





AN
A P O L O G Y

FOR THE 512
PRESBYTERIANS OF *Scotland*

Who are HEARERS of

The Reverend .

Mr. George Whitefield,

S H E W I N G,

That their keeping Communion with him, in the Ordinances of the GOSPEL, stands justified by the *Principles and Practice* of the CHURCH of SCOTLAND from the REFORMATION to this Day, especially by the *Westminster* CONFESSION of FAITH, and *Solemn League and Covenant.*



EDINBURGH,

Printed by T. LUMISDEN and J. ROBERTSON, and sold
at their Printing-house in the *Fish-market.*

M.DCC.XLII.

TRA
A 50109A

1-1-1954

1-1-1954



A N

A P O L O G Y

FOR THE

PRESBYTERIANS of *Scotland*

Who are HEARERS of

The Reverend

Mr. George Whitefield.



THE Reflections of late thrown out against the Hearers of the Reverend Mr. *Whitefield* in general are so frequent, and there has been so much Noise raised against the Presbyterians in particular who countenance his publick Ministrations, as if, by so doing, they acted inconsistently with themselves, and virtually condemned the Practice of their worthy Forefathers, who, in the late Reigns, suffered so much for refusing to hear the Episcopal Clergy, several of whom must be allowed to have been good Men, and to have preached the *Calvinist* Doctrine as well as Mr. *Whitefield*, that we have judged it would not be unacceptable to the Publick, to have this Matter set in a true Light; and, in order to which, we propose to shew,

First, The State and Circumstances of our Church under the Episcopacy introduced upon the *Restoration*.

Secondly, The Reasons which on that Occasion induced our Forefathers, to refuse Obedience to the Law obliging them to submit to the Ministry of the then *Episcopal Incumbents*. *Thirdly*, We shall account for the different Conduct of those in our first Period of Episcopacy, from the Year 1610 to the 1636, who submitted to the then Episcopal Ministers, without any such Opposition as happened after the *Restoration*. *Fourthly*, We shall shew, that as our joining with Mr. *Whitefield* in the Ordinances of the Gospel stands justified by the Principles and Practice of our Church from the Reformation, so also by our *Westminster Confession*, and *Solemn League and Covenant*.

With respect to the *First*, As Nations, as well as Persons, deal too often in Extremes; so the *English* Nation, from a wanton lawless Liberty in Religion as well as Civil Government under the *Usurpation*, run into a far greater Height of arbitrary Government than ever, of which we in *Scotland* felt the miserable Effects. And altho' Presbytery is well consistent with a limited Monarchy, as is plain from upwards of Fifty Years Experience since the *Revolution*; yet it is too much possessed of the Principles of Liberty, to subsist with an absolute Government.

Wherefore, upon the *Restoration*, Presbytery was cashiered, to make Way for Episcopacy, and a bold Supremacy, in order to complete the most absolute Tyranny over both Church and State, that ever this Nation knew before; which will best appear from a short Recital of a few of the Acts of Parliament whereby it was introduced, and these most rigidly execute upon the most modest Opposer, and which Acts are necessary in the after Reasoning.

1720, By the first Act of Parliament 1661, the Oath of Supremacy is enacted, "Declaring the King Supreme over all Persons, and in all Causes, &c. swearing never to de- claim his Power or Jurisdiction, &c." This is called an *Oath of Allegiance*, and conceived in Terms somewhat doubtful as to the Supremacy thereby intended, and on that account refused by many; but the Ambiguity was explained to the utmost Extent of Supremacy, by the first Act of the next Session introducing Episcopacy. This

Oath

Oath was sworn by the Parliament, and then by all Persons in Trust through the Nation.

2do, By the 26th Act of the same Parliament 1661, no Minister can be presented to any Church until he swear this Oath of Supremacy.

3tio, By the first Act of Parliament 1662, Episcopacy is enacted, and with it the most absolute Supremacy imaginable, as an inherent Right of the Crown: It begins thus, "Forasmuch as the Ordering and Disposal of the external Government and Policy of the Church, doth belong to his Majesty as an inherent Right of the Crown, by virtue of his Royal Prerogative and Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiastical, &c. it is declared, That whatever shall be determined by his Majesty, with the Advice of the Archbishops and Bishops, &c. shall be valid and effectual, &c. And rescinds and annuls all Acts of Parliament, or of the Church, which may be interpreted to have given any Church Power, Jurisdiction or Government, to the Office-bearers of the Church, &c. other than that which acknowledgeth a Dependence upon the sovereign Power of the King as Supreme, &c. to be regulate, &c. by the Archbishops and Bishops, who are, &c. to be accountable to his Majesty for their Administration."

4to, By the 2d Act of this same Parliament 1662, it is declared, "That if any Person or Persons, by Writing, Printing, Praying, Preaching, or Remonstrance, express or declare any Words or Sentences, &c. to the Dislike of his Majesty's Royal Prerogative and Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiastical, or of the Government of the Church by Archbishops, Bishops, &c. such shall be liable to the Pains therein-mentioned."

5to, By the 3d Act of this same Parliament 1662, the Churches of all such Ministers as had entred since the Year 1649 are declared vacant; allowing nevertheless every such Minister to be re-admitted to these their Churches, upon their accepting a Presentation from the Patron, and Collation from the Bishop of the Diocese; and, by the Act, the Patron is obliged to present them.

6to, By the 4th Act of this same Parliament 1662, every Minister within the Church is appointed to attend the Visitations

tations of the Diocese by the Bishop or those appointed by him, as also his Diocesan Assemblies; and to assist in all Acts of Discipline, as he shall be required by the Archbishop or Bishop: And, in case of his Absence from any of these, he shall for the first Fault be suspended *ab officio & beneficio*, and for the second deposed. This Act also dischargeth all Meetings in private Houses for religious Exercises, other than by the Members of the Family.

By these Acts, every Minister within the Church was brought under the miserable Alternative, either to comply with this rigid Episcopacy he had but lately abjured, or be turned out of his Church, and discharged the Exercise of his Ministry so much as in a private Family.

From the Writings of these Times, of good Credit, we are informed of the following Particulars; That, before the *Restoration*, a Spirit of Religion and Godliness did much abound, with an outward moral Deportment suitable thereto. It was rare to meet with Families where the Worship of God was not to be found, and as rare to have heard so much as a profane Oath, or to have seen a Person drunk; which thereafter became ordinary Offences, but were then a very great Scandal. And which, under God, did proceed from the painful and successful Labours of a Multitude of zealous and faithful Ministers, who were, upon the *Restoration*, all turned out of their Churches, for no other Cause than that they would not submit to the Prelacy, which they had but lately abjured as contrary to the Word of God; and were obliged to remove from their Houses and Parishes, with their Families, they knew not where: And for preaching in Corners, and among Hills and Deserts, they were declared Rebels, and hunted from Place to Place, until they were forced to flee their native Country, and wander in foreign Parts.

Above one third Part of the Ministers of *Scotland*, and these the most eminent of them for Piety and Learning, mostly in the *South* and *West* Parts, were thus turned out of their Churches; while near the other Two thirds of them, generally through the North and Isles, did submit to Episcopacy.

The Churches thus vacated were, by the Bishops, filled with

with such as they could find. Bishop *Burnet's* Account of them is in these Words: "The new Incumbents, who were put in the Places of the ejected Preachers, were generally very mean and despicable in all Respects. They were the worst Preachers I ever heard; they were ignorant to a Reproach, and many of them were openly vitious; they were a Disgrace to their Orders, and the sacred Function, and were the Dreg and Refuse of the Northern Parts. Those of them who arose above Contempt and Scandal, were Men of such violent Tempers, that they were as much hated as the others were despised." And this his Character of them agrees with the other Accounts of those Times. Now, such having no other Title to their Churches than the Presentation of the Patron, and Collation of the Bishop, were thrust upon their Parishes.

Wherefore their Reception generally was bad: In some Places they were received with Tears and Entreaties to be gone, and in other Places with Reasons and Arguments they could not answer, and others entertained them with Affronts and Indignities too many to be repeated; while the more grave and serious mourned in secret over the miserable Exchange, and, from a Principle, could never submit to hear them or countenance their Ministry. The Effect of which was empty Churches through whole Counties of the Nation.

And as this Episcopacy, the Idol of the State, wanted now nothing to make it complete but the Submission of the Nation, from the *Reformation* averse to it, therefore, by the 2d Act of 3d Session of this first Parliament 1663, *against Separation*, it is statute as follows, "And as his Majesty doth expect from all his dutiful Subjects an Acknowledgment of, and hearty Compliance with, his Government Ecclesiastical and Civil, as now established by Law, &c. and that, in order thereunto, they will give their cheerful Concurrence, Countenance and Assistance to such Ministers as, by publick Authority, are or shall be admitted into their severall Parishes, and attend all the ordinary Meetings for divine Worship in the same; so his Majesty doth declare, that he will account a withdrawing from, and not keeping and joining in, these Meetings, to be seditious, &c. And that all and every Person, who shall

“ shall hereafter ordinarily and wilfully withdraw and absent themselves from the ordinary Meetings of divine Worship in their own Parish-church on the Lord’s Day, shall incur the Pains and Penalties under-written, *viz.* Each Nobleman, Gentleman, or Heritor, the Loss of a fourth Part of each Year’s Rent in which they shall be accused, and convicted; and every Tenant or Farmer, the Loss of such Proportion of his free Moveables (after Payment of his Master’s Rent) as his Majesty shall think fit, not exceeding a fourth Part thereof; and every Burgefs the Loss of the Liberty of Merchandising, and all other Privileges within Burgh, and a fourth Part of his Moveables.” All which Fines the Council are, by the Act, appointed to cause levy, and to inflict such other corporal Punishment as they shall think fit.

In *January* thereafter 1664, the *High Commission* Court was erected, consisting of Archbishops, Bishops, and the other Ecclesiastick and Laick Persons therein named by his Majesty; the shameful Instance of a Protestant Inquisition. To this Court the Execution of this last Act, and the whole other Laws against the Presbyterians, was committed: And the regular Troops were sent through the Country for levying these Fines, who everywhere took free Quarters, with many other Barbarities, until the Fines were paid. And, by the Repetition of these Fines, Multitudes of honest People being robbed of all their Substance, were forced to wander in Deserts, and from Place to Place, in the Want of all Things.

Many, who could not bear to be thus robbed of their Substance, complied to hear these Episcopal Incumbents, whom they called *Curates*, but despised them in their Hearts; their Practice (as our Authors say) was so unworthy of their Profession. However, several of these Curates being found in their Doctrine, and regular in their Lives, not only reconciled their Parishes to hear them, but also in Time brought them to a liking of Episcopacy itself.

And as this their refusing to hear the Curates was really the Ground-work of the many and grievous Hardships afterwards inflicted upon the Presbyterians during this Period, thro’ the Obstinacy of the Government to force Episcopacy on

on the Nation ; and which, however, could never be effectual, until the Nation was brought to submit to it, in order to complete the absolute Tyranny over both Church and State then intended : Such as did submit to hear suffered no Hardships, but were accounted the Friends of the Government, from their bare Attendance on the Ministry of these Curates ; while those, who refused to hear, were esteemed the Enemies of the Government, and prosecuted as above, merely for this simple Refusal to hear, and which was all they could now do to signify their Disapprobation of the Violence then done to both Church and State : For, at this Time, no Person durst either preach, pray, write, print, or speak against these, or any Thing else the Government was pleased to do ; as appears by the 4th Act before-recited.

And however this their refusing to hear the Curates may appear to some at this Day, to be an Article too weak and circumstantial to have founded such Suffering upon ; yet it is to their Stedfastness and Perseverance in this and some other Things, that we, at this Time, owe all the Liberty, Peace and Tranquillity we have enjoyed since the *Revolution*, as a Mean in the Hand of Providence to bring about that happy Event of our Freedom from Tyranny and arbitrary Power. Wherefore,

II. We shall give the Reasons which induced these our worthy Predecessors to suffer any Hardships, rather than submit to hear these Episcopal Incumbents, then called *Curates* by the Vulgar ; and, as we go along, shall show under each Reason, that none of them do at all concern our hearing Mr. *Whitefield*, except the Episcopacy and Supremacy, our Answer to which is reserved to the fourth and last Head.

REASON I. From the Act of Parliament last recited, the hearing of these Curates, required by that Act, was an Attendance upon all ordinary Meetings for divine Worship dispensed by them ; and that as an Evidence, not only of their *hearty Compliance with the Government Ecclesiastical and Civil as then appointed by Law* (which was the fore-said Episcopacy and Supremacy in the Church, and Tyranny in the State) but also as an Evidence of their *cheerful Con-*

currence, Countenance and Assistance to the Ministry of these Curates, as settled in their Parishes by that Authority: For the one is expressly affirmed to be in order to the other, and therefore an Evidence of it.

1st, Let it be only supposed, that the hearing of Episcopal Incumbents was in its Nature lawful, as was the Practice of Presbyterians in the Period before the Year 1638, (and in certain Cases, and upon certain Conditions, it will be made appear that it is lawful; but, at present, it is only supposed to be so) yet, as the Hearing then required by the foresaid Act is in order to shew, and as an Evidence of, their hearty Compliance with the Prelacy and Supremacy in the Church, and Tyranny in the State, then established by Law, it was impossible for any Presbyterian to give that Hearing without Sin. The Heathen Persecutors used to require the Christians to throw their Bibles into the Fire, to save themselves from it, which they refused; and then condescended that they should only throw a Bit of Paper into the Fire instead of the Bible, but this they also refused, chusing rather to be burnt themselves. The Cases are precisely parallel: For, as throwing a Piece of Paper into the Fire, and hearing the Curates (when supposed lawful) are innocent; yet, being connected with, and Evidences of, other sinful Acts as above, they are Sin: But we must suffer rather than sin.

2dly, The Hearing of these Curates, required by the Act, is an Attendance upon all the *ordinary Meetings for Divine Worship* by them dispensed; joined with a *cheerful Concurrence, Countenance and Assistance to their Ministry, as settled in their Parishes by the Authority therein-mentioned, merely Erastian.* Now, as the then Presbyterians had but lately, by the Covenants, sworn to the Doctrine and Government, &c. of their Presbyterian Church as conform to the Word of God, and on that account had abjured Popery, Prelacy, &c. because contrary thereto: Therefore, if any such believed his Principles on that Head to be conform to the Word, and his superadded Obligation from the Oath he had sworn, it was impossible for him to give Obedience to this Act, without *Sin*, and manifest *Perjury*; so that *Suffering* was much more eligible.

Now,

Now, is our hearing of Mr. *Whitefield* required of us as an hearty Approbation of, or Submission to, Episcopacy and Supremacy, or of our Submission to it in any Sort? Were that the Case, we are sure as little Countenance would have been given, even by us at this Day, to any of his Ministrations, upon such Terms, as by our worthy Predecessors at the Restoration. Nay, did Mr. *Whitefield* so much as attempt to justify his Episcopacy, by teaching us Arguments in favours of it, we believe he would have few Hearers: But, on the contrary, he appears amongst us as a Presbyterian, laying aside all that belongs to his Episcopacy, for the Pleasure he has of preaching to us Christ and him only; and hath openly declared, from the Pulpit, before the most numerous Congregations, that our Presbyterian Church (whatever were his former Sentiments) is the best constitute National Church upon Earth: And that he acknowledges no Head of the Church but Jesus and him only.

REASON II. They tell us, They could never give Obedience to the foresaid Act, by acknowledging these Curates as the lawful Ministers of the Parishes into which they had intruded themselves: For, as Presbyterians, they believe that this Church, as well as every other true Church, has a Right to introduce her own Pastors, according to the Order prescribed by God's Word; but these Curates were thrust into their Churches over the strongest Opposition of their Parishes, and without the Consent of any Judicatory, who were all then cashiered; so that they could pretend no Right to these Parishes, but the Presentation of the Patron: A shameful Bondage on the Church of Christ, introduced in the Darknes of Popery, and now unworthily re-introduced; and, at best, could only give Title to the Benefice, in the Event of a regular Vacancy, which was not the Case. And the other Part of their Right was the Collation of the Bishop, which, according to Presbyterian Principles (even the most moderate of them) could give no Right to any Parish, or found a Pastoral Relation without the Consent of the People. But especially, when the worthy Pastors were all turned out, allenary for adhering to the Work of Reformation they had sworn to, and these thrust in who had denied the same; their Submission to such, by a *cheerful Con-*

currency, &c. as the Act requires, would be a consenting to the Exclusion of the one, and the Intrusion of the other; which they could never do without Sin, but must look upon them as our Saviour teacheth, *John* x. 1,—5. as not coming in by the Door, and therefore *Thieves and Robbers*, whom they could not hear, but must flee from them, as the Text commands.

Now the Sum of all this is, that these Curates had no Right to their Parishes. But then Mr. *Whitefield* claims no Relation to any Parish in *Scotland*; nor did he condescend to come here, until he was persuaded to it by the Invitation and Subscription of a good many Christians, and at the earnest Desire of several Ministers: And, after his Arrival, preached nowhere without an Invitation from the Ministers of the Parishes, one or two Instances excepted, which happened thro' Mistake, or from Elders or People in some few vacant Congregations.

REASON III. That they ought to refuse Compliance with this Act for the Sake of the Curates themselves, who were not only immoral in their Lives, but had also corrupted their Doctrine, *2 Thess.* iii. 6,—14. *If any Man obey not the Word, note that Man, and have no Company with him, N. B. that he may be ashamed.* And *1 Cor.* v. 11. *If any Man that is called a Brother, be a Fornicator, or Covetous, or an Idolater, or a Railer, or an Extortioner, with such an one, no not to eat.* And, says our Author, such as know our Curates best will grant, that, were they impannelled, there are but few of them whom an impartial Jury would not find guilty of some one or other of these Crimes. And it is, says he, notour, that many of them, both in their Ministerial and Personal Capacities, are so scandalous, that Profaneness has gone forth through the Land, whereby they have made Men to abhor the Offering of the Lord, *1 Sam.* ii. 17. And even such as are Strangers to their personal Immoralities and Ignorance cannot but know the Scandal of Apostasy, Perjury and Breach of Covenant. And not only, say they, were the Curates thus scandalous in their Lives, but also had corrupted and perverted their Doctrine and Worship, &c. in so far as, many of them were tainted with *Arminian* and *Popish* Errors, and all of
them

them, in Preaching, taught the Lawfulness of Prelacy, and vented bitter Investives against Presbytery; and condemned the Reformation that had been attained to, the Covenants, and their Testimony for the same, as if such were no other than Sedition and Treason: And therefore they must esteem them as Blasphemers in doing so. Nay, say they, even in their very Prayers, they reproach the Work of Reformation, praying for a Blessing on the Prelates, and their sinful Councils and Courses, with several other Things which tender Consciences could not endure; and therefore they could not give Obedience to the foresaid Act without Sin, *Deut. xiii. 5,—8. Isa. ix. 16. Rom. xvi. 17. 1 Tim. vi. 3,—5.*

Now, as we know no such Immoralities in Mr. *Whitefield's* Life, so his Hearers are appealed to for the Orthodoxy of his Doctrine. And with respect to Perjury, altho' a late printed Paper does alledge that he has abjured the Solemn League and Covenant; yet he utterly refuses the Charge as false. And, with respect to Apostasy and Defection, we know no Truth of God, to the Knowledge of which he has attained, that ever he again denied, but persists therein stedfastly. If he did preach to us as the Curates appear to have done, he would soon thin his Congregation: But, on the contrary, it is his Doctrine, indefatigable Labour, Zeal, and fervent Preaching of Christ to the Souls of Men, with the blessed Effects of it, which we observe, that commends him to our Love and Esteem.

REASON IV. Say they, That no Man must give a Ground of Offence or Scandal to another, nor put a *Stumbling-block or Occasion to fall in his Brother's Way*, *Rom. xiv. 13. We must forbear some Things for Conscience Sake; I say, not our own, but of others, 1 Cor. x. 28, 29. For whosoever shall offend one of Christ's little Ones, it were better for him, &c. Mat. xviii. 6.* But their Compliance with the foresaid Act must create an Offence or Scandal; 1st, Say they, with respect to Malignants, as it may harden and encourage them in their Opposition, and all other Backsliders and Compliers with them in their Apostasy. 2^{dly}, In reference to the Godly, while such Example might induce them to the like sinful Compliance, to the after wounding of their Conscience. 3^{dly}, With respect to Posterity: For, altho'

tho' they could not transmit to Posterity what they wished, yet, say they, a standing Controversy for Zion should be kept up; for thereby Posterity shall see, at least, the Interest of Christ neither sold nor buried quick, but living tho' in a dying Condition, and thereby induce them to engage in the Quarrel.

Now, what Relation has all this to Mr. *Whitefield*? There is no Usurpation on our Church at present, as was then; and therefore no Occasion for such Testimony. So that there can be no Argument from their Case to ours.

And, in respect that some People do alledge that Offence is given by Presbyterians running after Mr. *Whitefield*; we answer, It is their Ignorance of Presbyterian Principles which makes them take such Offence, as we shall presently shew. And as their Ignorance is their Sin, so, we hope, they do not expect that we are to partake of their Sin to avoid their Offence. The Matter of Offence can only relate to such Things as are indifferent and belong to our Christian Liberty, 1 *Cor.* viii. 12, 13. When the Thing is not indifferent, then we are in the Case of Sin and Duty, by which we are determined peremptorily, without Regard to Offence being taken at what we do. Thus, because we are bound to pursue the Purposes of our Souls Salvation by all the Means that the Word of God, and our Consciences enlightned thereby, direct us to; therefore, if any of us find these valuable Purposes advanced by the Ministry of Mr. *Whitefield* (to the hearing of whom we can see no Impediment) in that Case our abstaining from such Ministry would be our Sin, which we can never submit to, for avoiding the Offence which any Man shall take at our so doing.

R E A S O N V. They endeavour to shew, that the Prelates and their Curates are guilty of Schism, and cause *Divisions*, &c. whom therefore they were called to avoid, *Rom.* xvi. 17. 1 *Cor.* xii. 25. For, say they, *1mo*, They had separated from the Presbyterian Church of *Scotland*, while they could never yet challenge any Principle or Practice thereof as contrary to the Word of God, or as not subservient to the Union and Order therein prescribed. *2do*, That they had innovate the Worship and Government of a true Church, and thereby had made a Rent in her very
Bowels.

Bowels. 3^{to}, They had divided themselves from the Fellowship of a true Church, in her Ministry, Ordinances, and Judicatures; in that they had caused the Ejection of her Ministers, the dissipating of her Judicatures, and Subversion of their pure Ordinances. 4^{to}, That they had broken Union with such to whom they were bound to adhere, both from antecedent moral Obligations, and the superadded Ties of the National Oath; while they could never as yet pretend any Cause whatever to loose them from either of these Ties. 5^{to}, The Prelates and their Curates were a Party within the Reformed Church, who had overturned the Reformation, and thrust out and persecuted the sound Adherers thereto. From all which they were plainly Schismatics, from whom they must withdraw by the fore-cited Texts, and were bound to endeavour the Extirpation of such their Schism by the Covenants.

Now, these schismatical Practices of the then Curates, was so far the reverse of Mr. *Whitefield's* Conduct, that, ever since he came amongst us, he has made it his Business to reconcile us to our God, to our Ministers, and to one another in Love; labouring incessantly, both in publick and private, for these excellent Purposes.

REASON VI. They say, That as they must keep at the greatest Distance from every Sin, into which their joining with the Curates in these Circumstances would involve them, 1 *Thess.* v. 22. *Abstaining from all Appearance of Evil:* And therefore from every Thing that Circumstances may make sinful. For suppose a Thing to be materially lawful, yet Circumstances may make it sinful: As *an Idol is nothing, and Things offered to Idols are nothing*, and yet they who eat of them, when they know them to be so circumstanced, *have Fellowship with Devils*, 1 *Cor.* x. 18, — 21. and is called *Idolatry*, *Ver. 14. and provokes the Lord to Jealousy*, *Ver. 22.* especially when an Action is so circumstanced, as that it would infer an Omission of their Duty, or a denying of their Testimony against Sin, then it is clearly sinful: For *whosoever will deny Christ before Men, &c. Mat.* x. 33. And even a small Matter becomes great, when a Testimony is concerned in it; were it but an open Window, *Daniel* must not omit it to avoid the *Lion's Den.*
And

And now their Refusal to hear the Curates was become a Case of Confession, when there was no other Way left them to exoner their Consciences before God and the World; against the then Defection from the Truth: For then there was no Access by Petition, Protestation, Remonstrance, &c. the Parliament having declared all such treasonable; and that they must of Necessity give Testimony against these evil Courses, carried on against the Word of God and solemn Engagements. There was no other Way left but this of refusing to hear these Curates, altho' suffering should be the Consequence of it.

Now, as the whole of this 6th Reason relates entirely to what was peculiar to those Times, and their then Testimony against the same, such can have no Concern with our hearing Mr. *Whitefield*: But then we observe, that this Reason was useless, unless we allow that, even on the *Restoration*, it was an Opinion that hearing an Episcopal Minister was in its Nature lawful; and severals of their then Reasonings do plainly suppose it. And in the first Period of Episcopacy, it was the Opinion, because it was the Practice, as we shall presently see, and of which we shall mention only one eminent Instance, *viz.* Of these eight worthy Ministers whom King *James* called to *London Anno 1606*, and kept them there for some Years; we find these hearing the Bishops and Deans, &c. of the Church of *England*. Now, we are sure from the Boldness of these great Men, Messieurs *Andrew* and *James Melvils*, &c. that, if they thought it a Sin in its Nature to hear Persons who held Supremacy and Episcopacy as their Principle, no Command of the King would have made them submit to it; but, on the contrary, Mr. *Calderwood* mentions no Scruple that any of them had in the Matter, but that they did it as oft as desired by the King.

REASON VII. That the Prelates had taken the Assurance to re-ordain the Presbyterian Ministers, and contrived the 5th Act (before cited) 1662 for that Purpose, to induce the unthinking Part of Mankind to believe that Ordination could only belong to them. This led some few of our Presbyterians of that Period to dispute the Validity of their Episcopal Ordination, by shewing, 1st, That the Curates had

had not the Scripture Qualifications of Ministers, 1 *Tim.* iii. 2, — 4. from the gross Disorders of their Lives, which (they say) was then notour, and from their Ignorance, &c. and therefore could have no inward Call to the Office of a Minister: For, whom God calls to that holy Office, he fits and qualifies for it, as his Word describes, by affording the Means necessary to the End. 2dly, That, as they had no inward Call to the Ministry, so (say they) from the Nullity of their Episcopal Ordination, they had not even the external Call; in which they shew the Validity of Presbyterian Ordination by following forth the Order which the Word of God prescribes, and the Nullity of Episcopal Ordination for the Neglect of that Order, and the entire Dependence it has upon a human Authority usurped upon the Church of Christ by the Magistrate; in so far as, by the 3d Act before cited introducing Prelacy, as also by the Act for the High Commission, it appears that the Bishop is, as it were, the King's Depute accountable to him, and the Curate the Bishop's Depute accountable to him. But then, for us to enter into Particulars, whereby to give any tolerable Account of this Debate, and the Arguments on both Sides, so as to satisfy an impartial Reader, would far exceed the Bounds of this Essay, especially that this Debate is continued for so many Ages thro' the Church to this Day.

However, it must be observed, 1700, That, after they have disputed the Nullity of Episcopal Ordination, they still give up the Question as to the total Nullity of their Ministry, and seem to restrict it, so as thereby to prove that they could have no Right to these their Parishes, from this bare Prelatical Ordination, and no more: For the Author of the *Hind let loose*, Page 238. at the End, after he has largely disputed this Nullity of their Ordination, he infers from thence the Nullity of their Baptism as by them performed, as indeed the one must be the unavoidable Consequence of the other: But to this he replies, *viz. The same Answers may serve here which are adduced for Popish Ordinations and Baptisms; and factum valet quod fieri non debuit, i. e. it ought not to be done, but, being once done, it is effectual and valid*: Which he could never say, if he believed the absolute Nullity of their Ordination and Baptism,

from the certain Principle in Law concerning Nullity, *viz.* *Quod nullum est, nullum in jure sortitur effectum.* And thus, when he has done, he both admits Popish and Episcopal Ordination and Baptism: But, as *Nullity* is a Law-term, so these Divines do not seem to have understood the full Import of it. And so also the Author of the *Apologetical Relation*, P. 294, 295. plainly restricts this Nullity to this, That the Curates, by such Ordination, could have no Interest, Right or Title to these their Parishes, but allows them to be Ministers. And the Author of *Naphtali*, in his fifth Reason against hearing the Curates. P. 170. follows *Apologetical Relation* in the Place above-cited. And the Case must be so: For,

2do, That whatever Arguments some few particular Members of our Church have thus occasionally used for invalidating the Episcopal Ordination, yet our Church herself did at no Time adventure, by any Church-deed whatever, to declare such Ordination null; but, on the contrary, in all the Periods of it, have acknowledged such Ordination: For, in the Year 1638, when many Ministers ordained by the Bishops were then in the Church, not one of these was ever re-ordained; and so it was also at the *Revolution*, following the Example at the 1638; and the rather, because, at the *Reformation*, many of the Popish Clergy, turning Protestant, went on in the Exercise of their Ministry without Re-ordination by this or any other of the Reforming Churches; and that because our Church still chused to respect the Scripture Qualifications of a Minister, as his Piety, Knowledge, Aptness to teach, with these other Endowments, whereby the Spirit of God, having fitted and qualified a Man for the Office, in due Time by his Providence calls him to the Exercise of it. These our Church seem to have regarded principally as the Evidences of the inward Call of God's Spirit: But the Episcopal Clergy (with us at least) laid the principal Stress on the external Form of Ordination, to the dispensing whereof they claim to themselves an uninterrupted Right of Succession, while our Church did not so much mind who were the Administrators of the external Form, provided the foresaid Evidences of the inward Call to the Office appeared in the Person:

son: For it is certain, that there have been many eminent Lights in the Christian Church, of the Popish as well as the Episcopal Ordination; and, in some Instances, our Church seem'd to neglect the external Call by Ordination more than they ought, as in the Case of Mr. *Robert Bruce*. See *Calderwood's History*, P. 423, 424.

From the whole it appears, that as the foresaid extravagant Assurance of the Episcopal Clergy of this Period, in pretending to re-ordain the Presbyterian Ministers, introduced the Dispute of the Validity of such their own Ordination, when bestow'd on some at least, who, by all the Accounts of these Times, had none of the valuable Ministerial Qualifications before-mentioned, nay, nor any other Title whatever to that holy Office, except the Shell or Husk of an external Ordination by a Prelate, then wantonly given to Men so unworthy of it; so from thence they shew, that this was really nothing, and at best could never entitle them to these Parishes, from which the true and worthy Pastors of them were forcibly cast out, and who therefore, notwithstanding that Violence, did still remain the true spiritual Pastors of these Parishes; while the Curates, altho' in Possession, were only Intruders, without any Title whatever.

And, with respect to such as had submitted to be re-ordained by the Bishops, they reason thus: That altho', by their Presbyterian Ordination regularly execute by the Call and Invitation of their Flocks by them accepted, they had been regularly admitted the lawful Pastors of their Parishes, by Fasting and Prayer, and the Imposition of Hands of the Presbytery, according to the Order of God's Word, whereby they had then an unquestionable Right to their Parishes; yet, as, by the 5th Act before cited, their Churches were declared vacant until they accepted of Re-ordination from the Bishop, such Ministers, who accepted that Condition of Re-ordination to recover the Possession of their Churches, acknowledged the Vacancy by such Acceptance, and therefore implicitly renounced their former just Title to their Parishes, having nothing left them but this Re-ordination of the Bishop, good for nothing: Wherefore, altho' they formerly had Right to their Parishes, they now have none.

REASON VIII. That, by Presbyterian Principles, all Ministers of Christ should hold their Commission from Christ, as the only King and Head of his Church; and their Office not only conveyed to them by Officers of Christ's Appointment, and conform to the Order he has prescribed, but also in a Way of Dependence and Subordination to Christ as King and Head, to whom they must account for the Ministry committed to them.

But, by the 3d forecited Act establishing Prelacy, the Bishops and their Curates were subjected to the King as Supreme; and this Supremacy thereby declared to be the "inherent Right and Prerogative of the Crown, and that there is no Power in Church-officers but what depends upon the King as Supreme; and the Bishops thereby declared accountable to him for their Administration." And, by vertue of which Supremacy, he has, by his forefaid Act for the *High Commission*, put Excommunication and Church-censures, and thereby the Power of the Keys, into the Hands of Persons merely Civil. By all which Usurpation upon the Church of Christ, the King, as the Fountain of all Church-government, did impart his Authority to such as he pleased; and the Bishops seemed to be no other than his Commissioners in the Exercise of that Ecclesiastical Power originally in himself; and the Curates only, as it were, his Under-clerks. Now, these Things were so contrary to the Principles of Presbyterians founded upon the Scriptures of Truth, that a *cheerful Submission to the Ministry of such*, and that as an Evidence of their *heartly Compliance* with this very *Supremacy*, in terms of the forefaid Act 1663, must have been a Sin, &c.

But our Answer to this Supremacy and Episcopacy shall be given under the 4th and last Head, when we shall have under the 3d Head considered the different Practice of our Church during the first Period of her Episcopacy.

REASON IX. That, by Unfaithfulness to God in his holy Covenants sworn by these Curates, they were become perjured, and Truce-breakers, 2 *Tim.* iii. 3. and from whom they were there commanded to *turn away*, ver. 5. For, by the *Solemn League*, these Curates, as well as others through
the

the Nation, were bound, 1st, To the *Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland*. 2^{dly}, In order thereunto, they stood bound to endeavour the *Extirpation of Popery, Prelacy, with all that depends upon it, Superstition, Heresy, Schifm, Profaneness, and whatever else is contrary to sound Doctrine and the Power of Godliness*. Now, these Curates, instead of following forth the Particulars of this their Oath, had not only embraced the Prelacy thereby particularly abjured, but had become the Persecutors of all those that endeavoured to adhere to that Oath. Therefore, &c.

We have already observed, that Mr. *Whitefield* never abjured our Covenants, nay, he says, that he never so much as heard of this *Solemn League* until he came to *Scotland*. But a further Consideration of the *Solemn League* comes also under the 4th and last Head.

This Abstract of the Reasons for not hearing the Curates, on the *Restoration*, is gathered from the *Apologetical Relation, the Hind let loose*, and others of that Time; in which we have sometimes cast two of them together because of their Coincidence, but have not designedly omitted any Thing that was material in them.

III. We come to account for the different Conduct of these in our first Period of Episcopacy, from 1610 to 1636, who submitted to the then *Episcopal Ministers*, without any such Opposition as happened after the *Restoration*.

That in the Year 1606, by Act 2. Parl. 18. *James VI.* the Estate of Bishops was restored; and therein the King is declared to be "sovereign Monarch, absolute Prince, Judge and Governor over all Persons, Estates and Causes, both Spiritual and Temporal, within the Realm." The Supremacy had been enacted before this, as by 1st Act, Parl. 8. *Anno 1584.*

And in 1610, by the 1st Act, Parl. 21. *James VI.* after further Ratification of the Estate of Bishops, it is among other Things enacted, That every Minister, at his Admission, shall swear Obedience to his Majesty, and to the Bishop of his Diocese, there called his *Ordinary*, according to the Form following; "I *A. B.* now nominated and ad-
mitted

“mitted to the Kirk of *D.* do testify and declare, in my
 “Conscience, That King *James VI.* King of *Scotland, &c.*
 “is the only lawful supreme Governor of this Realm, as
 “well in Matters Spiritual and Ecclesiastical, as in Things
 “Temporal, &c. And further, I acknowledge and confes
 “to have and hold the said Church, and Possession of the
 “same, under God, of his Majesty and his Crown Royal
 “of this Realm; and, for the said Possession, I do Homage
 “presently to his Highness, in your Presence, &c. So
 “help me God!” And also it is hereby enacted, That e-
 very Minister shall, at his Admission, swear Obedience to
 his Bishop (there called his *Ordinary*) in the Form follow-
 ing; “*I A. B.* now admitted to the Kirk of *C.* promise and
 “I swear to *E. F.* Bishop of that Diocese, Obedience, and to
 “his Successors, in all lawful Things. So help me God!”

And by this same Act it is statuted, That every Minister,
 who shall absent from the Visitation of the Diocese by the
 Bishop, or from the Diocesan Assembly, he shall for the
 first Fault be suspended from his Office and Benefice; and,
 if he amend not, he shall be deposed. As also, the 114th
 Act of Parliament 1592, establishing Presbytery, is repeal-
 ed by this Act.

By the Acts above cited it appears, that Episcopacy was
 fully established in this Period.

The Apologies offered by our Authors, after the *Restora-
 tion*, for this same Diversity of Practice of the first Period,
 by their hearing the Episcopal Incumbents, while those of
 the second Period refused it as above, are, from the *Apolo-
 getical Relation*, and the *Hind let loose*, as follow;

1st, “That those of the foresaid first Period bore Testi-
 “mony against those sinful Innovations, by Protestation, Re-
 “monstrance, &c. against them.” As to which, we ob-
 serve, That such Testimony was then given by some zealous
 and worthy Ministers of that Period, who suffered for it.

2dly, “That they had General Assemblies, and were still
 “in Hopes of recovering them for Redress of their Grie-
 “vances; and therefore submitted to their Episcopal In-
 “cumbents in the mean Time.” As to which we observe,
 That, as there were no Assemblies during the first Period
 of Twenty six Years Episcopacy, but what were declared
 corrupt

corrupt and null upon the 1638; so, during the Reign of King *James VI.* they had as little Reason to expect Redress, as during the Reign of King *Charles II.* seeing the one thirsted as much after absolute Government in Church and State as the other. And these their Expectations could be no Argument for a sinful Compliance in the mean Time; but we believe they thought it no Sin, otherwise they would never have complied.

3dly, "They say, It is a bad Consequence, that they in that Generation should go backward, because their Forefathers, in the first Period of Episcopacy, could not advance forward." As to which we observe, that, the Question being about refusing to hear Episcopal Incumbents, this could have been refused in the first Period as well as in the second; and with much more Safety, because there was then no Law commanding to hear under Pains and Penalties, as was in the second Period: So that they were at Liberty to have refused, but continued to hear notwithstanding. From which we must allow, that either they judged it their Duty to do so; or that they continued to hear against their Light and Conscience, which it is absurd to admit.

4thly, They say, "That the Church, at or near the Reformation, may do many Things which cannot be done when she is fully reformed; seeing, in the one Case, she is but coming from Darkness to Light; and, in the other, she must not part with the Light and Reformation she has attained to: For the one is as the Twilight, and the other as the Sun-shine;" with a great deal more to this Purpose. Which amounts in whole to this, That Wrongs in a Person or Church are more or less such, according to the Degrees of Light they are possessed of at the Time they commit such Wrongs.

Now, this Argument is most certainly true: But then it will apply much more favourably to Mr. *Whitefield*, born and bred up within the present Darkness of the Church of *England*, who, with respect to his Situation and Means of Knowledge, must have been as much prejudged in favours of Episcopacy as any Papist could be in the Errors of Popery, and therefore more excuseable than even those of our first Period of Episcopacy, where the People were generally bred

up

up with an Opinion that Episcopacy was a Corruption in God's House ; and, by their then Protestations and Remonstrances against it, shew much more Knowledge of the Error of Episcopacy, than it was possible for Mr. *Whitefield* to know, being educate in the Belief of it as a Truth. And, considering the Situation of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, by *Arminianism* and other Errors, he must have been in as great Darknests as to some of the most valuable Doctrines of the Gospel : With respect to which he is now, by the Blessing of God, brought into a State of Light and Conversion, and that attended (as we are bound to believe) with a Disposition ready to renounce every Error, and embrace every Truth, so soon as he is able to discover them ; which is the true and very Disposition of a converted Mind : Therefore he ought to be embraced by every Christian, conform to Presbyterian Principles, as we shall shew.

But as these Apologies, made by the Writers on the *Restoration*, appear to be too weak and insufficient for the Justification of this first Period, and that they do not exhaust what we learn from the Histories of these Times, we shall add as follows ;

Imo, That altho' Episcopacy was always, as it must be, by every Presbyterian held as an Error, and is truly a very great Incroachment on the Christian Church, against which we find several worthy Ministers, in this first Period of Episcopacy, petitioning, protesting and remonstrating ; yet we hear nothing of the People refusing to hear the Episcopal Ministers of that Period ; altho' Episcopacy and Supremacy were then fully established by Law, and submitted to through the Nation ; and altho' they were still Presbyterian in their Principle, as appears from their zealously throwing off Episcopacy in the Year 1638, yet they submitted to their Ministers, tho' then subjected to the Bishops and the King's Supremacy in the absolute Manner already mentioned. The Remonstrance made against it in this Period was only by some worthy Ministers, a few of whom were banished, and others confined, while the rest submitted.

Again, in the second Period of Episcopacy, after the *Restoration*, the refusing to hear the Curates was from the Necessity laid upon them by the foresaid Act of that Period, where-

whereby the hearing there required was a Test of their inward and hearty Approbation of the *Supremacy*, and a cheerful Compliance with the Episcopacy then introduced, as appears from their first Reason before mentioned: A Thing never required of the People during the first Period; for, if it had, it would have been refused. Wherefore, in the first Period, they heard and continued Presbyterian still; but, in the second Period, they could not do so, but, by their hearing, renounced Presbytery, and became Episcopal, *presumptione juris*: For the Law did enact the Presumption upon them, and accordingly this is the true Reason for their not hearing. From which it appears, that it was never accounted unlawful, in this Church, to hear a Minister, merely because he was Episcopal, without other Reasons joined; altho' we still held and do hold Episcopacy to be an Error, and do as firmly believe as ever that the Presbyterian Church-government, as now established in *Scotland*, is the only Form of Church-government we know that is agreeable to the Word of God.

2do, That, in this first Period of Episcopacy, there was no Intrusion; the Ministers then, tho' ordained by the Bishops, being regularly called or submitted to by their respective Flocks. But it was quite the reverse after the *Restoration*, the Curates being then thrust upon their Parishes, besides the Exclusion of the worthy and regular Pastors of these Parishes, which was a principal Cause of their refusing to hear the Intruded.

3tio, That the Incumbents, in the foresaid first Period, had not abjured Episcopacy, as those in the second had done, but a few Years before their Submission to it, which was another Reason for refusing to hear them, as was observed. But this Objection of Perjury could not be made against Ministers by the Hearers of the first Period.

4to, That, upon the *Restoration*, this refusing to hear the Curates was the only Testimony left them of that Period against the Supremacy, Episcopacy and Perjury then introduced; seeing Petitioning, Protesting and Remonstrance, were then utterly discharged, as by the Act before cited. But, in this first Period, there was no such Inhibition laid upon them; but they continued petitioning, protesting, &c. And

therefore, as long as they could exercise their Testimony in this Way, they judged Hearing and Submission their Duty.

510, We find, from the great and worthy Men about that Time, Mr. *Andrew Melvil*, Mr. *John Davidson* at *Salt-Prestoun*, &c. that as the Doctrine of the Reformed Church was the great Thing to be attended to, so the Discipline was looked upon as the Hedge for Preservation of it. Thus Mr. *Davidson*, in his Letter to the Assembly 1597, fearing the Mischief then attempted upon the Discipline, says, "That the Unity in the sincere Doctrine is this Day the Rose-garland of the Kirk of *Scotland*; and that the Preservation of this Unity in the Doctrine came from the Agreement in the Liberty of the Execution of the Discipline, which (*N. B.*) hath been the Hedge and Bulwark, as it were, of the Doctrine." And as this was the Opinion of those Times, therefore, in this first Period, they thought it wrong to throw away the Doctrine merely because it had lost its Hedge, to their great Grief; especially that they had other Ways of executing their Testimony against the Incroachments made on the Discipline, than by throwing up the Doctrine too; or that, because they could not have both, they would have neither. And which was not the Case upon the *Restoration*, when they had neither Doctrine nor Discipline left them, as we have heard; and had no other Way left to bear a Testimony against the Incroachments made on the Discipline, but by withdrawing from hearing in their publick Assemblies.

610, That, in this second Period of Episcopacy, the great Complaint against the then Curates was the Errors in their Doctrine, as well as the Immoralities of their Lives, as before set forth; which is a concluding Objection against any Man's Ministry, of whatever Denomination. But, in the first Period, they had no such Objection, and were then nearer the Times of our Reformation, when the inward Call to the Ministry was principally attended to, by the Evidences of a Man's Piety, Knowledge, Aptness to teach, &c. whereby the Spirit of God, having fitted and qualified a Person for the Office, in due Time calls him to the Exercise of it by his Providence: Which was the Case of several of our first Reformers, particularly Mr. *Robert Bruce* and
Mr.

Mr. *James Balfour*, Anno 1598, who had exercised their Ministry, for a Course of Years, without any external Ordination; insomuch that Mr. *Calderwood* says, on this Occasion, "That the external Ordination, by Imposition of Hands, was held as a Ceremony unnecessary and indifferent in our Kirk, until that, now they are laying the Foundation of Episcopacy, it is urged as necessary." This was the Opinion of that Time. And tho' we do not approve of it, yet as this Debate about Ordination was when they were laying the Foundation of Episcopacy, and but a very few Years before the full Establishment of it by Law, it must have influenced the Conduct on that Occasion: So that if they were satisfied about their Minister's having the inward Call to the Ministry as above, and that the external Ordination was but a Ceremony and indifferent, it must be equally indifferent by whom it was given, whether by Bishop or Presbyters; because that, whether given or not, or by whom given, is all one, as to a Thing indifferent. Wherefore, altho' Episcopacy was always looked upon as a Wrong in this Church, yet Episcopal Ordination, being once given, was accounted valid.

IV. We come to shew that, as our joining with Mr. *Whitefield*, in the Ordinances of the Gospel, stands justified by the Principles and Practice of our Church from the Reformation, thro' the different Periods of it, so also by our *Westminster Confession of Faith*, and *Solemn League and Covenant*.

Now, as it appears, by the above Passage from Mr. *Calderwood*, that, from the Reformation to the first Period of our Episcopacy Anno 1606 and 1610, it was accounted indifferent by whom the external Form of Ordination was given; so, during the first Period of our Episcopacy, they accepted Ordination from the Prelates, as they had done before from Presbyters: And their People notwithstanding continued in Submission to them as their lawful Pastors, yet still remonstrating against that *Prelacy* and *Supremacy* then introduced, as an Inroad on the Church of Christ; but, upon the *Restoration*, they refused such Submission to the Curates, because they had no other Way left them for a Testimony

against the then Usurpations, but by refusing to hear as we have shewed. And in respect that the *Supremacy* and *Episcopacy* are the only two Particulars, within the whole of the Reasons before-mentioned, that can concern Mr. *Whitefield*, we shall further observe,

1720, That, in the Reign of *Henry VIII.* the *English* Bishops, disposed to the *Reformation*, endeavoured to prove from Scripture, that the King was supreme Head of the Church, and not the Pope of *Rome*; which they did by shewing what *David* and the other good Kings of *Judah* had done, by disposing of the Priests in their Courses, and reforming the Temple-service, &c. Whatever was in their Reasoning, yet it prevailed so far with that King, as to induce his Revolt from the *Romish* See, and to do many Things which brought on the Reformation of that Church. It was quite otherwise in *Scotland*, where our *Reformers* struggled against all such Attempts to Supremacy by King *James VI.* (as fond of it as *Henry VIII.* could be): Therefore so soon as he got upon the Throne of *England*, where he found Supremacy and Episcopacy, these favourite Engines of arbitrary Power, to be the very Principles of that Church deliberately professed from their Reformation, as above; he then resolved to force it upon *Scotland* also, as he did by the Acts above-mentioned, and by Confinement and Banishment of such worthy Ministers as opposed it.

So that Supremacy and Episcopacy having been maintained as tenaciously in *England* from their *Reformation* to this Day, as Freedom from it has been struggled for in *Scotland* from Age to Age since our *Reformation*, it follows, that Supremacy and Episcopacy, however bad in themselves, must be far more tolerable in the *English* Clergy than they could ever be in the *Scots*; as the Opinions of Forefathers, long Custom, and the Prejudice of Education, are strong Biasses upon their Minds, which we in *Scotland* never felt: Nay, so strong are these, that they are the best Account that the most Part of the World of Mankind can make of their very Principles.

If Mr. *Whitefield*, being in this Situation, did take an Oath of Supremacy, at his Ordination, it is evident that this can be no Argument against joining with him at present,

seeing,

seeing, upon considering the Matter more fully, he now openly declares, as before hinted, his Belief of the Headship of Christ over his Church, and his Abhorrence of every Principle in the least inconsistent therewith.

2do, We must beg leave here to notice what was formerly observed, That seeing *Supremacy* and *Episcopacy* were fully established both on the *Restoration*, and also in our first Period of *Episcopacy*, and that, in both Periods, each Minister was, at his Admission, obliged to swear the Oath of *Supremacy*; in the first Period they submitted to the Ministry of such notwithstanding; in the second they refused, because it was then become a Sin against their Knowledge, and an Apostasy from the Reformation they had attained to; whereas in the first Period they were not so fully informed concerning the Evil of these Things, and, being nearer the Times of our first Reformation, they were but coming from Darknes to Light, &c. Which as it is the very Apology that they upon the *Restoration* make for this different Practice of the first Period, as we have heard; so it exactly suits Mr. *Whitefield's* Case, bred up in greater Darknes of his Church than ever was in ours as to these Points.

From whence we conclude, That as our hearing of Mr. *Whitefield* stands justified by the Practice of our first Period of *Episcopacy*, as also by the foresaid Apology of these on the *Restoration*; therefore, our Practice being justified by the Practice of the first and Judgment of the second Period, it follows, that, if the *Presbyterians* of both these Periods were in Life, they would hear and embrace Mr. *Whitefield's* Ministry just as we do, and to doing of which (as we shall presently shew) they stand bound by the Principles of our *Confession of Faith, and Solemn League and Covenant*.

And yet at the same Time we are perswaded, that neither the *Presbyterians* of our first Period, nor any *Presbyterian* at this Day, would have submitted to hear these Curates on the *Restoration*, for the very first Reason before given, altho' there had been no other, because they could not give Obedience to the foresaid Act of Parliament until they became really *Episcopal* in their Judgment: For, if they continued *Presbyterian*, they became guilty of the grossest *Disimulation* imaginable, by Obedience to that Act;

not

not to mention the other Reasons before recited, which are by themselves taken together relevant to infer a Refusal to hear these Curates, and to admit of the hearing of Mr. *Whitefield* at the same Time.

3tio, That as it pleased God, from the blackest of Popish Darkness, at the *Reformation* to enlighten some great Men eminently as to the Doctrine, and yet to allow them to die unenlightned as to the Prelacy of that Romish Church, as in many Instances in foreign Parts, and in *England* particularly, where these great Bishops, *Ridley*, *Lattimer* and *Cranmer*, were honoured to make so glorious an Appearance for the *Doctrine*, and for their stedfast Adherence thereto were burnt at a Stake, with Multitudes of others at that Time, giving Glory to God and the Testimony of Jesus in the Midst of Flames; and yet it pleased God to allow them to die unenlightned as to the *Supremacy* and *Episcopacy*, which was then and is still in that Church: We say, why might not the same God, from amidst the present Darkness of that same Church, enlighten a Man as to the Doctrine; and send him to preach it, eminently supported, and followed with remarkable Success; and yet in the same Manner allow him to die unenlightned as to the *Supremacy* and *Episcopacy*? But the Reader will observe, that there is no Need of this Supposition to support our present Argument, since Mr. *Whitefield* by no means adheres to the *Supremacy* in its Consequences.

And now, we come to justify this Conduct of our Church from the *Solemn League and Covenant*, and our *Westminster Confession*. And, with respect to the *Solemn League*, altho' we ourselves could not swear that Oath, unless it was altered in several Respects, nor can we approve of the Methods then taken to oblige Persons to swear it; yet we do not incline to enter into any Dispute about these or the Oath itself, as it was the Deed of our worthy Predecessors, who are not here to answer for themselves, and who we believe entred into it in the Simplicity and Sincerity of their Hearts. But then we cannot help noticing the Reflections of a late Author, who, 1st, treats it so contemptibly as to call it a *mischievous State-tool* of certain Persons, &c. We answer, That, as we hinted before, that the *Reformation* of *England* was brought
on

on by the Pride and Ambition of *Henry VIII.* so, at our Reformation in *Scotland*, the Possessions of our Popish Clergy, being the one Half of the Nation, betwixt their Tiends and Temporalities, were given away to the Nobility and Gentry, and erected into temporal Lordships and Baronies; whereby that valuable Event was greatly forwarded by the covetous Views of a Multitude of Persons enriched thereby. Now, will it follow that these great and valuable Events both in *England* and *Scotland* were bad Things, because the Designs of those, who perhaps were principally concerned in bringing them about, were thus evil?

2dly, He excepts against the Expression, That *they shall endeavour the Extirpation of Popery, Prelacy, &c.* This is generally exclaimed against, and should never be justified by us, if it was not for the Sense which our Predecessors appear to have had of it when they swore that Oath, as we have it in their Paper called *An Exhortation to the taking the Solemn League, &c.* (See our Collection of Confessions, printed 1725, Page 104th at the Top.) in Paragraph 4th concerning the Extirpation of Prelacy, they assert thus, *Nor is any Man hereby bound to offer any Violence to their Persons, i. e. of Prelates, but only in his Place and Calling to endeavour their Extirpation in a lawful Way.* Now, as this Exhortation and Declaration was drawn up by the *Assembly at Westminster*, and approved by the Parliament of *England*, and by them ordered to be read in every *Parish-church* before the swearing of the Covenant; so we have thereby the whole Authority which authorised and appointed the Covenant, declaring that this was the Sense of it, and in which Sense they themselves had by this Time sworn it, and therefore do now give it out to the Nation to be sworn in this Sense, and in no other. Nor was it possible it could have any other Sense in *Scotland*, seeing it would be monstrous that the Oath should have two Senses, one in *Scotland* and another in *England*; especially that, as our Commissioners from *Scotland* were present at the *Westminster Assembly* when such is declared to be the Sense of it, so they had been also present at every Conference, both in *Scotland* and *England*, concerning the *Covenant*, and thereby must know what was meant and intended by every Expression in it. Therefore of Necessity

cessity this must be the Sense in which both Nations took it.

From thence it is evident, that, by their *endeavouring the Extirpation of Prelacy*, they meant, *1mo*, No Hurt or Violence to the Person of any Man, not even of the Prelates themselves. *2do*, That their Endeavours must be in a *Way* that was *lawful*, i. e. first by the Laws of God, and then by the Laws of the Land; which comprehends all these Scripture Means whereby we ought to reclaim our Brother from an Error, as by Exhortation, Reproof, Perswasion, &c. or by hindering or preventing his Practice or Execution of any Part of his Prelatical Usurpation on the Church of Christ, as the Laws of the Land did permit or prescribe. *3tio*, That, in doing of all this, no Man must exceed his *Calling* and Station.

Now, as this was all they meant, we can see no just Exception that can arise from the Sound of a Word; *nam verba valent usu*. Indeed if that Oath was to be sworn at this Day, that Word behoved to be altered, because it would not now imply the Sense in which they then conceived it as above: But at present we are only concerned with their Sense of it.

3tio, He says, "That these Covenants were not binding on any other Persons than those who signed them; and, if his Father's Subscription to these could bind him, he might by the same Rule bind him to be a *Makometan*." This is a common Objection, but of no greater Weight than the other: For the Father's Oath to be a *Makometan* could neither bind Father nor Son; because no Oath can bind any Man, far less his Posterity, to sin against God. But, if the Gentleman shews any particular Thing to be sinful in our Covenants, we shall then acknowledge that neither he nor we are bound to that Particular; and, if he can go through the whole of the Covenants in that Way, we shall then acknowledge that we have no more to do with them: But, till then, we must beg his Excuse, and to be allowed to state the Case of our Covenants in our own Way, as follows:

That the Effect of an Oath, with respect to Matters indifferent and belonging to our natural Liberty, is, that such by our Oath cease to be indifferent, and we become bound peremptorily in the Terms of our Oath. But, with respect

to Matters of Sin and Duty, our Oath can only be a super-added Ty, to pursue the Duty and avoid the Sin; but without Possibility of making any Alteration in these from what they were before the Oath, because established by a higher Authority than any Oath we can make.

That these our Covenants (binding us to certain Duties, and to avoid and reform certain Errors and Corruptions, as therein declared) being sworn nationally, bind our Nation so long as it is the same Nation, in the same Manner that a Man's Oath binds him so long as he is the same Man; conform to that grand Instance of it decided by God himself, in the Case of the *Gibeonites*, *Joshua ix. 3,—27.* & *2 Sam. xxi. 1,—15.* where *Joshua* and the People of *Israel* having sworn to preserve the *Gibeonites*, 400 Years thereafter *Saul* attempted their Destruction, for which God plagued *Israel* with three Years Famine, until Satisfaction was made to the *Gibeonites*.

Now, we say, that even when our Covenants are considered as Civil Contracts betwixt one Nation and another, or nationally by one Nation to each other amongst themselves; such cannot be dissolved but by the Consent of the Parties-contracters: But, when the Oath of God is interposed, then God becomes a Party invocate, because of his Oath. Nor is it at all sufficient for that Gentleman to say, "That altho' our Solemn League was execute through the Nation by the then publick Authority of the Nation, yet it was afterwards dissolved by the same publick Authority." For tho' such might dissolve it as it was a Civil Contract, yet it could never dissolve the Oath of God adhibite to it, because superior to our highest national Authority; and from which we can never get free, but by shewing that the Subject-matter is sinful. But to return, let it be observed, that,

170, Chap. 26. of our *Westminster* Confession, Parag. 2. asserts, *That Saints by Profession are bound to maintain an holy Fellowship and Communion in the Worship of God, and in performing such other spiritual Services as tend to their mutual Edification, &c. Which Communion, as God offereth Opportunity, is to be extended to all those who in every Place call on the Name of the Lord Jesus.*

2do, That the great Design of our Predecessors by this

Solemn League was to bind themselves, and these Nations, to the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government of our Presbyterian Church, which they did by the first Clause of that Oath; and, as a Consequence thereof, they, by the second Clause, bound themselves to a Reformation from every Thing that is contrary to the *sound Doctrine* they had secured by the first Clause, and therefore became bound to *endeavour the Extirpation of Popery, Prelacy, Heresy, Schism, &c.* as contrary to this *sound Doctrine*, whereby this second Clause, and haill other Clauses, are really as a Guard to the punctual Performance of the first.

310, Where is or can be the *Doctrine* of our Presbyterian Church thus sworn to in the *Solemn League*, if it is not in the *Westminster Confession*, which, by these who had sworn that Oath in their Act of *Assembly* ratifying the said *Confession*, 27th August 1647, is declared to be the *chiefest Part of that Uniformity in Religion, which by the Solemn League we are bound to, &c.* and, after full Examination, is there also declared to be *most agreeable to the Word of God*, and, N. B. *in nothing contrary to the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government of this Kirk*; and therefore ever since, from Time to Time, subscribed by the several Members of this Church, as the very Standard and Test of her Doctrine, and ingrossed in our Acts of Parliament as such? So that we stand bound to the Doctrine of the fore-cited Article of our *Confession*, by this first Clause of our *Solemn League*: And therefore our *endeavouring to extirpate Prelacy, Heresy, &c.* conform to the second Clause of that Oath, must be consistent with the *Doctrine* of the foresaid Article of our *Confession*; because our Oath can never contain what is inconsistent, for such would for ever disannul the Obligation of it.

40, That as, by the foresaid Article of our *Confession*, *we must keep Communion in the Worship of God, with all those who in every Place call on the Name of the Lord Jesus*, and to the punctual Performance of which we are bound by the Oath of God in this first Clause of our *Solemn League*; it follows, that our *Endeavours to extirpate Prelacy, &c.* cannot be by refusing *Communion* with such in the *Worship of God*, but it must be by all the other *lawful Means*

Means before-mentioned, conform to the Law of God, and the Laws of the Land, to *endeavour the Extirpation of Prelacy*, as it is an Error, and Ineroachment on the Church of Christ: But still our Endeavours to reform that *Error*, must be consistent with the *Doctrine* which in the same Oath we have sworn to maintain.

5to, That as we are bound by the foresaid Article of our *Confession of Faith*, and the Oath of our *Covenant*, thus to *keep Communion in the Worship of God, with all those who in every Place call on the Name of the Lord Jesus*; this can never be restricted to those of our own Church: For it is *all those who in every Place, &c.* whereby *Episcopals* or *Independents*, whether Ministers or Laicks, whether of this or of any other Nation, cannot be excluded from our Communion. So that as soon as we are satisfied concerning the *Reality* of a Person's *Christianity*, altho' we should differ from him in some Points, yet, provided these Points are consistent with the *Truth* and *Reality* of his *Christianity*, we are bound to keep *Communion* with him, as above: But if these Points, wherein we differ, are inconsistent with the *Truth* of his *Christianity*, we have nothing to do with such Person; because this *Communion* is, by the Article, the *Communion of Saints*.

6to, As it is thus evident, that we cannot submit to any *Error* in *Doctrine*, which is destructive of the Person's *Christianity* with whom we hold this *Communion*; so as little can we submit to any *Idolatry* in our *Worship*, or to any other *sinful Term* of this *Communion*: But then, so soon as any Person that is *Episcopal*, or of any other Denomination whom we admit to be *real Christians*, laying aside whatever we except against as unlawful in their *Worship*, shall submit to such Manner of *Worship* against which we can make no Exception; we then become bound, by this Article of our *Confession*, and by the Oath of our *Covenant*, to hold *Communion* with such Person in the *Worship of God*, and in every other *spiritual Service or Exercise* tending to our mutual *Edification*, as expressed in the foresaid Article.

We hope by this Time it is evident, that altho' Mr. *Whitefield* has been excepted against as being too extensive in his *Charity*, and on that account called *law*, and of *late*

itudinarian Principles; yet, from any Thing he has said, he cannot well be more extensive in his Charity, or *latitudinarian* in his *Communion*, than our Church is, in the forefaid Article of our *Confession*, to which we are bound by the Oath of God in our *Solemn League*.

And now, from the whole of what is past, it appears, that, of the many Reasons for refusing to hear the Curates on the Restoration, none of them concern Mr. *Whitefield*, except the *Supremacy* and *Episcopacy*: And altho' these are insert amongst the foregoing Reasons, and largely insisted on, as they are an Usurpation on the Church of Christ; yet it was especially because these Curates had so lately abjured *Episcopacy* and *Supremacy*, and thereafter submitted to both notwithstanding; whereby they were become wilfully perjured, and Apostates from the Reformation they had attained: So that it was *Episcopacy* and *Supremacy* as complicated with several other and greater Crimes, which made them refuse to hear, on the *Restoration*. But, when separate from these other Crimes, we find Supremacy and Episcopacy no sufficient Ground to refuse a Man's Ministry otherwise unexceptionable, as was the Case of the first Period of *Episcopacy*, for the Reasons before given; especially that their Ministry was always allowed to be valid by this Church from the *Reformation* to this Day: For, if it had not, they must have been re-ordained; but Re-ordination was never heard of in our Church, except by the Prelates in the Case before-mentioned. And when the Validity of their Ministry was disputed by some particular Members of this Church, it was for a particular Purpose only, and the Question always given up as to their being Ministers still; and, if Ministers, surely Ministers of Christ, provided they are otherwise worthy of that Office; and that because our Church still founded upon the Evidence of an *inward Call*, as before described, with an Indifference by whom the external Ordination was performed. And that this must necessarily have been the Principle of our Church, appears unavoidably from the Case of the Assembly 1638: For if Episcopal Ordination was not good and valid, then our whole Reformation upon the 1638 must be null, because *a non habente potestatem*, as being performed by Persons ordained by Prelates in
the

the preceding Period. So that, before we could give Validity to our then Reformation, we would be obliged to prove that, at least, the far greater Part, if not the whole; of the Assembly 1738 were ordained by Presbyters, while the contrary is true; insomuch, that it would be impossible to prove, that a third, or even a fourth Part, or any considerable Number of them, were ordained by Presbyters. Wherefore it must be allowed, as it always was by this Church from the *Reformation* to this Day, that Persons Episcopally ordained are Ministers of Christ, provided they are otherwise worthy of that Office.

And as this was the Principle and Practice of our Church, so they formed our *Confession of Faith* accordingly, as we have seen from the fore-cited Article thereof; from which, and consequently from our *Covenant*, we have made appear evidently our Obligation to keep Communion with such in the Worship of God, on the Terms and Conditions before-mentioned. And as this was the Principle of our Church from and since the Time of our fore-said *Confession* and *Solemn League*, so, when this our *Westminster Confession* was approved by Act of Assembly, our Church therein declared, that it was, N. B. *in nothing contrary to the received Doctrine, &c. of this Church*, as well as, N. B. *most agreeable to the Word of God*: And therefore this must have been our Principle from the Reformation to that Time, which we are sure was true, because it was their Practice, the best Evidence of every honest Man's Principles; and which Practice could be yet further made appear in many Instances, if needful. Wherefore we conclude, that this was the Principle of our Church from the Reformation to this Day.

And because we can have no more from any Church under Heaven, than her Principle and Practice in that Behalf; we shall therefore conclude by observing, that this Principle and Practice of our Church is conform to the Scripture, and the very Spirit of the Gospel therein. From which it appears, that, so soon as we are satisfied of the *Truth* and *Reality* of each others *Christianity*, we ought to hold *Communion* in the *Worship of God* together, so far as we are agreed; or in the Apostle's Words, *Whereto we have already attained*, we ought to *walk by the same Rule*, and *mind*
the

the same Things, waiting until God reveal that unto us wherein we, or any of us, are unenlightned or *otherwise minded*, Phil. iii, 15, 16. The Scriptures allow and authorize an Interruption of this Communion in certain Cases;

1mo, By the Texts following: 1 Cor. v. 11. *If any Man that is called a Brother be a Fornicator, or Covetous, or an Idolater, or a Railer, or a Drunkard, or an Extortioner, with such an one no not to eat.* And, 2 Thess. iii. 6, — 14. *Now we command you, &c. that you withdraw from every Brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the Tradition which he received of us.* Ver. 11. *For there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, &c.* Ver. 12. *Such we command and exhort, &c. that with Quietness they work, and eat their own Bread.* Ver. 14. *Note that Man, and have no Company with him, that he may be ashamed.* Now, as all these Sins enumerate in the first Text, together with the Sin of Idleness mentioned in the second, are all Immoralities which are obviously such, even by the Light of Nature without the Help of Revelation, so they are all Sins against *Light and Knowledge*; or if we take in the Expression, ver. 6. *Contrary to the Tradition which he received of us*, to comprehend other Sins; yet these, being contrary to what a Person *has once received*, must still be against his *Knowledge*: So that the whole Sins here mentioned, being committed or persisted in against *Light and Knowledge*, they are quite different from the Communion we plead for, which is only in the Case of a Person's being *unenlightned*, or, in his Enquiries and Searches after Truth, happens to *differ* from us in this or that Point nowise *inconsistent* with his *Christianity*.

It is in vain to say, that if we may *withdraw* from a Person on account of the Immoralities before-mentioned, much more ought we to *withdraw* on other Accounts of more Importance to the Church of Christ; for still these, whatever they are, must be in the Circumstances of these Texts, by being Sins against *Light and Knowledge*, before we can by the Warrant of these Texts *withdraw* from such.

Therefore it follows, that where a Person is *unenlightned*, or, in his Searches and Enquiry after Truth, happens to *differ* from us in some Points not *inconsistent* with his *Christianity*, we are within the Case of the fore-cited Text, *Phil. iii.*

15, 16. bound to hold *Communion* with him so far as we are agreed, or *whereunto we have already attained*, &c. But in the Case of a Person guilty of the *Immoralities* before-mentioned, or otherwise sinning *wilfully* against his *Light*, we are by the Texts last above cited bound to *withdraw* from such, *that he may be ashamed*; and, if he persists in such *wilful sinning*, he becomes the Object of Church *Censure*, even to *Excommunication*.

2do, Another Interruption of this Communion which the Scripture enjoins, is, when by *spiritual Tyranny*, *Imposition* and *Persecution*, the Truth is corrupted, and our Christian Liberty destroyed, as in the Times of our *Forefathers*; then indeed it is, in a more special Manner, necessary *that we should contend earnestly for the Faith*, and even in the least Things *stand fast in the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free*, without suffering *ourselves to be again intangled with the Yoke of Bondage*, Jude 3. Gal. v. 1. But when we are not in such a Case, as blessed be God we are not at present, then the former Rule from *Phil. iii. 15, 16.* ought to take Place amongst visible Saints, as it did in the Beginning of Christianity, *Acts iv. 22. Where the Multitude of them that believed were of one Heart and of one Soul.* N. B. It is not said, of one Mind, Judgment or Opinion in all Things, which we can never expect to be while in this imperfect State, not even amongst those who are the most closely connected together, even by Partiship itself, or otherwise.

And when, notwithstanding all these Differences in lesser Matters, which are not *inconsistent* with our *Christianity*, we shall, by the Blessing of God, be brought to a regular Execution of this Article of our *Confession* and the Scriptures before cited, then, and not till then, shall that Part of our blessed Lord's intercessory Prayer have its Accomplishment, *John xvii. 21. That they all may be One, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be One in us: That the World may believe that thou hast sent me.* Ver. 23. *I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in One, and that the World may know that thou hast sent me.* Where our blessed Lord puts the Evidence of his Mission upon this very Unity of his Members in him, and amongst themselves. *Amen.*

... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...

... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...

... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...

... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...



