

Report of the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Historical Association Rapport de l'assemblée annuelle de la Société historique du Canada

Report of the Annual Meeting

Dr. Charles Inglis in New York, 1766-1783

A. H. Young

Volume 11, Number 1, 1932

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/300107ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/300107ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada

ISSN

0317-0594 (print)

1712-9095 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Young, A. H. (1932). Dr. Charles Inglis in New York, 1766-1783. *Report of the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Historical Association / Rapport de l'assemblée annuelle de la Société historique du Canada*, 11(1), 87-96.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/300107ar>

DR. CHARLES INGLIS IN NEW YORK, 1766-1783

By A. H. YOUNG

Among the Loyalists from the city of New York none, perhaps, became more eminent after 1783 than did the Rt. Revd Charles Inglis, D.D., first Bishop of Nova Scotia, the earliest Colonial See of the Anglican communion to be established. This preferment he well deserved to receive from his "most worthy King," George III, "for whom," he declared, "every British Subject should bless God, and for whom, while he continues what he is, they should cheerfully spend their Fortunes and their blood, were it necessary."¹

These words written in 1763 Inglis translated into actions throughout the whole of his New York period of seventeen years. In the latter half of it he suffered separation from his family, deep anxiety of mind, confiscation of his property, attainder, and exile. Yet he never relaxed in the discharge of the many and varied duties of his cure, which were greatly multiplied by the enormous increase in the number of the distressed refugees who crowded into the city in the closing stages of the War of Independence. This he and other men of his way of thinking called always "this horrid rebellion."

Born in 1734, he was a son of the Revd. Archibald Inglis, a clergyman of the Church of Ireland. To judge from the family name, which is commonly mispronounced in both New York and Halifax, he must have been of Scottish descent.

Whether he was a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, is still a question, but he appears from a letter of the Revd. George Craig of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, to have emigrated to America in the year 1754.² That he was a "redemptionist"—bound to work out by personal services the price of his ocean passage—as charged by the Revd. Samuel Peters, D.D.,³ in the heat of pamphlet warfare, it is permissible to doubt, for this first Loyalist parson to withdraw to England spoke and wrote somewhat unadvisedly at times.

Be the charge true or false, Inglis stood high in the esteem of both the clergy and the laity of Lancaster. The Revd. Thomas Barton,⁴ who succeeded Mr. Craig in the mission, joined with him in recommending the young ordinand to the Bishop of London, certifying that he was "a young Gentleman of unblemished character, discreet in his Behaviour and free even from ye suspicion of any thing unbecoming."

After spending three years (1755-1758) as "Preceptor to ye Free School" in Lancaster, Inglis, like all Colonial candidates for the Anglican Ministry prior to 1787, went to London, England, to receive his Orders. As a "servant" of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign

¹ Inglis to the Revd. Richard Peters, D.D., August 15th, 1763. Peters Manuscripts, Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Vol. 6. p. 16.

² June 14th, 1758. S.P.G. Journal XIV, p. 97.

³ For "Bishop" Peters and his letters to the S.P.G. see *Papers and Records of the Ontario Historical Society*, Vol XXVII, pp. 583-623. On page 5 of Volume I of "Leaders of the Canadian Church" the name has been mistakenly transformed into Barlow.

⁴ S.P.G. Journal XIV, p. 98.

Parts, he was appointed to the mission of Dover in the County of Kent, which is now in the State of Delaware.

The sojourn in Dover, with which were associated the counties of Sussex and Newcastle, lasted from the middle of 1759 to December 16th, 1765. On the latter date began, by way of Philadelphia, the removal to New York, which had first been mooted over eighteen months previously. Then the prospect had been very welcome owing to the insalubrity of the climate of Dover and to the consequent decline of his wife's and his own health; but, his wife dying, it had been deferred until a successor in the mission could be found.

As a result of this delay Inglis became second, instead of first, assistant to the new rector of the parish, the Revd. Samuel Auchmuty, D.D. To be first assistant he was promoted in 1774, on the decease of the Revd. John Ogilvie, D.D.,⁵ and, on that of Dr. Auchmuty in 1777, to be rector, His Excellency Governor Tryon approving the election and giving orders for the induction.

In all three of these positions Inglis continued to correspond with the "Venerable" Society, even though he had ceased as from January, 1766, to be its "servant." As an elected member of it from March 1, 1768, onward, he tendered advice and expressed opinions upon matters of policy and administration such as the supply of missions, the prosecution of missionary work among the Indians, and the great need of bishops in America, if the Church was to thrive and prosper, if civil tranquillity was to be restored, and if the political connection with Great Britain was to be maintained. He furnished valuable information regarding the conventions of the clergy; the hostility of the dissenting ministers to the Church and to the idea of allowing it to have bishops; the ministers' activity in spreading disaffection to government; the course of the events of the war; the hardships endured by the loyal clergy and people; and their utter surprise at the terms of the "miserable peace" of 1783.

Of the discretion with which Mr. Barton had rightly credited Inglis, he had given proof very early in his Dover period. Arriving in summer, he had witnessed in September, if not in August too, appalling scenes of debauchery preparatory to the annual election, on October 1st, of sheriffs and of members of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Pennsylvania. "To ingratiate themselves with the people," he wrote, "candidates for these offices appoint places where they invite the Inhabitants to treat them with liquor provided for that purpose." At the meetings, held weekly at one or another of these places "the people's Morals were entirely debauched . . . , for he was best liked who gave the most liberal treat."

To overcome these evils Inglis took steps as the time for the election of 1760 was approaching. He gave notice that, on all days of meetings, he should preach near to the buildings in which they were advertized to be held. "This at first drew the more serious part of my own hearers from them," he reported, "as well as those of other denominations, whose example was soon followed by great numbers. I also prevailed with the most considerable of the Candidates not to go to them and those of less note followed their example. Thus by . . . setting them in that horrid light they deserved, these riots are dwindled almost to nothing." He evidently felt satisfaction at being able to add: "This gives me the greatest

⁵ For an account of Ogilvie, who had served successively in Albany and in Montreal before removing to New York, see *Papers and Records* of the Ontario Historical Society, Vol. XXII, pp. 296-337.

pleasure, and the more so as it has been in great measure, the means of increasing my communicants to about double what they first were when I came here."⁶

The paragraph next following discloses an abrupt change of subject—to the outstanding event of the year, the capitulation of Montreal. "By the latest accounts from the northward Montreal [,] the only place of importance that was in the hands of the French, is in our possession, so that this campaign will secure us all North America. If it is confirmed by a peace, as I hope it will, it may be a means of having Bishops sent over to us. A late affair in Virginia, which doubtless you have heard of, and Mr. Macleennachan's Schism here [in Philadelphia] show how absolutely necessary they are."⁷

The Peace of Paris, which to Inglis seemed "so honourable and so advantageous," was otherwise regarded in other quarters, he found. The addresses presented to His Majesty on the occasion were, so far as he had noticed, few in number and characterized by "very great coldness." Therefore he suggested to his good friend, the Revd. Richard Peters, D.D., rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia, and secretary of the province of Pennsylvania, that "an affectionate and warm Address" from the convention of the local clergy might be very acceptable. "This," he declared, "I look upon in some Measure to be our Duty; and further, it might dispose the King hereafter to be readier in doing any Thing for our languishing Church in this Quarter of the World, that might be proposed to him."⁸

Two things in particular appeared to Inglis and to other men worthy of being made the subject of petition to the King. The one was bishops for America, already mentioned in the letter of 1760; the other, the Christianization of the Indians.

As early as 1710 the question of the Indians had been brought to the attention of Queen Anne and in consequence a mission to the "faithful Mohocks" at Fort Hunter, N.Y., had been established, Her Majesty presenting them with the famous communion plate, which is now divided between their descendants at Tyendinaga and at Brantford. From that year down to 1760, when Ogilvie left the place to take up his four years' residence in Montreal, the work had been carried on successfully upon the whole, in spite of the successive missionaries' being under obligation to spend part of their time in the mission and the chaplaincy of Albany, forty miles distant.

Ogilvie's successor proving unacceptable to both Whites and Indians, he presently moved away. For a new missionary the great Superintendent of Indians for the northern department, Sir William Johnson, who was thoroughly devoted to their interests, began a search after the final submission of Pontiac in 1766. Although he was aided by his clerical friends, Barton, Richard Peters, and William Smith, Provost of the College of Philadelphia, it was only in the spring of 1770 that he found a suitable man—John Stuart, schoolmaster in Lancaster.⁹

⁶ S. P. G. Letters, B. 21, Pennsylvania, p. 140.

⁷ On the capitulation and the prospects of peace see the paper on Ogilvie already cited, p. 323 and p. 320.

⁸ *Peters Manuscripts*, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Vol. VI, p. 16. Inglis to Peters, August 15th, 1763.

⁹ For a memoir of Stuart (1740-1811), who became the first Church of England Missionary in the upper country of the province of Quebec, "father of the Church" and Inglis's Commissary in Upper Canada, "spiritual father" of Bishop Strachan, and founder of a very public-spirited family, see O'Callaghan's "Documentary History of the State of New York" Vol. IV, pp. 505-520 and Canniff's "The Settlement of Upper Canada", pp. 258-266. There are some inaccuracies in both.

As but a preliminary to much greater things this re-establishment of the mission was regarded by Sir William, who had allowed himself to be proposed for membership in the Society, and by Inglis, who had meanwhile become interested in the subject. In order to obtain fuller information, Inglis had paid a visit to Sir William, taking with him as a companion Dr. Myles Cooper, second President of King's College, who was desirous of there receiving Indian youths as students.

On the basis of what he learned from Sir William, for whom he had a very high regard, Inglis drew up a memorial to the Society, although he was "sensible that the embarrassed state of affairs in England and the Colonies, may throw difficulties in the way, & make the success of an application to government for an Indian missionary at this time more dubious."¹⁰ He suggested that, for the support of the various missions and the schools which he proposed, government might order a grant of the quit-rents of the province of New York. For this purpose also, or for the endowment of one bishopric or more, he noted that Governor Franklin of New Jersey reported as still ungranted certain islands in the Delaware. He thought too that, if Government could find £100 sterling per annum for a Roman Catholic missionary in Nova Scotia, as it had recently done, it could surely find something for more than one Church of England mission on the frontier of New York.¹¹

These suggestions and these exertions proved to be futile in spite of the influence and the prestige of Sir William, who had shewn his sympathy in a very practical fashion by offering to bestow a generous tract of land for the support of both Indians and bishops. Government was unwilling, in view of "dissenting" attacks upon the Society to incur further unpopularity by bestowing any favours upon it. Nor were the Indians in a mood to receive more missionaries, considering the encroachments of White speculators upon their lands which lay beyond the limits set by the Treaty of Fort Stanwix, which, as it happened, Government was slow to approve.¹²

The "intrusion" of the Society's missionaries into New England had been resented by the inhabitants of that region, seeing that Congregationalism was there established by law. They took with an ill grace the command from London, although they obeyed it, to exempt members of the Church of England from the operation of the law requiring them to contribute toward the maintenance of the Congregational establishment and to allow their rates to be available for the support of their own parsons. Dr. Chauncy and Dr. Mayhew, two outstanding pastors, made, accordingly, vigorous attacks upon the Society and the Church of England, which were answered by the Revd. East Apthorp, of Cambridge, and by other Anglicans.

A ferment was necessarily aroused when the Anglicans began to talk openly, as many of them had done more or less secretly since Queen Anne's time,¹³ of making application for the allowance of bishops for their Church in America. It was increased by a sermon preached before the Society at its anniversary meeting of 1767 by the Bishop of Llandaff, Dr. Ewer, and by a pamphlet issued by the Revd. Thomas Bradbury Chandler of Elizabeth-

¹⁰ S. P. G. Letters. B. New York Part I. March 8th, 1770.

¹¹ S. P. G. Letters B. New York Part I. Inglis to the Society, March 8th and June 15th, 1770; March 8th and June 20th, 1771.

¹² See *Sir William Johnson Papers*, Vols. VI and VII, and E. A. Carter: *Correspondence of General Gage*.

¹³ See the Autobiography of the first President of King's College, New York, and his correspondence with Archbishop Secker and other men of influence in England. Herbert and Carol Schneider: *Samuel Johnson, President of King's College, His Career and Writings*, 4 vols. New York, 1929.

town, N.J., "An Appeal in Behalf of the Church of England in America." Answers and replies to the answers ran off the presses in quick succession, giving satisfaction doubtless to the writers and their respective parties but probably convincing few or none of their opponents.

"In this "Paper War with the Dissenters," as Inglis called it, he took part, almost of necessity. In reply to Mr. Livingston's "insolent, abusive Letter" to Bishop Ewer he wrote a "Vindication", which met with the approval of the Society. He urged its republication in England in order to offset the effect produced there by the pamphlets of the adversaries of the Church, which had been freely circulated by their sympathizers.

To take part in this controversy Inglis had an impelling motive of a personal kind aside from his convictions, which were strong, and from any pugnacity that he, as a Scoto-Irishman, may have inherited. On Sunday, April 6th, 1766, Messrs Giles and Wilson, two young men appointed to succeed him in the mission of Dover, had perished in sight of land when the ship on which they were returning from their ordination in London foundered.

They were by no means the first to pay in similar circumstances the penalty for desiring to dedicate themselves to the ministry of the Church. Twenty per cent of the men sent over for that purpose, Dr. Chandler asserted, had met a like fate.¹⁴

"The Expence & Hazard in going to England for Orders were always discouraging circumstances," Inglis wrote. "This melancholly accident will increase our apprehension of Danger, & shews they are well founded. Nothing but our having Bishops here can remove these & many other Grievances which the American Churches labour under.

"Our having Bishops here on the Terms we want them, is a Thing so equitable in itself, & so essential to the Interest of Religion & our Church, that I am lost in astonishment at our being deprived of them so long. Why are we denyed the common previledges of all other subjects? Or why are we distinguished by Grievances & persecutions to which all other Denominations are perfect Strangers?

"Our Church must necessarily decline while we are in this Situation, & must finally sink, unless the timely Remedy is applied. If the Clergy of England therefore do not exert themselves & with Spirit second the Applications hence, on this Head, a person without the spirit of prophecy may easily tell what the event will be. For my Part, I look upon it to be the immediate Cause of Christ & his Church; & therefore every Obligation we are under to serve these, calls on us to promote this Measure.

"As we want not to encroach on the liberties or previledges, Civil or Religious, of any other Denominations, the most violent, unreasonable Dissenter dare not openly avow his Disapprobation of this Measure. Some may murmur in secret; but as their Murmurs will not bear examination, proceeding entirely from a perverse, persecuting Spirit, they keep them to themselves. All of them that are moderate and reasonable, & in Charity we should suppose them to be the Majority, own the Necessity and Equity of our having Bishops. This I know to be the case. But suppose they were violent in opposing this—yet have they any Right to do so, or be heard? Have we not an equal right to oppose their having Ordinations, & Synods, & Presbyterys, & Sessions? Or might we not with equal Justice oppose any Sect here in having the full Exercise of their Discipline & Government?

¹⁴ Dr. Thomas Bradbury Chandler: *Appeal etc.*

"We have already seen what Delays in this affair produce. They only weaken our Cause, & add strength to our Opponents. And I pray God the Government may not have Cause to repent, when it is too late, their Omission of what would be so great a Means of Securing the Affections & Dependence of the Colonies, & firmly uniting them to the Mother Country. Even good policy dictates this Measure, were the Interest of Religion & our Church left out of the Question."¹⁵

"Good policy" and its effects were exactly what the "Dissenters" feared. These, they conceived, would lead to the appointment of bishops to Executive and Legislative Councils and, probably, to an attempt to fasten upon the other Colonies establishments such as the Church of England enjoyed more or less fully in Georgia, the Carolinas, Virginia, Maryland, and in parts of New York, not to speak of Ireland. Hence the organization which Inglis intimated that they had formed for the purpose of frustrating the endeavours of the Anglicans despite their honest declarations that they wanted only "spiritual," not political, bishops.¹⁶

To Inglis as to Chandler, who had written two "Defences" of his "Appeal," and to Sir William Johnson, who had offered to deed over 25,000 acres of land for an Episcopal endowment, it was a case of unfair, unjustifiable discrimination that the Moravians and the Roman Catholics had both been allowed to have their bishops, the former by Act of Parliament and the latter by a wise, politic connivance. A propos of this connivance a letter from Inglis, bearing date July 10th, 1766, had said: "This I hope is a prelude to the like Indulgence to the best friends that England has in America—the Members of the Church of England. Surely it would sound very strange, & the politics must be preposterous, that denied them an Indulgence which is granted to Moravians and Papists, when equally necessary, and as earnestly desired; yet no Way more injurious to other Denominations."

These and countless other representations from America bore no fruit on the unfriendly soil of eighteenth-century officialdom, intent upon keeping the Colonies in subjection to London and unappreciative of the spiritual functions of the Church. So it languished till the "horrid rebellion" had spent itself and Loyalists like Inglis had become expatriated.

From ecclesiastico-political controversy into that of a purely political kind Inglis, with Chandler, drifted, though of this he gives no account before the year 1776. In fact from June 20th, 1771, when he was about to act for six months in the room of Mr. President Cooper, down to October, 31st, 1776, the Society seems not to have heard from him, thanks to the non-importation and to the increase of non-intercourse generally between the two countries.

On the latter date he began to fill in the gaps of the intervening quinquennium. He told of Doctors Chandler and Cooper being compelled in May, 1775, to flee because of their loyalty to the Unity of the Empire and their opposition to the promoters of independency; the defenceless situation in which the citizens of New York had been left by reason of General Gage's concentration of the troops at Boston; and the ills which

¹⁵ S. P. G. Letters, B. New York, Part I. April 19th, 1766.

¹⁶ S. P. G. Letters, B. New York, Part I, May 5th and October 10th, 1766, also August 12th, 1769.

befel them at the hands of Committees of Safety before and after Washington's army took possession of the town, General Howe's retreat to Halifax having allowed the latter to withdraw from Boston.

Having removed his wife and family "seventy miles up Hudson's river", Inglis had returned to town and carried on in Dr. Auchmuty's absence through ill-health. From one of the Continental Generals he received a message, requesting him to omit the "violent prayers for the King and Royal Family" when his Commander-in-Chief should attend Church.

The unreasonableness of the request was pointed out to Washington at the earliest opportunity and the intimation given "That it was in his power to shut up our churches; but by no means in his power to make the Clergy depart from their duty." "This Declaration", Inglis added, "drew from him an awkward apology for his conduct, which I believe was not authorized by Washington."

On another Sunday, when Inglis was officiating "& had proceeded some length in the Service, a Company of about one hundred armed Rebels marched into the Church, with Drums beating & Fifes playing—their Guns loaded & Bayonets fixed, as if going to Battle. The Congregation was thrown into the utmost terror, & several women fainted, expecting a massacre was intended. I took no notice of them, & went on with the Service, only exerted my voice, which was in some Measure drowned by the noise and Tumult. The Rebels stood thus in the Aisle for near fifteen minutes; till being asked into Pews by the Sexton, they complied. Still however the People expected that when the Collects for the King and Royal Family were read, I should be fired at, as Menaces to that purpose had been frequently flung out—the matter however passed over without any accident. Nothing of this kind happened before or since, which made it more remarkable. I was afterwards assured that something hostile and violent was intended; but He that 'stills the Raging of the sea and Madness of the People' overruled their Purpose, whatever it was."

For the clergy to pray in public for the King after Independence had been declared and after the new legislature of Virginia had formally altered the liturgy, would have been "rash to the last degree," bringing as its consequence "a Demolition of the Churches & the destruction of all who frequented them." Not to pray for him was "against their Duty & Oath, as well as Dictates of their Conscience." Therefore, like the majority of his brethren elsewhere, Inglis, with the approval of his vestrymen who were in town, shut up his three, first complying with the request to have the King's arms taken down.

Sending away the other assistants, Inglis remained in town alone "to visit the sick, baptise Children, bury the dead, & afford what support he could to the remains of his poor Flock, who were much dispirited; for several, especially of the poorer sort, had it not in their power to leave the City." When asked to deliver the keys to the "Patriots", he declined, telling them that, "if they would use the Churches, they must break the Gates & Doors to get in." Accordingly, he said "I took possession of all the keys, lest the Sextons might be tampered with; for I could not bear the thought that their seditious & rebellious effusions should be poured out in our Churches."

With difficulty he stood his ground till mid-August, being "watched with a jealous, suspicious eye" as one who was "*notoriously disaffected*"

and known to be "the author of several pieces against the proceedings of the Congress." In particular, he had written "an answer to a Pamphlet entitled *Common Sense* which earnestly recommended and justified Independency. It was one of the most virulent artful & pernicious pamphlets I ever met with; & perhaps the wit of man could not devise one better calculated to do mischief. It seduced thousands."

No sooner was the answer advertised than "the whole Impression was seized by the sons of Liberty & burnt." He "then sent a copy to Philadelphia, where it was printed, & soon went through a second edition." "The answer," he said, "was laid to my charge & swelled the catalogue of my political transgressions."

The enforced absence consequent upon these "transgressions" lasted only a month. Early on Monday morning, September 16th, he was able to be back in town, General Howe having landed upon New York Island the day before.

The city "exhibited a most melancholly appearance, being deserted and pillaged," all the bells carried off, and his own house "plundered of everything by the Rebels". On Saturday the 22nd, "about one thousand houses or a fourth part of the whole City," were consumed by fire, set, supposedly by "Several Rebels" who had "secreted themselves in the Houses to execute the diabolical purpose of destroying the City."

By this untoward event, which was prevented by officers and men of the Navy and Army from assuming still more serious proportions, the Corporation of Trinity Church lost property valued at £25,000 sterling. The church building was gone, together with its Charity School, other buildings, and the Rector's own home, which was his private property.

The shortage of houses was the more serious because of the civilian refugees who had followed the army. Among them were already two clergymen; and many more were yet to come. For the most part they were in indigent circumstances through their people's being unable to support them and through the impossibility of drawing on London for the salaries, which the Society was still allowing them even though they were absent from their missions. And they were glad to avail themselves of the special fund raised for them by the Society and by other generous friends in England.

Of the missionaries in town and out of it he gave news as often as he could find time and opportunity. He told of the Commander-in-Chief's kindness in finding army chaplaincies for the majority of them and of His Excellency's and the Town Major's allowing fuel, rations etc. to the few for whom such appointments were not available. From time to time he had to chronicle the death of one or another of these parsons within the confines of the town, the total by February 28th, 1781, having mounted up to eleven, including his old friend Barton. And with gratitude he referred to the generous subscriptions made by gentlemen of the army and navy toward the upkeep of the Charity School.

Certain that "this rebellion cannot continue much longer", he had been unable to understand the panic with which the people in England had seemed to be stricken on receipt of the news of General Burgoyne's "Disaster", in 1777, thinking it, as he judged, "to be more formidable than it really is." "Be assured", the Journal reports him as saying, "if Great Britain will but exert Herself; if but a moderate Share of Wisdom,

is employed in planning her Operations, and of Vigour in their Execution, this Rebellion may easily be suppressed."¹⁷

Whenever occasion offered he exulted over the defeat of the rebels and their allies, as, for instance, in 1779, when news arrived of the frustration of Count d'Estaing's attempt upon Savannah. "After a week's severe cannonade & bombardment, a general assault was made, & the assailants were repulsed with the loss of 3,000 men killed and wounded! We did not lose 50 men! These are the accounts we have from thence, & we believe them to be true. This happy event has changed the face of things here."¹⁸

In May of the following year he was sure that the rebellion was "near its last gasp," for news had arrived of the successful storming of Charleston, at the cost, unfortunately, they heard, of Sir Henry Clinton's life. To offset this rumoured loss, came news from the West Indies that Admiral Sir G. Rodney had "gained a signal victory over the French fleet."

The "Prospects in Europe and America" were "rather gloomy" a twelvemonth later but they were "not such as should make us despond, nor do I by any means think our affairs irretrievable."¹⁹ . . . Our new Commander in Chief Sir Guy Carleton, is arrived, & indicates a disposition toned with vigour; & this, with a little Judgement and Common Sense, will soon change the face of affairs here."

The buoyant hopes with which this letter concluded were doomed to disappointment. On June 6th, 1783, Inglis lamented the "sad perplexity and distress in which the vague terms of the last miserable peace have left the poor Loyalists." "The most violent, malignant spirit against the Loyalists appears every where at present. If this continues, very few of the Missionaries will be able to return. In short, almost all the Loyalists, and, among others the Doctor himself will be obliged to fly, having been "attainted, proscribed and banished"; and his estate "confiscated and actually sold; to say nothing of the violent threats thrown out against his life.

.....
 "If there should be any prospect of personal safety, he is resolved, with the blessing of God, to stay and submit to every other inconvenience for the sake of his Churches. The prospect at present is discouraging; but it may mend; if not, he must seek an asylum elsewhere."²⁰

By the beginning of August he saw that he must go away—perhaps to Nova Scotia, where "several respectable families of his Congregation" were minded to settle. Before setting out, he joined with several of his brother parsons in writing letters to Sir Guy, begging him to transmit to London one more request for bishops, one to take care of the flocks they were leaving behind in the new United States and one for those who were going out into the wilderness.²¹

To care for the former, they made request for the consecration of a fellow-loyalist, Dr. Samuel Seabury, who would be acceptable to the people of Connecticut. To care for the others, they petitioned for the appointment of Dr. Chandler, who was still in England.

¹⁷ S. P. G. Journal XXI, p. 398.

¹⁸ S. P. G. Letters. B. New York, Part I, November 26th, 1779.

¹⁹ S. P. G. Letters. B. New York, Part I, May 6th, 1782.

²⁰ S. P. G. Journal XXIII, p. 146 ff.

²¹ For the letters relating to Nova Scotia and Chandler see Nos. 80 and 105, dated March 21st and 26th, 1783, in Royal Institution American Manuscripts, Vol. XLII, pp. 73-77 and p. 79. Transcripts in the Public Archives of Canada.

Legal and diplomatic obstacles seeming to stand in the way in England, Dr. Seabury was consecrated in 1784 by the non-jurant bishops of Scotland. Only in February, 1784, was the way finally made clear for the consecration of Bishops White and Provoost for the dioceses of Pennsylvania and New York, by authority of an Act of Parliament passed in 1786.

The granting of this boon implied almost necessarily the granting of a similar one to Nova Scotia. The see was offered first to Dr. Chandler, whose state of health did not permit him to accept it. Naturally it was next offered to Inglis, who, after four years of uncertainty as to his future and of frequenting ante-chambers of ministers and prelates, was rewarded for his services and his sufferings by being consecrated at Lambeth Palace on Sunday, August 12th, in the same year, 1787. Thus ended definitively the New York period of one who, "possessed of an independent private estate, and of the best ecclesiastical preferment in North America," had had "little thought that he should be entirely stripped of the one, and compelled to abandon the other."²²

²² S. P. G. Journal XXV, p. 181 ff.