. Mc.C/----- is a successful and popular advocate in the cause of truth and religion. “ This gentleman has for some time past officiated in Philadelphia, and has given such specimens of his zeal &c. Of all this we have been *Witnesses*, that is we have heard so, “ and so remarkable a blessing has attended his ministry in some striking instances of unquestionable reformation from vice and infidelity. Now we beg to be understood right---We don't believe Mr Mc C----- to be a pious man, but a very *Imprudent* man. Yet we think and believe,

that

that a clergyman of the church of England may reform from vice and intidility, and convert people from their sins, tho he be not converted himself. And this is more your grace knows than we ever allowed could be done by a Presbyterian minister.)

“ And we beg leave to assure your grace that tho’ we will not be accountable for any mans prudentials. (For be pleased to observe again, Mr. Mc. C-----n is very imprudent, yet he is very worthy of our hearty and “ warm recommendations, and very fit to propagate religion and virtue. -- “ We say tho’ we “ will not determine future contingencies” (that is we would not have your grace to take us for *Witches*;) “ yet it is our opinion that his continuing in Philadelphia will advance christianity” “ And therefore, we most earnestly pray your grace would use your influence to have him *Inducted*”) Now mark us well, we would not have him *Inducted* in your prelatical way of *Inducting* or lugging in at the church door, or window by the end of the bell-rope, or drawing him thro’ the key-hole; but we would have him *Inducted*, that is *settled* and installed in our own godly way, by a deputation from the *Presbytery*, and the elders of the congregation, of the prelatical church of Philadelphia. Nor is it so much him that we would have *inducted*, *settled*, or installed neither, as his truly strict “ Calvinism and his zeal for its support” and his said calvinism and zeal for its support so *inducted*, *settled*, or *installed* to continue a popular-preacher in the city of Philadelphia for ever.

Praying for your Grace, we are, &c.

My dear brethren I have taken notice of every thing that I saw material in these two flimsy performances, and shall beg my leave of you for this time, it giving me the greatest pleasure and satisfaction to think that I have presented you with them, as a second *fairing*; hoping that this one of the *fall* will be as acceptable, as the last spring one I sent you. If these men make a due improvement of the gentle treatment I have now given them, I shall rest satisfied; but if they continue hardened I have a rod in store for them, and shall not spare it, at giving them their third correction next spring; and this I shall do, if I live, without the assistance of any episcopalian teacher, or layman whatsoever, for not a circumstance relating to them has escaped my notice, these twenty years, and upwards: and indeed I should be ashamed to ask assistance to demolish a hundred such opponents as have yet appeared against me for I am well acquainted with the abilities of the whole

[illegible]

AS I am a young author, just set out in the practice of writing, a country farmer, chiefly employed in tilling and manuring my plantation, serving the public without fee or reward; I have reason to hope for a favourable indulgence, if any inaccuracies may be found in this my second performance. Plain truth, without art or embellishment, is what I aim at thro' the creole. Finding my first Letter flouting the rest of so many attacks, made by men who are paid for their abuse, (and consequently ought to be no bunglers) and supposed also (no doubt from its merit) to be the joint-production the Teachers of a large persuasion; I begin to have a greater opinion of my abilities than formerly, and make no doubt but I shall every day mend upon it; especially recollecting a passage I have read somewhere. "That the Naphians in 1790, learned the art of pruning their vines, by observing, that when an Als had browsed upon one of them, it thrived the better, and bore fairer fruit," considering this observation, and applying it to my present purpose, I delayed this second epistle for some time, until it was expedit by the public, in order that these Androsians might have their full swing at the First. For had I thrived by their way sooner, they would have left off nibbling at the second, to have fell foul of the latter. And then perhaps its fruit might have been confined to a small compass, whereas now they are scattered over all these northern Provinces, besides numbers gone to Europe.

The Layman.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥